

ARTICLE II.

THE DIVINE IMMANENCY.

BY THE REV. JAMES DOUGLAS, D.D., LL.D., PULASKI, NEW YORK.

[*Concluded from Vol. xlvi. p. 72.*]

THE RELATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE IMMANENCE TO INSPIRATION.

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that the analysis of the word "inspiration" in its true and original signification, especially as given in the New Testament, affords no ground whatever for the development of a mechanical theory, yet such theory has been commonly held in some form by Bible-interpreters. The original significance of inspiration is *inbreathing*. In the New Testament (2 Tim. iii. 16) we find the word *θεόπνευστος*, "God-breathed."

God is Spirit and the breathing of the Divine Spirit into the human spirit must produce the effect of re-enforcing the human spirit that is thus made recipient of the Divine Spirit, itself the source of the human spirit. The very word *θεόπνευστος* is itself a statement of the doctrine of the divine immanence in inspiration, and denotes not external or mechanical, but internal or immanent action; not mediately, as one human spirit by the media of words as expressions of thought acts on another, but immediately, as the Divine Spirit alone can act on the human spirit, because it alone is source and fountain of all life and intelligence.

The mechanical theory of inspiration seems to originate in the failure to distinguish the difference in the relations which the divine personality sustains to human personality,

and those which one human personality sustains to another. The Creator and Father of our spirits, as the life, the originating and sustaining life, of our spirits, alone holds such relations to our spirit as to render it possible for him to become an inbreathing power of inspiration. All the analyses of the action of one human spirit on another fail to illustrate or explain the action of the Divine Spirit, as a power of inbreathing, or inspiration, in its relations to the soul, which is its creation and of which it is the sustaining life. The action of one human spirit upon another must necessarily be as an *external* power; but that of the Divine, by the very term inspiration, or inbreathing, is presented to us as an *internal* vivification and energizing. The theory, which is irreconcilably opposed to the mechanical, is found in the analysis of the word "inspiration" itself; so that we can but regard a mechanical inspiration as a contradiction in terms. And this contradiction cannot be evaded by the allegation that the source is external, for the question under consideration is not of origin, but of *mode* of action. How does the Divine Spirit act? Externally or internally? If externally, then the word "inspiration" is not the proper term to use. And here let it be observed, that by those holding the mechanical theory, other terms are constantly used, such as "superintendence," "dictation," to "guide," "control," "direct," in order to define the action of the Holy Spirit in harmony with such theory.

In defining our theory of the internal or immanent action of the Holy Spirit in inspiration, we can find no word more appropriate than that of inspiration itself. As opposed to the mechanical theory, we would call it the inspiration-theory of inspiration, notwithstanding the tautology.

There is always one supreme test of the truth or validity of a theory, which is, that it is inclusive of all the facts connected with it, and that it fully harmonizes and explains *all* the facts. Now let us apply this principle to the various

theories of inspiration. While the fact of historical discrepancies in the different Gospel narratives can be easily explained in harmony with the theory of the immanent or internal action of the Holy Spirit, it is impossible to reconcile the mechanical theory with such facts. And it is doubtless for this reason, that so much fruitless effort has been expended, by those holding the mechanical theory, to devise some plan for reconciling or removing such discrepancies.

Of the fact of historical discrepancies in the Gospel narratives, it will be sufficient to refer to four such instances.

The first which we will consider, is one on which much research, as well as ingenuity, has been expended in explanation, but unsuccessfully in the opinion of some of our best as well as most candid scholars. It is the different accounts given on one side by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and on the other by John, concerning the time at which Christ and his disciples ate the last Passover, or paschal supper, together. Says Alford, concerning the account given by John, "Plainly it does not agree with the view of the three other evangelists." ¹

Another is the account given by three evangelists of a miracle of healing the blind (Matt. xx. 29-34 ; Mark x. 46-52 ; Luke xviii. 35-xix. 1). Matthew speaks of *two* blind men ; Mark and Luke, of only *one*. Mark states that the healing was performed as Christ and his disciples *went out of* Jericho ; Luke affirms that the healing was wrought "as he was come nigh unto Jericho ;" and, after it was performed, that "Jesus entered and passed through Jericho."

Says Alford on this topic : "The only fair account of such differences is, that they existed in the sources from which each evangelist took his narrative. This later one is easily explained from the circumstances having happened close to

who would stumble at such discrepancies, and not rather see in them the corroborating coincidence and testimonies to the fact itself." ¹

For another example of historical discrepancies, compare Luke's account of Paul (Acts ix. 20) with Paul's own account of himself (Gal. i. 16-22). Compare, also, the conflicting narratives, to which Professor Huxley refers in his controversy with Dr. Wace on agnosticism, concerning what he calls "the Gadarene story" (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 2; Luke viii. 27).

With reference to such discrepancies, Professor Ladd, in his "Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," writes: "It is the shallowest folly to busy the apologetic forces of historical Christianity solely with quibbles about the possibility of justifying this or that detail of narrative, or of harmonizing this or that small discrepancy of one writer with another."² Again: "To show how doctrinal truth, which is given by the spirit of revelation in historical form, should be distinguished from the historical faultiness of that form, may involve difficulties and dangers; but these difficulties and dangers are small in comparison with those involved in the denial of plain facts. . . . Critical inquiry may compel us to pronounce unhistorical some of the alleged histories of Scripture."³ On page 346, Professor Ladd raises the question, "Were the mere facts of the past ever revealed to the writers of the Bible?" If not, then they were dependent on historical statements already in existence, which sometimes may have been erroneous.

Professor Ladd here discloses a fruitful source of confusion often appearing in discussions of the subject of inspira-

But the former denotes divine inbreathing, the latter is ἀποκάλυψις, "unfolding."

A radical defect with most theories of inspiration has been, that inspiration has not been kept distinct from revelation. Inspiration and revelation are commonly confounded together by those who hold the mechanical theory of dictation by the Holy Spirit. But a careful distinction should be made between the revelation which comes from inspiration of the Holy Spirit exalting the moral perceptions and the revelation or unfolding of facts as in the presentation before the mind of the scenery of the future.

Revelation of *moral* truth is, sometimes at least, a result of inspiration in giving perfect moral perception. While it is true that the Holy Spirit performs both offices (for its offices are multifarious), both that of revealing and inspiring; yet these offices are distinct, and no more to be confounded than are the chemical and mechanical functions of the air, although united. The Holy Spirit may inspire without revealing, at least without revealing or unfolding historic facts, past or future. It may reveal the future, without inspiring, or enabling the subject to adequately comprehend, or record the revelation. In the one case, *inspiring*, it acts as an immanent, in the other case, *revealing*, it acts as a transcendent power.

INSPIRATION.

Inspiration is the impartation of a larger measure of that very intellectual and moral life and power which man already possesses, derived from the Divine Being. The effect of inspiration is to re-enforce the mental powers, to quicken the intellectual and moral perceptions, to enlarge and intensify the intellectual operations, to enable its subject to see intellectual and moral truth more clearly, to distinguish more accurately truth from error, to discern right from wrong. Christ himself taught his disciples that this was to be the effect, to quicken the mental faculties. He says of the Holy

Spirit, or Paraclete, "He shall bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." The apostle Paul speaks most emphatically of the increased power of moral discernment which the Divine Spirit imparts (1 Cor. ii. 14-15).

Inspiration does not make a mere automaton of its subject, unconscious of his own acts. It did not put the inspired penman into a trance, and then move his arm to record what it dictated. Modern spiritism presents no illustration of its action. It did not take away the consciousness, but rather intensified it. It did not over-rule self-direction; it enlarged that capacity. It did not repress any individualities, but rather exalted them. It did not change any personal or customary peculiarities in writing. The man inspired by the Holy Spirit was still himself, thoroughly himself, only with mental powers exalted and intensified, fully, grandly, consciously, himself, and self-directing. With sharpened intellect and clarified moral perceptions, he remembers the past distinctly and sees moral truth perfectly.

While inspiration gives such augmented power, greater clearness and precision to the intellectual as well as moral faculties,—such that its subject remembers accurately and fully what he has seen and heard of an historical character,—it does not correct any error of perception that may have occurred in observing events or attendant circumstances. It does not *reveal* those historic events or incidents, only gives to memory a clear recollection of them, as they occurred to his own observation, or as narrated to him by others. To illustrate: Two men may have been seen together. One may have been leading the other. The observer may have supposed, or he may have heard some one say, that they were both blind. In the narration of the incident, even if this same observer had been subsequently inspired as a writer, he would give the facts as he observed or heard them, although there may have been in reality but one blind man.

Inspiration would not correct this error; that would come under the province of revelation.

But let it be observed, that inspiration, while it gives the power of accurate recollection, gives also, as a quickening power not only of the intellectual but also of the moral faculties, clear and perfect perception of moral truth. Here there would be no error. Superadded to the perfect perception of moral truth would be a clear discernment of the most appropriate words with which to express those truths, so adapted to the mental condition and habits of those to whom they were addressed, as to make them the most clearly and easily apprehensible. It was thus that Christ spoke in parables to the common people. In this completeness, inspiration furnishes to us, both in respect to moral truth and to the record of it, a perfect religious and moral rule for our faith and practice.

VERBAL INSPIRATION.

Thus it is that inspiration as a quickening power to the intellectual as well as to the moral nature, inducing an exalted mental state, enables the writer fully to apprehend the true import and significance of language, to discern and select with perfect intellectual precision the appropriate words in which to express his thoughts. This gives *verbal inspiration*, a condition indispensable to a perfect record of truth.

The objections and arguments commonly adduced against the doctrine of verbal inspiration—such, for example, as are given by the learned commentator Alford—apply only to the theory of dictation, a theory which this commentator rejects as “making the writers of the Scriptures mere mouthpieces or organs of the Holy Spirit, as they were not affirmed to be, but holy men under the divine inspiration.” But, from our present theory of inspiration, we obtain a doctrine of verbal inspiration entirely consistent with that of the fullest personal consciousness of the inspired writer.

It is not on the ground that the facts they narrated were

revealed by the Spirit, but solely that they were eye-witnesses of those things,—that they narrated what they had seen and heard,—that the inspired writers of the historic portions of the Old and New Testaments claim credence. It was on this ground, as Luke says in the proem to his Gospel (i. 3.), “having had a perfect understanding of all things from the first,”—and the sources of such knowledge he also gives (ver. 2), “even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word,”—and not on the ground that all things were revealed by the Holy Spirit to himself, that he undertook the work of “setting forth in order a declaration of those things.” The apostle John also says: “That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you” (1 John i. 3). Christ himself claimed credence on no other ground. “We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen,” was his declaration to Nicodemus (John iii. 11).

The reliableness of the historic facts is affirmed only on the ground that the writers gave what they had seen or heard. Memory was quickened by inspiration, so that they remembered clearly what they had seen or heard. The concession that different writers vary in some unimportant matters of detail or incidents does not in the slightest degree invalidate their claim to inspiration, neither does it impair the credibility of their testimony. It only shows, that their information in regard to some of the incidents was obtained from different sources, each different from the other. These variations in different narratives only confirm the truth of what is affirmed, that each one gives an *independent* narrative of events as he himself saw the event, or as he received the narration of it from another on whose testimony, as competent and trustworthy, he could rely. Exact similarity in narration would of itself be most conclusive evidence of collusion among the different writers, and would destroy our belief in the fact of *independent* authorship; a fact which is especially called in question by the higher criticism.

DIVERSITY OF STYLE.

Again, this theory of inspiration, based on the doctrine of the divine immanency, that by the inbreathing of the Holy Spirit the human mind is quickened, the mental powers exalted and re-enforced, recognizes the fact, and accounts for it, that the various writings of the Bible exhibit peculiarities of thought and expression depending upon the culture of the individual writer, and conforming more or less to the modes of expression and habits of thought common to the age and nation in which he wrote. Inspiration did not transform a man into a scientist, nor furnish him with a precise, philosophic, or technical terminology. Neither did it force upon him an unusual mode of expression, foreign to his habits and culture. And yet it gave clear and perfect discernment of moral truth, of obligations and duties, in all the relations of life, and so furnishes an infallible rule of religious faith and practice; a perfect rule—perfect in apprehension, perfect in expression, because presented in language the fittest, best, and most appropriate for conveying to others a clear and accurate knowledge of the truth.

When the mental and moral faculties are so exalted and quickened by the Divine Spirit that a man sees right and wrong as God sees them, he must discern them perfectly. And when his mental faculties are so vivified that he apprehends clearly and perfectly the word best fitted to express accurately his thought,—for there is always a correlation between clearness of thought and accuracy of expression,—

cies between exact scientific truth and colloquial truth may be harmonized.

By colloquial truth is meant such statement of truth as is common in ordinary and familiar conversation. We do not expect here the use of exact scientific phrases. The learned scientist and the common ignoramus alike use in ordinary conversation the phrase "the sun rises," although known to the former to be scientifically incorrect. Conversation especially will be characterized by the prevailing habits of a people, or by the modes of expression common among them. If, like the Orientals, they are accustomed to the abundant use of metaphors, similes, hyperboles, or exaggerated comparisons, we must expect to find such modes of expression in the narrations given of their conversations.

Christ himself spoke, in conversation with men, not in the stilted language of exact science, but in modes and phrases familiar and common with the people among whom he lived, as a man among men, using the language of the common people, which was one among other reasons why they heard him gladly, *ἡδέως* (with pleasure, as one easy to understand).

The use of parables was an especial characteristic of his teachings. These were used as illustrations, not cited as actual historical incidents; and were so understood by the people to whom these modes of instruction were familiar. Yet how often are parables not only, but especially metaphors, figures, and even hyperboles, interpreted in the most rigid literalism, by a rule that is triumphantly announced as the supreme law of interpretation, "The Bible must be taken just as it reads"! The apostle Paul tells us truly, "The letter killeth, the Spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. iii. 6).

POETIC, ALLEGORIC, AND SYMBOLIC TRUTH.

So, also, this view of inspiration prepares the way for a mode of interpretation that reconciles the discrepancies between exact scientific truth and poetical truth, as we find it

in the Bible. Poetry possesses certain inherent and essential characteristics wherever found, whether in sacred or profane literature. What is the effect of poetic inspiration? How does the poet use language under the influence of its afflatus? What would poetry be without figures, tropes, and metaphors?

But although often confounded, it is not a question of inspiration, but of interpretation concerning the poetic figures, metaphors, allegories, symbolisms, and even the narratives of Scripture, whether or not they are to be literally interpreted.

The controversy between Luther and Zwingli concerning the true significance of the phrase "This is my body," was not dependent upon any theory of inspiration, for both held the same theory of dictation, common to the Roman Catholic Church, in which they were both alike educated. It was simply a question of interpretation. Luther in his writings distinctly states that "the Holy Spirit itself is the writer," and Zwingli insisted, even more firmly than Luther, on the supreme authority of the Scriptures.¹

So, again, it is not a question of inspiration, but of interpretation, whether the story of the garden of Eden, the temptation by the serpent and the expulsion, is to be interpreted, as was done by Origen, as an allegory, descriptive of temptation and sin with universal humanity, or literally, as an historic narrative; whether the term "Adam" (1 Cor. xv. 22 and 45-50) is to be interpreted generically both in regard to the first and last Adam,—the one denoting the natural man, the other the spiritual man regenerated,—or whether they are to be regarded as specifications of distinct historic characters.

So, also, it is a question, not of inspiration, but of interpretation,—for if Christ spake in parables, the Holy Spirit could dictate parables,—relative to the book of Job, and

¹ Hagenbach's *History of Doctrine*, Vol. ii. p. 242 *et seq.*

even that of Jonah, whether they are to be regarded as narrations of actual historic events, or whether they were written like parables for the end of illustrating moral truth: in the one case, that affliction is not always punitive, but disciplinary; in the other, that God is not a respecter of persons, but extends his mercy and forgiveness to the heathen, as well as to the Israelite.

So, also, there are those who hold to the literal interpretation of the parables of Christ as actual historical events, although not differing in theory of inspiration from those giving a different interpretation. Although the theologian may have modified his interpretation of the Hebrew word *yom*, "day," in Genesis, and no longer insists on regarding it as designating only a period of twenty-four hours, yet it by no means necessarily follows that he has also modified his doctrine of inspiration.

So, again, the question whether the description in the book of Joshua, of the sun and moon standing still, is to be interpreted as the exact narrative of an historical event, or as a quotation from the poetic book of Jasher, in which the writer intends to surround with poetic embellishments the statement, that Joshua accomplished two days' work of slaughter in one, is to be decided on principles of interpretation, and not on doctrines of inspiration. So, also, a literal and materialistic as well as a spiritual interpretation is given to the Apocalypse, both in its descriptions of the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and of the scenery of heaven, by those holding the same theory of inspiration. And yet it is common for these discordant interpreters to charge each other with holding erroneous doctrines of inspiration.

Differences of interpretation arise freely in answer to the question, What did the writer mean? not Who was the real writer? or How did he write? But they have nothing to do with questions of inspiration. It is only the conceded facts

of the existence of historical discrepancies and of diversities of style that involve the subject of inspiration, since such facts are inexplicable on the theory of mechanical inspiration. For if the writer was only an amanuensis writing by the dictation of the Holy Spirit, or an automaton guided and directed by the same Spirit thus acting as an external or mechanical power, then the various records, all being dictated or supervised by the same power and personality, must necessarily have that perfect unity and harmony in the narration of historical facts and that uniformity of style and expression which are direct consequents attending the condition of identity of origin in the self-same dictating and guiding power.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE PENTATEUCH.

The objection to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, formerly paraded with a false assumption of learning, that the art of writing was not in existence at the time that Moses lived, is utterly dissipated by the discoveries of modern archaeology, whose researches have brought to light writings in Egypt,—the very land where Moses was born and educated, with all those opportunities which his princely position, as the adopted child of Pharaoh's daughter, conferred,—whose date reaches back to more than fifteen hundred years before his birth. These discoveries exhibit the fact, that the writing of the Pentateuch was as possible to Moses as to any priest or scribe of the post-exilic period.

But, besides this, all proper or valid claim to the inspiration of the Pentateuch, especially to the book of Genesis, is deemed by many to be nullified, on the theory that Moses wrote it, or a portion of it, in the use of traditions and legends, or of historic narratives and documents then existing;—a theory which constitutes what is called "the documentary hypothesis."

But even in such a case, the power of divine inspiration

enabled him to discriminate between the fictitious and the true, between the imaginative and the real. No better proof of the divine inspiration of Moses can be furnished than in comparing the most ancient traditions and legends of the nations of antiquity concerning the creation of the world and of man, and also those of the Deluge, with the narratives given in the book of Genesis.

Compare, for example, the Babylonian legend of creation given by Berosus, of which Clodd in his "Childhood of Religion" very appropriately remarks, "the wild and ugly features of which are in strong contrast to the simpleness and quiet dignity of the story of Genesis;" or compare with the Mosaic account, the Chaldean or again the Phœnician legends of creation, native to the very land of Canaan, and regarded by archaeologists as the best ancient record which has yet been discovered.¹

Now while it may be admitted that there are some points of agreement between these legends, especially between the native or Phœnician account and the Mosaic cosmogony; and also admitted that these were known to Moses, yet in the evident superiority of the Mosaic narrative, which places man, unlike the others, last in the work of creation, and gives an orderly sequence to the development of animal organisms, such as is confirmed by all the researches of science, we have the most convincing proof that no one, unless inspired with wisdom not less than divine, could have wrought, out of the crude materials of ancient legends, a record so complete—one that has come forth triumphant from the criticism of hostile scientists.

Nor should it be forgotten that the most eminent scientists have recognized the most convincing proofs in the Mosaic cosmogony itself, of its divine inspiration not only, but also of the fact of divine revelation. Says Professor Dana: "The record in the Bible is profoundly philosophi-

¹ Records of the Past, Vol. ix. pp. 117-118.

cal in the scheme of creation which it presents. It is both true and divine. It is a declaration of authorship both of creation and the Bible on the first page of the sacred volume."¹

And again:—

"This document, if true, is of divine origin. For no human mind was witness of the events and no such mind in the early age of the world, unless gifted with superhuman intelligence, could have contrived such a scheme—would have placed the creation of the sun, the source of light to the earth, so long after the creation of light, even on the *fourth* day, and what is equally singular between the creation of plants and that of animals, when so important to both; and none could have reached to the depths of philosophy exhibited in the whole plan."²

Accepting the view of this renowned scientist, it matters not whether the author of the so-called Mosaic cosmogony was Moses or not; the fact of its inspiration is verified from the researches of science itself in the judgment of one of the most learned among scientists. It is unreasonable to suppose that Moses was the very first of all inspired writers. By the inspiration given him he was endued not only with a divinely conferred power of moral discernment as law-giver, but also as historian, of discerning what writings or legends then existing were inspired.

There is no reason to suppose that God's Spirit may not have spoken as divinely through writers whose names are lost to history as through Moses or Isaiah, through Mark and Luke, who were not apostles, or through the disputed author of Hebrews. That men held converse with God in times long anterior to those of Moses, the sacred record itself furnishes the most incontestable assurance in the narratives it gives of such characters as Enoch and Noah and

¹ Manual of Geology, p. 770.

² *Ibid.*, p. 767.

Abraham. Whatever may be proven of the antiquity of those sources of legendary lore from which Moses derives the materials of his own history, it by no means necessarily detracts from its just claim to inspiration.

MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

This theory of inspiration as an immanent power of the Divine Spirit vivifying and quickening the whole spiritual nature, imparting clearer mental and moral vision, more penetrating and comprehensive views, especially of spiritual realities and relations, profounder discernment of moral principles and truths, of their significance and application, fully explains those most perplexing enigmas presented in some of the Messianic prophecies; showing, how the narratives of events originally historic were subsequently seen to be prophetic, and the descriptions of characters primarily applied to personages who had their historic existence cotemporaneous with the writer are afterward interpreted as prophetic of the Messiah.

Take, for illustration, the interpretation given by Matthew (i. 22) to the narrative by Isaiah (vii. 14) of an event affirmed by the prophet as destined to occur in his own time. The child which was to be born of one who was then in her youth and virginity, and to receive the name Immanuel, although an historic, was also a prophetic character. The complete significance of that event was fulfilled in him who was born of the Virgin Mary. He was the true Immanuel fulfilling the import of that word, "God with us." And it was divine inspiration that enabled Matthew to discern the fact that the prediction of the prophet Isaiah reached beyond the historic event of his own day and had its complete fulfilment in the advent of the babe of Bethlehem, Jesus of Nazareth, although to him was not given the name Immanuel, but simply that of Jesus.

It was the same power of divine inspiration that imparted

such discernment to the apostle Paul as enabled him to discover an allegorical significance in the history of the two sons of Abraham, "one by the handmaid and one by the free woman" (Gal. iv. 22-24).

This prophetic principle is widely unfolded in nature, as well as in history. The modern scientist discloses to us the fact that the very lowest organism in the kingdom of the vertebrates, in its leading homologies of structure, was prophetic of the highest in that very kingdom, but destined to appear only in long ages after. He can now show how the fish, not only in its vertebral column, but also with its fins, was a promise of that complete structure which has its perfect development in man. On the same principle of discernment of prophetic types, applied to historic personages, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews was enabled, by divine inspiration, to interpret the ideal character described by the Psalmist, although it may have been primarily written as a tribute to an historic personage of his own time, as prophetic in its true and complete fulfilment in the only perfect type of humanity, the Christ of history and the Messiah of God. But let it be clearly understood, that this view of prophetic events, characters, and personages in history by no means militates against the belief that there were utterances by the prophets which were of a completely prophetic nature. ¹

¹ Says W. Robertson Smith, "The prophecies contain (1st) reproof of present sin, (2d) exhortation to present duty, (3d) encouragement to the godly and threatening to the wicked, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose.

This view of inspiration as an immanent power re-enforcing the mental and moral faculties also explains the reason why it is so often spoken of in the Old Testament as imparting courage in battle, cunning in workmanship, inspiration in poetry and song, discernment in interpretation of dreams, wisdom in counsel, strategic skill in planning and conducting battles, sound judgment in discharging the duties of ruler and king; while in the New Testament we have the comprehensive promise of the giving of "understanding in all things" (2 Tim. i. 7).

The questions so often asked concerning the continuance and present existence of the divine inspiration receive solution in the light of that theory. True, the canon of the Sacred Scriptures is closed, but the effluence, activity, and ministry of the Holy Spirit do not cease, else all prayer for its inspiring, illumining, and sanctifying as well as strengthening influences is a mockery; and the promises, alike of prophecy and of Christ, for its more copious bestowment, are not fulfilled (Joel ii. 23-28; Acts ii. 17; John xvi. 13). Wisely, philosophers like Newton and Kepler, who in his own language sought "to think God's thoughts after him," supplicated the Divine Spirit to aid them in their researches into the hidden mysteries of nature,—that nature which God has made. Where is the consistency in professed instructors in divine truth invoking in prayer the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the services of worship, while in sermon they affirm that the divine inspiration was confined to the biblical writers of a past age?

The power of inspiration is the Holy Spirit, which Christ

While it is doubtless true that many of the Messianic prophecies were primarily spoken by the prophets as predictions relating to their own times, there are others that as evidently were uttered with primary reference to the Messiah of God. There is no other historic personage to whom it is possible to apply the description given in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

defines as the spirit of truth (John xvi. 13) and the apostle as the truths *τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια* (1 John v. 6). The measure of inspiration by the Spirit of truth is the truth itself. And here might the question be asked, Which has the more of inspiration, the prayer or the sermon? True prayer has its origin, not only in the sense of need, but also of the presence and power of a divine helper, the One in whom we live, and move, and have our being; in the belief that the infinite includes the finite,—that not a sparrow falls on the ground without the Father (Matt. x. 29);

"Wher'er we be, at home, abroad,
We are surrounded still with God;"

that this source of being is also at the centre of being, for thus he must be, if he is not only a creative but also a sustaining power of life; immanent as well as transcendent. While, on the other hand, the sermon is too often a mere speculation about God, as something outside the universe, an artificer, or mechanic, maker of a world subject to "the reign of law," and that law based on necessity, in whose orderly movements the divine power sometimes interferes by miracle. The one is the expression of a theism revealed in the spiritual consciousness, what God has made manifest within (Rom. i. 19); the other, it may be, is a disquisition of theologian scholasticism, based on dualism; not God-breathed at all, no true message from God, nor about God, but the figment of a sciolist's brain.

The divine inspiration, as a veritable inbreathing, also enters as a quickening, conscious, indwelling power of life into the *life* of its recipient. The enthusiasm for humanity, of which the author of "Ecce Homo" speaks as being created by the spirit of the gospel, is itself inspired and sustained by the Divine Spirit. The developed consciousness of the Christian, the Divine Spirit witnessing with his own, is that God works *in* him to will and to do according to the divine pleasure, not according to his own; that the animat-

ing power of his own life is the divine life, and the consciousness of the apostle Paul becomes verified in his own. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20).

With this view of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, as inbreathing, immanent, in its operations in the minds of the inspired writers, we are able to defend the Bible as complete in divine inspiration, notwithstanding the existence of historical discrepancies, against the assaults of agnosticism and the higher criticism, as it is not possible to do on the mechanical theory of inspiration.

It is as a divine revelation, especially of moral and religious truth—comprehensively of spiritual truth, fully or plenary inspired, both in respect to thought and expression, the right word formulating the true idea, that the Bible becomes to us a perfect rule, or norm, of faith and practice, "the one book of the ages," "the Book of books."