

MINEOLA BIBLE INSTITUTE AND SEMINARY

Page | 1

Theology II

Radical, Biblical, Apostolic, Christianity



Bishop D.R. Vestal, PhD
Larry L Yates, ThD, DMin

“Excellence in Apostolic Education since 1991”

Copyright © 2019

Mineola Bible Institute and Seminary

All Rights Reserved

Page | 2

This lesson material may not be used in any manner for reproduction in any language or use without the written permission of Mineola Bible Institute and Seminary

Contents

Chapter One--Theology Proper	6
PART 1. INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY PROPER	6
I. INTUITION	7
II. TRADITION	9
III. REASON	11
IV. REVELATION	13
PART 2. NATURALISTIC THEISTIC ARGUMENTS	14
I. THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT	20
II. THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT	29
III. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARGUMENT	37
IV. THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT	41
CONCLUSION	44
PART 3. ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES	45
I. ATHEISM	46
II. AGNOSTICISM	47
III. EVOLUTION.....	49
IV. MATERIALISM.....	54
V. POLYTHEISM.....	55
VI. IDEALISM AND REALISM	56
VII. PANTHEISM.....	57
VIII. DEISM	60
IX. POSITIVISM	61
X. MONISM.....	61
XI. DUALISM.....	61
XII. PLURALISM.....	62
CONCLUSION	62
Chapter Two--Angelology.....	63
PART I. INTRODUCTION TO ANGELOLOGY	63
PART II. GENERAL FACTS ABOUT THE ANGELS	66
I. ANGELIC SPHERES	66
II. THE REALITY OF THE ANGELS.....	69
III. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ANGELS AND MEN	69
IV. THE PERSONALITY OF THE ANGELS	71

V. THE CREATION AND MODE OF EXISTENCE OF THE ANGELS 72

VI. THE ABODE OF THE ANGELS..... 75

VII. THE NUMBER OF THE ANGELS..... 77

VIII. THE POWER OF THE ANGELS..... 78

IX. THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE ANGELS 79

XI. THE PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANGELS 89

CONCLUSION 92

Chapter Three--Ecclesiology 93

PART I. INTRODUCTION TO ECCLESIOLOGY 93

PART II. CONTRASTS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE CHURCH 94

 I. THE EXTENT OF BIBLICAL REVELATION..... 95

 II. THE DIVINE PURPOSE..... 95

 III. THE SEED OF ABRAHAM..... 95

 IV. BIRTH..... 96

 V. HEADSHIP..... 96

 VI. COVENANTS..... 97

 VII. NATIONALITY 97

 VIII. DIVINE DEALING 97

 IX. DISPENSATIONS..... 97

 X. MINISTRY..... 98

 XI. THE DEATH OF CHRIST 98

 XII. THE FATHER 98

 XIII. CHRIST 98

 XIV. THE HOLY SPIRIT 99

 XV. A GOVERNING PRINCIPLE 99

 XVI. DIVINE ENABLEMENT 99

 XVII. TWO FAREWELL DISCOURSES 99

 XVIII. THE PROMISE OF CHRIST’S RETURN..... 100

 XIX. POSITION 100

 XX. CHRIST’S EARTHLY REIGN 100

 XXI. PRIESTHOOD..... 100

 XXII. MARRIAGE 101

 XXIII. JUDGMENTS 101

 XXIV. POSITION IN ETERNITY..... 101

CONCLUSION	101
PART III. SEVEN FIGURES USED OF THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO CHRIST (I-V).....	102
I. THE SHEPHERD AND THE SHEEP	105
II. THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES	109
III. THE CORNERSTONE AND THE STONES OF THE BUILDING	112
IV. THE HIGH PRIEST AND THE KINGDOM OF PRIESTS.....	115
V. THE HEAD AND THE BODY WITH ITS MANY MEMBERS.....	119
PART VI SEVEN FIGURES USED OF THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO CHRIST THE LAST ADAM AND THE NEW CREATION	130
PART VII. SEVEN FIGURES USED OF THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO CHRIST THE BRIDGROOM AND THE BRIDE.....	131

THEOLOGY II

Chapter One--Theology Proper

PART 1. INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY PROPER

The term “Theology Proper” is a somewhat modern designation which represents the logical starting point in the study of Systematic Theology, being, as it is, its primary theme, namely, a scientific investigation into what may be known of the existence and characteristics of God - Father, Son, and Spirit, and quite apart from their works. Since the whole field of Systematic Theology is so extensive, it is the part of wisdom to reserve the consideration of the works of God, as unfolded in Angelology, Anthropology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology, and Eschatology, for later contemplation. Unabridged investigation of truth concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit, including their works, is to be undertaken under the two cardinal divisions, Christology and Pneumatology.

Following the period - unknown as to its duration - when un-fallen man was in normal, unbroken relations with God, and which ended with the expulsion of man from the presence of God, the thoughtful and sincere from among the human race, have been engaged in a feeble attempt to penetrate into the vast field which the knowledge of God represents. Their handicap has been drastic, for it is written: “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (1 Cor. 2:14); and, again, “All his thoughts are There is no God” (Ps. 10:4, R.V.). Doubtless, each generation has added something to the total of finite speculation regarding God. In the midst of all these human groping’s after the knowledge of Him, God has spoken in specific revelation of Himself, and to those thus enlightened; the disclosure is far-reaching and final. But to the unenlightened, little is added through revelation, their neglect of the Scriptures and their native inability to receive them, being sufficient proof.

The source of knowledge about God, which are somewhat interdependent, are four:

I. INTUITION

Intuition is confidence or belief which springs immediately from the constitution of the mind. It must ever be so; hence intuition is a necessary human function, therefore, it may be said that intuitive knowledge is that which the normal, natural mind assumes to be true. It includes such themes as time and eternity, space, cause, and effect; right and wrong; mathematical demonstration; self-existence, the existence of matter, and the Person of God. These and other primary truths are already accepted by the rational mind, are little enhanced by added demonstration, nor are they greatly decreased by counter-argument. Intuitive knowledge is little more than a bias in the direction of certain truths. Each intuitive theme offers a field of endless research and conceals inexhaustible stories of reality. This is particularly true of the knowledge of God. The very universality of the belief in God proves that it is intuitive. Such general knowledge is not the superstition of perverted minds, for it is evidently more assertive where culture and education obtain. In the midst of a universe of transcendent marvels, whether observed in their telescope grandeur or microscopic perfection, the rational mind can find but one explanation for the phenomenon which is observed, namely, a God of infinite wisdom and power. It is true that some men have sought to move away from this intuitive conception of God and profess to be agnostic. The Bible recognizes this abnormal mind when it says: "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God" (Ps. 14:1; 53:1).

If by definition is meant a complete statement of all that is in a subject, it is impossible for man to define God. The most that man can do is to recognize the incomparable position which God occupies above all beings, to ascribe attributes to Him, and to frame a general statement of what the mind conceives to be true. The extent of the scope of this declaration will, of necessity, depend on the degree of understanding to which the mind of the author of the statement has advanced. A wild range of individual visions is observable at this point, which extend all the way from the most elemental institution of the untrained unregenerate person to the full-orbed experience of God which belongs to the most spiritual and mature saints. A well

defined twofold grouping will be perceived when this wide latitude of human apprehension is analyzed - the apprehension of the unsaved on the one hand and of the saved on the other - with but little in common between them. Of the regenerate persons, it may be said that in their knowledge of God they have passed beyond mere intuition and attained unto that insight which is revelation.

Intuition is direct knowledge, a rational perception which by its nature precedes all the processes of observation and deduction. Descartes taught that the intellect finds itself at birth, or when the mind awakens to conscious action, to be in possession of conceptions that need only to be identified for what they are. Calvin writes: "Those who rightly judge will always agree that there is an indelible sense of divinity engraved upon men's minds" ("Institutes," 1:3:3, cited by Strong, "Systematic Theology" p. 30).

On the ground of their essential nature, intuitive truths are to be tested by certain factors, namely whether or not; **(a)** they are universal - that is, they are common to all men, not that all men understand them or assent to them, but in the sense that all men consciously or unconsciously act upon them; **(b)** they are necessary - that is, they are wrought into the constitution of every normal person; and **(c)** they are self-evident and self-demonstrating - that is, they are subject to no other truths for their cognition.

The following from Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas ("Principles of Theology" pp. 4, 5) will serve to summarize this theme:

What is the origin of the idea of God? There are two general explanations. By some idea of God as a Supreme Being is regarded, in technical language, as "an intuition of the moral reason." St. Paul seems to have recognized in the mind an innate perception of God (Acts 17:28). This means that the belief in a personal God is born in every man, not as a perfect or complete idea, but as involving a capacity for belief when the idea is presented. If this is so, it is one of the primary intuitions of human nature. It is certainly a mistake to suppose that we derive the idea of God from the Bible, for races that have never heard

of the Bible possess a definite belief in a Supreme Being. The Bible reveals God's character and His purpose for man, and thus gives us a true idea of the Divine Being, but the emphasis is on the truth rather than on the mere fact. In the same way, it is equally incorrect to say that we obtain the idea of God from reason, for reason is not in this respect originative. By reflection, we can obtain a fuller conception of God, but the reason itself is not the source of the conception. By those who hold that our idea of God is intuitive, the conception of God is analyzed into three elements: first, a consciousness of power in God, which leads to a feeling of our dependence on Him; second, a consciousness of His perfection, which leads to a realization of our obligation to Him; third, a consciousness of His Personality, which leads to a sense of worship of Him. Others object to the idea of God as intuitive, and say that it is the result of the reason instinctively recognizing Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, and that these coalesce in the thought of one Reality. On this view, these three elements afford an argument for Theism.

The latter of these theories is that advanced by Everett in his "Theism and the Christian Faith" (Unitarian and Hegelian) which lacks the support of human experience as well as that of the Scriptures.

II. TRADITION

Tradition may be considered either **(1)** as that which is remote - the early impressions of the race - or **(2)** as that which is present - teaching which is given to children.

1. THE REMOTE. Scripture records the fact that un-fallen man began with the highest knowledge of God, such as one must possess who walks and talks with God. His memory and sense of the reality of God were not lost in the fall, for even then Adam heard the voice of God in judgment and received the divine provision of clothing from the hand of God, which clothing implied divine grace to the sinful. Adam's testimony

concerning God was given directly to succeeding generations, for hundreds of years, with all the force of an original expression, and in a time when tradition as a means of education was paramount. It is, therefore, conceivable that the authoritative, original beginning of traditional knowledge about God was disseminated from generation to generation. On the other hand, it must be conceded that tradition is as potent in the transmission of error as it is of truth, that the fallen nature of man is ever prone to depart from the knowledge of God (Romans 1:19-32), that if traditional impressions regarding God survive, they do so in spite of counter forces.

2. THE PRESENT. The present influence of tradition as represented in the instruction of children is the most vital aspect of education. Children are being taught the faith (or no faith) of their parents, and when the saving knowledge of God pervades a home or community the effect may be traced into succeeding generations. The reverse of this is also true.

The influence of the teacher or parent upon the child's understanding of God and relationship to Him is far-reaching, else the church of Rome would not assert, that is, of little consequence as to what later influences encompass a life, provided they have the molding of the early years.

This, it will be observed, is closely related to the general theme of "intuition;" for a child cannot be taught what he has no constitutional competence or faculty to receive. All education proceeds on the principle that the learner has the capacity to receive the instruction imparted. There must be a latent ability that needs only to be awakened by the challenge which the facts present. In the knowledge of God, children receive the truth more readily than adults. This is not a feature of immaturity. It is due to purity. "...the pure in heart: for they shall see God."

On the general relation between tradition and intuition, Dr. Samuel Harris declares:

Why is the belief in the existence of a God the common characteristic of humanity? Why has it been so spontaneous, powerful, and persistent? How,

comes man, by the ideas of eternity, immensity, unconditionedness? Some say that they come from his knowledge of his own limitations. But how can I have the ideas of finiteness, conditionedness and imperfection except as I contrast them with the ideas of the unlimited, the unconditioned, by the perfect? And if it is said that these ideas and the idea of the all-perfect God have been communicated by tradition, this only pushes us back on the question; How did it originate, so that man's ancestors had it to transmit? Certainly, if the belief in a divinity has no root in the constitution of man; if man has no rudiment of a faculty for knowing God, then this grand idea of the absolute Spirit, infinite in power and perfect in wisdom and love, could not have been originated by man, nor even communicated to him by instruction or revelation from without. The idea would simply be impossible to him - "The Self-Revelation of God," pp. 357-58.

III. REASON

By the term reason, reference is made to the highest capacity in man - apart from revelation and the divine energy imparted to man - in his attainment unto the knowledge of God. It is that sanity in man which makes possible the pursuance of logical deductions based on those realities which he observes.

The general subject of reason may be considered either **(1)** on the ground of its own intrinsic value, or **(2)** on the ground of that which it has accomplished.

1. THE INTRINSIC VALUE. The intrinsic value of reason must incorporate the essential fact that reason is one of the characteristics belonging to God and that the universe in its order, system, and purpose reflects the perfect reason which is in God. Similarly, all conclusions of rational beings are but the recognition of, and adaptation to, the primary reason which is in God. On the fact that man can know by inference or reason, only as it is assumed by him that God exists and that God acts in perfect reason, Dr. Samuel Harris states:

If the mathematics by which astronomers make their calculations are not the mathematics of all space and time, all our astronomy is worthless. If the law of causation, and the principle of the uniformity of nature, that the same complex of causes always produces the same effect, are not true of the whole universe, all our science is invalidated. If the law of love is not the law of all rational beings, all ethical knowledge is annihilated. That the principles of reason are everywhere and always the same, is the basis of the possibility of rational knowledge. But this is only saying that reason, supreme and universal, everywhere and always one and the same is energizing in the universe and is the ultimate ground of its existence, constitution, and development. And this Energizing Reason is God. Science assumes that the universe is a system of cosmos concatenated and ordered under principles and laws everywhere and always the same and that by these it can determine what the ongoing of the universe is in its farthest extent in space and what it has been and will be in the remotest past and future. This is possible only because these truths and laws are eternal in the one absolute reason who expresses them by his energizing in the constitution and evolution of the universe. And the theist adds that the evolution of the universe is the forever progressive expression and realization, not only of truths and laws but also of rational ideals and ends; ideals and ends of wisdom and love, which are eternal and archetypal in the Absolute Reason, God. - "The Philosophical Basis of Theism," rev. ed., p. 82.

2. THE ACHIEVEMENTS. The value of reason as measured by its achievements may, in the case of God, be observed in the ongoing of the universe. The reason which is in God being absolute, its results are infinitely perfect. The consummation of all things as predicted in the Scriptures will be a demonstration of this. The value of reason as measured by its achievements in its exercise by men is altogether another matter. All human limitations and imperfections are reflected in the exercise of human reason. Man being finite, his premise and his deduction are too often distorted by error. However, in no sphere has this exalted faculty in man been more exerted than in his attempt to prove, by nature deduction and apart from revelation, the existence, the

existence of God. None has excelled in this endeavor as has Samuel Clarke (1675-1729). The naturalistic arguments which the great metaphysicians have expounded have, for the most part, and their origin with the ancients; but when followed, apart from revelation; these arguments have led to nothing more real than “a dumb idol of philosophy, neglected by the philosopher himself and unknown to the multitude; acknowledged in the closet and forgotten in the world.” There was naught in this reasoning which made God real to any heart, nor was there enough to keep men from drifting into polytheism, pantheism, or any other anti-theistic notion. Turning to idolatry was, to some extent, their attempt to realize the unworthy ideals which grew out of the error of their reasoning.

In general and apart from the usual theistic arguments men have advanced, the process of reasoning in the direction of the discovery of truth concerning God, has followed three general methods, namely, by negatives; which plan called for the elimination of all imperfections, by eminence; which method ascribes all human excellencies to God, and by deduction; which process ascribes all perfections and qualities to God which reason assumes to be true of Deity.

IV. REVELATION

God has spoken to man through nature, through the manifestation of Himself in His Son, and through the Scriptures of Truth. By means of the written Word of God, man has become possessed of truth in its full and absolute form. The dim lights of intuition, tradition, and reason, are submerged under the blazing irradiation of revealed truth. No measurement can be placed on the advantage the Word of God is to those who humbly receive and profit by its message.

Of these four sources of knowledge concerning God, intuition and tradition add but little to the science of Systematic Theology. Reason and revelation are vital factors, yet revelation surpasses reason as the Word of God surpasses the thoughts of men.

The term “Theology Proper” is a somewhat modern designation that represents the

logical starting point in the study of Systematic Theology, being as it is, its primary theme, namely, a scientific investigation into what may be known of the existence, and characteristics of God. Quite apart from the works of the Godhead, Theology Proper is subject to a twofold division: **(1)** Theism, which concerns the existence and character of God as an extramundane Being, the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the universe; and **(2)** Monotheism, which is the recognition of the three offices of God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

PART 2. NATURALISTIC THEISTIC ARGUMENTS

The etymology of the word “theism” would give it a wide range of application, but in common usage, it has come to mean, a belief in God, and incorporates a system of beliefs which constitutes a philosophy, restricted, indeed somewhat, to those findings and conclusions which human reason suggests. Even in its Biblical expression, theism is not confined to Christianity, though Christianity is a theistic system. The term “theism,” could with practical value, be more largely used, and the field of truth which it connotes, more clearly defined. I. H. Fichte writes: “It is now time again to install theism, that inextinguishable and fundamental conviction of humanity, as a science in its true significance: but therewith equally to free it from so many obstructions and veils which long enough have darkened its true light. Theism is neither a hypothesis grubbed out by one-sided speculation, as some represent it; nor is it an invention or priestcraft nor of superstitious fear, old ways of representing it, which one still unexpectedly meets. It is also not the mere confession of any exclusive school or religion. But it is the ultimate goal of all investigation, silently effective in that which externally denies it” (“Theistische Weltansicht;” “Vorwort,” S. ix, cited by Harris, “Philosophical Basis of Theism,” rev. ed., p. 314).

Since all lines of general study of necessity are related to created things, there is no more exalted subject to which the finite mind may address itself than “theism” with its contemplation of the Person and character of God. Theism, as also the larger field of Theology Proper, excels all other themes, as infinity exceeds that which is finite. To

quote William Cooke: “There is, indeed, no element of sublimity either actually existent or even conceivable in nature, but what is, indefinitely surpassed in the idea of God. The proposition, therefore, that there is a God, has no equal, no competitor; it stands alone in unrivaled and unapproachable grandeur; and if its sublimity does not prove its truth, it renders it at least worthy of inquiry, and imposes a weighty task on the unbeliever; for if it be false, it is not only the sublimest of all errors but is an error more sublime than truth itself - yea, more enabling and elevating to the mind than any truths which nature can present to our contemplations. If this is a paradox, its solution is a task developing on those who deny the being of a God” (“The Deity,” 2nd ed., p. 3).

In the Bible, man is ever reminded of the fact of his own limitations and of the knowledge-surpassing perfections of God. Anti-theistic agnosticism has taken refuge in the denial of divine cognoscibility; but there is a true knowledge of God - there as far as it is able to go - which does not fully comprehend its subject. Such incompleteness, indeed, may be predicated of very much, if not all, of human cognizance. In his defense of anti-theistic agnosticism, Hamilton declared: “The last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar to the unknown or unknowable God.” It is probable that this inscription represented the highest level to which the unaided philosopher of Athens had attained (Acts 17:23). However, this conception became only a starting point in the God revealing discourse of the inspired Apostle. There is an approach, at this point, to an engaging and closely related discussion of the dependability of thought itself as bearing on the contemplation of infinity; but, it suffices to indicate that the limitations which anti-theistic agnosticism confesses are due to their negative predictions concerning God, which result in an utter void quite without substance for rational thinking. The vaguest of all impressions of God is that styled “Absolute,” which pantheism and agnosticism employ. Being without qualities or attributes, it is blank in itself and equally blank as a subject of thought. The lowest fetishism has substance beyond this. Over against this professed ignorance, is the fact that God has revealed Himself to men, and this revelation is sustained and enforced by the illuminating work of the Holy Spirit. Added to this, also, is the twofold unveiling in which the Father reveals the Son, and the Son reveals the Father. It is written that the

Son said, "All things are delivered to me of my Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matthew 11:27). By the authority of the Son, it is asserted that eternal life is given, to the end, that the Father and the Son might be known (John 17:3). When praying for His executioners, Christ said, "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34), and the Apostle, when writing of Christ as the manifestation of the wisdom of God, disclosed the precise nature of the ignorance of the executioners of Christ when he wrote: "...which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory" (1 Cor. 2:8). Beyond the mere knowledge of God, which is in the range of theism and common to multitudes, it is possible to know God in that intimacy of a son with his own father. And what shall be said of those, who by the Spirit, press on to know the "deep things of God?" How, indeed, may "Abba, Father" be interpreted if God cannot be known? Agnosticism, with its professed ignorance, may well give heed to the Word of Christ: "Take heed, therefore, that the light which is in thee, be not darkness" (Luke 11:35).

Passing beyond the low level of agnosticism, there are two distinct fields of theistic research **(a)** that which is within those facts which obtain in the sphere of creation, or nature, and is subject to human reason; and **(b)** that which, though incorporating all that is disclosed in nature, is extended to include the limitless, absolute, and all-satisfying revelation set forth in the Scriptures of Truth. The former investigation is rightly designated "naturalistic theism," and the latter "Biblical theism."

Theology Proper enters every field from which any truth may be gained relative to the existence and character of God, or the mode of His Being. However, in view of the basic twofold division of the human family into "saved" and "unsaved" with their varying attending abilities to comprehend divine truth, there is peculiar advantage in a division of the general subject of theism into that which is naturalistic and that which is Biblical. The unsaved, natural man, though unable to receive the things of God, is nevertheless, everywhere confronted with effects which connote a Cause and with design which connotes a Designer. To such a one, naturalistic theism with its restricted appeal to

creation and reason is peculiarly adapted. To the devout student who, being saved, is able to receive the “deep things of God,” there is none of the ultimate or consummating satisfaction in naturalistic theism that he experiences in Biblical theism. He should, notwithstanding, neglect no part of the divine revelation.

All that belongs to naturalistic theism is of vital importance to the theological student in view of the fact that, to a limited degree, God is revealed in His creation (Ps. 19:1-6; Romans 1:19, 20), and in view of the fact that unregenerate men, especially the educated, are groping in the sphere of those truths which belong in the circumscribed realm of naturalistic theism. To discover, exhibit, and defend all that reason affirms and that revelation discloses relative to that which may be known concerning God, is a task which Systematic Theology assumes. It is the function of naturalistic theism to adduce such arguments and to reach such conclusions as are within the range of reason; while it is the function of Biblical theism to recognize, classify, and exhibit the truth set forth by revelation. These two fundamental sources of erudition, though wholly dissimilar as to the method they employ and the material they utilize do nevertheless, coalesce as the essential parts of the one grand theme - Theology Proper.

In the following discussions, the author assumes no originality in the presentation of rational argument or in the discovery of revelation. Much that is presented has been the contention of writers on these subjects from the earliest times. In fact, so general are many of these lines of thought, as found in the vast literature, which the present generation inherits, that to quote an original author would be difficult indeed, if not impossible. Since reason is native to man and revelation is largely an acquisition without which the majority of men have had to live and labor, it is proper that the findings of reason should be weighed before those of revelation.

The book of nature is as much God’s book as is the Book of Revelation. The universe is His work, and therefore must attest His Being, and, as far as it can advance, unfold His ways. The voice of nature and the voice of revelation proceeding from the same source must harmonize; nor can either be slighted with impunity. It is not

contended that the book of nature is comparable in extent, exactness, or elucidation, with the Book of Revelation. Pious minds, wholly satisfied with the Scriptures of Truth, should not be indifferent to the testimony of nature; nor should the superficial and profane disregard the pleadings of reason. The sincere student of truth will hardly do so. He will not avert his eye from the light of God. As their names denote, philosophy is “the love of wisdom: and science is “the interpretation of nature;” therefore, no worthy philosopher will ignore the source of all truth and no sincere scientist will shrink from the investigation or right evaluation of the claims of naturalistic theism. The proposition that there is a God introduces at once the cause of all causes, the finality of all philosophy, and the alpha and omega of all science.

Consistency dictates that the student who is en-rapport with the sequence which he observes between secondary causes and their effects, should not discontinue abruptly his investigation at the point where they are consummated in the discovery of the First Cause - even God. If the facts and forces of nature are engaging to the serious mind, how much more engaging should be the Person and power of the God who created nature? And how much is added to the importance of this investigation into the proposition there is a God, when the moral and saving values are included? It was Pilate’s error hurriedly to inquire “What is truth?” And then, as hurriedly, to pass on without waiting for the incomparable answer, which might have come from the lips of Him, who is the embodiment of all truth.

When the evidence that there is a God is being pursued along the highway of reason, the laws of logic and of deduction are as essential as the truth which is involved. Palpable contradictions and absurdities are to be rejected, while every proved fact must be accepted and acted upon with fairness and uprightness. How else may any trustworthy progress be made?

The naturalistic theistic arguments, or arguments based on reason, attempt but a limited field of demonstration. The existence, personality, wisdom, and power of God are in view; but no proof from nature or reason can be deduced to prove or establish the fact of the love and saving grace of God. All that is related to redemption belongs to

revelation and constitutes an imperative message, which is as much needed by those who believe in a God through nature or reason as it is by those to whom no knowledge of God has come.

Arguments in proof of the existence of God which are restricted to the limitations of naturalistic theism are subject to a twofold general classification, namely, the “argumentum a posteriori” and the “argumentum a priori.”

An argumentum a posteriori is inductive in its procedure and conforms more naturally to the processes of human reason. This form of argument moves from phenomena back to ground, from particulars back to principle, from consequent back to antecedent, and from effect back to cause. There are three primary a posteriori arguments usually offered in naturalistic theism - the cosmological, the teleological, and the anthropological. The a posteriori argument is employed when from the mechanism of a delicate and intricate instrument or work of art, the fact of the mastermind is implied with its power to design and form. As the Apostle has declared, “Every house is builded by some man; but, he that built all things is God” (Heb. 3:4); that is, as the house proves the fact of a builder, so the universe proves the fact of a Creator.

The “argumentum a priori” is deductive in its procedure since it advances from ground to phenomena, from principle to particulars, from antecedent to consequent, and from cause to effect. This form of reasoning is employed by the astronomer when from the laws which govern the movement of the solar system, he determines the time of the return of a comet or of an eclipse; or when the paleontologist determines by the principles of comparative anatomy, the size and form of prehistoric animals from some geological fossil. The “a priori” argument is one which is based on something which has gone before, as an assumed reality, an innate belief, or an intuitive impression. To postulate as a premise, that miracles are impossible with its syllogistic conclusion that there are therefore no miracles, is to advance an “a priori” assumption and the argument based on that assumption is “a priori” in character. The “ontological” argument is the only “argumentum a priori” which teachers have advanced in the field of

naturalistic theism. The “ontological” argument is exceedingly difficult, being too refined for the general rank and file of mankind to follow. Indeed, treat metaphysicians have declared themselves to be unconvinced as to its value as evidence. Over against this, as great or greater, metaphysicians have stressed its worth.

The “cosmological” argument traces the cosmos back to its Maker. The “teleological” argument recognizes the rational ends in creation, while the “anthropological” argument differs from the “cosmological” and the “teleological” in the sphere of its logical principles, tracing from the mind and spirit of man back to the Creator. The “anthropological” argument is an extension into a specific realm of the more general features of the “cosmological” and “teleological” arguments. Though each of these three “a posteriori” arguments are distinct as to their field of proof, all three are required together to complete the full theistic argument. At best, this complete argument, it will be observed can attempt to prove but a limited body of truth concerning God. But much, indeed, is wrought, if by these rationalistic lines of evidence, the fact of the existence of God, is indicated. To this, “Biblical theism” has very much to add as to the Person, attributes, purpose, and ways of God.

These “naturalistic theistic” arguments are now to be weighed separately and in the order already suggested.

I. THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The universe is a phenomenon or an effect that connotes an adequate cause. The cosmological argument adduces evidence that God exists and is the First Cause of all things. Four theories have been entertained by philosophers and metaphysicians as to the origin of the material universe; **(a)** that the constitution of nature is eternal and its forms have existed forever; **(b)** that matter has existed forever, but its present constitution and form has been subject to self-development, which was the contention of Epicurus, and is the avowed credence of the modern atheist; **(c)** that matter is eternal, but its present arrangement and orders is the work of God, which was the teaching of Plato, Aristotle, and many others; **(d)** that matter is a created thing, being cause - to

caused - to exist - from nothing, by the engendering power of God, which is the Biblical revelation. The last of these four philosophies is not to be confounded with the impossible notion that the universe has evolved itself out of nothing. Its declaration is that God has, by infinite power, caused nonexistent matter to exist. It is written: "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1:1), and "... so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. 11:3). Leland declares: "Few, if any, of the ancient pagan philosophers acknowledged God to be, in the most proper sense, the Creator of the world. By calling him...." the Maker of the world" they did not mean, that he brought it out of nonexistence into being; but only that he built it out of pre-existent materials, and disposed it into a regular form and order" ("Necessity of Revelation," cited by Watson, "Institutes," I. 274).

The cosmological argument depends upon the validity of three contributing truths: **(a)** that every effect must have a cause; **(b)** that the effect is dependent upon its cause for its existence; and **(c)** that nature cannot produce itself. The essential, fundamental character of these contributing truths, as well as the conclusive deduction that the universe is caused by the direct creation of a self-existent, intelligent, and eternal Cause, will appear as the pursuance of this form of argument advances.

On the meaning of the word "cause," a quotation from Dr. Charles Hodge is germane: "The common doctrine on this subject includes the following points: **(1)** A cause is something. It has real existence. It is not merely a name for a certain relation. It is a real entity, a substance. This is plain because a nonentity cannot act. If that which does not exist can be a cause, then nothing can produce something, which is a contradiction. **(2)** A cause must not only be something real, but it must have power or efficiency. There must be something in its nature to account for the effects which it produces. **(3)** This efficiency must be adequate; that is, sufficient and appropriate to the effect. That this is a true view of the nature of a cause is plain. Dr. Hodge goes on to illustrate these points by human experience. He writes:

(1) We are causes. We can produce effects. And all three of the

particulars above mentioned are included in our consciousness of ourselves as cause. We are real existences; we have power; we have power adequate to the effects which we produce. **(2)** We can appeal to the universal consciousness of men. All men attach this meaning to the word, cause, in their ordinary language. All men assume that every effect has an antecedent to whose efficiency it is due. They never regard mere antecedence, however, uniform in the past, or however certain in the future, as constituting a causal relation. The succession of the seasons has been uniform in the past, and we are confident that it will continue uniform in the future, yet no man says that winter is the cause of summer. Everyone is conscious that cause expresses an entirely different relation from that of mere antecedence. **(3)** This view of the nature of causation is included in the universal and necessary belief, that every effect must have a cause. That belief is not that one thing must always go before another thing; but that nothing can occur, that no change can be produced, without the exercise of power or efficiency somewhere; otherwise something could come out of nothing. - "Systematic Theology," I, 209

This vital distinction between cause and effect inheres in the very nature of human speech. "The language of every nation is formed on the connection between cause and effect. For in every language there are not only many words directly expressing ideas of this subject, such as cause, efficiency, effect, production, produce, effectuate, create, generate, etc., or words equivalent to these; but every verb in every language, except the intransitive impersonal verbs, and the verb substantive, involves, of course, causation or efficiency, and refers always to an agent, or cause, in such a manner, that without the operation of this cause or agent, the verb would have no meaning. All mankind, except a few atheistically and skeptical philosophers, have thus agreed in acknowledging this connection, and they (the skeptics) have acknowledged it as fully as others in their customary language" (Dwight, "Theology," I, 5, cited by Watson, op. cit., 1, 280-81).

The intuitive credence that every effect must have a cause is the basic principle

upon which the cosmological argument advances to its certain conclusions. “Ex nihilo, nihil fit” - out of nothing, nothing can arise - is an axiom, which has been recognized by philosophers of all the ages. To assert that anything has caused itself to exist is to assert that it acted before it existed, which is an absurdity. Nonexistence cannot engender existence. Had there ever been a situation in eternity when there was neither matter nor spirit, no being of any description - intelligent or unintelligent, created or uncreated, - the universe itself a boundless vacuity, thus it must have remained forever. But two basic ideas are possible, namely, **(a)** that the universe, with all its organized system and complex forms, has existed forever - which theory, though void of any semblance of justification, has been the greatest impediment to the irrational belief in a First Cause throughout all generations; and **(b)** that the universe is both designed and created by God and for worthy ends. The former is the atheist’s contention, while the latter is that of the theist.

Reasoning from the assumed premise that there is no God, the atheist is compelled to predicate of matter that it is eternal and, therefore, self-existent. Matter is composed of innumerable particles that are unrelated or without dependence on each other. Thus, to each particle must be attributed, the element of eternal self-existence. Added to inert matter must be all chemical forces, nature’s laws, and the principle of life in all its forms. The atheist cannot modify the demands of his philosophy based on the assumed premise that there is no God. Should he retrench, by the slightest concession from his claim, to the eternal self-existence of matter or allow it to pass as a hypothesis, rather than an infallible certitude, the whole structure of atheism falls. The atheist boasts of his incredulity and slavish bondage to reason; yet, if the idea that matter is self-existent and eternal, be found to be no more than conjecture or theory, all is surrendered. In fact, the notion that matter is a self-existent and eternal entity should be capable of demonstration, if true and be all but, an axiomatic proposition, that it is not. The atheistic philosophy rests on an un-provable hypothesis which has been weakened to the point of extinction by the later finds of science. The assertion, that the creation of matter, is impossible to man. But who has ever substantiated the claim, that the creation of matter is impossible to the infinite God? The claim that God created all

things, offers no contradiction, but merely assigns more ability to God than resides in man. Cudworth asserts:

Because it is undeniably certain, concerning ourselves by all imperfect beings, that none of these can create any “new substance,” men are apt to measure all things by their own scantling, and to suppose it universally impossible for any power whatever thus to create. But since it is certain, that imperfect beings can themselves produce “some things” out of nothing pre-existing as “new cogitations, new local motion,” and “new modifications” of these things corporeal, it is surely reasonable to think that an absolutely perfect being can do something more, i.e. create “new substances,” or give them their whole being. And it may well be thought as easy for God or an omnipotent Being to make a whole world, matter and all,as it is for us to create a thought or to move a finger, or for the sun to send out rays, or a candlelight, or lastly, for an opaque body to produce an image of itself in a glass of water, or to project a shadow; all these imperfect things being but the “energies, rays, images, or shadows” of the Deity. For a substance to be made out of nothing by God, or a Being infinitely perfect; is not for it to be made out of nothing in the impossible sense, but it comes from him who is all....But nothing is in itself impossible, which does not imply a contradiction; and though it be a contradiction for a thing to be and not to be the same time, there is surely no contradiction in conceiving as imperfect being, which before was not, afterward to be. - (Cited by Watson, *ibid.*, I, 325-26.)

As a blind rejection of truth, the atheist’s assertion that matter is self-existent and eternal is equaled by the unproved and absurd impression that nature is capable of self-production, that chance is adequate to account for the universe, or that necessity is the ground on which all things exist. Doubtless, in their determined rejection of God, men have encouraged themselves by turning to these false and God-dishonoring notions. However, the cosmological argument for the existence of God as the First Cause of all things stands unlicensed in its evidential value.

By the same logic or reasoning which demonstrates that the existing universe cannot produce itself by acting before it existed, so the First Cause is not self-created, but is eternal and therefore self-existent, since He depends on nothing outside Himself, being caused by nothing. The proposal of a sequence of secondary causes, that is, that each cause is the effect of a prior cause, offers no solution to the problem of the origin of things. It is true that the mind may be stultified by the indefinite extension of such a sequence, but reason avers that there is an Original - First Cause. This idea of the sequences of secondary causes eventuating in a first cause is illustrated by Wollaston: "Suppose a chain hung down out of the heavens from an unknown height, and though every link of it gravitated toward the earth, and what it hung upon was not visible, yet it did not descend, but kept its situation, and upon this a question should arise, what supported or kept the chain up, would it be a sufficient answer to say, that the first or lowest link hung upon the second, or the next above it; the second or rather the first and second together, upon the third; and so on "Infinitem?" For what holds up the whole?....And thus it is, in a chain of causes and effects, tending, or (as it were) gravitating towards some end. The last, or lowest, depends, or (as one may say) is suspended, upon something above it" ("Religion of Nature Delineated," cited by William Cooke, "The Deity," 2nd ed. p. 40). To this Dr. Paley adds: "A chain composed of an infinite number of links can no more support itself than a chain composed of a finite number of links. If we increase the number of links from ten to a hundred and from a hundred to a thousand, etc., we make not the smallest approach, we observe not the smallest tendency toward self-support" (cited by Watson op. cit., I, 283).

There is a First Cause self-existent and eternal, and that First Cause is wise enough to conceive of creation in all its marvel and powerful enough to bring it into being. The statement of the cosmological argument by Locke is thus: "I exist: I did not always exist: whatever begins to exist must have a cause: the cause must be adequate: this "adequate" cause is unlimited; it must be God" (cited by Watson, *ibid.*, I, xv). Similarly, the statement of the argument by Howe is conclusive: **(1)** Somewhat hath existed from "eternity:" hence **(2)** must be uncaused: hence **(3)** independent: hence **(4)** necessary, hence **(5)** self-active; and hence **(6)** "originally vita," and the source of all

life” (cited by Watson, *ibid*).

From the foregoing, it will be observed, the cosmological argument is stressed in proof of various qualities in God, namely, self-existent, eternal, all-wise, powerful, unlimited, self-active, vital, and the source of all life. Though these conclusions are reached quite apart from revelation and by reason alone, the illation is complete. Space cannot be given here to trace the extended discussion which precedes each of these arguments. This should be undertaken as collateral reading on the part of the student. A quotation from John Howe (1630-1705), English Puritan divine, will serve to state some aspects of the cosmological argument and also to disclose the manner in which the great logicians of the past ordered their attack upon atheism. To quote:

We, therefore, begin with God’s existence; for the evincing of which, we may most assured, First, that there hath been somewhat or other from all eternity, or that, looking backward, somewhat of real being, must be confessed eternal. Let such as have not been used to think of anything more than what they could see with their eyes, and to whom reasoning only seems difficult because they have not tried what they can do in it, but use their thoughts a little, and by moving them a few easy steps, they will soon find themselves as sure of this as that they see, or hear, or understand, or are anything.

For being sure that something now is, (that you see, for instance, or are something,) you must then acknowledge, that certain something always was, and hath ever been, from all eternity; or else you must say, that, sometime, nothing was; or that all being once was not. And so, since you find that something now is, there was a time when all being did begin to be; that is, that till that time there was nothing, but now, at that time something first began to be. For what can be plainer than that if all being sometime was not, and now some being is, everything of being had a beginning. And thence, it would follow, that some being, that is, the first that ever began to be, did of itself startup out of nothing, nor made itself to be when before nothing was.

But now, do you not plainly see that it is altogether impossible anything should do so; that is, when it was as yet nothing, and when nothing at all as yet was, that it should make itself, or come into being of itself? For surely making itself is doing something, but can that which is nothing do anything? Unto all doing, there must be some doer. Wherefore, a thing must be, before it can do anything; and therefore, it would follow, that it was before it was; or was and was not was something and nothing, at the same time. Yea, and that it was diverse from itself; for a cause must be a distinct thing from that which is caused by it. Wherefore, it is most apparent, that some being hath ever been, or did never begin to be.

Whence, farther, it is also evident, Secondly, that some being was uncaused, or was ever of itself without any cause. For what never was from another had never any cause, since nothing could be its own cause. And somewhat, as appears from what hath been said, never was from another. Or it may be plainly argued thus; that either some being was uncaused, or all being was caused. But if all being was caused, then someone at least was the cause of itself; which hath been already shown impossible. Therefore, the expression commonly used concerning the first being, that it was of itself, is only to be taken negatively, that is, that it was not of another; not positively, as if it did some time make itself. Or what there is positive signified by that form of speech, is only to be taken thus, that it was a being of that nature, as that it was impossible it should ever not have been; not that it did ever of itself step out of not being into being.

And now it is hence farther evident, Thirdly, that some being is independent upon any other, that is, whereas it already appears that some being did never depend on any other, as a productive cause, and was not beholden to any other that it might come into being; it is thereupon equally evident that it is simply independent, or cannot be beholden to any for its continued being. For what did never need a productive cause, doth as little need a sustaining or conserv-

ing cause. And to make this more plain, either some being is independent, or all being is dependent. But there is nothing without the compass of all being whereon it may depend. Wherefore to say, that all being doth depend, is to say, it depends on nothing, that is, that it depends not. To depend on nothing is not to depend. It is, therefore, a manifest contradiction to say that all being doth depend; against which it is no relief to urge, that all beings do circularly depend on one another. For so, however, the whole circle or sphere of being should depend on nothing; or one, at last, depend on itself, which negatively taken, as before is true, and the thing we contend for - that one, the common support of all the rest, depends not on anything without itself.

Whence also, it is plainly consequent, Fourthly, that such a being is necessary, or doth necessarily exist; that is, that it is of such a nature as that it could not or cannot but be. For what is in being, neither by its own choice, nor any others, is necessarily. But what was not made by itself, (which hath been shown to be impossible,) not by any other, (as it hath been proved something was not,) it is manifest, it neither depended on its choice, nor any other's that it is. And therefore, its existence is not owing to choice at all, but to the necessity of its own nature. Wherefore, it is always by a simple, absolute, natural necessity, being of a nature to which it is altogether repugnant and impossible ever not to have been, or ever to cease from being. And now having gone thus far, and being assured, that hitherto we feel the ground firm under us; that is, having gained a full certainty, that there is an eternal, uncaused, independent, necessary Being, and therefore actually and everlastingly existing; we may advance one step further. And with equal assurance add, Fifthly, that this eternal independent, uncaused, necessary Being, is self active; that is, (which is at present meant), not such as acts upon itself, but that which hath the power of acting upon other things, in and of itself, without deriving it from any other. Or at least that there is such a Being as is eternal, uncaused, having the power of action and of itself. For either such a Being as hath been already evinced is of itself active or un-active, or hath the power of action of itself or

not. If we will say the latter, let it be considered what we say, and to what purpose we say it.... – (“Living Temple,” cited by Watson, *ibid.*, I, 281.84.)

Having indicated the untruth of the atheist’s assertion that matter with all its forms is eternal - which conjecture the atheist advances in support of his credence that there is no God, the argumentum a posteriori in its cosmological form thus begins with the recognition of the universe as a phenomenon or effect which connotes a cause, and proceeds to indicate that that cause is “self-existent, eternal, all-wise, powerful, unlimited, self-active, vital, and the source of all life.” If there be not a God, from whence does the phenomenon or effect, which the universe is, arise? To what First Cause may all these so evident attributes be ascribed?

II. THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The teleological argument, being “a posteriori,” adduces evidence that God exists from the presence of order and adaption in the universe. The term “teleology” is the compound of “tenos” and “Noyos” and thus signifies “the doctrine of ends” or “rational purpose.” The principle which is germane to the cosmological argument is not abandoned, but, building upon that principle, the teleological argument proceeds to establish, by rational evidence, the intelligence and purpose of God as manifested in the design, function, and consummation of all things. By so much, the existence of God is declared. The teleological argument could hardly be stated better than it is by the Psalmist: “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know? (Ps. 94:9,10). The fact of design, which is exhibited in every created thing, exposes the acumen and rational purpose of the Creator. This manifest intent which characterized all of God’s works is illustrated - as the finite can illustrate the infinite - by the fact of design and purpose which is exhibited in the achievement of men, which achievements, because of this design, display the acumen and rational purpose of men.

In this age, which is characterized by mechanical development beyond any other,

men are, justly impressed with that which human ingenuity and inventiveness have effected. But man really originates nothing, and his most cherished feat of devising is never more than a discovery and utilizing of provisions and forces which are already wrought into the creation which God has effected. When man glories in his discovery of the secrets of nature, it is pertinent to inquire who has so created and constituted nature with its unified and systematized marvels, so wonderful, indeed, that no human mind can comprehend its telescopic extent or discern its microscopic perfection. From this array of incomprehensible wonders, man snatches an occasional fraction of something, which fraction at best, could be no more than a feeble representation of that whole of which it is a part. It may be concluded, then, that it is the function of the cosmological argument to indicate the evident existence and power of the Creator as these attributes are displayed in the cosmos He had made; to the same end, it is the function of the teleological argument to indicate the evident existence and all-comprehensive design and reason of the Creator as displayed in the order, construction, and end of all things which enter into the constituted universe.

Probably there is no division of naturalistic theism so engaging or so capable of almost endless illustration and expansion as the teleological argument. As to the structure or trend of the argument, the following is quoted from Bowne:

If, then, knowledge be possible, we must declare that the world-ground proceeds according to thought-laws and principles that it has established, all things in rational relations, and balanced their interaction in quantitative and qualitative proportion, and measured this proportion by number. "God geometrizes," says Plato. "Number is the essence of reality," says Pythagoras. And to this, agree all the conclusions of scientific thought. The heavens are crystallized mathematics. All the laws of force are numerical. The interchange of energy and chemical combination are equally so. Crystals are solid geometry. Many organic products show similar mathematical laws. Indeed, the claim is often made that science never reaches its final form until it becomes mathematical. But simple existence in space does not imply motion in mathematical relations, or

existence in mathematical forms. Space is only the formless ground of form, and is quite compatible with the irregular and amorphous. It is equally compatible with the absence of numerical law. The truly mathematical, is the work of the spirit. Hence, the wonder that mathematical principles should be so pervasive, that so many forms and processes in the system represent definite mathematical conceptions and that they should be so accurately weighed and measured by number

If the cosmos were a resting existence, we might possibly content ourselves by saying that things exist in such relations once for all, and that there is no going behind this fact. But the cosmos is no such rigid monotony of being; it is, rather, a process according to intelligible rules; and in this process, the rational order is perpetually maintained or restored. The weighing and measuring continually goes on. In each chemical, just so much of one element is combined with just so much of another. In each change of place, the intensities of attraction and repulsion are instantaneously adjusted to correspond. Apart from any question of design, the simple fact of qualitative and quantitative adjustment of all things, according to fixed law, is a fact of the utmost significance. The world-ground works at a multitude of points, or in a multitude of things, throughout the system, and works in each with exact reference to its activities in all the rest. The displacement of an atom by a hair's-breadth demands a corresponding re-adjustment in every other within the grip of gravitation. But all are in constant movement, and hence, re-adjustment is continuous and instantaneous. The single law of gravitation contains a problem of such dizzy vastness, that our minds faint in the attempt to grasp it; but when the other laws of force are added, the complexity defies all understanding. In addition, we might refer to the building processes in organic forms, whereby countless structures are constantly produced or maintained, and always with regard to the typical form in question. But there is no need to dwell upon this point.

Here, then is a problem, and we have only the two principles of intelligence

and non-intelligence, of self-directing reason and blind necessity, for its solution. The former is adequate, and is not far-fetched and violent. It assimilates the facts to our own experience, and offers the only ground of order of which that experience furnishes any suggestion. If we adopt this view, all the facts become luminous and consequent.

If we take the other view, then we have to assume a power which produces the intelligible and rational, without being itself intelligent and rational. It works in all things, and in each, with exact reference to all, yet without knowing anything of itself or of the rules it follows, or of the order it found, or of the myriad products compact of seeming purpose which it incessantly produces and maintains. If we ask why it does this, we must answer, Because it must. If we ask how we know that it must, the answer must be, By hypothesis. But this reduces to saying that things are as they are because they must be. That is, the problem is abandoned altogether. The facts are referred to an opaque hypothetical necessity, and this turns out, upon inquiry, to be the problem itself in another form. There is no proper explanation except in theism. - (Bowne, "Philosophy of Theism," pp. 66-69, cited by Miley, "Systematic Theology, I, 87-89.)

On the combining for an advantageous end of otherwise disassociated elements with the impelling evidence of design which the result affords, Paul Janet writes: "When a complex combination of heterogeneous phenomena is found to agree with the possibility of a future act, which was not contained beforehand in any of these phenomena in particular, this agreement can only be comprehended by the human mind by a kind of pre-existence, in an ideal form, of the future act itself, which transforms it from a result into an end - that is to say, into a final cause" ("Final Causes," p.85, cited by Miley, *ibid.*, p.90).

In elucidation of this phenomenon of the combination of disassociated elements into one advantageous end, Dr. John Miley gives this illustration: "The hull of a ship, masts, sails, anchors, rudder, compass, chart, have no necessary connection, and in relation to

their physical causalities are heterogametic phenomena. The future use of a ship is not contained in any one of them, but is possible through their combination. This combination in the fully equipped ship has no interpretation in our rational intelligence except in the previous existence of its use in human thought and purpose. The use of the ship, therefore, is not the mere result of its existence, but the final cause of its construction" (ibid., I, 90).

The human organism with its relation to the environment in which it functions, is a display of design, and therefore denotes both existence and acumen of the Designer. On this feature of the argument, Paul Janet has written:

The external physical world and the internal laboratory of the living being are separated from each other by impenetrable veils, and yet they are to each other by an incredible pre-established harmony. On the outside there is a physical agent called light; within, there is fabricated, an optical machine adapted to the light; outside, there is an agent called sound; inside, an acoustic machine adapted to sound; outside, vegetables and animals, inside, stills and alembics adapted to the assimilation of these substances; outside, a medium, solid, liquid, or gaseous; inside, a thousand means of locomotion adapted to the air, the earth, or the water. Thus, on the one hand, there are the final phenomena called sight, hearing, nutrition, flying, walking, swimming, etc.; on the other, the eyes, the ears, the stomach, the wings, the fins, the motive members of every sort. We see clearly in these examples the two terms of the relation - on the one hand, a system on the other, the final phenomenon in which it ends. Were there only system and combination, as in crystals, still, as we have seen, there must have been a special cause to explain that system and that combination. But there is more here; there is the agreement of a system with a phenomenon which will only be produced long after and in new conditions, - consequently a correspondence which cannot be fortuitous, and which would necessarily be so if we do not admit that the final and future phenomenon is precisely the bond of the system and the circumstance

which, in whatever manner, has pre-determined the combination.

Imagine a blind workman, hidden in a cellar, and destitute of all intelligence, who, merely yielding to the simple need of moving his limbs and his hands, should be found to have forged, without knowing it, a key adapted to the most complicated lock which can possibly be imagined. This is what nature does in the fabrication of the living being.

Nowhere is this pre-established harmony, to which we have just drawn attention, displayed in a more astonishing manner than between the eye and the light. "In the construction of this organ," says Trendelenburg, "we must either admit that light has triumphed over matter and has fashioned it, or else it is the matter itself which has become the master of the light. This is at least what should result from the law of efficient causes, but neither the one nor the other of these two hypotheses takes place in reality. No ray of light falls within the secret depths of the maternal womb, where the eye is formed. Still less, could inert matter, which is nothing without the energy of light, be capable of comprehending it? Yet, the light and the eye are made, the one for the other, and in the miracle of the eye, resides the latent consciousness of the light. The moving cause, with its necessary development, is here employed for a higher service. The end commands the whole, and watches over the execution of the parts; and it is with the aid of the end that the eye becomes the light of the body." - (Op. cit., pp. 42, 43, cited by Miley, *ibid.*, pp. 90-91.)

The elaboration of the teleological argument by William Paley (1743-1805) as set forth in his "Natural Theology," or "Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity collected from the Appearances of Nature," has nothing to excel it. In the following brief passage in which he challenges those who suppose the universe to be the result of chance, his clear thinking and exquisite diction are disclosed.

"By what art would they make a seed? And which way would they inspire it with a

seminal form? And they that think this whole globe of the earth was compacted by the casual (or fatal) coalition of particles of matter, by what magic would they conjure up so many to come together as to make one clod? We vainly hunt with a lingering mind after miracles; if we did not more vainly mean by them nothing else but novelties; we are compassed about with such: and the greatest miracle is, that we see them not. You with whom the daily productions of nature (as you call it) are so cheap, see if you can do the like. Try your skill upon a rose. Yea, but you must have pre-existent matter. But can you ever prove the Maker of the world had so, or even defend the possibility of uncreated matter? And suppose they had the tree grant of all the matter between the crown of their head and the moon, could they tell what to do with it, or how to manage it, so as to make it yield them one single flower, that they might glory in as their own production? (cited by Watson, "Institutes," I, 305).

Again, a quotation from Cicero, to the same end, but discloses the fact that the naturalistic theistic arguments were in use a century and more before Christ:

"Can anything be done by chance which has all the marks of design? Four dice, may be chance, turn up their aces; but, do you think that four hundred dice, when thrown, by chance, will turn up four hundred aces? Colors, when thrown upon canvas without design, may have some resemblance to a human face, but do you think they could make a picture as beautiful as the Coan Venus? A hog, in turning up the ground with his nose, may make something in the form of the letter A; but, do you think that a hog could describe, on the ground, the Andromache of Ennius? Carneades imagined that, in the stone quarries at Chios, he found in a stone that was split, a representation of the head of a little Pan (or sylvan deity). I believe he might find a figure not unlike; but, surely not such a one as you would say had been formed by an excellent sculptor like Scopas. The truth is, indeed, that chance never perfectly imitates design" ("De Divinatione," lib. i., cap. 13, cited by Cooke. "The Deity," pp. 134-35).

An interesting illustration of the influence of the teleological argument upon an unnamed skeptic is reported by Dr. William Cooke as follows:

Some years ago, I had the misfortune to meet with the fallacies of Hume on the subject of causation. His specious sophistries shook the faith of my reason as to the being of a God, but could not overcome the repugnance of my heart to a negation so monstrous, and consequently left that infinite, restless craving for some point of fixed repose, which atheism not only cannot give, but absolutely and madly disaffirms.

One beautiful evening in May, I was reading by the light of a setting sun, my favorite, Plato. I was seated on the grass, interwoven with golden blooms, immediately on the crystal Colorado of Texas. Dim, in the distant West, arose, with smoky outlines, massy and irregular, the blue cones of an offshoot of the Rocky Mountains.

I was pursuing one of the academicians' most starry dreams. It laid fast hold of my fancy, without exciting my faith. I wept to think it could not be true. At length, I came to that startling sentence, "God geometrizes." "Vain reverie!" I exclaimed, as I cast the volume at my feet. It fell close by, a beautiful little flower, that looked fresh and bright, as if it had just fallen from the bosom of a rainbow. I broke it from its silvery stem, and began to examine its structure. Its stamens were five in number; its calyx had five parts; its delicate coral base, five, parting with rays, expanding like the rays of a Texas star. This combination of five in the same blossom appeared to me very singular. I had never thought on such a subject before. The last sentence I had just read in the page of the pupil of Socrates was ringing in my ears - "God geometrizes." There was the text, written long centuries ago; and here this little flower, in the remote wilderness of the West, furnished the commentary. There, suddenly passed, as it were, before my eyes, a faint flash of light - I felt my heart leap in my bosom. The enigma of the universe was opened. Swift as thought, I calculated the chances against the production of those three equations of five in only one flower, by any principle devoid of reason to perceive number. I found that there were one

hundred and twenty-five chances against such a supposition. I extended the calculation to two flowers by squaring the sums last mentioned. The chances amounted to the large sum of fifteen-thousand-six-hundred and twenty-five. I cast my eyes around the forest: the old woods were literally alive with golden blooms, where countless bees were humming, and butterflies sipping honeydews.

I will not attempt to describe my feelings. My soul became a tumult of radiant thoughts. I took up my beloved Plato from the grass, where I had tossed him in a fit of despair. Again and again, I pressed him to my bosom, with a clasp, tender as a mother's, around the neck of her sleeping child. I kissed the book and the blossom, alternately bedewing them both with tears of joy. In my wild enthusiasm, I called to the little birds on the green boughs, trilling their cheery farewells to departing day - "Sing on, sunny birds; sing on, sweet minstrels! Lo! ye and I have a God." – (Ibid., pp. 136-38.)

III. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The anthropological argument follows the same "a posteriori" order as is followed by the two preceding arguments, but unlike the cosmological argument, which contemplates the entire cosmos and the teleological argument, which observes the element of design as manifest in all the universe, the anthropological argument is restricted to the field of evidence, as to the existence of God and His qualities, which may be drawn from the constitution of man. There are philosophical and moral features in man's constitution, which may be traced back to find their origin in God, and on that ground, this argument has been styled, either the "philosophical argument" or the "moral argument." But since the latitude comprehended in the argument is the whole of man's being, the all-inclusive designation - "anthropological argument" - is more satisfactory.

On the basis of the principle declared by the Psalmist - "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?...He that teaches man knowledge, shall not he know? - The anthropological argument indicates that the

elements which are recognized as the innate properties of man must be possessed by his Creator. As a ground for proof, the organic constitution of man belongs to the teleological argument, but there are specific features in man's being which supply exceptional proof of the divine finality, and these are properly stated in the anthropological argument.

At the opening of his discussion of the anthropological argument, Dr. A.A. Hodge states: "The Cosmological argument led us to an eternal self-existent First Cause. The argument from the order and adaptation, discovered in the processes of the universe, revealed this great First Cause as possessing intelligence and will; that is, as a personal spirit. The moral or anthropological argument furnishes new data for inference, at once, confirming the former conclusions as to the fact of the existence of a personal intelligent First Cause, and at the same time, adding to the conception, the attributes of holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. The argument from design includes the argument from cause, and the argument from righteousness and benevolence includes both the arguments from cause and from design, and adds to them a new element of its own" ("Outlines of Theology," p. 41).

Man is composed of that which is material and that which is immaterial, and these two constituent parts are unrelated. Matter possesses the attributes of extension, form, inertia, divisibility, and chemical affinity; while the immaterial part of man possesses the attributes of thought, reason, sensibility, consciousness, and spontaneity. Were it possible to account for the origin of the physical part of man by a theory of natural development (which it is not), the immaterial, as to its origin, remains an insoluble problem apart from the recognition of a sufficient cause.

Though in its general organic structure, the material part of man is similar to that of the higher forms of animals, it is so refined as to be superior to all features of material creation. The hand of man executes the exalted designs of his mind in all manner of construction and art; his voice answers the demands of an elevated mind for speech; his ear hears and his eye sees into realms of reality and foreign to the beast. The

human body is thus a specific proof of a Creator, since it cannot be accounted for otherwise.

The immaterial part of man, which embodies the elements of life, intellect, sensibility, will, conscience, and an inherent belief in God, presents even a more insistent demand for an adequate cause. Life cannot evolve from inert matter, and though the evolutionist claims to trace, all that now, is back to an original fire mist, or protoplasm, all these forms of life, according to this theory, must have been present in latent form in that original something. Such unproved theories would not be tolerated in any field of investigation other than wherein the darkness of the natural mind is demonstrated in its inability to receive the things of God. Again, the intelligence of man with its achievements in discovery, invention, science, literature, and art, exacts with relentless requisition, an adequate cause. Similarly, and under the same unyielding compulsion, both sensibility and will, with their transcendent capacities, demand a worthy cause. And, finally, the conscience as well as the inherent belief in God, can be accounted for on no other ground than that man has come forth from One, who possesses all these attributes to an infinite degree. A blind force, however exceptional it may be, could never produce a man with intellect, sensibility, will, conscience, and inherent belief in a Creator. The product of a blind force will never betake itself to the pursuit of art and science, and the worship of God.

According to the evolutionary theory of natural development, the creature is the effect of a natural cause and is molded and fashioned according to forces over which he had no control; yet, suddenly this effect arises and exerts authority and power over the very nature that is supposed to have produced him, and bends all natural resources to serve his purpose and will. Is it not pertinent to inquire when man became lord over the creation which is supposed to have wrought him? "Can it be conceived," Janet inquires, "that the agent thus endowed with the power of coordinating nature for ends is himself a simple result that nature has realized, without proposing to itself an end? Is it not a sort of miracle to admit into the mechanical series of phenomena, a link which suddenly should have the power to reverse, in some sort, the order of the series, and which,

being itself only a consequent resulting from an infinite number of antecedents, should henceforth, impose on the series this new and unforeseen law, which makes of the consequent, the law and rule of the antecedent?" (Final Cause," pp. 149, 150, cited by Miley "Systematic Theology," I, 103).

Writing of the moral aspects of the anthropological argument, Dr. Augustus H. Strong states:

The argument is a complex one, and may be divided into three parts.

I. Man's intellectual and moral nature must have had for its author an intellectual and moral Being. The elements of the proof are as follows: - **(a)** Man, as an intellectual and moral being, has had a beginning upon the planet. **(b)** Material and unconscious forces do not afford a sufficient cause for man's reason, conscience, and free will. **(c)** Man, as an effect, can be referred only to a cause possessing self-consciousness and moral nature, in other words, personality.... **2.** Man's moral nature proves the existence of a holy Law-giver and Judge. The elements of the proof are: - **(a)** Conscience recognizes the existence of a moral law which has supreme authority. **(b)** Known violations of this moral law are followed by feelings of ill-desert and fears of judgment. **(c)** This moral law, since it is not self-imposed, and these threats of judgment, since they are not self-executing, respectively argue the existence of a holy will that has imposed the law, and of a punitive power that will execute the threats of the moral nature.... **3.** Man's emotional and voluntary nature proves the existence of a Being who can furnish in himself a satisfying object of human affection and an end which will call forth man's highest activities and ensure his highest progress. Only a Being of power, wisdom, holiness, and goodness, and all these indefinitely greater than any that we know upon the earth, can meet this demand of the human soul. Such a Being must exist. Otherwise man's greatest need would be unsupplied, and belief in a lie, be more productive of virtue than belief in the truth. -("Systematic Theology," pp. 45, 46.)

Summarizing the scope and value of the “a posteriori” arguments, it may be observed: **(a)** In the cosmological argument, the existence of the cosmos, originating in time, constitutes proof of a First Cause who is self-existent and eternal and who possesses intelligence, power, and will. **(b)** In the teleological argument, the evidence of design extends the proof of the intelligence of the First Cause into details of telescopic grandeur and microscopic perfection far beyond the feeble ability of man to discover or comprehend. And **(c)** in the anthropological argument, while confirming the proofs advanced in the two preceding arguments, an added indication is secured which suggests the elements in the First Cause of intellect, sensibility, and will; and the moral feature of conscience in man, declares his Creator to be actuated by holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

IV. THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

“Ontology is the science or systematic discussion of real being; the philosophical theory of reality; the doctrine of the categories or universal and necessary characteristics of all existence” (“New Standard Dictionary,” 1913). The ontological argument in theism consists in a course of reasoning from God as the absolute First Cause of all things to the things He has caused - specifically, the inherent idea that God exists. God is recognized as the Creator of the human mind in which this conception of Himself is found. The fact of the existence of God is involved in this congenital idea. As the claim of idealism is that material things do not exist, being as asserted, only an impression of the mind, the ontological argument is a reversal of idealism in that it avers that there is reality or substance where the mind recognizes it to exist. According to this argument, the existence of God is certified by the fact that the human mind believes that He does exist. It is an “argumentum a priori” and as to its value in proof of the existence of God, metaphysicians have always differed. Dr. Shedd uses in his treatment of this one argument two-thirds of the space given to theistic proofs, while Bishop R. S. Foster declares that he had never caught the meaning or force of the argument at all. Anselm (1033? - 1109) is given credit for its first enunciation and his statement of it - has never benefited by later revisions. The following from the Encyclopedia Britannica under “Anselm” is clarifying:

“In the “Proslogion,” as the author himself tells us, the aim is to prove God’s existence by a single argument. This argument is the celebrated ontological proof. God is that Being than whom none greater can be conceived. Now, if that, than which nothing greater can be conceived existed only in the intellect, it would not be the absolute greatest, for we could add to it, existence in reality. It follows, then, that the Being than whom nothing greater can be conceived, i. e., God, necessarily has real existence” (14th ed). Gaunilo, the monk, immediately questioned this argument, stating that we readily form the idea of purely imaginary beings, and reality or actual existence cannot be predicted of these ideas. Anselm’s reply was that the objection was cogent with respect to imperfect or finite beings, because with them, actual existence is not the necessary content of the conception; but, that the objection could not apply to the most perfect Being, since actual existence is the very essential feature of the impression. Gaunilo declared that the idea of a “lost island” does not imply that there is such in reality. To this Anselm replied that if Gaunilo will show that the idea of the “lost island” implies “necessary” existence, he will find the island for him and guarantee that it will never be lost again (see Shedd, “Theology,” I, 226-27).

Dr. Samuel Harris writes:

It is evident, therefore, that the human mind cannot rid itself of the idea of the absolute. It persists in the implicit consciousness, regulating thought, even when theoretically disclaimed. It is evident that without the assumption, explicit or implicit, that the absolute Being exists, the reason of man cannot solve its necessary problems, nor hold steadfastly to the reality of it, is knowledge, nor know the continuity, the unity, and reality of the universe. The necessary conclusion is that the principle that the absolute Being exists is a primitive and necessary postulate in all thinking about being.

In this exposition of the origin of the idea of the absolute Being and our belief of its existence, I have set forth the so-called "a priori" argument for the existence of God in its true significance. This is an argument from the idea of the absolute or perfect Being to its existence. In order to the conclusiveness of this argument, it must be shown both, that the idea of the perfect Being is necessarily included in the idea; that is, its existence must be as necessary to the reason as the idea of it. This is what has been shown. –("Self-Revelation of God," pp.163.64.)

Of the same argument Milton Valentine writes:

"The germs of this were involved in Plato's doctrine of "ideas," but it was first formulated by Anselm in the eleventh century. From the existence in the human mind of the idea of a "most perfect being," it concluded that the most perfect being exists - because real existence is a necessary part of the idea of the most perfect being. Descartes, Bishop Butler, Leibnitz, Cousins, and many other eminent writers have used this method of argument but, standing alone, it has often been shown to be unsound, in confounding real objective existence with the simple idea found in the mind" ("Christian Theology," I, 189).

Similarly, Dr. Charles Hodge states: "If this argument has any validity, it is unimportant. It is only saying that what must be, actually is. If the idea of God as it exists in every man's mind includes that of actual existence, then so far as the idea goes, he who has the one, has the other. But the argument does not show how the ideal implies the real" (Systematic Theology," I, 205).

On the same argument, Richard Watson writes: "No instance is, however, I believe on record, of an Atheistic conversion having been produced by this process, and it may be ranked among the over zealous attempts of the advocates of truth. It is

well intentioned, but unsatisfactory, and so far as on the one hand it, has led to a neglect of the more convincing, and powerful course of argument drawn from “the things which do appear;” and on the other, has encouraged a dependence upon a mode of investigation, to which the human mind is inadequate, which in many instances is an utter mental delusion, and which scarcely two minds will conduct in the same manner; it has probably been mischievous in its effect by inducing a skepticism not arising out of the nature of the case, but from the imperfect and unsatisfactory investigations of the human understanding, pushed beyond the limit of its powers” (Theological Institutes,” I, 330).

CONCLUSION

The “argumentum a posteriori” in its three parts has always been valid and vital. The “argumentum a priori” has wrought little or nothing but idle speculation. Of this distinction between the usefulness of the two, Dr. John Dick states:

“It is by this argument (the “a posteriori”) that we rise to the knowledge of the uncaused existence of the Author of the universe, and not by abstract speculations on necessity. We should never have known that he exists, but from our own existence and that of other beings around us; and as in this way, we ascertain that he does and must exist, it seems absurd to talk of proving his existence “a priori.” Whatever use may be made of this argument to prove his perfections, it cannot be employed in proof of his being. Dr. Clarke, himself, acknowledges, that “the argument a posteriori” is by far, the most generally useful argument, most easy; to be understood, and in some degree, suited to all capacities; and therefore, it always ought to be distinctly insisted on” (“Theology,” p. 83).

To the spiritual Christian to whom God’s illuminating, authoritative, “Thus saith the Lord” of the Scriptures has come, little will be added by rationalistic theistic arguments; however, these arguments exist and do contribute to theology

that which reason suggests. On this ground, these arguments should be pondered by every student of doctrine.

PART 3. ANTITHEISTIC THEORIES

The natural man who does not receive or know the things of God (1 Cor. 2:14), has in all ages sought to answer the problem of a visible universe and by his efforts has unceasingly proved this divine estimation of his limitations to be true. It may be difficult for the spiritually enlightened mind to comprehend the fog of confusion in which the often sincere, but un-regenerated men are plunged. It should be remembered that argument does not create divine enlightenment. Only by the new birth can one “see the kingdom of God.” The cure for spiritual darkness is “the light of the world.” The groping’s of natural men - and sometimes they are men of great mental powers - are varied and complex. However, they have formulated certain general lines of philosophy, and these, like the false religions of the earth, bespeak the spiritual limitations of fallen man.

“Theism” means a belief in God and its naturalistic form is a philosophy regarding God which is restricted to the one divine Essence. Biblical theism believes that Essence, according to revelation, subsists in a three-fold revelation or manifestation of God. As a rationalistic philosophy, naturalistic theism is sustained by the traditional arguments already considered, and may be distinguished from certain anti-theistic theories.

The cognizance of nature on the part of man and his restless investigation into the facts of the universe and its origin are traced in the history of philosophy. Many schools of thought have appeared, some of which exist, at the present time, only in the records which constitute their history. These systems of thought reflect the groping’s of the human mind when unaided by revelation. It is recorded that some philosophers rejected revelation when it came to them (Romans 1:18-32). It is also true that others to whom revelation was denied would have responded to, and rejoiced in, the glorious light

which it affords. Plato has said: “The philosophers are able to grasp the eternal and immutable....those who set their affections on that which in each case really exists.” Sincerity, which welcomes added light, is reflected in these utterances. The earlier philosophers were occupied with cosmology and not until Socrates and Plato, was there any serious consideration of moral or intellectual phenomena. The fact that Socrates confused knowledge with virtue suggests the immaturity which his philosophy has evinced. The student of theology will do well to become familiar with the principal antithetic theories of this and past ages; for these, being more or less native to the unregenerate mind, are ever reappearing in one form or another. Some of these theories are:

I. ATHEISM

An open and positive denial of the existence of God is indicated by the term “atheism” (a-*theos* - “no God”). The designation is not properly applied to mere ignorance of God. A dogmatic atheist is one who assumes himself informed as to theistic claims, yet emphatically denies the existence of God. It is probable that a consistent atheist has never existed. He is a sporadic individual who has forced intuition and reason out of poise in an attempt to maintain by sophistical speculation or by the indulgence of sinful passions, precisely as subjective idealism is possible. It exists in the following forms: **1.** Practical, **2.** Speculative. Again, Speculative Atheism may be **(1)** Dogmatic, as when the conclusion is either **(a)** that God does not exist, or **(b)** that the human faculties are positively incapable of ascertaining or verifying his existence (e.g., Herbert Spencer, “First Principles,” pt. **1**). **(2)** Skeptical, as when the existence is simply doubted, and the conclusiveness of the evidence generally relied upon is denied. **(3)** Virtual, as when **(a)** principles are maintained essentially inconsistent with the existence of God, or with the possibility of our knowledge of him: e.g. by materialists, positivists, absolute idealists. **(b)** When some of the essential attributes of the divine nature are denied, as by Pantheists, and by J. S. Mill in his “Essays on Religion.” **(c)** When explanations of the universe are given which exclude the agency of an intelligent Creator and Governor, the moral government of God, and the moral freedom of man, e.g., the theories of Darwin and Spencer, and Necessitarians

generally. - "Outlines of Theology," pp. 46, 47.

II. AGNOSTICISM

Theism is to be distinguished also from agnosticism, which is the view that there is no sufficient ground for either an affirmative or negative answer to the question: Does God exist? Therefore, it is claimed, judgment on this interrogation must be suspended. In reality, it is an unwillingness to accept the impressions of the mind on certain subjects as dependable, or to be convinced by a licit process of reason. The leading agnostics of the past are Sir W. Hamilton, Dean Mansel, Herbert Spencer, and Huxley. The last-named coined the term, "agnosticism" about 1870. It is evident from the etymology of the word, that it may apply to any degree or shade of unbelief on any subject. It is used, however, with a restricted meaning. To quote the Encyclopedia Britannica:

Page | 47

"Whereas skepticism, as a technical term in philosophy, denotes varying degrees of doubt as to whether some or all of the psychological processes, purporting to yield knowledge, really do so, agnosticism rather asserts that, of certain kinds of objects or facts, we possess assured knowledge, while as to certain other kinds of alleged existents we have, and can have, none. The kinds of alleged objects, acknowledged as to which the agnostic believes to be impossible, are such as are the primary concern of metaphysics and theology: God, the soul and its immortality, and - more generally speaking - the ultimate realities of which phenomenal things, such as the sciences study, are appearances. Of these phenomenal things, we have ever-increasing and irrefragable knowledge; as to the things "per se," the total or noumenal existence, of which the "things" of common sense and science are the knowable shadows or appearances; we can never have knowledge pure and subjectively undefiled. If we know that they are, we cannot know what they are; if we can assert their existence, we are ignorant as to their essence" (s.v., Agnosticism, 14th ed.).

Again, as the etymology of the word implies, agnosticism is simply, not knowing. Its objective is to discredit certitude in the field of human knowledge. It is an attack upon man's mental powers and engenders a distrust in the common facts and forces of

human existence. It is negative in every particular, and therefore, destructive in its effect upon truth, which is gained by the normal functions of the human faculties. Agnostics discard reasonable proofs, which process, if followed consistently, would eliminate the very proofs they advance for their own theories. Of this form of unbelief, Dr. George Park Fisher writes:

It is obvious that Agnosticism is the destruction of science. All the investigations and reasonings of science proceed on the foundation of axioms, - call them intuitions, rational postulates, or by any other name. But these, according to Agnostics, denote simply a certain stage at which the process of evolution has arrived. What is to hinder them from vanishing, or resolving themselves into another set of axioms, with the forward movement of this un-resting process? What then will become of the doctrine of Agnosticism itself? It is plain that on this philosophy, all knowledge of realities, as distinct from transitory impressions, is a house built on the sand. All science is reduced to "Schein" - mere semblance.

It is impossible for the Agnostic to limit his knowledge to experience, and to reject as unverified the implications of experience, without abandoning nearly all that he holds true. If he sticks to his principle, his creed will be a short one. Consciousness is confined to the present moment. I am conscious of remembering an experience in the past. This consciousness as a present fact, I cannot deny without a contradiction. But how do I know that the object of the recollection - be it a thought, or feeling, or experience of any sort - ever had a reality? How do I know anything past, or that there is a past? Now, memory is necessary to the comparison of sensations, to reasoning, to our whole mental life, yet to believe in memory is to transcend experience. I have certain sensations which I attribute collectively to a cause named, my "body." Like sensations lead me to recognize the existence of other bodies like my own. But how do I know that there is consciousness within these bodies? How do I know that my fellowmen, whom I see about me have minds like my own? The

senses cannot perceive the intelligence of the friends about me. I infer that they are intelligent, but in this inference I transcend experience. Experience reduced to its exact terms, according to the method of Agnosticism, is confined to the present feeling, - the feeling of the transient moment. When the Agnostic goes beyond this, when he infers that what is remembered, was once presented in consciousness, that his fellowmen are thinking beings, and not mindless puppets, that any intelligent beings exist outside of himself, he transcends experience. If he were to predict intelligence of God, he would be guilty of no graver assumption than when he ascribes intelligence to the fellowmen whom he sees moving about, and with whom he is conversing. - "The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief," rev. ed., pp. 78, 79.

Agnosticism is better expressed by the phrase, "I will not believe," than by the phrase, "I cannot believe."

III. EVOLUTION

"In general," writes the late Dr. Leander Keyser, "evolution is the theory that the cosmos has been developed from crude, homogeneous material to its present heterogeneous and advanced status by means of resident forces" (A System of Natural Theism," p. 106). Evolution is either "theistic" or "atheistic." The former recognizes God as the Creator of original materials, but contends that evolution is the method by which all development from a supposed primordial state to the present completeness has been wrought. The latter - atheistic evolution - rejects the Person of God, denies His work in creation, and contends that matter is eternal or self-developing.

From the beginning, fallen man, having no knowledge of revelation and no disposition to esteem the work of God, has speculated on the problem of the origin and development of the universe as he beheld it. With all its strain upon credulity, the evolutionary theory is the best solution of this problem which the natural man can devise. That it is a godless system is self-demonstrated. "God is not in all his thoughts." No place is made for Him as a factor in this system, nor is His Word ever

referred to by quotation. It could not be otherwise. The Biblical doctrine of creation accounts for all things upon the fact of divine creation, which is a principle diametrically opposed to that proposed by the theory of evolution. On the other hand, the promoters of the evolutionary theory seek to avoid every consideration of the supernatural, attempting, as they do, to reduce the works of God to natural processes. The Biblical doctrine of creation faces toward God; the evolutionary theory, regardless of the supposition of theistic evolution that God created, that from which the universe is said to have evolved, faces away from God.

Evolutionists distinguish between living and non-living things and recognize that each of these realities presents its own problem of origin and development. In fact, the evolutionary theory is not properly concerned with origin. It has rather to do with the unfolding or expansion of things from an assumed beginning. As to the origin of the material universe, few, indeed, are prepared to defend the notion that it is eternal or that it is self-wrought. Matter, being unintelligent and inert, could neither exert itself nor could it have acted with a purpose. Only intelligence, no less than infinite, and capacity, equal to the task, could have achieved such a beginning. The immensity of the undertaking and the acumen it connotes, are not lessened by the assumption that all once existed in the form of a fire mist or protoplasm. It is doubtful, if it is less an effort, to make an egg out of which a chicken might come, than to make the full developed chicken. The fire mist of protoplasm which holds this universe potentially within it, would be a miniature of the whole. So far as the evolutionary theory extends, the problem of the cause of the miniature, remains unsolved.

In the introduction to its treatise on "evolution," the Encyclopedia Britannica states: "From the earliest times, man must have speculated on the nature and origin of the multitude of living creatures, both plants and animals, which people the surface of the earth. Some have assumed" - the writer humbly interposes what he believes to be a better phrase, namely, that they "believe" on absolute authority - "that the diverse forms, with their different shapes and sizes, properties and habits, were each specially created, probably to fill a particular place and serve a special purpose; others preferred to

consider them as the gradually developed products of nature.” According to modern doctrine, evolution and the diversity we see around us are due to the action in the past of “natural causes,” which can be observed still at work in the present. This conception has been applied to the whole cosmos, including both living and non-living things.”

On the extent to which evolution is received by educated individuals, the same introduction goes on to remark:

The idea of evolution has penetrated many other departments of thought. Anthropology and ethnology are permeated with it, and so are history and comparative religion. Modern psychology recognizes that the human mind is unintelligible without an evolutionary background. The idea of evolution has re-emphasized our kinship with the animals; it has dethroned man from his position as lord of creation; but in place of the old idea of fixity, it has given us the idea of the possible advancement of the human race and of man as the trustee of future evolutionary progress. And again, it is now universally held by competent biologists that all organisms, living or extinct, have arisen from remote common ancestors by a process of gradual change or evolution, and further, that living matter or “life” itself, in all probability, arose from non-living matter in the first stages of this evolutionary process. The only doubt which remains, concerns the exact steps in the process, and the nature and relative importance of the various factors which have contributed to it. – (14th ed., VIII, 916-17).

The above statement that “life itself in all probability arose from non-living matter” is a pure conjecture. It is, no doubt, the best solution of the origin of life that godless, impious minds can devise. Here, the true scientific method of proceeding, only upon proved facts, seems cast to the winds. Evolution now does, until it is verified by facts. In defining a fact, the New Century Dictionary states: “A deed or act....also, something that has really happened, or is actually the case; a real occurrence, or state of things, as distinguished from something merely alleged or believed; hence, a truth known by

actual observation or authentic testimony” (1936 ed). The evolutionary hypothesis does not answer to one of these requirements, and therefore, is void of facts on which a science might be grounded. Over against this, having established the truth that the Bible is the Word of God by a demonstration which does conform completely with all that goes to substantiate a fact, it is scientific to believe that “in the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth.” That statement presents a proved fact which is based on “authentic testimony” and is therefore scientific. However, because of the spiritual darkness resting on the human understanding concerning God and all His works, the Scriptures with equal finality and clarity assert: “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear” (Hebrews 11:3).

In the intellectual world, as in all walks of life, men choose between the only alternatives, namely, the direct creation of all things by God as asserted by His own authoritative Word, or the evolution of this complex and marvelous universe without a cause or a guiding purpose, out of nothing. The choice is finally between God and nothing. And what darkness is evinced on the part of those who choose nothing?

Any attempt to analyze the theories of naturalistic evolution should take into account the fact that, in spite of its antiquity, it is a present-day belief and not to be classed with abandoned notions of past ages. The doctrine is not new, having been held, in crude form, by many ancient philosophers. Latterly, it appears with the assumed importance, which shrewd and cultured men assign to it. In Huxley’s day - nearly a century ago - he gave to this theory the weight of his great influence. He stated: “The matter of life is composed of ordinary matter, differing from it only in the manner in which its atoms are aggregated.” And again, “I must carefully guard myself against the supposition that I intend to suggest that no such thing as Abiogenesis has ever taken place in the past or ever will take place in the future. With organic chemistry, molecular physics, and physiology yet in their infancy, and every day making prodigious strides, I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call “vital,” may not some day be artificially brought together”

(cited by Hodge, "Theology," II, 5).

The most recent authoritative statement concerning the present claims of naturalistic evolution will be found in the latest edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, where it is asserted - a portion of which statement has been quoted earlier in this work - "Finally there is the pragmatic value of the evolution theory. The biologist in studying living things, finds that the idea of evolution works and helps him to interpret his facts and to discover new facts and principles; while no other theory, so far put forward, helps him at all. The idea of evolution is as important a biological tool, as, for instance, the microscope....It is often asserted by irresponsible people that "Darwinism is dead." This is very far from being the case. In so far as Darwinism was a reasoned assertion of the fact of evolution, it is much more firmly grounded today than it was in Darwin's own time, and every year brings fresh evidence in its support. Only in regard to the nature of the variations, which are to be selected, has the theory of evolution by Natural Selection, suffered any important modification; in other respects, it remains unshaken" (VIII, 916).

There are certain obvious phenomena for which the evolutionary theory offers no explanation, namely, the origin of matter; matter has never evolved life; species remain separate wherever observed and no transmutation of species has ever been observed; motion; life; consciousness; Christ; Christian experience; a future life. So far from being subordinate issues, these are the essential facts of all creation. It will not suffice to claim, at this point, that evolution is a principle which cannot concern itself with details. The above-named realities are fundamental. Science, to be worthy of its name, must proceed on the basis of proved facts. Scientific men who embrace the unproved theories of naturalistic evolution outrage the requisitions of their profession. As Dr. Miley declares: "Evolution then is an inference from a mere hypothesis. This is not the method of science. Hypothesis is an utterly insufficient ground for any science. No theory can claim a scientific position until it has verified itself by facts" ("Systematic Theology," I, 135). The explanation of this strange departure on the part of many learned men from the acknowledged fundamental basis of science, is that they have no

choice. Since “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God” (I Cor. 2:14), they find no solution to the problem of origin in the revelation that God created the universe. To such a mind, it is evidently easier to believe in an unproved theory that something evolved out of nothing; that matter produced life, than to believe that God created all things by His own sufficient power and for His own all-wise ends. Spiritual illumination, and not argument, is the cure for the incapacity of the unregenerate man. How abnormal these things are. How perverted is the intellectual experience of a person who sees “foolishness” in the sublime creative acts of God, but sees no foolishness in the sodden notion that tadpoles and monkeys are the progenitors of men. Faith alone and not scientific reasoning discovers the things of God “Through faith,” and not all men have faith, “we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear” (Hebrews 11:3). The doctrine of divine creation is not only the starting point of revelation, but all subsequent Scripture recognizes that teaching and builds upon it.

IV. MATERIALISM

“The doctrine that states the facts of experience are all to be explained by reference to the reality, activities, and laws of physical or material substance. In psychology, this doctrine denies the reality of the soul, as physical being; in cosmology, it denies the need of assuming the being of God as Absolute Spirit, or of any other spiritual ground or first principle: opposed to spiritism. Materialistic theories have varied from the first, but the most widely accepted form, regards all species of sentient and mental life, as products of the organism, and the universe itself, as resolvable into terms of physical elements and their motions” (“New Standard Dictionary,” 1913). To this, the Encyclopedia Britannica adds: “It may perhaps, be fairly said, that materialism, is at present, a necessary methodological postulate of natural-scientific inquiry. The business of the scientist is to explain everything by the physical causes which are comparatively well understood and to exclude the interference of spiritual causes. It was the great work of Descartes to exclude, rigorously from science, all explanations which were not scientifically verifiable” (14th ed. s.v.).

The world awaits the introduction of a balanced and unprejudiced science which gives to the spiritual its transcendent place above matter. The blind groveling of modern evolutionists who, for want of spiritual light, are forced to seek the origin of life as an emanation from “psysico-chemical complexity” (whatever that may mean - cf. Encyclopedia Britannica on evolution) is burying itself in the muck from which it is unable to lift its eyes. As God is greater than the works of His hands, so man’s spirit, being a direct impartation from God (Genesis 2:7), surpasses in importance the mere “earthen vessel” in which it dwells. The history of science is one of endless admission of a misunderstanding and error. In the field of that which is merely physical, certain progress has been made; but in the field of that which concerns life and spiritual being, there has been no progress, nor can there be, until scientific men welcome revelation as a valid source of information. If all science hesitates over the problem of mere animation, when will its high priests awaken to an appreciation of the greater marvel of “the gift of God (which) is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord?”

V. POLYTHEISM

The belief and teaching that there is more than one God is distinguished as “polytheism,” and, by so much, is a great disregard of the first commandment of the Decalogue. It has been the claim of infidels and modern evolutionists that, in their earlier developments from crude animal existence, men have believed in many gods. On the contrary, the intra-Biblical and extra Biblical evidence demonstrates that men began with a belief in one God and from that belief they departed, being unwilling to “retain God in their knowledge.” No better or more accurate history of this drift could be written than is recorded by inspiration in Romans 1:18-32. To quote Dr. A. A. Hodge again:

Polytheism....distributes the perfections and functions of the infinite God among many limited gods. It sprang out of the nature-worship represented in the earliest Hindu Veids, so soon and so generally supplanting primitive monotheism. At first, as it long remained in Chaldea and Arabia, it consisted in the worship of elements, especially of the stars and of fire. Subsequently, it

took special forms from the traditions, the genius, and the relative civilizations of each nationality.

Among the rudest savages, it sank to Fetichism, as in western and central Africa. Among the Greeks, it was made the vehicle for the expression of their refined humanitarianism in the apotheosis of heroic men rather than the revelation of incarnate gods. In India, springing from a pantheistic philosophy, it has been carried to the most extravagant extreme, both in respect to the number, and the character of its deities. Whenever polytheism has been connected with speculation, it appears as the exoteric counterpart of pantheism. – (“Outlines of Theology.” pp. 47,48).

Polytheism presents no similarity whatsoever to the Biblical doctrine of Monotheism. The Bible is, to the last degree, a monotheistic revelation.

VI. IDEALISM AND REALISM

Regarding these two opposing systems of thought, the New Standard Dictionary (1913 ed.) asserts: “idealism: That system of reflective thinking which would interpret and explain the entire universe, things and minds and their relations, as the realization of a system of ideas, or as the progressive evolution of an ideal. It takes various forms as determined by the view of what the idea or ideal is, and of how we become sure of it. Idealism is customarily regarded as, and in particulars often is, the antithesis of realism; but the extremes of each obliged, while denying many, to admit not a few of the claims of the other. On the other hand, while agnosticism admits the possibility of reality as independent of consciousness, it denies the possibility of knowing such reality. Idealism, therefore, differs from agnosticism by refusing to admit the possibility of a non-ideal reality.”

Regarding realism as related to philosophy, it is similarly stated: “The doctrine that the objects of human cognition have real existence, and not merely existence in the subject mind which perceives or otherwise cognizes the opposed to nominalism, and

skeptical or subjective idealism.”

Thus it is declared that, in the case of idealism, nothing exists except in the thought or impression which the mind sustains; and, in the case of realism, all objects of which the consciousness is aware are realities. It is needless to point out that realism alone is sustained by the Word of God, while idealism has, in past ages, served for useless and endless speculation.

VII. PANTHEISM

As the term implies, pantheism is the belief that God is everything and that everything is God, thus confounding God with nature, matter with spirit, and the Creator with the things He has created. Two widely different approaches have been made to pantheistic philosophy. One is, that matter originates everything and is God, life and spirit being only modes of the existence of the all-inclusive Absolute. The other, is that spirit is everything and that matter has no substantial existence beyond the mental impression, or delusion, that it exists. In either instance, God is all. Thus, both idealism and realism are represented in the two forms of this philosophy. As seen in the hoary religions of Brahmanism and Buddhism, this belief has led to the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, which also contends that the soul derives all existence from God and eventually, after countless reincarnations, returns to, and is absorbed into, God. In the “Veids,” it is taught that “the whole universe is the Creator, proceeds from the Creator, and returns to him.” Similarly, from the same source: “Thou art Brahma, thou art Vishnu, thou art Kodra, etc, thou art air, thou art Andri, thou art the moon, thou art substance, thou art Dijam; thou art the earth, thou art the world! O Lord of the world, to thee humble adoration! O Soul of the world, thou who superintendest the actions of the world, who destroyest the world, who createst the pleasures of the world! O life of the world, the visible and invisible worlds are the sport of thy power; thou art the sovereign, O Universal Soul; to thee humble adoration!” (cited by Cooke, “The Deity,” rev. ed., p. 170).

The human mind seems to need no more than a thread of suggestion on which to

build by imagination, mystery upon mystery, and fable upon fable, seeming never to challenge itself with the fact that the thing thus imposed is a monstrous delusion. Over against this, revelation has provided the demon of Luke 11:24, "walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none," is prone to deify and worship anything from a "creeping thing" to the universe itself. The extent to which pantheism as a philosophy may go is reflected in innumerable writings - ancient and modern. Lucan said: "Whatsoever thou seest is Jupiter." Seneca inquires, "What is God?" and answers, "He is all that you see, and all that you do not see" (cited by Cooke, *ibid.*, pp. 171-172). The following versification, by Dr. Mason Good, of a poem ascribed to Orpheus, represents the philosophical thought of its day:

Jove first exists, whose thunders roll above;
 Jove last, Jove midmost, all proceeds from Jove.
 Female is Jove, immortal Jove is male;
 Jove the broad earth - the heaven's irradiate pale.
 Jove is the boundless Spirit, Jove the fire
 That warms the world with feeling and desire.
 The sea is Jove, the sun, the lunar ball;
 Jove king supreme, the sovereign source of all.
 All power is his; to him all glory give,
 For his vast form embraces all that live,
 Cited by Cooke, *ibid.*, p. 171

Pantheism has become the inheritance of every nation on earth, and has cursed the streams of human thought beyond all estimation. It assumes the eternity of matter and the absurdity that matter has power to originate life and spirit. In its idealistic form, it contradicts human consciousness and destroys the very ground upon which reason is based and the fundamental method of its own procedure. It breaks down the most essential distinctions between existing things, by which alone they are identified. According to pantheism, the potter and the clay are one and the same thing - if they exist at all. The promoters of these notions of necessity contradict, in their daily lives,

the very speculations they propound. They cannot state a theorem, or even commence to do so, without departing from their major idea. Every effort to build this theory assumes the principle that destroys it. Attempting to support it, they dig down its supposed foundations. The theory obliterates all distinctions. It levels all elements to one item. There is no recognition of the fact that God is infinite while creation is finite; that God is omnipotent while creation is impotent; that God is immutable while creation is mutable; that God is eternal while creation experiences both birth and death. Error is incidental to other minds, but unavoidable and essential to the pantheistic teachers. Though it recognizes a god such as human speculation conceives, pantheism is the mother of atheism and the grossest idolatry. It is promoting the notion that matter is God and God is matter and it is a short step from this to the assertion of the fool that there is no God. It is but a step, likewise, to the worship of any inanimate or animate thing, since the theory contends that it is all a part of God. The system leads to blasphemy and licentiousness. The basis of every moral distinction is obliterated by it.

If all nature is God, then human action is not distinct from God, but is the very action of God. The whole category of human crime becomes as worthy as virtue itself. The terms by which evil is described are only conventional ideas. Reason is assassinated and virtue defamed. Such is the fruit of modern pantheistic philosophy current in educational centers today. The student of doctrine may well ponder the following utterance which is a normal offspring of pantheistic philosophy: "The belief in a personal living God is the chief foundation and origin of our worm-eaten social state; and further, that so long as mankind shall hang by a single hair to the idea of heaven, there is no happiness to be looked for on earth. Man himself is the religion of futurity. God stands in need of man, but man has no need of God" (cited by Cooke, *ibid.*, p. 186). These revolting assertions are the very creed of atheism and communism, which are clutching the throat of the social interests of the world and which hate the things of God with a perfect hatred.

The following extended quotation from Dr. William Cooke, published in 1862, summarizes the evil character of this philosophy:

Whether we contemplate the system theoretically or practically, it is the most outrageous monstrosity which the human mind has ever yet fabricated or can fabricate. It is the ultimum of absurdity and immorality. It was generated by conceit, fostered by pride, and matured by the most consummate depravity. Viewed by the eye of philosophy, it is arrant nonsense; by the eye of morality, it is disgustingly obscene; and, by the eye of religion, it is horrid blasphemy. It is repugnant to our reason, and revolting to our moral sense; it is a foul disgrace to the intellect and character of man, which it is both humiliating and loathsome to contemplate; and the disgrace is deepened when we think of the men, the country, and the age with which the system has sprung up in modern times. A maniac could not equal its folly, nor a demon exceed its wickedness. The Prince of Darkness himself..... could not desire a more complete abasement of the human intellect, a more entire wreck of the human character and happiness, a more perfect subversion of the authority and designs of Almighty God. Its universal prevalence would consummate the wishes of that apostate and malignant spirit, in dissolving all the bonds of society, uprooting the foundations of social order and happiness, and in filling the earth with lust, violence, and blood. We wonder not at the spread of socialism, communism, libertinism, anarchy, and hatred to religion; we wonder not the vices are open, crimes unblushing, and the vilest of men are held in reputation. There is a cause. Learning and talent have prostituted their powers in advocating an atheistic lie, and have sent it abroad through society; and the lie thus sanctioned, and ministering to the vilest passions of human nature, has produced the effects we deplore. – (Ibid., pp. 187-88).

VIII. DEISM

This term, from the Latin “Deus,” meaning “God,” is closely allied to the Greek word, “Theos.” As a philosophy, the contention is that God is personal, infinite, holy, and the Creator of all things; but, that He purposely abandoned His creation when completed with the intent that it should be self-sustaining and self promoting by the forces resident

in it. God is not immanent in creation, but transcends it. Deism rejects the Scriptures or any suggestion that God is providentially working since creation. According to this system, there is no possibility of reaching God by prayer, or of holding communion or fellowship with Him. It is “the religion of nature” since it contends that all that can be known of God is restricted to such deductions as can be made from creation. There is no moral influence flowing out of Deism and this, its followers have demonstrated. Carlyle, thus described the Deist conception of God: “An absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath at the outside of the universe, and seeing it go” (cited by Strong, “Theology,” p. 204).

IX. POSITIVISM

The philosophy elaborated by Auguste Comte (1798-1857) which is based on the assumption that man’s knowledge is restricted to phenomena, and of these, man can know only in part. It rejects all consideration of metaphysics or speculative philosophy. The theistic arguments as to First Cause and design, as well as the conclusions of human reason, are refused.

X. MONISM

“The doctrine which refers the explanation of all the existences, activities, and developments of the universe, including the physical and psychical or spiritual beings, to one ultimate principle or substance: opposed to philosophical “dualism and pluralism.” Of this principle or substance is conceived of, in terms of personal life, the doctrine takes the form of “idealistic monism;” if in terms of matter and physical mechanism, it is called “materialistic monism;” if in terms which deny the reality of both finite personal life and finite physical existences, but affirm that both are only the phenomenal manifestations of an impersonal ground, the doctrine becomes “pantheistic monism” (“New Standard Dictionary,” 1913 ed).

XI. DUALISM

“A system or theory which asserts a radical duality or twofold-ness of nature, being,

or operation. In the history of reflective thinking, for species of “dualism: have developed, which are to some extent interdependent, but are not identical, according to the subject matter of reflection. These are **(1)** “theological dualism,” or the doctrine that there are two eternal and opposing principles, or divine beings, one good and the other evil. This view was characteristic of Zoroastrianism, and certain Gnostic systems, but is opposed by monistic religions like Christianity and Mohammedanism. A special form arose in early Christian controversy, in the doctrine attributed to Nestorius, which held that the Logos dwelt in Jesus as a distinct person, thus regarding Christ as having two personalities, rather than as being one divine human person. **(2)** “Philosophical dualism,” or the theory which considers the ultimate being of the universe, or “World-Ground,” to be twofold or to be constituted of two independent and irreducible elements, as opposed either to idealistic or materialistic monism. **(3)** “Psychological” or “psychophysical dualism,” the theory that the body and mind of man are two different existences.... **(4)** “Ethical dualism,” or the system of morals which demands and justifies one kind of conduct toward one’s fellows in the same social group and another kind of conduct toward other men” (ibid.).

XII. PLURALISM

Aside from its general use, relative to the plural aspect of things, the term “pluralism” has a specific philosophical meaning in which the essential unity of the world is denied. It contends that “inasmuch as the mind makes its own world, for practical purposes, there are as many worlds as there are minds to make them” (ibid.).

CONCLUSION

Such in general are the naturalistic arguments pro and con for the existence of God, and the philosophical issues which they engender. From this, as important as it is, the spiritual mind turns with relief to the complete, satisfying, and authoritative revelation of God as set forth in His own Word.

Chapter Two--Angelology

PART I. INTRODUCTION TO ANGELOLOGY

The truth that there is an order of celestial beings, quite distinct from humanity, and from the Godhead, who occupy an exalted estate above the present position of fallen man, is the teaching of much Scripture. These celestial beings are mentioned at least **108** times in the Old Testament and **165** times in the New Testament, and out of this extended body of Scripture, the student may construct his doctrine of the angels (cf. Gaebelein, "Angels of God," p. 12).

The designation "angel" - whether "malak" of the Old Testament Hebrew or "aggelos" of the New Testament Greek - means "messenger." These beings execute the purpose of the One whom they serve. The holy angels are the messengers of their Creator, while the fallen angels are the messengers of Satan - "the god of this world" - whom they elect to serve. Men, too are sometimes styled "messengers," as they seem to be addressed in Revelation 1:20, though certain expositors, as well represented by Alford, contend that spirit beings are the messengers of the seven Church of Asia. The term, "angel" is not only "generic," in that it is applied to all orders of created spirits, but it is expressive, also, of their office or service.

When considering the angels, as in other doctrines, there is some field for the exercise of reason. Since God is spirit (John 4:24), partaking in no way of material elements, it is natural to assume that there are created beings, who more closely resemble God than do the mundane creatures who combine both the material and the immaterial. There is a material kingdom, an animal kingdom, and a human kingdom; so, it may be assumed, there is no angelic or spirit kingdom. However, Angelology rests not upon reason or supposition, but upon revelation.

As the universe has been ordered, it has not pleased God to give to man any intercourse with the angels, or any consciousness of their presence; yet, the Bible states that angels not only observe the affairs of men, but that good angels minister to

man's well-being (Hebrews 1:14) and evil angels wage warfare against that in man which is wrought of God (Ephesians 6:12). The reality of angelic influence in human affairs is not restricted to a limited portion of human history. The angels are reported to be present from creation and on into the eternity to come. Under a comprehensive fivefold division of God's finite creatures, as they now exist, the angels comprise two divisions, namely, the holy angels and the fallen angels. To these, are added the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Christians. However, all classes of beings, regardless of the order of time of beginning, being originated and constituted as they are, go on in their group distinctions into eternity to come. There is no evidence that other orders of finite beings will be introduced in this age or future ages.

In the Middle Ages, unprofitable and often grotesque speculation so characterized the discussion of the doctrine of the angels, that a depreciation of this body of truth is abroad today. Of these discussions, Dr. Augustus Strong writes: "The scholastics debated the questions, how many angels could stand at once on the point of a needle relation of angels to space); whether an angel could be in two places at the same time; how great was the interval between the creation of angels and their fall; whether the sin of the first angel caused the sin of the rest; whether as many retained their integrity as fell; whether our atmosphere is the place of punishment for fallen angels; whether guardian angels have charge of children from baptism, from birth, or while the infant is yet in the womb of its mother" ("Systematic Theology," sixth edition, p. 221). Thus, also, Rossetti in his "Shadow of Dante" (pp. 14-15), says of Dante: "The fall of the rebel angels he considers to have taken place within twenty seconds of their creation, and to have originated in the pride which made Lucifer unwilling to await the time prefixed by his Maker for enlightening him with perfect knowledge (cited by Strong, *ibid*).

The presence of spirit beings has been recognized in almost all systems of religion. On this fact, Dr. William Cooke makes this comment:

Indeed, in nearly all the systems of religion, ancient or modern, we trace such beings; in the Aeons of the Gnostics, the Demons, the Demi-gods, the Genii, and

the Lares, which figure so largely in the theologies, poems, and general literature of heathen antiquity, we have abundant evidence of almost universal belief in the existence of spiritual intelligences, ranging in different orders between man and his Maker. Here, however, we often find truth draped in fiction, and facts distorted by the wildest fancies of mythology. The doctrine of the heathen, respecting spiritual beings, may be thus briefly stated. They believe the souls of departed heroes and good men were exalted to dignity and happiness; these were called demons, and were supposed to be employed as mediators between the supreme divinity and man. There was, however, another class of demons who were supposed never to have inhabited mortal bodies at all; and of these, there were two sorts: the good, who were employed as the guardians of good men; and evil ones, who were said to envy human happiness, and sought to hinder their virtue and effect their ruin. In these notions, we see a substratum of truth; but in the Scriptures, we have the truth itself in its original purity, free from the corruptions of superstition and the licentious imagery of the poet; and truth, the more majestic from its unadorned simplicity.

Heathen philosophers and poets often spoke of the ministry of spiritual beings. Socrates often spoke of a good demon attending him, and directing and guiding him by his admonitions. Plato taught that the higher kinds of demons, such as, never dwelt in mortal bodies, were appointed guardians unto men. But old Hesiod ascribes a ministering agency to the spirits that had once inhabited mortal bodies during the golden age, and speaks of them as:

Aerial spirits, by great Jove desing'd
To be on earth the guardians of mankind.
Invisible to mortal eyes they go,
And mark our actions good or bad below;
The immortal spies with watchful care preside,
And twice ten thousand round their charges glide;
They can reward with glory or with gold,

A power, they by divine permission, hold.

We have here a brief representation of that general sentiment on the offices of these superior beings, which we find so abundantly amplified in the speculations of philosophers, and the dreamy fictions of the poets. But with what steadfast foot we tread when, leaving the flitting theories and amusing dramas of the heathen, we come to the substantial verities of revelation, and in the narrative of simple truth, hear what God has said and saints have seen of the angel world. - "Christian Theology," 5th edition, pp. 610-11, 21-22.

PART II. GENERAL FACTS ABOUT THE ANGELS

The doctrine of the angels lends itself to twelve general divisions, which are now to be attended:

I. ANGELIC SPHERES

In approaching the Biblical revelation, relative to angelic beings, it is necessary to consider the broader sphere of the whole universe and not to restrict this contemplation to the limited boundaries of the earth. Modern astronomy has presented evidence for the vastness of material in creation. Solar systems, greater than this, extend on beyond the range of human power to comprehend. Other suns, with all that surround them, removed from this earth and its sun by thirty to sixty billion miles, are known to exist. Camille Flammarion states: "Then I understand that all the stars which have ever been observed in the sky, the millions of luminous points, which constitute the Milky Way, the innumerable celestial bodies, suns of every magnitude and of every degree of brightness, solar systems, planets, and satellites, which by millions and hundreds of millions succeed each other in the void around us, that whatever human tongues have designated by the name of universe, do not in the infinite represent more than an archipelago of celestial islands and not more than a city in a grand total of population, a town of greater or lesser importance. In this city of the

limitless empire, in this town of a land without frontiers, our sun and its system represents a single point, a single house among millions of other habitations. Is our solar system a palace or a hotel in this great city? Probably a hotel. And the earth? The earth is a room in the solar mansion - a small dwelling, miserably small" (cited by Gaebelein, "The Angels of God," pp. 8-9).

From earliest times, men have considered the question whether this earth is the only inhabited planet. Science ventures guesses, but the Bible speaks with authority on this age-old problem. It is disclosed that the angels dwell in the heavenly spheres and in numbers beyond human computation. They are gathered in groups which are identified as "thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, authorities," and "the hosts of heaven." Yet, all these are wholly subject to the Lord Jesus Christ, who created this universe and all it contains, including angelic beings. He created "things....visable and invisible" (Col. 1:16). Peter declares that these beings are subject to Christ (1 Peter 3:22). No intimation is ever given that these beings are limited to the sphere of this earth or to any restricted part of the universe. Christ said, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14:2). The "Father's house" is no less than the universe in which there are many abodes. Jude asserts 1:6, that angels have their own dwelling places. On this passage, Dr. A.C. Gaebelein writes: "In the Epistle of Jude, we find this significant statement: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6)...The one thing we wish to consider is the fact, the outstanding fact, that these angels had "their own habitation." They had an estate given to them. This seems to us conclusive, that angels have in the heavens - habitations, places where they dwell, which they can leave as the unseen ministers of God" (Op. cit., pp. 39-40). Hooker states: "Angels are linked into a kind of corporation amongst themselves....Consider the angels of God associated, and their law is that which disposeth them as an army, one in order and degree above another (Luke 2:13; Matthew 26:53; Hebrews 12:22)" (Ecc. "Polity," Book I, iv.2, cited by Gerhart, "Institutes of the Christian Religion," I, 644). This consideration is important since it is natural for men to suppose that the human sphere forms a center about which other orders of

beings are gathered. Angelic existence antedates that of humanity by countless ages, and what is germane to the united, interrelated commonwealth and accomplishments of angels, for which they were created, has been continuously executed without reference to, or dependence upon the lower and later order of human subsistence. The meaning of the above cited designations - "thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, authorities" - is little related to or dependent on mundane things. These terms betoken the cooperation amongst the angels themselves. Another sphere of relationship is reflected which is itself as vast as the universe wherein it resides and wherein it functions.

The angelic beings are declared to have interest in the things of earth and some service in this direction; but, no revelation is given as to the extent and nature of the facts and forces which constitute the reality in which the angels live, which reality was in action ages before the creation of man. The Bible is not addressed to the angels, nor does it center or enter upon an exhaustive description of their estate or interrelationships. It is implied however, that a vast universe, which the human eye but feebly penetrates, is inhabited by unnumbered spirit beings, and that, upon release from the limitations of this sphere, the dwellers of earth are inducted into those extended domains - not to be angels, but to enter the sphere which divine teleology has designed for them.

The natural human vision is not able to discern the presence of angels, but that fact does not impugn the truth that the angels are about us on every hand. Milton has written by poetic fancy and not by inspiration: "Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep" (cited by Strong, "Systematic Theology," sixth edition, p. 227). When the natural vision of the young man of 2 Kings 6:17 was augmented, he saw the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha. One reason angels are rendered invisible to human sight may be that, if they were seen, they would be worshipped. Man, who is so prone to idolatry as to worship the works of his own hands, would hardly be able to resist the worship of angels were they before his eyes. The Apostle admonishes against the "worshipping of

angels” (Col. 2:18), and John testifies: “And I, John, saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel, which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, see thou do it not: for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God” (Rev. 22:8-9).

II. THE REALITY OF THE ANGELS

In the light of so much revelation, the speculations of Gnosticism regarding angels must be rejected. The angels are living beings of the highest position and the greatest consequence in the universe. They are more than mere powers emanating from God. Though in no way independent, in the sense that they are self-originating, self-sustaining, or capable of self-annihilation, they are free moral beings and have, in the past ages at least, held their own destiny within the power of their own choice. It is revealed that some of the angels “sinned” and that they “kept not their first estate” (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 1:6). Of the tremendous issues involved and the far-flung epochs of history embraced in these brief declarations, no complete disclosure is proffered. Whenever occurred, there could be no breaking away from the creature’s relation to the Creator, and, as stated in the Scriptures, these fallen angels, must in the end, account to the One whom they repudiated (Ezekiel 28:16-17; Matthew 25:14). The sufficiency of the angels, like that of all created beings, is of God alone. They live and move by virtue of divine enablement. Even Michael, the archangel, when in controversy with Satan asserted his dependence on God (Jude 1:9).

III. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ANGELS AND MEN

The Scriptures maintain that man was “made a little lower than the angels” (Ps. 8:4-5; Hebrews 2:6-7). Whether this refers to estate, or to essential, inherent qualities, is not determined. It is probable that the angels are superior to man in both respects. Much dispute has arisen in earlier days over this question. Among more recent writers, Martensen, with many others, argues that the angels are inferior to men, while Dorner, with even a larger group, contends that the angels are superior. The Bible

avers that man was made in the image of God; no such work is spoken of angels. Man possesses a material body with its experiences; no such experience is reported of the angels, though it is evident that demons seek embodiment whenever that is possible.

Discoursing on the angels, Dr. Gerhart writes on the relative importance of angels and men: “Man is a physico-spiritual being, organically uniting in his constitution body and soul. The body is not, as has frequently been taught, a clog to the soul or a degradation of manhood, or the infliction of a penalty. It is an element of dignity, a condition of spiritual vitality. Conjoining body and soul in indissoluble unity, man is connected with two worlds. On the one side, bodily organization binds human life, human personality, with matter, with all the forces and process of nature backward to its beginnings. On the other side, spiritual life allies man to the pre-mundane dominion of Spirit. Connected with the heavenly realm and with the economy of earth, his constitution qualifies him to be the mediator between the infinite and the finite, between the heavenly and the earthly, the material and the spiritual, the representative of God in His relations to the world, the organ of the world in its relations to God. Revelation does not accord this position of dignity to any order of angelic spirits” (Op. cit., pp. 648-49). Martensen in his “Dogmatics” (pp. 132-33) states: “Although the angel, in relation to man, is the more powerful spirit, man’s spirit is nevertheless the richer and the more comprehensive. For the angels in all his power is only the expression of a single one of all those phases which man in the inward nature of his soul, and the richness of his own individuality, is intended to combine into a complete and perfect microcosm.... It is precisely because the angels are only spirits, not souls, that they cannot possess the same rich existence as man, whose soul is the point of union in which spirit and nature meet” (cited by Gerhart, *ibid*). No consideration of the relative importance of angels as compared to man will be complete which fails to observe that man, though now sunken to “a horrible pit” and “miry clay,” when redeemed, lifted up to a place of secure standing on the Rock (Ps. 40:2) and destined to the image of Christ, which final estate is far above that of the angels. There is a marked discrepancy in much of the effort to draw a contrast between these two orders of divine creation. The Bible is the only source of trustworthy information and is primarily a revelation to man of his own relation

to God. Beyond the mere part that angels have in the affairs of men, there is little intimation about those larger spheres of activity into which the angels enter. The discussion reaches no satisfactory conclusion for want of even elementary knowledge regarding the angels.

IV. THE PERSONALITY OF THE ANGELS

Truth bearing on the personality of angels is also attended with difficulties. Agreement cannot be accorded the following vague statement by Martensen:

There are many sorts of spirits under the heavens, and for this very reason, also many degrees of spirituality and spiritual independence; and we may therefore, very properly assert that the angels are divided into classes.....If we contemplate the angels in their relation to the conception of personality, we may say: there are powers, whose spirituality is so far from being independent, that they possess only a represented personality; in short, are only personifications. Of such a character are the tempests and flames, which execute the commands of the Lord.....There exist other powers in the creation which possess a higher degree of spirituality, an intermediate state of existence between personification and personality. Under this category may be classed the spiritual powers in history, as for instance, the spirits of nations and the deities of mythology.....But if in this matter we find powers in history, which hover in the region lying between personality and personification, it is no less certain that revelation recognizes a third class of cosmical powers which constitute a free and personal spiritual kingdom. – (“Christian Dogmatics.” p. 131), cited by Gerhart, op. cit., p. 642.

Though their service or dignity may vary, there is no implication in the Bible that some angels are more intelligent than others. Every feature of personality is predicated of the angels. They are individual beings, and, though spirits, experience emotions; they render intelligent worship (Ps. 148:2); they behold, with due understanding, the

face of the Father (Matthew 18:10); they know their limitations (Matthew 24:36), their inferiority to the Son of God (Hebrews 1:4-14); and, in the case of the fallen angels, they know their ability to do evil. The angels are individuals, yet, though sometimes appearing in a separate capacity, they are subject to classifications and varying ranks of importance.

V. THE CREATION AND MODE OF EXISTENCE OF THE ANGELS

It is assumed from Colossians 1:16-17, that all angels were created simultaneously. In like manner, it is assumed that the creation of angels was completed at that time and that none will be added to their number. They are not subject to death or any form of extinction; therefore, they do not decrease, as they do not increase. The plan by which the human family is secured through propagation has no counterpart among the angels. Each angel, being a direct creation of God, stands in immediate and personal relation to the Creator. Of certain of the human family as they appear in the next world, it is said by Christ, "They neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matthew 22:28-30). Thus, it is concluded that there is no decrease or increase among these heavenly beings.

The existence of angels is assumed in the Scriptures, and the Scriptures form the only source of worthy information bearing on those beings who, aside from supernatural appearances, are not allowed to come into the sphere of human consciousness. As man is the highest creation of earthly spheres, so the angels are the highest creation of larger spheres described in Colossians 1:16-17, where it is written: "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." As the angels, in common with all other moral beings, were created by Christ and for Christ, so they abide forever unto the praise of His glory. Though some human beings and certain angels now withhold their worship of God, the greater part of the angels are before His throne in ceaseless adoration. It can be no small issue in the divine counsels, that certain creatures, fallen in sin, withhold their note of praise from the One to whom all

honor is due. This repudiation could not go on forever. It is gratifying to read that, in His kingdom reign, Christ will put down all rule and authority, and that, at the close of this present age, He will, by the ministry of angels, gather out of human spheres, all things that offend. Of the disposition of enmity in higher spheres it is said: "For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (I Cor. 15:26-26), while of the disposition of enmity in the lower spheres it is written: "The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matthew 13:41-43).

As compared with human and animal existence, the angels may be said to be incorporeal, but only in the sense that they do not sustain a mortal organization. The Scriptures imply that the angels do have embodiment. God is a Spirit, yet, when addressing the Jews, Christ said of the Father, "Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape" (John 5:37; cf. Ex. 33:23; Ezek. 1:1-28; Ps. 104:1-2). It is essential to a spirit that it have localized, determinate, spiritual form. Too often the problem is confused by imposing upon spiritual beings, those limitations which belong to humanity. For the saints in heaven, there is promised a "Spiritual body" - a body adapted to the spirit of man (I Cor. 15:44). Such, indeed, is the body of the glorified Lord (Phil. 3:21). There are many kinds of bodies even on the earth, the Apostle points out (I Cor. 15:39-40), and goes on to say: "There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial." It is small evidence that there are no celestial bodies, if the issue rests on no more than the truth that man has no power to discern such bodies. Spirits have a definite form of organization which is adapted to the law of their being. They are both finite and special. All this may be true, though they are far removed from this mundane economy. They are able to approach the sphere of human life, but that fact in no way imposes upon them the conformity to human existence. The appearance of angels may be, as occasion demands, so like men, that they pass as men. How else could some "entertain angels unawares?" (Hebrews 13:2). On the other hand, their appearance is

sometimes in dazzling white and blazing glory (Matthew 28:2-4). When Christ declared, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Luke 24:37-39), He did not imply that a spirit has no body at all, but rather, that they do have bodies which in constitution are different from those of men. In a discreet and prudent manner, Dr. William Cooke has canvassed the complicated field of truth relative to the nature and corporality of the angels thus:

In the Old Testament, the Psalmist calls them spirits - "Who maketh his angels spirits," civ. 4. And in the New Testament, they are designated by the same term- "Are they not all ministering spirits?" (Hebrews 1:14). Here, however, a question arises - are angels so spiritual as to be absolutely immaterial like God?

Or are they enshrined in a refined material fabric? Opinions both ancient and modern, are much divided on this subject. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nicene, Cyril, and Chrysostom, held that angels are absolutely immaterial; but, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen Caesarius, and Tertullian, among the earlier fathers, thought those blessed beings were enshrined in a refined material fabric. The term spirit, applied to them, does not of itself absolutely decide the question; for as that word in both Hebrew and Greek is primarily a material term, indicating wind, air, or breath, it may be applied, either to a pure spirit or to a refined material nature. It is true that, on the appearance of angels to man, they assumed a visible human form. This fact, however, does not prove their materiality; for human spirits in the intermediate state, though disembodied, have in their intercourse with man, appeared in a material human form: on the Mount of Transfiguration, Moses, as well as Elias, was recognized as a man; and the elders who appeared to and conversed with John, in the Apocalypse, had also the human form, Rev. 5:5, and 7:13. Yet, such appearances cannot absolutely decide the question.

Theologically, there is nothing incongruous or improbable in the supposition

that angels are invested with a refined material nature. Heaven is undoubtedly suitable as a habitat for such. Enoch and Elijah were exalted body and soul to heaven by translation; the glorified humanity of our Lord is there enthroned; and angels, though enshrined in a material fabric, may dwell in the splendors of the Divine presence....Yet, as it is a law of adaption, that no such gross materiality as “flesh and blood” can enter that region of blessedness, it follows that if angels are enshrined in a material frame, it must be so refined in its nature as to exclude all that involves the possibility of decay, and any organization with animal appetites and wants. Our Lord himself has decided this, by affirming that human beings in heaven neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God (Matthew 22:30). In this comparison between the final state of the righteous and the present state of angels, we have a glimpse of the condition of both. It invests our theme with augmented interest to know that the exalted beings with whom we are to live forever, have a nature so much in common with our own; it is still more interesting to know that in the higher attributes of both, angels and men so much resemble the human nature of Christ. – (“Christian Theology,” pp.613-14).

Medieval art has seized upon the account (Daniel 9:21), that an angel “flew swiftly” as the ground of their imposition of wings upon all angelic beings. It is true, however, that the cherubim, seraphim, or living creatures, are said to have wings. And thus, the cherubim appear in golden images above the ark of the mercy seat. Angels pass from one locality to another with incredible speed (Daniel 9:21).

VI. THE ABODE OF THE ANGELS

The abode of the angels is likewise a matter of definite revelation. An intimation has been recorded earlier of the truth that the whole universe is inhabited by innumerable hosts of spirit beings. This vast order of beings with all their classifications have fixed abodes and centers for their activities. By the use of the phrase, “the angels which are in heaven” (Mark 13:32), Christ definitely asserts that angels inhabit heavenly spheres.

The Apostle writes, “though an angel from heaven” (Gal. 1:8), and, “the whole family in heaven and earth” (Eph. 3:15). Likewise, in the prayer which Christ taught His disciples, they were instructed to say: “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven (Matthew 6:10). Dr. A.C. Gaebelain has written of the abode of the angels, saying:

In the Hebrew, heaven is in the plural, “the heavens.” The Bible speaks of three heavens, the third heaven is the heaven of heavens, the dwelling place of God, where His throne has always been. The tabernacle possessed by His earthly people, Israel, was a pattern of the heavens. Moses, upon the mountain had looked into the vast heavens and saw the three heavens. He had no telescope, but God Himself showed to him the mysteries of the heavens. Then God admonished him when He was about to make the tabernacle and said to His servant, “See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mountain” (Hebrews 8:5). The tabernacle had three compartments, the outer court, the Holy part, and the Holiest. Once a year, the high priest entered this earthly place of worship to pass through the outer court, into the Holy part, and finally carrying the sacrificial blood, he entered into the Holiest to sprinkle the blood in Jehovah’s Holy presence. But Aaron was only a type of Him, who is greater than Aaron, the true High Priest. Of Him, the true Priest, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, it is written that He passed through the heavens (Hebrews 4:14), “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Hebrews 9:24). He passed through the heavens, the outer court, the heaven surrounding the earth; the Holy part, the immense universes, with their immeasurable distance, and finally He entered the third heaven, that heaven astronomy knows exists, but which no telescope can ever reach. In the heavenlies, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, are the principalities and the powers, the innumerable company of angels. Their dwelling places are in these heavens. God, who created them, who made them spirits and clothed them with bodies suited to

their spirit nature, must have also assigned to them habitations....it is also significant and not without meaning that the phrase “the host of heavens,” means both the stars and the angelic hosts; the “Lord of Hosts” has also the same double meaning, for He is the Lord of stars and the Lord of the angels. - Op. cit., pp. 34-35.

VII. THE NUMBER OF THE ANGELS

Its allusion to the number of the angels is one of the superlatives of the Bible. They are there described in multitudes “which no man could number.” It is reasonable to conclude that there are as many spirit beings in existence as there will have been human beings in all their history on the earth. It is significant that as the phrase, “the host of heaven” describes both the material stars and the angels, the latter may be as much beyond number as the former (Genesis 15:5). To quote Dr. Cooke, again, where he gathers Biblical testimony on the number of the angels:

Hear what Micah says, “I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him, on His right hand and on His left.” - I Kings 22:19. Hear what David says, “The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even many thousands of angels.” - Psa. lxxviii.17 Elisha saw one detachment of these celestial beings sent to be his bodyguard, when “the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about him.” - 2 Kings 6:17. Hear what Daniel saw, “Thousand thousands were ministering unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand were standing before him.” - Daniel 7:10. Behold what the watchful shepherds saw and heard on the morn of the Redeemer’s birth, “A multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest.” - Luke 23: 13. Hear what Jesus says, “Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?” - Matthew 26:53. Look again at the magnificent spectacle which John saw and heard as he gazed into the heavenly world. “And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living ones and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand

times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," etc. - Rev. 5:12. These numbers may be taken literally, they indicate 202 millions, yet, they were only a part of the celestial host. It is probable, however, these figures were not intended to indicate any precise number, but that the multitude was immense, beyond what usually enters into human computation. Hence, in Hebrews 12:22, we read not of any definite or limited number, however great, but of "an innumerable company of angels." - (Op. cit., pp. 614-15).

VIII. THE POWER OF THE ANGELS

What is true of all creatures relative to the power they exert, is equally true of the angels: their power is derived from God. Their power, however great, is restricted. They are unable to do those things which are peculiar to Deity - create, act without means, or search the human heart. They may influence the human mind as one creature may influence another. The knowledge of this truth is of great importance when, as later, contemplation will be given to the ascendancy evil spirits may assume over human beings. It will be found that human beings are able to thwart the influence of evil spirits only by divine enablement (Eph. 6:10-12; I John 4:4). Even an angel may claim divine assistance when in conflict with another angel (Jude 1:9). Continuing in his same comprehensive manner, Dr. Cooke writes of angelic power:

"Strong angel" and "mighty angel," are terms we read in the Apocalypse. The name Gabriel means "the mighty one of God;" and among the designations of angelic orders, we find that of powers ("ouvauéis"). The attribute of extraordinary power pertains to angelic natures in general, as we learn from David, who exclaims, "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, who excel in strength. It is impossible to form any comparison between the power of a spiritual being, such as an angel, and the physical power of man, which is limited by his organization. If, however, the power of man be estimated by the wondrous effects he can produce by his superior knowledge, and the appliances he can use, we have then displays which may give us some faint idea of the

resources of angelic power, for probably their superior knowledge of nature would enable them to employ in a far higher degree than ourselves the resources of the universe, to fulfill any commission which God might give them to perform. Whatever be the mode or media by which their powers are exerted, the effects there of, are astounding. Milton describes them as plucking the seated hills from their foundations and hurling them on their antagonists. This is poetry; but in the records of Scripture, we have truth without the colour of fiction; and here we find one angel, as a minister of vengeance, destroying 70 thousand persons of the kingdom of David in three days; another destroying in one night, 85 thousand stout warriors in the mail-clad army of Assyria's proud monarch; and another destroying all the first-born of Egypt in a single night. In the Apocalypse, we see angels holding the four winds of heaven, discharging the vials, and wielding the thunders of Jehovah's wrath upon the guilty nations; the old earth trembles under the displays of their mighty power as the ministers of a sin-avenging God. But angels are equally powerful for good; and while their holy nature makes them the faithful executors of justice, their benevolence, as well as their holiness, makes them delight to employ their energies in the service of mercy. – (Ibid. pp. 620-2)1.

IX. THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE ANGELS

1. Governmental Rulers. Revelation specifies certain groups as well as various important individuals amongst the angels. Mention has been made of five major representations of supremacy among these beings, namely, thrones (“Opovoi”), dominions (“Kupiorntes”), principalities (“apxai”), authorities (“ecovoiai”), and powers (“Suvauéis”). Since the Bible does not indulge in useless tautology, it may be believed that there is a specific meaning to each of these denominations, which meaning no doubt corresponds to earthly realities which bear these appellations. The revealed truth regarding the angels is not sufficiently complete for a full analogy to be set up. The term “thrones” refers to those who sit upon them, “dominion” to those who rule, “principalities” to those who govern, “powers” to those who exercise supremacy, and “authorities” to those invested with imperial responsibility. Though there is seeming

similarity in these denominations, it may be assumed that representation is made by these titles to incomprehensible dignity and varying degrees of rank. Heavenly spheres of rule exceed human empires as the universe exceeds the earth.

2. Elect Angels. Reference in I Timothy 5:21, to “elect angels” at once opens an interesting field of inquiry regarding the extent to which the doctrine of sovereign election is to be traced in the relation of angels to their Creator. It will be conceded that angels are created for a purpose and that in their realm, as with man, the designs of the Creator are to be executed to infinity. The fall of some angels is no more unanticipated by God than the fall of man. It may be implied, also, that angels have passed a period of probation.

3. Cherubim, Seraphim, and Living Creatures. Interpretations bearing on this threefold classification of the angels vary greatly. Dr. A.H. Strong contends that they are “artificial, temporary, symbolic figures” which have “not themselves personal existences.” He seeks to sustain this idea by the assertion that these specific designations are not coupled with the angels in any Scripture passage. Smith (“Bible Dictionary”) and Alford (“Greek Testament”) maintain that these are only symbols of the attributes of God. The great proportion of expositors salute these as exalted angels of the highest station, quite apart, perhaps, from governments. Some expositors seek to discover distinctions of position and rank between those to whom these appellations are assigned. It is more satisfactory to accord to them, not only the highest station, but one and the same general grouping. The different terms used seem to indicate a distinction in service rendered rather than in essential position. Because of the exalted state of these angels, the service they render should be considered with due attention.

a. Cherubim. The Cherubim title speaks of their high and holy position and their responsibility as such is closely related to the throne of God as defenders of His holy character and presence. In a note under Ezekiel 1:5, Dr. C.I. Scofield, in his “Reference Bible,” makes the following statement:

The living creatures are identical with the Cherubim. The subject is somewhat obscure, but from the position of the Cherubim at the gate of Eden, upon the cover of the ark of the covenant, and in Revelation 4, it is clearly gathered that they have to do with the vindication of the holiness of God as against the presumptuous pride of sinful man who, despite his sin, would "Put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life" (Genesis 3:22-24). Upon the ark of the covenant, of one substance with the mercy seat, they saw the sprinkled blood which, in type, spake of the perfect maintenance of the divine righteousness by the sacrifice of Christ (Exodus 25:17-20; Romans 3:24-26, notes). The living creatures (or Cherubim) appear to be actual beings of the angelic order. Cf. Isaiah 6:2, note. The Cherubim or living creatures are not identical with the Seraphim (Isaiah 6:2-7). They appear to have to do with the holiness of God as outraged by sin; the Seraphim with uncleanness in the people of God. The passage in Ezekiel is highly figurative, but the effect was the revelation to the prophet of the Shekinah glory of the Lord. Such revelations are connected invariably with new blessing and service. Cf. Exodus 3:2-10; Isaiah 6:1-10; Dan 10:5-14; Revelation 1:12-19).

The Cherubim first appear at the gate of the Garden of Eden after man has been expelled and as protectors lest man return to pollute the holy presence of God. They appear again as protectors, though in golden images, over the ark of the covenant where God was pleased to dwell. The curtain of the tabernacle, which separated between the divine presence and the unholy people, was embroidered with figures of cherubim (Exodus 26:1). Ezekiel refers to these beings under this title, nineteen times and the truth concerning them is to be derived from these passages. He presents them as having four appearances - the face of a lion, the face of an ox, the face of a man, and the face of an eagle (Ezekiel 1:3-28; 10:1-22). This symbolism relates them at once to the living creatures of John's vision (Rev. 4:6, 5:14, etc. - the translation of "swov" by "beast" is unsatisfactory).

b. Seraphim. The Seraphim title speaks of unceasing worship, their ministry of purification, and their humility. They appear in Scripture, but once under this designation (Isaiah 6:1-3). Their threefold ascription of worship, as recorded by Isaiah, is again stated by John (Rev. 4:8) and under the title of the living creatures, which fact goes far to establish the identity of this group. Dr. Scofield writes as a note under Isaiah 6:1-3; “Heb. “Burners.” The word occurs only here. Cf. Ezekiel 1:5, note. The Seraphim are, in many respects, in contrast with the Cherubim, though both are expressive of the divine holiness, which demands that the “sinner” shall have access to the divine presence only through a sacrifice which really vindicates the righteousness of God (Romans 3:24-26, notes), and that the saint shall be cleansed before serving. Genesis 3:22-24, illustrates the first; Isaiah 6:1-8 the second. The Cherubim may be said to have to do with the altar, the Seraphim with the laver.

c. Living Creatures. The Living Creatures is a title which represents these angels as manifesting the fullness of divine life, unceasing activity, and abiding participation in the worship of God.

Uncertainty, at best, must characterize human understanding regarding the surpassing glory of the object of their adoration, Bishop Hull (1634-1710), as quoted by Dr . Gaebelein (Op. cit., pp. 46-47), wrote:

When we consider what glorious beings the angels are, and yet, that they are but creatures of, and servants to, the God whom we serve waiting before His throne, and humbly attending His commands; this consideration, if we let sink deeply into our hearts, must needs possess us with most awful apprehensions of the glorious majesty of our God at all times, but especially in our approaches to Him in His worship, and fill us with the greatest reverence and humility. We should do well often to call to mind Daniel’s vision, to whom was represented the “Ancient of Days, sitting upon the throne, a thousand, thousand ministering unto Him, and ten thousand times the thousand standing before Him.”

With what reverence should we behave ourselves in our addresses to the Divine Majesty, before whom the Seraphim themselves hide their faces. And if they cover their feet, are conscious to themselves to their natural imperfection, compared to the infinitely glorious God; how should we clods of earth, we vile sinners, blush and be ashamed in His presence, assuming no confidence to ourselves, but what is founded on the mercies of God and the merits of our blessed Redeemer and Advocate, Jesus Christ.

And when we find ourselves inclined to pride and vanity, to think highly of ourselves and of our services to God, let us reflect at what a vast distance we come behind the holy angels; how far short our poor, lame, imperfect services are of their holy and excellent ministry. Yet, when we think of the ministry, which the holy angels perform towards God, and for us; let us at the same time, propound them to ourselves, as patterns and examples for our limitation.

4. Individual Angels.

a. Lucifer, Son of the Morning (Isaiah 14:12). This, the most exalted one of the angels - both by creation and by appointment. By his sin - the first in the universe, so far as revelation discloses - he became Satan and appears in the Word of God under about forty different titles. As he is the theme of the following section on Satanology, further examination of the truth bearing on this mighty angel will be deferred at this point.

b. Michael (Dan. 12:1). The meaning of this name, which meaning is significant, is "Who is like God?" In what respect he is like God is not disclosed, but from the three passages, where he is directly mentioned, it is to be seen that he is in great authority. According to Daniel 12:1, he is said to be the one who "standeth" for Daniel's people, Israel, doubtless, in some form of defense. In Jude 1:9, he is seen to be in controversy

with Satan over the body of Moses; but, in such a situation and in spite of all his greatness, he dare not “bring a railing accusation against Satan,” but, falling back in dependence upon God, he declares “The Lord rebuke thee.” In this text, he is given the added title of “archangel;” and there is but one archangel. Michael is again seen, in prediction, recorded in Revelation 12:7-12. He, as head of the armies of heaven, fights a victorious battle in heaven against Satan and his angels. It is further revealed that the “voices of the archangel” will be heard when Christ returns for the Church (I Thess. 4:16).

c. Gabriel (Dan. 9:21). The meaning of this designation is the mighty one, and He is evidently all that the name implies. He is never said, in the Bible, to be an archangel, though often so styled by men. He appears four times, as the Scriptures record, and always as a messenger or revealer of the divine purpose. He spoke to Daniel concerning the end time (Dan 8:15-27). Similarly, he brought to Daniel, the almost incomparable prediction of Daniel 9:20-27. The prophet had discovered from the writings of Jeremiah (25:11-12), that the allotted period for Israel in Babylon was seventy years, and the time when these years were about completed. He therefore, gave himself to prayer for his people. The prayer, as recorded, could have occupied, but a few moments, yet, in that time, Gabriel passed with incredible swiftness from the throne of God to the praying prophet on earth. It was then, this angel unfolded the purposes of Jehovah concerning the future of Israel. It was Gabriel who brought the message to Zechariahs of the birth of John, and it was he who came with the greatest of all messages to the Virgin Mary regarding the birth of Christ and of His ministry as King on David's throne (Luke 1:26-33).

5. Angels Especially Designated. Certain angels are known only by the service they render. Of these, there are those that serve as angels or angels of judgment (Genesis 19:13; 2 Kings 19:35; Ezekiel 9:1, 5, 7; Psalms 78:49). Account is made of the “watcher” (Dan. 4:13, 23); “angel of the abyss” (Rev. 9:11); “angel over fire” (Rev. 14:18); “angel of the waters” (Rev. 16:5); and of “seven angels” (Rev. 8:2). In the Apocryphal writings, mention is made of three angels not spoken of in the Bible,

namely, Raphael, Uriel, and Jeremiel.

X. THE MINISTRY OF THE ANGELS

The 273 references in the Bible to the angels are largely accounts of their activities, and by these, a very wide field of achievement is disclosed. However, that which is most important, is not their relation to the inhabitants of earth, but rather their service to God. This is primarily a service of worship and suggests the ineffable majesty and glory of God, which unfallen angels understand, and which, because of the infinity of the worthiness of God, continues, without ceasing, forever. John states that in their worship, the living creatures, “rest not day and night saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come” (Rev. 4:8). Isaiah asserts that they “cried one unto another, and said, Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of His Glory” (Isaiah 6:3). To the same end, the Psalms declares: “Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of His Word” (Psalms 103:20); “Praise ye the Lord. Praise ye the Lord from the heavens; praise Him in the heights. Praise ye Him, all His angels: Praise ye Him, all His hosts” (Psalms 148:1-2). Their humility, suggested by the covering of their feet (Isaiah 6:2), is natural since they are ever before Him whose majesty and glory is transcendent.

The birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ were to the angels stupendous realities. It is of no small consequence that, as stated by the Apostle, Christ, while here on the earth, “was seen of angels” (I Timothy 3:16). Their interest in, and devotion to, the Lord of glory is measured to some degree by the worship they have offered Him from their creation to the present hour. Only feebly, does the most spiritual of saints anticipate what it will be, to look directly and unendingly upon the face of the Lord of glory. The response that will be awakened in the heart of man - enlarged as to its capacity beyond measure - as he views his Creator and redeemer cannot be foreseen; but, such has ever been the experience of the angels. They behold the Lord without a veil between. Their consideration of Him, while here on earth, is befittingly

presented by Dr. Cooke:

How constant their attendance on the incarnate Saviour during his mysterious life amongst men. At his birth they are his heralds, and with songs exultant announce the glad tidings to mankind. In his temptation, they minister to him, in his agonies, they succour him; on his resurrection, they are the first to proclaim his triumph; on his ascension, they come to escort him to the mediatorial throne; in his glorified state, they render him supreme homage as their Lord; and when he returns to judge the world, they will form his retinue! What sublime thoughts would be suggested, what emotions of wonder and joy would be excited, by the scenes they witnessed on earth and still witness in heaven, in reference to Christ, his two-fold nature, and his great redeeming work. God incarnate! This was new to them. They had seen the Son in his Deity; but never till now, enshrined in humanity. What amazing condescension! Obeying his own law as if he were a mere creature, and in the attitude of a servant. This was new. They had seen him as the governor of the universe; but never till now, as a subject! Encountering Satan in conflict and prolonged temptation! This was new. They had seen him remove the arch-rebel from his presence and hurl him to perdition; but never till now submitting to be tempted by him, whose subtlety and power had secured myriads to eternal ruin. Suffering the scorn and reproach of sinful men! This was new. They had seen myriads of happy spirits worship, adore, and love him, but never till now, had they seen him personally insulted, reproached and maltreated by his creatures. Groaning in Gethsemane, and crucified between two thieves, and dying as a sacrificial victim! This was new. They had seen him supremely happy and glorious; but to see him agonize, to hear that dying wail and to behold him, a bloody corpse, and all this to save the world which had revolted from him! What mysterious love! To see him, after all this, enthroned and glorified in human nature. This was a new fact in the moral history of the universe. The whole scenes were full of interest, wonder, and mystery; a gradation of wonders rising in succession, until they culminated in the permanent presence of the God-

man, resplendent with a glory that fills the heaven of heavens. Here were chapters of instruction for angelic minds to ponder; here were developments of hidden truths; here were discoveries of the Divine perfections, never known before; and still unfolding in brighter effulgence as ages roll on! (Op. cit., pp. 622-23).

The faithful service of angels to mankind cannot be explained on the ground of their own love for humanity. They are interested in that which concerns their God. If He would give His Son to die for a lost race of men, they would follow Him as far as possible and at least give instant service, for His sake, wherever it is appointed unto them. It is not imagination, but reality, that the angels are servants of men in a thousand ways. No truth is more established by Scripture than that stated in Hebrews 1:14, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?"

With respect to the specific ministries of the angels in the earth and in behalf of mankind - especially the saints - the details form a very extensive field of investigation such as cannot be undertaken here to any extent. Though angels were present at creation, no reference is made to their ministries on earth until the days of Abraham. In company with the Lord, they visited the patriarch at Mamre (Genesis 18:1-2), and from there went on to deliver Lot. The angels appeared to Jacob and were familiar to Moses. It is written that the Law "was ordained by angels" (Galatians 3:19), and it was administered by the "disposition of angels" (Acts 7:53). Their care of God's elect people is asserted in both Testaments. In Psalms 91:11-12, it is written "For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone;" and in Hebrews 1:14, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" It is an angel with the three men in the furnace of fire (Daniel 3:25), and with Daniel in the den of lions (Daniel 6:22).

In Old Testament terminology, sometimes angels are called sons of God, while men

are called servants of God. In the New Testament, this is reversed. Angels are servants, and Christians are sons of God. This peculiar order may be due to the fact that, in the Old Testament, men are seen as related to this sphere, over which angels are superior; while, in the New Testament, saints are seen as related to their final exaltation into the likeness of Christ, compared to which estate the angels are inferior.

Turning to the New Testament, it is to be observed that many of the references to the angels are found in the Gospels and the Acts. In view of the truth that it was their Creator, the Lord of glory, whom they worship and adore, that was laying aside His glory and descending to a sphere "lower than the angels," it is not strange that one from the heavenly hosts should announce the birth of the forerunner to his father; the birth of the Saviour to Mary; that the angels should announce His birth to the world; that they should direct the flight into Egypt; that they ministered to Him in the wilderness; that they succored Him in the garden; that they were ready in legions to defend Him should He call; that they saw Him die and His body placed in the tomb; that they were present to announce His resurrection; and that they gave counsel to His disciples at the moment of His ascension back to heaven. Thus, it is seen that the relation of the angels to the incarnate Son of God is one of the major features of revelation, and upon these disclosures, the devout mind may dwell with profit. In the plan of God, the present age is evidently void of angelic manifestations. This could easily be due to the fact that, as in no other age, the saints of God are indwelt by the Holy Spirit and are subject to His leading, which leading is more constant, vital, and exalting than angelic visitations could possible be. However, the angels are prominent at the close of this age. It is then that the Lord returns with the shout of the archangel.

At His second advent, "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 13:41-42; cf. vs. 30). It is then, also, that Christ shall "send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect (Israel) from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matthew 24:31). The presence of angels in the

scenes of the second advent is emphasized generally. It is written: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works" (Matthew 16:27); "Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8-9). To these may be added Jude 1:14-15, in which context the words ten thousands of saints is better rendered holy myriads, and may refer to the angels.

Following the kingdom age, in which no angelic ministrations are predicted and when the King is present in His visible glory to rule and the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:16-21), the angels are again seen and finally and eternally related to the city which comes down from God out of heaven (Heb. 12:22-24; Rev. 21:12).

Certain New Testament passages indicate specific angelic ministrations. Luke 16:22, asserts that the angels transported, at death, a soul into another sphere; whether this is always the case, is a pure conjecture. Acts 5:19 and 12:7, relate the deliverance of apostles from prison. Acts 8:26, 10:3; 27:23, recount messages, which angels bore.

XI. THE PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANGELS

The Scriptures disclose the truth that the angels are learning much from their observations of men on earth - especially in the outworking of redemption. Incidentally, this indicates that the angels are not omniscient. However, it should not be concluded that the angels know less than men. What, indeed, would be the field of discovery and interest to men were it given to them to see all that transpires in angelic spheres? Peter's declaration, "which things the angels desire to look into" (I Peter 1:12), divulges the truth relative to their interesting the affairs of men. It is significant that these "things" referred to relate to God's program in the first and second advents of Christ and the gospel of divine grace now to be preached to the whole world. To the same end, the Church on earth is an unveiling to the angels of the wisdom of God. It is written, "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by

the Church the manifold wisdom of God” (Ephesians 3:10). Thus, also, the Church will yet be an unveiling to angels of divine grace; for it is said: “that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus” (Ephesians 2:7). Writing on this theme, Otto Von Gerlach pointed out: “By the revelation of Himself in Christ, by the institution of the Christian Church on earth, God after a manner hitherto unknown, glorifies Himself before the heavenly principalities. They, who until now, had filled with awe, been praising Him for the wonder of creation, now see His wisdom glorified in a new form in the Christian communion through the manifold ways by which lost men are saved. Entirely new and inexhaustible wealth of divine wisdom was manifested in redemption” (cited by Gerhart, op. cit., p. 664).

There is no basis for a belief that redemption through Christ’s death is extended to the fallen angels (cf. Matthew 25:41; Rev. 20:10). The holy angels evidently are benefited and pass into higher spheres of knowledge and consequent spirituality through what they see of redeeming love in Christ. Thus, Christ becomes to them a Mediator. No writer has stated this with more clarity than Dr. Gerhart; to quote:

Emphasis is put by the apostle on the fact that unto principalities, God’s wisdom is made known through the Church. The existence of the Church, and the preaching of the un-searchable riches by the Church, condition the growth of the angels in spiritual knowledge. How much more of Christian truth will not the “principalities” know when the Church, now imperfect, shall attain to perfection; now militant, warring against enemies, both human and diabolical, shall become the Church triumphant? The final consummation at the Second Coming will affect, not only the relative position and the spiritual knowledge of the angels, but Scripture suggests, that the final consummation will likewise affect the life of the angels. Indirectly at least, they will participate in the spiritual benefits which come to the Church from the Son of Man. Paul teaches that God the Father made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, which He purposed in the Beloved unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things

in the heavens, and the things upon the earth. Both the human race upon the earth and the angelic orders in the heavens are embraced in “all things” to be summed up in Christ. Angelic spirits will then bear a relation to the Head of the Church, which they do not bear to Him now, and which they will not realize before “the fulness of the time.” Of similar import is the prophetic vision of Paul in Colossians 1:20. It was the good pleasure of the Father through the Son to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heaven. Things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created through the Son, and unto the Son. Accordingly all angelic orders exist for the Son; He is their end. In the Son, these orders of spirits consist, hold together; He is the law by which they are upheld and governed. Having made peace between God and men, between Gentiles and Jews through the blood of His cross, He becomes also for the angels a Mediator through whom their life passes from its present plane to a higher plane of spiritual perfection and glory. The kingdom of the Son of Man comprehends all orders of angelic spirits no less than all races of mankind. When the impending transcendent eon, now in process of ripening, shall supersede the current eon, angels as a consequence of the glorification of the body mystical will rise into more intimate fellowship with the fountal Source of life, of light, and love. But though as to their life and knowledge advanced to a higher status of spiritual perfection through the Church, yet in the final glory of the kingdom, the position and office of the angels will be subordinate to the authority and office of the saint. – (Ibid., pp. 664-65).

XII. THE ANGELS AS SPECTATORS

In four instances, angels are said to be observing. In Luke 15:10, they are seen beholding the joy of the Lord over one sinner who repents. It is not the joy of the angels, as too often supposed (cf. Jude 1:24). In Luke, 12:8-9, the Word of Christ is written: “Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God; but he that denieth me before

men shall be denied before the angels of God.” So, also, the whole earth life of Christ was “seen of angels” (I Timothy 3:16), and in Revelation 14:10-11, the angels are said to observe the eternal woes of those who “worship the beast and his image.” Over against this, the Church, it is predicted, shall judge angels (I Corinthians 6:3), as poorly prepared as they are at present, to judge in the least of matters on the earth.

The presence of the angels is recorded at the creation of material things (Job 38:7); at the giving of the Law (Galatians 3:19; Acts 7:53; Hebrews 2:2); at the birth of Christ (Luke 2:13), at the temptation (Matthew 4:11), at the resurrection (Matthew 28:2), at the ascension (Acts 1:10), and at the second coming (Matthew 13:37-39; 24:31; 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:7).

CONCLUSION

A consciousness of the reality of the vast hosts of angelic beings - the benefit derived from the good, and the opposition of the bad - can be gained only through meditation upon the Scriptures that record these truths, and through prayer.

Chapter Three--Ecclesiology

PART I. INTRODUCTION TO ECCLESIOLOGY

This, the sixth major division of Systematic Theology, contemplates the New Testament doctrine of the Church. Because of the permitted intrusion of compromises with the pagan world and the attending over-lordship of ecclesiasticism, which came in the third and fourth centuries, things which have continued to some extent, to the present hour, an extended introduction which essays to clarify a number of distinctions, is in order. In this preliminary word, some features to which reference is made only in part, are to be considered more completely in the following main thesis of Ecclesiology.

Two separate, dissimilar, and unmistakable revelations were given to the Apostle Paul, namely: **(1)** that, through the death and resurrection of Christ, a perfect and eternal salvation into a heavenly state is provided for, and offered to, both Jew and Gentile alike and on the sole condition of saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Of this revelation, the Apostle writes: "But I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:11-12). The importance of this revealed Gospel is reflected in the warnings respecting judgment that must fall upon those who misstate this Gospel. Such warning should occasion consternation in the minds of all who venture forth as preachers of the Gospel. It is written: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again; If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:8-9). The unique and incomparable character of the Gospel is directly declared by the Apostle, when he says by inspiration, that it is a specific revelation, and is implied in the warnings which demand the preservation of its purity by those who proclaim it. This Gospel of divine grace was lost to view during the dark centuries in which the corruption of Rome was unrestrained. It was given to Martin Luther, with his colleagues, to restore the main features of this Gospel and these features have been

the cherished possessions of Protestants from Reformation days. **(2)** Just as definitely and as supernaturally, a second revelation was given to the Apostle Paul and this disclosure concerns the divine purpose in the present age. It is the substance of Ecclesiology. He writes: "For this cause I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the Grace of God, which is given me to you-ward; how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ) which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel" (Eph. 3:1-6). On this passage, Dr. C. I. Scofield publishes the following note: "That the Gentiles were to be saved was no mystery (Romans 9:24-33; 10:19-21). The mystery "hid in God" was the divine purpose to make of Jew and Gentile, a wholly new thing - "the Church, which is his (Christ's) body," formed by the baptism with the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:12-13) and in which the earthly distinction of Jew and Gentile disappears (Eph. 2:14-15, Col. 5:10-11). The revelation of this mystery, which was foretold, but not explained by Christ (Matthew 16:18), was committed to Paul. In his writings alone, we find the doctrine, position, walk, and destiny of the Church." ("The Scofield Reference Bible," p. 1252).

A Scriptural conception of the truth respecting the Church demands the background of an accurate understanding of important distinctions concerning God's creatures, and concerning God's times and seasons, as well as a right understanding of the precise character of the Church itself.

PART II. CONTRASTS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE CHURCH

Though much has already been presented in the general introduction to Ecclesiology bearing on the distinctions which obtain between Israel and the Church, a partial summarization of this inexhaustible field of investigation is included at this point. Twenty-four contrasts are to be indicated in briefest outline and this will be followed by a

recognition of the similarities which are present between these two important groupings of humanity.

I. THE EXTENT OF BIBLICAL REVELATION

With respect to primary application, Israel occupies nearly four-fifths of the test of the Bible, while the Church, with respect to primary application, occupies slightly more than one-fifth.

II. THE DIVINE PURPOSE

Because of a strange inattention on the part of many, it needs to be stated that there are two major divine purposes, both quite apart from that which concerns, either the angels or the Gentiles. The distinction between the purpose for Israel and the purpose for the Church is about as important as that which exists between the two Testaments. Every covenant, promise, and provision for Israel is earthly, and they continue as a nation with the earth when it is created new. Every covenant or promise for the Church is for a heavenly reality, and she continues in heavenly citizenship when the heavens are recreated.

III. THE SEED OF ABRAHAM

In view of the fact that Abraham is not only the progenitor of the nation of promise, but is also the pattern of a Christian under grace, it is significant that there are two figures employed by Yeshua respecting Abraham's seed - the dust of the earth (Gen. 13:16), and the stars (Gen. 15:5; cf. Heb. 11:12). The extent of this Abrahamic covenant is expressed in Romans 4:16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all." Aside from Ishmael's line and the children of Ketarah concerning whom there is no revealed divine purpose, the children of Jacob, or Israel, and without reference to Esau, are counted as the physical seed (cf. Gen. 22:2; Heb. 11:17) of Abraham; for with these

God has made covenants respecting their earthly privilege.

Contrariwise, the heavenly seed of Abraham are not regenerated by Abraham, but are generated by God on the efficacious principle of faith; and because of the truth that this faith was exercised specifically by Abraham (Gen. 15:6; Romans 4:1-3, 17-24), those of like faith are Abraham's spiritual seed. It is written, "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" (Gal. 3:9). A vital distinction is drawn by the Apostle between Israel after the flesh and that portion of Israel within Israel who are saved. Those who are saved are styled "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16), and the statement that "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Romans 9:6), is a reference to the same distinction. The use of these passages to prove Israel and the Church to be the same, is deplored in the light of the truth which these Scriptures declare.

IV. BIRTH

Israelites become what they are by physical birth. They are each one begotten of human parents and their inheritance is transmitted by human generation. Christians become what they are by spiritual birth. They are begotten directly by God and, are therefore, His legitimate offspring. Their inheritance is immediate in that each is a child of God.

V. HEADSHIP

Abraham is the head of the Jewish race, and they are properly designated as "the seed of Abraham." Though born of Gentile stock, Abraham was set apart by God to the high honor of being the progenitor of the elect earthly people. Over against this it may be said of Christians, though when magnifying the element of faith, they are called "Abraham's seed" (Gal. 3:29). God is their Father and by the Spirit they are joined to Christ and He, the resurrected Lord, is their federal Head.

VI. COVENANTS

God has made unconditional covenants with His earthly people. He will yet make a new covenant with them when they enter their kingdom. That new covenant will govern their conduct and will supersede the Mosaic covenant of the law (cf. Jer. 31:31-33; Deut. 30:8). This new covenant for Israel will be in four parts, but these four features are the present blessings of the Church. This heavenly people are sheltered under a new covenant made in His blood. It is individual in its application and everlasting. It guarantees every divine grace upon those who believe in Christ as Saviour.

VII. NATIONALITY

Israel belongs to the earth and to the world-system. Though above all nations in God's reckoning, they are still in the world as one of its nations. Over against this and forming the strongest contrast is the fact that the Church is composed of all nations, including Israel, and sustains no citizenship here, but instead, the believers are strangers and pilgrims.

VIII. DIVINE DEALING

The fact that, in the present age, Israelites, like Gentiles are shut up to their individual responsibility respecting the claims of the Gospel, doubtless misleads those who do not consider the wide range of human history which the Bible covers. They fail to realize that the present divine arrangement is exceptional and that God has in other ages dealt with nations - especially Israel - as a whole. The present arrangement is restricted to the one age in which responsibility is altogether personal.

IX. DISPENSATIONS

The earthly people, though their estate may vary, are present in the earth in all ages from the beginning in Abraham on into eternity to come, while, as stated before, the Church is restricted to the present dispensation. The dispensation now operative itself

is characterized by her presence in the world. It was introduced for her sake; and is therefore, unrelated to that which goes before or that which follows.

X. MINISTRY

Israel was appointed to exercise an influence over the nations of the earth (cf. Ps. 67:1-7), and this she will yet do perfectly in the coming age; nevertheless, there was no missionary undertaking and no Gospel proclaimed. Israel maintained her self-centered worship. She faced inward toward the Tabernacle or Temple and all her benevolence was consumed on her own worship. However, immediately upon her formation, the Church is constituted a foreign missionary society. It is her obligation to face outward and to those of her company is given the task of evangelizing the people of the earth in each generation.

XI. THE DEATH OF CHRIST

That nation which demanded the death of Christ and who said by their officials, "His blood be on us, and on our children," is guilty of that death; yet, they will be saved as a nation on the ground of that sacrifice. On the other hand, a present and perfect salvation to the praise of God is the portion of the Church through the offering of the Lamb of God.

XII. THE FATHER

To Israel, God is known by His primary titles, but not as the Father of the individual Israelite. In distinction to this, the Christian is actually begotten of God and has every right to address Him as Father.

XIII. CHRIST

To Israel, Christ is Messiah (Yeshua), Immanuel, and King with all that those appellations imply. To the Church, Christ is Saviour, Lord, Bridegroom, and Head.

XIV. THE HOLY SPIRIT

Only in exceptional instances and for unusual service did the Holy Spirit come upon an Israelite, and the Spirit withdrew as freely as He came, when the purpose was accomplished. The strongest contrast is to be seen here, in that the Christian is indwelt by the Spirit; in truth, he is not saved apart from this relation to the Spirit (Romans 8:9).

XV. A GOVERNING PRINCIPLE

For fifteen centuries, the Law of Moses was Israel's rule of daily life. It is written: "But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children; to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them" (Ps. 103:17-18). Unlike this, the members of Christ's Body, being wholly perfected in Him, are under the beseeching and directions which grace provides.

XVI. DIVINE ENABLEMENT

The law system provided no enabling power for its achievement. That system is declared to have failed because of the weakness of "the flesh" to which it was evidently addressed (Romans 8:3). To the Church, however, as certainly as superhuman requirements are laid on her members, so certainly supernatural power is provided for every demand. It is on this account, the Apostle could say, "Sin shall not have dominion over you." The reason, of course, is that "ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Romans 6:14).

XVII. TWO FAREWELL DISCOURSES

Several days before His departure from the world, Christ addressed a farewell discourse to the nation of Israel, which contemplated her future and that in its relation to His return (Matthew 23:37; 25:46). Quite removed from this and wholly different in all its features, Christ, the night before He was put to death, gave His parting message to the

Christians. When these two addresses are contemplated side by side, it is seen that the widest distinctions are indicated between Israel and the Church.

XVIII. THE PROMISE OF CHRIST'S RETURN

As seen in His words, specifically addressed to Israel, Christ returns to her as her King in power and great glory, at which time, she will be gathered from every part of the earth by angelic ministrations and into her own land (Deut. 30:1-8; Jer. 23:7-8; Matthew 24:31). Over against these great events promised to Israel is the return of Christ for His own Bride, when He takes her with Him into heaven's glory (John 14:1-3). The contrasts between these two situations may be drawn out to great lengths and with equally great profit.

XIX. POSITION

Isaiah declares, "But thou, Israel, art my servant" (Isaiah 41:8). Though individuals in Israel attained to great usefulness as did the prophets, priests, and kings, yet, they never reached a higher distinction than that they were the servants of Yeshua. Contrariwise, the individuals who compose the Church are forever in Christ and are members in the family and household of God.

XX. CHRIST'S EARTHLY REIGN

Those of the elect nation are appointed to be subjects of the King in His earthly kingdom (Ezekiel 37:21-28), while those who comprise the Church are to reign with the King as His Consort in that kingdom (Rev. 20:6).

XXI. PRIESTHOOD

The nation, Israel, had a priesthood. The Church is a priesthood.

XXII. MARRIAGE

As a nation, Israel is likened by Yeshua to His wife - a wife untrue, and yet, to be restored (Jer. 3:1, 14, 20; Ezek. 16:1-59; Hos. 2:1-23; Isa. 54:1-17; cf. Gal. 4:27). In marked distinction to this situation respecting Israel, is the revelation that the Church is to Christ as one espoused and to be married (2 Cor. 11:2; Rev. 19:7-9).

XXIII. JUDGMENTS

It is clearly predicted that Israel must come into judgment (Ezek. 20:33-44; Matthew 25:1-13); but is as clearly declared that the Church will not come into judgment (John 5:24; Romans 8:1, R.V.).

XXIV. POSITION IN ETERNITY

In his enumeration of the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem, the writer to the Hebrews asserts that there shall be those present who are identified as "the spirits of just men made perfect." Such can easily refer to the saints of the Old Testament who, while in this life, were styled, just men. This designation occurs upwards of thirty times in the Old Testament and always with reference to those who were in right relation to God. In the same enumeration of the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem there is recognition also of the "Church of the firstborn" (Heb. 12:22-24).

CONCLUSION

In concluding this extended series of contrasts between Israel and the Church, it should be observed that, in certain respects, there are similarities between these two groups of elect people. Each, in turn, has its own peculiar relation to God, to righteousness, to sin, to redemption, to salvation, to human responsibility, and to destiny. They are each witnesses to the Word of God; each may claim the same Shepherd; they have doctrines in common; the death of Christ avails in its own way for each; they are alike, loved with an everlasting love; and each, as determined by God,

will be glorified.

PART III. SEVEN FIGURES USED OF THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO CHRIST (I-V)

Page | 102

The true Church, though contemplated under many cognomens, is the central theme of that major portion of the New Testament, which bears on the present age. She is the purpose of God in the present age and the supreme purpose of God in the universe. The current neglect of the extensive doctrine of the Church is not only blameworthy, but has led to a considerable array of baneful errors. Sectarianism, with its offense against every specific revelation respecting the one Body of Christ, is not the least of these sins. Had theological instruction of the past given even a small proportion of the recognition to this theme that rightfully belongs to it, Christendom might have been spared its present tragic appearance of being a camp of warring factions. Apparently, the only sacred thing which is honored, at this time, is the sect.

Attacks are tolerated against the most basic and indispensable doctrines without resentment, but disloyalty to a sect is resented. The cure is not in mass movements; it lies in the personal responsibility of every believer to "keep the unity of the Spirit" (Eph. 4:3), by loving and fellowshiping with every other child of God. America alone knows at least three-hundred sectarian distinctions, each of which is self-satisfied and promoting Church loyalty, all of which, being interpreted, means sectarian fidelity and homage. True, Christ said, "Love one another, as I have loved you;" but, this direction must be restricted in scope to include only those of the group to which one belongs. Over against this - though to many it seems not to exist - is the doctrine of the one Body of Christ, the one family, and household of God. Happy, indeed, is the individual, who can adjust his life and activities to this New Testament reality.

Very much truth concerning the Church is to be discovered in the three groupings of sevens in which she appears, namely, the seven parables of Matthew 13, the seven letters to the seven Churches in Asia of Revelation 2 and 3, and the seven figures used

of the Church in her relation to Christ. The first two of these seven, deserve at least a brief consideration, while the third is the theme of this entire division of Ecclesiology.

(a) Without exact identification of her precise nature or her name, the seven parables of Matthew 13, present the specific group which comprises the Church according to the divine purpose in this age, and disclose the facts regarding two other facts and influences which were to be, and have been, both present and equidistant with the Church in this age. By a process of sowing of seed to many people, a residue of what is called wheat would be, and has been, secured; counterfeit and destructive seed would be, and has been, sown by Satan; a structure of profession, which is out of all proportion to its small beginning, and which harbors evil birds, which catch away the seed would be, and has been, developed; leaven, the symbol of evil doctrine, would be, and has been, injected into the very company of the elect; Israel, likened to a treasure, would be, and has been, hidden in the field - the cosmos world - the Church, likened to a pearl of great cost for which Christ sold all that He might possess it, would be, and has been, secured through redemption; and the age will end by a division of the good and bad fish, as also by the separation of the wheat from the tares. In the end, the wheat will be gathered into His barn and the good fish into vessels. In concluding these parables, Christ said, "So shall it be at the end of the world (consummation of the age): the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 13:49-50).

(b) In an extended and accurate exposition of the seven letters to the seven Churches, as presented in his "Lectures on the Book of Revelation," Dr. H.A. Ironside writes the following:

Before we begin our study of "The things which are," let me give you this parable. Sometime ago, rummaging through an old castle, some people came across a very strange-looking old lock which secured a stout door. They shook the door and tried to open it, but to no avail. They tried one way and

another to move the lock, but could not turn it. By and by, somebody picked up a bunch of old keys from some rubbish on the floor and he said, "Maybe I can unlock it." He tried one key and it made no impression. He tried another and it gave a little; another and it gave a little more; and so on, but none would open the lock. At last he came to a peculiar old key. He slipped it into the lock, gave a turn, and the lock was open. They said, "Undoubtedly this key was meant for this lock."

You will understand my parable if I draw your attention to the fact that, in the 20th verse of the 1st chapter, we are told that there was a mystery connected with the seven lampstands. The seven lamp stands are said to symbolize the seven Churches of Asia, but there was a mystery connected with them. While some have tried one key and some have tried another (and there have been all kinds of efforts made to interpret this mystery), no solution was found until some devout students of Scripture, weighing this portion said, "Might it not be that inasmuch as this section of the book presents "the things which are," God has been pleased to give us here a prophetic history of the Church for the entire dispensation?" But would the key fit the lock? They compared the first part of the Church's history with the letter to Ephesus. Here it fitted perfectly. They went on and compared the letter to Smyrna with the second part of the Church's history, and the agreement was most marked. They went on right down to the end, and when they came to Laodicea, they found that what is written to the Church of Laodicea, answers exactly to the condition of the professing Church in the days in which we live, and they said: "There, the mystery is all clear. The lock has been opened; therefore, we have the right key." - pp. 35-36.

It is obvious that these seven letters were written to existing Churches and that they applied in a specific manner to the believers to whom they were written. It is equally to be noted that these messages are addressed to all believers and to all Churches of God everywhere and at any time. The phrase, "He that hath an ear, let him

hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches” - with which each letter ends - is proof of the universal application of those post ascension messages from Christ. Yet, again, and even more vitally, and as Dr. Ironside points out, these letters anticipate - and so it has been fulfilled - the course of the history of the visible Church in this age. While this body of truth belongs primarily to the division of Ecclesiology, which contemplates the organized Church in the world, the true Church, for the most part, is within this company and, therefore, what is declared of the one involves, to some extent, the other.

(c) The all-important revelation respecting the true Church is contained in the seven relationships which she sustains to Christ, which are: **(a)** the Shepherd and the sheep, **(b)** the Vine and the branches, **(c)** the Cornerstone and the stones of the building, **(d)** the High Priest and the kingdom of priests, **(e)** the Head and the Body with its many members, **(f)** the Last Adam and the New Creation, and **(g)** the Bridegroom and the Bride. Attention will now be given to these in order.

I. THE SHEPHERD AND THE SHEEP

The term “sheep,” as applied in the Bible to men, is broad in its significance. With complete propriety, it is used of Israel and of the nations that will yet stand on the right hand of the Kingdom and later enter the kingdom prepared for them (Matthew 25:34). The designation, then, in its larger scope, is of any people who are favored of God. However, the use of the word “sheep,” in the figure under consideration, is restricted to believers of the present dispensation. The utter helplessness of a sheep renders that animal an apt illustration of the Christian.

As the Gospel by John is written that the reader may believe that Jesus is the Christ and believing may have life through His name (John 20:31), it is essential to recognize, also, that, with the exception of chapters 13-17, the Words of Christ contained in that Gospel were spoken to Jews. There is no implication here that the truth uttered belonged to Judaism; on the contrary, these extended portions demonstrate the truth that the Gospel of God’s grace is addressed to Jews as it is to Gentiles, and on the

same terms of faith in the Saviour. The people of Israel were the “sheep of His pasture” (Ps. 74:1; 79:13; 95:7; Jer. 23:1). The divine undertaking, which is portrayed in John 10, under the figure of the shepherd and the sheep, is, first, of the coming of the Saviour, the Good Shepherd, who comes by the door, who is the Door, who gives His life for the sheep, who leads them out, and whom they intuitively follow. The sheep, are not here, said to be led into the fold, but, rather they are led out of it to find salvation, liberty, and pasture (vs. 9). The reference is to those, who through faith in Christ, are led out of Judaism, Israel’s fold; and these together with other sheep - Gentile believers, which are not of the Jewish fold - will form one flock, under the one Shepherd (the translation of “ttoiuvn” in vs. 16, by the term “fold,” is misleading, the word means “flock,” R.V.; cf. Matthew 26:31; Luke 2:8, I Cor. 9:7). The “flock,” that was anticipated by Christ, is the Church called out from both Jews and Gentiles. Dr. A.C. Gaebelien writes clearly on this great theme:

The teaching of this chapter is closely linked with the preceding event. It has become evident that the true sheep of Christ, belonging to His flock, would be cast out of the Jewish fold. The healed man cast out had become one of His sheep. Therefore, He teaches now more fully concerning Himself as the Shepherd and about His sheep. The Old Testament speaks often of Israel as the sheep of Jehovah, and of Jehovah as the Shepherd (Ps. 80:1; 95:7; Ezekiel 34; Zech. 11:7-9; 13:7). The true Shepherd had come through the appointed door into the sheepfold, that is among Israel. He is the only One, and the porter (the Holy Spirit) opened to Him. He came and called His own sheep by name to lead them out. And the sheep hear His voice and follow Him. All is Jewish. He came, the true Shepherd, into the sheepfold to lead them out to become His flock. It was a parable He spoke in these opening verses, but they did not understand it. What follows is a fuller revelation of Himself as the good Shepherd, and the sheep who belong to His flock. Judaism was a fold out of which the Shepherd leads His flock. He is the Door of the sheep. He is the means of getting into a house. Through Him all His sheep must enter by faith into the flock. There is no other door and no

other way. He came into the fold by God's appointed way and He is God's appointed way. "I am the door, by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." A most blessed promise. He is the door. Any man, it does not matter who it is, any man may enter in by Him and then having entered in by Him, that is believed on Him, He promises salvation, liberty, and food. These three things are bestowed upon all who believe on Him. Salvation is in Him and it is a present and a perfect salvation; liberty, freed from the bondage of the law, which condemned the sinner, a perfect liberty, pasture, food, which He supplies; He Himself is the food, a perfect food. It is all found outside of the fold of Judaism, and in Christ. He came, that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly. The abundant life He speaks of here, is the life which comes from His death and resurrection. The good Shepherd had to give His life for the sheep. How different from the hireling, who fleeth and careth not for the sheep. The hirelings were the faithless shepherds (Ezek. 34:1-6). Again, He said: "I lay down my life for the sheep." In verse 16, our Lord speaks of other sheep, which are not of this fold. These are the Gentiles. He leads out first from the Jewish fold, His sheep; then there are the other sheep, whom He will bring and who will hear His voice. The result will be one flock and one Shepherd. The Authorized Version is incorrect in using the word "fold." Judaism was a fold, the Church is not. The ecclesiastical fold in which Christendom is divided have been brought about by the Judaizing of the Church. The fold no longer exists. There is one flock as there is one Shepherd; one body, as there is one Lord. All who have heard His voice, believed on Him, entered in by Him, are members of the one flock." – ("The Annotated Bible: Matthew - Acts," pp. 213-15.)

To the same end, F. W. Grant's notes in his "Numerical Bible" are just as convincing:

He is come then to give life: as the Good Shepherd, by laying down

His own: yet, it is not so much doctrine that is here, as the insistence upon a love proved at whatever cost. The hireling cares but for his wages: the sheep are not his own, and he is not personally concerned about them: when the wolf appears, he leaves the sheep and flees: alas, no supposititious case, but what has been abundantly seen in history. The wolf in consequence, the open adversary, catches them and scatters them. The hireling acts in character; nothing better could be expected of him. On the contrary, between the Good Shepherd and His own, exists a bond of the most tender intimacy.

“I know My own, and they know Me: even as My Father knoweth Me, and I know My Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep.” “The world knew Him not:” there was the strangeness resulting from contrasted natures. His sheep know Him: for they have received His life and nature, and have thus been brought into communion; and this is the same kind of knowledge as exists (however much more perfectly) between the Father and the Son. The love implied in it is manifested in this, that He

lays down His life for the sheep. But His sheep, as thus defined, have no longer any Relationship with the Jewish fold, still less can be limited to those who have such law could not give this gift of eternal life, nor have, therefore, any control over it. In the fold itself, there had been those that were not His own; and there are sheep of His, not of that fold at all, but Gentiles, far enough off, to be brought nigh and made to hear His voice. Then there shall be one flock, one Shepherd. There is not fold anymore, the fold was Jewish and legal, and is gone. In Christ, is neither Jew nor Gentile. – (“The Gospels,” pp. 548-49).

The salient features, which the figure of Christ as Shepherd and the Church as the flock, contributes to the whole doctrine of the true Church are: **(a)** that Christ came by the door, which is the appointed way; **(b)** that He is a true shepherd, going before His sheep, and no other voice will they hear; **(c)** that He Himself is the door for the sheep - out from their former estate into His saving grace, and as a door of security, as well, which closes behind them (John 10:28-29); **(d)** that salvation, freedom from a merit obligation, and food for the new life are all provided by the Shepherd; **(e)** that all other

shepherds are hirelings at best; none have given, nor could they give, their life for the sheep as the Good Shepherd has done; **(f)** that there is a communion of understanding within the family of God - the sheep know the Shepherd, as the Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father; and **(g)** that there is but one flock; for saving grace, has brought every individual sheep, regardless of his former situation, into one and the same perfected position in Christ Jesus.

It should be noted, then, that through the God - provided Saviour, there is life, liberty, and sustenance; that this Saviour is efficacious because He laid down His life for the sheep; that there is a complete relationship established between the shepherd and the sheep unto eternal ages; and that there is but one flock.

The entire doctrine of the Shepherdhood of Christ is properly introduced in this connection - His ceaseless intercession, His ceaseless advocacy, and His ceaseless impartation of Himself as spiritual food and spiritual vitality. "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want." If that great reality were true of David, within the provisions of Judaism, how much more is it true of the believer under grace?

II. THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES

This figure, quite in contrast to that of the Shepherd and the sheep, which was spoken to Israelites, is addressed to believers (John 15). It is the peculiar character of the Upper Room Discourse (John 13-17), that it looks on to conditions that would obtain after Christ's death, after His resurrection, after His ascension, and after Pentecost. This discourse is, more than any other portion of the Scriptures, the clearest and dearest message to believers in this dispensation. It is, therefore, follows that this figure, falling, as it does, within the limits of this specific portion of the Scriptures, is directly applicable to Christians. They are not here said to have been led out of Judaism, nor is there any reference to their former estate. Though of real significance in its place, little importance is to be placed at this point on the truth that Israel was the vineyard of Jehovah (Isaiah 5:1-7; Jer. 2:21; Hos.10:1; Luke 20:9-16). There is little

doubt that the phrase, "I am the true vine," is intended to be in contrast to the Israelitish vine. That vine was fruitless; but, the True Vine must be fruitful and it will be. The Lord Himself will achieve this; but, from the human side, fruitfulness depends on abiding in Christ - a relationship which the believers, as branches, are appointed to maintain.

Discussion on the meaning of this figure has gone before in this work, and attention has been directed to the distinction which obtains between "union" with Christ and "communion" with Christ. It has been demonstrated that the purpose of this figure is to develop the underlying truth respecting "communion" with Christ, and that "union" with Christ is assumed - as evidence by the words, "every branch in me" (vs.). At no time here or in any part of the New Testament is it ever declared that "union" with Christ is a human responsibility or accomplishment, or is it implied that it might even be sustained by any human virtue or effort. To be in Christ is the highest of positions and is distinctly declared to be a result which is brought about by the baptism with the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:13). Abiding in Christ means unbroken fellowship with Christ. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love. (John 15:10). Similarly, the Lord's own commandments are contained in His written Word. It therefore is said, "If ye abide in Me, and My Words abide in you" (vs. 7); thus, finding His will in His Word and doing that will, becomes the Christian's uncomplicated responsibility if he would abide in Christ. "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself, also so, to walk, even as he walked" (I John 2:6). Dr. C. I. Scofield's note on abiding in Christ is conclusive: "To abide in Christ is, on one hand, to have no known sin, un-judged and unconfused, no interest into which He is not brought, no life which He cannot share. On the other hand, the abiding one takes all burdens to Him, and draws all wisdom, life, and strength from Him. It is not unceasing "consciousness" of these things, and of Him, but nothing is allowed in the life which separates from Him" ("Scofield Reference Bible," pp. 1136-37).

It may well be restated that the results of abiding in Christ, as indicated in John 15, are: pruning (vs. 2), prayer effectual (vs. 7), joy celestial (vs. 11), and fruit perpetual (vs. 16). No features of a true Christian life are more vital than these: growth and

improvement through discipline, measureless efficacy in prayer, that joy which is due to an unbroken fellowship with Christ (cf. I John 1:3-4), and lasting fruit to the glory of God. Fruit is here seen to be the product of the Vine whose vitality is imparted to the branch. Apart from this flow or real value can be wrought (vs. 5). Fruit is the product of the Holy Spirit (Galatians 5:22-23). The very purpose of union with Christ is that the believer may “bring forth fruit unto God” (Romans 7:4). The fruitfulness of believers is a most important factor in the divine plan and purpose for this age. The Church is being called out by the testimony and ministry of the members in Christ’s Body. It is the ministry of the saints that is now completing the Body. This truth is asserted by the Apostle thus: “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love” (Eph. 4:12-16). In like manner, concerning the true Church, it is said of her when about to be presented to her Lord: “Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready” (Rev. 19:7). It is no small feature of this achievement that the Bride “hath made herself ready.”

The contribution, which the figure of the Vine and its branches makes to the doctrine of the Church is particularly that, by the unbroken communion of the believer with His Lord, the enabling power of God rests upon him both for his own priceless experience of joyous fellowship and for fruitfulness by prayer and testimony unto the completion of the Body of Christ. The vine and the branches partake of one common life. This is true also of Christ and the Church.

III. THE CORNERSTONE AND THE STONES OF THE BUILDING

Another wide distinction is indicated when it is declared that Israel had a temple (Ex.25:8) and the Church is a temple (Eph. 2:21). The figure of a temple or building which is now God's habitation in the earth - a temple purified and holy through the merit of Christ - is presented in Ephesians 2:19-22; "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Cornerstone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Of this conception, Christ spoke when He said, "Upon this rock I will build my Church" (Matthew 16:18). In like manner, Peter, to whom Christ thus spoke concerning His purpose to build His Church, said, "Ye also, as lively (living) stones, are built (being built) up a spiritual house" (I Peter 2:5). Reference is made to "Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we" (Heb. 3:6); also it is said, "Ye are God's building" (I Cor. 3:9).

The symbolization of Christ as a stone is to be seen in various particulars: **(a)** in relation to Gentiles, He is the Smiting Stone in their final judgment (Dan. 2:34); **(b)** to Israel, His coming as a Servant rather than as a King became a stumbling stone to them and a rock of offense (Isaiah 8:14-15; I Cor. 1:23; I Peter 2:8); **(c)** to the Church, Christ is the Foundation Stone (I Cor. 3:11), and the Chief Cornerstone (Eph. 3:20-22; I Peter 2:4-5). The exaltation of Christ as Chief Cornerstone was accomplished by His resurrection (He was not that before), and was accomplished in spite of the opposition to, and rejection of, the Stone by the "builders" - Israel. In Psalm 118:22-24, it is declared: "The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." Speaking of His resurrection, Peter asserts that "this is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner" (Acts 4:11). Christ quotes the same Old Testament prediction and forecasts that the kingdom of God will be taken from Israel and given to a people bringing forth the fruits thereof. This prediction foresees the impending transition from the former

divine purpose in Israel to the present divine purpose in the Church. Yet, further, He anticipates the fact that Israel would stumble over Himself as the “rock of offence,” and that the Gentiles will “be ground to powder” under the judgment of that same Smiting Stone. The passage reads, “Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scripture, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes? Therefore, say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder” (Matthew 21:42-44). Thus, as the Stone, Christ becomes the de-struction of Gentile authority (cf. Ps. 2:7-9; Isaiah 63:1-7; Rev. 19:15), the Stumbling Stone to Israel, and the Foundation Stone and Chief Cornerstone to the Church.

A building is being constructed which has three specific distinctions, namely, **(a)** that each stone in the building is itself a living stone; that is, it partakes of the divine nature (I Peter 2:5); **(b)** its Chief Cornerstone, like its Foundation, is Christ (Eph. 2:20-22; I Cor. 3:11; I Peter 2:6); and **(c)** the whole structure is itself “an habitation of God through the Spirit” (Eph. 2:22).

After reminding the Gentile believers in Ephesus (Eph. 2:19-20) that they are “no more strangers and foreigners,” as they were before said to be (cf. Eph. 2:12), the Apostle declares that they are now “fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God” - a blessing, which it should be observed, is as much higher than the commonwealth and covenant privileges of Israel, as heaven is higher than the earth. Though once excluded from the earthly Jerusalem the Gentiles are now come with a gracious welcome to the heavenly Jerusalem (Hebrews 12:22-24), in which the city the unregenerate Jew, with all his national preference and title to earthly Jerusalem, is an alien. The phrase, “fellow citizens with the saints,” must be received in its restricted meaning as also the fact that this spiritual structure is built on “the foundation of the apostles and (New Testament) prophets.” God has had His saints in all dispensations, but they of the past ages have not formed any part of the Church. Saints are sanctified

ones set apart from God. That New Testament saints are advanced to a higher position of standing than the Old Testament saints (though not necessarily to more faith and piety), is revealed in Hebrews 10:10, where we read: "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." This sanctification, or sainthood, could not be realized until Christ died and rose again, for it is characterized by position in Him, which position could be accorded only to those who are by the Spirit united to the risen Christ. It is true that all saints of all the ages will be gathered eventually before God in a new heaven and a new earth (Heb. 11-39-40; 12:22-24); but the Old Testament saints were no part of the New Creation in Christ, nor were they builded upon the foundation of the apostles and the New Testament prophets. In this Ephesians passage, it is declared that the Church, like a building, is being built upon the foundation of the apostles and New Testament prophets, Jesus Christ Himself, being the Chief Cornerstone. It is in Him that all the building is being fitly framed together and is thus "growing" into an holy temple in the Lord. In Him, the separate and various members, are being builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. During the past dispensation, the habitation of God was the tabernacle, and later the temple - the earthly sanctuary or holy place made with hands (cf. Heb. 8:2; 9:1-2, 24) - which, though held in antithesis to the heavenly sanctuary into which Christ has now entered, was, nevertheless, the type of the present spiritual habitation of God in a temple of living stones. However, at this point, the Apostle is not dwelling on the truth which concerns the individual believer, but rather on that which has to do with the corporate Body of Christ; and his declaration is that the Church, as it is now being formed in the world, is being builded as an habitation of God through the Spirit. Let it be said again, Israel had a building in which God was pleased to dwell; the Church is a building in which God is pleased to dwell.

The contribution which is made to the doctrine of the Church by the figure of the Chief Cornerstone and the stones of the building is that of the interdependence of each saved person upon every other saved person, as a building is weakened and on its way to dissolution by the removal of one stone from the structure; the whole building is built on Christ and thus depends wholly on Christ; and, lastly and of paramount importance,

this building, like each stone in the structure, is a temple of God, through the Spirit. The fact of the indwelling Spirit is a characterizing feature of the Church which receives supreme emphasis in Scripture revelation.

IV. THE HIGH PRIEST AND THE KINGDOM OF PRIESTS

The priesthood of Christ is typified by the Old Testament high priest, by Aaron, and by Melchizedek. This extended field of typology is set forth in its antitypical meaning in the letter to the Hebrews (cf. 5:1-10; 6:13, 8:6). In His High Priestly service, Christ is over the hierarchy of priests which constitutes the Church and as the Appointer to, and Director of, their service. In His Aaronic ministry, Christ offered a sacrifice to God. That sacrifice of Himself, offered without spot. In this undertaking, He was both Sacrificer and Sacrifice; but the Aaronic pattern could go no further than to be the Sacrificer. In His Melchizedek priesthood, He is King-Priest. Melchizedek was of Salem, which is “peace” (Isaiah 11:6-9); he had no beginning or ending of days, no human parents; and he was high priest by divine authority (Ps. 110:4).

The Christian is a king-priest unto God. His service as King is deferred until the coming age when we reign with Christ (Rev. 20:6); but his priestly service is in force at the present time. There is a future aspect of the believer’s priesthood as declared in Revelation 20:6, “But they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.” Israel was first appointed to a similar position (cf. Ex. 19:6); but in this they failed. The present king-priest position of the Church, being sustained by God, cannot fail.

In the Old Testament order, the priesthood was a hierarchy over the nation and in their service, they were under the authority of the high priest. In the New Testament order, every believer is a priest unto God (I Peter 2:5-9; Rev. 1-6) and the whole ministering company of New Testament priests is under the authority of Christ, who is the true High Priest, of whom all other high priests were but types. Therefore, according to the New Testament order, service is committed to all believers alike and on the

ground of their priestly relation to God. As there was no evangel to be preached to the nations of the earth, service, in the period covered by the Old Testament, consisted only in the performance by the priests of the divinely appointed ritual in the tabernacle or temple. In contrast to this, the New Testament priestly ministry is much broader in its scope, including not only a service to God and fellow believers, but to all men everywhere.

1. The Service of Sacrifice. At this point, there is a striking similarity to be observed. The Old Testament priest was sanctified or set apart, both by the fact that he was born into the priestly family of Levi and by the fact that he, with due ceremony, was inducted into the priestly office, which appointment continued so long as he lived. Likewise, at the beginning of his ministry, he was ceremonially cleansed by a once-for-all bathing (Exodus 29:4). In fulfilling the antitype, the believer priest is wholly and once for all cleansed at the moment he is saved (Col. 2:13; Titus 3:5), and, by virtue of his salvation, is set apart unto God. So, also, he is set apart by the new birth into the family of God. In addition to all this, it is peculiarly required of the New Testament priest, that he shall willingly dedicate himself to God. Concerning his self-dedication, we read: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Romans 12:1).

The phrase, the mercies of God, refers to the great facts of salvation, which have been set forth in the preceding chapters of the Book of Romans, into which mercies, every believer enters the moment he is saved, while the presentation of the body as a living sacrifice is the self-dedication to the will of God of all that the believer is and has. That which is thus yielded, God accepts and places where He wills in the field of service (Eph. 2:10). According to the Scriptures, this divine act of accepting and placing, is consecration. Therefore, the believer priest may dedicate himself, but never consecrates himself to God. In connection with the divine act of consecration, it should be observed that the present work of Christ as High Priest - appointing, directing, and administering the service of believers - fulfills that which was typified by the ministry of

the Old Testament priest in the consecration of the sons of Levi. Having yielded to God and being no longer conformed to this world, the believer priest will experience a transfigured life by the power of the indwelling Spirit, and by that power, he will make full proof of “what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God” (Romans 12:2).

According to the New Testament order, priestly service in sacrifice toward God is threefold: **(a)** the dedication of self, which is declared to be a “reasonable service” (Romans 12:1), or more literally (R.V. marg.), “a spiritual worship.” As Christ was Himself, both a Sacrificer and a Sacrifice, so the believer may glorify God by the offering of his whole body as a living sacrifice to God; **(b)** the sacrifice of the lips, which is the voice of praise and is to be offered continually (Heb. 13:15); **(c)** the sacrifice of substance (Phil. 4:18).

Referring to the cleansing of the priests, it should be noted again that the Old Testament priest, upon entering his holy office, was once for all cleansed by a whole bathing, which bathing was administered to him by another (Exodus 29:4); however; afterwards, though thus wholly bathed, he was required to be cleansed repeatedly by a partial bathing at the brazen laver, and this before undertaking any and every priestly service. In fulfilling the typical significance of this, the New Testament priest, though wholly cleansed and forgiven when saved, is at all times required to confess every known sin, in order that he may be cleansed and qualified for fellowship with God (1 John 1:9). As the appointment of the Old Testament priest was for life, so the New Testament priest is a priest unto God forever.

2. The Service of Worship. As worship was a part of the service of every priest of the old order, so every believer is now appointed to worship. In like manner, as the furnishings of the holy place symbolized the worship of the priest in the Old Testament order and every feature and furnishing of that place spoke of Christ, so the believer’s worship is by and through Christ alone. Again, in service unto God, the believer’s worship may be the offering of one’s self to God (Romans 12:1), the ascribing of praise and thanksgiving to God from the heart (Heb. 13:15), or the sacrificial gifts that are

offered to Him. In connection with the worship of the Old Testament priests, there were two prohibitions recorded and these, also, are of typical meaning. No “strange” incense was to be burned (Exodus 30:9) - which speaks typically of mere formality in service toward God; and no “strange” fire was allowed (Lev. 10:1) - which symbolizes the substitution of fleshly emotions in our service for true devotion to Christ by the Spirit, or the love of lesser things to the exclusion of the love for Christ (I Cor. 1:11-13; Col. 2:8, 16-19).

3. The Service of Intercession. As the prophet is God’s representative, sent to the people, so the priest is the people’s representative dispatched to God, and since priesthood is a divine appointment, the necessary access to God is always provided; however, no priest of the Old Testament dispensation was permitted to enter the holy of holies other than the high priest, and he but once a year on the ground of sacrificial blood (Heb. 9:7). As for this dispensation, in addition to the fact that Christ as High Priest has with His own blood now entered into the heavenly sanctuary (Gen. 4:14-16; 9:24; 10:19-22) and is now interceding for His own, who are in the world (Romans 8:34; Heb. 7:25), when Christ died, the veil of the temple was rent - which signifies that the way into the holiest is now open, not to the world, but to all who come unto God on the ground of the shed blood of Christ (Heb. 10:19-22). Having unhindered access to God on the ground of the blood of Christ, the New Testament priest is thus privileged to minister in intercession (Romans 8:26-27; Heb. 10:19-22; I Tim. 2:1; Col. 4:12).

The contribution which is made to the doctrine of the Church by the figure of the high priest and the kingdom of priests, is that, in this life, the believer is not only closely associated with Christ positionally, being in Him, but is closely associated in those activities which He is undertaking on the plane of infinity and which may be extended, by His grace, into the finite sphere. As has been seen, these activities are: service, sacrifice, and intercession. Again, it is made clear that it is given to the members of His Body to share in the great achievement of the out-calling and perfecting of the Church of Christ. The Saviour has a glory, which accrues to Him, because of His great accomplishment, but His own who are in the world are His instruments who will share

with Him in His merited glory. Theirs is not merely a glory which is a benefaction, but is one which is due to a glory which is a benefaction, but is one which is due to a partnership fruition.

V. THE HEAD AND THE BODY WITH ITS MANY MEMBERS

In contrast to Israel, which nation was an organization or commonwealth (Eph. 2:12), and in contrast to the visible Church, which is merely a human systemization, the true Church is an organism. The term organism, indicates that the thing specified is permeated throughout all its parts with one common life. It is the same life in the roots and the upper structure of a tree. It is the same life which is in every member of a human body. Similarly, it is the same life that is in the Church. Each individual in that company has not only been baptized into one Body, but has been made to drink into one spirit (I Cor. 12:13). The figure of the head and body with its many members is employed in the Sacred Text more than any other and serves to indicate certain essential facts respecting the Church, namely, **(a)** that the Church is a self-developing body, **(b)** that the members of this body are appointed to specific service, and **(c)** that the body is one.

1. The Church, A Self-Developing Body. The central text bearing upon this aspect of the activity of those who comprise the Church is Ephesians 4:11-16. In this passage - following the enumeration of ministry gifts in this age of the Church, namely apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers - the writer declares that the ministry of these gifted men, especially the pastor and teacher, is for the perfecting of the saints unto their work of the ministry. In this age, as in no other, there is a specific message to be preached to every creature and, while there are leadership men who are God's gift to the Church, the obligation to witness, rests upon every Christian alike. Too much recognition cannot be given to the uncounted multitudes of faithful witnesses, who are discharging their commissions as Sunday School teachers, mission workers, personal soul-winners, and living exponents of divine grace. This is the God-appointed New Testament evangelism. The latent evangelizing forces of a congregation of believers

are beyond all human calculation; but, they need to be trained for their task, and God has prescribed definitely that they should be trained. How else would they be accurate and skillful, even in their limited sphere of service? That they are to be trained, is indicated in Eph. 4:11-12. The revelation here is not only of the fact that the saints have a witnessing service to perform, but also of the fact, that they are to be equipped for this service by the gifted men whom God has placed over them as their leaders. The word, "karapriouos," here translated "perfecting," is a noun, which is but once used in the New Testament and means "equipment," and so refers to that preparation which all saints should have that they might be effective witnesses for Christ. The verb form of this word is found elsewhere in the New Testament, and with significant meaning. According to this passage (Eph. 4:11-12), the pastor and teacher is responsible for the equipment of those given into his care. Although this equipment does involve methods of work, It includes much more, namely, an accurate knowledge of the truth.

But the pastor and teacher must be trained for his leadership task. Under existing conditions, this preparation is committed to the professors in the theological seminary. Their responsibility is greater than that of other men inasmuch as the heavenly things transcend the things of earth. Observe this stream flowing forth from its source; whatever truth and ideals the professor imparts to students in training, they, in turn, will later impart to the larger groups over which they are given spiritual care. If a congregation is not actively engaged in soul-winning and missionary work, it is usually because of the fact that they have been deprived of the God-intended leadership to that end. If the pastor has no soul-winning passion, no missionary vision, is limited in his proficiency, and inaccurate as an exponent of the Word of God. His lack, in these respects, may generally be traced to the fact that he has been deprived of the God-intended spiritual and vital training in the seminary. It may, therefore, be restated that the responsibility of the seminary professor is no less than superhuman. If this is true, no man is fitted to render faculty service in a seminary who is not himself awake to his responsibility and, in addition to that advanced training and accuracy in the truth which his position demands, is himself a worthy example of missionary zeal, evangelistic passion, and tireless soul-winning effort. What revival fires would be set burning and

spiritual forces be released should the Church demand the purification and perfection of her fountain sources of doctrinal teaching, as well as the worthy illustration of spiritual vitality and soul-winning passion in the life and ministry of those who mold the character of her God-appointed leaders.

This is not an appeal for a lowering of worthy scholarship. The all too prevalent notion that scholarship and spiritual passion cannot exist together in one person was forever answered at the beginning of the Christian era in the case of the Apostle Paul, to say nothing of thousands of great preachers of the past, who have attained to enviable scholarship without restricting their spiritual lives or restraining their passion of soul.

The objective in this general witnessing on the part of the whole company of believers is to accomplish a specific task in a prescribed time; “till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Eph. 4:13). The “perfect man” here cited is not to be interpreted to mean perfect men; it is the completion of the Body of Christ by the adding thereto of all who are His elect people in this age. The dangers which beset believers who are deprived of the teaching that which was referred to in the previous verse, is described in verse 14: “That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.” Over against this, the one who is taught will “hold the truth in love.” The word in verse 15, translated “speaking,” is better rendered “holding” (cf. R.V. marg.). The truth is to be held as a controlling possession. Such a one will grow up into Christ in all things. To conclude this statement respecting the developing of the Body of Christ, the Apostle writes: “From whom the whole body, fitted together, and connected by every joint of supply, according to (the) working in (its) measure of each one part, works for itself the increase of the body to its self-building up in love” (vs. 16, J. N. Darby translation).

From the above, it will be seen that the Church, like the human body, is self-

developing. Her members, as evangelizing agencies, are appointed to secure other members. Intelligent soul-winning service, on the part of Christians, is the New Testament expectation.

2. The Members Are Appointed to Specific Service. This extensive portion of truth, which likens the Christian to a member in the human body and with a special function to perform, is centered in I Cor. 12, and as these functions represent the exercise of spiritual gifts, the context continues through chapters 13 and 14. A similar and exceedingly important passage respecting the members of the Body and their service is found in Romans 12:3-8. Yet again, contributing a vital part to the general doctrine of the gifts which the members of the Body exhibit is I Peter 4:7-11. It is to be seen, also, that the entire theme of the baptism with the Spirit, and that which it accomplishes, is closely related to the figure in question, since it is by that baptism that each individual becomes a member in Christ's Body, and thus, is joined to Christ (I Cor. 6:17). It is in I Cor. 12:12, that the unity of the Body, in its relation to the Head, is stated. The passage declares: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ." In this connection, it will be remembered, that in Eph. 4:4, the apostle makes uncomplicated averment, "There is one body," and it is in I Cor. 12:13, that he defines the manner in which members are joined to Christ. He states: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (cf. 6:17; Gal. 4:27). All believers are of the one Body: "Now ye are the body of Christ" and members in particular" (I Cor. 12:27); "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. 5:30).

The possibility that, through human weakness, there may be jealousy and strife between the members of the Body is guarded against by first pointing out that each member in the Body is placed where he is in the sovereign will of God. Of this sovereignty, the Apostle writes in strong statements: "Dividing to every man severally as he will" (I Cor. 12:11), and, "But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him" (vs.18).

Likewise, in Romans 12:3, the same sovereign purpose is recognized, with respect to those gifts, which are manifestations of the specific activity of each individual member in the Body. It is written: "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but, to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." When dealing with jealousies and strife, the Apostle reminds the members of Christ's Body that the honor before God is the same whatever the position in the Body may be, or whatever human ideals may suggest. All members are necessary and all will be equally rewarded, according to their fruitfulness.

3. The Body is One. The extent of this theme is to be seen in the fact that it forms the very framework upon which the highest revelation respecting the Church is fashioned - that set forth in the letter to the Ephesians (1:23; 2:15-16; 3:6; 4:12-16; 5:30). The argument, relative to the one Body, after the introduction of the theme in chapter 1, begins in chapter 2. It is defined in chapter 3, is enforced in chapter 4, and concluded in chapter 5.

In chapter 1, the direct statement is made that the ascended Saviour is Head over the Church and that the Church is the fulness - completion, in respect, to desire - of Him that filleth all in all. The passage declares: "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (vss. 22-23).

Chapter 2 is largely the disclosure of the fact that, though there was in all generations so great a difference between Jew and Gentile, the bringing of Jew and Gentile into one Body has broken down, within the Church wherein they are united, the middle wall of partition that separated them, and destroyed the enmity. After nineteen hundred years, in which the privileges that constitute the distinction between Gentile and Jew have been divinely set aside, it is difficult in the present time for one to realize the difference which prevailed between these two peoples at the beginning of the present age. Two underlying facts should be observed:

(a) God, while not releasing His power and sovereignty over the nations, had, nevertheless, declared His favor toward Israel alone, which people formed the acknowledged heritage of God. True, there was a welcome accorded to strangers who chose to ally themselves with Israel; but, all were strangers who were not Israel. There was no other nation or people who were the chosen of God (Yeshua) (Deut. 7:6-1), to whom He married (Jer. 3:14), whom alone He knew among the families of the earth (Amos 3:2), and whom He had redeemed from Egypt, both by blood and by power (2 Samuel :23). Probably no passage of Scripture describes the peculiar estate of Israel, before God, more completely, than Romans 9:4-5. It is written: “Who are Israelites; to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.” Certainly Israel would have been reprehensible had she failed to acknowledge, or to respond to, this divine election. However, the distinction was national and provided no basis for that Pharisaism, which came to prevail in the attitude of the Jews toward individual Gentiles. **(b)** The prejudice of the Jew toward the Gentile, based upon divine favor, had come to be nothing less than hatred and contempt. To the Jew, the Gentile was a “dog,” and it was contrary to custom for a Jew to keep company with a Gentile, let alone enter his house. Only divine command could persuade Peter to enter the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:20). Probably no other Scripture describes the actual estate of the Gentile before God more completely than Ephesians 2:12. While the lost estate of the individual has been disclosed in verses 1-3 of this chapter, the national position of the Gentile, which was equally true of the individual, is described in verse 12. Again, it is written: “that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Five disqualifying charges are here preferred. The Gentiles were “without Christ,” not only personally Christless, as all unsaved are, but having no national Messianic hope; they were outside Israel’s one divinely recognized commonwealth; they were “strangers from the covenants of promise” - this does not deny that God had predicted great earthly blessings for the Gentiles in the

coming kingdom age (Dan. 7:13-14; Micah 4:2); it asserts, rather, that He had entered into no covenant with them as He had with Israel - the Gentiles had "no hope," since no covenant promise had been accorded them; and they were without God in the world. So they could make no claim to His purpose or favor, and they formed that portion of humanity which was under the curse and was doomed to destruction. The world today knows little of the godless and hopeless condition of human life among the Gentiles in the days to which reference is made. It is said that, at the highest state of Greek culture, under Alexander the Great, it was commonly held that the best thing was not to be born at all, and next to that was to die, so fully did the experience of the human heart reflect the actual relation which it unknowingly sustained to God.

In the midst of these distinctions between Jew and Gentile which were set up by God, owned of God, and accentuated by human prejudice and hatred, a new divine purpose was introduced, made possible on the ground of the death and resurrection of Christ and the advent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. That divine purpose is no less than the forming of a new Body of heavenly people drawn from both Jews and Gentiles, each individual in that Body perfected in Christ and the whole company destined to be to "the praise of the glory of his grace." Therefore, because it is to the glory of His grace, each individual in this company, whether Jew or Gentile, is called and saved upon that distinct principle of selection - the sovereign grace of God, apart from all human merit. As a basis for this exercise of sovereign grace apart from human merit, the most startling divine decree was announced, startling indeed, because never before heard of in the world, and because it is so contrary to the hitherto divinely sanctioned exaltation of Israel over the Gentiles. That decree declares that, now, there is "no difference" between Jew and Gentile; they are all under sin (Romans 3:9). So, again, there is "no difference" between Jew and Gentile, "for the same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him" (Romans 10:12). There was little for the Gentile to unlearn in connection with this new age-purpose and plan of salvation. He had no ground for hope before, and the gospel of salvation by grace became to him as life from the dead. But the Jew stumbled over the way of salvation through the cross, and only a few, though their national preference is set aside for this age (Romans 11:1-36), have

been able to abandon their assumed national standing with God and to accept the exceeding grace of God in Christ.

By the words “but now,” at the beginning of 2:13, a sharper contrast is drawn between the former estate of these Ephesian Gentiles described in verse 12, and their new position in Christ. Here they are told that they, as Gentiles, who were at previous time “far off” from God, henceforth, because of their new position in Christ, “made nigh,” not by external ordinances or human virtue, but by the blood of Christ. To be nigh to God is one of the exalted positions unto which each believer is brought at the moment he is saved. The perfection of this position is seen from the fact that one could not be nearer to God in time or eternity than he is when in Christ. So perfect is the efficacy of the blood of Christ in providing a righteous ground for divine grace, that every desire on the part of God, though prompted by infinite love, can now be satisfied completely on behalf of those who believe on Christ.

Verse 13 is closely related to verse 17 (cf. Isaiah 59:17). In the former, only Gentiles are in view; but in the latter, both Jews and Gentiles are seen. The Gentiles are identified as those who, because of no former covenant relation to God, were “far off,” while the Jews, because of their covenants, were “nigh,” but no nigh to the same degree in which the saved Jew and the saved Gentile are now, being in Christ and redeemed through His precious blood.

In verse 14, Christ is declared to be “our peace,” and to have broken down the middle wall of partition between Gentile and Jew. The wall of separation, here said to be broken down, was set up by divine arrangement at the time when God entered into covenant relation with Abraham; but, now a new thing is introduced (“new” as a declared testimony and actual undertaking, but, in purpose and promise, it is older than the created universe - cf. 1-4). By saving both, Jew and Gentile alike, upon the same condition, and into the same heavenly glory, Christ becomes in the fullest sense, their Peace; and, by reconciling both to God, becomes thereby, the most effective or reconciling agencies. Every distinction is lost in this glorious oneness in Christ. Neither

Jew nor Gentile can rightfully claim superiority over the other, since they are both perfected forever in Christ (Heb.10:14). So, likewise, in addition to the fact that Christ establishes perfect peace between Jews and Gentiles, they being united to Him by faith, He breaks down the middle wall of partition between them. The revelation that Jews were under divine legislation, not imposed on Gentiles - a fact typified by the wall which separated the court of the Gentiles in the temple from the restricted area reserved only for the Jews - because a wall of separation between these two classes of people. By the death of Christ, the wall was broken down. The Gentile was not elevated to the level of Jewish privilege; but, the Jew was lowered to the level of the hopeless Gentile, from which position, either Jew or Gentile might be saved through grace alone into a heavenly position and glory. In His flesh, Christ abolished the enmity, "even the law of commandments" (vs.15), and every aspect of law which might seem to provide, because of its meritorious character, as basis for man's responsibility to God, thus, placing the child of God, whether Jew or Gentile, upon a new obligation - one not of striving to establish merit, but rather to living in all devotion to Him whose perfect merit is vouchsafed to all who believe. This new obligation is elsewhere termed "the law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2; cf. I Cor. 9:21). The removal of both the enmity and the partition between Jew and Gentile is divinely accomplished through the creation of "one new man," not by renewing individual men, but by forming one new Body - the Church - of which Christ is the Head. Thus, in the Church (vs. 16), He reconciles both Jew and Gentile "unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby," separated, as they were, by the different relationships they sustained to God.

It is through Christ (vs. 18) that both - Jew and Gentile - have access by one Spirit unto the Father. This declaration provides indisputable evidence that believers now have peace; and how marvelous is that peace when it is the portion of those who were not only at enmity among themselves with a divinely established partition dividing them, but who were enemies of God (Romans 5:10).

Chapter 3 of Ephesians defines the Church as a sacred secret, hitherto unrevealed, which provides for the forming of a new Body, by making Gentiles "fellow heirs, and of

the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.” There is no ground for contention about whether the “promise in Christ by the gospel” is a note never before sounded. It is as “new” to Jew as it is to Gentile.

According to verse 5, this Pauline revelation is the unfolding of a mystery, or sacred secret, “which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit.” No better definition of a New Testament mystery will be found than that set forth in this context. A New Testament mystery is a truth hitherto withheld, or “hid in God” (vs. 9), but now revealed. This sum total of all the mysteries in the New Testament represents that entire body of added truth found in the New Testament which is unrevealed in the Old Testament. On the other hand, the New Testament mystery is to be distinguished from the mystery of the cults of Babylon and Rome, whose secrets were sealed and held on penalty of death; for the New Testament mystery, when it is revealed, is to be declared to the ends of the earth (vs. 9), and is restricted only to the extent of the limitation of the natural man (I Cor. 2:14).

If, for the previous bringing in of other divine purposes of an earthly nature, it were necessary to employ “holy men of God (who) spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Peter 1:21), how reasonable is the declaration that “holy apostles and prophets” were used of the Lord for the present bringing in of the revelation of the heavenly purpose. Under these conditions is anyone justified in the assumption that the New Testament apostles and prophets who spoke forth a later revelation were one with less honored of God as media of divine truth than the “sons of God” - the “holy men of God” - who spoke forth the former revelation? Messiah’s kingdom occupied the Old Testament prophets’ vision. They saw not the mystery of that “new man” (2:15), which bears collectively the name “Christ” (I Cor. 12:12). True, indeed, the Messiah was to die a sacrificial death. This fact had not only been typified, but it had been solemnly promised in every Jewish sacrifice. On the other hand, little had been revealed about the value that would occur from His resurrection. That particular event, being more related to the New Creation than to the old, was, to some extent, withheld as a part of

the “mystery.”

What then is the “mystery?” It is stated in verse 6, here in the simplest of terms; “that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.” This declaration must not be treated lightly. That the Gentiles should be fellow- heirs and of the same body is not a recognition of the Old Testament prediction that, during Israel’s coming kingdom glory, Gentiles will be raised to a subordinate participation in those covenant blessings (Isaiah 60:12). Those predictions were of an earthly calling, and, being revealed in very much Old Testament prophecy, could be no part of the heavenly calling - the “mystery....hid in God.” This mystery is of a present uniting of Jews and Gentiles into one Body - a new divine purpose, and, therefore, in no sense the perpetuation of anything which has been before.

That the Church is a new purpose of God could not be more clearly stated than it is in verses 3-9, yet certain schools of theology contend that the Church in her present form is but a continuation of God’s one purpose from the beginning of the human family. They speak of an “Old Testament Church” and seek to relate this to the one Body which constitutes the New Testament revelation. The fact that Jews are now invited into fellow heirship in the one Body with Gentiles is no warrant for the belief that Old Testament saints are included in this new divine purpose. Arguments for an Old Testament Church are usually based on (1) the fact that the Old Testament sacrifices looked forward to Christ; (2) that Israel was a sanctified nation; (3) that there was a godly remnant in each of Israel’s generations; (4) that the Septuagint translates the word which indicates an assembly or gathering of people by the word, “ekknoia;” and (5) that, since all saints go to heaven, they must, because of that fact, constitute one company. These arguments are insufficient at every point.

In verse 7, 8, and 9, the Apostles contends for his unique position as the one chosen of God for the reception and declaration of the new message concerning the mystery of Christ (vs. 4). In verse 10, he declares that it is through the Church that the angelic

hosts now know the manifold wisdom of God, as, in 2:7, the angels are, in the ages to come, to know by the Church the exceeding riches of the grace of God. All this disclosure concerning the Church and her present ministry to the principalities and powers as a revelation of God's wisdom is, likewise (Cf, 1-9), according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord (vs. 11). It is given to the angelic hosts to observe that, through our faith in Christ, Christians have boldness, free intimacy with God, and introduction into His blessed fellowship; but how great is the privilege granted to those who experience this intimacy and fellowship.

Chapter 4, which enforces the truth of the one body, opens with the call to all believers to recognize and observe the obligation growing out of the doctrine of this unity which has been created by the Holy Spirit of God - a unity established by seven particulars, namely, "one faith, one baptism, one God and Father." On the assured principle that the Epistles take up and expand the germ truths constituting the substance of Christ's Upper Room Discourse, the early portion of the fourth chapter of Ephesians is evidently an amplification of the petition in Christ's prayer, "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, they also may be one in us" (John 17:21). As this point is the central theme of the next division of this discussion, its consideration is deferred at this time.

The diversified contribution which the figure of the Head and the Body with its many members makes to the doctrine of the Church has been noted above, namely, that the Body of Christ is growing by self development, that the members render specific service under the direction of the Head, and that the Body is one in the sense that it is an organism indwelt by one life-principle.

PART VI SEVEN FIGURES USED OF THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO CHRIST THE LAST ADAM AND THE NEW CREATION

This division of Ecclesiology which contemplates the true Church as a New Creation with the resurrected Christ as its federal Head introduces a body of truth unsurpassed both in its importance and its transcendent exaltation. Naturally several vast themes

combine under this conception; **(a)** the resurrected Christ, **(b)** the New Creation, **(c)** two creations require two commemoration days, and **(d)** the final transformation. As before indicated, the New Creation, as a designation of the true Church, includes more than is comprehended in the idea of the Church as Christ's Body. In the New Creation reality, Christ is seen to be the all-import- and part of it, whereas, in the figure of the Body, that entity is viewed as a thing to be completed in itself and separate from and yet to be joined to, the Head. The Body is an entire unit in itself, which is vitally related to Christ. Over against this, the New Creation is a unit, which incorporates the resurrected Christ and could not be what it is apart from that major contribution - the Source of all the verity which enters into it.

PART VII. SEVEN FIGURES USED OF THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO CHRIST THE BRIDGROOM AND THE BRIDE

This, the last of the seven figures which speak of the relationship between Christ and the Church, is distinctive in certain respects, and may be developed by noting as points:

- (1)** the type as contrasted with Israel, **(2)** as a delineation of Christ's knowledge-surpassing love, **(3)** as an assurance of the Consort's authority, **(4)** as a revelation of the Bride's position above all created beings, **(5)** as a surety of infinite glory, **(6)** the Bride types, and **(7)** the meaning of this figure.

It is evident that the majority of these distinctions are anticipations of realities to be enjoyed in ages to come. In this respect this figure serves a specific purpose and introduces contemplations into which no man may enter fully either in understanding expression.

This discussion may well follow the general order of topics indicated above.

#####