

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 6.—April, 1881.

I.

INSPIRATION.

THE word Inspiration, as applied to the Holy Scriptures, has gradually acquired a specific technical meaning, independent of its etymology. At first this word, in the sense of God-breathed, was used to express the entire agency of God in producing that divine element which distinguishes Scripture from all other writings. It was used in a sense comprehensive of supernatural revelation, while the immense range of providential and gracious divine activities concerned in the genesis of the Word of God in human language was practically overlooked. But Christian scholars have come to see that this divine element, which penetrates and glorifies Scripture at every point, has entered and become incorporated with it in very various ways, natural, supernatural, and gracious, through long courses of providential leading, as well as by direct suggestion, through the spontaneous action of the souls of the sacred writers, as well as by controlling influence from without. It is important that distinguishable ideas should be connoted by distinct terms, and that the terms themselves should be fixed in a definite sense. Thus we have come to distinguish sharply between Revelation, which is the frequent, and Inspiration, which is the constant attribute of all the thoughts and statements of Scripture, and between the problem of the genesis of Scripture on the one hand, which includes historic processes and the concurrence of natural and supernatural forces, and must account for all the phenomena of Scripture; and the mere fact of Inspiration

timist, political or social sentiments, or national aspirations. We think that most thoughtful Americans who seriously study the works of God, not to speak of spread-eagle orators, would be inclined to believe that Providence will grant a longer time than Mr. Guinness will allow for the development and utilization of the natural resources of this continent. The doctrine of the book tends to repress well-founded Christian aspirations as well as legitimate national hopes. The work, as a whole, is a sad memorial of misdirected study. We cannot forbear noticing in its strange collection of facts some extracts from medical writings (pp. 261-2), which are altogether unfit for the eye of most non-professional readers. We would recommend Mr. Guinness, in revising his book for a new edition, to try to construct his argument without the adduction of such indelicate particulars.

DUNLOP MOORE.

THE TRUE HUMANITY OF CHRIST. By HOWARD CROSBY, D.D. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

In this little volume Dr. Crosby presents a view of the person of Christ which he regards as more Scriptural than that commonly held. He agrees with the creed statement that the person of Christ is constituted of two natures, the divine and the human, but differs from it in maintaining that during Christ's state of humiliation the divine nature was entirely dormant and inactive. The following extracts will explain his view:

"The divine nature, as regards its efficiency, was dormant in Christ during His humiliation. Its essence was there, for it is impossible for deity to become extinct, but its efficiency was in some mysterious way paralyzed in the person of Jesus." p. 26. The Logos "reduced himself, until the godhood was inefficient or inactive." p. 4. "There is not a vestige of deity in Christ's conscious life till after the resurrection." p. 44. "No action of our Saviour's life from Bethlehem to Calvary exhibits divinity." p. 23. "The mystery is in the dormancy or quiescence of the godhead, and not in the confusing presence of godhood and manhood together in their conscious acting." p. 43.

In developing his theory, the author first proves the deity of our Lord from the New Testament. That this work is well done by so accomplished an exegete, we need not say. The reader will agree with him when he says that "the supreme godhood of Jesus Christ is as clear as the light of day." Having thus established the fact that a divine nature was one of the constituents of Christ's person, Dr. Crosby then proceeds, in the remainder of the essay, to prove that this nature was "quiescent," "dormant," and "paralyzed" to such a degree that it made no manifestation of itself in the personal life of our Lord until after His resurrection. Although Christ had really two natures He exerted and used only one of them prior to His exaltation. In endeavoring to prove this position we do not think the author is successful.

The personal quality and characteristics of our Lord appear in two general ways: In His words and in His works; in His teachings and in His actions. Respecting the first, the author says but little. He remarks that Christ's words "are not rays of divinity, but they assert divinity. Christ's knowledge of His divinity during His humiliation was not through consciousness, but through faith in God's Word and Spirit." p. 27. By this we understand the author to mean that when Christ taught a doctrine or revealed a fact He was inspired to teach and reveal as the prophets and apostles were, only in a higher degree. He did not speak directly out of the omniscient intuition of His divine nature, because, this being temporarily dormant and paralyzed, could not teach or reveal anything in His consciousness. Prior to His resurrection, Christ was not immediately conscious that He was God, but He knew and believed that He was God upon the testimony of Scripture and of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Crosby cites no texts to prove this position. We quote the following in proof that Jesus Christ had as immediate and full consciousness of His divinity as He had of His humanity:

"I am the resurrection and the life. I say unto you that in this place is one greater than the temple. Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. I will give you a mouth and a wisdom which none of your adversaries shall be able to gainsay or resist. Before Abraham was, I am. O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. All mine are thine and thine are mine. I and my Father are one."

In such utterances as these, our Lord speaks out of the fulness of His personal consciousness. He is not relating what He has been taught by another, but what He feels in His own being. These are very different utterances from those that are prefaced by such phrases as, "The word of the Lord came unto me," "The Lord said unto me," in the instances of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and all the prophets who were inspired and instructed by the Holy Ghost. And this great difference between the Mediator and His agents is noted in the words: "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him."

Respecting the works of Christ, Dr. Crosby reasons more at length. He quotes from the New Testament to prove that our Lord did not work His miracles by the direct exercise of the deity that was in His person, because this was quiescent and paralyzed temporarily, but by the exercise of His human nature, which was appointed and empowered so to work as it was in the instance of Peter, Paul, and others. "We are asked," he says, p. 27, "if Christ's miracles were not the actions of omnipotence. We reply No; no more than the miracles of Moses, Elijah, and Paul. There is a popular fallacy that our Saviour spake, in working miracles, with an authority peculiar to Himself, while others who wrought miracles modestly spake in the name of God." He then quotes Paul's words to the Lystra cripple: "Stand upright on thy feet," and Christ's words to Jairus's daughter: "Maid, arise," and asks, "Is there any difference of tone?"

The only way of answering this question is to examine the Scripture representations; since only the original spectators heard the actual tone in each instance, and saw the difference between the manner and bearing with which the Lord of Glory and the Prince of Life wrought a miracle, and that of His disciples and servants. To our mind, it is as evident that Christ spake with authority, and not as the apostles, when He wrought a miracle, as that He spake with authority, and not as the scribes, when He announced a doctrine. He employs the personal pronoun, I, continually, and does not lean upon any power but His own. He who says, "I am the resurrection and the life," says, "I go that I may awake him out of sleep"; "I will; be thou clean"; "I charge thee, come out of him"; "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise"; "Neither do I condemn thee"; "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee."

In these instances, and others like them, there is no reference or appeal to a higher power in order to obtain a strength or an authority that was lacking in the speaker. The ego is as explicit, calm, and commanding as when the Supreme Being says, "I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another." Christ's own person is the centre and source of the omnipotence which He employs. "He rebuked the winds, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still." "Jesus stretched forth his hand and caught him, saying, O thou of little faith."

But the "tone" is altogether different in the instance of the apostles. Peter said to Æneas, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole." Upon another occasion he said, "Ye men of Israel, why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power we had made this man to walk. The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, hath glorified his Son Jesus; and his name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong; yea, the faith which is in him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." And subsequently Peter repeats his testimony before the Sanhedrim: "If we this day be examined of the good

deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole." The "name," in the Hebrew use, denotes the essential being and nature of the person spoken of. Consequently, a miracle wrought by the name of Jesus Christ is wrought by the almighty power that is in His divine nature; which power He imparted to His apostles. Accordingly, this was always acknowledged. "The seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us, through thy name." The apostles prayed for miraculous power as coming from the Redeemer. "Grant unto us, thy servants, that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus." This prayer was speedily answered in the miraculous deaths of Ananias and Sapphira. Since the power was not their own, but a derived power, they recoiled with abhorrence at the thought of being worshipped for it. At this proposition "Barnabas and Paul rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, saying, Sirs, we also are men of like passions with you." But our Lord, after the miraculous calming of the sea, permitted "them that were in the ship to worship him, and to say, Of a truth thou art the Son of God."

We find the disciples of Christ sometimes failing in their attempts to work a miracle; but Christ never fails. Said a man of the company: "I besought thy disciples to cast him out, and they could not. Jesus answering, said, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? Bring thy son hither. And as he was yet a-coming, the devil threw him down, and tore him. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father. And they were all amazed at the mighty power of God."

Dr. Crosby refers to our Lord's prayer at the tomb of Lazarus, in proof that He too, like His disciples, had to depend upon a miraculous power imparted for the occasion. But our Lord *explains* this prayer—a thing He would not have done had it been a prayer for a power that was lacking, such as His disciples put up. He says that He offered the prayer "because of the people which stand by, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." It was not that He felt Himself to be unable to work the miracle, and needed first to be empowered for the act; but He wished that the spectators should know that He and the Father were one in all acts and words, so that whatever the Son did and said was also the deed and doctrine of the Father. If the spectators had seen Lazarus recalled to life from the dead by an act of Christ that was accompanied with no allusion to the eternal Father—with no uplifting of the Filial eye, and no utterance of the Filial heart—they would have been apt to separate Him and His agency, in their thoughts, from the eternal Father, and He would have stood before them as a kind of independent and separate God. This He prevented by the act of Filial communion with the Father with which He prefaced the exertion of His own omnipotence, and respecting which he says, "I know that thou hearest me always"—implying that His prayer is not like that of a mere mortal, which is not always heard, and which may or may not be heard, according as God shall see best.

This same desire of our Lord to have His unity and identity of being with the Father, in all His words and acts, recognized and acknowledged by the people, appears in those words which are often quoted to disprove His deity, but which, in fact, prove it in the most emphatic way: "Verily, verily I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." Our Lord here says that it is impossible for Him to work a miracle "of Himself," that is, alone and by Himself, as if He were a separate and different Being from the Father, and in isolation from Him. He and the Father, although two persons,

are one Being. Hence neither person can do a work, or teach a doctrine, to the *exclusion* of the other. When the Father performs a personal and official work, He does not exclude the Son's participation in it. And when the Son performs a personal and official work, He does not exclude the Father's participation in it. "All mine are thine, and thine are mine" may be said by both Father and Son. The Son says: "My Father worketh hitherto and I work. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will: that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father."

It seems to us that such teachings of the New Testament make it very evident that Christ, upon certain occasions, exerted personally and immediately the omnipotence that belonged to His divine nature, and that this nature was not totally dormant and paralyzed during His public ministry. That He did not continually exert the energy of His omnipotence, is of course conceded. His omnipotence was under the control of His own will, and He could employ it as He pleased. When he pleased to exert His omnipotence, no power of man or devil could harm Him, "for his hour was not yet come." And when He pleased not to exert His omnipotence, a little band of men led Him away "as a lamb to the slaughter." The Catholic doctrine is, that the godhead was voluntarily limited and conditioned, but not paralyzed, during Christ's state of humiliation, by the humanity with which it was united. It was obscured, as the sun is behind the clouds. *Occultatio* is a term which the Reformed theologians frequently use in this connection. But, as the sun flashes occasionally through the thickest clouds of the gloomiest day, so the divine nature flashed occasionally through the veil of flesh, the "muddy vesture of decay," in which it had condescended to dwell. On the Mount of Transfiguration there was a sun-burst of the Godhead that made the human nature so resplendent that the three beloved disciples "were sore afraid."

Dr. Crosby charges the common view of Christ's complex person with being Nestorian. If both of the natures are active, then Christ, he says, is two persons; but if only the human nature is active, He is one person. Consequently, the Church is in error in teaching the activity of both natures. Two remarks are suggested by this statement. In the first place, if the author's view is correct, Christ must be two persons after His resurrection, even if He is not before it. For in the estate of exaltation, the divine nature resumes its original condition, and is no longer in the state of dormancy and paralysis. We understand Dr. Crosby to hold the common view that the human nature is still a constituent in the complex person of the glorified Mediator, and we do not understand him to say that Christ's human nature is dormant and paralyzed in heaven. This being so, the glorified Christ is a Nestorian Christ, upon Dr. Crosby's theory. On the mediatorial throne Christ has two active natures, and hence must be two persons.

In the second place, Dr. Crosby's idea of personality is erroneous, in that he regards a special mode or form of consciousness as equivalent to a person. He argues that if Christ had a divine form of consciousness and a human form of consciousness—if these two different kinds of consciousness were in His personal experience—He must be two persons. This does not follow. One and the same person may have a variety of experiences or consciousnesses. When a man is eating or drinking, he has a mode of consciousness that is sensuous. It is founded in the activity of his physical nature. When the same man is praying or worshipping, he has a mode of consciousness that is mental and spiritual. It is founded in the activity of his moral and spiritual nature. Here are two different natures in one single person, and two different forms or modes of consciousness springing out of them. A human person is not a mere

mode of consciousness; but he is two natures in union. A man's person is the union of his soul and his body; the synthesis of two natures, an immaterial and a material. These two natures will yield different experiences. Sometimes the soul will furnish the elements of the man's consciousness at a particular moment, and sometimes the body will furnish them. The man will, in this way, have a variety of experiences, but he will not be a variety of persons, for this reason.

Now apply this to the person of our Lord. He had two natures: a divine and a human. The union of these, at the incarnation, constitutes the God-man: the Jesus Christ who says "I." By reason of these two natures, He will have two general forms or modes of consciousness, the divine and the human, according as the one or the other nature furnishes the elements of the consciousness. When the human nature yields the elements of the particular consciousness, and determines the particular experience of the moment, then Jesus Christ hungers, thirsts, sorrows, rejoices, and expresses His consciousness accordingly. When the divine nature determines the form of consciousness at a particular moment, Jesus Christ commands the raging sea to be still, and it obeys; says, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." "Before Abraham was, I am." In this way there was, in the complex person of our Lord, a continual fluctuation of consciousness, or variation of experience, according as the divine or the human nature was uppermost, if we may so speak. At one moment, he felt, spake, and acted like a feeble, dependent, and finite creature; at another moment, perhaps the very next, He felt, spake, and acted like the almighty and self-subsistent Creator. The finite and infinite, man and God, the creature and Creator, met and mingled in that wonderful Person who was not divine solely, or human solely, but was Divine-human. "There is," says Bengel, on Mark xiii. 32, "an admirable variety in the motions of the soul of Christ. Sometimes He had an elevated feeling, so as hardly to seem to remember that He was a man walking upon the earth; sometimes He had a lowly feeling, so that He might almost have seemed to forget that He was the Lord from heaven. And He was wont always to express Himself according to His mental feelings for the time being; at one time, as He who was one with the Father; at another time again, in such a manner as if He were only of that condition in which are ordinary and human believers. Often the two are blended together in wonderful variety."

This brief tract of Dr. Crosby grapples with a very intricate problem: the Kenosis of the Logos. Had the author attempted a full exhibition of the subject, and written a treatise instead of a tract, we suspect that he would have found himself more in harmony with the Reformed view, and would have had fewer objections to urge against it. He now inclines more to the Lutheran than to the Reformed construction of the doctrine. While disagreeing with him, we recognize and respect his profound reverence for Scripture, his close and erudite study of it, and his devout and earnest spirit.

W. G. T. SHEDD.

IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

SABBATH ESSAYS. Papers and Addresses presented at the Massachusetts Sabbath Conventions, at Boston and Springfield, October, 1879. Edited by Rev. W. C. WOOD. Congregational Publishing Society, Boston.

In January, 1879, the Evangelical Ministers' Association of Boston appointed a committee to make arrangements for the holding of two grand conventions, one for the eastern, and the other for the western part of the State, in the interest of the Sabbath. One of the conventions was held in Springfield on