

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

APRIL, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

THE PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

1. *Theopneusty, or the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* By S. R. L. GAUSSEN, Prof. of Theology in Geneva, Switzerland. Translated by EDWARD NORRIS KIRK: Fourth American, from the second French edition, enlarged and improved by the author. New York: John S. Taylor, 143 Nassau-st. 1850.
2. Chapter vi. *Philosophy of Religion.* By J. D. MORELL, A. M., author of the *History of Modern Philosophy, etc.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1849.

In an article on the United States, in the October number of the Edinburgh Review, a writer to whom our country appears to contain only New England and an *outside-barbarian* territory, among many anti-slavery and some rationalistic utterances, well and truly says, that "*the question which lies at the root of all dogmatic Theology is the AUTHORITY OF THE LETTER OF SCRIPTURE.*" And there are many indications of the interest which that question is exciting on both sides of the Atlantic. The appearance of the fourth American from the second French edition of Gausсен's work, is one of these indications. Another is, that even the literary Reviews of the day are discussing it. The Edinburgh devotes to it some paragraphs in the article above named.

The last Westminster also, in a disquisition on Septenary Institutions, which affects to be learned, but is simply pedantic,—a mere jackdaw decked out with a peacock's tail,—declares that “the early books of the Old Testament abound with misapprehensions of the meaning of Ancient Astronomical and Chronological emblems,” and with “imaginative interpretations and misrenderings of hieroglyphical records;”—that the Pentateuch is a “miscellaneous collection of fragmentary records,” a “compilation of old documents interspersed with narrations founded on oral traditions;” that “the story of the Serpent reads like one of the numerous myths which arose out of the zodiacal emblems;” that “the story of Joshua, and the sun and moon, is one of the whimsical mistakes in the progress of the change from the pictorial hieroglyphic to the phonetic mode of writing;” and that, in fact, “Christ himself denied the infallibility of the Jewish Scriptures,” and was nailed to the cross in great part on account of this “infidelity,” as it was considered by the “zealots” of that as well as of this period! Such are the sentiments of the Westminster,—the *spirit* of it appears in the following extract, which we quote just to remind the reader how truthfully Robert Hall delineated the *ferocity* of modern infidelity :

“The days of sanguinary codes have gone by. Opinion is in favour of the total abolition of the penalty of death, excepting for murder, which we call the greatest of all crimes. But the crime of depriving a fellow-creature of life, is not the offence of greatest magnitude of which any human being can be guilty.—If capital punishments be allowable for that, then would death without mercy—the death of the Mosaic law, death by stoning—be the appropriate penalty, not of Sabbath breaking, but of trafficking in superstition,—trading in man's weakness, and with his loftiest aspirations,—converting his instincts of awe and reverence for the wonderful and admirable, into abject terrors; his most sacred emotions of grief, his solemn moments of parting on the confines of eternity, his very hopes of immortality, into implements of a craft, a source of income, a miserable instrument of popularity and power; and the object attained, endeavouring to perpetuate it, by proclaiming the infallibility of creeds and canons, persecuting those who question it as infidels to God, resisting the extension of knowledge among the masses, or rendering it exclusive and nominal, and thus seeking to crush the human

mind under the wheels of the modern Juggernaut of conventional idolatry."

The Christian Ministry maintaining the obligation of the Sabbath and the infallibility of God's word, are here described as guiltier than murderers; hanging is too good for them; they ought to be stoned to death!

We turn to the Edinburgh Reviewer, who talks of the disingenuous timidity of "our religious teachers." He says, "The clergy of almost all sects are afraid of it," (that is, of the question of the authority due to the letter of Scripture,) "and the students of nature intent only upon facts which God has revealed to our senses, have to fight their way against the self-same religious prejudice which consigned Galileo to his dungeon." Geology, however, he thinks, has vanquished "the opening verses of Genesis," and "the text, it is now admitted, is not conclusive against physical demonstration." "Is it conclusive (he asks) against moral induction and metaphysical enquiry? Let a layman put that question, and an awful silence is the least forbidding answer he will receive." We beg our friends, the Philosophers, to give up this cry of our hostility to enquiry and research. It is only wasting time and distracting the attention of enquirers. Let us have, instead, their strongest arguments; and these charges, already so often repeated, will, if just, demonstrate themselves in our replies. If they find one Protestant Minister of any sect lispng a word against free enquiry, we will help the Philosophers in quoting his words to his disgrace. We are as willing, to say the least, as our adversaries can be, to observe the rule which is quoted by this Reviewer from the farewell charge of the Puritan Pastor Robinson, to his people at Leyden, before they set sail in the *May Flower*: "be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written word of God." "That is, indeed, (as the Reviewer says) a rule for all times," and we doubt not "it will outlive all the systems in the world," excepting that very one which itself confirms and supports. It is for our opponents an unfortunate allusion which the Reviewer makes to this rule. That is a rule as good *for all men* as it is good "for all times;" and we commend it to the Reviewer and his party. If they admit the text to be God's *written word*, we ask them

how can that text be otherwise than conclusive against mere "moral induction and metaphysical enquiry." The Bible either is or is not infallibly true. If it be not, let us scout it as a fraud and fable, not to be believed at all because it has set up these false claims. But if, on the contrary, the Bible be infallibly true, then it must be conclusive against all opposing morals, and all opposing metaphysics.

The infidelity of the eighteenth century was bold enough to take the consistent position of rejecting, with ribald scorn and furious hate, the claims of Scripture.— But, as has been well said, "The undying instincts of virtue, the unceasing voices of conscience, and the inevitable needs of human life, in all its passages of sadness and sin, arose in constant and unanswerable protest against this grinning and ghastly mockery of that which meets all the demands of the human soul." And, therefore, infidelity now takes this new and less repulsive form. It admits that Christianity is no imposture, but "a true life," "a genuine manifestation of the religious spirit," and that the Bible is God's inspired word. But then, Christianity, profoundly thankful for these compliments, must let all her claims not weigh one feather against those of the youngest sister in the circle of the sciences. And the Bible must be a thing of wax to be shaped at will by any Philosopher, or school of Philosophers, who may have, by "metaphysical enquiry or moral induction," established a new theory. And the "student of nature," as soon as he discovers new facts, *from which he draws conclusions* subversive of the authority of Scripture, must have not only his facts, but also his conclusions, too, received and accepted, or else he becomes another persecuted Galileo! In the name of Science, we protest against this profane abuse of her name and influence! Let these noisy votaries of hers go forward in their investigations! But let them be careful how they overthrow her kingdom by setting science against herself! The elucidation and arrangement of the Evidences of Christianity have employed much of her time and strength. She has demonstrated the Scriptures to be the revealed word of God, by arguments which never have been successfully withstood.— She has proved, on testimony which human reason cannot

but receive, that Jesus Christ and His Apostles were witnesses sent from God. Having done this, she has accomplished a grand and noble task, and the results of it should meet with neither open nor covert hostility from any true lover of Science. Having accomplished this work, Science has no more to do with the *authority* of Scripture, but only with its *interpretation*. She resigns her first position and Faith steps in, seats herself at the feet of Jesus, and meekly learns of Him and His inspired servants. Then it becomes accordant with the *strictest philosophy* and the *purest science* to receive any doctrine as *proved*, for which there can be found in Scripture, a "Thus saith the Lord." The immortal rule of Robinson then prevails; and then, if seeming contradictions arise between these old and any new elaborations of Science, every son of hers eschews all proud and rash haste, and takes full time to examine and compare. Truth always must and always will be harmonious.

We have said, the admission that Christianity is true and the Bible inspired, accompanied by the subjugation of Scripture to any inferences of Geologists or any theories of Philosophers, moral or metaphysical, is but a new form of infidelity. We do not charge that *the men* who adopt these loose views of inspiration, are all infidels; but we do affirm that their *theories*, fairly carried out, can stop nowhere short of infidelity. For the Scriptures *claim to be inspired* as to their very words, and to deny this one claim of the Bible, is to falsify it entirely; while any attempt to *explain away* this claim, so often and so distinctly made, is to demoralize our very faith! Accordingly, any observer can perceive that among those who receive these loose views of inspiration, there are to be found all kinds of unbelievers. The theory is so loose, that even Deists of every grade may receive it. They can easily admit that the writers of the Bible, some of them always, and all of them sometimes, were inspired, just in the same sense as Homer and Shakspeare; and it will cost them little to acknowledge further, that the inspiration of the Scriptures was *in a higher degree* than that of either Homer or Shakspeare, or of any other men that ever lived. It suits the temper of our times and the present relations of unbelief and Christianity to make these admissions. The bitterest ene-

my of every peculiar truth in the Christian scheme may make them, for, making them all, he yields just nothing, being still at liberty to except to any statement of these inspired men which does not quadrate with his opinions. Let the eloquent pen of the ready writer advocating these new views of inspiration, discourse therefore, ever so charmingly about the "intuitional consciousness" of the sacred writers being "supernaturally elevated to an extraordinary power and susceptibility;"* let it describe in the most musical strains "their inward nature" as being "so perfectly harmonized to the Divine; so freed from the distorting influences of prejudice, passion and sin; so simply recipient of the Divine ideas, circumambient around it; so responsive in all its strings to the breath of Heaven, that truth leaves an impress upon it, which answers perfectly to its objective reality;" he has, in all this, we conceive, made no acknowledgment of essential truth on the subject of inspiration. And when he proceeds, still in the same eloquent strain, to say that the New Testament Scriptures were written "to retain *so far as possible* the bright impressions of Apostolic men, after they should have passed away to their eternal rest," we are forced to set down all his acknowledgments of the *inspired Writers* as just so many denials of the *inspired Writings*.

We have in this last sentence indicated the two schools, into which, doubtless, may be divided all opinions at this day on the question of inspiration. And the two writers whose names stand at the head of this article may be regarded as champions of these respective schools.

M. Gaussen is Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Institution of Geneva, Switzerland. His work, of course, presents to the English reader of it the inevitable defects of a translation. The Rev. E. N. Kirk, who has given it the dress it wears among us, is doubtless an accomplished French scholar, and has executed his task with faithfulness and ability. Still the book shews much of that stiffness, that abruptness, that unnaturalness in air and gait and manner, which always marks the stranger in a strange land. In this respect the work of Morell has the greatest possible advantage. Its author is not only an

* Morell, page 149.

Englishman of disciplined and powerful mind, but he writes in an enchanting style. His thoughts, both in this and his preceding work, "The History of Philosophy," flow out in an unbroken stream of beautiful and clear expressions. The very title of Gausson's work gives it an *outré* appearance. It is called *Theopneusty*, and the author himself, in his preface, expresses some dread lest this title, though derived from the Greek terms for *Inspiration of God*, and itself for a long time used by the Germans, should occasion in some minds a prejudice against the book, as too scientific to be popular, and too little popular to be useful. But we take on us to promise every reader of Gausson both the highest profit and the highest pleasure, if he will but open Mr. Kirk's translation with the expectation that he is about to converse with a vivacious Frenchman, or rather that he is about to hear one lecture very eloquently and ably in our language.

Gausson does not write for the disciples of Porphyry, Voltaire or Rousseau. He judges, as we do, that the question of *Plenary Inspiration* properly belongs only to believers in the truth of Christianity. He would doubtless fully agree with Coleridge that an inquirer, especially a sceptical one, should not be met with the dogma that the whole Bible is infallible. There is a preliminary question, and if that be settled against the Scriptures, there is no room at all for this one about the nature and extent of inspiration. For if the Bible be false, what need is there to prove that the very words, as well as the thoughts, originated with man and not with God. If the Apostles and Prophets were deceivers, who cares whether their claim to inspiration extended to the form, as well as the substance of their writings? The only reasonable and philosophical course would then be, to throw away the whole production as worthless and wicked.

Again, Gausson treats the question of Plenary Inspiration as being purely a question of Revelation—that is, not that reason does not support Revelation in favour of it, but that as believers in the Bible are alone prepared to examine it, so the testimony of the Bible alone can ever decide it. It is admitted on all hands, that there are some doctrines of Christianity which human reason never could have discovered, and which therefore never could have been known

but from the Bible. For example, the doctrine of the Trinity;—whether we believe it or not, we all admit, *Theologians of every school admit*, that it is purely a question of Revelation, because it respects a point, about which we do not naturally know any thing. So, whatever be the opinions on other points, held by any man who calls himself a Christian, only the Bible can decide his belief respecting Plenary Inspiration. For from the very nature of the case, we cannot reason *a priori* on such a question. How could we tell, before having *satisfactory testimony* on the subject, that a given book was or was not dictated by the Divine Being? And what testimony could be satisfactory on the subject, short of the witness of God himself? For who could know, except God should miraculously make it known, that He had granted such dictation to a writer? Admitting, then, as do all professed Christians, that the Apostles and Prophets were the true and miraculously accredited messengers of God, if they have not told us that God dictated the very words of their writings, how can we ever expect to be certified that He did so? And if, on the contrary, they, being the true and miraculously accredited messengers of God, have said that their writings are the very words of God, then how dare we deny or doubt it?

The stand-point, then, from which Gausson views the subject of Inspiration, is this: The first teachers of Christianity assert that their writings are plenary inspired, without explaining the mode by which the Spirit of God influenced their minds, and without distinguishing in what parts, if any, He influenced them more, and in what part less directly and positively. Being satisfied with the irrefragable proofs which demonstrate that these men came from God, he believes implicitly what they declare about the inspiration of their writings, without presuming to explain any more than they explain it. His single object then is to enquire, and he does it after a truly philosophic method, whether those who receive the Bible as a true book, are not bound to receive it as also an inspired book; and whether, receiving it as an inspired book, they are not bound to receive it as also a book plenary inspired,—that is, as being absolutely the very word of God from beginning to end.

But in saying that the Bible is God's word, our author *does not exclude man from the authorship of it, in a certain sense.*

“Every word of the Bible (he remarks) is as really from man as it is from God. In a certain sense, the Epistle to the Romans is entirely a letter from Paul; and in a still higher sense, the Epistle to the Romans is entirely a letter from God. Pascal might have dictated one of his provincial letters to a mechanic of Clermont, and another to the Abbess of Port Royal. Would the first have been any less Pascalian than the other? Surely not. The great Newton, when he desired to transmit his wonderful discoveries to the world, might have procured some child in Cambridge to write the fortieth, and some servant of his college to write the forty-first proposition of his immortal Principia, whilst he dictated the other pages to Barrow and Gregory. Should we thence have possessed, in any less degree, the discoveries of his genius and the mathematical reasonings which were to exhibit all the movements of the universe under the same law? Would the entire work have been any less Newton's? Surely not. Perhaps, at the same time, some man of leisure might have felt some interest in ascertaining the emotions of these two great men, or the simple thought of that child, or the honest prejudices of that servant, while their four pens, alike docile, were tracing the Latin sentences which were dictated to them. You may have been told that the two last, even when writing, were roving in their imaginations in the gardens of the city, or in the court yards of Trinity College; whilst the two professors, entering with lively transports into all the thoughts of their friend, and soaring in his sublime flight, like the eaglets upon their mother's back, were plunging with him into the higher regions of science, borne along and aloft upon his powerful wings, and sailing enchanted in the new and boundless space which he had opened to them. Yet, you may have been told that, among the lines thus dictated, there are some which neither the child nor even the professors were able to comprehend. What do I care for these details, you would have replied. I will not spend my time upon them; it is the book, Newton's book I want to study. Its preface, its title, its first line, its last line, all its theorems, easy or difficult, understood or not understood, are from the same author; and that is sufficient for me. Whoever the writers may have been, and at whatever different elevations their thoughts may have ranged, their faithful and superintended hands traced alike the thoughts of their master upon the same paper; and I can there always study, with an equal confidence, in the very words of his

genius, the mathematical principles of Newton's Philosophy. Such is the fact of Theopneusty; the divine power, in causing the Holy Scriptures to be written by inspired men, has almost uniformly put in operation their understandings, their wills, their memories and all their individualities, as we shall presently shew.

"It is thus that God, who would make known to his elect, in an eternal book, the spiritual principles of the divine philosophy, has dictated its pages, during sixteen centuries, to priests, kings, warriors, shepherds, tax-gatherers, fishermen, scribes and tent makers. Its first line, its last line, all its instructions, understood or not understood, are from the same author; and that is sufficient for us. Whoever the writers may have been, and whatever their circumstances, their impressions, or their understanding of the book; they have all written with a faithful, superintended hand, on the same scroll, under the dictation of the same master, to whom a thousand years are as one day; such is the origin of the Bible. I will not waste my time in vain questions; I will study the book. It is the word of Moses, the word of Amos, the word of John, the word of Paul; but it is the mind of God and the word of God." (Theopneusty, pp. 39-41.)

The comparison made by Gaussen, in this extract, of the sacred writers to four supposed amanuenses of Newton, of course does not apply in all points. No illustration ever does. It is obvious to object to this illustration, that whereas Barrow and Gregory, and the child and servant, above supposed, would all write in one and the same Latin style—that is, in the one style of Newton; on the contrary, each one of the sacred writers has impressed his own individuality on his own particular productions. Now, so far from denying this fact, Gaussen declares that, it is with profound gratitude, with ever increasing admiration, he regards "this living, real, dramatic, human character, infused so powerfully and so charmingly into every part of the book of God. Yes, here it is, the phraseology, the stamp, the accent of a Moses; there of a St. John; here of an Isaiah; there of an Amos; here of a Daniel or St. Peter; there of a Nehemiah; there of a St. Paul," (page 53.) "We perceive that the composition of each book has depended greatly, both for its matter and its form, upon the peculiar circumstances and turn of its author. Their memory has full play, their imaginations are exercised, their affections are drawn out, all their being is employed, and their moral physiognomy is clearly portrayed in their

writings," (page 50.) But "what bearing (he asks) has the absence or the presence of the writer's affections on the fact of Theopneusty? Cannot God alike employ them or dispense with them? He who could make a statue speak, can he not make even an infant speak as he pleases?" (page 54.) He demands of those who say that any given passage is in the style of Moses, or of Luke, of Ezekiel, or of John, and therefore cannot be in that of God, if they would undertake to tell us what is the peculiar style of God, and what the precise accent of the Holy Ghost? (p. 55.) He reminds the objector how the sovereign action of God, in no one field of its exercise, excludes the employment of second causes. In the field of creation he gives us plants by the combined employment of all the elements; in the field of Providence, he combines millions of human wills alternately intelligent and submissive, or ignorant and rebellious. It is just so in the field of prophecy, and even in that of miracles—the Red Sea is divided by Moses' rod, the blind man's sight is restored by clay. And in the field of redemption, too, he converts a soul by the truth. Why, then, should it not be so also in the field of revelation? "Why, when he sends his word, should he not place it in the understanding, in the heart, and in the life of his servants, as he puts it upon their lips? Why should he not associate their personality with that which they reveal to us? Why should not their sentiments, their history, their experiences, make part of their Theopneusty?" (p. 57.)

We refer to one more of the various answers of our author to this objection, because whatever some may think of it, we find it exceedingly delightful. He takes the ground that this human personality, to be found in the Scriptures, so far from being a stain, impresses a divine beauty on the sacred page.

"Admirable word of my God! it has been made human in its way, like the Eternal Word! It is divine, but full of humanity. It is God who thus speaks to us, but it is also man; it is man, but it is also God." (p. 66.)

"With what a powerful charm the Scriptures, by this abundance of humanity, and by all this personality which clothes their divinity, remind us that the Lord of our souls, whose touching voice they are, himself bears a human heart upon the throne of

God, although seated in the highest places, where the Angels can serve and adore him! By this, too, they present to us not only this double character of variety and unity which at once so embellishes and distinguishes all the other works of God, as Creator of the heavens and the earth, but also that union of familiarity and authority, of sympathy and grandeur, of practical detail and mysterious majesty, of humanity and divinity, which we recognize in all the dispensations of the same God, as the Redeemer and Shepherd of his Church." (p. 67.)

"Domestic scenes, avowals of the conscience, secret effusions of prayer, travels, proverbs, revelations of the depths of the heart, the holy career of a child of God, weaknesses unveiled, falls, revivings, intimate experiences, parables, familiar letters, theological treatises, sacred commentaries on some ancient Scripture, national chronicles, military pageants, political censuses, descriptions of God, portraits of Angels, celestial visions, practical counsels, rules of life, solutions of cases of conscience, judgments of the Lord, sacred songs, predictions of the future, accounts of the days which preceded our creation, sublime odes, inimitable poetry; all this is found in turn, and all this is there exposed to our view, in a variety full of charm, and in a whole, whose majesty is captivating as that of a temple.

"It is thus the Bible must, from its first page to its last, associate, with its majestic unity, the indefinable charm of an instruction, human, familiar, sympathizing, personal, and with a drama of forty centuries." (page 70.)

"But mark, at the same time, the peculiar unity, and the numberless and profound harmonies in this immense variety! Under all these forms it is always the same truth; always man lost, and God the Saviour; always the first Adam, with his race leaving Eden and losing life, and the second Adam, with his people re-entering Paradise, and finding again the tree of life; always the same appeal, in a thousand tones, 'Oh heart of man, return to thy God; for thy God pardons. Thou art in the abyss; come up from it; a Saviour has descended into it—he gives holiness and life!'" (p. 71.)

In this manner Gausson readily accounts for that free and unaffected individuality of manner which characterizes all parts of the Bible, and distinguishes the production of every individual writer. Thus also, he wipes out, as with a sponge, all the vain and dangerous speculations which many have indulged respecting the different degrees of inspiration belonging to different parts of the Bible. Some things, stated by every writer, may indeed have

been within the knowledge of his own mind, without the Spirit's express dictation, as some other things stated by every writer, were certainly beyond their own knowledge. Even as it said the prophets did not understand their own prophecies ; (1 Peter 1, xi.) but it concerns us not at all to discover or point out any of these differences, for the Bible does not point them out. The witnesses sent from God, on this subject, equally include all the Scriptures, and all parts of the Scriptures, under the one category of God inspired.

Another qualification of the statement that the whole Bible is God's word, which Gaussen and all other advocates of the doctrine of plenary inspiration unite in making, is this obvious one: that *not every word in the book is according to the mind of God, or is approved by God.* The Bible presents us with many sayings of wicked men, and even of the Devil ; of course these are not God's words, but they are recorded by the inspiration of God. So, too, of the many improper expressions and sinful actions of good men, recorded by the spirit of God.

Another obviously necessary qualification of the doctrine before us, is, that when we say the Scriptures are divinely inspired throughout, *we do not speak of translations or copies, but of the original writings.* For the Almighty to direct the pens of the sacred writers is one thing, and it is quite another for him to guide, infallibly, the pens of all in every age who may copy or translate or quote the Bible. It requires very little reflection, as Haldane observes, to perceive how pernicious would be such a continued miraculous interference on God's part.

The degree of correctness, however, which characterizes the existing Scriptures of the old and new Testaments, translated and copied from the beginning till now, as no other writings ever were or ever will be, is absolutely amazing. The very men who used to say of what use is a primitive text, dictated by God, if the present MSS. of that text present 150,000 variations, have acknowledged that they can no longer urge this objection against the text on the ground of the absolute insignificance of these variations. "Michaelis remarks that they have ceased to hope any thing from these critical researches, at first earnestly recommended by them, because they expected dis-

coveries which no one has made," (Tome ii, p. 266.) The learned rationalist, Eichorn, himself, also acknowledges (Einleitung 2 Th. S. 700,) that the different readings of the Hebrew MSS. collected by Dr. Kennicott, offer scarcely sufficient compensation for the labor they cost," (p. 88). The most Herculean labors undergone during the last half of the last century, by Mill, Bengel, Wettstein, Griesbach, and others, in the diligent collation of all the MSS., and the equally diligent and laborious continuations of these investigations by Nolan, Matthei, Lawrence, Hug, and Scholz, have established this result: that of the 7,459 verses of the New Testament, there are scarcely *ten verses* where the existing differences (chiefly in *letters*) have the least importance.

As the learned Bentley said, in his *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*: "the real text is competently exact indeed, even in the worst MSS. now extant, nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them, chuse as awkwardly as you can, chuse by design the worst out of the whole lump of readings." (Phil. Lip. pp. 68, 69.)

While therefore the Plenary Inspiration of every chapter, verse and word of the Bible is asserted, the advocates of this doctrine do not assert *the exclusion of man from the writing of any one verse of Scripture*; they do not assert *the truth or goodness of all the sentiments expressed in Scripture*; they do not assert *the immaculate purity of any copy or the infallible accuracy of any translation of scripture*. And moreover, they do not, in discussing this question, undertake to prove *the inspiration of the writers of Scripture*. Whether *the men* were, or were not always inspired, is a different question; that before us concerns only *the books*. The conduct of the Apostles, the thoughts and feelings of the Apostles or Prophets, may have been chargeable with error; but their written words, contained in the Old and New Testaments, are the words of God.

Such is the old, the primitive doctrine of Plenary Inspiration. It is a doctrine denied in the early Christian times only by the Gnostics, the Manicheans, and the Anomians; in the fifth century by Theodore, of Mopsuesta, himself condemned by the fifth general council as a Pelagian; and in the seventh century, by the Arabian impostor. Mr. Morrell's astounding statement that the early Christians did

not receive this doctrine, is just one of those blunders which the best scholars will sometimes allow themselves to make. He brings to us, on the other hand, a theory which the modern Germans have but reproduced from the Rabbins of the 13th century. Gaussen (p. 334) quoting from Rudelbach, says that Maimonides taught that "prophecy is not the exclusive product of the action of the Holy Spirit; but that just as when the *intellectus agens* (the intellectual influence in man) associates itself more intimately with the *reason*, it gives birth to the *secta sapientum speculatorum*; and just, as when it operates on the *imagination*, there arises from this the *secta politicorum legislatorum, divinatorum, and præstigatorum*;" so likewise, when this superior principle exerts its influence in a more perfect manner, and at once on these two faculties of the soul, it produces the *secta prophetarum*. These, it will be acknowledged, are very much like some of the positions of Morell. It was the Hebrew Spanish Doctor who also taught our modern philosophers to distinguish several degrees of inspiration. "Maimonides sometimes numbered eight, sometimes eleven. Joseph Albo reduced them to four, and Abarbanel to three." In this manner inspiration is allowed by one phase of the modern theory to the evidently moral and religious parts of the Scripture, but is denied to everything in the Bible which may appear to concern only scientific or historical truth. As if it comported with the glory of the Almighty that He should produce (to use Bp. Van Mildert's expression) "a motley composition of divers colors, half human, half divine!" Or as if it comported with the wisdom or goodness of God so to mix up fallible elements with his word as to destroy all binding power in it over any rational creature's belief, and thus to make it of no practical value whatever. With equal *unreasonableness*, another phase of the rationalistic theory, in modern times, seeks to improve on the old doctrine, by distinguishing between the thoughts and the words of Scripture, admitting the first, and denying the second to be inspired. God always gave the thoughts, say the advocates of this explanation but not always the words. The Scripture, however, tells us God gave the words always, but not always the thoughts. The sacred writers may have sometimes had the thoughts themselves, without any direct and

immediate communication from God ; as, for example, on *common subjects* ; or sometimes they may not have had them at all ; as for example, when the Prophets spoke *what they themselves understood, not*. But as to the words, they were always given, says the Bible : " All the scripture or writing (which of course is made up of words and letters,) is given by inspiration of God." And yet the Rationalists object that they cannot conceive how the Holy Spirit could have dictated the very words of men who wrote in such different styles. As if it were any easier to explain how he could have furnished so many different minds their varying thoughts and conceptions of the same truth. Or, as if it were not evident that, for the just expression of any given sentiments, a proper selection of words is of the utmost importance. Or, as if it were in the power of man ever to think long without the aid of language. As if the effort to form any train or combination of ideas, without at least a mental employment of words, must not soon convince any man that thought, without words, is, for us, necessarily indistinct and confused.

" Many of the essential signs of truth," therefore (as Mr. Kirk remarks in his preface to the first edition of Gaussen,) distinguish the old and primitive doctrine from this confused rabbinical theory, " vascillating," as it does, " in a misty indefiniteness between an inspiration of the men and of their writings ;" of their thoughts and of their words ; of their declarations on one and on another class of subjects. The old doctrine is " simple ; it is precise ; it comes directly to the book as an existence, as a thing, and says of it, this is inspired, all inspired, all equally so, all infallible."

But it will be asked, how does this agree with one of the qualifications of the doctrine stated by yourselves above ? How does it accord with your not asserting the immaculate purity of any copy, or the infallible accuracy of any translation of the Scriptures ? We think it very easy to find a satisfactory reply. As for errors of copyists, enough has been said above, and we need not repeat. But as to the fallibility of translators, we can readily admit it ; for the admission affects, not in the least, the foundations of our faith. Is not the divine text of the original always

at hand, by which any errors of translators may be corrected? After two centuries, can we not correct King James' translation; after three centuries, that of Luther; after fourteen centuries, that of Jerome? And whosoever cannot himself read the original, may always find some impartial scholar to translate it for him. And he may thus multiply translations until there shall not remain any doubt that he comprehends the original as surely as if he were a Hebrew or a Greek; because every new translation would diminish his uncertainty until it should vanish completely. To use, with some alterations, a beautiful illustration of Gaussen, on page 78, if a Calcutta boy, early brought to this country, and having quite forgot his native Bengalee, should receive a letter by some Eastern messenger from his dying father, full of communications of the utmost importance to him, and all of it either written down by his father's own hand, or else dictated word for word by him, would it seem to that youth a point of no importance whether this letter were or were not his father's, simply because he must get it translated to him? Repeated and independent translations would soon make him infallibly acquainted with the contents of the letter; and if he were only certain that it was really the *production in full* of his father's mind, he could soon be certified of being in complete possession of his father's dying wishes. But instead of a fallible translation of an infallible original, take the supposition of our adversaries—an original not infallible! The sacred writer had given to him only thoughts, not words; and he has sometimes expressed these thoughts incorrectly! Where, in that case, are to be found any means of correcting his errors? None such exist. The error is not reparable by length of time, or carefulness of comparison, or depth of research. Ours then becomes the case of a Hindoo boy not possessing, as before supposed, a letter, certainly his father's very words, but a letter in the words of a stranger, merely narrating, and that perhaps very incorrectly, what the dying father said. If this be indeed a true representation of the inspiration of the Bible, then, instead of having our doubts of the translation shut up in a narrow field, and that a field ever narrowing still more as new translations are made, or varying copies collated, "where shall we stop (a Gaussen demands) in our suppo-

sition of errors?" And we may well adopt his answer: "I do not know." The Apostles were ignorant, I must say; they were unlettered; they were Jews; they had popular prejudices; they Judaized; they Platonized; * * * I know not where to stop. I should begin with Locke, and I should finish with Strauss. I should first deny the personality of Satan, as a rabbinical prejudice, and I should finish by denying that of Christ, as another prejudice. Between these two terms, in consequence of the ignorance to which the Apostles were exposed, I should come, like so many others, to admit, notwithstanding the letter of the Bible, and with the Bible in my hand, that there is no corruption in man, no personality in the Holy Spirit, no deity in Jesus Christ, no expiation in his blood, no resurrection of the body, no eternal punishment, no wrath of God, no Devil, no miracles, no damned, no hell.

Accordingly Gausson believes, and so do we, that it is infidelity to say that errors of Philosophy or History have been or can be pointed out in the Bible. Gausson regards the Bible, and so do we, as *one book*, the whole of which must be relinquished, if a falsehood of any kind can be proved against any part of it, as originally delivered. So far from regarding Christianity as not depending on the gospels—the new theory on this subject—our author regards it, and so do we, as depending even on the books of Moses, the oldest in the volume. We say (and this, notwithstanding Morell's declaration that the old doctrine has been generally abandoned, is the prevalent Christian opinion both in this country and Great Britain,) that if the Pentateuch really did utter one philosophical or one historical untruth, then the whole volume of inspiration must be rejected. It is nothing but an insult to the majesty of the God-inspired word, to say that its errors in philosophy do not affect its claims to infallibility in morals, because *it was not intended to teach the former*. With all its high and lofty pretensions, the Bible cannot be sustained by any such excuses. How long would the Bible be admitted by these very parties as any authority whatever even in morals, were this excuse of theirs, for its errors in other departments, once admitted? And would those who make this excuse for the Bible, take the same kindly (as Carson well asks) if made for themselves? Would they like it if,

in a court of justice, the lawyer on whose side their testimony had been given, should, while urging their evidence as credible on one point, still admit that they had uttered, on oath, many falsehoods, but offer as an excuse that these falsehoods had no relation whatever to the subject then before the Court?

Having made these explanatory and qualifying observations on the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration, we will proceed, without further delay, to substantiate what we have just said respecting the high and holy pretensions of the Bible—pretensions which, in our judgment, leave no middle ground between the Christian doctrine of Plenary Inspiration and absolute Infidelity.

We point our readers, then, to that declaration of the Apostle Paul, in 2 Tim. iii. 16. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." The Greek is *pasa graphe*—*all the writing*, or *every writing*. What does he refer to? Consult the context. He reminds Timothy, in the 15th verse, how from a child he had known the Scriptures—in Greek *ta iera grammata*—*the holy letters or writings*. The Scriptures here referred to were, of course, the Jewish Scriptures, the very same books which we now possess in our Hebrew Bibles, and which every Jew knew, and could enumerate by their names; and the Apostle evidently declares that these well-known books are not only inspired, but that *all the writing* in them is so, and the *very letters sacred and holy*.

This plain testimony of the Apostle it is sought to get rid of, by nibbling at the text. But we might allow the proposed emendation, and the text would still, by plain implication, teach what now it positively asserts. Our opponents would have Paul say, "All scripture given by inspiration is profitable," &c. Now, as it is admitted, the writings referred to in the 15th and in the 16th verses are the same books, the only difference we can perceive between the old text and this new and amended text is, that the old *asserts* and the new *assumes* all Scripture to be by inspiration of God. Our adversaries are welcome to the difference. We believe any thing Paul assumes to be true, as readily as any thing he asserts to be true.

Who was Paul? It is historically demonstrable that he had been a learned despiser and cruel persecutor of the

Christians; that he was converted by the miraculous appearance of Christ to him; and that he suffered even unto death for the testimony which he afterwards bore. Having listened, then, to what this very reliable witness said of the Plenary Inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, we will now hear him respecting that of his own writings. Let the reader bear in mind that this Paul is a witness whose veracity is not questionable—we have agreed to believe whatever he declares—we are arguing with professed believers and not unbelievers in the truthfulness of the Apostles.

Paul then speaks respecting his own inspiration, after this manner: "If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." (1 Cor. xiv. 37.) "Which things also we speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." (1 Cor. ii. 13.) "He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who also hath given unto us his Holy Spirit." (1 Thess. iv. 8.) "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." (1 Thess. ii. 13.)

Hear next what the Apostle Peter says, respecting the Old Testament prophets: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into." (1 Peter, i. 10—12.)

The Inspiration of these prophets, according to this Apostle, extended so strictly to their very words, that sometimes they did not even know themselves precisely what the spirit of Christ in them did signify, and accordingly, with pious zeal, they searched into his meaning, as we are commanded now to search into it.

Hear another testimony from the Apostle Peter: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i. 20, 21.)

Here notice —

1. This passage refers to *written* revelations—prophecy of the *Scripture*.

2. That those who gave them are called holy men of God.

3. That *never* (*ou pote*) did any one of these writings come by the impulse or government of the *will of man*.

4. That the holy men who wrote them were *impelled* or *borne along* by the Holy Ghost. (See Gaussen, p. 346.)

Now let us see how this Apostle refers to the epistles of Paul: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given him, hath written unto you; as also in *all his epistles*, speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do *also the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction." (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.)

Here, according to the Apostle Peter, Paul's writings must stand on the same platform of a full, verbal Inspiration with *the other Scriptures*, which Peter says were written and spoken according to the *motions* of the *Holy Ghost*.

But hear Peter's claim for himself and the other Apostles: "That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us, the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour." (2 Peter, iii. 2.)

Thus the commandments of the Apostles are put on the same level of Plenary Inspiration with the words spoken before by the Prophets!

In the book of Revelation the Apostle John also claims in solemn language the fullest verbal Inspiration. "If any man add to, or take from *the words* of this Book, God shall add its plagues to him and take away his part out of the book of life." (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.)

But that full verbal inspiration which the Apostles claim for themselves, we find their Master expressly promising to them. "The Holy Ghost shall teach you all things." (John xiv. 26.) "The Spirit of truth shall guide you into

all truth." (John xvi. 13.) Repeatedly he promises them immediate inspiration in their most critical and trying times. Thus he puts them on the same platform with prophets. And *they* even claim and rightly claim to be *more* than prophets. "God hath set some in the Church *first Apostles, secondarily prophets.*" (1 Cor. xii. 28.) The Apostles' writings then are as truly "prophecy of the Scripture" as Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, (see Luke xxiv. 44) and all their authors may say with Paul, "Christ speaketh by me." (2 Cor. xiii. 3.)

These are but a small specimen of the testimonies of Scripture to its own Plenary Inspiration. Gausson presents many others. Of this portion of his work we commend especially to the reader's attention section v. of chapter vi. in which he argues from the *examples of the Apostles and of their Master* that all the words of the Holy books are given by God. The example which he refers to is their example whenever they quote the Scriptures. They quote it as every word of it divine. "With religious assurance the Apostles often insist on a single word to deduce from it the most serious consequences and the most fundamental doctrines." Paul, as our author shews by many references, whenever he has occasion to quote from the Old Testament, "pauses at the least expression; with confident expectation of the Church's submission, he there points out the employment of one particular *word* in preference to any other, and seems to press out each bit of the passage between his hands even to its last drop of meaning." p. 381. It is true indeed that modern philosophy contemns all such arguments as puerile and absurd, but such was nevertheless the manner in which divinely-attested men behaved themselves towards the Old Testament. And even Christ appears to have had these very impressions respecting the Inspiration of the Bible. He seems to have held to that same doctrine which is now sneered at as a "stiff and *mechanical*" theory, for he has employed continually the same appeal we make to the *very words* of the text. The force of his arguments often turn upon a single word. He declares (Matt. v. 18, and Luke xxi. 33) most solemnly, that the Heavens and the Earth shall pass away sooner than one iota of the Old Testament or of his own words. From his cradle to his

tomb, in the temple with the Doctors, in the desert with the Devil, and in the synagogue with the Pharisees, he is constantly bringing proofs of what he says, from the Scriptures of the Old Testament. On the very cross, twice he has them in his dying lips, and one of these quotations was the comparatively unimportant word "I thirst," which nevertheless must needs be spoken by him on purpose to fulfil the Scriptures. And when he rises from the dead, in the few and hasty interviews he holds with his disciples, it is still, and even more than ever, *the Scriptures of the Old Testament* he is holding up before them. On the way to Emmaus, he makes the heart of two of them burn while opening to them the Scriptures, he expounds the things written in *all* those books concerning himself (Luke xxiv. 27); and again in the upper chamber, when they are all together, he opens their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, even the books of Moses (now so much despised) and the Prophets and Psalms. (Luke xxiv. 44, 45.) This topic of our Lord's reverential regard for the Old Testament Scriptures, Gausson illustrates (see pp. 383-398) in a manner exceedingly forcible and impressive. We sympathize with him in the personal experience he avows of the strength of this particular argument for Plenary Inspiration:—"Nothing has produced in our soul so intimate and powerful a confidence in the entire theopneusty of the Scriptures." (p. 380.) And when we see "the Eternal Wisdom, the Uncreated Word, the Judge of Judges" thus yielding the authority of a law upon him "to a word, a single word, whether of a song or of a historical book," how dreadful then appears the daring and rash impiety of such expressions as we quoted in the beginning of this article from the Westminster Review. Even the more guarded language of Morell is in this contrast distressing to us in the highest degree. His language may be more decent than that of the Reviewer just named, it is certainly more elegant; but the meaning it conveys is in no degree less derogatory to the Majesty of the Scriptures. And we quote, therefore, as applicable even to him, these solemn and eloquent passages of our author:

"We tremble, when we have followed with our eyes the Son of Man, commanding the elements, stilling the tempests, and burst-

ing the sepulchre, whilst filled with so profound a respect for the sacred volume, he declared that he was to return one day to judge; from this book, the living and the dead; we tremble, and our heart bleeds, when afterwards crossing the threshold of a Rationalist Academy, we there see seated in his professoral chair, a poor mortal, a learned, miserable sinner, a responsible soul, handling, without reverence, the word of his God; when we follow him accomplishing this wretched task before young men eager for instruction; as future guides of an entire people capable of so much good, if you lead them to the high places of faith, and of so much evil, if you train them to the contempt of those Scriptures which they are one day to preach! With what peremptory decision they exhibit the phantasmagoria of their hypotheses; they retrench, they add, they commend, they condemn; they pity the simplicity, which, reading the Bible as Jesus Christ reads it, attaches itself, like him, to all the words, and can find no error in the word of God; they decide what interpolations or what retrenchments, (which Jesus Christ never suspected,) the holy Scriptures must have undergone; they purify the chapters which they have not understood; they point out mistakes in them, reasonings badly conducted or badly concluded, prejudices, imprudencies, vulgar errors! * * * * * Either Jesus Christ exaggerated and reasoned badly when he thus quoted the Scriptures, or these imprudent and unhappy men ignorantly blaspheme their majesty. * * * * * Alas! in a few years these professors and their pupils will be sleeping in the same tomb; they must wither like the grass; but then not a tittle of this divine book shall have passed away; and as surely as the Bible is truth, and as it has changed the face of the world, so surely shall we see the Son of Man returning upon the clouds of Heaven, and judging, by this eternal word, the secret thoughts of men." Rom. ii. 16; John xii. 48, Matt. xxv. 31.

The discussion we have been pursuing of the testimony borne by our Saviour to the Inspiration of the Bible, brings to mind the position taken recently by an Episcopal clergyman of this State, relative to the question of Christ's sanctioning the Pentateuch. And it accords with the plan on which we set out, to notice this writer's position on this particular question, inasmuch as he ranks himself on the side of Morell respecting Inspiration, and indeed, in his advertisement, "earnestly recommends the *Philosophy of Religion* to all who wish to see most of the topics discussed" by himself, "handled with great ability—and masterly logic."

We refer to "*Philosophic Theology*" by the Rev. Mr. Miles of Charleston, a work published by Russel and noticed at the time of its appearance in this Review. It has found, notwithstanding our honest condemnation of its Rationalistic tendencies, many admirers in this country, and the great Neander himself, a short time before his decease, wrote and published a very complimentary notice of it in a Berlin Magazine. Some of our newspapers, republishing this notice of *Philosophic Theology*, spoke of Neander as having maintained "a firm stand against the Rationalists," the object being to represent Neander as a *standard authority* among opposers of Neology. All we have to say on this point is *non tali auxilio, nec istis defensoribus*. The genus *Rationalist* embraces many species. With us it is no question, upon which of two points the great German's encomiums of "*Philosophic Theology*" shed most light—Mr. Miles' orthodoxy or his own heterodoxy. Simply as a merited compliment to the abilities of our countryman, however, we are as proud of Neander's letter as any of the other friends of Mr. Miles can be.

To proceed then with what we have to say upon the one point of Mr. M's position respecting our Saviour's testimony to Moses, we find him thus expressing himself on p. 205 "Geology has fought its battle; the question of the Unity of the race is now fighting its; and other questions of authenticity, genuineness, antiquity, chronology and history will have to fight theirs." Among these other questions of "authenticity and genuineness," which will yet have to be battled, he puts the questions (we think a good deal battled long ago) whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and whether it is an Inspired book. And in a long and labored note to the sentence we have just quoted above, (see Appendix, p. 229) he endeavors to shew that Christ has not given his sanction to the prevalent doctrine on either of these points. Mr. Miles admits that "if Christ did sanction the Pentateuch as an inspired book, and as the work of Moses it must certainly be so;" also that "if Christ was mistaken in that respect, it would be futile to argue his divinity further." Thus far we agree with him fully. He proceeds: "But on the other hand, if Christ did not express an opinion respecting the Pentateuch; or if he so expressed an opinion as to imply that it was not inspired

or written by Moses; or if he only alluded to it as a received sacred book of the Jews, without expressing any opinion as to whether it was inspired or not, or by whom written; or if he implied that the book contained elements of a revelation to the Jews, but that it was of no importance who wrote it; or if he referred to it for the sake only of an *argumentum ad hominem*, and in view of his own revelation did not deem it important to express any opinion about the Pentateuch; in any of these cases, it is evident that the Pentateuch has nothing to do with Christianity, or with the claims and character of Christ." Mr. Miles does not tell us which of these numerous hypotheses he adopts. But he proceeds to explain away several of the passages in which Christ has been generally supposed to give his sanction to Moses and the Pentateuch. We mean no offence, but we must characterize these exegetical remarks of Mr. M. as Magee did those of Priestley on the words *Christ died for us*. "They furnish a striking specimen of the metaphysical ingenuity with which the *Rational* expositor of the present day are able to extricate themselves from the shackles of Scripture language." We must say again, as Magee then said, that "no form of expression whatever would be proof against this species of criticism." The five books were held by every Jew to be *God's word*, and were constantly referred to under the titles of *Moses and the Law*; and in these circumstances whenever Christ appealed to Moses or the Law, in proof of any doctrine, he could not be understood by the people as appealing otherwise than as to God's word, and as to an Inspired authority. To have appealed to them, having any other thought in his mind, would not have been *honest*. What is fairly necessary therefore, to make out Christ's sanction of Moses or of the Pentateuch, is not as Mr. Miles appears to suppose, that we should produce a passage wherein the Lord Jesus shall say expressly, that *Moses is the author* of the five books; or shall say expressly that *the five books are Inspired*. If we find him quoting from "*Moses*" it is almost the same as for him to say that *Moses wrote the five books*—and if we find him quoting from "*the Law*" in proof of any doctrine, it may be held equivalent to his declaring the five books Inspired. We regard it as a fundamental principle of interpretation

that a critic must well consider circumstances and occasions. Mr. Miles we think leaves these altogether out of view in his exegetical labours on the passages he refers to. Just think of his dismissing one of these (Luke xxiv. 27th, and he should have joined with it the 44th verse also) with this single remark, "Nothing more is implied than that there were prophecies of Moses recorded!" It was when Jesus talked with the two going to Emmaus, and made their hearts burn as he opened to them the Scriptures. He goes through all the prophets, "*beginning with Moses;*" and that same evening again he opens the understanding of all the band gathered together, with his exposition of the things respecting himself to be found in "the Psalms and Prophets, and Moses." How many of the types and shadows of the law and the dreams and visions of the Patriarch's which had foreshadowed himself, he doubtless shewed to them that evening for the first time in their true light! And this, Mr. Miles would have us believe, was in no important sense or degree a sanction by Christ of Moses or of his five books!

As to the quotations from the Pentateuch by Christ, in his mysterious conflict with the tempter, Mr. M. says "our Saviour evidently employed them as an *argumentum ad hominem* by repelling Satan's temptations based upon quotations from the Old Testament, with quotations from the same authority to which the tempter had appealed." There is some mistake here in point of *fact*. Satan did not make *quotations*, but only *a single quotation* from the Old Testament; nor did Satan appeal *first* to the Scriptures. His was the endeavor to repel (and the vain endeavor to repel) our Lord's reference to God's word. The case stands therefore as it did before Mr. Miles wrote this criticism. Our Lord in that grand conflict as second Adam and our head, with him who overcame our first head and forefather, did upon each renewed assault of the adversary go to the word of God,—Yes! and no where but *to the Pentateuch* itself, for a weapon of defence! But, of course, the errors of fact being admitted and corrected, there will be no difficulty in devising some new explanation of the case, which will do away with the force of our Lord's resorting so constantly, in his time of pressure and difficulty, to that one divine Magazine of Spiritual arms!

Mr. Miles says, respecting John v. 46, 47, that "it is evident our Lord did not intend, in these words, to express an opinion respecting the Pentateuch, but to apply to the Jews an argument based upon what they themselves admitted as authority." But let us look at the context. Our Lord is arguing with the Jews respecting his own claims, and he makes his appeal *first* to John the Baptist's testimony respecting him (verse 32); then *secondly*, to the testimony of his own works (verse 36); and *thirdly*, to that of his Father (verse 37). He proceeds to explain how his Father had testified to him—namely, in his *word*, and he calls on them (verse 39) to "search the Scriptures" for that testimony. "In them ye think ye have eternal life, (said he,) and ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Having thus charged upon them their indifference to, as well as their ignorance of, the very Scriptures on which they relied for salvation, he refers more particularly to one portion of the Scriptures, for which they professed special regard and veneration. "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom you trust." (v. 45.) Their "trusting in Moses" (that is, in the Pentateuch,) corresponds to their "thinking" of the Scriptures generally, that they "had eternal life in them." But he proceeds to tell them why Moses would accuse them; viz., for their not believing sincerely, but only nominally, in his five books. "For if ye had believed Moses ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe my words?" (verses 46, 47.) Here it is declared with emphasis that, if a man believe not in Moses' writings, he cannot believe Christ's words. To us it appears that this is sanctioning Moses in the strongest manner; for it is Christ's refusing to consider any disbeliever in the written words of Moses (contained in five well-known books,) as in any sense a believer in his own spoken words. The force of the passage is just this: that if the Jews, then present before him, were true believers in Moses, (that is, in the Pentateuch,) they would believe in him, for Moses in his five books wrote about him; but that they really did not believe in the Pentateuch, *which they ought to believe in*, and for not believing in which, *they should be accused by those divine writings before his father*; and that, so

long as they withheld their full belief from the very words written down in the five books, it was impossible they should believe any word he might himself speak. Thus he *stakes even his own credibility itself* on the absolute and entire credibility of the writings of the Jewish legislator.

Mr. Miles, in commencing his remarks on this class of passages, implies that he has given his attention to *all of them*. With very little searching we have found four to which he makes no reference. One is, "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John." (Matt. xi. 13.) Here the law, that is, the five books of Moses, is called *prophetical* by our Lord, and he puts it in the same category with Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c. If the Pentateuch, then, is given up, they must be given up likewise.

Another passage is Mark vii. 9—13, where Christ charges the Pharisees with rejecting the *commandment of God*, and for proof, quotes, as a *saying of Moses*, the precept which they had rendered null and void. His language is, "Full well ye reject the *commandment of God* by your tradition; *for Moses said*, Honour thy father and mother, but ye say," and then he quotes their tradition, and concludes, "making *the word of God* of none effect." Now is it to be supposed that Christ, who even rebuked the Jews on account of their excessive veneration for Moses' person, would have employed this free alternation of the terms "*commandment of God*," "*saying of Moses*," "*word of God*," if he had not wished to leave room for our inferring that, as Moses was God's mouth-piece in giving the ten commandments, so also whatever other sayings Moses in his five books claimed to deliver as from God, were indeed the very words of God?

Another passage is, what Christ makes Abraham say: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." (Luke xvi. 31.) Here again Moses, or the Pentateuch, is ranked with the prophets, and his testimony is declared to be as complete on the subjects of sin and repentance, and also as competent in regard to the future punishment of the wicked and the necessity of a holy life, as could be that of an express messenger from the world of spirits.

The fourth passage not noticed by Mr. Miles, is this:

“It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail.” (Luke xvi. 17.) Be it that *the law* here refers both to the law and the prophets, which he had mentioned in the verse preceding. The greater includes the less. If the whole Jewish law or Old Testament be here sanctioned by Christ, then the Pentateuch, which was part of it, is sanctioned by him. If Christ said, every jot of the whole Old Testament is firmer than the heavens, then he said the same thing of every word of the five books of Moses.

Having thus stated, and as we suppose, established the primitive doctrine of Verbal or Plenary Inspiration, we will now place in contrast with it the opposite theory as it is presented in Mr. Morell's chapter on Inspiration. “The Philosophy of Religion, by J. D. Morell,” (his vi. chapter included) has already been reviewed in our pages; but the great importance of the subject, and the established popularity of the writer, all justify us in again calling attention to the fallacies employed by him in his discussion of this point. The position maintained by Morell, is the very opposite of that which Gausson holds. With him the sacred writers were inspired, and not the sacred writings. Indeed, by a whole previous chapter on Revelation, he labours to prepare the way for his peculiar definition of Inspiration, according to which *it never can be predicated of a writing*, but only of its author. “For a Revelation, at all to exist, (says Mr. Morell) there must be an intelligent being on the one hand, adapted to receive it, and there must be on the other hand a process by which this same intelligent being becomes cognizant of certain facts or ideas,” (p. 128, Appleton's edition.) On the next page, he characterizes this process as *not logical*, that is *not by means of definition or explanation from the lips of another*, but *intuitional*, that is “by a direct and immediate gazing upon it;” and also declares, on the page following, that “the idea of Revelation is universally considered to imply this direct presentation from God to the mind.” Accordingly, when he comes to treat of Inspiration, he sets out with these principles as so many *data*. “All Revelation, as we showed, implies two conditions: it implies, namely, an intelligible object presented, and a given power of recipiency in the subject; and in popular language, when speaking of the

manifestation of Christianity to the world, we confine the term Revelation to the former of these two conditions, and appropriate the word Inspiration to designate the latter," p. 147. Of course, with this definition of Inspiration, he comes naturally enough to the conclusion, that it is "in no sense mechanical but purely dynamical," p. 148. It is something not to be predicated of any machine, or of any writing, or other merely material existence. It can only be predicated of an intelligence, it ascribes to such an intelligent being a certain elevation of his mental and moral powers. The truth made known is Revelation, but Inspiration cannot characterize that truth, either as spoken or written; but from the very nature of it can belong only to the mind of him who receives the truth. Now, of course, we allow our author the common privilege of defining the sense in which he employs terms; but his statement that this is the "*popular*" use or the "*universal*" understanding of the terms he uses, we must just put along side of his other astounding declaration about the early Christians not believing in Plenary Inspiration.

Such being Morell's theory of Inspiration, in distinction from the primitive doctrine as upheld by Gausson, we pause here to ask, of what possible use, on his principles, can the sacred writings be to us? The old doctrine makes them plenary inspired, and so, an infallible guide; but Morell teaches us that "the idea of a revelation, implies a case of intelligence in which the whole result lies beyond the reach of the logical understanding," p. 130, that is, a case in which we do not "arrive at truth *mediately*, by definition or explanation from the lips of another," p. 129. He teaches us that the sacred writers had their intuitional consciousness supernaturally elevated, so as to perceive directly, and gaze immediately upon the truth; but they have passed away to their eternal rest, and behind them remain some documents written "in order to represent, and so far as possible to retain the bright impressions of these Apostolic men," p. 160. If, then, we cannot receive *mediately*, by definition or explanation, from their lips, the truth revealed to them, of what use is it to us? Did our author merely intend to say that even after an infallible guide is put into our hands, we require our minds to be illuminated by the spirit in order to understand the spirit-

ual truths revealed therein, he would be only asserting a well-known doctrine of Christianity. The necessity of divine teaching, by the Holy Ghost, in order that a blinded heart should receive the things which cannot be naturally discerned by man, is no greater difficulty attached to the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration, than the necessity there obviously exists for God's word, written by Apostles and Prophets, to be translated into our language, and the art of spelling and reading it, so translated, to be communicated to us. The necessity under which we may be lying, of a second gift from God, to render a first gift available, is no proof that he has not made us the first gift. But this is not at all the meaning of our author; he is not content to repeat what Apostles before him said respecting the natural blindness of the human heart. His position is this bold one, that Inspiration is in no sense mechanical, and cannot be predicated of any writing or other lifeless object. He maintains that the very idea of Inspiration implies intelligent powers to be elevated. Inspiration is purely dynamical. It belongs only to the writers, and does not belong to their writings. One question therefore returns, of what use is it to us now that those writers are dead? or of what use, indeed, would it be if they were alive? They could do nothing towards furnishing us a revelation, for that can never be done by any logical means. It is purely an *intuitional* affair, in which God works immediately upon the mind. Of course, therefore, according to this theory, God directly enlightens all who are enlightened, *without the use of any of those logical forms which the Bible contains*, and consequently the Bible is of no use! Morell's argument would make us all to be, what Neander tells us Mr. Miles is, "far from Bibolity."

Our author proceeds to discuss the question of Plenary Inspiration under three aspects:

I. The first is, that aspect of the subject in which it stands related to *Miracles*. He manages this topic with great delicacy, making no attack on the proof we are accustomed to derive from miracles in favor of the credibility of the Apostles. His new definition of Inspiration being received, there is no need of any such attack, and thus he is smoothly carried over what would otherwise be an insuperable difficulty. All he has to do with miracles is, as

he says, "to show that they have nothing to do immediately with Inspiration," p. 149. He merely desires to have it understood that there is not any "new or supernatural capacity presupposed by Inspiration," it being merely the "supernatural elevation of a natural faculty." Accordingly his whole effort here is simply to adduce some cases of men having miraculous powers, who were yet not inspired; and of men, on the other hand, who were inspired without having miraculous powers; and from these facts to draw the general conclusion that "the one gift was not necessarily connected with the other; that miracles, while they evinced a divine commission, did not prove the infallibility of the agent as a teacher; that they were, in fact, separate arrangements of Providence, one demanding extraordinary physical power, the other a mental and moral enlightenment," p. 150.

How does it happen, we must be permitted to ask, that Mr. Morell so entirely mistakes "the place in the picture" which is assigned to miracles by believers in the old doctrine? It has never been pretended, so far as we know, that they *necessarily and always* prove an agent to be inspired, but only prove him such *if he claims* to be inspired. They have been considered as proving the worker of them *a true witness*, provided at the same time that the doctrines to which he gave testimony commended themselves to the conscience as good and true.* And accordingly we have been accustomed to view the testimony of the Apostles to their own Inspiration as receivable testimony. And we will insist upon it, this argument stands firm. If it be historically demonstrable that the Apostles wrought miracles, then that is one of the clear and decisive proofs that they came from God; and then we must believe them when they tell us that their writings are God's words.

II. In the *second place*, our author considers the old doctrine, as it supposes, "a special dictation of the actual words inscribed on the sacred page, distinct from the religious enlightenment of the writer." (p. 151.) Here he enters with boldness into the controversy, and maintains the writers *versus* the writings. He says the old view of the case has been "generally abandoned by the thoughtful in the

* See Trench's Preliminary Essay.

present day"—which plainly shows what reputation we are securing for ourselves by this present labour. He proceeds to state *four considerations* as against the doctrine.

The *first* is the want of any "*positive evidence* of such verbal dictation having been granted." We merely point the reader to the Scriptures quoted by us above. He goes on to object that the "supposition of its existence would demand a twofold kind of Inspiration, each kind entirely distinct from the other." We reply, it is our author who supposes a second kind; Inspiration, in our sense of the word, (that Inspiration which is predicable of the writings) having always been received among Christians. He admits that "the Apostles were inspired to teach orally," but says "we have the most positive evidence of this commission not extending to their very words." We would be glad to have had him produce this evidence, but he did not attempt it. We think his reasoning throughout this paragraph not only weak, but *suicidal*. His position is to question, if not to deny, the Inspiration of the Apostles as to their writings, but to admit it in a general sense as to their oral instructions. And yet he refers to Peter as having orally taught a specific error which was certainly of great importance. Surely this is killing to his own theory; for it would convict Peter of a grievous oral error, and shows that his "intuitional faculty," his "inward nature," was (*not*) so "perfectly harmonized to the divine; so freed from the distorting influences of prejudice, passion and sin; so simply recipient of the divine ideas circumambient around it; so responsive in all its strings to the breath of heaven, that truth left upon it an impress answering perfectly to its objective reality!" It happens, however, as we stated in a previous article, that Morell has here fallen into a small error of fact. Peter did not, so far as we are told, *teach* any thing *orally* on the occasion referred to; his dissimulation was in point of *conduct*.

The *second* consideration which our author produces as hostile to the old doctrine, is "the *distinctive style* maintained by such writer." (p. 152.) But is it any more incredible that God should *speak* in different human styles, than that he should *act* by instruments of different appearances and natures—that he should *destroy*, for example, by fire, by water, by famine, by disease? If the same

God acts in these, why may not the same God speak in those? But we retort this objection upon our author; he admits that the Apostles were inspired to teach orally, (p. 151) and does he mean to say that their tones of voice, their idioms and forms of expression, and their manner of gesticulation, were always identical?

The *third* consideration is a very singular one, as coming from a philosophic reasoner. It is that Plenary Inspiration "tends to diminish our view of the moral and religious qualifications of the writers, by elevating the mere mechanical influence into supremacy. In proportion as we possess a higher idea of the scriptural enlightenment of the Apostles, in that proportion we feel that there was less need of any such verbal dictation as we are now considering." (p. 152.) And what of that? we ask. *If our doctrine be true, there is no room and no use for your theory*—that is a strange kind of argument to prove our doctrine false! Suppose we should retort: this new theory diminishes our regard for the writings as infallible, by elevating into supremacy the mere personal enlightenment of the writers. Morell proceeds to say, (borrowing, for his first few words here, the pencil of a caricaturist,) "the writers of the Bible on this theory might have been mere tools or instruments, their minds need not have been inspired at all; on the contrary, if they were fitted as holy and inspired men to comprehend and propagate Christianity, they were also fitted to describe it either in oral or written symbols." We reply, if the author has any positive evidence that the minds of the Apostles were supernaturally elevated in the manner he asserts, let him produce it, or let him enjoy it unproduced, and welcome! *We* are taught by men sent from God that the Bible is a book divine, and we intend to stand fast in this doctrine. If it be in the way of this new theory, we cannot help it. If it even lowers the writers, as men, more than the new theory, while it more exalts the writings, as God's word, we only perceive in that fact a new analogical proof of the truth of the doctrine; for herein Christianity has been always the reverse of Philosophy—the latter always has glorified man, to the dishonor of God, but it is the very genius and design of the former to put God on the throne and man in the dust.

As to the Apostles, because holy and inspired men, being "fitted to set forth Christianity in oral or written symbols," how can our author so say, if that cannot be Revelation which is received "by explanation from the lips of another?" (p. 129.)

His *next and last* consideration Mr. Morell shall state in full. "Fourthly, 'The *positive* evidence against this theory—evidence which, to a thoughtful mind, amounts to a moral demonstration—lies here, that even if we suppose the letter of the Scripture to have been actually dictated, yet that alone would never have served as a revelation of Christianity to mankind, or obviated the necessity of an appeal from the letter to the spirit of the whole system.

* * The letter of the Scripture has to be illuminated by the spirit of truth before it affords to any one a full manifestation of Christianity, in its essence and its power; while, in proportion to the varied spiritual condition of the reader, the conceptions attached to the mere words are almost infinitely diversified.'" (p. 152.)

What does the reader think of this, as the "positive evidence," and *all* the positive evidence for this theory which Morell is able to produce against the plain and repeated statements of the sacred writings? Is it *evidence*, indeed, of any kind? Is it any thing more than *argument*? And as merely an argument, does it not better deserve to be called *negative* than *positive*? For it is simply this, that an infallible written Revelation would not be sufficient of itself for all our purposes! It is merely this, that the Bible is not infallible, because it cannot do the work of the Holy Spirit!

Mr. Morell proceeds, under this head of positive evidence against Plenary Inspiration, to say that "the letter alone, in fact, never has secured the unity of the Church." But this fact has no force in the present controversy. The old doctrine is, that the Bible is God's word throughout—the books, the words, the letters. And this author objects that the letter never has secured unity. Can he show that the Bible was designed or expected by God to secure unity? If he replies affirmatively, we ask again, is not this saying that God has failed in his design? Is it not one thing for God to give an infallible standard, and quite another for God to make all the readers or receivers of it infallibly cor-

rect in their opinions or belief? Does not the very giving of a rule presuppose that there will be deficiency and deflection to be evidenced when comparison shall be made with that rule? Is it not derogatory to the philosophical character of our author that he should thus imply the non-existence of a rule, from the very necessity and use of it?

But this argument of Mr. Morell, so feeble a shaft in his hand against us, we can send back with force against himself. He says the Bible is inspired as to the spirit but not as to the letter of it. Well, we ask him if the *spirit* has secured that unity which the *letter* has not secured? That unity does not exist, and if this fact disproves our doctrine, it equally affects his theory. He says "the unity we so much yearn after, comes only through the developement of the religious life." We ask again, where has there ever been any such developement producing any such unity? He tells us "the awakened religious consciousness of true believers as the real and essential revelation—the sole basis of Christian unity—the appeal to which we all in the end practically repair." We deny that this is the appeal we all practically make. And we ask him to tell us where we are to find that awakened consciousness of true believers, and how we are to get at it?

III. In *the third place* Mr. Morell considers that form of the old doctrine "which asserts a distinct commission in reference to the authorship of each one of the sacred books." (p. 154.) There is no difference that we can perceive, as was said in our former article, between this form of the doctrine and the one under which he has just considered it. It appears to have been introduced in this way merely that the writer might conveniently bring in the old worn-out objections to the canon, based upon our admitted ignorance of the dates and authors of some of the divine books. But we have no need to produce a distinct commission given to any of the sacred writers—nor yet, to discuss any questions of the mixed or single authorship of the Pentateuch, or of the date of the production of Job. Mr. Morell and ourselves are agreed that the books are authentic and genuine; if so, they contain the claims of miracle-workers to have written those books by the Spirit, and this settles the question in dispute. Most of the difficulties which occupy pp. 155-159 fall therefore to the ground. We have

nothing to do with them, nor has Mr. Morell, nor any one else. They only arise from his commencing his enquiries at the wrong end of the subject. In the investigation of the claims of the Bible, he should not begin with the Pentateuch, but with the New Testament. The argument runs thus: It is historically demonstrable that Jesus rose from the dead and that his Apostles wrought miracles. This makes him, and this makes them, to be true witnesses. They declare their writings inspired, and they declare the Old Testament also inspired. Therefore the whole Bible is inspired. Here is a short method with the chief part of Mr. Morell's difficulties on these four and a half pages.

But we would ask our author, suppose a distinct commission were claimed by each writer, how would that claim alter Morell's judgment of the case? Such a claim would get its value from the same historical testimony which we and our Rationalistic friends appear to estimate so differently. And such a claim, however plainly worded, would of course have no greater value in their eyes and present no greater barriers to their critical ingenuity, than any other sentence now to be found in the Bible.

Having viewed the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration in these three aspects, Mr. Morell offers three remarks in confirmation of his own views. *The first* is that they alone "give full *consistency* to the *progressive* character of the Scripture morality." Some of his observations on this head are very painful to our minds. We shall make no comments, however, but refer the reader to what appears on pages 314 and 315 of the third volume of this Review.

His second remark is that his view "alone gives a satisfactory explanation of the minor discrepancies to be found in the sacred writings." On this subject we refer to three admirable sections in Gaussen's work; sections v. vi. and vii. of his second chapter; in which all the alleged errors of reasoning or doctrine, errors in the narration, and errors in Natural Philosophy, are examined with candour and with great ability.

His third and last remark is that his theory "alone explains the formation of the Canon of Scripture and the facts connected with it." Upon this he observes that "with few exceptions there is not an entire book in the whole of the Old Testament with respect to which we can

determine with complete accuracy, who was the author,—when it was written,—at what time received into the Canon of Scripture, and on what special grounds.” And he asks “Now under such circumstances as these, how are we to stand forth and maintain the inspiration of the Jewish writings on the hypothesis either that they were all dictated by the Spirit of God, or written by express commission from Heaven?” p. 168.

We have produced the testimony of the New Testament writers to the inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, and if Mr. Morell or any one else cannot *on their authority* stand forth and maintain the divine character of the Old Testament, because forsooth he does not know the dates and authors of some of the books, we are prepared to find him setting no great value upon the Canonical claim of the Christian Scriptures either. And accordingly upon the New Testament Canon our author speaks in a similar strain. He represents the whole affair as one of great uncertainty. Now, upon this point, we have simply to remark, that it is not every mind which is competent to appreciate the argument by which the Canon of Scripture, as now constituted, is maintained. That our author should find any difficulty with that argument is of course to be ascribed to no mental deficiency in him. But that he should impugn an argument of the force and yet refinement of which he must be sensible, we may justly set down as a pregnant indication of the true and real *animus* of the new theory. Our author knows perfectly well how the simple fact that we are arguing about books written eighteen centuries ago, or written thousands of years ago, diminishes the quantity but increases the force of the proofs we have to furnish. He knows very well how the testimony of contemporaries or almost-contemporaries is all that can bear on such a question, and he knows how satisfactory is the nature of this sort of evidence. He knows how while a thousand difficulties and objections can easily be raised among posterity in such a case, a thousand replies to each objection and each difficulty could no doubt have been produced by contemporary receivers of the books, and therefore he knows how philosophical and how rational it is to rely with confidence upon the verdict given by the

early Church in favour of the New Testament Canon as now constituted.

The only other observation we shall offer upon Mr. Mo-
rell's views is, that he concludes his argument, as well he
might, with admitting, nay drawing out a parallel between
inspiration and genius!

We turn back to Gausson, and close our article by fur-
nishing the reader a specimen of the manner in which he
treats the objection to Plenary Inspiration from the insig-
nificance of some of the details entered into by the sacred
writers. We choose to hear him on the cloak Paul left at
Troas.

"In his youth, he was already eminent, a favorite of princes,
admired of all; but now he has left every thing for Christ. It is
now thirty years and more, that he has been poor, in labours more
than the others, in wounds more than they, in prison oftener; five
times he had received of the Jews forty stripes save one; thrice
was he beaten with rods; once he was stoned; thrice he suffered
shipwreck; often in journeyings; in perils upon the sea, in per-
ils in the city, in perils in the desert, in watchings oft, in hunger
and in thirst, in cold and nakedness. Hear him now; behold
him advanced in age; he is in his last prison; he is at Rome;
he is expecting his sentence of death; he has fought the good
fight; he has finished his course, he has kept the faith; but he is
cold, winter is coming on, and he is poorly clad! Buried in a
dungeon of the Mamertine prisons, he is so much despised, that
even all the Christians of Rome are ashamed of him, and that
at his first appearing, no man was willing to befriend him. Yet,
he had received, ten years before, while a prisoner at Rome, and
loaded with chains, at least some money from the Philippians;
who, knowing his sufferings, united together in their indigence,
to send him some succor. But now, behold him forsaken; no
one but St. Luke is with him; all have abandoned him; winter
is approaching. He would need a cloak; he has left his own,
two hundred leagues off, at the house of Carpus in Troas; and
no one in the cold prisons of Rome would lend him one. Has
he not then left every thing, with joy, for Christ; has he not es-
teemed all the glory of this world as dross that he might win
Christ: and does he not suffer all things cheerfully for the elects'
sake? We were ourselves at Rome, last year, in a hotel, on a
rainy day, in the beginning of November. Chilled by the pier-
cing dampness of the cold, evening air, we had a vivid conception
of the holy Apostle in the subterranean dungeons of the capitol,
dictating the last of his letters, regretting the absence of his

cloak, and entreating Timothy to bring it to him before the winter!

“Who would then take from the inspired Epistles so striking and pathetic a feature? Does not the Holy Spirit carry you to the prison of Paul, to astonish you with this tender self-renunciation and this sublime poverty; just too, as he shewed you, with your own eyes, his charity, sometime before, when he made him write in his letter to the Philippians: ‘I weep in writing to you, because there are many among you, who mind earthly things, whose end is destruction?’ Do you not seem to see him in his prison, loaded with chains, while he is writing, and tears are falling upon his parchment? And does it not seem to you that you behold that poor body, to-day miserably clothed, suffering and benumbed; to-morrow beheaded and dragged to the Tiber, in expectation of the day when the earth shall give up her dead, and the sea the dead which are in it; and when Christ shall transform our vile bodies, to make them like unto his glorious body? And if these details are beautiful, think you they are not also useful? And if they are already useful to him who reads them as a simple historical truth, what will they not become to him who believes in their Theopneusty, and who says to himself: ‘Oh my soul, these words are written by Paul; but it is thy God who addresses them to thee?’ Who can tell the force and consolation, which, by their very familiarity and naturalness, they have for eighteen centuries conveyed into dungeons and huts? Who can count the poor and the martyrs, to whom such passages have given encouragement, example and joy? We just now remember, in Switzerland, the Pastor Juret, to whom a coverlet was refused, twenty years ago, in the prisons of the Canton de Vaud. We remember that Jerome of Prague, shut up for three hundred and forty days in the dungeons of Constance, at the bottom of a dark and loathsome tower, and going out only to appear before his murderers. Nor have we forgotten the holy Bishop Hooper, quitting his dark and dismal dungeon, with wretched clothes and a borrowed cloak, to go to the scaffold, supported upon a staff, and bowed by the sciatica. Venerable brethren, happy martyrs; doubtless you then remembered your brother Paul, shut up in the prison of Rome, suffering from cold and nakedness, asking for his cloak! Ah! unfortunate he, who does not see the sublime humanity, the tender grandeur, the foreseeing and divine sympathy, the depth and the charm of such a mode of teaching! But still more unfortunate perhaps he, who declares it human, because he does not comprehend it. * * * * *

* * * * * We should adore that tender condescension, which,

stooping even to our weakness, is pleased, not only to reveal to us the highest thoughts of heaven in the simplest language of earth, but also to offer them to us under forms so living, so dramatic, so penetrating, often compressing them, in order to render them more intelligible, within the narrow space of a single verse.

“It is then thus, that St. Paul, by these words thrown at hazard even into the last commission of a familiar letter, casts for us a rapid flood of light over his ministry, and discovers to us by a word, the entire life of an Apostle; as a single flash of lightning in the evening, illuminates in an instant, all the tops of our Alps; and as persons sometimes show you all their soul by a single look.” (pp. 239, 243.)

ARTICLE II.

MATTHEW XXII. 29.

“Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.”

The triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, amid the shouts and hosannahs of the multitude; his authoritative purgation of the Temple, and his prophetic denunciations of the impending judgments of God against the Jewish Commonwealth, had roused the resentment of the Jewish authorities against him to the utmost pitch. They determined, by some means, to bring about his death. The fear of the people prevented them from open violence. They, consequently, resort to stratagem, that they might find some ground of accusation against him, which should have the effect of turning the current of popular favour into a tide of indignation, and give them a pretext, for consummating, without danger to themselves, their murderous design. The only expedient they could think of was an effort to entangle him in his talk. The Pharisees, accordingly, sent out some of their disciples with the Herodians, who proposed to him a question, so adroitly framed, that answer it as he might, it seemed impossible to avoid giving offence, either to the people, or the partizans of Cæsar. “What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or