

# The Teaching of Jesus



CONCERNING  
THE  
SCRIPTURES





BS 2415 .A2 T4 v.4  
Teachings of Jesus  
concerning the ...

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS  
*Edited by* JOHN H. KERR, D. D.

---

THE TEACHING OF JESUS  
CONCERNING  
THE SCRIPTURES

---

DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D. D., LL. D.

W

# THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS

## CONCERNING

HIS OWN MISSION. Frank H. Foster. *Ready.*

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH.

Geerhardus Vos. *Ready.*

GOD THE FATHER

Archibald Thomas Robertson. “

THE SCRIPTURES. David James Burrell. “

HIS OWN PERSON..... *In preparation.*

CHRISTIAN CONDUCT..... “

THE HOLY SPIRIT..... “

THE FUTURE LIFE..... “

THE FAMILY.....

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE .....

A Series of volumes on the “Teachings of Jesus”  
by eminent writers and divines.

Cloth bound. 12mo. Price 75 cts. each postpaid.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

# THE TEACHING OF JESUS

CONCERNING

THE SCRIPTURES

*By*  
*David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.*

---

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY

150 NASSAU STREET

NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1904  
BY AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY

## PREFACE

---

*A* MAN named Jesus claims to be the incarnate Son of God. Whence has he come? From “the glory which he had with the Father before the world was.” What is he doing here? He says that he has come into the world to teach the truth; “To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth” (John xviii. 37).

He finds a book in the hands of the people which is generally regarded as true and trustworthy every way. They hold it to be an “infallible rule of faith

and practice," that is to say, it is their ultimate authority in doctrine and ethics. This book is constantly before him. What will he do with it? What will he have to say about it?

This question is one of supreme importance to those who profess to follow him. As to others, they are at liberty to believe what they like ; but those who call themselves disciples of Jesus have no alternative but to renounce him or to accept what he says. His Court is the Court of Last Resort, for them. It is just as well to remember this, in these controversial times. There are teachers and teachers, but there is only one teacher for Christians. When Hillel and Sham-mai have spoken their last word, we await his "Verily, verily, I say unto you." Any man is at liberty to quit Christ ; but no man can cleave to Christ and withhold aught of loyalty from him.



# CONTENTS

---

	PAGE
I. ANTECEDENT PRESUMPTION AS TO THE ATTITUDE OF JESUS TOWARD THE SCRIPTURES . . . . .	I
II. THE ACTUAL ATTITUDE OF JESUS TOWARD THE SCRIPTURES . . . . .	18
III. THE SPECIFIC TEACHING OF JESUS CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES . . . . .	87
IV. THE PROVISION OF JESUS FOR THE WRITING OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT . . . . .	162
V. THE SILENCE OF JESUS AS TO AL- LEGED ERRORS OF THE SCRIPTURES.	163
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION . . . . .	180
APPENDICES . . . . .	195
A. THE INCARNATION . . . . .	195
B. OTHER INCARNATIONS . . . . .	196
C. ERRORS IN SCRIPTURE . . . . .	198
D. KENOSIS . . . . .	199
INDICES . . . . .	203, 209

## CHAPTER I

### *Antecedent Presumption as to the Attitude of Jesus toward the Scriptures.*

**I**F there were no Bible we should all be wondering why ; nor would our wonder cease until we had made a Bible, however full of faults, to satisfy it. This is why there are so many "sacred books" in the world. They represent not only a universal longing but a universal sense of the fitness of things. Men want a Bible and must have it. "There is a spirit in man" and "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." We were

made in God's likeness and, fallen though we are, the glory is not all departed. There are memories, hopes, desires, aspirations that bind us back to God.\* One of the lingering echoes of our pristine dignity when we walked with God in the Garden in the cool of the day is the feeling, everywhere prevalent, that he somehow still holds converse with us.

To the calm judgment of a Baconian logician this proves nothing. Is it not just possible, however, that there are more things in heaven and earth than the inductive sages can demonstrate by their system of reasoning? Is it quite necessary to assume that all truth, particularly such as falls outside the province of the five physical senses, must be classified under the formula *quod erat demonstrandum*? How, then, about the things that are "spiritually discerned"?

This is not to say, however, that a dem-

\* The word "religion" is held by many to be from *re-ligare*, meaning "to bind back."

onstration of the truth of Scripture cannot be made. Far from it. But we thus justify our beginning this little book with certain universal facts which furnish only circumstantial evidence; facts which, like the *ergo* in *cogito ergo sum*, draw on the imagination. They do not land us in the safe harbor of conviction; but they make it pretty certain that the harbor is somewhere and that, with favoring winds, we may presently sail into it. In other words, they create a presumption in favor of the argument lying farther on.

I

We say, then, at the outset, that *if there is a God anywhere in the universe, and if we are his children, he cannot fail to communicate with us in some way*. To think otherwise would be to assume that he is either unable or unwilling to do so. In the former case he would not be omnipotent; in the latter case he would

not be kind, and in either case we should have no practical interest in him because he would not be God.

## II

Our second step brings us to the assumption that *if God reveals himself at all it will probably be in a human form.*

He is said to have created man in his own image and after his likeness, the highest of and dominant among the orders of life. Is not this, therefore, the form in which he would probably embody himself, if he is to embody himself at all?

It is worthy of note that the doctrine of the incarnation, so far from being the sole possession of the Christian Church, is practically universal; though oftentimes so vague and even grotesque as to furnish a pathetic commentary on the inadequacy of human wisdom to answer human need. From which we infer that it is manifestly in accord with reason,

in so far as reason is represented in the intuitions of the race. The false religions abound in avatars and theophanies, vain gropings toward a true embodiment of God.\*

Men search for God in nature ; and behold the Pantheon ! Here are gods from hill and valley ; nymphs, dryads, nereids, deifications of nature in every form. Men worship the sun, the scarabæus, great Moloch with his fiery arms, a lizard, a crocodile, an onion. O the lamentable depths to which the race

\* " God's general revelation of himself is by fixed laws of order which know no pity, which show no forgiveness, which are indifferent to the interests of individuals, which conceal the divine character in some respects while they reveal it in others. God's special revelation of himself by intervening among these laws in miraculous acts and inspired words brings him nearer to individual hearts, and yet it leaves him far away ; for, after all, but signs and sounds have been given, not himself ; he is himself still shrouded in darkness, still hidden where no man can approach him. Can he come yet nearer man, that man may draw closer to him ? Christianity answers, and its answer is Christ,—the person, the character and the work of Christ." Doctor Robert Flint in "*Faiths of the World.*"

has fallen in its eagerness to find or make a suitable symbol of the invisible God!

They search for him in philosophy with no better result. The thinkers of the Orient ended their researches in a polytheistic deification of the universe; affirming that all things are God. The Occidentals, on the other hand, arrived at pantheism; affirming that God is all things. These ultimates were equally false and equally true.\*

Shall God be evolved, then, from the inner consciousness? The utmost that a man can do in this direction is to project himself in large dimensions on the skies, like the Brocken of the Alps. As there are many men of many minds the result

\* Thales professed to have discovered in water the potency of life. Xenophanes proclaimed that nothing could be more divine than thought. Plato anticipated the investigations of modern scientists who declare that the Ultimate is all-pervading law or force. The Stoics were Agnostics, giving up the quest in despair; saying, like Fichte, "We know nothing, not even that we know nothing."

must be a corresponding multiplicity of gods.

How then can God unveil himself? We have exhausted our resources. The world grows weary of seeking him. The fulness of time is the hour of despair. He now appears, as announced in the protevangel, "The seed of woman shall bruise the serpent's head." The great Father desires to communicate with his children. Our human medium of communication is language. The "word" of the Father shall be articulated for his children's use. The Word is made flesh and dwells among us.\*

God is manifest in flesh. *Theanthropos!* The child wrapped in swaddling bands is the very God that sat upon the circle of the universe and called into being things that were not. The little hand, that lies, pink and dimpled, on its mother's breast, is the same that spun the new-created worlds into space, and rolls the

\* See Appendix A.



rattling thunders through the skies. The lips that murmur in response to her lullaby are destined to speak the words whereat, in the process of the centuries, the thrones of the Cæsars shall fall in irremediable ruin and give way to a kingdom of truth and righteousness. He hath upon his vesture and his thigh a name written—a name to be made clearer and clearer in the logic of events—“King of kings and Lord of lords.”

The truth thus stated is fundamental to Christianity. It bears the same relation to our doctrinal system that a mainspring bears to a watch. Every pin and wheel and lever of the mechanism is more or less important; but break the mainspring and the watch stops.

Not only so, this doctrine is the touchstone of Christian sincerity; as it is written, “Hereby know we the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth

not Jesus is not of God" (1 John iv. 2).\*

### III

This brings us to the third step in our presumption; namely, *If God were to reveal himself in human form he would probably supplement and complement that Incarnation by a Scripture.*

Otherwise how would the Incarnation be of any practical use beyond its own place and time? The true religion must, presumably, be coextensive with all races and generations. It must extend its beneficence not only "from the river to the ends of the earth" but from Adam to the last man. In order to accomplish this an Incarnation of God, unless other provision was made, would have to be not only ubiquitous but contemporaneous with the whole human race! Now Christ lived in a small corner of a remote portion of the earth, during a brief period of only thirty-three years. It is claimed,

\* See Appendix B.

however, that the benefits of that short and circumscribed life are made both universal and perpetual by the Scriptures which contain the record of it. In the Old Testament he is set forth prophetically as One who should, in the fulness of time, be born of a virgin, and whose name should be called Immanuel, "which is, being interpreted, God-with-us." In the New Testament he is set forth as the historic Incarnation of Deity. In the Old and New Testaments combined he is presented to all ages and generations, from the beginning to the end of the world, as God manifest in flesh for the deliverance of the world from sin.

It is difficult to imagine how God could have made himself known to men in any other way. We are not unaware of the importance of natural theology; but nature "speaks a various tongue." The vernal winds whisper one thing and Euroclydon screams another. A stranger in a strange land, gazing at the stars,

solaces his loneliness with the thought that they are shining also on his distant loved ones ; but that does not answer the purpose of a letter from home. Coleridge in the Valley of Chamounix hears "all the signs and wonders of the elements" echoing God ; but this falls infinitely short of the satisfaction he feels on opening the Book and seeing his Father's name ; a satisfaction which he expresses thus, "It finds me."

It is not unnatural, I say, that God's children in the far country should look for such a letter from home. And they all do. Witness the sacred books of all the nations. Poor counterfeits, indeed, but how pathetic ! They certify to a universal longing. The expatriates have been "watching the mails" from the beginning of the ages. Is there, then, no word from God ?

Enter, the Bible with its claim. But how shall we know that the Bible is the veritable Word of God ? Why

not the Vedas, the Tripitaka, the Zend-Avesta, the Analects of Confucius or the Koran? Reason must answer. All, including the Bible, are bound to stand or fall upon their comparative merits. And the question is not, Which is the best? but, Which is the one? For truth is one, absolute and exclusive. And it should be obvious that when God reveals the truth, he makes no mistakes; he kindles no false beacons; he tells no lies.

In this inquiry we must be guided by internal evidence. Here is one of the functions of scholarship. It kindles the fires under all the sacred books; if they burn, so be it. The true Word must come from the flames without so much as the smell of smoke upon it. Let those who doubt the veracity of Scripture turn on the fuming and corrosive acids of adverse criticism. It must abide the issue. And, perpetually, the world looks on.

As to the result, every man must judge for himself whether the Bible verifies its claim or not. But history has somewhat to say. The "logic of events" is irrefutable. It is a significant fact that the pathway of the centuries is lined with discredited and discarded oracles. The sacred books of antiquity were weighed successively in the balance and found wanting. Where is the Egyptian "Book of the Dead"? It survives only in fragments deciphered from mummy-crypts and bands of byssus. Where are the mythologies of the Greeks, the Romans and the Norsemen? Where are the philosophies of Greece? Of devotees they have practically none; the spectres of disappointment are their only mourners. And of the sacred books of Buddhism, Brahmanism and Islam, which still survive, three things must be observed: *first*, infallibility is not claimed for them; *second*, they have no calculable following among the civilized nations of

the earth ; and *third*, they represent religions which are stricken with death.

Meanwhile, what of the Bible? It is the Book of Christendom—that charmed circle which includes practically all the light and life of these days. It is the center of a controversy which represents the mental and moral energy of the world. It counts among its friends and defenders an ever increasing number of those who are distinguished for character and culture. Its enemies contribute to its triumph and perpetuity by their assaults upon it. “Hammer away, ye rebel bands ; your hammers break, God’s anvil stands !” It may be confidently affirmed that more people are reading the Bible to-day than ever before ; and—as certified by the roll-call of the universal church—more people than ever are affixing their faith to it. We do not say that this proves the truth of the Bible, by any means, but only that it opens the way. It warrants us in affirming that it

looks as if there might, perhaps, be something in the claim that it is the veritable Word of God.

#### IV

Our fourth step brings us to a full statement of our antecedent presumption, to wit: *If God were to reveal himself in both human form and in Scripture, the Man and the Book would be in perfect accord with each other.*

On the one hand, the Book would be not only true, in the necessity of the case, but a complete setting forth of God so far as it is important that man should know him. It does not fall within the writer's province, at this time, to traverse the argument for the authenticity and trustworthiness of Scripture except so far as that is covered by the teachings of Christ. Let it suffice here to say that the Bible claims to be the written Word of God.

On the other hand, a man claiming to



be incarnate God would have to be, in the necessity of the case, a true and complete revelation of God in all his practical relations with us. He would need to be, as it were, the articulate speech of God addressed to men. And this is precisely the claim which is made for Jesus Christ. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth" (John i. 1, 14). As we are made acquainted with one another through the medium of language, so the eternal Logos in his incarnation becomes, as it were, the articulated speech of God, by means of which we know him.

If these respective claims of Christ and the Bible are true, we should expect them to agree, each with the other, perfectly. If they meet this requirement, we must conclude that the argument for the truth

of either is strengthened an hundredfold. This then is the question: Does the Bible bear an unequivocal testimony to the claims of Jesus as the Incarnate Word, and does Jesus bear witness, correspondingly, to the claim of the Scriptures as the written Word of God? If so, in the two together, constituting the binomial Word, we may confidently rest as in a full, true and final revelation of God.

It is only with the latter half of this question that the writer has to do. His task is *to discover and state, as clearly as possible, what the Incarnate Word has to say respecting the Written Word of God.*

## CHAPTER II

### *The Actual Attitude of Jesus toward the Scriptures.*

**N**O amount of *a priori* argument, such as the patient reader found in Chapter first, can settle the matter in hand. It is easy enough to lay down antecedent presumptions and probabilities; but the question, after all, is purely a question of fact: What *was* Jesus's attitude toward the Scriptures? The obvious way to arrive at a satisfactory answer is by making a comprehensive survey of his life and teaching, so far forth as they have any reference whatsoever to the matter before us.

*I. The Preparation*

*Observe, at the outset, Jesus knew the Scriptures.* In his childhood he was instructed in them. He was surrounded by a religious atmosphere. The *mezuzah* with its passage of Scripture\* was affixed to the doorpost of his home. Joseph and Mary were loyal Jews and, as such, nurtured and instructed the Holy Child in the sacred Word. At the first this duty would naturally devolve on the mother. "It needed not the extravagant laudations, nor the promises held out by the rabbis," says Edersheim, "to incite Jewish women to this duty. If they were true to their descent, it would come almost naturally to them. But while the earliest religious teaching would, of necessity, come from the lips of the mother, it was the father who was 'bound to teach his son.' To impart to the child knowledge of the Torah conferred as

\* "The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth and even forevermore" (Ps. cxxi. 8).

great spiritual distinction, as if a man had received the Law itself on Mount Horeb. Every other engagement, even the necessary meal, should give place to this paramount duty ; nor should it be forgotten that, while here real labor was necessary, it would never prove fruitless. That man was of the profane vulgar (an *Am ha-arets*), who had sons but failed to bring them up in the knowledge of the Law." \*

At the age of five or six Jesus was sent

\* Directly the child learned to speak, his religious instruction was to begin—no doubt, with such verses of Holy Scripture as composed that part of the Jewish liturgy, which answers to our creed. Then would follow other passages from the Bible, short prayers, and select sayings of the sages. Special attention was given to the culture of the *memory*, since forgetfulness might prove as fatal in its consequences as ignorance or neglect of the Law. Very early the child must have been taught what might be called his birthday-text—some verse of Scripture beginning, or ending with, or at least containing, the same letters at his Hebrew name. This guardian-promise the child would insert in its daily prayers. The earliest hymns taught would be the Psalms for the days of the week, or festive Psalms, such as the *Hallel*, or those connected with the festive pilgrimages to Zion." Edersheim's "*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*."

to the rabbinical school, where the Bible was the only text-book. The course of study began with Leviticus and continued through the Pentateuch; after which the prophets and then the poetical books were taken up. Much attention was given to the memorizing of certain portions, particularly the important precepts of the law and the acrostic Psalms. At ten years of age the pupil was permitted to enter on the study of the Gemara and the fundamental doctrines of the Jewish faith.

In this connection the further words of Edersheim, himself a Jew, are significant: "From his intimate familiarity with Holy Scripture, in its every detail, we may be allowed to infer that the home of Nazareth, however humble, possessed a precious copy of the sacred volume in its entirety. At any rate, we know that from earliest childhood it must have formed the meat and drink of the God-man. The words of the Lord, as re-

corded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, also imply that the Holy Scriptures which he read were in the original Hebrew, and that they were written in the square, or Assyrian, characters. Indeed, as the Pharisees and Sadducees always appealed to the Scriptures in the original, Jesus could not have met them on any other ground ; and it was this which gave such point to his frequent expostulations with them : ‘ Have ye not read ? ’ But far other thoughts than theirs gathered around his study of the Old Testament of the Scriptures. When comparing their long discussions on the letter and law of Scripture with his references to the Word of God, it seems as if it were quite another book which was handled. As we gaze into the vast glory of meaning which he opens to us ; follow the shining track of heavenward living to which he points ; behold the lines of symbol, type, and prediction converging in the grand unity of that kingdom which became reality in him ;

or listen as, alternately, some question of his seems to rive the darkness as with flash of sudden light, or some sweet promise of old to lull the storm, some earnest lesson to quiet the tossing waves—we catch faint, it may be far-off, glimpses of how, in that early child-life, when the Holy Scriptures were his special study, he must have read them, and what thoughts must have been kindled by their light. And thus better than before can we understand it: ‘And the Child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him.’”\*

In the single authoritative glimpse which we have into the early life of Jesus we find him, at twelve years of age, in the temple sitting in the midst of the doctors, “hearing them and asking questions and answering” (Luke ii. 41-50). It was probably in that apartment of the temple known as the Hall Gazith; and in all the

\* Edersheim’s “*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*”



world there was no more distinguished body of scholars than those accustomed to assemble there. Of the number were Annas, the high priest and president of the Sanhedrin; Ben Uzziel, the Targumist who wrote the Chaldee Paraphrase; Joseph of Arimathea, a man of wealth and character; Ben Buta, who had been blinded by Herod for his devotion to the Jewish cause; Nicodemus; the aged Hillel, and Shammai, his rival; and Gamaliel, a professor in the University of Jerusalem, known as "the Flower of the Law." In the midst of such a distinguished assemblage stood the boy of twelve, "hearing, asking questions and answering them."

No intimation is given as to the themes traversed in this remarkable conference; but we cannot go far wrong in supposing that it had to do particularly with the supreme problems of life to wit: God, man and the reconciliation of man with God. The basis of the con-

ference was doubtless the Holy Scriptures, for here the wonderful Boy and the learned Rabbis were on common ground; and the one truth about which the conversation turned was, to a moral certainty, the prophecies of the coming of the Messiah, which were called "the Hope" or "Consolation of Israel." It would be scarcely possible for such a company of Biblical experts, under such circumstances, to refrain from discussing it. The Boy in the midst of them would ask, "Who is this Messiah? When he cometh, how will ye know him?" And they would answer, "He is to be King of Kings, 'great David's greater Son.' In the fulness of time he will appear to deliver Israel; and he will reign in glory among us." The Boy would ask, "What then is the meaning of this scripture, 'A virgin shall conceive and bear a son and call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us'; or of this, 'He is a man of sorrows and acquainted with

grief, and we hid as it were our faces from him; he is wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, that by his stripes we might be healed? Or what is the meaning of your sacrifices? Why is the blood of the Paschal lamb sprinkled on the lintel of every doorway and upon all the sacred things of the temple? Why this blood, blood, blood everywhere?" And they could only say in their bewilderment, "It is written that if a man sin and bring a lamb without spot or blemish to the altar, his sin is taken from him." "But how can the blood of a lamb atone for sin? How can it wash away the crimson stain?" And they knew not. This boy of twelve was their Messiah; and they did not recognize him. He was himself the anti-type of all their sacrifices. His was the blood that should cleanse from sin. Was he aware of his personality and mission? Aye; always. The realization of his mission began with his dawning

consciousness. He knew who he was, whence he had come and what his errand was. Else what did he mean when he said to his mother, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" It is true that, in assuming mortal form, he "emptied himself" of the outward tokens of his Godhood; but never for a moment in such manner as to become ignorant of his mission or unable to perform it.\*

## *II. His Inauguration into His Ministry*

The time having come for the beginning of his great work, he one day closed the carpenter shop and never returned to

\* The proof-text of "the Kenosis" or emptying of Christ is Philippians ii. 5-11. It affirms of Christ that he laid aside not his Godhood but the "form" of it; not his essential glory but the "fashion" of it. In taking upon him "the form of a servant" he held the exercise of his divine attributes in abeyance; as a King lays aside his crown, scepter and purple robe, but always within reach. On frequent occasions he exercised his omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence; and never was he so divested of them as to endanger the perfect exercise of his functions as the Christ of God.

it. The work to which he had looked forward with desire, saying, "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how is my soul straitened until I shall accomplish it," was before him.

*Observe how, from this time forward, he made the Scriptures his rule of faith and practice.* He betook himself, straightway, to the Jordan, where John was baptizing, and presented himself "to be baptized of him." And when John refused saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thus to me?" he had immediate recourse to the Scriptures, replying, "Suffer it now; for *thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*" (Matt. iii. 13-17). In the Law it was prescribed that Aaron and his sons should be inaugurated into the holy office of the priesthood by being "washed with water at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation" (Ex. xxix. 4). It was incumbent on Jesus, as he entered upon the work of priestly sacrifice and intercession,

to comply with and complete that law. In this experience he struck the keynote of his entire ministry, which was in perfect accord with the Scriptures every way. The divine approval of this act was signified at his baptism by the descent of the Spirit and the Voice from heaven, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."

He was a loyal Jew, and the New Economy had not yet begun. If a son of Levi must be washed at the brazen laver on assuming his ministerial functions, so should Jesus; but instead of the temple we have the deep valley and the overarching skies; instead of the laver, the swift-flowing Jordan; instead of the anointing, the descent of the dove. Now this Jesus is the source and center of all right precepts and injunctions; his heart is the throne of law; the writings of Sinai are the flashings of his eye; yet under the Law he bows and passes into servitude. Though equal with God, he

takes upon him the form of a servant and becomes obedient. The inaugural rite is his bounden duty; to obey is better than sacrifice. "Thus it becometh me, as the 'Son of man'—that is, the ideal and representative Man—to fulfil all righteousness." If he thus respected the humblest duty, surely the same is becoming in us.

His next step was equally significant. From the Jordan he was "led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." In the continuous conflict of those forty days, thrice did the adversary assault the citadel of his character and thrice was he met and repelled with the Sword of the Spirit. To the first temptation which was addressed to the physical infirmity of Jesus he answered, "*It is written*, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'" To the second, which was directed at his Messianic consciousness and fortified by

a cleverly distorted reference to Scripture, he answered, "*It is written*, 'Thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God.'" To the third, which was a specious attempt to divert him from his purpose of establishing the kingdom through his vicarious death, he answered, "Get thee hence, Satan : *for it is written*, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' Then the devil leaveth him ; and behold, angels came and ministered unto him." "It is written!" "It is written!" "It is written!" Where? In the Scriptures. Thus Jesus not only vindicated his own character, as against all approach of evil, but tested triumphantly the mettle of his weapon, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (Eph. vi. 17).

Then back to the Jordan he turned his steps. The Baptist was still preaching and baptizing there. On seeing Jesus he said, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the



world!" Here is a plain reference to the Messiah, in whom all the sacrificial rites of Israel were to find their fulfillment, whose blood was to be shed for the cleansing from sin. Jesus accepted the title without demur, and then and there gathered about him the little group of disciples who were to follow him during his earthly ministry, forming the nucleus of that great and ever increasing multitude who were destined to serve him through the ages.

The record states that John and Andrew "abode with him that day." It would appear that in their interview with Jesus he must have opened the Scriptures unto them respecting the "Hope of Israel;" for Andrew immediately sought his brother Simon saying, "We have found the Messiah (which is, being interpreted, Christ)." And the day following, Philip, after a like interview, sought his friend Nathanael saying, "We have found him, of whom Moses in the

law and the prophets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." And when Nathanael objected incredulously, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" he answered, "Come and see;" from which we infer that Christ, in all such conferences with his early disciples, made it clear that he was the one "whom kings and prophets longed to see and died without the sight." Such a result could only have been achieved by an argument based upon the Scriptures to which these men affixed their faith.

### *III. The Judean Ministry*

Thus Christ began his public work by opening, expounding and putting into practice the Holy Scriptures. And thenceforward during the three years of his eventful life, we observe how incessantly he preached the Word.

The first authoritative act of his ministry was at the Passover, A. D. 27, when he purged the temple with a scourge of

small cords. In answer to the religious leaders who indignantly asked, "What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?" he said "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." That this was intended to be a reference to such prophecies as bore upon his resurrection is evident from what follows: "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this; *and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said*" (John ii. 13-22).

The next incident in the ministry of Jesus was his interview with Nicodemus (John iii. 1-21). This, also, illustrates his habit of teaching along Scriptural lines. The doctrine of regeneration, announced as a mystery, was followed by the practical and consequential doctrine of justification by faith, which he set forth in terms of kindergarten simplicity by an object lesson, "As Moses lifted up

the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life." Thus his last appeal was to the Scriptures. In the practical application of truth, the great Preacher always brought his hearers back to the Word of God.

#### *IV. The Galilean Ministry*

The interview of Jesus with the woman of Samaria on his way to Galilee, is another instance of his Scriptural method (John iv. 1-42). The references to the well which Jacob digged, to the mountain of worship, to the Judaic source of salvation and to the spiritual nature of the Deity are all biblical. And when, at the climacteric point of his interview, the doctrine of the Messiah was reached, it was like the lifting of a veil. Is there anything anywhere in the teaching of Jesus, clearer, more positive or more illuminating as to his relation to the rites

and symbols and prophecies of the Old Economy, than his closing words "I that speak unto thee am he"?

The first reported sermon of Jesus was at Nazareth. He had been teaching and working miracles for some months, in Judea and Galilee, when he returned to his native village. It is safe to say that his townsmen were on the *qui vive* to hear him. On the Sabbath he went to the synagogue "as his custom was." It was the rule to open the service with the singing of a Psalm. Then came the reading of a portion of the Pentateuch, followed by a lesson from the Prophets.\* It was customary at this point to request any distinguished stranger, known as a loyal Jew, who chanced to be present, to act as *Sheliach Tsibbur*, or "Messenger of the Congregation," on whom devolved the special duty of expounding the lesson of the day. The lesson on this

\* See Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Book III. Chap. X.

particular day was from the sixty-first of Isaiah, and Jesus was invited to read and discourse upon it. The *chazzan* or "minister" approached the chest and brought from it reverently the scroll of the prophecy, which, being carefully unwound from its cloth wrappings, was placed in the hands of Jesus, who opened it and read: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor; he hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke iv. 18, 19). The interest of the congregation is indicated in the words "And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him." His discourse is not given in full; but it is said to have been distinctly expository, and its personal bearing on the great question of the Messiahship is affirmed in the brief summary: "*To-day hath this*

*scripture been fulfilled in your ears."* At the conclusion of his discourse all were agreed in bearing him witness and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth; but they were not prepared to accept his interpretation of Isaiah's prophecy as applying to himself. "Is not this Joseph's son?" they asked. And when they demanded "a sign," he reminded them, with Scriptural illustrations, that "no prophet is acceptable in his own country;" whereupon they "were filled with wrath and rose up and cast him forth out of the city."

The sermon at Nazareth may serve as an example of the Master's method in all his subsequent preaching. *Ex uno, disce omnes.* Wherever he went he preached the Word. "And many hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that is given unto this man?" (Mark. vi. 2). In all such cases

the comprehensive answer of Jesus was "My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me" (John vii. 16), which, while indicating his mysterious essential union with the Father, was but another way of expressing his absolute loyalty to and accord with the written Word of God.

On leaving Nazareth he came to Capernaum which was to be, thenceforth, the center of his work. "And straightway, on the Sabbath day, he entered into the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as having authority and not as the scribes" (Mark i. 21, 22). The word here rendered "authority" is the Greek *ἐξουσία*, which designates an inward source. He taught not as the scribes, who referred for their authority to other teachers, but as one who could say, "I am the Truth." He taught not like the prophets, who introduced their discourses with "Thus saith the Lord," since he and the Father were in such complete



harmony that their word was one; wherefore he spoke on this wise: "Verily, verily, I say unto you." How bold is this manifesto! Who is this that sets his *ipse dixit* against precedent, tradition, the teaching of all ancient worthies? How this "I say unto you" goes crashing through the elaborate fabrics which had been set up by ecclesiastical courts and councils! Here is a tone of authority which finds no parallel except in the thunders of Sinai. No other preacher can dogmatize in this manner. He could speak thus not only because of his singular oneness with the Father but because, also, of his deep insight into the meaning of the divine Word and his absolute loyalty to it.

With Capernaum as his center of operations he made a number of memorable itineraries among the villages of Galilee, "preaching the good tidings of the kingdom of God." His plan was to enter the synagogues and discourse from the

Scriptures, according to custom, respecting the great doctrines of which his own Messiahship was chiefest of all.

The second Passover in the ministry of Jesus found him back at Jerusalem (John v. 1). On his arrival he visited the porches of Bethesda, where he healed a paralytic on the Sabbath. The religious leaders at once accused him of violating the Sabbath law; whereupon he preached the wonderful discourse recorded in the fifth of John in which he showed his devotion to the Scriptures, even to their last jot and tittle, while overwhelming the scribes and Pharisees with the most scathing denunciations on account of the sacrilegious liberties which they had taken with them. In these discourses he not only vindicates his own authority by reason of his singular relation to the Father as his incarnate Word, but yokes with it inseparably the authority of the written Word; as when he says, "The works which the Father hath given me to ac-

complish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me. And the Father that sent me, he hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form. And *ye have not his word abiding in you* : for whom he sent, him ye believe not. *Ye search the Scriptures ; because ye think that in them ye have eternal life ; and these are they which bear witness of me ;* and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life. I receive not glory from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in yourselves. I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not : if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe, which receive glory one of another, and the glory that cometh from the only God ye seek not ? Think not that I will accuse you to the Father : there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. *For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe*

*me : for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words ?*” (John v. 36-47).

All his preaching, during this brief visit at Jerusalem, was of the same tenor. It was a continual tribute to the truth and trustworthiness of Scripture. When the disciples were taken to task for going through the tilled fields on the Sabbath and rubbing the wheat in their hands in order to satisfy their hunger, he defended them by an appeal to Scripture ; “ *Have ye not read in the law, that on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are guiltless ? But I say unto you, that one greater than the temple is here. But if ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless*” (Matt. xii. 5-7).

A little later, while in attendance at one of the synagogues, he healed a man with a withered hand ; and when there was an outcry against this obvious viola-

tion of the rabbinical *toldoth*, his answer was an appeal from the false interpretation and superfluous citations of the rabbis to the original design and true significance of the law (Matt. xii. 9-14).

On returning to Capernaum he was "followed by a great multitude, when they had heard what great things he did." He spake to them, again and again, in the streets, on the hillsides, by the shore of the Lake: and always the burden of his discourse was "Return to the Word of God!"

It was somewhere about this time that he preached the Sermon on the Mount. Its Golden Text is, "*Think not that I came to destroy the law, or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all things be accomplished. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom*

*of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven*" (Matt. v. 17–19). In the whole of this wonderful discourse he shows not only his perfect acquiescence in and devotion to the teachings of Holy Writ but his divine insight into its significance. He ruthlessly exposes the errors in the Biblical expositions and interpretations of the scribes and elders—their *toldoth*, their eisegesis, their "traditions"—and insists imperatively on getting back to the original and down into the uttermost meaning of things. It is not the voice of the destroyer but of the restorer that we hear in his "Ye have heard—but I say unto you!"

One reason why "the common people heard him gladly" was because his preaching was so distinctly Scriptural. They believed in the Scriptures; if ever there was a people against whom the charge of bibliolatry could justly be made it was these Jews. When they went to

the synagogue it was with the desire and expectation of hearing a doctrinal or ethical discourse on that particular portion of the Scripture which was designated as "the lesson of the day." An expression of personal opinion on the part of the preacher was of little interest to them ; as little, indeed, as it is to the people of these days. Who cares, at the back and bottom of the matter, what this or that Doctor of Divinity thinks about the great problems of eternity? His breath is in his nostrils ; wherefore his experimental pilgrimages and peregrinations in *Terra Incognita* are no more important than those of any other man. One can guess as well as another ; and every one can conjure up enough "ifs" and "perhapses" of his own without going to church for them. The people go to church to hear a preacher set forth plainly not what he supposes but what God says. They want the clear light of a *Thus saith the Lord* on the

problems along the heavenward way. If the man in the pulpit has nothing better to offer than hypotheses, based on no better authority than personal opinion, they may lend an ear for a while to his fine phrases but sooner or later they will quit him for another who can lean on Scripture and say Yea and Amen. Jesus preached in this positive manner. To his personal authority as the divine Son—an authority which he shared with no other preacher whatsoever—he added a constant appeal to the ultimate and conclusive authority of the Scriptures: he “*preached the Word*” (Mark ii. 1, 2, et al.). In his miracles of healing he consistently honored it; as when he said to the leper at Chorazin, “Go shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, *according as Moses commanded*, for a testimony unto them” (Luke v. 14).

It was about this time that John the Baptist, a prisoner in the castle of Machaerus, sent messengers to him ask-



ing, "Art thou he that should come or look we for another?" The question having been answered in a most satisfactory and conclusive manner, he called the attention of the multitude to John himself as set forth in ancient prophecy; and his words are in notable contrast with certain views of prophecy which are advanced in our time. Hear him; "What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses. But wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. *This is he, of whom it is written,* Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet, he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is

greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force. *For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And if ye are willing to receive it, this is Elijah that is to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear* ” (Matt. xi. 7-15).

His credentials, as the divine Son, being called in question by the scribes and Pharisees, who clamored for a sign, he answered them by falling back on a notable sign given in the Scriptures (Matt. xii. 38-40) and put their unbelief to shame on this wise, “The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here ” (Matt. xii. 42).

A woman who chanced to be among his hearers was so carried away with enthusiasm that she cried, “Blessed is

the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou didst suck!" to which he answered, "Yea, rather, *blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it*" (Luke xi. 27-28). Was greater tribute than this ever paid to the Word of God?

At this point his teaching was largely in parables, and this method having been challenged he defended it by a reference to Scripture, showing that he was pursuing the divinely appointed path of instruction: "*Unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should heal them*" (Matt. xiii. 14, 15).

And when his disciples asked, in par-

ticular, for an interpretation of the parable of "*the sower who soweth the Word,*" he said, "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man" (Matt. xiii. 37).

In the last of the series of parables, uttered on this occasion, he laid down a comprehensive rule of homiletics for all preachers and for all time; "Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea. And he said unto them, Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old" (Matt. xiii. 51, 52). The preacher is here likened to an oriental host who receives a stranger into his home. Desirous of entertaining him he brings forth his wealth and spreads it before him. There were no banks or other places of safe deposit in those days. Treasure was buried in the ground or kept in a recess in the wall. The householder here goes to his treasury and brings

out things new and old : antique coins ; necklaces worn by princes of long ago ; golden shields bearing the dint of old-time battles ; precious stones plucked from the crowns of captive kings ; the loot of the campaigns of ages. All these are spread before the eyes of his wondering guest. Now, says Jesus, the scribe is the custodian of God's treasury. The preacher is a "scribe." It is his special function to expound the divine Word. The key is at his girdle. His business is to bring forth the wealth of Scripture, new truths and old truths, to dazzle the eyes.

The Pharisees having brought an accusation against Jesus, that he was "the friend of sinners" and that he "ate and drank with sinners," he made his defense on Scriptural grounds ; "*Go and learn,*" he said, "*what that meaneth,* I will have mercy and not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13 cf. Hosea vi. 6). In this saying he intimated his reliance on Scripture, in its deep spirit-

ual significance, as the final arbiter in all questions of right and wrong.

In his discourse at Capernaum, on the day following the miracle of the loaves, his assertion that he was himself the living bread of which if a man ate he should hunger no more, was openly resented by the Pharisees; to whom he replied, "*It is written in the prophets, 'And they shall be all taught of God.'* Every man that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (John vi. 45, cf. Micah iv. 2 et al.). This is no vague reference to an all-pervasive voice in nature, nor yet to the specific word of any inspired writer, but rather to the whole tenor of the Scriptures as pointing to Christ. And he goes on to explain by an allusion to the manna in the wilderness: "I am the bread of life. Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, and they died. This is the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which

came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world" (John vi. 47-51). Thus, over and over again, he shows himself not merely a preacher of the Word but a consistent and unwavering believer in it.

A complaint being made against the disciples for "transgressing the traditions of the elders" by eating without having previously washed their hands, he answered "Why do ye also transgress the *commandment of God* by your tradition?" (Matt. xv. 2, 3). He thus tore up the very foundations of their reasoning by announcing that no ecclesiastical prescript or human requirement whatsoever is for a moment to be compared with the Scriptures in binding force. They go for naught when they are at variance with the divine law. And, having laid down this fact, as a general proposition, the Master went on to emphasize it: "*For*

*God said*, Honor thy father and thy mother: and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is given to God; he shall not honor his father. *And ye have made void the word of God* because of your tradition. Ye hypocrites, *well did Isaiah prophesy of you* saying, This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" (Matt. xv. 4-9). Could anything be stronger than this "God said—but ye say?" Is it not obvious that to the mind of Jesus the Word was ultimate and there was no going beyond or getting behind it?

#### *V. The Perea Ministry*

As Jesus purposed to be present at the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles,



he set out with his disciples for the Holy City. This was that historic journey of which it is written, "He set his face steadfastly to go." The shadow of the cross was over him, but he swerved not an inch from his appointed path. Up to this time he had not clearly informed his disciples as to the fate awaiting him ; but now, as they journeyed, "he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and be killed and, after three days, rise again" (Mark viii. 31). How was this "teaching" done? If anything is to be inferred from his invariable custom, it was by "opening unto them the Scriptures." It is easy to imagine him, who from his childhood had dwelt in the atmosphere of revelation, reminding them not only of the many, many prophecies, but of the deep significance of all the sacrificial rites and symbols of the Old Economy, and showing how they pointed to him as the Lamb of

God. Indeed it is difficult to imagine how the truth which he desired to convey could have been impressed upon them in any other way. And when Peter, revolting at the thought of the Master's death, exclaimed "Be it far from thee! Lord this shall not be unto thee!" he rebuked him for offering a satanic suggestion against the vicarious sacrifice, saying, "Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God but the things of men." If this means anything, it indicates that Jesus, in foretelling his death, was following the red path of divine prophecy leading all through Scripture from the protevangel to the cross. It was not the path of human wisdom but the one which, in the Scriptures, was divinely marked out for him.

It was in the course of this journey, probably, that the transfiguration occurred. Six days after the departure from Capernaum Jesus turned aside, with three of his disciples, and climbed the

mountain where he was transfigured before them. In this scene he is significantly presented in converse with Moses and Elijah, representatives of the law and the prophets. Thus the written and the incarnate Word stood face to face. Moses, looking backward over the lapse of fifteen hundred years, knew now the real significance of all that he had been divinely moved to write in the ceremonial law ; and Elijah, also looking back, through a vista of nine hundred years, perceived the fulfillment of prophecy in Christ. And to emphasize this fulfillment of the written Word in its living complement, a Voice from heaven was heard, saying, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him !"

It is further recorded that, as Christ and the three disciples were coming down out of the mountain, they asked him, "Why say the scribes that Elijah must first come ?" His answer is in direct contravention of those who allow

that any Scripture can come to naught ; “ And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things : and *how is it written* of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought ? But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they would, *even as it is written* ” (Mark ix. 12, 13 ; cf. Matt. xvii. 10–13). The word “ verily ” is used in the teaching of Jesus to emphasize only the most important truths. And in showing these disciples “ how it is written ” it is evident that again he “ opened unto them the Scriptures ” with reference to his sufferings as the Son of man. Thus the Book is ever open before him.

On reaching Jerusalem the Master went up to the temple and began to teach. So wonderful were his words that “ the Jews marvelled, saying, *How knoweth this man letters, having never learned ?* ” Let it be remembered that the education of the Jews from childhood up was in the

Bible and in such literature only as bore more or less directly upon it. So that when they spoke of Christ's acquaintance with "letters" they referred to his familiarity with the Scriptures and their interpretation. The profound grasp of the Scriptures exhibited by a peasant, a mere carpenter, this was what amazed them. His answer was, "My teaching is not mine but his that sent me" (John vii. 15-18) and, that his reference was distinctly to the teaching of the Scriptures is clear from what follows: "*Did not Moses give you the law; and yet none of you keepeth it;*" and he proceeded to give a specific illustration of their departure from the clear meaning of the Word (John vii. 19-24).

On the last day of the feast, during the imposing ceremonies known as "the Effusion of Waters," Jesus stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, *as the Scripture hath said*, from

within him shall flow rivers of living water " (John vii. 37, 38). Here again we note the ever recurring, "*It is written*" which characterized the preaching of Christ. He did not take a text of Scripture as the headline of his discourse ; but his discourse was shot through and through with the Word of God.

One morning, a little later, he went early into the Temple and taught the people who came thronging about him. He was interrupted presently by a mob, led by scribes and Pharisees, who, dragging a woman taken in adultery threw her on the pavement before him, saying, " Moses in the law commanded that such should be stoned ; but what sayest thou ? " They intimated that he had been giving them a surfeit of Moses' law ; let him take his own medicine. There was no shrinking on his part ; but what scorn ! What unutterable scorn in his silence ! " He stooped and wrote upon the ground." Perhaps he merely read what

he had written there, when, looking on the woman's accusers, he said "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone at her." Here was not a word, not a syllable, against the law, such as they had expected, but the broadest, deepest, truest interpretation of it (John viii. 2-11).

This incident led to a discourse on the relation of Jesus to the Father, and on the testimony of the Father to his Sonship: "*It is written in your law* that the testimony of two witnesses is true. I am one that bear witness of myself; and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me." The reference here is to the Scriptures; it cannot be otherwise. And the whole discourse on this occasion, as recorded in John viii. is a far-reaching statement of the absolute accord of Jesus with the written Word, putting to confusion those who called themselves children of Abraham while refusing to obey Abraham's God and driving them to a very frenzy of hatred by his sublime

peroration "Before Abraham was, I am!"

At the Feast of Dedication (Dec. -20), Jesus having made several itineraries in Perea and elsewhere, was again present in Jerusalem. As he was teaching in Solomon's Porch the Jews renewed their attack on his Messianic credentials; "Tell us plainly," they said, "if thou be the Christ." He told them plainly; and they charged him with blasphemy, "because thou, being a man, makest thyself God." He again defended himself by falling back on the Scriptures, "*Is it not written in your law*, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, *unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken)*, say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John x. 34-36).

Being driven out of Jerusalem again by the malignity of his enemies, he took refuge in a city called Ephraim;



where he remained until the cross beckoned him. The time of the fourth Passover was drawing near when he set out for the Holy City. It is a singular fact, that in sending out his disciples to preach in the villages along the way, not a word occurs in their commission to indicate specifically what they were to preach. It is left for us to assume that they were to follow the example of their Leader in pointing out his Messianic office and work, as a fulfillment of the law and the prophets; that is, they were to preach the written Word as setting forth the incarnate Word. And that this was their mode of procedure seems clear from the words of Jesus on their return, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see; for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not" (Luke x. 23, 24).

It was somewhere on this journey that a certain lawyer (i. e. theologian) stood up and tested him saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? Now mark his answer, "*What is written in the Law? How readest thou?*" (Luke x. 25-28). Would that all his ministers were as faithful as Christ himself in referring sinners, learned or otherwise, to the Scriptures as the oracles of life!

In his preaching at this time he was most unsparing in his denunciation of the scribes or "lawyers." There was good and sufficient reason for this in their inefficiency and malfeasance as interpreters of the divine law. This was their special and particular function; to open the Scriptures to the people. They were the "Biblical experts" of that time. But how wretchedly they botched their work! On the one hand they emphasized the minor requirements of Scripture to the neglect of truth and righteousness; and on the other they added super-

erogatory precepts of their own ; the result being that their version of the Scriptures bore about the same relation to the original as the "Polychrome Bible" does in these days. Wherefore the Lord denounced them, saying "Woe unto you, lawyers (that is, instructors in Biblical literature,) *for ye have taken away the key of knowledge!* Ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered" (Luke xi. 45, 52). The "key of knowledge" here referred to was the doctrine of Messiah, his incarnation, atonement and triumph over death in behalf of all believers ; a doctrine which opens the true meaning of the Scriptures, and without which they are as meaningless as an indecipherable hieroglyph. This doctrine was rejected by those who were specially appointed to use it for the enlightening of the people, wherefore the Lord's "Woe unto you." The close application of his words on this occasion to certain par-

ticipants in current Biblical controversy affords a striking illustration of the adjustment of Christ's teaching to the progress of the centuries and to the needs of every age.

The religious leaders, particularly the Pharisees or orthodox party, were so infuriated by his teaching and so carried away with envy by reason of his hold upon the people\* that they openly ridiculed him; whereupon he rebuked them on this wise, "Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God" (Luke xvi. 15). And continuing he said, "*The law and the prophets* (that is, the Scriptures) *were until John*; from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it. But *it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away,*

\* Being "covetous" (*φιλάργυροι*) they "derided him" (Luke xvi. 14).

*than for one tittle of the law to fall*" (Luke xvi. 16, 17). "By the law and the prophets" he meant the Scriptures (as we shall see further on) and by saying that they "were until John" he could only mean that they had been divinely intended as a trustworthy guide in all things looking forward and leading up to the gospel dispensation. In so far as they were prophetic or symbolical they were proven true by their perfect fulfillment in that dispensation as "the kingdom of God."

Then followed the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in which the Master laid a still clearer and deeper emphasis on the importance and saving power of the Scriptures. For when Dives requested, in behalf of his five brethren, that one might be sent from the world of spirits to warn them of the terrible doom of a sinful life, the answer was "If *they hear not Moses and the prophets*, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from

the dead" (Luke xvi. 31). The only possible meaning of these words is that Moses and the prophets (that is, the Scriptures, as we shall see presently,) were a sufficient and trustworthy guide to salvation, and that God, in giving the Scriptures, had done the utmost possible to lead men to eternal life.

The attempt of the Pharisees to entangle him in the question of divorce led to a further statement of his unswerving loyalty to the written Word. "Is it lawful," they asked, "for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" to which he replied, "*What did Moses command you?*" And when they betook themselves evasively to a temporary provision made for Israel "because of the hardness of their hearts"—an exception which merely served to confirm the rule—he drove them relentlessly back to the sanctity of the marriage law, "*Have ye not read*, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female,

and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh? So that they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 4-6). In this, as in all his other teaching, he showed his faith in Scripture as the infallible rule of faith and practice for all people, under all circumstances and in every age.

As he journeyed among the villages a certain ruler came running and prostrated himself before him, asking "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" His answer, "*keep the commandments,*" shows again, his constant and consistent advocacy of the Scriptures. In his further counsel to this ruler he develops the fact, brought out afterwards in doctrinal form by Paul, that "the law is a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ;" and, inferentially, that a man who rejects the authority of the law as contained in the

Old Testament is not likely to be greatly helped by the gospel in his search for eternal life.

### *VI. Passion Week*

On Palm Sunday, April 2, 30 A. D., the Lord returned to Jerusalem from his last itinerary, fulfilling in every incident of his triumphal entry the prophecies which had been uttered concerning him. On presenting himself in the temple, where the lingering echoes of the popular adulations followed him, he was rebuked by the high priests and scribes for permitting the Hosannas of the children. Again he referred them to the Scriptures, saying "*Yea, did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?*" (Matt. xxi. 16).

And when certain Greeks came saying, "We would see Jesus," he, seeing in them the vanguard of the mighty army of the redeemed who were to be



given him as the fruit of the travail of his soul, spoke of his vicarious death, concluding "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." This provoked the reply, "We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth forever; and how sayest thou, 'The Son of man must be lifted up?' Who is this Son of man?" To which he answered, "Yet a little while is the light among you. Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not; and he that walketh in the darkness knoweth not whither he goeth. While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light" (John xii. 35, 36). We are thus informed (*a*) that "Son of man" was regarded as a Messianic title, (*b*) that Jesus appropriated this title to himself, (*c*) that being "lifted up" was understood as referring to death by crucifixion, (*d*) that Christ by his vicarious death on the cross was to become the Saviour of all who should

be drawn to believe in him, and (e) that all this is taught in the Old Testament. For Jesus and his controversial opponents were alike, on this occasion, speaking within the circumscription of the law.

In the second cleansing of the temple, which occurred at this time, our Lord justified his apparently high-handed procedure by saying "*It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer: but ye make it a den of robbers*" (Matt. xxi. 13).

In further defense of his Messianic authority he uttered the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen who rejected the messengers sent them by the owner of the vineyard and, finally, slew his beloved son. The application was perfectly clear; and it was clinched with the words, "*Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner; this was from the Lord, and it is marvelous in our eyes?*" (Matt. xxi. 42).

The religious leaders, infuriated by this sort of teaching and all the more because it was impregnably fortified by their own Scriptures, endeavored to ensnare him in his words. One of the Sadducees propounded the thumb-worn question of the sevenfold widow : "Teacher, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave a wife behind him, and leave no child, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were seven brethren : and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed ; and the second took her, and died, leaving no seed behind him ; and the third likewise : and the seven left no seed. Last of all the woman also died. In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of them ? for the seven had her to wife " (Mark. xii. 19-23). The answer of Jesus was a distinct challenge of their method of expounding the Word, which must have been doubly galling to those whose profession was

that of Biblical experts, "Is it not for this cause that ye err, that *ye know not the Scriptures*, nor the power of God? For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as angels in heaven. But as touching the dead, that they are raised; *have ye not read in the book of Moses*, in the place concerning the Bush, How God spake unto him saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: ye do greatly err" (Mark xii. 24-27). This is ideal Biblical exposition, an example for all who, like Jesus, believe in the Scriptures and aim to arrive at their real meaning.

The next question was by one of the Pharisees, who is mentioned also as "a scribe" and "a lawyer." They were evidently putting forth their best man to measure swords with Jesus in expounding the Law. "What is the first commandment of all?" he asked; and Jesus,

in his answer, gave that wonderful summary which the world has ever since received as its best and briefest compendium of ethics: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. *On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets*" (Matt. xxii. 37-40).

The method of Jesus in approaching the Scriptures is further illustrated in a later conference with the Pharisees: He asked them, saying, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, *How then doth David in the Spirit call him Lord*, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet? If David then calleth him Lord, how is he his son? And no one was able to answer him a word, neither

durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions'' (Matt. xxii. 42-46). Observe, Jesus asked the question, but did not elucidate it. Having given them food for reflection, he left them to digest it at their leisure. It may be worth our while to inquire how the destructive critics of our own time would answer it. (*a*) Some would evade the difficulty by denying that the one hundred and tenth Psalm is Davidic. What matters it that this Psalm, which is more frequently quoted by Christ and his apostles than any other portion of the Old Testament, is invariably ascribed to David? They deny it. What matters it that Jesus affirmed without if or peradventure that David was its author? They deny it. What matters it that the testimony of the Christian Church through all the centuries, as formulated in its creeds and confessions, is to the same purport? They deny it. (*b*) Others would answer by disputing the Messianic character of the Psalm.

If forced to admit that David was the author, they still insist that his reference was to one of his own princely sons. But which of them could meet the manifesto? Absalom, the scapegrace, or Solomon, the wise fool? Was there ever one of David's immediate or remoter lineage who became a priest, and a perpetual priest? Was ever one enthroned at Jehovah's right hand, the place of equality with him? Did ever one rally an army like the dewdrops of morning and go forth to universal conquest? Nay; surely the meaning lies deeper. The question is not answered yet. (c) Others, still, if forced to admit the Davidic and Messianic character of the Psalm, will deny its reference to Jesus. Nevertheless they profess to believe in him who said, as plainly as words could express it, "I am that One!" It was of precisely such men, the religious leaders of his time who professed to believe in the Messiah and to be looking for him, that he said

in words as scathingly denunciatory as they were pathetically tender, "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life!" Blind, blind under the noonday sun!

On Tuesday of Passion Week our Lord delivered his last public discourses. They were largely prophetic, relating to the overthrow of Jerusalem, the end of the world, the second advent and the judgment. In predicting these things he declares that he is reaffirming the prophecies of Holy Writ; "*that all things which are written may be fulfilled*" (Luke xxi. 22). He speaks of "*until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*" (Luke xxi. 24), and of the abomination of desolation which was *spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place*"\* (Matt. xxiv. 15) and of Noah, "For as in

\* This reference is worthy of note in view of the discredit put upon the prophet Daniel in these days.



those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall be the coming of the Son of man" (Matt. xxiv. 38, 39).

As Jesus sat at the Pascal supper with his disciples in the upper room, he spoke of the approaching betrayal as a fulfillment of the Scripture, "He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me" (John xiii. 18; cf. Ps. xli. 9); of his abandonment by the disciples in like manner, "All ye shall be offended in me this night: for *it is written*, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad" (Matt. xxvi. 31; cf. Zech. xiii. 7); also of the persecution of his enemies, "*that the word may be fulfilled that is written in their law*, They hated me without a cause (John xv. 25; cf. Psalm xxxv. 19); of himself as going "*even as it is written*" (Matt. xxvi. 24),

and still more explicitly, “ *This which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors; for that which concerneth me hath fulfillment* ” (Luke xxii. 37).

In his sacerdotal prayer on the same occasion, he associates himself with the written Word on this wise, “ I manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them to me; and *they have kept thy Word*. Now they know that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are from thee: for the words which thou gavest me I have given unto them; and they received them, and knew of a truth that I came forth from thee, and they believed that thou didst send me ” (John xvii. 6-8). And again he says, “ *I have given them thy Word* ” (verse 14), and again, as if to leave no doubt as to his meaning, “ *Sanctify them in the truth, thy Word is truth* ” (verse 17).

The same night, in Gethsemane, he

yielded himself to the eternal purpose, as marked out in the Scriptures, when he drank the purple cup of agony, saying "Father, not my will, but thine, be done!" (Luke xxii. 42).

As the band of soldiers approached to seize him, Peter drew his sword, whereupon Jesus said, "Put up again thy sword into its place. Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? *How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled*, that thus it must be?" (Matt. xxvi. 52-54). And to the soldiers he said, "Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize me? I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not: but *this is done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled*" (Mark xiv. 48, 49). Fulfilled! Fulfilled! How constantly he recurs to this fulfillment of the Word!

On trial before the Sanhedrin his Messianic claim was challenged again, "If

thou art the Christ, tell us." But why should he reiterate it? For three years he had done nothing but open unto them their Scriptures in proof of his Messiahship; nevertheless he answers, and there is no misunderstanding him, "If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I ask you, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God. And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What further need have we of witnesses? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth" (Luke xxii. 67-71). He was next haled before Pilate, who asked him "Art thou a King, then?" This question was of precisely the same purport as the preceding, since the Messiah was known as "King of the Jews." And Jesus answered, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the

world, *that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice*" (John xviii. 37). In all these affirmations, Jesus represents himself as a witness bearing testimony to the truth and to the truth as contained in the law and the prophets, that is, in the Word of God.

On the cross, where every incident was linked with prophecy, having reached the fearful climax of his anguish in the hiding of the Father's face, his breaking heart found utterance in words of Messianic import, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani!" (Psalm xxii. 1); and when the last moment was reached he uttered "with a loud voice"—like a soldier, wounded unto death, but waving his standard on the conquered ramparts—a single word, one word in which all prophecy is gathered into glorious fulfillment, *τετέλεσται!* "It is finished!" The red path from the protevangel in Eden to Golgotha has been traversed;

and all the blood of all the sacrifices finds its antitype in him. "Behold the Lamb of God!"

Is it possible for any one to pursue the foregoing record and not perceive that Jesus, by word and example, was committed to the truth of the Scripture? He lived in it, stood for it, died in vindication of it. If, however, there should be any lingering shadow of doubt concerning his attitude, it must surely vanish when we hear him on the way to Emmaus. It is after his resurrection. He has fallen in with Cleopas and a comrade whose eyes are holden so that they do not know him. They are lost in melancholy on account of his death. He hears their sorrowful tale and then says, "O foolish men, and slow of heart *to believe in all that the prophets have spoken!* Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?" (Luke xxiv. 25, 26); and then "*begin-*

*ning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.*" Wonderful teacher! What mastery of the Scriptures was his! What insight into its vast meaning! There was no need that he should unbind a scroll; the oracles were in his memory and at his finger tips. O teachers of men, here is One that can teach all! The Word, hidden in his heart, flows with the full freeness of a fountain from his lips. Blessed are all they that hear him. Aye, their hearts burn within them while he opens to them the Scriptures by the way.

## CHAPTER III

### *The Specific Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Scriptures.*

**I**T may seem a superserviceable task to pursue the question further; since the foregoing survey of the life and teachings of Jesus makes it perfectly clear that he believed in the Scriptures without an if or peradventure. But there are some further considerations which will "make assurance doubly sure."

#### *I. Our Lord's use of Current Versions*

At the outset, we give attention to a fact which is frequently employed to



show that Jesus did not believe in so-called "verbal inspiration ;" namely, his custom of using the Septuagint and other current versions of the Scriptures.

A precise statement of the case is as follows: (1) In some of his quotations he closely followed the Hebrew.\* (2) In others he appears to have quoted from a lost Aramaic version. (3) In others still, and most frequently, he followed the Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures made between two and three centuries before his time by a body of learned Alexandrian Jews. This was the Bible in common use.

*The first conclusion* drawn from this method of Jesus is that he *did not regard any of the current versions of the Scripture*

\* The language which our Lord commonly spoke was Aramaic ; and at that period Hebrew was completely a dead language, known only to the more educated, and only to be acquired by labor: yet it is clear that Jesus was acquainted with it, for some of his Scriptural quotations directly refer to the Hebrew original. Farrar's "Life of Christ."

*as absolutely true to the original.* Not one of them was in fact free from error. To say that these errors were such as would naturally occur in a transcript made by uninspired men, or that they were of such a minute character as not to affect any of the important truths or precepts of the original—both of which statements are quite correct—is not germane to the question now in hand. *The errors were there.*

And the same is true of the many versions in use throughout the world in our time. In the King James, the Oxford, the Douay, and all other versions in the English and other tongues, there are errors such as would seem to be inevitable in translations and transcriptions made by fallible men. This is never denied; it would be folly to deny it.\*

*The second conclusion* from the fact referred to, is that *this imperfection in the current Scriptures of his time did not pre-*

\* See Appendix C.

vent Jesus from placing his cordial confidence in them. This was partly due to the fact that he knew the insignificant character of those errors; which must have been infinitesimal indeed to his mind, since he nowhere made the slightest allusion to them; his attitude in this particular furnishing a striking contrast to that of certain critics of our time who make it an important part of their business to multiply and magnify them. When one pauses to reflect, it is indeed an occasion of immeasurable wonder that the Scriptures have been transmitted through so many centuries, transcribed by so many hands, and translated into so many tongues with so few traces of even the slightest departure from the original. The marvelous thing is not that there should be errors in each of these many versions; but that, on the one hand, those errors should be, as they confessedly are, so very slight; and, on the other, that all the versions should be,

as they are, in substantial accord with each other. This seems clearly to indicate the supervision and control of a special providence in the perpetuation of this singular Book.

But there is a *third conclusion* which must be drawn logically from Jesus' use of the Septuagint and other imperfect versions; namely, that *the real foundation of his confidence was the absolute truth of the original*. One of the destructive critics says, "We cannot avoid the question, Did Christ and his apostles, who chose to draw their quotations from the Septuagint version rather than from the Hebrew, believe in what some moderns are insisting on, namely, the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament? If they did, their ignorance of the Hebrew verbiage (*sic*) is simply amazing!"\* Did it not occur to this writer that if Jesus had quoted "from the Hebrew" it could not

\* "The Septuagint and Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament." *Homiletic Review* XXIV. 14.

have been from the original manuscripts but only from current copies of them? And when he speaks of the insistence of "certain moderns" on the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament, he surely cannot mean that anybody, ancient or modern, has claimed inerrancy for any current copies or versions whatsoever, in Hebrew, in English or in any other tongue; for that is not so. The claim of absolute inerrancy is made only and always for the original autographs of the Scriptures.

Ah, those "original autographs!" There are not a few among the controversialists of these days who deride the mere mention of them. Nevertheless, here is the very pivot of the argument; and there is much in the teaching and example of Jesus which leads us to believe that he himself so regarded it.

In this connection let it be observed *first* that the *original autograph* is a his-

*toric fact.* No one will question the statement that every portion of Scripture once existed precisely as it left the hands of those writers who “spoke as they were moved by the Spirit of God.”

*Second, every portion of Scripture in that original form must have been precisely true, to the last jot and tittle.* Else there is no value in the “moving of the Spirit,” and “inspiration” is an inane and meaningless word. God “breathed” the original Scriptures through “holy men;” and when he had thus breathed upon the parchment, the deposit left there must have been absolutely true; since God never breathed a lie.

*Third, this is the “traditional” view of the truth of Scripture.* The universal church has held it through the ages. The Jews, at the time of the advent, no more believed in the absolute correctness of current versions than we do nowadays: but they did believe unwaveringly in the perfect truth of the Scriptures in their

original form.\* And had not Jesus shared in that opinion he would surely, as an honest teacher, have made some protest against or dissent from it.†

\* "One thing at any rate was quite certain. The Old Testament, leastwise, the law of Moses, was directly and wholly from God; and if so, then its form also—its letter—must be authentic and authoritative. Thus much on the surface, and for all. \* \* \* Christ was in sympathy with all the highest tendencies of his people and time. Above all, there was his intimate converse with the Scriptures of the Old Testament. If, in the synagogue, he saw much to show the hollowness, self-seeking, pride, and literalism which a mere external observance of the law fostered, he would ever turn from what man or devils said to what he read, to what was 'written.' Not one dot or hook of it could fall to the ground—all must be established and fulfilled. The law of Moses in all its bearings, the utterances of the prophets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Micah, Zechariah, Malachi—and the hopes and consolations of the Psalms, were all to him literally true, and cast their light upon the building which Moses had reared. It was all one; a grand unity; not an aggregation of different parts, but the unfolding of a living organism. Chiefest of all, it was the thought of the Messianic bearing of all Scripture in its unity, the idea of the kingdom of God and the King of Zion, which was the light and life of all." Ederheim's "*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*."

† We pause just here to note a singular parallel between Christ and the Scriptures: (1) They are both alike called The Word of God. (2) They are both theanthropic; that is, the Divine and human are inextricably blended in their fabric;

*Fourth: The attitude of Jesus was not that of a Biblical critic, for obvious reasons:* (1) He showed his general accord with the ultimate purpose of the textual or "lower criticism," in the emphasis which he placed upon the authority of the Scriptures in their original form. Not once or twice but again and again he protested against the giving of co-ordinate authority to the "tradition of the elders." This could only be because he believed that the Scriptures, as thus originally given, were an absolutely faithful and correct presentation of the truth which God desired to reveal to men.

yet not so as to prevent their absolute truth and faultlessness. (3) Both originals have vanished from sight; and are transmitted through succeeding ages only through the lives and labors of fallible men. Nevertheless, we believe in the unseen Christ and thus believing "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." And for a like reason we believe in the Original Autograph of the Scriptures as it left the pens of those holy men who wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of God. (4) Despite all errors in the transmission of the two Words, written and incarnate, they are alike in such substantial perfection as to be "profitable unto every good work," and wholly effective in guiding and saving men.



And just here we note a singular differentiation between the Bible and all other literature. The "latest edition" of other books is the best. The text books used in our schools of learning must be "revised" from time to time in order to keep them abreast of the age. But the best edition of the Bible is its first one. The effort on all sides is not to revise it but to restore it to its original form. This can only mean that the Bible in that original was divinely adjusted to the progress of the ages. All its scientific propositions,\* its prophecies,†

\* "The order of creation, as thus stated in Genesis, is faultless in the light of modern science." Sir J. W. Dawson.

† Macaulay once ventured into the realms of prediction, when he intimated that perhaps, in the remote future, some traveler from New Zealand might, in the mist of a vast solitude, "take his stand on a broken arch of the London bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's." His words represent the very summit of improbability; yet there are a thousand prophecies in Scripture equally improbable, uttered at times when the world-powers were in their glory; and not one of them has gone by default. Tyre, Sidon, Egypt, Babylon, Assyria; they have turned out precisely as the ancient prophets said they would do. The graves of nations line the path of his-

its laws and jurisprudence,\* its theological statements,† and its plan of salvation,‡ were recorded with a definite view to the vicissitudes of time. And the fact that

tory; and from their solitary ruins the owl and bittern, the fox and jackal bear testimony to the exact truth or the Word of God.

\* It is sometimes affirmed, as an objection to the Scriptures, that there are portions which cannot be read aloud. It is true; but this is an argument in their favor; since they were not written to be read aloud but to regulate all human life. There are things occurring in every Civil Court which cannot be proclaimed on the housetops. There are surgical operations in every hospital, necessary and helpful, which it would not be well to perform before the public eyes. The Bible is intended to be a perfect system of moral pathology and therapeutics. It anticipates all public crimes and private vices, and deals heroically with them.

† All the discoveries of philosophy have not produced a single additional truth; they have merely thrown new light upon the teachings of the Book. Every doctrine which has been advanced, from time to time, in opposition to this teaching, has been pronounced a heresy and inevitably demonstrated to be false by the stern logic of events. No New Theology has thus far been able to vindicate itself; its only hope of vindication, in the clear light of history, being in its final adjustment to the doctrinal system of the Scriptures.

‡ There are other sacred books and other religions which offer us religious doctrines and ethical codes; but there is none that answers this question: "What shall a man do to be delivered from the record of a sinful past?"

none of them has been reversed or even amended in the progress of the centuries can only be explained by reference to their divine origin.

In 1881 a company of archaeologists under the leadership of Herr Brugsch, while excavating near the ancient city of Thebes, unearthed a burying-place called "The Gate of the Kings," from which they took thirty-six mummies of royal personages of the eighteenth dynasty, that is, a period prior to 1000 B. C. Among them was Rameses II, or Sesostris, the Pharaoh of the captivity. By the side of these royal mummies were found hampers of food, provided for their use at the resurrection. A strange awakening this! The shriveled bodies of the dead were carried forth on the shoulders of Arabs into the light of the Nineteenth Century of the Christian Era! They were wrapped in strips of byssus, which were inscribed with cabalistic sentences from the "Book of the

Dead," the Scriptures of ancient Egypt. How superannuated this book! How far behind the progress of events these worthies of long ago!

But suppose that, from among that imposing company of mummied worthies, a princess had calmly risen with all the ancient dignity of her high station, light in her eyes and unabated strength in her limbs, and had unfolded a scroll, written in our current speech, covering all the progress of the intervening centuries and fully abreast of the spirit of this age, would not that have been counted an extraordinary thing?

Yet this is indeed a veritable fact. Our Religion is as old as the Pharaohs and as fresh as this morning's dew. In the ancient personification of Wisdom it speaks on this wise: "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, before the world was" (Prov. viii. 23).

(2) But in so far as the "lower criticism" works toward its desired end by a com-

parison of diverse copies and variant readings of Scripture—however essential this may be now as the method of arriving at the original text—it is easy to understand why Jesus, in his capacity as a religious teacher, did not employ it.

(3) The same remark may be made with reference to the relation of Christ toward the “higher criticism.” This method is defined by Professor Zenos as “The discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characteristics.” It is called, also, “literary criticism,” and “historical criticism ;” and as such its value is beyond all question or peradventure. The so-called “Introductions to the Scriptures” are largely based upon it.\* It is scarcely

\* “The word ‘higher’ is here a technical term, used for the convenience’ sake over against the technical term ‘lower,’ to distinguish this literary criticism from another and still more external kind of criticism—viz., that which is occupied with determining the exact original text of Scripture. The lower criticism is textual criticism ; literary criticism, is higher criticism

necessary to say, however, that a method so distinctly literary lay outside the province of Jesus' work. Therefore he did not use it.

(4) It remains to add that the radical form of the "higher criticism," as represented by those who insist that no true estimate can be formed of the Scriptures except by such as first dispossess themselves of all conviction as to their divine origin and character, had no place in the precept or example of Jesus. Could he look at the Bible that way? Could he regard it as mere "literature?" Not for a moment! He believed in it as the one Book, standing solitary and alone,

because it rises from the subordinate and subsidiary question as to the accuracy with which certain records have been transmitted to us, to the higher and broader question as to how these records came into existence at all." And again, "The higher criticism is literary criticism as distinguished from textual criticism, which is the 'lower.' It is not biblical philology, nor exegesis, nor biblical history, nor dogmatics, nor apologetics, although it has relations with all of these. It is the Science of the structure and history of the Biblical writings as works of human authorship." Professor Francis Brown, in *Homiletic Review*. Vol. xxiii. 295.

separated from all other literature whatsoever by the fact that God breathed it.

And those who follow Christ regard it in the same way. A Christian is necessarily "prejudiced" in favor of the Bible; and by that fact he is disqualified from passing an "unbiased" judgment upon it. He cannot dispossess himself, even for such high purposes as are claimed for the higher criticism, of his faith in the Scriptures as a singular book, separated from all other literature by the fact that it was "written by men who spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." As well ask a loving and loyal son to give up his natural regard for his mother in order to qualify himself for service on a jury which has been empanelled to investigate her personal purity. It is impossible; it is unthinkable.

This does not mean, however, that there is no place for the higher criticism, even in this narrower sense. There are plenty of scholarly people in the world

who have no prepossessions in favor of the truth of Scriptures ; nor is there danger of ever having a dearth of such. And their work has a definite value, too. It reaches incidental conclusions, not infrequently, which accord with the truest views of inspiration. But, so long as this work is being so industriously pursued with such results by outsiders, why should the followers of Christ be expected or inclined to disrobe themselves of their devotion to principle in order to join the ranks of those who disavowing all religious predilections, are thoroughly qualified to sit in purely secular judgment on the Word of God ?

*II. Titles applied to the Scriptures by Jesus*

We are living in a vortex of conflicting voices ; and Christ's throne of authority is just there, in the "eye of the storm." He speaks to-day as he spoke to Job out of the midst of the whirlwind, and who are Bildad and Eliphaz and Zophar that



they should darken counsel by words without knowledge? Great scholars, no doubt; but, in our school, there is no expert but One. Are we asking a thousand questions about the Bible? So long as we remain Christians, they are all reduced to this, What does Jesus say?

It is our purpose now to consider the terms used by him to designate the Scriptures. This is important as preparing the way for his more positive and definite affirmations.

The Book in the hand of Jesus was the "Old Testament"; but at that time no such title was known. It was originated by Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 14-15, A. V., and popularized by Jerome's use of *Testamentum* in the Vulgate. Our Lord, of course, makes no reference to it.

(1) *He calls the Bible the Word of God:* this to begin with. Does he not qualify the phrase in any way? Never once. He says what he means and means what he says; and when he refrains

from qualifying a statement it is obviously superserviceable for any of his disciples to supply the omission. His teaching, taken as a whole, must stand as he leaves it.

In the Parable of the Sower, in which he sets forth the economy of his kingdom, he says, "The sower soweth the Word" (Mark iv. 14): wherefore he calls it "the Word of the Kingdom" (Matt. xiii. 19).

He prophesies the persecutions which shall arise from the preaching of the Word (Matt. xiii. 21; Mark iv. 17); and pronounces a blessing on those who shall "hear the Word of God and keep it" (Luke xi. 28).

In his denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees on account of their false teaching he charges them with "making the Word of God of none effect by their traditions" (Mark vii. 13).

He said to the Jews who sought to kill him, "Ye have not his Word abiding in you: for whom he sent, him ye believe not" (John v. 38), a plain reference

to the Messianic prophecies. And afterward he said to those who took up stones to stone him, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken)" etc. (John x. 25), thus making it quite clear that when he spoke of the Word of God he meant Scripture, or the written Word.

On another occasion he said, "If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father. But this cometh to pass, that the Word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause" (John xv. 24-25).

In his sacerdotal prayer he uses the title thrice; "I manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them to me; and

they have kept thy Word (John xvii. 6). Again, "I have given them thy Word ; and the world hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John xvii. 14). And again, "Sanctify them in the truth ; thy Word is truth" (John xvii. 17). It is evident that here he does not refer to God's oral word, as spoken to individuals on occasion, but to his Word as recorded in the Scriptures. And, in this connection, it is a fact worth mentioning that wherever this expression is used in the teaching of Jesus, it always appears to mean the written and not the oral Word. Not that this is a matter of supreme importance to the argument in hand ; for, were it otherwise, it would still remain that the word spoken to this or that patriarch or prophet, or to any particular age, would have been of merely temporary value had it not been transmitted in written form to succeeding generations.

(2) *Our Lord also refers to the Bible as Scripture or "Writings."* The reason is obvious, and it would be more obvious to his immediate hearers than to us. For there was, at that time, a body of learned Jews, called scribes, whose special function was to copy or transcribe the Word of God. Dr. Schaff says of them, "Inasmuch as such a minute acquaintance with the law, as their business implied, led them to become authorities upon the details of Mosaism, it came to pass that they were popularly regarded as the teachers of the law." In other words they were the "Biblical experts" of their time. So while the term Scripture or "Writings" is ultimately traced to the fact that "Men spake from God being moved by the Holy Spirit," and wrote accordingly, the fact that it was the familiar title was due, probably, to the relation of these scribes to the copies of Scripture in common use.

By the term "Scripture," in the sin-

gular, he sometimes designates a particular passage or portion of Holy Writ: as when, in the synagogue at Nazareth, opening the scroll of Isaiah at the lesson of the day (Isaiah lxi. 1-3), he said to the assembled worshipers, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke iv. 21). And again in reproving the scribes for rejecting him, "Have ye not read even this Scripture: The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner; this was from the Lord, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" (Mark xii. 10 cf. Ps. cxviii. 22). And at supper in the upper room, in reference to the betrayer, "I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me" (John xiii. 18 cf. Ps. xli. 9).

At other times the singular is used to designate the general trend of various portions of Holy Writ: as when Jesus lifted up his voice on the last day of the

feast, during the ceremony known as the Effusion of Waters, and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water" (John vii. 38; cf. Is. xii. 3; Is. xlv. 3; Is. lv. 1 et al.). And again, in his sacerdotal prayer, "I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me: and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled" (John xvii. 12, where a general reference is made to all portions of Scripture touching upon the betrayer and his punishment). And still again where he reminds his enemies of their familiar proverb that "the Scripture cannot be broken" (John x. 35).

The plural is generally used to designate the Old Testament as a whole: as where he says, "Ye search the Scriptures; because ye think that in them ye have eternal life and these are they which testify of me" (John v. 39). And again,

with reference to the difficulties of the resurrection suggested by the scribes in the problem of the sevenfold widow, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God" (Matt. xxii. 29-33).

At other times the plural is used to gather up a number of prophetic passages, or the sum total of their meaning, as when Jesus rebuked Peter for drawing the sword to defend him, "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword. Or thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" (Matt. xxvi. 52-54). Also in his words to those who arrested him: "Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize me? I sat daily in the temple teaching, and ye took me not. But all this is come to pass, that the



Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled ” (Matt. xxvi. 55, 56).

The term “ Writing ” or “ Writings ” is employed interchangeably with “ Scripture ” or “ Scriptures. ” The frequency with which Jesus used the expression “ It is written ” is significant of his loyalty to the written Word. In his temptation in the wilderness he foiled his adversary thrice in this manner, in each case quoting from Deuteronomy, which is the most discredited of all the books of Scripture among the radical critics of our time (Matt. ii. 5-10). Of John the Baptist he said, “ This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee ” (Matt. xi. 10). In his cleansing of the temple he said, “ It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer ; but ye make it a den of robbers ” (Matt. xxi. 13). To the scribes and Pharisees he said, “ Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it

is written, This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me" (Mark vii. 6). To the disciples who asked him, "How is it that the scribes say that Elijah must first come?" he answered and told them "Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought? But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they would, even as it is written of him" (Mark ix. 12-13). To the Jews who murmured at his hard sayings he answered, "It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me" (John vi. 45). He speaks of the teachings of Moses, in general and particular, as "Writings" (Matt. xix. 7; Mark x. 4, xii. 19; Luke xx. 28; John v. 46-47). To the Pharisees, calling his

credentials in question, he said, "Yea and in your law it is written, that the witness of two men is true. I am he that beareth witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me" (John viii. 17-18). And when they would have stoned him for making himself equal with God, he answered, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" (John x. 34). In his farewell interview with the disciples in the upper room he said, "The Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him: but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed!" (Matt. xxvi. 24). And again, "All ye shall be offended in me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad" (Matt. xxvi. 31). And again, "This cometh to pass, that the word may be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause" (John xv. 25).

(3) *Another of the familiar titles which*

*Jesus applies to the inspired volume is "The Law."* It must be remembered that the Theocracy or government of the Jews had no constitution or legal code apart from the Scriptures. For this reason the scribes were also called "lawyers," their special business being not only to transcribe but to expound the Word of God.

The Law is frequently used by our Lord as a general term including the whole Book: as where he says, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" (John x. 34), his reference being not to any portion of the law proper but to Psalm lxxxi. 6. Also in defending his credentials, "Yea and in your law it is written that the witness of two men is true" (John viii. 17). To his disciples he speaks of his rejection on this wise: "This cometh to pass, that the Word may be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause" (John xv. 25 cf. Ps. xxxv. 19 and Ps. lxix.

4). And where he defends his disciples for plucking the ears of grain on the Sabbath by reference to precedent: "Have ye not read in the law, that on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are guiltless?" (Matt. xii. 5; cf. Numbers xxviii. 9). Also in his denunciation of the Pharisees "Ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law," these weightier matters being specified as "justice, and mercy, and faith," which are fundamental principles in the higher ethics of the Law (Matt. xxiii. 23). And in his interview with a certain lawyer, "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" (Luke x. 26). To the Pharisees, again, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fall" (Luke xvi. 17).

This title is also applied specifically to the Pentateuch, which was the first of the three divisions familiar to every pupil in

the rabbinical schools, to wit, "The Law the Prophets and the Hagiographa." To the disciples in the upper room, after his resurrection, he said in terms which suggest a customary mode of instruction, "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms concerning me" (Luke xxiv. 44), where the third division is named after the first and most important book in it.

The Law as contained in the Pentateuch was divided into (*a*) The Moral Law, or Decalogue, in which were laid down certain fundamental principles, intended to be of binding force forever, because they are interwoven with the very nerves and sinews of the human constitution; (*b*) The Civil Law, which was intended to apply particularly to the government of Israel; but involving certain vital facts which were destined to

outlive the theocracy and furnish the basis of jurisprudence for every age; (c) The Ceremonial Law; an elaborate cult of rites and ceremonies, centering in the Messiah as "the Hope of Israel" and, for that reason, finding its fulfillment and end in Jesus. This is that "handwriting of ordinances" which was finally removed by Christ, who "nailed it to his cross, taking it out of the way."

"The Law and the Prophets" was another phrase used to designate the Old Testament as a whole. It suggests a two-fold division; "the Law," that is, the Pentateuch, and "the Prophets," including all the rest. In announcing the Golden Rule Jesus said, "This is the law and the prophets," meaning that it comprehends the ethical system of the entire Scriptures (Matt. vii. 12). A like use of this title is found in his announcement of the summary: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy

mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth and the prophets" (Matt. xxii. 37-40). In repelling the thought that his purpose was to abrogate the Moral Law or to annul any of the vital principles of the Mosaic Law in general, he said: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished" (Matt. v. 17, 18).

The comprehensive and flexible use of the phrase is seen in the statement "All the prophets and the law prophesied until John" (Matt. xi. 13).

The Law of Moses is a phrase of similar import. "Did not Moses give you the law?" (John vii. 10). "That the



Law of Moses may not be broken” (John vii. 23). “That all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the Law of Moses concerning me” (Luke xxiv. 44).

It will be seen that in each case of the three titles referred to—the Word, the Scripture and the Law—tribute is paid to the divine origin and authority of the Book. By “the Word” we are given to understand that Jesus accepted it as a communication from God. In his use of the term “Scripture” we perceive that he approved it, in its written form, as intended for common use. And when he called it “the Law” he emphasized its authority as a trustworthy rule of life.

Had he said nothing further of the Bible than what is clearly suggested in these titles, we should have sufficient reason to affirm that he believed it. But, as we shall see, his teaching goes much further ; it is not confined to mere

intimations and suggestions; before we are through with this investigation we shall find him confirming it with a Yea and Amen, and placing the red seal of divine authority upon it.

*III. Positive Affirmations by Jesus*

“It is impossible to frame a law” so runs the proverb, “through which an astute lawyer cannot drive a coach and four.” In other words, the definitive possibilities of human language are but a frail barrier against the subtle arts and stratagems of sophistry. A reasonably clever dialectician finds no difficulty in explaining away any ordinary proposition under the specious pretense of explaining it. One by one the sayings of Jesus respecting the truth of Scripture have been dealt with in this manner; and the method is best exposed and controverted by such a comprehensive survey of those sayings *in toto* as to make the intent of Jesus perfectly clear. This having been done, it

remains to indicate certain of his statements which are of so positive a character as to make instantly obvious the duplicity of any attempt at evasion, equivocation, circumvention or subterfuge.

(1). *He affirms that the Scriptures are true.* As he said of himself, "I am the truth;" so in his sacerdotal prayer he said of Scripture, "Thy word is truth." At the time of that utterance, in view of his approaching death, he was commending his disciples to the care of the Holy Spirit, by whose influence in sanctification they were to be kept, controlled, endued with power, directed in service, and built up and established in the most holy faith. It is an important fact, never to be forgotten, that all this is wrought by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of the Scriptures; a fact which Jesus distinctly recognized and taught in this solemn petition, "Sanctify them in the truth; thy Word is truth" (John xvii. 17).

Observe the form of the statement ; he does not say, Thy word contains truth, or even Thy word is true, but “Thy word is truth.” The emphasis of language could go no further.

If Jesus had said “The Bible contains truth” he would have said what everybody knows and concedes and does not particularly care for. In point of fact it would not have been worth saying at all. It is true the Bible “contains” some of the most sublime doctrinal and ethical wisdom ; but what of it? That fact does not differentiate the Bible from other books. It makes the superiority of the Bible a matter not of quality but of mere more or less. Some of the most glowing and enthusiastic tributes to the excellence of certain portions of Scripture have fallen from the lips of atheists and infidels. It means nothing, then, to say that the Bible “contains” truth. The question is whether it contains it in paying quantities or not.

Furthermore had Jesus in such manner affirmed the partial truth of Scripture he would thereby have intimated, also, that it is partly false. A solution of anything involves a solvent of something else. It should be observed, just here, that when reference is made by the destructive critics, to the errors of Scripture, they do not mean such as would be likely to arise from transcriptions running through a period of some thousands of years but they mean downright misstatements arising from ignorance, misapprehension or disingenuousness on the part of the original writers. This being so, it would be interesting to know how these critics would have the average reader distinguish between the false and true. Would it not be wise to have an Advisory Board made up of such as deem themselves competent to say just where the men (who "spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit") were wise and honest and where they were otherwise? Our Lord

(John v. 39, either version) encouraged the humblest of truth-seekers to read the Bible; but this cannot be done with impunity if there is an admixture of falsehood in it. As well invite a company of children to sit down at a table where unknown portions of the viands and condiments are known to be poisonous. "Ah, but the errors are only in non-essentials." Who knows that? Or who presumes to determine it? Or who can give assurance of it? No Biblical critic nor all Biblical critics together can regulate the runways of error when once the sluices are thrown open. The only safe plan would be to make the Church a co-ordinate source of authority in spiritual things and let it put all false and dangerous portions of the Bible into an *Index Expurgatorius*. That would settle it.

And further still, if Jesus had meant that the Bible merely "contains" truth, it could no longer be called "the best of books." Put a hundred of the standard

works of science and history into a heap, and over against them place these Scriptures: then ask your destructive critic to select from among them the least trustworthy of all, and if he is an honest man he will without hesitation point to the Bible. We used to think it only moderate praise to call the Bible "the best of books," but even this tribute must, under such circumstances, be withheld from it.

But, worst of all, if Jesus meant that the Bible merely "contains" truth, he made it practically worthless for the guidance of life. To say that a book which is partly false can be relied upon as an "infallible rule of faith and practice" looks to common people, who are as yet unfamiliar with the *technique* of Biblical criticism, like a reprehensible use of the English tongue. If it be replied that the purpose of the Scriptures is simply to save a man from hell-fire and not to instruct him in science and

chronology, we respectfully challenge the right of any man to limit the ends and uses of revelation in that way. If it be said that the alleged errors of Scripture are in non-essentials alone, we humbly challenge the right of any one to draw a line in Scripture between the things which are important enough to be true and those which are trivial enough to be false or true as the case may be. If a passer-by were to enter an apothecary's shop and thus insist on marking off the essentials from the non-essentials among the *materia medica* he would be ousted for his pains. But the disparity between God and our wisest philosopher is so much greater than that which separates the apothecary from his presumptuous visitor that our imagination breaks down in its endeavor to surmise what the divine opinion of such "advanced scholarship" must be.

All such difficulties, however, are removed by simply taking Jesus at his



word. He was accustomed to say what he meant and the safe way is to assume that he meant precisely what he said. The best aids to exegesis, in the long run, are not ingenuity and cleverness but honesty and common sense.

(2). *He affirmed Inspiration and left no reasonable doubt as to what he meant by it.* Not long ago it was publicly announced that one of Rubens' pictures was for sale in a Fifth Avenue gallery. On my way there I met a man expert in art matters, who said: "A Rubens, forsooth! It is a counterfeit; there is not a trace of Rubens in it." Whereupon I turned back. What did I care for a Rubens that Rubens never saw? Everything depends upon the authenticity of the signature. Anybody can write a check and sign it "Rothschild"; but the trouble is, where is the banker who would cash it? The question is this, Is the Bible what it purports to be? Is it a genuine autograph, bearing the true

sign-manual of the living God? Let us have the *pros* and *cons*, and weigh them all. We can only come to one of two conclusions: it is divinely given, or it is not. If it came from God, it can be absolutely depended on; if not, my special interest in the book ends, here and now. It is no more to me henceforth than any other of the important works of literature. If, however, it is God-breathed, and therefore true and trustworthy, I am ready to receive it as my infallible rule of faith and practice. I will henceforth take its statement as the last word respecting my creed and conduct.

But what does Inspiration mean? The words of Jesus, as recorded in Mark xii. 36, are in evidence: "For David himself *said in the Holy Spirit*, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet." Here is a clear reference to that singular influ-

ence of the Spirit on the minds of the sacred writers which produced the Book called "The Word of God."

We are sometimes advised by interested parties that the Biblical controversy is "a mere quarrel about definitions." Nothing of the sort; but, suppose it were, are not definitions worth while? And particularly the definition of inspiration; since the whole question of the trustworthiness of the Scriptures rests upon it? At this point, fortunately, all doubt is resolved by the fact that the Scriptures furnish their own definition and that Christ approves it.

The word "inspiration" is used in Paul's second Epistle to Timothy where he writes "Every scripture inspired of God, is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (II Tim. iii. 16, 17). The word here rendered

“inspired” is *theopneustos* (θεόπνευστος), literally “breathed of God.”

The inspiration of the Scriptures, thus defined by the Scriptures themselves as a divine in-breathing, is of a singular and exclusive sort, and must be clearly distinguished from other forms of so-called “inspiration.” (1) It is not human reason, which is a generic gift. “And God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Genesis ii. 7), that is, divinely quickened and, above all other creatures, in possession of the power to grasp spiritual things and commune with his Creator. (2) Not genius, which is an inborn gift, and may be used for good or evil. There have been gloriously gifted ones who used their power as did the red dragon in the Apocalypse, drawing after it one-third of the stars of heaven to hurl them down into the endless night. (3) Not spiritual illumination, which is the privilege of all believers. Its pur-

pose is personal holiness. It is indeed a divine in-breathing (Ezekiel xxxvii. 9), by which the soul, being quickened, is built up in character and continually made more and more alive unto God. (4) The inspiration here referred to, in connection with the composition of the Scriptures, may be thus defined: It is a spiritual influence qualifying and moving certain persons to communicate divine truth infallibly.

Now going back to Christ's reference to Psalm cx. we hear him affirming that David said a certain thing "in the Holy Spirit," which is a clear statement of the method indicated in *theopnustia* or inspiration. The men who "spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (II Pet. i. 21), were so inspired that God breathed through them in communicating truth.\*

\* On another occasion we hear him saying to his disciples, "And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit

The question which Jesus here addressed to his adversaries with reference to Psalm cx. is one that might profitably engage the attention of those who, while professing to believe in Christ, deny the singular and entire inspiration of the Scriptures: "*How then doth David in the Spirit call him Lord saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet?*" Is there anything in the diluted theories of "inspiration" which can answer that question? If it were propounded to David himself his reply would probably be something like this, "I, being under the influence of the Spirit, heard Jehovah say to my Son, 'Sit thou on my right hand till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet.' I saw him place the rod of divine authority in his hand, saying, 'Rule thou in the

shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say" (Luke xii. 11, 12). This is inspiration as Christ taught it and as his people are to understand it.

midst of thine enemies.' I saw a great company of soldiers gather at his command, not as mercenaries but willing in the day of his power, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousand of thousands like dewdrops from the womb of the morning. I saw Jehovah lift his hand and heard him swear, 'Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek.' And to me he said, 'The Lord at thy hand shall strike through kings in the day of his indignation.' All this I saw and heard when in the Spirit; and more I know not."

One thing is clear: when Jesus referred to the Scriptures as written by men under the influence of the Spirit he separated those scriptures generically from all other "literature" whatsoever. To his mind, the inspiration of these writers was a singular sort of inspiration, which produced a singular book. In his teaching it is presented as the one book having authority. The "traditions of

the elders," which were popularly associated with the Scriptures, were not infrequently mentioned by him but always with the purpose of discrediting their equally binding force. As when he said, "Ye reject\* the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition" (Mark vii. 9). Thus the Bible was to him *sui generis*, literally; and inspiration, as he taught it, was something which belonged not to literature generally but to one book only, namely, the Word of God.

(3). *He affirmed that the Scriptures are the medium of spiritual life.* So far as the present inquiry goes it makes no difference whether the words of Jesus recorded in John v. 39 be rendered "Search" or "Ye search the Scriptures." In the original the imperative and indicative are identical in form. For the former rendering we have the authority of Augustine, Chrysostom, Calvin, Mar-

\* Margin, "frustrate."



tin Luther, the Greek fathers generally, and the King James Version. On the other side are Beza, Bengel, Erasmus and the Revised Versions. But there need be no battle royal over the matter, since the meaning is practically the same either way. Our Lord was speaking to the Jewish savants, who cavilled at his divinity. He called the Scriptures to witness that he was the very Son of God. "Search them," he said, "and see." Search them indeed! That was distinctively the business of these men. They were Bibliolaters. They scrutinized with the utmost care the letter of holy writ; they counted its syllables; they weighed the relative merit of its precepts; they analyzed and classified it; they treated it as a fetich, declining to touch it with unwashed hands. "Search it indeed! We are the Biblical inquisitors." "Aye," said the Master, "ye do search it, but in your devotion to its letter ye lose the spirit of it. Ye

do search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life. And, behold, these are they which testify of me. Yet, strange to tell, ye will not come unto me for that eternal life ye seek. Thus ye miss the deep meaning and glory of the divine Word ! ”

One thing is very clear : our Lord unreservedly approves the object of the quest. He distinctly intimates to these Jews that they were right in searching the Scriptures for life. He says that the life is there if they can only find it ; and that they can find it by finding him in the Book, because he himself is the life and the Book is full of him. He tells them that they cannot pursue their quest too earnestly ; the word for “ search ” being *ἐπαινᾶτε*, which is commonly used of a hound on the scent. In one of Æsop’s fables he tells of a hound which was pursuing a hare, falling behind, and at length abandoning the chase. A goatherd who was passing by, jeered at

the hound, saying, "Shame that a hare should get the better of thee." "But you forget," the hound replied, "that it is one thing to be running for your dinner, and another to be running for your life." The deep longing of every earnest soul is for eternal life. The young ruler who threw himself before the Master's feet intensely desired this: "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" The man who, in the allegory, fled from the City of Destruction, thrust his fingers into his ears, lest he should be turned aside by the appeals of friends and kinsfolk, and ran, crying, "Life! Life! Eternal Life!" We were made in the likeness of God. There is something beyond and beneath the surface of things. Our spiritual nature craves something better than the world can give. The Bible holds the clew of the maze, and the earnestness of our search of the Scriptures will be meas-

ured by the sincerity of our longing for life.

If these things are so it is of immense importance that a man should preserve his confidence in the Scriptures. It is true, they need no defence. They are in no danger ; but men are in danger of losing their faith in them. It was a sorrowful day for Nero when he lost confidence in Seneca, his tutor. In his boyhood he had learned to love the old philosopher and, for a time, dutifully followed his teachings. But there were those among his associates who laughed at Seneca's melancholy face and pointed their fingers at his scholar's robe. Nero continued to love him and entertained him at the royal table ; but he ceased to heed his instructions. It is to be feared that some professing Christians regard their Bibles in the same way. They love them still, but there is a waning of confidence. Nevertheless, though they make shipwreck of

their faith, the Book stands true. The life is there, though they may lose it.

(4) *He affirmed, in particular, the truth of those portions of Scripture which are most discredited in certain quarters in these days.*

*The Creation of Man.* To the Pharisees who questioned him as to the marriage relation he said, "Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female" (Matt. xix. 4). This is a clear approval of the inspired account of the origin of the race. Jesus evidently did not believe that "Adam was a myth." If the record in Genesis is not correct, either this divine Teacher did not know it or did not wish his hearers to know it.\*

\* The attitude of Sir William Dawson toward the Genesis record was precisely that of Jesus: he said, "I know nothing about the origin of man save what the Bible says about it, namely that God created him; and I do not know any one who does." . . . Lord Kelvin, also: "Mathematics and dynamics fail us when we contemplate the earth fitted for life but lifeless, and try to imagine the commencement of life upon it. This certainly did not take place by any action of chemistry or electricity, or crystalline grouping of molecules under

*The Story of Cain and Abel.* This is commonly regarded by the destructive critics as purely legendary or allegorical ; but Christ referred to "the blood of Abel the righteous" (Matt. xxiii. 35) precisely as if he believed it.

*The Flood.* In the discussion as to whether the Scriptural account of the Flood is correct or not, scientists have generally conceded its substantial accuracy as proven by geology but the destructive critics are as a body arrayed against it. Jesus referred to it on this wise : "As were the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of man. For as in those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away ; so shall be the

the influence of force, or by any possible kind of fortuitous concurrence of atoms. We must pause, face to face with the mystery and miracle of the creation of living creatures."

coming of the Son of man ” (Matt. xxiv. 37-39).

*The Historicity of the Patriarchs.* The leaders of the anti-Biblical school of criticism are practically agreed that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were legendary characters ; but Jesus held the opposite view. In speaking of the resurrection of the dead he said, “ Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob ? ” (Matt. xxii. 31, 32). To say that he referred in such language to men who had not only succumbed to death but had never really existed is simply to stultify him. And again, “ I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven ” (Matt. viii. 11). And on another occasion he said to the cavilling Jews, “ Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day ; and he saw it, and was

glad." And when they said, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" he answered, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was born, I am" (John viii. 56-58).

*The Destruction of Sodom.* It is agreed on all hands, among the radical critics, that there was no historic basis for this "fable." Nevertheless Jesus said, "In the days of Lot they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all" (Luke xvii. 28, 29).

*Lot's Wife.* The story of this poor woman has been laughed out of court by many "advanced scholars" who profess an intense devotion to Christ. But Christ used her tragic death as a warning to the half-hearted (Luke xvii. 32). It does not seem to have occurred to him that there was no truth in it.

*The Exodus.* Kuenen says, "The



Exodus, the passage of the Jordan, the wandering and the settlement in Canaan, as they are described, are simply impossible ;” and the destructive critics of whom he is the distinguished leader agree with him. So did not Jesus. He mentioned with approval many of the events connected with it. (a) The Call of Moses at the Burning Bush (Luke xx. 37-38). (b) The Passover (Luke xxii. 15, 16). (c) The Manna: “Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness” (John vi. 49). (d) The Brazen Serpent (John iii. 14).

*The Pentateuch as a Whole.* It was to “the five books of Moses”—known among the Jews and accepted in like manner by the Samaritans as “The Law”—that he referred in the solemn words, “If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?” (John v. 46, 47). This is in striking contrast with the as-

sersion of Kuenen, "All this representation in the Hexateuch is absurd;" or of Wellhausen, "It is full of historical fictions;"\* or of Holzinger, "Its historical presuppositions of the giving of the Law are whimsies that force a smile;" † or of Smend, "The representation of the Pentateuch proves itself not historical;" ‡ or of Piebenbring, "The Priest Code, the heart of the Pentateuch, is legend, myth, saga, tradition, and not trustworthy, a proved historical fiction, bald, transparent fiction, artifice, fantasy, false history, absurd, impossible, contradictory, inconceivable, unthinkable and false, a bare-faced invention." § Is it not clear that between Christ and such criticism there is a bridgeless gulf; and that a true Christian will scarcely undertake the difficult feat of standing either midway or on both sides of it?

\* Wellhausen's "*History of Israel*."

† Holzinger's "*Introduction to the Hexateuch*."

‡ Smend's "*History of Old Testament Religion*."

§ Piebenbring's "*Theology of the Old Testament*."

*The Authorship of the Pentateuch.* It is frequently said that it "makes no difference who wrote the books of the Bible so long as they are true." This is correct, except when such authorship is designated in the books themselves or when Christ definitely states it. Now it so happens that Christ directly or indirectly ascribes the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses no less than ten times (Matt. xix. 7, 8; xxiii. 2; Mark x. 3; Luke xvi. 29, 31; xxiv. 27; John v. 45, 46, vii. 19, 23). In this the destructive critics, with one accord, take issue with him.\*

\* Dr. Henry Van Dyke of Princeton, in a Lecture on "Egypt in the Bible," in which he gives special attention to archæological research in its bearing on the authorship of the Pentateuch, reaches this conclusion: "What, then, shall we think of the origin of this account, as we read it in the light of these discoveries? Is it likely to be the invention of a later age, a fiction constructed by some clever priest many centuries after Israel had come out of Egypt, or, perhaps (to use a Hibernicism, for the sake of brevity), many centuries after Israel had never been there? Such a supposition would involve two miracles. First, the possession by the supposed novelist of an utterly abnormal literary skill; and, second, a preternatural foreknowledge of the archæological discoveries

*Deuteronomy.* If this book was written at the time and in the manner suggested by Ewald and others of his way of thinking, it is simply a bold forgery, unworthy of a moment's credence or consideration. That Christ had no sympathy with their views is evident from the fact that in his temptation in the wilderness (Matt. iv. 1-11), needing three arrows, he plucked them all from

which have actually been reserved for the present century to make."

"It certainly seems more natural, more reasonable, to suppose that this story of the patriarchs in Egypt is substantially the work of a man who, while he was himself a Hebrew—as the tone of the narrative shows—was at the same time learned in all the learning of the Egyptians; one who was familiar with the ancient customs and observances of both races; one who possessed a vivid knowledge of manners and of events which were subsequently lost for many centuries in the gloom of oblivion; and one (as we may infer from certain indications which I have not time to mention) who lived not earlier than the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty. Such a man was Moses. And there is no reason under the heavens, nor upon the earth, nor has any reason yet been discovered under the earth, why we should not think that the substance and much of the actual language of this ancient narrative come to us from the hand of Moses."

this quiver: "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Deut. viii. 3); "It is written again, Thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God (Deut. vi. 16); "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Deut. vi. 13).

*Prophecy.* In view of the fact that the supernatural factor is wholly eliminated from prophecy by the destructive critics it may be well to observe that the invariable teaching of Jesus was just the reverse. He rang the changes on the word "fulfilled" and honored the prophets whenever he mentioned them. The connection of Elijah with the Samaritan famine and his miracle at Sarepta (Luke iv. 25, 26); Elisha and the Syrian leper (Luke iv. 27); the destruction of Tyre and Sidon in pursuance of the predictions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel and Amos (Matt. xi. 20-

22) ; the conversion of Nineveh under the preaching of Jonah (Matt. xii. 41) ; Malachi's prophecy of John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 10 cf. Mal. iii. 1) ; the chain of Messianic prediction running through "all the Scriptures" (John v. 39, also Luke xxiv. 27) ; the lurid foregleams of the end of the world (Luke xxi. 22), including those of Daniel, the most savagely discredited of all the prophets by modern rationalistic critics (Matt. xxiv. 15) ; these and other like references of Jesus to the prophets of the Old Economy—taken in connection with the fact that he nowhere, by word or syllable or slightest suggestion, intimates the contrary—are incontrovertible evidence of his unswerving faith in the absolute truth and trustworthiness of the prophecies.

*Jonah and the Great Fish.* The Jews did not deny the miracles of Jesus. There were present in their assemblages those whose sight had been restored, whose leprous scales had been wiped

away, whose palsied limbs had been restored. In the face of such witnesses there was no room for denial or doubt. The only question was, Whence did Jesus derive the power to work such miracles? Was it from above or from beneath? The scribes and Pharisees intimated that it was from Satan. "No," said Jesus, "it is divine power. I can do nothing except the Father be with me. I and my Father are one." Then said the scribes and Pharisees, "Let us see your credentials. If this power be from heaven, show us a sign from heaven to attest it." He answered on this wise, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet: for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii. 38-40). This was, indeed, not a sign "from

heaven," but from earth, from the darkness of the tomb, from the belly of hell. How runs the record? "Now the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amittai, saying, arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before me. But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord; and he went down to Joppa, and found a ship going to Tarshish: so he paid the fare thereof and went down into it, to go with them unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord. But the Lord sent out a great wind into the sea, and there was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken. Then the mariners took up Jonah and cast him forth into the sea: and the sea ceased from her raging. And the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah; and Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights. Then Jonah prayed unto the Lord his



God out of the fish's belly. And the Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land." In his reference to this narrative our Lord did not only signify his assent to its truth, but he adventured the validity of his redemptive work upon it. As his resurrection was to be the seal of his atonement, so the truth of the Jonah narrative was the sign of his resurrection. Had he regarded it as mere folk-lore, he could not have made such use of it. We do not use fables as guarantees of fact. Try it in a court of justice. "As surely as Jason sought and found the Golden Fleece, so surely will I tell the truth." That would scarcely answer. You must certify by an indubitable fact like this: As surely as there is a God in heaven I will tell the truth! Or try it in a common matter like the contract for a debt; make out your note on this wise: "By the sign of Jack and the Beanstalk, or of Cinderella and her Crys-

tal Slipper, I promise to pay when this obligation falls due." Does this seem preposterous? It is not a whit more preposterous than to allege that Jesus referred to the "fable" of Jonah when called upon to produce a sign in verification of his own claims as the only begotten Son of God.

Is it not a remarkable fact, as shown by the foregoing, that the very portions of Scripture which have been most vigorously assailed and held up to ridicule by destructive critics are those which Jesus marked with his authoritative seal of approval? Verily, it looks as if he anticipated the things that are happening in these days! And in a clash of opinion between Jesus, as the champion of the divine Word, and all who oppose it, there is no room for hesitation on the part of those who sincerely follow him. They will be found standing with him.

(5) *He affirmed that the Scriptures are*

*complete, sufficient and ultimate in all matters touching the spiritual life* (Luke xvi. 31). In one of the cities of Cesarea Philippi there were six brothers, well-to-do gentleman—eminently respectable men. They attended to their own affairs. They probably paid their debts, obeyed the laws, and dealt justly with their fellowmen. This was the sum total of duty as they apprehended it. As to spiritual things they were non-committal. They said, “You tell us about God and immortality and righteousness and judgment to come. There may be something in these things, but we have no means of knowing it. There are some things that we can see and handle with our hands. We are living in a world of actual toil and struggle. Things that pertain to this present world are real and tangible; they lie within the reach of our finger tips. As to things invisible, we know nothing; let them pass.” So they took no interest in God or religion, but lived purely sordid

lives. That was the worst that could be said about them. They were not thieves, murderers, or adulterers, but just world-ings, that was all.

In course of time it happened that one of these brothers died—died, and went to his own place, that is, to the place for which his manner of life has fitted him. So it is written, “In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment.” His tongue was parched with an unquenchable thirst—a spiritual thirst; a vain longing for possibilities forever gone by. He suffered like Tantalus, who stood to his lips in clear water which receded whenever he sought to drink. The glories of heaven were in view, but he was shut out. He had chosen to turn his back on spiritual verities and now he was exiled from God. And “there was a great gulf fixed”—an eternal, bridgeless gulf. By reason of the fixity of his character he could never cross it. He was in his own place. He had no part in heaven, no fitness for it.

In the interview with Abraham, of which Jesus tells, this lost rich man makes a strange request: "I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldst send and admonish my five brethren, lest they also come into this place." Here is an implication that he, himself, had not been fairly treated. Had he known the dreadful outcome he would never have passed his life in the pursuit of sordid things. He would have his brothers warned in time. Now observe the reply: "It would be in vain. They have Moses and the prophets; if they hear not them neither will they be persuaded if one rise from the dead." For an angel to bear a message of warning or of invitation to those five busy worldings would be indeed love's labor lost. Did they not reject the supernatural? Would they not have pronounced the angelic visitor an impostor, an hallucination? Nor was there any common vocabulary by which this angel could have communicated with

them. How difficult it is to express a spiritual fact in carnal terminology! Our Lord himself found it no easy matter. He defined God as a Spirit; but what is spirit? He could but speak of heaven as a house of many mansions; our eyes are so heavy, our ears so dull to spiritual things. And what could a celestial messenger say to these men? "Your brother is in hell and Lazarus in the realms of endless joy." Would they have believed that? Would they not have said, "What? Our respected brother Dives lost, and Lazarus, that miserable beggar, in heaven? Nay, we believe not a word of it."

Here then is the proposition which Jesus clearly lays down, *There is no excuse for unbelief*. The truth has power to save. Every man who has the Scriptures has a fair chance. The evidence is sufficient. If one believe not the Scriptures there is nothing on earth or in heaven that can convince him.

(6) *He affirmed that the Scriptures are the*

*potent and determining factor in the propagation of the gospel and the establishment of his kingdom on earth.* In the Parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 1-19) he sets forth, under the figure of agriculture, the restoration of the world to God. In his explanation of that parable (Mark xiii. 18-23) he says that the good seed is "the Word of the kingdom." In the parallel passage in Luke it is stated still more explicitly, "The seed is the Word of God" (Luke viii. 11).

The following truths are involved in this parable: *First*, The Word, like the seed, has the power of life. *Second*, The Church,—as represented by the Apostles who gathered about Christ,—is made the custodian of the Word (cf. Romans iii. 1-2). *Third*, The Church is under commission to "preach the Word" to the uttermost parts of the earth. Christ preached the Word; so must we. This is our crusade. "The sword of the Spirit is the Word of God." *Fourth*, The na-

tions will never be converted until the Church, and Christian people generally, follow the plan which Jesus so distinctly marked out. "The field is the world" and "the seed is the Word;" and until the seed is planted in the field there will be no universal harvest. This is what Jesus meant when he said, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. xxiv. 14). *Fifth*, In the meantime every Christian is responsible, up to the full measure of his influence, for seeing that no man anywhere is left in ignorance of the Scriptures. We cannot save others, but we can give them the word which has the power of salvation in it (Heb. iv. 12). The business of a Christian, in this particular, is set forth particularly in the Parable of "the scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom" (Matt. xviii. 52). *Sixth*, The promise of Jesus that "the end shall come" when the Word is thus



preached everywhere, is a clear corroborating echo of the whole tenor of prophecy. Take for example the wonderful words of Isaiah, "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater: so shall my Word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isaiah lv. 10-13).

We are not asked to regenerate the race. That is a divine prerogative. But we are required to disseminate the Word, through which God works in saving men. The Church shall not fulfil her obligation until she has sent messengers to the uttermost parts of the earth, scattering the truths of Scripture as leaves of the Tree of Life. God will do the rest. His promise is sure: "Then shall the end come."

The experience of the past has proven beyond all peradventure that the secret of success in Evangelization is implicit faith in the Word. A Bible preacher is a man of power. A Bible preacher is a successful fisher of men. Not long before Mr. Moody's death he showed me a petition signed by sixteen thousand of the people of Australia and Tasmania entreating him to come over and "preach the old Bible and the blood of Christ." "Ah," said he "the old Book has not lost its power. Let them rail at it and revile it ; it stands as an impregnable rock. The power of salvation is in it !" This was the secret of that man's marvelous success. He sowed the Word ; and God, true to his promise, blessed it.

## CHAPTER IV

### *The Provision of Jesus for the Writing of the New Testament.*

**T**HE Old Testament—that is, the Bible prior to the Advent—stood like a half-built temple, awaiting the coming of Christ to complete it.

But he wrote no portion of the New Testament with his own hand. He committed that work to his disciples as a sacred trust and gave them an abundant equipment for it. Observe,

(a) A considerable portion of his teaching was in merest outline. Some of the most important truths could, in the

necessity of the case, be only hinted at. He said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now" (John xvi. 12). His use of parables is thus explained, "And with many such parables spake he the Word unto them, as they were able to hear it" (Mark iv. 33).

(b) He made provision that such teaching as must be presented thus by himself should subsequently be filled out. It must be remembered that Jesus did not profess to complete his system of truth. Luke says he only "began to teach" (Acts i. 1). His words were the substance of a revelation which was to be continued, formulated and completed by certain of his disciples, who were to write this further Scripture as they were moved by the Spirit of God.

(c) To this end he specially endued them with the Spirit, and promised "He shall guide you into all the truth" (John xvi. 13); and again; "He shall teach you

all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you" (John xiv. 26), and again: "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning" (John xv. 26, 27). The New Testament is simply the recorded testimony of these "witnesses." It consists of a fourfold biography of Christ, a brief history of the Apostolic Church, the formulation of Christ's doctrinal and ethical teachings in a series of apostolic epistles, and one book of prophecy. The canon of the New Testament, thus composed, has stood unchanged, issuing a challenge, as it were, to the passing centuries, "Supplement me if you can!"

(*d*) The exclusive bounds of the New Testament are indicated by Christ in his instruction and qualifications of the "wit-

nesses." Only such persons were to write as, having been auditors and eye-witnesses or companions of such, were specially qualified, commissioned and required thus to do (as in Rev. i. 19); and only such writings could be included in the canon as were produced in this way.

(e) And upon these writings our Lord placed the seal of divine authority in most explicit terms, saying, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me" (Luke x. 16). Here is food for reflection on the part of such as profess to find antagonism between the teachings of John or Paul or James and those of their divine Lord. It is simply fatuous for a professing Christian to say, "I accept the teachings of Christ but not those of his apostles," when Christ himself said, with reference to their teachings, "He that heareth you, heareth

me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me.”

(*f*) If further proof of Christ's endorsement of the New Testament is desired, we shall find it in his last impressive words, “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book” (Rev. xxii. 18, 19). It is not a matter of vital moment whether this solemn admonition refers to the entire volume of Scripture or only to the Book of the Revelation of St. John; since in any case it indicates the mind of the Master respecting the inviolable sanctity of Holy Writ. If the words mean anything, they mean that the Book is not to be irreverently tampered with,

added to or subtracted from at pleasure, or treated in any wise except as a full and complete, inspired and authoritative record of the divine mind and will concerning men.



## CHAPTER V

### *The Silence of Jesus as to Alleged Errors of the Scriptures.*

**I**T is a little thing to say of Jesus that he was an honest man. And yet there is much in that; for “an honest man’s the noblest work of God.” Moreover, there is nothing so rare. The rule among men is to wear masks and disguises. Not one of us would be willing to have a window in his breast through which our neighbors might see the secret imaginations of our hearts.

An honest man is a two-sided man; that is, his silence is as honest as his speech.

It is customary in Siam to punish an incorrigible falsifier by sewing up his lips. But the cure is inadequate ; for a lie may be told by the lifting of the eyebrows, or the pointing of a finger. It is possible " to convey a libel with a frown, or wink a reputation down." Indeed, a falsehood may be told by making no motion at all. A gossip comes to you with a scandalous story which you have reason to believe is false ; in common honesty you should make an indignant denial, but you utter not a word. Speak up, man ! Silence gives consent. Silence is a liar, a slanderer, a forsworn enemy to friendship and truth and righteousness.

Let us say, then, that Jesus, the divine Teacher, was absolutely honest. There was no guile on his lips ; there was no guile in his heart. His life was as transparent as his utterance ; his silence was as candid as his speech.

There are those who insist upon having no creed save the teachings of Christ.

If that statement may be accepted in its full significance, we shall not dissent from it. The teachings of our Lord had to do with all the great problems and verities of the endless life. But when we speak of his teachings, we must be permitted to include his eloquent silence. For in many ways his silence was more significant than his words. He found his disciples in possession of certain views respecting truth, of which, had they been false, it was his simple duty as an honest Master to dispossess them. It is with this consideration in mind that we turn our attention now to his assurance, "If it were not so, I would have told you" (John xiv. 2).

(1) *With reference to himself.* The world had been looking for the coming of Christ. This feeling of expectancy was universal, but the Jews in particular were on the *qui vive*. The coming of Messiah was spoken of as "The Consolation of Israel." They had been led by

their prophets from time immemorial to believe that in the fulness of time one would appear who should restore the glory of their nation. His nature and character were predicted in minute detail. This was "The Hope of Israel." The disciples of Jesus as Jews shared in the common expectancy. In their familiar intercourse with Jesus, listening to his sermons and beholding his wonderful works, they came to believe that he was the long-expected Christ. Let it be observed, that he permitted them to entertain that view and uttered no word against it.

At the beginning of his ministry he was announced by John the Baptist as the Lamb of God. The term had no significance whatever, except as it pronounced Jesus to be the antitype of all the sacrifices which the children of Israel had been wont to offer in expiation of their sins. John meant, if he meant anything, that Jesus was the Lamb of God

slain from the foundation of the world. It was so understood by the disciples, though with only a dim apprehension of the manner in which that intimation was to be ultimately fulfilled. And Jesus allowed his disciples to rest in that view of his office and work.

As he was journeying through Cæsarea-Philippi, he made inquiry of his disciples, "Who do men say that I am?" And when they answered, "Some say one thing, and some say another," he further inquired, "But who say ye that I am?" Then Peter witnessed his good confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!" Not only did Jesus make no disavowal, but he distinctly consented in the words, "My Father which is in heaven hath revealed it unto thee."

In the upper room he met his disciples after his resurrection, and bade doubting Thomas thrust his fingers into his wounds in evidence of his triumph over death.

Then the skeptical disciple fell before him, crying, "My Lord and my God!" Had Jesus been less than very God of very God, he must, in common honesty, have said in that moment, like the angel in the Apocalypse, "See thou do it not." But he permitted this act of divine homage, and so by his silence distinctly avowed his equality with God.

(2) *With reference to the Scriptures as the written Word.* One of the stock arguments of the destructive critics is based on the silences of Scripture. For example, the absence of a particular name of God from certain portions of the record is taken to show that the writer was unfamiliar with it. And the omission of certain words and expressions from the latter part of the book of Isaiah proves that Isaiah could not have composed it. So far as this argument is effective at all, it has a double edge; as will be seen when it is applied to the singular silence

of Jesus with respect to alleged errors in the Word of God.

Is it not extraordinary that the wonderful Teacher never uttered a word or syllable to indicate that he supposed that the Book was other than true from beginning to end? How shall we account for this? We are in a dilemma, facing a three-fold alternative. *First*: There are no such errors in Scriptures. *Second*: The errors are there, but Christ was not aware of them. *Third*: He was aware of these errors but did not choose to tell.

Of course the destructive critics are bound to reject the first horn of this dilemma. They insist not that there are occasional errors in the Bible but that it is honeycombed with them. There are hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of them. Annals purporting to be historic are pronounced legendary or wholly fabulous; prophecies are declared to be *ex post facto*; entire books are condemned as forgeries. And the errors in

question are not unimportant, but of a most vital character, touching every one of the great doctrines and ethical facts of our religion. In other words the destructive criticism, when frankly stated, makes the Bible a mingled tissue of truth and falsehood with no means of discriminating between them. So far from being "the best of books," if placed alongside of a hundred reputable works of science and history, it becomes the least trustworthy of them all.

But if the first horn of the dilemma be impossible to a friend of the destructive criticism, the second is still more so, assuming him to be a professed follower of Christ. Not long ago an essayist in a ministers' meeting enquired, "If the statements in the Pentateuch, to which Jesus referred, were not true, why did he not say so?" to which one of his audience replied, "Because he did not know any better." That is to say, Christ was less familiar with the true significance of



Scripture than the so-called Biblical experts of our time. This, however, is in direct contravention of Christ's constant claim of infallible insight into truth; as where he says, "I am the truth" (John xiv. 6); and, "To this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth" (John xviii. 37). If, indeed, with the assumption of omniscience on his lips, he really knew less of Scripture than our modern professors of Biblical science, we will probably agree that he is not competent to be our instructor in spiritual things. In that case, it would obviously be wiser for such as are in serious quest of truth to sit as disciples at the feet of those who profess to know more than he.\*

The third horn of the dilemma is all that remains; namely, Christ was aware of these alleged errors, but did not choose to tell. Worse and worse! The scholars who are exposing the alleged errors of

\* See Appendix D.

Scripture in our time profess to be doing so in the interest of truth and honesty. They say they are bound to attack "Bibliolatry," which is superstition. They are constrained by conscience to unearth the truth at all hazards. But what of Jesus, then, who so strangely held his peace? O that singular silence! That eloquent silence of his! What shall be said of it? The Jews of his time had an implicit faith in their Scriptures. They would not touch them with unwashed hands; they weighed and measured the relative value of their words and sentences; they wore them as frontlets between their eyes. Here was Bibliolatry indeed! Were they mistaken, and did Jesus know it? How easily he could have corrected their misapprehension. And still did he keep silence? Then, I say, he is not competent to be our guide in righteousness; for, evermore, "an honest man's the noblest work of God."

The alternatives are before us. I see

no logical position for a Christian to take but that the Scriptures are true. Out of the ministry of Jesus there comes a voice, solemn and conclusive, which determines our course in the midst of controversy: "Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in me . . . *if it were not so, I would have told you.*"

The writer is aware that the argument at this point is negative. It should be observed, however, that this is the form of argument most emphasized by the destructive critics. Let it be remembered, too, that silence is oftentimes convincing where speech is ineffective. The most serious misrepresentations are not unfrequently made without a word. He who permits a falsehood to pass unchallenged enters into complicity with it. Honesty constrains us to speak out. So when Jesus, professing to be a teacher of truth, in an age when the Scriptures were challenged on every side as vigor-

ously as at the present day, refused to lend his influence by word or syllable to the exposure of alleged Biblical errors, we are justified in concluding that he believed there were no such errors. He found his disciples holding a certain view of Scripture of which, had it been erroneous, he must in common honesty have dispossessed them. A word would have accomplished this, but the word was unspoken. He left them resting in their simple faith, covering the case with those significant words, "If it were not so, I would have told you."

## CHAPTER VI

### *Summary and Conclusion.*

**T**HE argument in Chapter First was to show a fourfold, progressive, Antecedent Presumption; first, that God would reveal himself to his children in some way; second, that this revelation would probably be in human form; third, that such an Incarnation must be complemented by a Scriptural revelation, since it would be practically ineffective otherwise; and fourth, that the Incarnate Word must be in complete harmony with the Written Word.

In Chapter Second it was shown by the

## *Summary and Conclusion* 181

cumulative testimony of all Christ's references to Scripture that he was not only in perfect accord with it but that he positively, invariably and absolutely approved its truth and trustworthiness every way.

In Chapter Third the same fact was demonstrated by a more specific and classified survey of his relations to the Written Word ; first, in his quotations from the current versions of his time ; second, in the various titles which he applied to it ; third, in his positive affirmations respecting its singular truth and complete trustworthiness.

In Chapter Fourth it was made to appear that Jesus placed his anticipatory approval on writings which were to be made by certain of his inspired followers respecting his life and doctrine ; and that by this approval the New Testament has co-ordinate authority with the Old, as being equally true and trustworthy.

And in Chapter Fifth emphasis was

placed on the eloquent silence of Jesus respecting the alleged errors of Holy Writ; showing that, had there been such imperfection he must have known it, and, knowing, must have declared it; leading us to the inevitable conclusion that, in his judgment, the Scriptures were worthy of absolute credence as the perfect Word of God.

It remains, in conclusion, to consider the question *Do Christ and the Bible stand or fall together?* To that question we unhesitatingly answer No. There is, in fact, no question as to Christ's or the Bible's standing or falling, apart or together. Neither can fall under any circumstances. They stand. They stand together as the mutually complementary, reflexively corroborative and equally trustworthy Incarnate and Written Words of God. And they stand forever, "for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

Were Christ shown to be other than

*Summary and Conclusion* 183

the veritable Son of God, the Bible would be proven a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, because it continually testifies of him; but no contingency is more remote than this. Conversely, were the Bible shown to be other than completely true and trustworthy it would be impossible, in view of the consistent teaching of Jesus respecting its truth, to believe in him as a teacher come from God; but this contingency is as remote as the other. There have never been wanting—nor are there wanting in our time—men who from within as well as from without the church have denied both the Godhood of Christ and the divine veracity of the Scriptures; but the Church as a compact whole was never truer to the Incarnate Word and to the Written Word than it is at this day.

The doctrines of the Incarnation of Christ and the Inspiration of the Scriptures are like the pillars Jachin and Boaz, which upheld the archway of the temple.



They are complementary each to the other. There is no Christ except the Christ of the Scriptures ; and there is no possibility of any assurance respecting Christ unless we are warranted in placing an unqualified trust in the testimony of those Scriptures as the very Word of God.

There are two that bear witness to the divineness of the Bible. *One of these is the Bible itself.* Not only its oft repeated claim, but its very existence, is evidence of its singular origin and character. The book is a record of miracles, but it records no miracle more amazing than itself. It has passed through the fire of centuries without the smell of smoke upon it. Other books, however wise and wonderful in their time, yield to criticism or fall behind in the progress of the ages. Our libraries are cemeteries. Here are three epitaphs which are at first sight scarcely recognized—"Novum Organum," "Hydriotaphia," "Eikonoklastes." Who

cares for them now? Yet *Novum Organum*, by Lord Bacon, formulated the inductive system of philosophy. *Hydriotaphia*, by Sir Thomas Browne, was a thesaurus of general information such as the world has seldom seen. And *Eikonoklastes*, by John Milton, was the historic manifesto against the divine right of kings. Thus the great books die, but one lives!—lives in spite of opposition and the rasure of time—lives gloriously and is destined to survive all.

It is printed in about five hundred languages and dialects. The interest which it excites in the universal mind, and by which it is separated infinitely from all books of human origin, is attested by the fact that within forty-eight hours after the Oxford version was issued two million five hundred thousand copies were disposed of. The telegraphic wires were kept busy, to the exclusion of everything else, transmitting the four Gospels from New York to Chicago in a tele-

gram of more than one hundred thousand words!

And what shall be said as to the metaphysical force in this volume—a force that grips hold of the sinner and somehow transforms him, changes his heart, conscience, brain, and will, and makes him a new man? The Chancellor of Queen Candace was converted by reading the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah; some centuries later Lord Rochester, a vicious infidel, was converted by reading the same. And this sort of thing is going on all the time. Has any other book such power? Do the Vedas, the Zend-Avesta, the Koran, the Analects of Confucius turn men about, reform them, transform them, and set their faces towards truth and righteousness and heaven and God? An old Highlander said to Claudius Buchanan, “I cannot argue, I cannot present any theological facts or reasons, I cannot explain the process or philosophy of revelation; but I know

this, that when I was a man with an un-governable temper and an evil character, this Book got hold of me and quelled the tiger in me." Ah, here is the master fact: the Bible makes men! Take your stand on a Broadway corner and select a hundred at random from among the passers-by who say that they believe in these Scriptures, and another hundred from those who reject them; let the two companies face each other; and contrast their characters. We will abide the issue. The best men of the world to-day are, as a rule, conspicuously and undeniably those who believe in the Word of God.

Or take a map of the world and draw a line around the nations that have fallen under the influence of this Book: and, behold, you have included all light and excluded all regions that lie in darkness and the shadow of death! You have drawn a line between barbarism and civilization, between charity and selfish-

ness, between oppression and freedom, between night and day!

The Bible is the only book in existence that boldly and conclusively touches the great spiritual problems. It is the only book that makes a distinct utterance with reference to the nature and character of God, and to the nature and character and destiny of man. It not only sets forth the great moral and spiritual truths, but it so simplifies them as to bring them within the grasp of the humble folk: as it is written, "Except ye become as little children ye shall in no wise see the kingdom of God." And a curious fact is this: the truths thus presented are capable of codification. No one ever heard of a doctrinal system belonging to Islam or Confucianism or to any religion except ours. There is a system of truths represented in the œcumenical creeds of christendom which is substantially—nay, absolutely—identical among all the multitudinous families of the

church militant. These truths are strung together in logical and coherent order, as if intended to furnish thus a necklace of pearls for the adornment of the Bride of God.

The Bible presents, also, the moral standards of the world. The courtesies, proprieties, humanities of our civil, social and domestic life are traced to the Sermon on the Mount. The jurisprudence of every civilized people on the globe is based upon the Decalogue. The Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount are the two brief historic summaries of Scriptural morality, and between them stands Jesus Christ, the exemplar of both of these symbols, the only Man who ever "brought the bottom of his life up to the top of his light," the perfect, the Ideal Man.

But the crowning testimony of the Bible to its own divineness is its power unto salvation. Of all the books in the world this is the only one that answers

the universal question "What shall I do to be saved?" There are others that with more or less correctness, set forth the precepts of right living; but there is none that suggests a way of blotting out the record of the misspent past or of escaping from the penalty of the broken law. All through this Book, from Eden to the Apocalyptic vision, walks the majestic figure of one who claims to be the deliverer of the soul. In the midst of these oracles stands the Cross, throwing its shadow four ways towards all the horizons of human life. Out of this blessed volume comes the voice, always and everywhere, "He that believeth on the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved"—saved here and hereafter, saved from the shame and bondage and penalty of sin.

Other books have poems, but no other sings the songs of salvation and gives the troubled soul a peace that floweth like a river. Other books have eloquence, but no other enables us to behold God him-

self stretching out his pierced hands and pleading with men to turn and live. Other books have history, but no other tells the story of divine love reaching from the remote councils of eternity to the consummation on Calvary, "the old, old story of Jesus and his love." Other books have science, but no other can give the soul a definite assurance with respect to spiritual life, so that it may say, "I know him whom I have believed and am persuaded that he is able to guard that which I have committed unto him against that day." Other books set forth philosophy, but no other makes us wise with respect to those great doctrines which centre in the living God.

Thus the Book bears witness to itself. Add to this *the testimony of Jesus* as traversed in the foregoing chapters—the positive testimony of his consistent affirmations, not infrequently sealed with a solemn "Verily, verily I say unto you,"—his negative testimony in the eloquent



silence which he observed with reference to all those alleged errors which are so magnified and emphasized by the destructive critics of our time—and what standing ground is left for hesitation on the part of any true child of God?

Aye, the Written Word and the Incarnate Word stand together! Neither can fall; but a man will fall from either when he lets go the other.

Blessed Bible! Old-fashioned but not obsolete; deep beyond the plummet of philosophy, yet clear enough to reveal thy deepest treasures to children's eyes; sharp as a Damascus blade to pierce a guilty conscience, but comforting as balm of Gilead to the wounds of the penitent; fierce as the lightning against all wrong and error, but gentle as a mother's touch in time of trouble! Dear Book that our fathers and mothers touched with reverent hands and pressed with loving lips, thou shalt be the man of our counsel also, a lamp unto our feet and a

*Summary and Conclusion* 193

light unto our way ! In sorrow we will find thy solace through our tears ; in weariness we will drink from thy crystal depths as soldiers at a wayside fountain ; in weakness we will gird our loins with thine exceeding great and precious promises ; and in our last journey thy living Word shall be our rod and staff to lean upon until we come to heaven's gate !

M

## APPENDICES

### A

It is conceded that the doctrine of the incarnation is supra-rational. The most veritable facts in human life and experience are not infrequently beyond the necessity, not to say the possibility, of argument. We thank no man for tearing apart the leaves and petals of a rose to help our appreciation of it. It would be a useless task to dissect the vocal apparatus of a skylark; let me see it soaring through the ether and hear its matchless song! I watch the sun go down in golden glory; and a discourse on the refraction of light just then would be an impertinence. O man of science, be still and let me drink this beauty in! Or who shall argue as to a mother's love? Who shall estimate it by a mathematical computation of the number of kisses imprinted on an infant's cheek? So with this doctrine of the incarnation; you cannot reduce it to a full scientific fact. Before you reach your *quod erat demonstrandum*, the life and glory have departed. Let this suffice. God is manifest in flesh. Let me bow and silently behold him. There is a magnetism in the presence of Christ, a light in his eyes, a warmth in his hands, a life out of his death, that forces me to cry like the centurion beneath his cross, "Verily, this is the Son of God!"

But the doctrine of the incarnation, though it transcends reason, is not contra-rational. It is a mystery. It is above, but not against, reason. It lies distinctly in the province of faith. The man who makes the assertion that no fact is to be received which cannot be apprehended by the senses, is in deep water; for we live and move and have our being in a realm of mystery. I will agree to explain the dual nature of Christ if any one will explain to me the dual nature of man. I am flesh and spirit; no scientist in the world can elucidate

the connection and co-operation of these two. I lift my hand. What does that mean? The power of mind over matter. My reason spoke to my will, my will commanded a sinew; and, behold, it was done! Thus spirit and flesh co-operate; my dual personality is a fact; no philosopher can explain it; none can deny it.

## B

If it be conceded that an incarnation of Deity is not improbable, the question arises, Which of the many alleged incarnations in the religions of the centuries is the true one? And this is a question of intrinsic comparison.

Take Osiris, who was alleged by the Egyptians to have come down from heaven and "conferred many incalculable benefits upon men." He was murdered by his enemy, Typhon, who cut his body in pieces and threw it into the Nile. His faithful wife Isis with many tears sought these fragments, and when they were placed together, lo! Osiris was alive again; and he liveth for evermore, enthroned in the judgment-hall of the invisible world. This has been justly pronounced "a wonderful forefeeling of the gospel narrative"—an outline, though dim, of the incarnation, life, suffering, vicarious death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus the Christ. But history has disposed of the claims of Osiris. He lies, like his mummied devotees,

"Cased in cedar and shut in sacred gloom,  
Swathed in linen and precious unguents old,  
Painted with cinnebar and rich with gold,  
Resting in solemn salvatory,  
Sealed from the moth and the owl and the flittermouse  
With his name on his brow."

The ancient Persians were wont to speak of *Sosioch* as the Coming One who would put down the black Ahriman and usher in the golden age. But they waited in vain. He never came!

The modern Parsees reject all thought of a Saviour. "There is no salvation," they say. "A man must suffer the penalty of whatsoever evil he hath done. The only saviour is a virtuous life." It was certain of their number, however, who,

made heartsick by hope deferred, followed the star to Bethlehem and paid their tribute to the veritable Son of God.

In the religion of the Hindus there are many avatars; but among them all Igni, or Brahma, is regarded as distinctly the incarnation of the divine essence. The portrayal of his character, as given in the Vedas, is a sufficient answer to his claims.

In the Buddhist conception of Gautama we have an apotheosis of man rather than a divine incarnation. The central thought of the system is human deification by self-culture. It appears that Gautama was a rationalist, since his last appeal was made to the human intellect. He was also a pantheist, inasmuch as he taught that the universal mind is everything and all. And he was practically an atheist, because he affirmed that aside from the impersonal Adi-Buddha there is no God.

In the Mythology of the Greeks there was no incarnation, but, instead, a singularly beautiful though futile deification of Nature in its multitudinous forms. If we enter their Pantheon we shall find Nature enthroned, the four elements deified, and sacrifices laid upon the altars of Storm and Season and Fruitfulness.

In the Mohammedan religion the possibility of an incarnation is denied in these words from the Koran:

“ Say there is one God alone?  
 God the eternal,  
 He begetteth not, is not begotten,  
 And there is none like unto him.”

But this denial, emphasized by the historic enmity of Islam toward Christianity, is itself a recognition of the universal thought; while its avowed fatalism, as formulated in *Karma*, “the doctrine of consequences,” is a confession of the ultimate impotence of a religion possessing a book without a Christ to complement it. The fatal defect of Islam is expressed by Lord Houghton in these words:

“ Mohammed’s truth lay in a holy book;  
 Christ’s in a sacred life.”

“So while the world rolls on from change to change,  
 And realms of thought expand,  
 The latter stands without expanse or range,  
 Stiff as a dead man’s hand.

“While, as the life-blood fills the growing form,  
 The spirit Christ has shed  
 Flows through the ripening ages fresh and warm,  
 More felt than heard or read.”

It thus appears that the false religions pay tribute to the importance of an incarnation, however vaguely and imperfectly they may realize it.

It is not for us to say whether such anticipations of a great Deliverer are lingering echoes of the protevangel (Gen. iii. 15), or the expressions of an intuitive conviction that a good God will not leave a sin-stricken world to an irremediable doom; in any case, we rejoice to know that even the nations that lie in darkness and the shadow of death are not wholly without a longing after God. They have slender clues of gospel truth, which, were they followed, would lead bewildered souls out of the dark labyrinths into the light. Thus, God is exonerated and the nations are without excuse (Rom. i. 20), if, becoming vain in their imaginations, they choose the unbroken night rather than the endless day.

### C

The errors referred to—which are frequently made to appear much more numerous and important than they really are—may be grouped as follows:

(1) Such as might naturally be expected in the process of transcription. It would be supposed that numberless errors would have occurred in this manner. But they are in fact so comparatively few and have so little bearing on the important truths of Scripture as to warrant the belief that even copyists and translators have been under the care of a special providence.

(2) It is averred that there are statements in Scripture which conflict with science. This is denied *in toto*, and by none more vigorously than by many scientists of established

name. It is conceded that the Scriptures account for the present order of things in a manner not altogether harmonious with certain so-called "scientific" hypotheses of these times; but there is an infinite chasm between a hypothesis and a scientific fact; and it is likely to be a long while before an unsubstantiated dream can be successfully pitted against an authority which has withstood the test of centuries as the Word of God.

(3) There are said to be statements in Scripture which are mutually contradictory. This also is denied, absolutely, except in the case of literal or numerical discrepancies of little or no importance, and due wholly to transcription. On the other hand, the wonderful harmony of the Scriptures—composed by above forty writers at intervals along a period of sixteen hundred years—affords a most striking proof of divine superintendence.

(4) There are variations of expression in the sacred record, frequently called "discrepancies," which on closer examination are seen to present the truth from various points of view. Such are the differences in the four Gospels. If I were desirous of forming an accurate conception of the personal appearance of the German Emperor, I could not do better than to send to Berlin for photographs as follows: A right profile, a left profile, a half front and a full face. This is precisely what the four evangelists have given us in their biographies of Jesus: three portraits from diverse standpoints, and one "full front" in which he appears as the eternal Son of God. The differences of expression in these four Gospels—allowing scope for the exercise of the writers' individual traits—afford us a satisfactory means of forming a full and clear judgment as to the life and character of Jesus Christ.

## D

How do those who, while professing to be Christians, deny the truth of Scripture, escape from this dilemma? By introducing a peculiar theory of the "*Kenosis*" or self-emptying of Christ. The suggestion is in Phil. ii. 5-11: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Jesus Christ: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of

a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross."

Now what was it that the only-begotten Son of God gave up when he "took upon him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men?" His Godhood? No; but the "form" of it. His essential glory? No; but the "form" of it.

It must have been a great day in heaven when the Second Person of the Godhead set out for earth to accomplish his great work. He vanished; and when next he appeared, lo! it was as a child wrapped in swaddling bands and lying in a manger. Between the gate of heaven and Bethlehem, something had fallen from him. Not his Godhood; it is unthinkable that he should cease to be God. But he had given up the outward form of deity. There was no halo about the Christ-child. "There was no form, nor comeliness, nor any beauty that we should desire him." He had emptied himself of the form of God, and taken upon him the form of a man. He was exclusively neither God nor man; but *Theanthropos*, the God-man.

He was made in this "fashion" for a threefold purpose: (1) To enter so into participation of our human nature that he might become a high priest able to be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; (2) to veil in such wise the divine majesty, upon which no man can look and live, as to adjust it to our fleshly eyes; and (3) to prepare himself for the great sacrifice. As Anselm says, "He must be man that he may suffer, and by the same token he must be God, that he may suffer enough for all the children of men."

Let it be remembered, however, that in emptying himself of the form, he still retained the essential nature of God. Now and then his disciples caught a glimpse of its glory. On the Mount of Transfiguration in the shadow of the luminous cloud, his garments were white and glistening, and his face as the sun shining in its strength.

In like manner he emptied himself of the outward form and exercise of his divine attributes. In becoming a servant, he held these prerogatives in abeyance. But they were always at his command, standing about him like genii awaiting his nod and beck. Where was his *omnipresence*? He whom the heaven of heavens could not contain, consented to be en-



closed within the narrow bounds of a manger, a carpenter-shop, a judgment-hall. Yet on occasion barred doors and gates could not restrain him. And his consciousness of omnipresence was manifest in his promise, "Lo, I am with you alway."

Where was his *omniscience*? In speaking of the Great Assize, he said, "But of the day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the Son, but the Father only." In other words, he had put away the exercise of his omniscience. Yet on occasion he recalled it; as when he perceived past and future events, and declared his acquaintance with the secret imaginations of the hearts of men. All things were naked and open before him. There was indeed an obscuration, but in no wise an obliteration, of his power of infinite sight. He was the great mind-reader. He needed no cathode rays to help him.

And where was his *omnipotence*? He who created the worlds consented to earn his livelihood in a carpenter-shop. He was anhungered and athirst, like other men; he lay asleep on the steersman's cushion of the little boat, wearied with the labors of the day; but mark, when the storm rises, and the sailors bend over him, crying, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" how he summons his almighty power, lifts his hands above the surging waves, and quiets them by his word, "Be still!" until, like naughty children, the winds and billows sob themselves to sleep.

But in his death this "self-emptying" went further still. "He became *obedient unto death*." The self-existent One, centre and source of life itself, bowed to the king of terrors, yet still remained Prince of life. When Peter drew the sword in Gethsemane Jesus rebuked him, saying, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" In other words, if he consented to die, it was not because he had not the power to live. "I have power to lay down my life," said he, "and I have power to take it again." So when Pilate said, "Knowest thou not that I have power to release thee and have power to crucify thee?" he answered, "Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above." He was not a struggling victim like Iphigeneia, the daughter of Agamemnon, who was dragged to the altar for the deliverance of the Greeks. He came to Calvary as a volunteer, saying, "Here am I, in the volume of the book it is written

of me, I rejoice to do thy will, O my God." He addressed himself to his great purpose in pursuance of an eternal covenant for the salvation of ruined men. In full possession of infinite power, he chose to be feeble like other men.

It is evident from the foregoing that no just or Scriptural interpretation of the Kenosis can give any warrant whatsoever for the astounding assertion that Jesus was ignorant of the facts in the controversy as to the truth of Scripture. He did, indeed, "lay his glory by" when he assumed our flesh; but it was precisely as a king puts aside his crown and scepter and purple robe. He does not lay them beyond his reach. He does not discard his royal functions or responsibilities. He does not abdicate when he "lays them by." On occasion he instantly reassumes them; so that even when discrowned and disrobed, he is still a king, supreme and regnant, with all his essential honors thick upon him.

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

### A

- Abreast of the age, The Bible, 99.
- Affirmations of Jesus as to Truth of Scripture, 121, seq.
- Agreement of the Incarnate and the Written Word, 15.
- Attitude of Jesus toward the Scriptures, 18, seq.
- Authority of Jesus, 39.
  - ultimate for Christians, preface, 103, 104.
- Autograph, original, of the Scriptures, 91-94.

### B

- Baptism of Jesus, 28-30.
- Baptist, John the, 47-49.
- Bibliolatry, 45, 46.
- Brugsch, Herr, discoveries of, 98.

### C

- Cain and Abel, 141.
- Caesarea-Philippi, journey through, 56, seq.
- Capernaum, Christ at, 39.
- Christ and the Bible, mutually complementary, 183, 184.
- Christendom testifies to Truth and Power of Scriptures, 14, 187, 188.
- Consciousness, testimony of, 7.
- "Contains," the mischief of the word, 126, 127.
- Creation, story of, approved by Christ, 140.
  - order of, 96, footnote.
- Credentials, Christ's, 49, 63, 71-73, 82, 83.
- Critic, Jesus not a, 94, seq.

204 *Index of Subjects*

- Criticism, Lower, 95, 99, 100.  
Higher, 100-103.  
Cross, Christ on the, 84.

D

- Danger, the Bible in no, 139.  
of losing confidence in the Bible, 139.  
Definition, importance of, 138.  
Deuteronomy, references of Christ to, 147, 148.  
Dilemma of the destructive critics, 174, seq.  
Disciples, qualified to write Scripture, 162-167.  
Disciples called, 32, 33.  
Discredited parts of Scripture approved by Christ, 14, seq.  
Dives and his brothers, 154-157.  
Divorce, 69.  
Doctors, Christ among the, 23-26.  
Doctrines, system of, in the Bible, 188, 189.

E

- Elijah, coming of, 58, 59.  
Emmaus, journey to, 85, 86.  
Errors in current versions, 89.  
Events, Scripture tested by, 13.  
Exodus, the, 143, 144.  
Experts, Biblical, an advisory board proposed, 124, 125.  
Explaining away the statements of Jesus, 121.

F

- Fables, not to be used in verifying facts, 152, 153.  
Father, relation of Christ to the, 62.  
Feast of Dedication, Jesus at the, 63.  
Fire, the Scriptures under, 12-15.  
Flood, story of the, 141.

G

- Gethsemane, 82.  
Greeks, the, who asked to "see Jesus," 71, 72.

## H

- Home, instruction of Jesus at, 19, 20.  
Honesty of Jesus, 168, 169, 176, 177.  
Hope of Israel, 170, 171.  
Householder, parable of the, 51, 52.

## I

- Inauguration of Christ into his ministry, 27, 28.  
Incarnation, antecedent probability of an, 4.  
    a universal thought, 5.  
    a mystery, 7.  
    woven into the Scriptures, 7.  
Inspiration of the Scriptures affirmed by Christ, 128-135.  
    defined by him, 129, 130.

## J

- Jonah, the story of, approved by Christ, 149-153.

## K

- Kenosis, the, 27, footnote. Appendix D.  
Key of knowledge, 66.  
Kingdom, patent factor in the, 158.  
Knowledge of the Scriptures, Christ's, 59, 60, 175, 176.

## L

- Lamb of God, 31, 32, 171.  
Law, the, 115, seq.  
Law of Moses, 119, 120.  
Law and Prophets, 118.  
Law, Prophets and Hagiographa, 115-117.  
Lawyer, a certain, 65.  
Leaders, Christ and the religious, 65-69, 75-79, 105.  
Letter from Home, the Scriptures a, 11.  
Literature, the Bible as, 96, 134, 135.  
Loaves, Christ's teaching in connection with the, 53.  
Lot's wife, 143.

## M

- Ministry, the Galilean, 35-55.  
     the Judean, 33-35.  
     the Perea, 55-71.  
 Miracle, the Bible its own best, 184, 185.  
 Mission, consciousness of Christ as to his, 26, 27.  
 Morality of the Scriptures, 189.  
 Moses and the Prophets, 156, 157.

## N

- Nature, vain search for God in, 5.  
 Nazareth, Christ's sermon at, 36-38.  
 New Testament, Christ's provision for, 162, seq.  
     truth and authority of, 165-167.  
 Nicodemus, Christ's interview with, 34.

## O

- Objections to Scripture, anticipated by Christ, 153.  
 Old Testament, origin of the title, 104.

## P

- Parables, 50.  
 Palm Sunday, 71.  
 Paralytic of Bethesda, 41.  
 Passion week, Christ's preaching during, 71-85.  
 Philosophy, vain search for God in, 6.  
 Power of the Scriptures, 186.  
 Patriarchs, historicity of the, 142.  
 Pentateuch, the, 116, seq.  
     its authority, 146.  
     its truth affirmed, 144, 145.  
 Prayer, Christ's sacerdotal, 81, 106, 107, 110.  
 Preaching of Jesus, Scriptural, 38, seq.  
     of the Disciples, 64.  
     for our time, 45-47, 159-161.  
 Prejudice in favor of the Scriptures, 102.  
 Probability, antecedent, of an incarnation, 4.  
     of a Scripture, 9.  
     of their mutual agreement, 15.  
 Propagation of the Scriptures, 185, 186.

## R

- Revelation of God, Bible the only, 12.  
Rule of faith and conduct, Christ's, 28-30.  
Ruler, a certain, 70.

## S

- Sabbath, Christ's teaching as to the, 43, 44.  
Salvation, through the Scriptures, 68-70, 97, footnote, 135,  
139, 153, 186, 187, 189-192.  
Scripture, antecedent probability of a, 9.  
    meaning of the title, 108, seq.  
School, Jesus at, 20.  
"Search the Scriptures," 134-137.  
Sermon on the Mount, 44, 45.  
Silence of Christ, argument from the, 168-179.  
    as to himself, 170-173.  
    as to Scripture, 173-179.  
Sinners, Christ the friend of, 52.  
Sodom, destruction of, 143,  
Sower, parable of the, 49, 50, 105, 158-160.  
Supper, the Lord's, 80.  
Stand or fall together, Christ and the Bible, 182, seq., 192.  
Summary of the argument, 180, seq.

## T

- Teachers, Christ's denunciation of false, 41-43.  
Temple, first purging of the, 33.  
    second purging of the, 73.  
Temptation of Jesus, 30, 31.  
Testimony of the Bible as to its own truth, 184-191.  
Testimony of Christ as to the truth of the Bible, 191, 192.  
Theology of the Scriptures, 97, footnote.  
Titles of the Bible, 103, seq.  
Traditional view of Inerrancy, 93.  
Traditions of the Elders, 54, 55.  
Transfiguration, the, 57, 58.  
Truth of Scripture denied by the destructive critics, 174, 175.  
Truth of Scripture affirmed by Christ, 41, 85, 122, seq.

## U

Unbelief, no excuse for, 157.

## V

Versions, current, Christ's use of, 87, seq.  
substantial correctness of, 90.

## W

Water, the living, 60, 61.  
Woman of Samaria, Christ's interview with the, 35.  
Woman taken in adultery, the, 61.  
Word, the Written and the Incarnate, 15-17.  
    their agreement, 15.  
Word of God, the Scriptures so designated, 104, seq.  
Worthless Bible, a, 126, 127.



## INDEX OF TEXTS

Genesis ii. 7	131	Zechariah xiii. 7	8
Exodus xxiv. 4	28	Matthew ii. 5-10	112
Numbers xxviii. 9	116	iii. 13-17	28
Deuteronomy vi. 13, 16	148	iv. 1-11	147
viii. 3	148	v. 17, 18	147
Psalms xxii. 1	84	17-19	45
xxxv. 19	80, 115	vii. 12	118
xli. 9	80, 109	viii. 11	142
lxix. 4	115	ix. 13	52
lxxxi. 6	115	xi. 7-15	49
cx.	77, 132, 133	10	112
cxviii. 22	109	13	119
cxxi. 19	80, 115	20-22	148
Proverbs viii. 23	99	xii. 5	116
Isaiah xii. 3	110	5-7	43
xliv. 3	110	9-14	44
lv. 1	110	38-40	49, 150
lv. 10-13	160	41	149
lxi. 1-3	109	42	49
Ezekiel xxxvii. 9	132	xiii. 1-19	158
Hosea vi. 6	52	14, 15	50
Micah iv. 2	53	19-21	105
		37, 51, 52	51
		xv. 2, 3	54
		4-9	55
		xvii. 10-13	59
		xviii. 52	159
		xix. 4	140
		4-6	70
		7	113

Matthew	xix 7, 8	146	Luke	iv 21	109
	xxi. 13	73, 112		25, 26, 27	148
	16	71		v. 14	47
	42	73		viii. 11	158
	xxii. 29-33	111		x. 16	165
	31, 32	142		23, 24	64
	37-40	76, 120		25-28	65
	42-46	77		26	116
	xxiii. 2	146		xi. 27, 28	50
	23	116		28	105
	35	141		45, 52	66
	xxiv. 14	159		xii. 11, 12	133
	15	79, 149		xvi. 15	67
	37-39	142		16, 17	68
	38, 39	80		17	116
	xxvi. 24	80, 114		29, 31	146
	31	80, 114		31	69, 154
	52-54	82, 114		xvii. 28, 29, 32	143
	55, 56	112		xx. 28	113
				37, 38	144
Mark	i. 21, 22	39		xxi. 22	79, 149
	ii. 1, 2	47		24	79
	iv. 14, 17	105		xxii. 15, 16	144
	33	163		37	81
	vi. 2	38		42	82
	vii. 6	113		67-71	83
	9	135		xxiv. 25, 26	85
	13	105		27	146, 149
	viii. 31	56		44	120
	ix. 12, 13	59, 113	John	i. 1, 14	16
	x. 3	146		ii. 13-22	34
	4	113		iii. 1-21	34
	xxii. 10	109		14	144
	18-23	158		iv. 1-42	35
	19	113		v. 1	41
	19-23	74		36-47	43
	24-27	75		38	105
	36	129		39 110, 125, 135, 149	
	xiv. 48, 49	82		vi. 45	53, 113
Luke	ii. 41-50	23		47-51	54
	iv. 18, 19	37		49	144

# Index of Texts

211

John vii. 10	119	Acts i. 1	163
15, 18	60	Romans	
16	39	iii. 1-2	158
19, 23	146	II Corinthians	
19, 24	60	iii. 14, 15	104
23	120	Ephesians	
37, 38	61	vi. 17	31
38	110	Phillipians	
viii. 2-11	62	ii. 5-11	27, 199
17, 18	114, 115	II Timothy	
56, 58	143	iii. 16, 17	130
x. 25	106	Hebrews	
34	114, 115	iv. 12	159
34-36	63	II Peter	
35	110	i. 21	132
xii. 35, 36	72	I John	
xiii. 18	80, 109	iv. 2	9
xiv. 2	170	Revelation	
6	176	i. 19	165
26	164	xxii. 18, 19	166
xv. 24, 25	106		
25	80, 114, 115		
26, 27	164		
xvi. 12, 13	163		
xvii. 6	107		
12	110		
14	81, 107		
17	81, 107, 122		
xviii. 37	5, 84, 176		

*The Teaching of Jesus Concerning His  
Own Mission*

BY

*Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., D.D.*

PRESS NOTICES.

“The style is clear, the thought elevated, the topics treated of are, in their logical deductions, extremely practical. Students of the Bible generally will find this a very useful volume to peruse and possess.”  
*N. Y. Observer.*

“If this first volume of this series is a fair specimen and representative of those that will follow, the series will not lack in ability or interest. Dr. Foster’s position is that of the conservative scholar who nevertheless is familiar with current critical investigations. The style of presentation is clear and admirably adapted to the needs of the layman and the student.” *The Interior.*

“This is a wonderfully interesting, suggestive and stimulating little book.” *The Baptist Teacher.*

“A very thoughtful and helpful book. . . will be found instructive and quickening.” *The Examiner.*

“The book is the work of a thorough scholar, is conservative yet progressive, and gives a remarkably wholesome presentation of a very important subject.” *The Baptist Argus.*

“Scholarly but popular. . . will be found extremely useful to all who desire a concise but accurate and comprehensive presentation of the leading teachings of Jesus concerning his mission.” *Baptist Review and Expositor.*

“Clear and simple enough for the intelligent layman, but not unhelpful to the clergyman who wants clearer ideas as to his Lord’s atoning work.” *The Treasury.*

*12mo. Cloth bound. Pp. viii, 136. Price 75 cents.*

# *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Church*

BY

*Geerhardus Vos, Ph.D., D.D.*

## PRESS NOTICES.

“This is a thorough yet compact study of Christ’s teaching on the Kingdom and the Church.” *Auburn Seminary Review*.

“A vigorous and discriminating discussion of a vital theme. . . will be read with help and satisfaction by a large audience.” *The Baptist Argus*.

“The discussion in this volume is of a great question, and the treatment is attractive and luminous.” *The Herald and Presbyter*.

“A scholarly volume. . . the whole argument is well expressed and worthy of profound consideration.” *The Examiner*.

“Scholarly, comprehensive and condensed. The discussion shows wide reading of the literature of the subject, evangelical conviction and feeling, and great skill in the use of exegetical power. The conclusions reached, as briefly restated in the closing chapter, will commend themselves to earnest and moderate men, and the whole discussion will be fascinating and suggestive to trained students.” *N. Y. Observer*.

“Impartial, reverent and very careful. . . Dr. Vos’ standpoint is at once modern and temperate. His study will be of value, not merely to the trained student but to the general reader as well.” *The Churchman*.

“The author has given a clear, strong, convincing argument in regard to his conception of the nature and place of the Kingdom of God in the world. It is a book that is profitable for reading, study and re-reading.” *The Midland Methodist*.

“A scholarly exposition of what is recognized to be the dominant theme of Christ’s teaching. Especially valuable is the exegesis of Peter’s confession and Christ’s consequent declarations.” *The Congregationalist*.

*12mo. Cloth bound. Pp. vi, 203. Price 75 cents.*

# OTHER BOOKS

BY

*David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.*

MINISTER OF COLLEGIATE CHURCH, NEW YORK

---

Hints and Helps. I. (Studies in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms, Daniel and the Acts of the Apostles).	463 pp.	\$1.25
Hints and Helps. II. (Studies in the Prophets, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Acts and the Epistles.)	388 pp.	\$1.25
Hints and Helps. III. (Studies in Genesis, Exodus and the Gospels).	405 pp.	\$1.25
The Early Church. (Studies in the Acts of the Apostles.)	312 pp.	\$1.00
(These volumes by Dr. Burrell and Rev. Joseph Dunn Burrell.)		
The Gospel of Gladness. (Sermons)	318 pp.	\$1.00
The Morning Cometh. (Sermons)	320 pp.	\$1.00
The Religion of the Future. (Sermons)	304 pp.	\$1.00
The Spirit of the Age. (Sermons)	381 pp.	\$1.00
For Christ's Crown. (Sermons)	370 pp.	\$1.00
The Golden Passional. (Sermons)	338 pp.	\$1.00
The Wondrous Cross. (Sermons)	351 pp.	\$1.00
God and the People. (Sermons)	355 pp.	\$1.00
The Verities of Jesus.	192 pp.	\$1.00
The Teachings of Jesus Concerning the Scriptures.	211 pp.	.75
The Unaccountable Man. (Sermons)	310 pp.	\$1.50
The Church in the Fort. (Sermons)	316 pp.	net \$1.20
The Wonderful Teacher. (Sermons)	327 pp.	net \$1.20
Christ and Progress. (Sermons.)	267 pp.	net \$1.20
The Gospel of Certainty. (Sermons)		\$1.50
The Religions of the World. Fetichism, The Religion of Ancient Egypt, Zoroastrianism, Brahmanism, Buddhism, The Religion of Greece, The Religion of the Norsemen, Confucianism, Islam, The True Religion.	332 pp.	\$1.25

---

Published or for Sale by

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY

150 NASSAU STREET  
NEW YORK



