

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,
No. LVII
AND
AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY,
No. CIX.

JANUARY, 1858.

ARTICLE I.

DR. ARNOLD'S THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS.

BY REV. BENJAMIN TAPPAN, JR.

THE late Dr. Thomas Arnold, of Rugby, was no professed Theological teacher. For nine years only of his life was he a parochial minister: and then much of his time was given to instructing a limited number of boys, who were under his charge. When he went from Laleham to Rugby, assuming the headship of one of England's great public schools, of course a great pressure of care and labor came upon him. He preached in the school-chapel every Sabbath afternoon: but his discourses were very short, usually written after the morning service. He interested himself in a variety of things: the general subject of education; political affairs; questions of reform, both civil and ecclesiastical. He studied history with great enthusiasm; published an edition of Thucydides, with notes and dissertations; wrote at length upon the early Roman history; and a year before his death received the appointment of Regius Professor of History at Oxford, and gave his first course of lectures.

But his earnest mind found time, nevertheless, for much

thought upon theological subjects. They were the subjects which really interested him more than any others. He wrote upon them not a little. His discourses at Rugby, short and hasty as they were, embodied results to which he had not come in a moment; and many of them strike one who reads them now, as eminently fresh and suggestive. The prefaces and appendixes to some of his volumes develop certain of his ideas more elaborately. He wrote some special dissertations upon points of great theological interest. As his mind, so his pen, was more or less constantly active in this direction.

Conceded by all to be one of the most remarkable men of his time, his theological opinions are certainly worthy of notice. We always like to know the thoughts of such a mind as his—so earnest, so independent, so indignantly casting aside all trick and artifice; at the same time so reverential towards God, so full of love to Christ, of goodwill to man. He has been denied to be, in the strict sense of the word, a profound thinker; to have the large round-about sense, which the greatest men have had. This, perhaps, would be the general verdict in regard to him. But it is not profound thinkers only that instruct us. Men of quick vision sometimes help our slower sight. Men of intense moral earnestness sometimes kindle our minds. It is well to learn how truth appears to them, as well as to men of the more speculative cast. Dr. Arnold would doubtless, in some cases, have arrived at sounder results, if he had engaged in more thorough research. The power of nice metaphysical analysis would sometimes have been of great service to him. As a Biblical scholar, it is to be regretted that he had no knowledge of the Hebrew. Yet he made up for this by a knowledge of the Greek, far surpassing that of most Biblical scholars in this country. His great fondness for Aristotle ought to have made him, one would think, a closer logician. It is plain that his strong, practical understanding was invigorated by communion with Aristotle and Thucydides (his favorite authors,) among the Greeks, and with Niebuhr among the Germans. It is precisely by this

strong, practical understanding that he attracts us as a writer — or by this, rather, pervaded always, as it always is, by his earnest love of truth and goodness. How much of the interest we feel in him as a writer, is borrowed from that which we feel in him as a man, it would, perhaps, be impossible to say. Every one who has gone through Stanley's biography of him, confesses to an attraction to the man, such as he almost never felt to any other. Still there is a vigor of thought in his pages, a transparent excellence of spirit and aim, and a general truthfulness of view, giving them no little independent value.

We give his views on some leading points.

Inspiration of the Scriptures.

In the *Christian Examiner* for September, 1856, pp. 260, 261, allusion is made to Dr. Arnold's opinions on this point, with one or two somewhat startling quotations from his writings. But if it should be inferred that he would have adopted the statements of that Article, or statements anywhere approximating those, great injustice would be done him. He attaches, indeed, the highest importance to the Scriptures, considered simply as human compositions. "Without assuming anything as to their divine inspiration," he maintains, "our Christian faith is reasonable; — not merely the facts of our Lord's miracles and resurrection, but Christian faith in all its fulness — the whole dispensation of the Spirit, the revelation of the redemption of man, and of the Divine Persons who are its authors — of all that Christian faith and hope and love can need."¹ But this position of itself necessitates a higher. "Having now the full record of our Lord's teaching, we find that he everywhere refers to the Old Testament as the Word of God. . . . The amazing fact that God should come into the world, and be in the world, cannot by possibility stand alone; it hallows as it were the whole period of the world's existence, from the beginning to the end, placing all time and every place in

¹ Sermons on the Christian Life, Course, etc., p. 394.

relation to God; it disposes us at once to receive the fact of the special call of the people of Israel; it gives, I had almost said, an *à priori* reason why there must have been in earlier times some shadows, at least, or images, to represent dimly to former generations that great thing which they were not actually to witness; it leads us to believe that there must have been some prophetic voices to announce the future coming of the Lord, or else the very stones must have cried out."¹ Speaking of the epistles of "the blessed St. Paul," Dr. Arnold represents him as having "the spirit of God so abundantly, that never, we may suppose, did any mere human being enjoy a larger share of it. . . . Are not his writings to be most truly called inspired? Can we doubt, that, in what he has told us of things not seen, or not seen as yet,—of Him who pre-existed in the form of God, before he was manifested in the form of man,—of that great day when we shall rise incorruptible, and meet our Lord in the air, and be joined to him forever,—can any reasonable mind doubt, that in speaking of these things he spoke what he had heard from God; that to refuse to believe his testimony is really to disbelieve God?"²

These citations show the general spirit of Dr. Arnold's views of the Bible. His uniform treatment of it is reverent. He finds in it what the Church has always found. He will not have his "faith in God" and his "hope of eternal life" "depend on the accuracy of a date, or of some minute historical particular."³ He calls it "an unwarranted interpretation of the term *inspiration*, to suppose that it is equivalent to a communication of the divine perfections."⁴ He thinks that Paul "expected that the world would come to an end in the generation then existing."⁵ But he believes also that "the scriptural narratives are not only about divine things, but are themselves divinely framed and superintended;"⁶ that "in whatever points errors may be discern-

¹ Sermons on the Christian Life, Course, etc., pp. 395, 396.

² Ibid. p. 398.

³ Ibid. p. 400.

⁴ Ibid. p. 400.

⁵ Ibid. p. 399.

⁶ Ibid. p. 399.

ible in Scripture, we shall find either that they are of a kind wholly unconnected with the revelation of what God has done for us, and of what we are to do towards Him; or if there be anything else which seems inconsistent with inspiration, in the sense in which we really may and do apply it to the Scriptures, namely, that they are a perfect guide and rule in all matters concerning our relations with God, then we shall find that God has made some special provision for the case, to remove what it might otherwise have had of difficulty." He makes in one place the remark, which the Examiner quotes. "I acknowledge that the Scriptures do not claim this inspiration for themselves:" yet in the next breath he says that if they did we should have "no right to tax them with having advanced a pretension proved to be unfounded;"¹ and in other places, as previous quotations show, he seems to assert that they do. "Any accurate, precise, and sharply defined theory of inspiration," one of his former pupils says, "to the best of my knowledge Arnold had not."² For all practical purposes, however, the statement just given comes very near it. Another of somewhat different character is given in these words: "Inspiration does not raise a man above his own time, nor make him, even in respect to that which he utters when inspired, perfect in goodness and wisdom: but it so overrules his language that it shall contain a meaning more than his own mind was conscious of, and thus give to it a character of divinity, and a power of perpetual application."³

This remark may serve to introduce a view of his system. But we may well regret that he did not live to develop it more completely, and that any circumstances should have induced him, while he did live, to employ his pen upon Roman history, rather than upon that.

¹ Sermons on the Christian Life. Course, etc., pp. 402, 399.

² Life and Correspondence, p. 135.

³ Sermons on Interpretation of Scripture, p. 141, Eng. ed.

⁴ See Life and Correspondence, p. 133.

Interpretation.

There is a very suggestive essay on this topic appended to the second volume of Sermons. His two discourses, also, on Prophecy, in the first volume, with the notes, are able and instructive. Various hints are scattered through his sermons generally, but more especially those contained in the posthumous volume published for the purpose of illustrating his mode of interpreting the Bible.

Some of the principles that he lays down in his essay on Interpretation are as follows :

I. "A command given to one man, or to one generation of men, is, and can be, binding upon other men, and other generations, only so far forth as the circumstances in which both are placed are similar. [A commandment of eternal and universal obligation is one that relates to points in which all men at all times are alike, and which there is the same reason, therefore, for all obeying equally. Other commandments may be of a transitory nature, and binding only upon particular persons, or at particular times ; but yet, when they proceed from the highest authority, their indirect use may be universal, even though their direct use be limited. That is, from knowing what God's will was, under such and such circumstances, we may gather, by points of reasoning, what it will be in all other circumstances, namely : the same when the circumstances are the same ; analogous when the circumstances are analogous ; and absolutely contrary, when they also are contrary.]"

II. "The revelations of God to man were gradual, and adapted to his state at the several periods when they were successively made. And on the same principle, commands were given at one time, which were not given at another : and which, according to God's method of dealing with mankind, not only were not, but *could not have been given.*"

These principles, particularly the latter, he applies to some of the more perplexing things in the Old Testament. He takes the ground in regard to the command to Abraham

to slay his son Isaac, the command to Saul utterly to destroy the Amalekites, that such commands could not be given to *us*, because "to our best reason appearing evil." He asks the bold question, "whether in our ignorance of the unseen world, any vision, dream, or revelation whatsoever, so commanding us to evil, can bear with it an external attestation of its coming from God, sufficient to counterbalance the internal evidence that it does not come from Him." He thinks it is not sufficient to say in regard to the command to extirpate the Canaanites, that "the destruction effected by an earthquake or a pestilence, is just as unsparing and indiscriminate, without being thought to impeach the goodness of God. The difficulty relates not to the sufferers in this destruction, but to the agents of it; because to men, in an advanced state of moral knowledge and feeling, the command to perpetrate such general slaughter,—to massacre women and infants, the sick and the decrepit, could not fail to be mischievous; or rather, it would be so revolting, that they could not, and ought not to think, that God could possibly be the author of it."

But in earlier times these commands could be given. "God has not thought proper to raise mankind at once to its highest state of moral perfection, any more than individuals are born at once to their maturity. . . . Their notions, therefore, on many particular points of practice were really irreconcilable with the principles which they acknowledged; but the inconsistency did not strike them; and revelation did not as yet interfere to make it palpable. . . . If an action on any one of these points was capable of strengthening their moral principles generally, or tended to serve any other useful end, it would properly be commanded to *them*, because it could do *them* no moral harm but probably the contrary; and because, being a command in a particular case, and not a statement of a general principle, it could not justly interfere with the acquisition of purer views by future generations, when the dispensation of the fulness of time was come. And, therefore, not only would practices be tolerated by God in early times, but actions

would be positively commanded, which, in a more advanced state of knowledge, men would be taught of God to shrink from as evil.

The key to the interpretation of this whole class of things in the Old Testament history, he finds in the remark of Christ, about the toleration of a certain practice on account of the hardness of men's hearts. This, he thinks, "has completely cleared the whole question, and enables us to recognize the divinity of the Old Testament, and the holiness of its characters, without lying against our consciences and our more perfect revelation, by justifying the actions of those characters as right essentially and abstractedly."¹ He finds the Old Testament, even in these parts, however, full of instruction. "The spirit of the story is an eternal lesson: the letter of it must be looked upon as passed away."²

Interpretation of Prophecy.

The general principle he maintains is "that of an uniform historical or lower, and also of a spiritual or higher, sense." The historical is the looser, the spiritual the more exact. He thinks it "a very misleading notion of Prophecy, if we regard it as an anticipation of History." He does not find it literally and minutely fulfilled in its lower subjects, except in certain exceptional cases. He does not think it was even meant to be. The lower subjects were simply to be the representatives of the higher; not their very images, because "those unmixed principles of good and evil, with which Prophecy is alone properly concerned," cannot be fully imaged by anything here below. "The true

¹ Christian Life. its Course, etc., p. 402.

² Sermons on Interpretation, p. 107. Compare also the sermons on Phineas and Jael. His strong remark (Life and Corresp. p. 485) about "a bibliolatry" — of "the Puritans and the Evangelicals" — "especially toward the Old Testament, quite as foolish and as mischievous as the superstition of the Catholics." must be placed by the side of those quoted above to be understood. It was aimed against a too narrow and literal system of interpretation. See also what follows.

subject of pure Prophecy, as distinct from history, is not any human person or persons, fact or facts, but ideas and principles which in no merely human persons or actions have ever been embodied perfectly. "The Babylon of History is only for a limited time, and in an imperfect degree, the Babylon of Prophecy. It is so for a limited time only, because the Historical Babylon has long since perished; but the prophecies in the Old Testament against it have been repeated in the New, almost in the very same words; so that the prophetic Babylon must have been in existence long after the historical Babylon had been destroyed. And only in an imperfect degree, because the language used respecting it, is the exact opposite to that used with respect to Jerusalem; and as the historical Jerusalem never came up to the pictures of the holiness and happiness of the prophetic Jerusalem, so neither have we any reason to believe that there was any such peculiar and unmixed wickedness in the historical Babylon, as to make it the proper and ultimate subject of the denunciations uttered against the Babylon of Prophecy. Not the proper and ultimate subject, but the subject of them partially and in the first instance; as Rome was partially also in the second instance; and as other places may be, and I believe are, in the third instance: so that the Prophecies, as I believe, will go on continually meeting with a typical and imperfect fulfilment, till the time of the end; when they will be fulfilled finally and completely in the destruction of the true prophetic Babylon, the World as opposed to the Church."

On this plan Dr. Arnold interprets the Prophecies generally. He does not deny that there may sometimes be a very minute and literal fulfilment of a prophecy, in its lower sense, but he maintains that this should be regarded "as a fulfilment *ex abundantia*; as one of those instances not to be drawn into a general rule, in which God has been pleased to grant an agreement of a minute and literal kind between the prediction and the event, as if for the satisfaction of those who could not appreciate agreement in mere general and essential points." "If we regard the present desolation

of the country around Babylon to have been necessary to the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning it, we must also require a similar literal fulfilment in all other cases, which it is impossible to find." He says in one of his earlier letters: "My own notion is, that people try to make out from prophecy too much of a detailed history, and thus I have never seen a single commentator who has not perverted the truth of history to make it fit the prophecy."¹ (*Life*, p. 55.) He questions whether the historical facts in regard to Egypt and Edom will bear the stress that is sometimes laid upon them, as exact fulfilments of prophecy. The language is hyperbolical in its lower application; exact only in its higher.

The same principle guides him in the interpretation of the Messianic prophecies. He finds them according to Luke 24: 44, in each division of the Old Testament, "the law or Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Psalms." "The prophetic witness here spoken of consists in the frequent recurrence of the same idea, namely, that of suffering and glory in the persons of God's true servants." "They are the representatives imperfectly of the good cause in human nature, which Christ represented perfectly." "Most remarkable is it to see in the Prophets and in the Psalms the confident anticipation of future triumph, which in the human writers individually was never verified. But by this very circumstance their incomplete and typical character is fully manifested; it is by this especially that they in a manner point to Christ; that they stretch out their arms to Him, imploring Him to fulfil what they could but faintly shadow, the whole condition of fallen and redeemed man: sufferings first, but afterwards glory; the serpent bruising man's heel; but man finally crushing the serpent's head. It is thus that the language of many of the Psalms, necessarily hyperbolical when used by their human writers, finds its perfect application in Him alone, who was the true image of human-

¹ His strong belief that prophecy could not have anticipated history, led him to question the authenticity of the latter chapters of Daniel. *Life and Correspondence*, p. 369.

ity in both its appointed conditions; in its sufferings first, and afterwards in its glory." "They seem to have felt themselves, at times, transformed into his image, so that the language, whether of hope or of devotion, which they uttered in their own persons, beginning in a tone suited to their own condition, as God's servants indeed, but yet compassed about with sin and infirmity, swelled gradually into a fuller and higher, such as became God's perfect servant and him only." "The human writer's own circumstances formed the ground-work. . . . so that he who lived and suffered and hoped, only in his own human and imperfect measure, was yet, in his words, by the power of God's Spirit, enabled to be, if I may so speak, as Christ himself."

One statement more may be quoted as a sort of summary of our author's general views of the higher import of the prophecies. "Looking at them, not from the time and country of their human writer, but from our own, from that period which the Scripture speaks of as the age to come, from the period of Christ's kingdom, we learn to substitute the realities of the spiritual world in the place of their historical symbols or images; sacrifice, priesthood, temple, the holy city, the Israel of God, Israel's enemies, Israel's prophets, kings, and deliverers, shake off as it were, the earthly garments which had concealed their true nature, and stand forth before us as they are. Then the language of Prophecy appears no longer hyperbolic; no tongue of man has described, nor heart of man conceived such a holiness or such a glory, but a greater than either is here. Then looking at the pictures of human suffering, so true an image of our actual condition, and of human exaltation, so lively an echo to our instinctive hopes, and finding that both were combined and more than realized in the death and resurrection of Christ our Lord; we understand how the prophecies have in their highest sense been fulfilled already, and we perceive, through the declaration of Christ's Gospel, how we ourselves may hope to have our portion also in this fulfilment; for it is Christ's will, that those whom God has

given him should be with him where he is, and should behold and share his glory."¹

Bible Doctrine.

The system which Dr. Arnold received, loved, and taught, was in its main features the so-called Evangelical. He did not class himself with the Evangelicals as a party in the English Church. He speaks of them from time to time in terms almost or quite contemptuous, for their supposed "ignorance and narrow-mindedness," their "shunning" liberal "studies as profane," their "bibliolatry, especially toward the Old Testament." The language his Biographer uses is, that "he was constantly repelled" from them "by his strong sense of the obstacles which (as he thought,) their narrow views and technical phraseology, were forever opposing to the real and practical application of the Old and New Testament, as the remedy of the great wants of the age, social, moral, and intellectual."² This last cause would seem to have operated more powerfully than any other. From his favorite views in regard to the Church they were, of course, at a wide remove.

But in one use of the word, as opposed to Socinian or Unitarian, he was, in the main, most deeply and heartily Evangelical: disposed indeed to believe that some of the Unitarians might be Churchmen at heart, notwithstanding their doctrinal errors, but setting himself against *these* in the most earnest manner; and thinking many of the *men*, in England at least, little better than Deists.³ "As to the Unitarian interpretations of St. Paul and St. John," he says, "they are really such monstrosities of extravagance, that to any one used to the critical study of the ancient writers, they appear too bad to have been maintained in earnest."⁴ And thus wherever Unitarianism has existed, together with

¹ The preceding citations are all from the Notes and Appendix to the Sermons on Prophecy in the first volume of Arnold's Sermons.

² Life and Correspondence, pp. 63, 154, 485, 171.

³ See, on this last point especially, p. 212 of the same volume.

⁴ Ibid. p. 350. Comp. Sermons on Interpretation of Scripture, p. 218.

any knowledge of criticism or philology, as in Germany, it has at once been assumed that the Apostles were not infallible, and that they overrated the dignity of Christ's person. So impossible is it to doubt what St. John meant in so many passages of his Gospel, and what St. Paul meant in so many passages of his Epistles."¹

Christ and his Work.

Evidence has already appeared that to Dr. Arnold, Christ was the Alpha and Omega of the Bible. He saw in him the realization of all human hope, and adopted Thomas's exclamation as his own. All his principles of interpreting the Bible, as we have seen, point to Christ as the infinite and perfect One. He adored and trusted in Him as such, with a full and glowing heart. "In Him," he says, "God has spoken to man face to face: with Abraham, on the plain of Mamre; with Moses, on Mt. Sinai; again with Moses and Elijah, on Mt. Tabor; with His chosen Apostles, for weeks and months together, on the shores of the Sea of Galilee."² "We cannot come to God directly; we require one to be to us in the place of God. But one in the place of God and not God, is, as it were, a falsehood; it is the mother falsehood from which all idolatry is derived. The mystery of Christianity has met this necessity of our nature, and at the same time has avoided the evil of the falsehood. We have one who is to us in the place of God, but who is also God truly;— we have one whom we may approach, although we cannot approach God; for he is also truly man." "Does then Revelation undo its own work, and after having labored to teach us to worship God only, and to lose all differences between creature and creature in the infinite difference between all creatures and the Creator, does it mean again to fix our minds and affections upon a creature, to bid us love and fear him religiously, to believe in him and put our trust in him, to look to him in life and

¹ Sermons, vol. 2, p. 99.

² Fragment on the Church, p. 17.

in death, as the Lord of Heaven and Earth: whereas, he, no less than ourselves, is the work of God's hands and therefore removed to a far greater difference from God than he can by any superiority of nature be from us, his fellow creatures? Revelation would thus undo its own work if Jesus Christ of Nazareth were indeed a man, and no more. Or go much higher still: exalt him ever so highly — above the highest angel — to a perfection which shall seem to our eyes infinite — still if it be not infinite, — if however exalted, He be yet only a creature, one of those who were because it was God's will that they should be; then also Revelation undoes its own work; then it teaches us practically to have more gods than one; it revives that very instinct of our nature which it had condemned, the oftener, namely, to dwell more upon the differences between the lower creatures and the higher, than on that infinite difference which exists between the highest creature and God, by whom he was created.”¹

With equal distinctness he sets forth the Evangelical view of the Atonement. “He suffered for the Church, not only as man may suffer for man, by being involved in evils through the fault of another, and by his example awakening in others a spirit of like patience and self-devotion; but in a higher and more complete sense, as suffering for them, the just for the unjust, that they, for His sake, should be regarded by God as innocent.”¹ The atonement was “revealed to us,” “in order to convey to us, in the most forcible manner, notions of God's perfect holiness, and His perfect love.” “To show us that it was no little thing to break God's laws, a penalty, we are told, must be paid, and that so vast a one, that all the world would be unable to pay it. But He whose justice would not remit it lest we should be encouraged to offend, Himself undertook to pay it, that He might so fulfil all His love toward us. Himself undertook to pay it: God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself: or in order to show the same thing as fully as possible, and yet

¹ Sermons on Interpretation, 434, 435.

keep out of sight the notion of Godhead being capable of suffering, it is said, God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son,—that is, the most precious thing that a human father could give, supposing it were impossible to give himself.”¹

Human Sinfulness.

Dr. Arnold always speaks of sin, like a man in earnest. Nothing is more characteristic of him than his vivid sense of moral evil. “In a deep sense of moral evil,” he says, “more, perhaps than in anything else, abides a saving knowledge of God.”² “The feeling of thinking lightly of sin is one which belongs to our times; it is one of the evils which seem to accompany naturally a high state of civilization. As all things about us are softened, so are our judgments of our own souls. I need not say that Christ’s death shows sin to be an exceeding evil.”³ Like Dr. Chalmers, he is doing all proper homage to human virtue, but in many places denies that it will avail before God. “We were made for our Maker’s glory; that we should live in Him, and for Him, and to Him If we answer these ends, then we are good creatures; if we do not, we are bad creatures; nor does it matter how many other good or amiable qualities we may possess, like the blossoms and leaves of a barren fruit tree; we are bad of our kind, if we do not bring forth fruit. . . . This is the corruption of nature, which makes us evil in the sight of God; which makes the imagination of our hearts in his judgment to be evil from our youth.”⁴ “The actions of whole days and weeks, passed as they are by too many in utter carelessness, are nothing but one mass of sin; no one thing in them has been sanctified by the thought of God or of Christ.” “Alas who or what is it that we do not love heartily and constantly, except that vile and worthless and hateful thing,

¹ Sermons on Interpretation, pp. 474, 475.

² Life and Correspondence, 478.

³ Christian Life, Its Hopes, etc., p. 116. American edition.

⁴ Sermons, vol. 1, pp. 29, 30.

our own self?¹ "The whole, said He, need not a physician. . . . That is, in coming to Him we must not fancy that we have a knowledge and a goodness, imperfect indeed, yet of some value, and requiring only to be improved and strengthened. . . . We must come to Him as having no knowledge as to the great matter of saving our souls; as having no goodness that can abide God's judgment."² "It is the certain consequence of that fall of man, which was related in the first lesson this morning, that this course of life will quite surely, if left to itself, lead to destruction."³ The bias of our nature to evil is so strong, that it can only be corrected by changing the very nature itself."⁴ He speaks of "the corruption of our nature, and how it is completely alienated from God."⁵ "Prosperity makes a man feel strong and confident; but it does not make him feel grateful, because knowing God to be a holy God and himself to be alienated from him, he cannot think that his good things are God's gift, but rather enjoyed in spite of Him. But if enjoyed in spite of Him, he is constantly fearing that God may take them from him, or punish him for enjoying blessings without deserving them. So then he learns to hate God, and the more he enjoys his earthly good things, the more he hates Him. He thinks of Him only as connected with death and the judgment, and many are the wishes of his heart that death and the judgment might never come, and that there was no God from whom to fear them."⁶ There are other expressions which show what views Dr. Arnold took of the pervading influence of sin in the soul. "But now suppose farther, that any one while so watching against one particular fault, and so praying, were to have his eyes opened more generally; were to see his faults, not in one point or points only, but as running through his whole nature; were to look at the commands of God's law

¹ *Christian Life, Its Hopes, etc.*, p. 159. American Ed.

² *Ibid.* p. 187.

³ *Ibid.* p. 93.

⁴ *Sermons*, vol. 1, 28.

⁵ *Chr. Life, Hopes, etc.*, p. 311.

⁶ *Sermons on Interpretation*, pp. 129, 130.

which bid us to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul, and our neighbor as ourselves. This is very often the crisis of a man's whole state Then (after an experience of the redeeming power of the Gospel), sin is looked for and hunted out, as it were, of every thought and word and deed, and then it appears, to our amazement, how deeply it had possessed us. Then our old nature begins to die sensibly, in no part without pain. What a multitude of evil thoughts possess us, what a multitude of evil words we utter, what a multitude of evil deeds we do, when they are all seen by the light of God's grace!"¹ "In order that God's Spirit may ever bear witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God, it must have convinced our spirit first of sin; it must have borne witness with our spirit, not once only, but long and often, that we are by nature, and are still by inclination and practice, the children of sin."²

The Penalty of Sin.

Here also Dr. Arnold is perfectly outspoken, and often solemn and earnest in the highest degree. "This is, of all the revelations of Scripture, the one which men can least bear. They would fain find something of hope, something of mitigation, even in the heaviest sentences of God's anger. . . . And in this matter, where the temptation to deceive ourselves is so great, . . . what security for our faith has God provided? . . . The declaration of His truth is in His own Scriptures, clear and full; no man can mistake, no man can dispute its meaning. . . We have it in the words of Christ himself, who knew with the knowledge of divinity the certainty of the things which He uttered. He said of Judas, that it were good for him if he had never been born. He said that his own sentence on the wicked at the last day should be, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Can that be inconsistent with God's mercy, which is declared by

¹ *Christian Life, Hopes, etc.*, pp. 151, 152.

² *Ibid.* p. 187.

Him who laid down His life for us? Are we more wise than Christ? Are we more full of love than he is, that our measure of what is true and just and good should be one that we may choose to prefer to His?"¹ "It will be true of every one of us, that it were good for us that we never had been born, unless we cross over from death unto life, and so think and so watch and so pray, as many of us now perhaps can hardly fancy themselves doing."² "For us, for each of us,—if we do fail of the grace of God—there is reserved a misery of which indeed the words of the text are no more than a feeble picture. There is a state in which they who are condemned to it shall forever say in the morning, Would God it were even! and at even, Would God it were morning! for the fear of their heart wherewith they shall fear, and the sight of their eyes which they shall see. There is a state in which the tender and delicate woman shall hate those whom once she most loved; in which they who lived together here in a friendship wherein God was no party, will have their eyes evil against one another forever. For where selfishness has wrought its perfect work, and the soul is utterly lost, there love is perished forever; and the intercourse between such persons can be only one of mutual reproaches, and suspicions, and hatred. Here eternal restlessness, and eternal evil passions, mark the everlasting portion of the enemies of God; just as an eternal rest, and a never ending life of love and peace are reserved for those who remain to the end His true children."³

Conversion.

Dr. Arnold here seems to follow substantially the general analogy of his system of belief, though his language is not quite so explicit as on some other points. Sometimes he seems to deny an instantaneous change of character. "We must indeed all be changed; once in a moment, in the

¹ Vol. on Interpretation, pp. 347, 348.

² Ibid. p. 170, in a sermon which argues at length from the words of Christ about Judas.

³ Ibid. pp. 50, 51.

twinkling of an eye, at the last trump ; and once also before that, not in a moment, but during the three-score and ten years of our pilgrimage ; not in the twinkling of an eye, but through a long period of prayer and watchfulness, laboring slowly and with difficulty to get rid of our evil nature.”¹ By constant repentance, constant faith, — and not faith only, but all the other graces of the Holy Spirit, each in their order — we are gradually ripened for our appointed hour. In this sense we may say, if we will, that we are born daily, by daily becoming more and more ready to be born ; but the actual birth is at our resurrection, or else, in a lower scale, when we are admitted into the Church of Christ on earth for the first time. But as in this sense it is past with all of us, and as in that higher sense which alone concerns us, it can only come after our deaths ; so there is no birth to be looked for now, as some one sudden change, which shall divide, as by a great gulf, the latter parts of our lives from those which have gone before.”² Still he says, “ I imagine that most men who have become Christians in earnest, can look back upon some one part of their life as on what may be called the crisis of their character, when the change in their principles and conduct first began. And it is often the case, also, that they can remember some particular circumstance which first led to this change ; something happening to themselves or their friends, or it may be some particular conversation, or sermon, which struck them unusually, and produced a lasting impression on their minds.”³ Again he inquires : “ This step from the cold prayer to the living, from the weak faith to the faith victorious ; who shall give it us ? Yet in that one step lies everything. Surely the experience of every one of us tells us, that our salvation is not of ourselves, neither in the last place nor in the first ; we can no more of ourselves apprehend Christ risen, than we could have atoned for our own sins without Christ crucified. That the work must first and last be of God is

¹ Vol. on Interpretation, p. 493.

² *Ibid*, p. 209.

³ Sermons, vol. 1, pp. 15, 16.

surely no refined point in theology, but the very instinctive cry of our consciousness, when we see salvation before us, and our hand seems as it were palsied, we cannot lay hold upon it." Still again he says: "What would have happened to him, who at the end of this coming fortnight, sitting where he now sits, and with all the sights and sounds around him the same as they are now, should yet have experienced in the interval the greatest of all charges which can befall a human soul, should have undergone consciously some of the pains of that great inward struggle which works death to our sins, and to ourselves life and glory?"² How far Dr. Arnold had any clearly defined theory of conversion is doubtful. It is plain that he had no sympathy with the idea that the religious life is the mere fruit of culture and development. It is equally plain, on the other hand, that he was anxious to impress those for whose good he labored, with the thought, that "dying to sin," in the comprehensive sense of the phrase, "is mostly a gradual process; a thing going on for a long time, and not beginning and ending in one sharp struggle."³ Yet the previous quotations show that he did recognize the existence of such a struggle; and in many passages he is very earnest in exhorting his hearers to an immediate and decisive putting away of their evil and selfish hearts. He held also that salvation from first to last was of God; yet his preaching tended to encourage anything rather than mere passivity in the sinner; or contentment in anything short of supreme and uncompromising devotion to Christ.

Justification by Faith.

Nothing can be more hearty than Dr. Arnold's assent to this great doctrine. He sets forth his views very fully in three sermons upon it in the second of the two volumes upon the Christian Life. A sermon in the volume on Interpretation discusses the seeming conflict between Paul and James. His position in brief in respect to this is, that

¹ Sermons on Christian Life, Hopes, etc., p. 325.

² *Ibid.* p. 149.

³ *Ibid.* p. 147.

James "was permitted to write, condemning most justly the misrepresented doctrine of St. Paul, in no way touching the doctrine itself."¹ The doctrine as misrepresented was, that mere intellectual belief in the facts of Christianity justifies; "that if a man's opinions about God be right, he need care nothing about his affections and conduct. . . . Whereas St. Paul was not speaking of any such belief, as was no more than mere opinion."² "What did he mean then, when he spoke so earnestly against the law? Did he mean the law of ceremonies? St. Paul in condemning circumcision did condemn the law of ceremonies and forms, maintaining most decidedly that all such things were a snare which would lead us away from our justification by Christ. Did he mean then to say only this, and is his great doctrine of justification by faith no more than a repetition of the old Scripture, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' or 'The sacrifices of God are a troubled spirit'? Let any one look at the 7th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and see whether the law there spoken of means the ceremonial law. . . . St. Paul declared that by the fruits of neither tree could we be justified, neither by the ceremonies of the law, for they were vain, nor yet by the moral commandments of the law; for though holy and mighty to save in themselves, yet we could not keep them. And therefore declaring that by the law, whether ceremonial or moral, there would no flesh be justified, he set forth another justification, not of works, whether ceremonial or moral, but of faith in Jesus Christ, whom God gave as the propitiation for our sins.³ "He who would be justified by the law says to God, 'Thou has commanded certain things, and I have done them, therefore I have earned my wages'; whereas he who would be justified by faith says rather, 'Thou hast commanded certain things, and I have not done them, therefore I have earned no wages, but Thy displeasure; only I throw myself upon Thee as a God who forgivest sin, whereof

¹ *Christian Life, Hopes, etc.*, p. 262.

² *Vol. on Interpretation*, p. 369.

³ *Christian Life, Hopes, etc.*, pp. 262, 263, 265.

Thou hast given assurance to all men in that Thou hast given Thine own Son to be a sacrifice for sin, that so there might be forgiveness.' The essence of justification by works is a reliance on what we have done for ourselves; that of justification by faith is a reliance on what God has done and will do for us."¹ "This faith entertained not once only, but always, ascribes clearly the whole merit of our justification to Christ; that for His sake God looks upon us, not as enemies but as children, not as condemned but as forgiven."² In answering the question, whether, having been justified once, we are justified always, Dr. Arnold says: "Faith in Christ is not only faith in His having died for us; it is faith in Him as our Saviour now also by his life; it is that throwing ourselves upon him in all things, as our Redeemer, as our Saviour, as our Head, of whom we are members, desiring our life only for Him. . . And here, if we take it rightly, is found the solution of the great difficulty, holiness without the sense of merit, strength without pride. . . . Our dependence on Christ is not once only but perpetual. . . If at any time we sever our communion with Him by walking as it were by ourselves, and doing our works as our own works, then our strength fails, even as our faith has failed: at the very moment we lose our sense of being united to Christ as branches of the vine, and as deriving all our spiritual life from His Spirit, the supply of strength so to speak is stopped; showing us that as we can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth us, so in our own strength we can do nothing, and by the deeds of the law which we are endeavoring to do, there will no flesh be justified. And thus it is true that our faith in Christ alone justifies; our faith in His death once, in His life evermore; our faith in Him as redemption, and as sanctification; our faith in Him as everything, in ourselves as nothing; our faith in Him leading to union with Him, that so being His members truly we shall be with Him and in Him evermore."³

¹ *Christian Life, Hopes, etc.*, pp. 270, 271.

² *Ibid.* p. 276.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 278, 279. The whole concluding part of the sermon from which

Predestination.

How much thought Dr. Arnold gave to this and the connected topics, does not appear. He speaks of "the thorny questions of God's foreknowledge, and election, and reprobation, and man's free-will, which have so distracted the peace of the Christian Church, and have led to so great and so many evil consequences." "Surely," he adds, "these foolish and unlearned questions which gender strife, can be no fit subject for the Christian minister, who, for his own sake and that of his hearers, should dwell on nothing from this place, but what may be profitable for godliness."¹ In one sermon he seems to admit something like individual election. "St. Luke says in the Acts of the Apostles, 'that as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.' What, think we, does he mean by those 'ordained to eternal life?' Those doubtless whose hearts God had mercifully saved from our three great dangers, — dull and obstinate hardness, — utter lightness and thoughtlessness, — and carefulness about earthly things only."² But in commenting upon Romans 8: 30, he remarks: "In this passage, so full of the most lively faith, and thankfulness, and joy, it were indeed most fatally to misinterpret it, if we were to suppose St. Paul to mean that this chain would of necessity always remain unbroken, and that all those who were called and once acquitted, would certainly enter at last into glory. But he does regard it as something so shocking that it should be otherwise, that he is willing to look upon it as impossible. And we should do better to regard it in this light, and therefore to be careful not to let it happen in our own case, than to rest in any fond notions that God's word has pronounced it to be impossible, while our evil lives and low and selfish affections declare aloud, that it is not only possible, but has actually befallen us."³ Yet a sentence or two further on

these extracts are taken, shows Arnold's deeply evangelical spirit, and draws to him irresistibly every heart, that, like his own, finds its whole life in Christ.

¹ Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, in volume on Interpretation, p. 498.

² Sermons, vol. 1, pp. 8, 9.

³ Sermons on Interpretation, p. 488.

he says: "It is very true that where this love has once taken root in the heart, it is almost impossible to shake it; but our misfortune is, that with too many of us it has never taken root in us at all."¹ What authority he has for inserting the word "almost," when he regards Paul as expressing "his assurance that no dangers, or sufferings, or labors, how great soever, will ever be able to shake his deep-rooted love and devotion to God, which had been excited by the mercies displayed in his redemption,"² does not appear. And there seems a strange inconsistency between many things that he says about the love of Christ, and the idea of any uncertainty about His losing and keeping His followers to the end. Perhaps when he speaks of the 8th of Romans as containing "encouragement so great that, as is well known, some have supposed it to do away with the necessity of all warning,"³ we may find the matter in part explained. The ninth and two following chapters he refers to national election.

The Trinity.

He has one sermon in the volume on the Interpretation of Scripture, in which he treats this doctrine devotionally and practically, but nowhere does he treat it speculatively. "Does the Scripture," he asks, "ever speak of the Trinity as of a fact, so to speak, in the Divine existence? Does not its language always refer to the various relations of God with ourselves? In this, the language of the Catechism is exactly Scriptural: 'I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, in God the Holy Ghost, who hath sanctified me'; that is to say, our notions of God should never for an instant be separated from our own personal relations to Him. And if the external evidence were less decisive against it, the internal would of itself be sufficient in my judgment to throw strong suspicion on the famous ruse of the Three

¹ Sermons on Interpretation, p. 489.

² *Ibid.*

³ Christian Life, Hopes, etc., p. 138.

Heavenly Witnesses ; the abstract of the declaration of the relations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to one another, (for their unity does not bear upon their witness, but is mentioned as a thing by itself) appearing to me to be at variance with the character of the revelations of Scripture.”¹ “If we would ascend from His mercies to Himself, the tongue and thought of man must utterly fail ; and that in His divine existence, which is dimly shadowed to us by the representation of the Three Eternal Persons in one Godhead, like all the other truths which relate to God’s nature, and not to his dealings with man, must of necessity be far beyond the reach of our minds to grasp it.”²

The Church.

Dr. Arnold did not live to develop fully his views on this subject, although it was always prominent among the themes that employed his thoughts and his pen. He designed a systematic and elaborate treatise ; but this, like other cherished purposes, was defeated by his premature death. How he would finally have maintained that the Church should be organized as a working force, we do not know ; but we should have liked to see how he would have disposed of the practical difficulties of such a scheme as his, when set fully before his mind ; and how he would have reconciled the different parts of the mere theory. His favorite idea was that of the identity between Church and State. “The *ἐργον* of a Christian Church and State is absolutely one and the same.” “I look to the full development of the Christian Church in its perfect form, as the kingdom of God, for the effectual removal of all evil, and promotion of all good ; and I can understand no perfect Church, or perfect State, without their blending into one in this ultimate form.”³ “The Church during her imperfect state is deficient in power ;—the State in the like condition is deficient in knowledge ;—one judges amiss of man’s highest happiness ;

¹ Fragment on the Church, p. 164.

² Christian Life, Hopes, etc., p. 170.

³ Life and Correspondence, pp. 341, 367.

— the other discerns it truly, but has not the power on a large scale to attain it. But when blended into one, the power and knowledge become happily united; the Church is become sovereign, and the State has become Christian.”¹ The doctrine of the Crown’s Supremacy in the English Church he speaks of as “the great principle of this system,” “vouchsafed to our Church by so rare and mere a blessing of God.” He looks upon it however “as no other than an assertion of the supremacy of the Church or Christian society over the clergy,” and a denial, of course of the opposite view, which he holds to be “one of the most mischievous falsehoods ever broached.”² No one ever maintained more earnestly than he that the clergy is for the Church, not the Church for the clergy. “I am for the Church and against the priesthood,”³ was a sentence in one of his letters, and the virtual text of some of his most earnest sermons and essays. A priesthood proper he warred against with all his might. “Any attempt to convert the ministry into a priesthood, that is to represent them as standing, in any matter, as mediators between Christ and his people, or as being essentially the channel through which His grace must pass to His Church, is directly in opposition to Him, and is no better than idolatry.”⁴ “So far as Popery is priestcraft, I do believe it to be the very mystery of iniquity.”⁵ He had no belief in the apostolic succession. He thought it a most mischievous heresy.⁶ He rejected all pure divine episcopacy. “Viewed in the large . . . I hold that one form of Church-government is exactly as much according to Christ’s will as another.”⁷ The following might almost have been written by a Congregationalist: “A†t he abstract church of Christian society is divided into a great number of particular churches, each having its own laws, in all mat-

¹ Fragment on the Church, p. 226.

² Life and Correspondence, pp. 367, 392.

³ Sermons, vol. 3, p. 384.

⁴ Christian Life, Correspondence, etc., p. 363. Comp. Sermons, Vol. III. p. 122. Fragment on the Church, chapter 1, etc.

⁵ Life and Correspondence, p. 294.

⁶ Same letter.

⁷ Life and Correspondence, p. 375. Comp. p. 227.

ters not already provided for by the common divine law of the Scriptures, so each church may appoint its own ministers, whether teachers or governors, in such a manner, and with such powers, as it shall judge expedient. And all ministers so appointed, under whatever different titles, and with whatever different powers, if they teach the same Gospel which the Apostles taught, and govern Christian people after the principles of Christ's law, they are the true successors of the Apostles, just as the children of Abraham's faith, not the children of his body, were the true and only heirs of the promises made to him." He objected to the whole priestly idea of the sacraments, holding strongly on the other hand the spiritual and Protestant one. He held the indispensableness of a holy ministry. "It is a grievous sin, he affirms, to appoint as a Christian minister any man who wants that quality, which is as essential to the Christian ministry as being born of a particular family was essential to the Jewish priesthood. This quality is holiness."¹ He held that the Church is appropriately a holy body. "The Church has its living and redeemed members; it may have those who are craving to be admitted within its shelter, being convinced that God is in it of a truth; but beyond these he who is not with it is against it."² He sets one against mere outward Church-extension, "the real living church itself with all its manifold offices and ministers, with its holy and loving sense of brotherhood."³ "Christ's Church, the living temple of the Holy Ghost, puts in the place of this natural and corrupt man, whose witness is against God, another sort of man, redeemed and regenerate, whose whole being breathes a perpetual witness of God."⁴ He does indeed say that "it is baptism . . . which makes us members of the Church."⁵ But he does also say: "Where repentance and faith exist there is the qualification for baptism :⁶ and as to any necessary regeneration in infancy connected with bap-

¹ Vol. on Interpretation, p. 108.

² Christian Life, Its Course, etc., p. 358.

³ Ibid. p. 361.

⁴ Ibid. p. 279.

⁵ Ibid. p. 362.

⁶ Sermons, vol. 3, p. 371.

tism, his significant remark is: "It is possible, very rare, doubtless, but still possible, that some having been brought to Christ in their infancy, and having been trained up carefully from their earliest years in His faith and fear, have never within their remembrance gone astray from Him altogether, like the sheep that was lost."¹ He "dislikes Articles, because they represent truth untruly, that is in an unedifying manner, and thus robbed of its living truth, whilst it retains its mere literal form; whereas the same truth, embodied in prayers, or confessions, or even in catechisms, becomes more Christian, just in proportion as it is less theological."² He was for having everything done that could be to bring the disciples of Christ into living communion with one another and with Him. "Daily church service, frequent communions, memorials of our Christian calling continually presented to our notice in crosses³ and way-side oratories; commemoration of holy men, of all times and countries; the doctrine of the communion of saints practically taught; religious orders, especially of women, of different kinds, and under different rules, delivered only from the snare and sin of perpetual vows; all these, most of which are of some efficacy for good even in a corrupt church, belong no less to the true church, and would be purely beneficial."⁴ We can well pardon some opinions in this direction, of questionable tendency, for the sake of the genial spirit with which he writes, his desire to make the church more effective for good, and to restore the freedom and heartiness of primitive fellowship among its members; and especially to make supreme always that which contains "the positive opposite of all their ("the

¹ Christian Life, Hopes, etc., p. 179.

² Life and Correspondence, p. 214. This was a favorite idea of his. He thought there was danger in stating the truth in any other than the Bible way. Comp. Frag. on the church. p. 165. "The truths declared are wholly relative and practical" "Abstractedly nothing has been revealed about them."

³ Christian Life, Course, etc., p. 49.

⁴ He was also inclined to advocate the use of images to some extent, believing the second commandment abolished by the fact of the incarnation. See Sermons, Vol. III. p. 36.

Oxford Judaziers'") idolatries, the doctrine of the person of Christ; not His Church, not His sacraments, not His teaching, not even the truths about Him, nor the virtues he most enforces, but Himself; that only object which bars fanaticism and idolatry on the one hand, and gives life and power to all morality on the other."¹

ARTICLE II.

LEE ON INSPIRATION.²

BY PROF. POND, BANGOR, ME.

We welcome the appearance of the work before us, and are glad to see so beautiful a reprint of it from the press of the Messrs. Carter of New York. Not that it is everything we could desire, in a work for general circulation. There is too much parade of learning about it; too many learned mottoes, appendixes, and notes. Then it discusses a variety of topics, more or less connected with the subject in hand, though not directly upon it. From both these causes, the work is too large, commending itself rather to Biblical scholars, than to the generality of Christian readers.

Still, we are glad to see it, and that for more reasons than one. It treats of a vitally important subject, — "the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture;" and amidst all the laxity on the one hand, and extravagance on the other, the denials and avowals, the doubts and the dogmatism, which prevail at this day, it takes substantially the right ground, and

¹ Life and Correspondence, p. 282.

² The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof. Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By William Lee, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. 1857.