Presented by
Susan Reid Hayland
1927

OUTLINES

OF

THEOLOGY

BY

REV. S. W. HOWLAND, D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AND N. T. GREEK

ATLANTA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ATLANTA GEORGIA U. S. A.

1908

PRINTED AT THE A. C. M. PRESS, TELLIPPALAI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

An outline of Rational Theology.

A Foreword.

Some explanation seems necessary for such a title as this. It is not intended by the use of the word "Rational" to imply that other works on Theology are not rational. But in this case the appeal is made more directly to the Reason than is usual. The word has been discredited by its use in connection with the so-called "Rationalists", who will accept nothing that does not accord with their own reason, meaning what they individually regard as reasonable, at the same time seeking to eliminate the supernatural. While seeking to avoid this pit-fall, this brief outline admits that "Reason", as based on the Absolute Reason, and interpreted by the Common Consciousness of man, is the sole arbiter of Truth, and the attempt has been made to test every statement by this touchstone, though the process of the test is not always written out. This leads to a considerable divergence from the usual forms in the statement of many doctrines. Yet it is hopedthat the forms of statement will commend themselves to the reader. The purpose of the work as a brief"outline", does not admit of extended discussion or presentation of many differing views for criticism, but it is believed that the self-evidencing power of truth will be manifest.

The points of divergence of this system from others are not such as are usually regarded as heretical or un-evangelical, as they are in the main in accord with the cardinal doctrines of the Christian religion as generally held. Yet they appear quite important for the elucidation of the truths involved.

That form of doctrine which has a wider bearing on other doctrines than any other is that concerning the tripartite nature of man. This is not new,except inits form, which seeks to avoid those forms of statement which have made the theory so objectionable. This modifies the statements of the doctrines of sin and salvation, the person of Christ, His death and resurrection, etc. The "trinity of man's spirit" also has its bearing on the doctrines of the divine Trinity, and the "free-will of man" and the "decrees of God".

It is believed that the re-statement of the belief of the church along these lines will be found fresh and helpful if carefully studied, and will sufficiently justify the putting forth of another work on Theology and approve the use of the title. This work is a result of much prayerful study in connection with the teaching of these subjects, both in the foreign field and in the home land. It is possible that the necessity of meeting these problems and defending the truth of Christianity in the face of the advocates of other religions and of opponents of Christianity as it were in the open field, without the consciousness of the presence of the church around on all sides, leads to a more independent and original treatment of the themes.

Yet it is not claimed that anything here is original, although credit is not given to any author, as such authors might not care to father the forms of statement here given. Yet I may say that Dr. Laurens P. Hickok has influenced my thought more than any other writer.

The position here taken on the Scriptures, while resembling the so-called "traditional" or conservative position is not the same. Some of the claimed results of the higher criticism are accepted, but, although studied carefully with an earnest desire to agree with the learned leaders of modern thought, the arguments for many of their positions which are not accepted here seem so inconclusive, that they are neglected in this brief treatise.

Theology as a Science.

Theology, as indicated by the etymology of the word or name, is the Science of God. A science, as distinguished from knowledge, is systematized knowledge. Knowledge is the knowing of facts and truths, or the possession of them by the mind. Facts, as the derivation of the word indicates, are things done. (Latin, factum) The word is usually applied to deeds and events, but it is often made to include truths also.

Truth is that which is, and may be dealt with in the science of Ontology. Truth may also be defined as the expression of that which is, or is possessed of reality. In theology we must deal with truths quite as much as with facts. The attributes of God cannot be called facts in any literal sense, because they are neither things done nor events. But they may be classed as truths in the sense of existing or possessing reality.

Thus as furnishing the materials for constructing theology or the science of God, we have the facts and truths pertaining to God. But a subject is only fully known when all its relations are known. Therefore, in order to know God as fully as possible, we must seek to know all His relations, and also everything to which He is related, for only by knowing these latter can we know the relations, and so know Him more fully. God, as Creator, has relations with the whole universe, therefore Theology embraces the whole universe in its scope, and might be made to include the systematization of all knowledge. But it is usual to limit Theology to the more religious aspect of the facts and relations pertaining to God, and to exclude the sciences that discuss the mutual relations of God's creatures. Thus Astronomy, Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Botany and such like sciences, though they may have an indirect bearing on Theology and require occasional notice, are not usually included in the discussion of Theology.

Religion, as implied by the etymology of the word (re-lig-

to bind back) is a union or attempted union with God, on the part of rational beings, who alone are capable of such union. Theology is sometimes called the science of religion. But although all its material has a religious aspect or relation, yet its facts and truths are not all strictly the facts and truths of religion. Thus, a knowledge of the attributs of God may help to the union with God, yet they are not truths of that union.

Theology may be called the Science of Sciences, not only because it might include the whole universe and so embrace all sciences, but it is the most exalted of sciences and the most important of all, and at the same time does include a large number of other very important sciences. It is the most exalted because it deals with the highest conceivable subject, even God Himself, and the grandest thoughts and ideals of which the human mind is capable are found in it.

Moreover, since a science is systematized knowledge, the systematization must be done according to philosophical principles, and the philosophy employed in Theology must be the most fundamental and all-embracing. Theology is the most important science, because it deals with our highest welfare, both in this life and in the supposedly endless life hereafter. It is sometimes said that we may have religion and secure man's best welfare without theology. It is true that a high degree of piety or good religion may be attained without much theological knowledge.

But any religion, or attempted union with God, must have some knowledge as the basis, and that is theology; however imperfect or erroneous it may be. And the more perfect the knowledge of a person, the more perfect can be the union with that person. So the more perfect the knowledge of God by theology, the more perfect can be the union with God, which is the very best thing possible for man. Christ said that knowing God and Jesus Christ, whom He sent, is

life eternal, which is the highest state attainable by man, or perfection, or his best good.

Still further, the more perfect our knowledge of both God and man, the more readily can we bring about the union of God and man, which is the best thing possiblefor man.

Among the sciences which Theology more directly includes, we may mention Ontology or the science of being, Cosmology, the science of creation, Anthropology, the science of man, Hamartialogy, the science of sin, Soteriology, the science of salvation, Christology, the scientific knowledge of Christ, Penology, the science of punishment, Pneumatology, the discussion of spirits, and Eschatology or the doctrine of the last things, as well as many other subjects, which are in their treatment raised into sciences.

The materials of the science, i.e. its facts and truths, must be gathered wherever they can be found. In the physical sciences the facts are secured by observation and experiment, and when found they must be verified to prove their right to a place in the system. In this science some of the material can be secured by these processes, and some cannot. Reason must furnish some and revelation others. The facts pertaining to man and sin can to a considerable extent be secured by observation and verified by experiment. But Reason must furnish others.

By Reason we mean the powers of rational beings. A rational being is a being that uses reasons, or perceives and uses causes and relations. Simply he is a spirit. The term includes God, angels, the spirits of men, and other such beings, in other worlds. God is Absolute Reason, that is, He is a rational being, absolved or freed from all limitations. Angels and men are finite Reason. Reason has the power of intuition, or of seeing things or relations as they are, i.e. of perceiving truth. For each man his individual reason is his standard. He may be mistaken in his understanding of what it tells him, nevertheless, it is the standard for him.

The verdict of the reasons of all men is practically infallible. This we call the universal Reason, or the common consciousness of mankind. That which is seen by all to exist, pretty certainly does exist. The proof of this comes into the domain of Ontology, but without entering that any further we can easily see the necessity of this conclusion. All have a capacity for perceiving, and what all see must be in existance. If we cannot trust this we cannot trust anything. We can know nothing. We have no common ground to stand on for discussion, either to assert or to deny. Therefore, the verdict of Reason or of the common consciousness is our foundation.

But the verdict of the common consciousness, as soon as discovered, must be verified by the consciousness of the individual, each for himself. If it is not so verified it has no value for him. The voice of Reason is one, whether in the many or in the one, and if the verdicts do not seem to agree, it must be either because I do not understand the verdict of the many, or because I mistake my own; and both must be re-investigated until harmony is secured. As this is fundamental, the last appeal is always to Reason, and that is the sole arbiter or standard. Revelation may give us many facts or truths which cannot be otherwise obtained, but they also must needs be verified by the same touch-stone of truth, the Reason. Experience is not merely my own experience.

The verdict of common consciousness is discovered first and chiefly in etymologies. A word expresses the thought of a man, or his perception of truth. When it is adopted by a whole people, the whole people has added its verdict to his, and so has expressed the verdict of the common consciousness.

Secondly, it is found in proverbs. When a proverb becomes current, the whole people has approved and adopted the sententious sentiment first expressed by one man.

Thirdly, the verdict is found in laws. Every government ex-

ists either by the suffrage or the sufferance of the people, and its laws are the voice of the people to a large extent, and judgments which are found in the laws of all or most peoples may be taken as the verdict of all those peoples.

Fourthly, when popular leaders, who have the approval of the masses, express sentiments they may be taken with some degree of confidence as the sentiments of the mass. But this source is more liable to error than the previous three, as giving more room for personal peculiarities.

In a somewhat similar manner we may rely upon a universal verdict in matters of religion or of theology. This is sometimes called the common consciousness of the Church, or the Christian consciousness. The famous dictum that what is believed by "all, everywhere and at all times" (semper, ubique et ab omnibus) is true, is based upon the confidence that the Holy Spirit is in all believers, and according to Christ's promise, is leading them into all truth, and that what all see to be the truth is true. The verdict of the Christian consciousness is more difficult to identify than that of the common consciousness, and like that it must be personally verified.

It may perhaps be first found in hymns of wide acceptance and usage, and secondly in prayers. Some prayers are so artificial as to be no guide. But as a rule, when a man comes face to face with God, he drops all artificial, man-made opinions, and speaks as the Holy Spirit teaches. His vision of God and divine things is then clearer and more to be relied upon. Creeds are of value, but are very apt to be artificial, and reflect individual influence, and so are unreliable.

Many writers make Reason, Scripture and Experience to be three co-ordinate sources of material for Theology. The latter is sometimes described as "the church" and again as "Christian consciousness". These are all helpful, but can hardly be called co-ordinate

or of equal importance. There are many things which we could not know concerning God and His will and the plan of salvation, except by Revelation; and yet as said before, whatever the source of apparent truth or fact, as material for constructing our Theology, it must be verified by Reason, which is ultimate, and admits no appeal. And we may add that it must also be approved by the Christian consciousness, both universal and individual, or it is not a truth for me. Verification by experiment is considered very important in most of the physical sciences, that is predicting what will take place under altered conditions and observing the fulfilment of the prediction. Astronomy, however, does not readily lend itself to such verification, and yet it is one of the most exact of sciences. Theology likewise does not furnish much opportunity for such demonstration, yet it deals with positive truths which we can confidently regard as proved as certainly as those of any science.

In developing our subject it would at first sight seem natural to first discuss the being and nature of God as the source and foundation of all that is, and then discuss His works of creation, preservation and redemption, treating under each head the topics naturally coming under it. Then under the last, discussing man as the subject of redemption, then sin, as making the need, then Christ the God-man or the means, then His work or the method of redemption, and finally the completion of the work and the other departments of eschatology.

But another order will be found more feasible. Man's knowledge begins with himself. His knowledge of himself is the most intimate and most complete, and he being in the image of God he can best know God by knowing himself. Therefore, it is wiser to begin with Anthropology, and then to advance to Theology in its restricted sense, including God's plan, Creation and Providence. Then the consideration of God's attributes will lead us to the subject of the Trinity, and this to the Person of Christ, and this

in turn to His Work, or Redemption. This is naturally followed by the consideration of the work of the Spirit and then the last things.

Meanwhile as Revelation is a source of much of our material it is important that we obtain clear views as to its position, character and contents, and for this reason this subject must be discussed among the first.

Also, as the science of Ethics is fundamental for all questions of Theology, it will be discussed with some fulness under the head of Anthropology. This therefore will be the order followed-

Revelation, including The Scriptures and Inspiration,
Miracles as proof of Revelation,
Anthropology, or the Tripartite nature of Man,
Pneumatology, or the Trinity of Spirit,
Ethics, Free-will,
God, Proof of His Existence, His Attributes,
Creation, Omnipresence, Providence, God's Plan,
The Chief End of Man,
The Trinity, Jesus Christ, The Incarnation,
Sin- Origin, Nature, Results,
Soteriology, Atonement,
Christ's Offices,
Sundry Doctrines-Election, Predestination, Effectual Calling, Justification, Perseverance, Sanctification,
The Holy Spirit,
The Kingdom of God,
Eschatology, Sheol, Hades,
The Millennium-Christ's Second Coming,
The Final Judgement, The Resurrection,
Heaven and Hell,
Penology,
The Consummation.

II. Revelation.

When we approach the Scriptures, we should not come with preconceived ideas and attempt to prove them. Nor should we even determine a priori what we think is necessary, and then endeavor to establish that as a fact. We may, in order to remove the presumption against miracles, and admit testimony in their favor, which otherwise would be insufficient, show the probability of miracles as attestation of a revelation by showing the need of a revelation. But this does not require us to take any position as to the manner or method of the revelation.

The proper way is to first ascertain what claim the Scriptures make for themselves, and then examine to see if the claim is substantiated. The words "reveal" and "revelation" are not used in the New Testament as applicable to any part of Scripture except in the last book, which is called the "Revelation of Jesus Christ". Christ said of Himself that He came to reveal the Father. Therefore, His teachings, life and works may be called a revelation. The Apostles claimed to have received revelations, but do not apply this term to their writings. Therefore as Christ was the Revelation, and not only the gospels which record His life but the other New Testament writings, as well as the Old Testament books, help us to understand Christ, we may say that the Scriptures contain a revelation.

The words most frequently used in the New Testament to refer to the Old Testament are "graphe" and "graphai", corresponding very closely to our English words "Scripture", and "Scriptures". Although the words mean "writing" and "writings", just as the English words do, the New Testament writers apparently used them in a technical sense, just as we use the English words, because these words, although used over fifty times never refer to any other writings. Another word of more general meaning is used, "grammata"-writings, as in 2 Tim. 3:15, where it is qualified by the word "sacred" to distinguish it from other "writings". Paul in one place (Ro. 1:2)

applies the term "holy" to "graphe" where the word is plainly used in its usual technical sense, which shows Paul's opinion of the Scriptures.

In writing to Timothy he says "all Scripture is "theopneustos", or God-breathed or inspired of God. The revised version reads "every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable" etc. Some understand this to mean that Paul distinguishes "inspired Scripture" from other Scripture, and means to assert that only the former is "profitable" etc. But it should be remembered that the word is everywhere used in the technical sense, unless this case is an exception. Moreover the word "inspired" is not a relative, but an adjective, and the statement does not read: "every Scripture that is inspired", and if Paul meant that, it is most probable that he would have said that, as he was very careful to say just what he meant. The sense seems to be that: "every Scripture, being inspired, is also profitable" etc. The construction seems to require this interpretation, and the connection confirms it, for Paul has just spoken of the sacred writings being ableto make wise unto salvation, and goes on to say that every Scripture inspired of God is profitable, not only for conversion, as just asserted, but also for perfecting and fitting for every good work. There appears no other possible interpretation when the connection is considered.

The Apostle Peter repeats the claim and applies it to the New Testament. In 2 Pet. 1:20 he says that "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation", evidently using the word "prophecy" as is so commonly the case, not in the sense of "foretelling" or prediction, but of "forth-telling" or teaching, applying it to all the teachings of the Old Testament, and he goes on to explain it by saying that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit". This he makes characteristic of the whole contents of the Old Testament.

In 2 Peter 3:15,16, after speaking of the delay in Christ's

coming. he goes on to say "our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you. Wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unstedfast wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." Here he assertsthat Paul writes "according to the wisdom given". Of course it is God who gives the wisdom, and so Paul wrote under the inspiration of God, and his words are so authoritative that those who prevert their meaning do so to their own destruction. This could not be said unless they had the same authority as the direct words of God, and he attributes this quality to the Scriptures, and by using the word "other" calls Paul's writings Scriptures, the same as the Old Testament. Moreover by putting in the word "also", he puts his own writings on the same level as those of Paul, and so on a par with the Scriptures, which are so dangerous to misuse, even though difficult of understanding.

Some say that Paul makes a distinction between his own authority and that of Christ in 1 Cor. 7:12 etc., but he is here speaking of what Jesus had taught while on earth. In one place he quotes what Jesus said; on another point he says that Jesus commanded nothing on that, therefore he himself gives directions, and he claims to speak by the Spirit (v.40), so the only difference of authority is that between Jesus and the Holy Spirit speaking through Paul. In v. 25, he gives his "judgement as one that has obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful", apparently referring to his appointment as an apostle (1 Tim. 1:12-16). He begins all his epistles with a reference to his position as an Apostle as if he intended by it to indicate that his letter should be received as a message from God.

All the New Testament writers seem conscious of their position as authoritative expounders of truth, and as writing what was on a par with the Old Testament Scriptures; and so called "the Word of God".

The position of the Old Testament writers was not exactly the same, although they do in many cases claim to speak the word of God,

but the claim made for them is more important for us. Christ said, "Scripture cannot be broken". The word "broken" might have a variety of meanings, but the connection admits of but one here. Christ is arguing that the Old Testament uses the word "God" as applied to men, and so He is not blaspheming in using it in reference to himself, because Scripture cannot be mistaken. There is no point to the argument unless the expression means this.

Some say that he meant that they thought Scripture could not be mistaken, and so could not blame him. But if that was what he meant why did he not say so. He was not accustomed to say what he did not mean. On another occasion he said (Jno.5:39) "Ye think that in them ye have eternal life". There would seem to be much more occasion to say "ye think" here than there if that were what he meant.

Again Jesus said that not one smallest letter (yod) or one corner of a letter (tittle, that distinguishes two similar letters) shall pass from the law (or Scripture) till all is fulfilled, a figurative statement, but apparently meaning that the least details are reliable. Moreover he quoted from the Old Testament, not as if its only authority were in the truth it embodied, as one might quote a proverb, but as if it had the authority of a command of God.

There is still further testimony of the Apostle Paul bearing on the subject. He says (1Cor. 10:6-11) that the events recorded were not only recorded for our benefit (and this of course was not in the intent of the writer, but of the Holy Spirit), but that they happened for our good. If that is true then they differed from other history, and how were the writers able to select such divinely directed events unless themselves under special divine direction.

In recent times much has been made of the human element in the Scriptures. We may recognize the human element in every part. But although we say that "to err is human" we do not mean that a human quality necessitates errors. Jesus Christ was God become man in

such a way that in every thought, word, feeling and action, He was thoroughly human, and yet we do not think that He erred in anything. Being limited in knowledge He might have erred, but having come as a messenger from God, and receiving the aid of the Holy Spirit sufficient to keep Him from error, we accept His claim that He was free from error. Likewise, it is easy to believe that although the Scripture writers give evidence of their personal idiosyncrasies in almost every line so that they were thoroughly human, yet the Holy Spirit was able to so control them as to keep them from expressing any error, and justified their claim.

A careful study of the whole fails to reveal any error that may not easily be attributed to careless copyists. It is said by some that if the writers were kept from error, the copyists also ought to be so kept. But the writers were God-sent messengers, authenticated by the miracle-working power which was given for that purpose (Heb. 2:4 "God also bearing them witness with signs" etc.) We cannot prove that they were such in every case, but we know that many were, and the claims made by them or for them imply it for all.

The work of the higher critics in distinguishing the different documents in the composite parts of the Scriptures may be gratefully acknowledged and used profitably, and many suggestions as to dates of composition may be accepted. But when they set aside the testimony of Scripture to itself, on very slight evidence, we may prefer to take Scripture at its own valuation, and as honest and reliable.

The doctrine of Evolution cannot be applied to the history of the geologic ages, except as we admit divine interference and control; and likewise it can only be applied to the religious history of mankind with the same limitation. The length of time demanded by biologists is denied by the physical scientists. God's control alone solves the difficulty. We readily admit a progress of doctrine, a limited revelation adapted always to the stage of progress attained

by man.

The evidence seems to be conclusive that all the higher forms or species of plants and animals have been derived from lower forms, and these from other lower ones in an unbroken series. This is agreed to by every scientist. But they differ as to the forces that have brought about the evolution.

Those who admit only the forces of Nature as agents of the process demand at least a thousand million years for the process. But authorities in other departments of science assert that the time since the earth was too hot for life has been much less than that. If we admit that God has been using these forces in a manner similar to that in which a gardener produces new varieties of plants, and a breeder new varieties of animals, then one department of science can be harmonized with the other. Likewise we may admit that there has been a progress in doctrine and in religious belief in the history of man.

But if we claim that the progress has been by the unaided efforts of man, we shall come into conflict with the Bible which can only be explained on the supposition that God's hand has been in human history, and that He has been gradually revealing himself as man has become able, by receiving earlier revelations, to receive later and fuller disclosures of God and his will. The "higher criticism" discusses the dates and origins of the various Scripture writings, and this is a legitimate and useful work. But we deny the assumption on which many of them proceed, that the whole progress must be explained by an evolution from within without any divine interference from above. This being the case, the book which records the progressive revelation, becomes to us, who have had no other direct revelation, in all its parts a book of revelation, that is, itself a revelation to us, like Christ Himself, every word both human and divine.

We do not assert verbal inspiration in the old meaning that Scripture is all practically dictated by God, but we assert that what seems to be taught is that the Holy Spirit rested upon the

writers, stirring them up to do the work, in a somewhat similar manner to that in which he rested upon the builders of the tabernacle and others who had a special work to perform, quickening all their natural powers, clarifying their spiritual vision and in some cases telling them things they did not already know, and in other cases restraining them when they were liable to assert error. The style of a writer was in no case interfered with, so that it may always be recognized. The writers held erroneous views in some things, but in a marvelous manner were kept from expressing them in their official writings.

The questions as to the Canon are interesting. For the Old Testament it is settled for us by Christ and the Apostles. We know from Josephus and others what writings were included in the "Scriptures" in their times. The way in which they came to be included may be interesting, but it is not very important. We may presume that the process was similar to that of the formation of the New Testament Canon.

Those most competent to discuss the matter gradually came to an agreement as to what books or writings belonged in the Canon, i.e. not necessarily including all the writings of certain individuals, for it is quite supposable that Paul wrote other epistles, but including only those that were written under the direct control of the Spirit. This would be determined in part by their authorship, in part by the style, and in part by the contents. There could be no infallible standard that could be applied to any one. But the consensus of the church settled it, illustrating the use of what we have called the "Christian Consciousness". Their verdict has on the whole been confirmed by that of the church in all ages, even though some prominent Christians, like Luther in relation to the epistle of James, have disagreed in reference to some portions.

It would be presumptuous to assert that this verdict has at the same time been a verdict in favor of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, although it would be rather presumptuous to deny it. We may feel safe in affirming at least this much, that the verdict of the Christian consciousness is to the effect that the contents of the Scrip-

tures, whether including some minor errors or not, are different from other writings, and are in some special sense "sacred writings". Many leading Christians and scholars take the position that the Spirit's control extended only to matters of religious instruction or doctrine, but not to mere history or science. They say that the Scriptures are an "infallible rule of faith and doctrine". But we have seen that the history at least is inseparable from the religious teaching, being the basis of it, and inerrancy in the one would seem to involve inerrancy in the other.

Errors of fact have frequently been thought to have been discovered. But in many cases further discoveries have proved the accuracy of the Scriptures, and it is not certain that any historical errors have been surely pointed out. If they should be proved, the facts must be accepted, for truth is sacred, and any deviation from it can only work harm. Even if the Scriptures prove less perfect than we thought them, the fact cannot be denied that they are a message from God, and are the chief agency for the salvation of the world.

If we admit errors, there is no reason why we should open the gates as many do, and concede as an error anything which does not exactly harmonize with what we think it ought to be. Just as we would defend the character of a friend so far as possible, even while admitting some defects, so we would defend the contents of Scripture so far as Reason permits, not setting up our individual reason as the sole standard of judgement.

It is true that some defenders have done more harm than good by their methods, but this ought not to deter us from efforts at defence, though it should make us careful to be reasonable, and to make it manifest that we seek truth rather than the maintenance of our own opinions.

As we proceed in the construction of our system of Theology, we shall find abundant materials in the Scriptures, but we must not admit anything apparently found there unless it is verified by Reason. A guide is useful who leads me to hidden treasure, even if I do not accept his estimate as to its value. Yet it is a satisfaction to me personally if I can have confidence in his wisdom as well as in his integrity.

III. Miracles.

In former times miracles were regarded as the chief proof of the scriptures. In more recent times miracles have been looked upon as a burden rather than as a help. Apparently the truth lies between the two extreme opinions. The New Testament writers use three words to describe them which are more or less synonomous, i.e. "wonders, mighty works or powers, and signs". The significance of the words implies that they are such events as cause persons to marvel at their strangeness, give evidence of being wrought by a powerful being, and are evidence to authenticate a messenger.

When we examine these three qualities of miracles, as indicated by their names, more carefully, we see their strangeness is such that they manifestly cannot be accounted for by the ordinary forces of Nature or of man's powers, and therefore must have been wrought by the Author of Nature.

Then the power which is required to perform them indicates the same thing, that they can be wrought only by the omnipotent Author of Nature.

And thirdly they are manifestly wrought to authenticate a divine messenger and so are "signs." Nicodemus evidently understood this when he said "We know that thou art a teacher sent from God, for no man can do the signs that thou doest except God be with him." i.e. they are works so manifestly wrought by God that the one who does them has evidently the approval of God, and these signs mark him and his message as approved by God. Peter in his pentecostal sermon spoke of Christ as "approved of God to you by powers, wonders and signs, which God wrought through him in your midst". And the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says of the Apostles that "God bore witness with and to them by signs and wonders and divers powers and gifts of the Holy Spirit". If any man is using divine power in any special manner it must be that

God approves of his message, and has in some sense sent him, so that his message is authenticated. It cannot be that all that such persons do and say was approved of God. The men themselves distinguished what they said or did under divine guidance from their other acts and words, as in the incident related in 1 Kings 13:17,20 and in many other cases.

A miracle may be defined as an event in Nature, manifestly not accounted for by the ordinary forces of Nature or the powers of man, and authenticating a messenger. The words "in Nature" are needed to exclude the case of conversion or the new birth, which although manifestly supernatural is not properly called a miracle. Moreover power over Nature must be manifested so as to show the presence of the Author of Nature.

Hume's famous argument against miracles was that a miracle being against nature, and experience having proved the uniformity of nature, and the unreliability of testimony, a miracle cannot be proved by testimony. Taken by itself the argument is valid. Our confidence in the uniformity of nature is greater than that in the reliability of testimony. We are sure of the uniformity of nature, not only through experience, although experience confirms it. Reason asserts it, and this very uniformity gives to miracles much of their value. But when we assert uniformity, we cannot claim it to be absolute, only relative compared with testimony.

No amount of testimony would prove to us a bare miracle at the present time. We need to see first the reason for a miracle. The state of mankind is such as to make us to see that a loving Creator would be moved to do something to help him out of his misery. We need first the proof of the beingand nature of God who is a loving Father, and the probability of His telling His children how to attain good. If He sends a message He must in some way prove that it is from Him. The only adequate proof would be to accompany the message with evidence of the approval of the Author of Nature. Having shown that a message from God is to be expected, the proof of the existence of such a message may be easily accepted. It is like a

king's proclamation with his seal attached. A proclamation without a seal must be received as spurious. A seal without a proclamation must also be spurious. But if the two seem to come together, we examine each carefully to see if by itself it seems authentic, and if both are found satisfactory we say that they prove each other.

So it is with the miracles. A miracle cannot be proved by itself by any amount of testimony. But having shown the need of a revelation and the importance of having it authenticated when recieved, we have a presumption in favor of miracles, such that the same testimony as would prove any ordinary event would be sufficient to prove them. Then when anything is presented to us as a miracle we look ~~for an accompanying message, and we scrutinize the message~~ to see if it has an accompanying message, and we scrutinize the message to see if it has internal evidence of genuineness and authenticity, and is worthy of God, as we know Him from other sources, and is self-evidencing and in accordance with Reason. All this proof having been found satisfactory, we next scrutinize the evidence for the miracle, not only in the weight of testimony, such as would conclusively establish any other event, but also as to its harmony with the teaching and all the circumstances. All these mutual relations being found satisfactory we accept the miracle, not only as a genuine work of God, but also as a valid proof of the revelation which it accompanies.

Christ himself made this claim. He said that the works which He did bore witness of him that the Father had sent Him. (John 5:36; 10:25,38; 14:11). He said that He did among the people works that no one else ever did, and because of this they were to blame for unbelief (John. 15:24). When John the Baptist asked proof of Christ's being God's messenger, Christ cited the miracles as the sufficient proof (Matt. 11:5).

Miracles were not as common in Bible times as is often supposed. Most of them were grouped in three periods of about seventy years each.

1st. Those in connection with the establishment of the theocracy from the time of Moses and onward.

2nd. The time of the decline of the theocracy, and the warnings of Elijah and Elisha.

3rd. The time of Christ and the Apostles.

The Apostles all had the power of working miracles (Matt. 10:1), and they had the power of bestowing the gift on others (Acts 5:14-17; 19:6), but these others could not in turn pass it on. When the Samaritans believed and were baptised by Philip, two apostles were sent to lay their hands on the believers and bestow on them the power of working miracles. This was the gift of the Holy Spirit enabling its recipients to be mouth-pieces for God and declare His will.

The power of working miracles ceased wtih the last of the associates of the apostles, for there was no one to transmit the gift. So there was afterwards no one competent to write Scriptures. We cannot assert positively that all the Scripture writers were workers of miracles, but we know that all the New Testament writers were apostles or associates of apostles. The authors of all the books are known except of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and scholars are agreed that if Paul did not write that, most probably Barnabas or Apollos did, and these both had the miracle-working power.

The writers of the Old Testament are many of them unknown, but Moses, Samuel, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, and others, who were probably among the writers, seem to have had a special endowment of the Holy Spirit, which manifested itself occasionally by the working of miracles. Others who perhaps did not write, were able to work miracles, as Elijah and Elisha, but they had a message for the people which is also a message for us.

Some assert that a miracle is not against Nature, but is in itself natural, only a higher law coming in and contravening lower laws. But we need to define carefully what we mean by Nature. Nature from Latin nascor, natus, that which is born, means that which is so involved in the chain of necessary cause and effect that the event is wrapped up in the antecedent, and is born from it.

being practically in existence in germ before it comes out in fact. The supernatural is that which has free-will and the ability to act without the constraint of necessity. The word "nature" is sometimes used in a loose sense of human nature, God's nature, etc., but this is inexact. The very essence of a miracle is that it is manifestly not wrought by the forces of Nature, and although in Nature is from the Author of Nature. Therefore although we do not say a miracle is "against Nature", we say that it is what Nature cannot accomplish. All the forces of Nature are the activities of God, but they are fixed methods of acting, which are so uniform that they seem as if self-acting. Their uniformity is what brings them into the class called "Nature".

Thus we have reason to believe, both because of the claims they made, and because of what is said of them, that the Scripture writers all recieved the gift of the Holy Spirit to fit them for their task, and all were authenticated by the miracle-working power, both as competent to the task, and as using the power in a manner acceptable to God. This puts the Scriptures in a class by themselves, entirely distinct from all other writings, and puts God's distinct stamp of approval upon their writings, as His special message. This does not necessarily prove that there are no errors in them but that conclusion follows very naturally from this position.

Many persons decry the value of miracles as testimony, because the people of that time were not competent to discriminate between the natural and the supernatural, just as those Indians were made to believe that an eclipse was a warning from God. But this is not a valid objection. For example, at the crossing of the Red Sea the drying of the sea was shown by the account to have taken place by natural forces, and the supernatural element was in the opportuneness and unusual aid to accomplish what was claimed to be God's purposes. Any persons would have been competent witnesses to the actuality of the event. Again in the raising of Lazarus even the most learned scientist of the present day might have been incompetent to determine between actual death or a trance-like swoon. But if it was not actual death, Jesus was a deceiver. If he was too good to deceive and too wise to be mistaken, as we are convinced, we must admit that the event was a genuine miracle, and sufficient to

attest a messenger from God. The competence of the observers does not in the least affect the question. In the case of Joshua's victory, it may be conceded that the people of the time could not certainly determine a prolongation of the day, as they were not using clocks, but the miracle lay in the victory over the foe being accomplished with God's aid before the sun set, and there is no assertion of anything that implies the stopping of the earth on its axis.

When a miracle is claimed its reality does not depend on the capacity of the witness to discriminate between the natural and the supernatural. When Christ walked on the water, or stilled the waves, anyone was competent to testify as to the fact. If he cast out evil spirits, it was he himself who claimed to do it and appealed to it as authenticating his mission. We accept the claim, but not of itself, as we have shown.

The difference between the views here presented and that commonly called "verbal inspiration" may be perhaps more clearly indicated by an illustration. A business man has several stenographers working for him. He calls one and dictates a letter which is taken down word for word. He calls another and directs that a letter be written detailing a certain transaction familiar to the stenographer. When the letter has been written the employer looks it over and perhaps makes some corrections, and then signs it and it is sent to its destination. The former is "verbal inspiration".

In the latter case the writer's style is manifest so that the recipient may be able to recognise the individuality of the stenographer, while yet every word is vouched for by the business man who sends it, and his purpose is also behind it, and is the source of it. God does not revise his writings after their completion, but supervises them in the process of writing, and the miracle-working power, authenticating the writer, is his signature. This view is not taken because it is thought to be necessary or desirable, but because the Scriptures seem to claim it for themselves, and because the facts seem to justify the claim.

IV. Man.

The word "man" is from the same root as the word "mind", ~~which~~ which indicates that the essential characteristic of man is mind. But mind is usually defined as that which knows, feels and wills, and these three activities are found in animals as well as in men. We must therefore either define mind differently, or say that those activities are more perfect in man, so as to especially characterize him in distinction from animals. Many evolutionary biologists have helped to confuse the subject by insisting that there is no difference of kind between man and animal, but only of degree. However, if we admit etymology to be reliable, we must take mind as that which distinguishes man from animal in some sense. The study of animals will not therefore be necessarily excluded from mental science, for man is certainly in part animal, and the study of animal powers may help us to understand some of man's higher powers, at least by way of contrast as well as comparison.

On any theory man is at present at the head of creation or of the visible world, in the sense that he dominates all the rest, and makes all subservient to himself. He is in some sense the product of all else, in that all else finds its purpose or object of existence in him, and he has in part at least been produced by all else. The inorganic world contributes to man's material or earthly frame, which, when man is through with it, returns to its primitive elements. SO that it is literally true that this earthly body "returns to the earth as it was", not only at death, but from moment to moment, and it is true also that this frame was made by some process or other "of the dust of the ground".

Organized matter is also found in man, in fact nearly all the matter connected with him is organized. Organization implies an organizer. Matter cannot organize itself. An organism is that which has organs, each of which has its functions or office to perform for the whole organism, which is not complete without all its organs. No one has ever seen or touched an organizer, but the work it does proves its existence.

An organizer is not perceived by the senses, as it does not consist of matter, but is a user of matter. Its presence is proved by what it does. It has laws according to which it selects the

kinds of matter suited to its needs, and builds it up in forms according to those laws. While it is using matter that is called living matter. When it has no further use for what it has taken, it rejects it, but this is still called organic matter, because it has been combined by the organism, usually in more complex compounds than otherwise combined. Its presence is also manifested in other words by living growth, which is different from the growth of a stone or a crystal, which has mere accretion, sometimes in forms beautiful, but mathematical. The growth of an organism is addition of parts helpful to those already existing. The organizer extends through the space occupied by the matter which it uses, and where it is active. Organizers are found in plants, animals and men.

Life is the state of being able to perform normal functions. When the material form or a part of it, is so injured that the organism cannot use it, it withdraws from it and that portion is called "dead". While a part or the whole is able to perform its functions, even imperfectly it is called "alive". When an organizer has ceased to manifest its presence we have no proof of its continued existence, but, on the other hand, there is no proof of its ceasing to exist. We can only say that the circumstances favorable for its manifestation have ceased to exist and therefore it has ceased to manifest itself. So we call it "dead".

Plants and animals are organisms, therefore each has an organizer, which is sometimes called a "life power", but may better be called the "immaterial body" which seizes upon material particles and builds them up into the earthly body, constantly renewing them so that the material part is never the same in any two successive instants. The matter, therefore, is but the clothing of the true body or its outer manifestation, or agent, or means for expressing itself.

This organizer is evidently divisible, for a branch may be taken from a tree and planted so as to form a separate individual tree with the same powers as the original tree, and the same laws and standard for attainment. The same thing takes place in all new plants, for a seed is but a modified portion of a stem. Life powers may also be combined as in grafting, or in the case of the pollen of one plant fertilizing the ovaries of another plant. These and related facts indicate that when we seem to divide a life power we

do not really do so, but that it is not dependent upon space in the same way as matter, and that what we call dividing is only individualizing by providing favorable opportunities for the separate manifestation of the activity of the life power. When a plant dies, nothing ceases to exist so far as we know, but the circumstances favorable for manifestation having come to an end, the activity is no longer manifested in that connection. Animals have a similar organization to that of plants, though it is usually more complex and of a higher grade.

Soul, animals have, however, in addition something of an altogether different nature, something which is capable of sensation, which involves what is called consciousness. Animals are by some persons characterized by the incapacity to use inorganic matter or to change it into organic, that is, they are dependent on organic matter for food. But sensation seems a better characteristic. This excludes sponges, which are included by the other definition. This immaterial something is closely associated with the life power, and there is no decisive proof of its separate existence but only probable proof. It appears to be divisible and unitable at the same time, and by the same means as the other or life-power. This dividing and uniting is seen in the facts of heredity and generation. Offspring possess many mental as well as physical characteristics of both parents. This is only explainable on the supposition of the transmission of the higher animal nature, called the "animal soul". Wallace, one of the leading evolutionists, has unequivocally declared that in the process of evolution there have been three points at which outside forces have come in. These occasions were, first, when life power first appeared, and second, when sensation or animal soul intervened, and third, when rational nature came upon the scene. He and others give the verdict of the latest and most advanced science in favor of the radical difference between these three entities.

The distinction between animals and plants is so marked that it is hardly supposable that the intelligence of animals is merely the addition of certain powers to the organizer of plants. Although in some animals there is very little difference noticeable from some plants, yet the possession of nerves and through them of sensation is a very marked distinction and we cannot regard this as developed

from anything any plants possess. If this were developed from plants we would expect to find that it came through the highest grades of plants, whereas the lowest grades of animals seem more clearly related to the lowest grades of plants, as if the power of sensation were bestowed by giving a new immaterial substance as the scientists say a coming in from without of a new power rather than the development of something already existing. This is confirmed by the Scripture usage which attributes "souls" to animals. (Gen.1:20, Lev.17:11 etc)

When we study animals, we find in them such activities as knowing, feeling and willing, memory and judgement, etc., but the willing is simply the carrying into effect of impulses,- the strongest controlling without any alternative in reason. They may learn by experience, but their standard is ever either self-seeking or the gratifying of appetite, and the latter may be restrained by the former, but there is no good evidence of conscience-control. Some have thought that they had discovered in animals a trace of conscience, but it is probable that what looked like it was only the effect of affection with and for men.

Spirit, the third and highest power reported by these scientists is found in man, and differentiates him from all mere animals. This is called "spirit" or "rational nature" because it uses reasons as animals cannot. In man we find all the lower grades of being together with this. He has inorganic matter. He has an organizer, or an immaterial body, similar to that in plants or animals, although of a higher grade than either. He has also all that the animal has, and so has "animal soul". Also, according to these scientists, he has rational nature or spirit. This is manifestly different from animal soul, as we shall see. Thus man is tripartite, matter being no integral part of man, but only temporarily associated with him in passing. The permanent elements, being all immaterial, are body, soul and spirit.

The last, i.e. spirit, being the essential characteristic of man, is the most important, and so worthy of careful study and discrimination. Man is possessed of personality. This word means

"sounding through" (a mask) per-sonus, and refers to the different characters in a play, and so comes to mean that which gives character, and usually it is understood to imply the possession of self-consciousness and free-will, both of which are essential to the formation of character.

Consciousness means the knowledge within the self of varing states, such as result from outside stimulant, and are the essential element of sensation. Animals have this, but not self-consciousness in which the abiding self is discriminated from the passing states and sensations.

Self-consciousness is a direct knowledge of the self. In order to this there must be a self which is the knowing subject, and a self-sufficiently distinct from the other to be the object known. The self must objectify itself, i.e. it must look at itself as if it were some other than itself. Not only so, but when the mind thinks, or uses words, it is putting into the form of words, or definite thought, what is in itself, it is expressing itself. This expressing activity is the object of the perceiving activity, and the two activities of the one person are so different that they seem like separate selves, or distinct individuals within the one person. It is a distinction of activity.

This objectifying of the self to be the object of the self-knowing is an act of every day experience. It is the moral activity of spirit. This proves at least a duality in the very nature of spirit, but we can easily see that it is trinality rather than a duality.

The fact of free-will involves a knowledge of duty, spirit knowing itself, knows or perceives duty, as we shall see hereafter. This perception of duty is legislative action. No good legislatures ever make laws. They endeavor to discover or perceive what the good of the community requires, and then they declare that to be law so that legislative action is perceiving law.

Spirit not only perceives duty. It compares the perceived law with its own action and that of others, and thus judges. This

judging activity is the same as we before noted as the self-expressing activity. A judge's chief duty is expounding the law by applying it and so judging is expressing or bringing out the inner content.

But the spirit does more, when the self has judged the act of the self to be or not to be in accordance with the law, a third self or form of activity inflicts punishment or rewards obedience. This is the executive department. These three activities of spirit in the presence of law together make up what is called the conscience. And as these three activities, legislative, judicial and executive are the functions of all good government, the conscience is found to be the ruler of the spirit. The executive faculty not only rewards and punishes, but by this very fact furnishes an incentive to right action. This department in another aspect is that which experiences.

This threefold activity of spirit may be noted in other relations. Rational being naturally approves of rational being, and this approval is a seeking of union with it. When rational being seeks union with rational being, it finds rational being first in itself, looked upon as another self, or in other words, rational being expresses itself as another self in order to be an object of the going forth of the first self in search of other rational being.

The going forth of a self toward another is Love. Love is "lief", or leaving of self for another, as shown by etymology. Thus the first self loves the other self, as if other than itself, and this other or second self expresses itself to be an object of love, just as we saw that it does this expressing to be the object of self-knowing. These two selves are the legislative and judicial selves.

But there is a third self as the bond of union of these two. The going forth or the seeking, or perceiving, activity finds a bond of union with the expressing activity in the experiencing activity. This is the executive activity which we saw to be the same as the experiencing faculty.

The chief experiences are love, joy and peace. This "love" is

perfected love, though the simple going forth is the first and essential element of rational love, but the mutual resting is perfect love as an experience.

These three activities may be illustrated by the electric battery. A metal is inserted in a liquid which acts upon it and electricity is generated. Another metal is put in near the first, and the tension is increased, but there is still no flow. A third metal or a wire joins the two, and the current flows through the three. The metal acted upon the most is called the generating metal, and the current seems to flow from it, yet it really flows both ways through all three.

The three activities of spirit may be better described as follows:-

1. Reason going forth to meet reason, or spirit perceiving.
2. Reason expressing reason, or spirit judging.
3. Reason resting in reason, or spirit experiencing.

The names given by the Greeks to these three were respectively, Nous, Logos and Pneuma. The activities of these three so-called selves within the one person or individual, are clearly distinguished by the names.

The nous is that which perceives (noeo) intuitively, the logos is that which forms ideas or thoughts, (logizomai) expressing what is in the mind, and the pneuma or "spirit in particular", is the most spiritual activity of "spirit in general", or its highest form of activity. Thus common consciousness by etymology proves this threefold classification, and any man may verify it in his own experience.

It is customary to classify mental activities as knowing, feeling and willing. This classification is applicable to the animal nature, which is also in man, but is not satisfactory for the whole man. In animal nature knowledge is followed by emotion or feeling, which in turn becomes an impulse to action. But thinking, which is

perhaps the most characteristic action of a rational being hardly comes under the head of knowing. Willing can hardly be classed by itself because it is involved in every activity of self-conscious being, and yet there is a form of willing which comes under the head of "reason going out to meet reason" or choice. The experiences of spirit (love, joy and peace, etc) are not so much direct motives to action as emotions are, as they are results of action.

The Greek philosophers regarded "the Good, the Beautiful, the True" as the only worthy objects of effort. These three may be defined as reason in action, reason in form, and reason in principle, being the activities of the nous, the logos, and the pneuma respectively. Beauty is not in color or shape of themselves, but when a rational being by his logos has expressed rational ideas, by means of color, or form, or sound, another rational being perceives it by his nous as beauty, and in so perceiving experiennes in his pneuma a satisfaction called "joy", for "a thing of beauty is a joy forever". We said before that truth is an expression of that which is or possesses reality. We may now further define Truth as the abstract rational principles or archetypes, the standard of all that is rational in God or man or the universe, and see that harmony with it results in the experience of "peace". These standards underlie all that has form, and they alone possess abiding reality. Christ is called "the Truth" because these are in Him, he being "the express image of God," and for this reason He gives "peace".

The science of mind is commonly called Psychology, or the Science of the Soul. We see from the above that this is a misnomer unless we take "soul" in the sense of the whole self, and this is allowable by usage. The "mind" also must mean the whole immaterial part of man, including body, soul and spirit, and not merely that which knows, feels and wills.

We should keep in mind that the "body" is the immaterial organizer of the material frame. The "soul" is the animal nature which resides in and uses the body, and has self-interest as its rule of

life. The "spirit" is the companion and rival of the soul, is the image of God in its triunity and has the conscience as its standard. These three are often in conflict with each other, and yet the action of the man, involves all three, although the responsibility is with the spirit alone, for it alone has freedom.

The word "soul" often appears in common usage as equivalent to "spirit". The Scriptures themselves do not seem to discriminate always between the two words. But sometimes they do distinguish most decidedly, as in 1 Thess. 5:23 where the three substances which make up the whole man are mentioned. In Heb. 4:12 the motives of the two are contrasted, as elsewhere explained. In 1 Cor. 2:16 "the natural" is literally the psychic or "soul-man", or the one who is selfish, or ruled by the animal soul. See the same again in Jas. 3:15 and Jude 19. This distinction also makes plain the reference in Rev. 6:9 & 20:4, also in 1 Cor. 15:44, etc.

The apparent confounding of the two words is due to Old Testament usage. When the animal soul rules it makes the man selfish, so the word "soul" is naturally used for the self, and so may include the whole self, or inner man, as Ps. 103:1, and then it is used for the individual as in Ezek. 18:4,20, & 1 Pe. 3:20. In many places the word "soul" is used for the life, as in the animals, see marg. Lev. 17:11, etc. The expression "dead soul" is also naturally used for a dead body, as in Num. 8:6, 9:6,7,10 etc. As a natural consequence they talk of killing souls, Num. 31:19, 31:35, etc. Then for individuals in general in Num. 31:46. In other places the word "soul" is used for self, in Math. 16:25, 1 Jno. 3:16, etc. These usages of the word "soul" do not conflict with the discrimination between the two.

Many writers attempt to show that animals have "reason", by instancing cases where animals have used reasoning or deduced conclusions, but as we have shown "Reason" is only properly applied to self-consciousness and free-will, or the possession of conscience, and there is no good evidence of animals possessing these.

V. Ethics.

This is the science of duty, and comes up naturally for consideration under the topic of Man, and being fundamental in Theology must be studied before we proceed further. "Duty" is that which is "due" just as what one "ought" is what he "owes". A man owes when he possesses something which belongs to another, or which another rightfully claims. We have thus the witness of common consciousness to these two words and their meanings, and so to our fundamental position. Who owes? and to whom? The man possesses a capacity for becoming perfect, therefore the self that becomes, owes perfection to the other self that holds the ideal. Perfection is thus due by the nous to the logos.

Thus the conscience claims authority over the spirit. This cannot be evaded or set aside or denied. There is no other source of authority over the spirht. We may say that it is the demand of reason, but it is not because it is reason, but from the nature of the case, or we might ask where reason got its authority. It is the demand of reason because the spirit is reason. God is the Absolute Reason, and Reason makes the same demand of Him. In other words God has a conscience which is his guide in action, and this conscience of God and our conscience necessarily harmonize with each other when acting normally. Perfection is that which we are capable of normally.

The nous, knowing self, perceives what we are capable of, and so lays down the law,- we are a law unto ourselves, or have the law within ourselves. Goodness is perfection or some approach to it. So it is our duty to choose that which is good, yet not because it is good, but because it is duty or due, and the logos demands it. Let us repeat. Law is the standard of action. The standard of action is that of which we are capable normally. "Normally" means according to norm, or law. This seems like talking in a circle, but it is not. We are capable of sin. But sin is action against the standard or law. So when we say that the standard is that of which we are capable normally, we mean that a certain method of acting is inherent in us, or fit to our nature, or worthy of us, so that when we so

act we are perfect. There is an ideal which we are capable of attaining, and it is our duty to attain it, i.e. the self which has the capacity of attaining owes it to the ideal self to attain it,- the nous which wills, or chooses, and which therefore has the capacity of attaining, owes it to the ideal expresser or logos, to come up to it. This is a constraint of duty, a binding to the standard, or a pressure to come up to the standard. There is no authority which can conflict with this constraint which we call conscience. In fact it is the source of all authority.

The State has authority when its officers are elected by the people, so that they represent the combined voice of the consciences of the people, so far as it is possible to combine them. When its officers are not formally elected, they still represent the people by suffrance. If they did not, the people would rise and overthrow their rule. In cases where the people would so rise if they were able, but do not, because they are not able, we may say that the authority exercised is not rightful.

A seeming exception to this is where the unwillingly-accepted rule is really for the good of the people,- the best possible under the circumstances. We may say that such rulers have the suffrages of all the consciences acting normally, or rationally, and so have rightful authority; for abnormal consciences really have no authority rightfully.

Likewise in church government the source of authority is the voice of the individual consciences collectively expressed so far as possible.

It is sometimes objected that consciences vary in their verdict, and so cannot furnish an absolute standard. We have shown that the law is based on the subject's capacity, it aims at his perfection. The conscience is the only interpreter of that standard to the subject, and therefore the only ruler. The vision may be dim or distorted,-that does not alter the fact. As with physical vision, distorted or imperfect vision may cause loss to the one who sees but he has to endure it. Yet it is well to remember that our vision.

moral as well as physical may make use of helps. Our consciences should be compared with those of others in their verdicts, particularly with those who are specially fitted to be leaders. Also with the common consciousness of mankind, and with the revealed will of God. If difference is found the cause must be sought, and the difference adjusted. The conscience should be trained to clear vision by every means available, especially should sensitiveness be secured by careful and prompt obedience to its behests.

The application of moral principles to concrete cases need not be difficult. "Spiritual worthiness" is another rather vague way of expressing the standard, meaning that which is worthy of a rational being, or that by doing which a rational being attains to perfection. This is the same position as we have taken. The conscience perceives more or less clearly this "worthiness", and this is always duty. The obligation lies in the "ought" of the capacity. It may be perceived by the man's own conscience, or by that of others, or it may be discovered in God's revealed Word.

Christ and Paul both said: "Love is the fulfilling of the Law". How does this agree with the above? Love is self devotion. Self-devotion is a supreme choice. It is a choice of good; this includes God, the good One. If it is a choice of God, it is a choice of all good, and will include all worthy objects. So Love satisfies the law of obligation in its inner constraint. Moreover this complete self-devotion leads to keeping the rules of the law in all overt action; so it fulfills the law. We said before "good is reason in action". It is the choice of perfection, which is the standard of reason or for rational beings, and right choice is the action which perfects. Some object, saying that perfection itself being a choice, we cannot take a choice , which does not exist until the choice is made, as the object of choice; for it is the absurdity of choosing itself while itself is as yet non-existent. But this is not a valid objection. We objectify in the mind the perfection which we

can perceive before it exists, and we choose that which stands as an ideal, not yet actualized, but sufficiently real in idea to be perceived and to be an object of choice.

Others say that duty lies in the obligation to choose a greater good in preference to a lesser one. But how can we determine which is the greater good,-my perfection , or yours; the greater perfection of a lower grade of being, or the lesser perfection of a higher being. There is no sure means for determining duty thus.

Some say the essence of good is pleasure, because pleasure or gratification is the only motive that moves us, but how do we know that present gratification will not give greater enjoyment than some future pleasure, and if it does it is duty on this rule, which really can give no standard for action and this is not the only motive. Common consciousness teaches that duty does not get its authority or binding force from pleasure, although it may be accompanied by pleasure.

But others object that we have duties to God and our fellow men, which contradicts the idea that all duty is to self. It is true that we owe God reverence, love, worship and obedience, but why do we owe them to Him? Because our relations to Him are such that we would be imperfect if we did not render these. We owe these to Him because we owe it to ourselves to render them to him.

Likewise, we owe our neighbor love, respect, truthfulness etc. Why do we owe them? Because we would be imperfect if we did not render them to him. SO we owe it to ourselves to render these. Our duties to God and to our neighbor are first duties to ourselves, and spring from our capacities and our relations to them. My conscience demands it of me.

Butsome say it is selfishness to make one's own perfection the standard of duty. It is not so. Selfishness is seeking some seeming good for one's self to the neglect or detriment of the good of others. My own perfection includes a regard for the good of others, and will not permit me to put my own good or advantage before that of others. Moreover, I cannot evade the demand of duty,

as noted before, due by nous to logos. Christ recognizes this standard saying, "Be ye perfect," giving at the same time a pattern, "as your Father".

This brings us to the question of God's authority. The fact of creation does not give authority; it creates responsibility. Suppose an evil being able to create, he would not have the right to rule, so creation does not of itself give authority. God having brought into being, is under obligation to secure the best good of His creatures so far as possible, and if he is not sure to be able to bring about their best good on the whole, He has no right to bring into being.

But God's conscience being Absolute Reason will agree with the consciences of all finite rational beings, acting rationally, therefore He represents the voices of the consciences of all, and as a consequence He has the authority of all these consciences. This community of rational beings requires a ruler for its best good. He cannot evade the responsibility because He created, and, as practically elected, He has the authority of the consciences of all. No being can say I did not agree to His rule and so He has no authority over me, any more than a citizen of this country can say I did not vote for this President, and so he is not my ruler. Thus it is truethat all true government of the people, is for the people, and by the people, and God is our righteous ruler, and we are bound to render Him obedience for conscience' sake.

We said that choice of good is goodness, and that not only is perfection goodness, but approach to perfection is also such. This depends on the fact, discovered and verified by experience, that there are many degrees of goodness. Nothing has a moral quality unless it involves an element of choice. Choices are of many kinds.

A choice may be all-controlling or minor choices, or it may only partially control. Moreover, there are abiding or permanent choices and temporary or transient choices.

The choice of an end of life, either of the good end or the bad end, is the most abiding. In fact this choice is what determines character, and will never be reversed by the man of himself, because it sets the standard for all choices, either the man has made evil his good, or true good is to him good. Minor choices may lie directly against this supreme choice, which, however, tends to control all less permanent choices. The degree of its control depends on the intensity with which it is made, or to which it attains.

The supreme choice for evil is rarely made in one act, but is usually the result of many minor choices for evil which bring about a fixed habit, though it may not be known at what time the habit becomes fixed and the character determined. It is possible that a good habit forming a supreme choice for good may be fixed in a similar way resulting from numerous minor choices for good, if the evil choice has not already been made. The degree of goodness of a person, who has made the supreme choice for good, depends on the degree of intensity of that choice, and its power to control minor choices.

Free-will means that, circumstances being as they are, a man may choose in either of two ways, i.e. he has a free alternative to his choice. The animal's choice or act is determined absolutely by its heredity and environment. Man is in part animal, so his heredity and environment influence him, and he may act as they impel him, or he may refuse to so act and take the alternative. The conscience, when it perceives duty, furnishes an impulse to action in accord with it. These differing motives do not determine the action, their relative strength cannot be compared. If a man is asked why he chose as he did, he may mention the motive in accordance with which he chose, or he may say simply "I chose to do so, and that is all there is to be said about it." If he chose the right, he may state the motive and say "that is the reason", meaning the reasonableness of the choice. The law of cause and effect which obtains in the natural world does not hold here, because man is in this above Nature.

That law is that with a given cause, including the circumstances, a certain result will follow and no other.

The law of cause applicable to man's free-will is that "the cause must be competent to the effect". It is also competent to some other effect. Thus man is in this respect a real creator, bringing into existance something, not "out of nothing", but "not out of anything already existing". Man is author of his choice.

When a man has made the permanent choice he is no longer free to change that choice. He has used his freedom, but he still has a degree of freedom in minor choices so that in them he can choose either according to his lower nature or according to his conscience. A good man may do bad things, and a bad man may do good things. Yet they are not perfectly free in this, as the supreme choice tends to control minor choices, and in turn these minor choices tend to modify the intensity of the supreme choice, making it either more or less intense, and so modifying the character.

The soul and body are inherited from the parents, and are apt to have abnormal strength of impulse. They do not necessarily go against the spirit with its conscience, but they are very apt to do so. When the bodily appetites rule in a man, he may be called sensual. Although the body in plants has no sensation, in animals and man the senses seem naturally to go with the body in the matter of impulses, while the impulse to action from the soul seems rather to be to care for self, and so tend to selfishness.

If the spirit rules against the impulses of the lower nature, the man is spiritual. But when the lower natures have ruled for a time and the fixed choice of the man for evil has been developed, then by association with evil spirits, either human or other, the human spirit may gain ascendency with a strong choice for evil, so that the man chooses evil because it is evil. Then he may be called "devilish". This is the most hopeless state of a man, and comparatively rare, we may hope.

The state from which a man is most easily recovered, although the most degraded, is when his appetites rule. But the most common state of evil is selfishness, where the soul rules, called in the Scripture psuchikos (Jas. 3:15). The spirit of man is God-like in its powers, and is the image of God in man. We can therefore easily believe that it is a "gift of God". (Ecc.12:7)

The Will.

The will is the action of the whole man, spirit, soul and body. Choice is the action of the individual going out towards an object as alternative to some other object. Of the three, the spirit is the only truly free agent but it cannot act entirely by itself. Choice and will are the same thing. We use the former word with reference to an alternative, expressed or implied. The other word we use to indicate the going forth of the being toward the object, with no suggestion of an alternative. The term "free-will" is used by contrast with the will of animals, which is determined from the outside and therefore is not free.

The body presents an impulse from an appetite, the soul perhaps another impulse toward self-seeking. These two impulses come from the inherited nature, or from circumstances, and are such as the animal has, and necessarily control in it. At the same time the spirit may present another impulse from the conscience, which is very likely the opposite or negative of these two, thus making an alternative. When the man acts, it is the spirit that chooses, among the three impulses, but it may be in accord with any one of the three.

Whichever impulse is followed, the act is of the whole man, all three are involved. The strength of the three cannot be compared with each other, if the man is truly free. If any impulse is abnormally strong there is a proportionate probability of the man's action being in accordance with it. If any impulse is decisively strong through previous habit, or controlling choice, the man is not metaphysically free in making his choice, the man is the bond servant of sin or of righteousness, whichever the case may be. (Rom. 6:16). Though thus metaphysically bound, if his surrender was to righteousness he is in a higher sense truly free, (Jno. 8:36)

These considerations make plain Paul's discussion in Rom. 7. The "I" which "hates" is the spirit, the "inner man" as Paul calls it, the "I" which "does" is the whole man. The "members" are the soul and body, or inherited nature, in which sin resides, by these having acquired control by habit, which gives the "law of sin", "the law of the mind" or of the nous is the law perceived by the conscience, which may or may not prevail in the final act, both in the converted and in the unconverted, for the struggle may continue in either.

I QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW Introductory

What is a Science?
What are its materials?
Compare "facts" and "truths".
What does Theology include?
What is Religion?
How is Theology superior to other Sciences?
Name the included Sciences.
What is Reason?
What is its office?
How is the verdict of Common-consciousness secured?
" " " Christian-consciousness " ?
Compare the sources of Material for Theology.
What is the natural order of Subjects?
" most useful " " ? P-s 1-7.

II QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW (REVELATION)

What is Revelation?
What words are used for the SCRIPTURES?
What claims do the Scriptures make by Peter?
" " " " " Paul?
" " " " " Christ?
Compare the Written Word with the Incarnate WORD.
What of the "Higher Critics"?
What bearing does Evolution have on the Scriptures?
What may we suppose to be the method of Inspiration?
How was the Canon settled?
Give other views.

P-s. 8-15.

III QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW (MIRACLES).

The Bible names of Miracles.
The meaning of miracles.
A Definition of a miracle.
Hume's Argument.
Compare miracles with a king's seal.
State Christ's claim for miracles.
Give the Times of miracles.
Show that Bible-writers were miracle-workers.
What is the meaning of "Nature"?
Compare this theory with 'Verbal Inspiration.'

IV QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW (MAN).

What is man according to Etymology?
Relation to other beings.
What is an organism?
Distinguish plants and animals.
" body and soul.
" animal and man.
What is personality?
Give elements of self-consciousness.
Describe three-fold activity of spirit.
" conscience.
" perfect love.
Prove three activities of Reason.
What did the Greek philosophers seek?
What is Truth?
What is Psychology?

pp 16-22.

V QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW (ETHICS).

Give foundation principle from etymology.
What is perfection?
" " goodness?
" " Law?
" " obligation?
How does state get authority?
" " church " " ?
What of varying consciences?
" is remedy for " ?
How apply these principles.
How does love fulfil the law.
Can we choose a choice?
Why not the greater good.
" " " " pleasure.
Is not this selfishness?
Whence God's authority.
Compare varying choices.
How is character determined?
What is Free-will
Compare three kinds of moral character
Compare will and choice
" the strength of impulses.
Expound Rev. 7 Chap.

pp 23-27.