

APPENDIX

Note I

(see ch. 2)

In these pages I am dealing only with miracles in the theological sense; that is, with Divine miracles. The phenomena of Spiritualism I have never personally investigated, but if genuine, they are clearly miraculous. And to reject on *a priori* grounds the mass of evidence adduced in proof of them in books like Professor A. R. Wallace's "Miracles and Modern Spiritualism," seems to me to savor of the stupidity of unbelief. Assuming their genuineness, no Christian need hesitate to account for them by demoniacal agency. To attribute them to departed spirits is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. It would seem that in this Christian dispensation, when the third Person of the Trinity dwells on earth, demons are subject to restraints which were not imposed in a preceding age, but there is no reason to refuse belief in their presence or their power.

Religious miracles also claim a passing notice here. I do not allude to the tricks of priests, but to cases of extraordinary cures from serious illness; and some at least of these appear to be supported by evidence sufficient to establish their truth. The phenomena of hysteria and mimetic¹ disease will probably account for the majority of cases of the kind. Others again may be explained as instances of the power of the mind and will over the body. The diseases which are necessarily fatal are comparatively few. But when a patient gives up hope, his chances of recovery are greatly reduced. On the other hand, the progress of disease may be controlled, and even checked, by some mastering influence or emotion which turns the patient's thoughts back to life and makes him believe he is convalescent. But while the vast majority of seemingly miraculous cures may thus be explained on natural principles, there may perhaps be some which are genuine miracles. There are no limits to the possibility of faith, and God may thus declare Himself at times.

There is nothing in this admission to clash with the concluding statement of my second chapter, that in our dispensation, unlike those which preceded it, there are no *public* events to compel belief in God. I am there dealing not with the mere fact of miracles, but with their evidential value; and if there have been miracles in Christendom, that element is lacking in them. I may add that among Christians it is pestilently evil to make the exceptional experience of some the rule of faith for all. The Word of God is our guide, and not the experience of fellow-Christians; and when this is ignored, the practical consequences are disastrous. The annals of "faith-healing," as it is called, are rich in cases of mimetic or hysterical disease; but about the spiritual wreckage due to failures innumerable, they are silent.

1 Characterized by, exhibiting, or of the nature of imitation or mimicry

APPENDIX

Note II

(see ch. 4)

According to the dictionary, the primary meaning of *religion* is "piety." But this, of course, is entirely personal and subjective. In these pages I use the word only in its original sense, in which alone it occurs in our English Bible. "How little 'religion' once meant godliness, how predominantly it was used for the *outward* service of God, is plain from many passages in our Homilies, and from other contemporary literature." But though Archbishop Trench, from whose "English Past and Present" this sentence is quoted, suggests that such a use of the word is now obsolete, I venture to maintain that it is in this, its original but now secondary meaning, that it is commonly used at the present day.

And I may appeal to the fact that the Revisers have retained it even in Gal. 1:13,14, where "the Jews' religion" is twice given as the equivalent of "Judaism." In the only other passages where it occurs (Acts 26:5 and James 1:26,27), it is the rendering of the Greek θρησκεια, a word which, with one exception, is always translated *godliness* in the fifteen passages where it occurs. Θρησκεια is rendered *worshipping* in Col. 2:18, thus plainly showing it is outward ceremonial that it implies. Its use in Acts 26:5 needs no comment, but in James 1 its significance is generally missed. "Pure religion," the writer declares, "is this"--and every Israelite (for to such the Epistle was specially addressed) would expect a reference to new ordinances in lieu of those of the bygone dispensation. But his thoughts turn in a wholly different direction--"to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." As Archbishop Trench remarks, the very θρησκεια of Christianity "consists in acts of mercy, of love, of holiness." The words are intended, not to indicate a parallel, but to suggest a contrast. In no more forcible and striking manner could the apostle teach that Christianity is not a θρησκεια at all.

APPENDIX

Note III

(see ch. 5)

The Acts of the Apostles is divided by theologians into three main periods: The *Hebraic* (chaps. 1-5); the *Transitional* (6-12); and the *Gentile* (13-28). But this classification is arbitrary. The *Hebraic* section includes at least the first nine chapters; and if the view of the Book here advocated be correct, the rest must be regarded as *transitional*. That it is so in a real sense no student can fail to recognize; and that this is the intention of the narrative, I venture to maintain. The admission of the Gentiles, recorded in chapter 10, was on strictly Jewish lines, as the apostles came to understand and James explained at the Council of Jerusalem (15:13, &c.). Those that were scattered by the Stephen persecution preached "to Jews only" (11:19). The marginal note to verse 20 in R.V. shows that the passage must not be strained to imply a denial of this. That Paul's ministry during the year he spent in Antioch was confined to Jews appears from 14:27². When from Antioch Paul and Barnabas came to Salamis, "they preached in the synagogue of the Jews" (13:15). When they came to Pisidian Antioch, they again repaired to the synagogue (verse 14). And it was not till the Jews rejected the ministry that the apostles "turned to the Gentiles" (verse 46). This passage marks one of the minor crises in the narrative. At Iconium again the apostles preached in the synagogue of the Jews (14:1). As the "Greeks" here mentioned were attending the synagogue, they were evidently proselytes, and are not to be confounded with the "Gentiles" of verses 2 and 5. Verse 27 of the fourteenth chapter makes it clear that Paul's ministry among the Gentiles began with his sojourn in Pisidia (chap. 13).

Chapter 15 claims far fuller notice than can here be given to it. Anyone can see, however, that it records the session of a council of Jews to deal with new problems to which the conversion of Gentiles had given rise. Chapter 16:1-8 records the apostles' visits to existing Churches. The vision of verse 9 then called them to Philippi where (as probably at Lystra) they found no synagogue. But on passing thence to Thessalonica, "Paul, as his manner was," frequented the synagogue (17:2). So also at Berea (verse 10), and at Athens (verse 17).

From Athens Paul came to Corinth where "he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath" (18:4). So also at Ephesus (verse 19 and 19:8). Thence it was he turned towards Jerusalem upon that mission which is regarded by some as the fulfillment of his ministry, and by others as a turning away from the path of testimony to the Gentiles, seemingly marked out for him to follow. Be this as it may, having been carried a prisoner to Rome, his first care was to call together--not the Christians, much though he longed to see them (Rom. 1:10,11), but--"the chief of the Jews," and to them to give the testimony which he had brought to his nation in every place to which his ministry had led him. In his introductory address to them, he claimed the place of a Jew among Jews: "I have done nothing against the people, or the customs of our father" (28:17). But when these, the

² Because if Gentiles had been evangelized during his first visit, there would have been no need to announce on his return that God had opened the door of faith to Gentiles.

Jews of Rome, refused the proffered mercy, his mission to his nation was at an end; and for the first time separating himself from them, he exclaimed, "Well spoke the Holy Ghost through Isaiah the prophet unto *your* fathers"--and he went on to repeat the words which our Lord Himself had used at that kindred crisis of His ministry when the nation had openly rejected Him (Acts 28:25 R.V.; Matt. 13:13, *cf.* 12:14-16).

My contention is that the Acts, as a whole, is the record of a temporary and transitional dispensation in which blessing was again offered to the Jew and again rejected. Hence the sustained emphasis with which the testimony to Israel is narrated, and the incidental way in which the testimony to Gentiles is treated. Of the thousands baptized at Pentecost, a large proportion doubtless were of the strangers mentioned in 2:9-11; and these carried the testimony to the Jews in all the places there enumerated. The 5,000 men mentioned in 4:4 were apparently resident in Jerusalem, and these, when scattered by the Stephen persecution, "went everywhere preaching the Word," "but to the Jews only" (8:1,4 and 11:19). Surely we may assume that there was not a district, not a village, inhabited by Jews where the gospel did not come.

Some, perhaps, will appeal to passages like Acts 15:12 to disprove my statement that miracles had special reference to the favored nation. The careful student, however, will see that nothing in the narrative is inconsistent with what I have urged. For example, the miracle at Lystra was in response to the faith of the man who benefited by it (14:9), and its effect on the heathen who witnessed it was not to lead them to Christianity, but first to make them pay Divine honor to the apostles, and then, finding they were not gods but men, to stone them. I have not said that there were no miracles wrought among the heathen, but that, when the gospel was carried to the heathen, miracles lost their prominence, and that they ceased absolutely just at the time when, if the recognized hypothesis were true, they would have been of the highest value. The great miracle of 16:26 was a Divine intervention on behalf of the apostle. And among the Jews of Ephesus (19:11) and Christians of Corinth (1 Cor. 12:10), there were miracles, as doubtless elsewhere also. But there were no miracles seen by Felix or Festus or Agrippa; and, as already noticed, when Paul stood before Nero, the era of miracles had closed. The miracles of Acts 28:8,9 are chronologically the last on record, and the later Epistles are wholly silent respecting them.

APPENDIX

Note IV

(see ch. 8)

Everyone recognizes that the advent of Christ marked a signal "change of dispensation," as it is termed; that is, a change in God's dealings with men. But the fact is commonly ignored that the rejection of Christ by the favored people, and their fall in consequence from the position of privilege formerly held by them, marked another change no less definite and important (Rom. 11:15). And yet this fact affords the solution of many difficulties and a safeguard against many errors. As indicated in these pages, it gives the clue to the right understanding of the Acts of the Apostles--a book which is primarily the record, not, as commonly supposed, of the founding of the Christian Church, but of the apostasy of the favored nation. But it also explains much that perplexes Christians in the teaching of the Gospels.

During the last Carlist rising in Spain, a wealthy Spanish marquis was said to have mortgaged his entire estate to its utmost value, and to have thrown the proceeds into the war chest of the insurrection. It was a reasonable act on the part of anyone who believed in the Pretender's cause. To him, and to others like him, the accession of Don Carlos to the throne would bring back their own, and far more besides. So was it with the disciples in days when the kingdom was being preached to the earthly people. Certain of the Lord's precepts had reference to the special circumstances of that special dispensation. Take "the Sermon on the Mount," for example. Our Lord was there unfolding the principles of the promised kingdom, and giving precepts for the guidance of those who were awaiting its establishment. It is all for us, doubtless, but not always in the same sense that it was intended to convey to them. Christians, for instance, pray the kingdom prayer. But with us "Thy kingdom come" is a general appeal for the advancement of the Divine cause; with them it was a definite petition for the near realization of the promised earthly reign. And what a meaning the prayer for daily bread had for those who were enjoined to carry neither purse nor scrip, but to trust their heavenly Father to feed them as He feeds the birds. For, like the birds, they had "neither storehouse nor barn."

Principles are unchanging, but the definite precepts recorded in such passages as Matt. 5:39-42 and 6:25-34 were framed with reference to the circumstances of the time, and to the special testimony which the kingdom disciple was to maintain. The Christian, unlike the kingdom disciple in this respect, is entitled to defend himself against outrage, and to resist any invasion of his personal or civil rights; and he is expressly enjoined to make provision for the future. Banking, insurance, and thrift are not forbidden by Christianity. "Take nothing for your journey," the Lord directed, as He sent out the Twelve, "neither staves, nor scrip, nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats" (Luke 9:3). And referring to this, when He was about to be taken away from them, He asked, "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. Then said He to them, But now, he who has a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip; and he who has no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one" (Luke 22:35,36).

What can be plainer than this? In civilized communities, of course, the State takes charge of "the sword" (Rom. 13:4), and the individual citizen is not left to defend himself; but the principle is the same. One who is "instructed unto the kingdom," the Lord declares, is like "a householder who brings out of his treasure things new and old" (Matt. 13:52). But Christians nowadays are not thus "instructed." They are rather like householders who, bringing out whatever comes first to their hand, give new milk to their guests and old wine to their babies! And as the result, Holy Scripture is brought into contempt, and earnest and honest-hearted believers are stumbled or perplexed.

Another clue is needed to guide us in the right use of the teaching of the Gospels. Some of the Lord's words were addressed to the apostles *as such*, and we must remember this in applying them to ourselves.

With reference to the Sermon on the Mount, it may be asked, Does anyone imagine our Lord supposed that people would wish to add twenty inches to their height? Matt. 6:27 should no doubt be read as the American Revisers render it, "Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit *to the measure of his life?*"

APPENDIX

Note V

(see ch. 10)

The primary and usual meaning of μυστηριον in Biblical Greek is indicated by its use in the Septuagint. It occurs eight times in the second chapter of Daniel (vss. 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47 (twice) and again in chap. 4:9), and in every case it is translated *secret* in our English version. The word occurs also in the Apocrypha, and always in this same sense. This too is its ordinary use in the New Testament; but the word was then already acquiring the further meaning which belongs to it in the writings of the Greek Fathers, namely, a *symbol* or *secret sign*. And in this sense it appears to be used in Rev. 1:20 and 17:5, 7. In chapter 10:7 it occurs in its earlier meaning. So also apparently in Eph. 5:32, though the Vulgate understands it differently, using the word *sacramentum* to translate it. If it is to be read in the one way, the *secret* referred to is that believers are members of the Body of Christ; if in the other way, marriage is the *symbol* intended.

The Latin version of Eph. 5:32 is of special interest, as indicating the original meaning of *sacrament* as "a mystery; a mysterious or holy token or pledge" (Webster). Bishop Taylor thus speaks of God sending His people "the sacrament of a rainbow." And Hooker writes: "As often as we mention a *sacrament*, it is improperly understood; for in the writings of the ancient fathers all articles which are peculiar to Christian faith, all duties of religion containing that which sense or natural reason cannot of itself discern, are most commonly named *sacraments*. Our restraint of the word to some few principal Divine ceremonies imports in every such ceremony two things: the substance of the ceremony itself, which is visible; and besides that, something else more secret, in reference whereunto we conceive that ceremony to be a sacrament."

In this passage, it will be noticed, the word is used precisely in the secondary sense assigned to it in Johnson's "Dictionary," viz., "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." Johnson's first meaning of the word is "an oath"; and the Latin word *sacramentum* may possibly have acquired that meaning on account of some outward act or sign which accompanied the taking of an oath. According to Hooker's use of the word *sacrament*, the English practice of kissing the Testament would be so described.

APPENDIX

Note VI

(see ch. 11)

If the reader will take up the New Testament, and with the help of a good concordance turn to every passage where the devil is mentioned or referred to, he will be startled to find how little there is to give even a seeming support to the popular superstition upon this subject. Three passages only can I find that seem to suggest that Satan tempts to acts of immorality. Of 1 John 3:8-10 I have already spoken. The other two are 1 Cor. 7:5 and 1 Tim. 5:15; and with these I will deal presently.

In the temptation of our Lord there was, of course, no question of morality. The devil's aim was to draw Him away from the path of dependence upon God, and specially to divert Him from the path which led to the Cross. It was this also which brought such a terrible rebuke upon Peter when the Lord addressed him as "Satan" (Matt. 16:23). And when Satan asked to have Peter (as he had asked to have Job), it was his *faith* he sought to destroy. "I made supplication for thee," the Lord added, "that thy *faith* fail not" (Luke 22:31,32.R.V.).

And with the memory of this before him, no doubt it was that the apostle wrote the words, "Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion walks about seeking whom he may devour; whom withstand steadfast in your *faith*" (1 Pet. 5:8-9). In the parable of the tares in the field, it is the devil who sows the tares (Matt. 13:39). And in the parable of the sower, the devil's work is described as taking away the work out of the hearts of those who hear it, "lest they should *believe* and be saved." And if Elymas the sorcerer was called a "son of the devil," it was because of his "seeking to turn aside the proconsul from the faith" (Acts 13:8,10).

Two passages indicate his mysterious "power of death," viz., Heb. 2:14, and Jude 9 which tells of his claiming as of right the body of Moses. And two passages again indicate his power of inflicting disease and pain, namely, Luke 13:16 and Acts 10:38; but these may probably be explained by reference to the case of Job.

In Rev. 12:9 (R.V.), he is called "the *deceiver* of the whole world" (*cf.* Rev. 20:10); and in that book he is represented as the leader in the great coming struggle between faith and unfaith, between the acknowledgment of God and the denial of Him. There is no need to quote the many passages which indicate his malignant hatred of God and of His people, but if he be the obscene monster of Christian tradition, how is it that from cover to cover the Bible is silent on the subject? In his "devices" upon men, the Satan of Scripture is the enemy not of morals, but of *faith*.

And if in view of the mass of testimony leading to this conclusion we turn back to the two passages above cited, we shall be prepared to read them in a new light. In 1 Tim. 5 we shall read verse 15 in the light of verse 12. The "turning aside after Satan" there referred to is "the setting at nought their first *faith*." And the Christian will not hesitate to follow

Calvin in understanding the "faith" here intended as the faith of Christ. The word πιστος occurs two hundred times in the Epistles, and in this sense only is it used, with the solitary exception of Titus 2:10. There is the very strongest presumption therefore against the suggestion that here [in 1 Tim. 5:12] it means no more than a woman's "troth" [faithfulness] to her dead husband. Such a suggestion, moreover, makes the apostle contradict himself. It makes him say that young widows "have condemnation" because they wish to marry again; and yet he ends by expressly enjoining that they are to marry again! (verse 14 R.V.). Verses 11-13 give his reasons for that injunction. The passage is incidentally an overwhelming condemnation of nunneries, but the usual construction put upon it is an outrage upon Holy Writ and a gross libel upon women. And I may add that if that construction were the true one, the limit of age at which widows were to be provided for would certainly have been fixed much earlier than sixty.

The expressions "waxing wanton against Christ" and "turning aside after Satan" are to be explained by reference to the Scriptural standard of spiritual life and the Scriptural theology of Satanic temptations. So also of 1 Cor. 7:5. The solemn practical lesson there to be learned is that any departure from prudence and propriety may give Satan an advantage--an occasion to undermine or corrupt the Christian's faith.

As for Ananias, his story is so misread that the lesson of it is lost to the Church. He was not a bad man, but a good man. In the enthusiasm of his zeal, he sold his landed property that he might devote the proceeds to the common fund. But here the suggestion presented itself to him to put aside a portion for his own use. His wife was in the plot, and boldly lied to conceal it. But Ananias *spoke* no lie; he only acted one, as people are used to do nowadays. If he lived today, he would be held in the highest repute. Indeed, there are few to be found in these selfish days who could compare with him. The moral is not the wickedness of man but the holiness and "severity" of God, and the subtlety of Satanic temptations. Satan tempted him, not to a vicious or "immoral" act, but only to do what, as the apostle said, he had an unquestionable right to do. He did not lie to men--so the Word expressly tells us--but he lied to God, and swift judgment fell on him. If God were dealing thus with men in our day, the number of the burials would be a serious difficulty!

To the case of Judas, I have not expressly referred because it so obviously falls within the category of temptations aimed directly against Christ Himself.

APPENDIX

Note VII

(see ch. 11)

The exegesis here offered of John 8:44 is not based on the grammar of the Greek article. The Revisers have adopted an unsatisfactory compromise between exposition and translation. "To speak a lie" is not English. In our language the proper expression is "to tell a lie." But no one would so render the Greek words λαλειν το ψευδος ; and by inserting in the margin the old and discarded gloss, the Revisers only betray their dissatisfaction with their own reading. The words must mean either some definite lie, or else in the abstract sense the whole range of what is false. (See Psa. 5:6 LXX). In this view of the passage, all speech would be regarded as divided between truth and falsehood--God-speech and devil-speech. But this is somewhat fanciful here, and, in regard to the words which follow, somewhat forced. And if, as I venture to urge, it is not the false in the abstract which is here in view but a concrete instance of it, the question of grammar is no longer open. And thus rendered the connection is clear between Satan the liar and Satan the murderer. He is not the instigator to all murders, but to *the* murder there and then in question, the murder of the Christ; he is not the father of *lies*, but the father of *the* lie of which "the murder is the natural consequence.

In Rom. 1:25, where both words ("truth" and "lie") have the article, I suppose both are used in the abstract sense. In Rev. 21:27 and 22:15 the word "lie" is anarthrous. But in 2 Thess. 2:11 it is again *the* lie of John 8:44. The Lawless One who is yet to be revealed is described as he "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." God does not incite men to tell lies or to believe lies. But of those who reject "*the* truth" it is written, "He shall send them strong delusion that they should believe *the* lie." Because they have rejected the Christ of God, a judicial blindness shall fall upon them that they shall accept the Christ of humanity, who will be Satan incarnate.

In these pages I have kept clear of prophecy, for they are addressed in part to those who have no belief in prophecy. But if the prophetic student will shake himself free from the Satan myth, he will find the Divine forecast of the future become radiant with new light. Terrible wars are yet to convulse the nation, bringing famine in their train. But the coming Man will bring peace to the world. He will command universal homage not merely by reason of his Satanic miraculous powers, but because of his splendid human qualities. The adherents of "*the* truth" will, alone of all the race, have cause to mourn his sovereignty. His reign will be the era of man's "millennium," a time of order and prosperity unparalleled, when the arts of peace shall flourish, and the utopias of philosophers and socialists will be realized. And that the Satan cult which will then prevail on earth will be marked by a high morality and a specious "form of godliness" is plainly indicated by the warning that, but for Divine grace, it would "deceive the very elect." It is also, I venture to think, plainly foreshadowed by current events. Christians are trifling with skeptical attacks upon Scripture. But the real issue involved in these attacks is the Divinity of Christ; and I venture to predict that those of us who shall live for another quarter of a century shall yet witness a widespread abandonment of that great

truth by many of the Churches. The decline of faith during the last five-and-twenty years has been appalling, and we are already within measurable distance of a more general acceptance of the Satan cult--a religion marked by a high morality and an earnest philanthropy, but wholly devoid of all that is distinctively Christian. "Free from dogma" is the favorite expression; and this "freedom" means the ignoring of the great truths of Christianity.

APPENDIX

Note VIII (see ch. 11)

How deep-seated and venerable [commanding respect] is the popular belief that all misdeeds of a certain gravity are due to Satanic influence. But this belief suggests a difficulty which has perplexed and distressed many a thoughtful Christian. Multitudes innumerable thus transgress. Nor are they to be found only in the squalid dwellings of our city slums, but in the abodes of wealth and culture; not only in our great unlovely towns, but in every village and hamlet in the land. Nor are these shores in any special sense the domain of Satan. On the contrary, if vice and crime are signs of his presence and power, other countries must claim more of his activity than our own. And when we turn to the darker scenes of heathenism, the appalling tale of hideous vice and cruelty gives proof that there the devil must be still more busy than in Christendom. But if the majority of the many thousands of millions of mankind are thus under his personal influence, he must be acquainted with the life and circumstances of each individual. Are we, then, to conclude that he is practically omnipresent and omniscient? Are we to ascribe to him these attributes of Deity?

As regards the unseen world, any belief which does not rest upon revelation is essentially superstitious. What, then, is the testimony of Scripture on this subject? The first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans treats of the condition of the heathen with a definiteness which leaves nothing to be desired. To this passage, then, let us appeal, and by it let the popular belief be tested. Here are the words:--

"Knowing God, they glorified Him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonored among themselves; for that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. For this cause God gave them up unto vile passions....And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting" (Rom. 1:21-28, R.V.).³

If Satan were immediately responsible for the baser immoralities of men, it is inconceivable that such a passage would contain no allusion to the fact; but allusion there is none. The words are clear and simple--"God gave them up"; and human nature in its alienation from God accounts for their depravity. Nor will it avail to plead that it is only

³ The whole passage from ver. 18 claims careful study. Science explains the condition of civilized man by evolution--although the only *law* it can point to is degeneracy; the rest is all mere theory--Revelation explains the state of the world generally by the fact that, having originally the knowledge of God, they willfully lost it, and so God left them to the darkness of their own deliberate choice.

pagan depravity which is here in question. If no devil is needed to account for the abominations of the heathen world, why appeal to the supernatural to explain the vices and crimes of Christendom? To do so is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural.

And why should Satan tempt men in this way? His doing so would be intelligible if his power over them depended on their leading vicious lives. But Scripture vetoes this suggestion. Some who own his sway are slaves of vice, but others are religious zealots of blameless character; and our Lord expressly declares that it is the zealots who are farthest from the kingdom (Matt. 21:31).

Not that immorality is any passport to heaven, any recommendation to Divine favor. On the contrary, it is a highway to "the City of Destruction"; but it is for this very reason that it brings a man within reach of hope, for in "the City of Destruction" it is that the Savior is seeking the lost. The devotee of blameless life, who thanks God that he is not as other men, is entirely on the devil's side; whereas, were he tempted to open sin, he might be brought to his knees to pray that other prayer which would bring all heaven to his help.

How it would simplify matters if morality were a distinctive badge of the regenerate, and immorality characterized the rest! But vice is not the hallmark of the devil's handiwork. "A form of godliness" (2 Tim. 3:5) is one of his "devices." Among the most dangerous enemies of Christ and Christianity are men who live pure and upright lives, and who preach righteousness. "And no marvel; for even Satan fashions himself into an angel of light; it is no great thing therefore if his ministers also fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:14,15, R.V.). And if "the very elect" are deceived by the fraud, it is mainly because they are blinded by this error of the Satan myth.

It is not, I again repeat, in the domain of morals that the devil's influence is distinctively declared, but in the spiritual sphere. Our race has not sprung from Adam in Eden innocence, but from Adam the fallen and sinful outcast. Human nature is thus poisoned at its very source by ignorance and distrust of God. It is a *fallen* nature. And Satan it was who thus debased it. What wonder, then, that he is able to influence the main currents of human thought and action in regard to things Divine! What wonder that he can control the religion of the race!

All this may excite the contempt of the agnostic, but we challenge him to offer some other explanation of the well-ascertained facts. The evolutionist pretends to account for the condition of the lower strata of humanity; but how can he explain the phenomena of the religion of Christendom? In spite of all the advantages which civilization affords, men have bartered the sublime truths of Christianity for the superstitions of old-world paganism. Such figments as baptismal regeneration and the possession of mystic powers by a priestly caste are wholly repugnant to Christianity; and Judaism, even in its apostasy, was free from them. And yet they have been adopted as an integral part of the Christian religion. This one fact is proof that, so far at least as the origin of man is concerned, evolution is false and the story of the Eden fall is true.

But this kind of Satanic influence involves no knowledge of the inner experience of each

life, no possession of Divine attributes. It implies no special action directed simultaneously against millions of individuals scattered over all the globe. That the devil does deal with individuals we know; but Scripture indicates that such cases are exceptional. The warning to the Twelve--that Satan desired to have them--though intended for all was specially for Peter. It is but natural that he should seek to drag down those who stand out as champions of the truth. Nor can even the lowliest disciple be sure of immunity from his attacks. He "walks about, " we read, "as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet. 5:8). And a prowling lion may seize even the very weakest for his prey. This may explain conflicts which sometimes try the faith even of the humblest Christian.

The old classification of "the world, the flesh, *and* the devil" is a right one. And "our *wrestling* is not against flesh and blood" (Eph. 6:12, R.V.). In the "flesh" sphere, our safety is in flight. But flight from Satan is impossible. "Flee youthful lusts (2 Tim. 2:22), but "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you" (James 4:7). Such is the distinction clearly marked in Scripture. The baser "lusts of the flesh" are entirely under a man's control, unless indeed he is enervated by vicious indulgence; but with the strongest and holiest of men, "the whole armor of God" is the only sure defense against the attacks of Satan (Eph. 6:11).

Of the devil's aim and methods I have already spoken. No one, I repeat, may assert that he might not use the basest means to ensnare a minister of Christ and thus mar his testimony and destroy his usefulness. But it cannot be asserted too often or too plainly that his normal effort is not to tempt to the commission of sins such as lead to contrition and teach us how weak we are; but it is to draw us away to mere human morality or religion or philosophy, and to deaden or destroy our sense of dependence upon God. For sin may humble a Christian, but human philosophy and religion can only foster his self-esteem. And pride is "the snare of the devil (1 Tim. 3:6,7), not humility.

That there are "unclean spirits" we know. And certain abnormal phases of depravity may be due possibly, even in our own day, to demoniacal possession. But this is wholly distinct from Satanic temptations. And demons even are not all "unclean." The warned-against "teachings of demons" in "later times" are not incitements to vice, but to a more exacting morality and a spirituality more transcendental than even Christianity enjoins. Marriage itself is repulsive to this fastidious cult, and certain kinds of food, "which God created to be received with thanksgiving," it absolutely rejects.⁴

The flagrant immoralities of some of the Corinthian converts drew from the apostle no suggestion of Satanic agency, save indeed as a possible means towards the restoration of those who had sinned (1 Cor. 5:1-5). The warning, "lest Satan should get an advantage of us," was given when their zeal to clear themselves betrayed them into resentment against the offenders (2 Cor. 2:11). And it was the advent of false teachers "preaching another Jesus" which evoked the further warning against the Serpent's "subtilty," lest their minds

⁴ See 1 Tim. 4:1-4. It may be noticed here in passing that during recent years, both in Europe and America, these doctrines have been insidiously taught by certain spiritualists, who commend their teaching by seemingly pure and blameless lives.

should be "corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3,4). So again, when persecution prevailed in the Thessalonian church, he was solicitous "to know their faith," fearing "lest the Tempter should tempt them" and their confidence in God should fail.

There is one passage of Scripture which some seem to think refutes what has been here maintained. As a matter of fact, it may be appealed to in support of it. The following are the opening words of the second chapter of Ephesians:--

"And you did He quicken, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins, wherein aforetime ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now works in the sons of disobedience; among whom we also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest" (Eph. 2:1-3, R.V.).

Those who read this passage in the light of the Satan myth entirely lose its special teaching. The life of every unregenerate man, whether marked by the grossest vice or by high morality, by utter atheism or by intense religious zeal, is "according to the spirit that works in the sons of disobedience." The life of Saul the persecutor had been as pure and blameless as was the life of Paul the apostle of the Lord. And yet he here brackets himself with the Ephesian converts. Hence the emphatic "*all*" of the third verse. All alike had walked "according to the prince of the power of the air," and therefore "according to the course of this world," for Satan is this world's prince and god.⁵ So far from implying that their "trespasses and sins" had been due to supernatural incitement, the apostle expressly declares they had been altogether natural and human. The Gentile sensualists were but "doing the desires of the flesh"; the Jewish zealot "the desires of the mind."⁶

The terms immorality and sin are not convertible. The one refers to an arbitrary human standard of right; the other to a standard altogether Divine. As already indicated (chap. 11), the essence of sin is *lawlessness*. Man was endowed by his Creator with a will absolutely free. But, though all blessing depended on his keeping it in subjection, he asserted it in opposition to the Divine will. And as a result, "the carnal (or natural) mind is enmity against God; for (as the apostle adds), it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be" (Rom. 8:7). Our fallen nature has thus become subject to its own law of gravitation; and it would be as unreasonable to expect a man to achieve the physical feat of mounting upward towards the sky as to suppose that, apart from Divine grace, the life of an unregenerate sinner could turn Godward. In the one case as in the other, a miracle alone could account for the phenomenon. And such a miracle both the apostle himself and the Ephesian converts had experienced. Hence the added words: "But God, being rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, quickened us together with Christ" (Eph. 2:4,5, R.V.). No miracle, indeed, is

5 John 14:30, 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4.

6 In the N.T. "the flesh" means usually either the body, or bodily nature, of man, or else human nature as a whole in its fallen and corrupt condition. But in Eph. 2:3 it is contrasted with "the mind," and therefore it appears to mean man's corrupt *bodily* nature. In Eph. 1:18 and 4:18 (as also in 1 John 5:20), *διανοία* is translated "understanding." (In 1:18 the R.V. reads *καρδία*.) St. Paul uses the word *flesh* in different senses even in the same passage; see Eph. 2:3, 11, 15, *ex.gr.*

needed to enable men to lead moral and religious lives. Here the words of Enid's song are true:--

"For man is man, and master of his fate."⁷

It is in the *spiritual* sphere that, by the law of his nature, he ever gravitates downward and falls away from God.

Finally, I would again remark that the Christian who turns to prophecy with a mind unbiased by traditional views about Satan will find new meaning in the predictions relating to the "latter days." Delegated authority was all the devil claimed in the Temptation, as appears from the very words he used. To him, he declared, had been "delivered" the kingdoms of the world, with all the power and the glory of them (Luke 4:6). But the power and the glory the Christian has been taught to ascribe to God alone. In his last great effort, therefore, Satan incarnate will claim to be Divine (2 Thess. 2:4). And the lie, we are told, will be accredited by "all power and signs and lying wonders" (2 Thess. 2:9). God's "millennium" will be anticipated and travestied [grotesquely imitated] by the reign of the Man of Sin. And the fact that the devil will yield to him "his throne and great authority" (Rev. 13:2, R.V.) has led to the assumption that his rule will be marked by Saturnalian orgies of violence and lust. But how then can we explain the words of Christ, that the world will hail him as the true Messiah and that, if such a thing were possible, the very elect would be deceived by the imposture?⁸ If read with a right appreciation of the Satan of Scripture, these words of our Divine Lord are a most solemn warning to the believer, even for the days we live in. But read in the false light of the Satan myth, they remain an insoluble enigma.

⁷ "Idylls of the King."

⁸ Matt. 24:24. See Note VII.

APPENDIX
Note IX
(see ch. 12)

According to English law, "the Lord's day" (as Sunday is designated in the old statutes) is a day on which no judge or magistrate may sit and no jury may be impaneled. The criminal may be taken red-handed, but all that the law can do is to hold him in ward until the day of grace has run its course, and a competent tribunal may adjudicate upon his crime. If our law went further in the same direction, and the functions of the constable also were suspended, it would afford an apter illustration of the great truth that is here in question. But to make the parable complete, we must go even further still and suppose not only that the criminal enjoys for the moment freedom even from arrest, but that there is an amnesty in force by which he may secure absolute immunity from all the consequences of his crime.

But to hold such language is to speak in an unknown tongue; and to turn to the words of Scripture in support of it is to risk losing men's attention altogether. The mystery of the gospel is that God can *justify* a sinner, and yet be just. He justifies the *ungodly*. "To him who works not, but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:5). Here is another kindred statement: "The grace of God has appeared salvation-bringing to all men." And the passage proceeds: "For we also were aforetime foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one another. But when the kindness of God our Savior, and His love-toward-man, appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to His mercy He saved us" (Tit. 2:11-14 and 3:3-5). Or if any would wish to have words spoken by the lips of our blessed Lord Himself, they will be found in many a passage of the Gospels. Here, for example, is His testimony to Nicodemus: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Are we not justified, then, in saying that forgiveness and eternal life are brought within reach of all; that heaven is made as free to sinful men as infinite love and grace can make it? If words have any meaning, this--and nothing less than this--is the truth. But how is this gospel treated? In the minds of the religious, it excites the utmost indignation. They no longer burn men at the stake for proclaiming it, as in darker days they used to do; but though their anger shows itself in gentler ways, it is just as real. And upon common men it makes no impression whatever. A man once stood on London Bridge, for a wager, offering real sovereigns for a shilling each. The notice he displayed was plainly worded, and it was read by hundreds of the passersby. But by all it was read incredulously, and therefore with indifference. He won his wager; not a single coin was taken from him! And for the same reason "the gospel of the grace of God" is ignored. It will be thus ignored by hundreds who will read these pages. Men are possessed by the belief that eternal life can be attained only upon impracticable conditions, and so their attitude towards the whole matter is one of apathy. But apathy gives place to anger if anyone dares to speak of eternal judgment and a hell for the impenitent. No blasphemy can be too daring to hurl

at a God who would not bring a sinner to heaven in the way that a constable brings a drunken prisoner to the lockup--without his will, or, if needs be, *against* his will!

But a man, made in the image of God, is endowed with a will, and to that will the Divine appeal is addressed. "Ye *will not* come to Me that ye might have life" was the Lord's yearning entreaty to those who listened to His words but refused to give heed to them. "Whosoever *will*, let him take the water of life freely." God's own heaven is the home to which He is calling sinful men. Hell has been prepared, not for such, but for the devil and his angels. But if men refuse Christ and take sides with Satan, they must reap what they sow.

APPENDIX

Note X

(see ch. 13)

"Of what value, then, is prayer? someone will ask, and "What place is there for it?" It is with extreme diffidence that I venture to give expression to thoughts on this subject, which have long taken possession of my own mind. And I do so only because it may possibly bring relief to many who are sorely distressed at the seeming failure of the prayer-promises of the Gospels. Words could not be plainer than those in which our Lord impressed on His disciples that Almighty power was absolutely at their disposal, if only they had faith. When they wondered that the fig tree withered at His word, He told them that they too could command this, or even the moving of a mountain. And He added, "And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive" (Matt. 21:20-22). How many there are who in intensest earnestness have claimed such promises, and have reaped bitter disappointment which has staggered their faith! It is easy, of course, to explain the failure by reading into the promise conditions of one kind or another, though the Lord Himself made no conditions whatever. But instead of tampering thus with His words, let us consider whether the true solution of the difficulty may not be found in the truth which these pages have endeavored to unfold.

And here the striking fact claims attention, that while the record of the Pentecostal dispensation presents us with the practical counterpart of all such promises, the Epistles (which unfold the doctrine of the present dispensation and describe the life which befits that doctrine--the life of faith) inculcate thoughts about prayer which are essentially different, and which are entirely in accord with the actual experience of spiritual Christians.⁹

Some perhaps may urge that while the earlier Gospels may thus be explained, *St. John* cannot be treated in this way. I can in reply but plead with the thoughtful reader to consider whether every word addressed to the apostles is intended to apply to all believers at all times. Take John 14:12 as a test of this. Is every believer to be endowed with miraculous powers equal to or greater than those exercised by the Lord Himself? We are prepared at once to limit the scope of such words. Is it so clear, then, that the words which immediately follow are of universal application? We have the fact, I repeat, that both these promises were proved to be true in the Pentecostal dispensation, and that neither has been proved to be true in the Christian Church.¹⁰ So also of chap. 15:16 and 16:23, &c.

But, it will be asked, Is not the promise explicitly repeated in St. John's First Epistle (1 John 3:22 and 5:14,15)? I think not. It seems to me that the apostles were *in a special sense* empowered both to act and to pray in the name of the Lord Jesus, whereas the

9 James 5:13 may seem to be an exception. But without raising the question where "the Elders of the Church" are to be found in our day, it may suffice to notice that this Epistle, being expressly addressed to *Israel* (chap. 1:1), belongs dispensationally to the Pentecostal era, which will be renewed when *Israel* is restored.

10 See Chap 5. I am convinced that they will be equally true in a dispensation which is still future; but I do not enter on such topics here.

Christian should bow in presence of the words "according to His will." As Dean Alford here remarks: "If we knew His will thoroughly and submitted to it heartily, it would be impossible for us to ask anything, for the spirit or for the body, which He should not hear and perform. And it is this ideal state, as always, which the apostle has in view." But the Christian too commonly makes his own longings or his supposed interests, and not the Divine will, the basis of his prayer. He goes on to persuade himself that his request will be granted. He then regards this "faith" as a pledge that he has been heard. And finally, when the issue belies his confident hopes, he gives way to bitterness and unbelief. True faith is always prepared for a refusal. Some, we read, "through faith" "obtained promises"; but no less "through faith," "others were tortured, not accepting deliverance."

Some, perhaps, may think it a sufficient refutation of all this to appeal to what are called "striking answers to prayer," such as certain Christians have experienced in every age. But the appeal refutes itself. They are justly regarded as "*striking* answers" precisely because they are exceptional. No one may dare to limit what God will do for the believer. But to make the experience of some the standard of faith for all is one of the greatest errors and snares of Christian life. If these promises are of universal application, the fact that any answer to prayer should be considered striking in any sense is proof of general apostasy.

A detailed examination of the passages in the Epistles which refer to this subject would far exceed the limits of a note. One more may suffice. I allude to the familiar words of Phil. 4:6,7: "In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passes all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus" (R.V.). It is a solemn thing to make unconditioned demands upon God. To the record of such prayers may often be added the solemn words, "He gave them their request, but sent leanness into their soul." Hezekiah prayed in this way. He claimed a prolongation of his life, and God granted his petition; and the added years gave him his son Manasseh, and the consequences of Manasseh's sin (that God "would not pardon") still rest as a blight and a curse upon that nation! Such a prayer, I make bold to say, is unfitting to the Christian. How different the teaching of the Divine Spirit! It may be the life of husband or wife, of parent or child, that is in the balance. What then shall be the believer's attitude? To claim it, as Hezekiah did, and chance the awful risks which the answer may entail? Or, "by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving," leave the request with God, and having thus left it all with Him, to trust His love and wisdom with the issue? It was thus the apostle prayed when he sought relief from that mysterious hindrance to his ministry. And the denial of his request, instead of bringing bitterness of soul, only served to teach him more of "the power of Christ" (2 Cor. 12:8,9). Above all, it was thus the Master prayed in the garden of Gethsemane (Matt. 26:39,42).

The prayer of the Pentecostal age was like drawing cheques to be paid in coin over the counter. The prayer of the Christian dispensation--that is, of the life of faith--is to make known our requests to God, and to be at peace. If the matter were one within the power of a friend to deal with--a friend whose wisdom we could trust and of whose love we were assured--should we not be content to say, after telling him all, "Now you know my feelings

and my wishes, and I leave the case entirely in your hands." And this is just what God invites.

APPENDIX

Note XI

(see ch. 13)

The skeptic seldom admits that any position once held by him is untenable, and a signal exception to this is deserving of special notice. Not content with making havoc of the Old Testament, criticism has long been "running amok" through the New Testament also. "It has been demonstrated" (says a recent writer) "that the selection of the books composing it and their separation from the vast mass of spurious gospels, epistles, and apocalyptic literature was a gradual process, and, indeed, that the rejection of some books and the acceptance of others was accidental."¹¹ But all this is now exploded by the greatest living authority upon the subject, Professor Harnack of Berlin. And his testimony is all the more telling because he gives no sign of repentance as regards his utter rejection of Christianity. Himself the foremost champion of unorthodoxy, he freely owns that in this matter the critics are wrong and the orthodox are right. Here is an extract from the preface to his recent work on "The Chronology of the oldest Christian Literature":--

"There was a time--the general public indeed has not got beyond it--in which the oldest Christian literature, including the New Testament, was looked upon as a tissue of deceptions and forgeries. That time is passed. For science it was an episode in which it learned much, and after which it has much to forget. The results, however, of the following investigations go in a 'reactionary' direction, beyond what can be described as the middle position of present-day criticism. The oldest Literature of the Church in all main points and in most details, from the point of view of literary criticism, is genuine and trustworthy. In the whole New Testament there is in all probability only a single writing which can be looked upon as pseudonymous in the strictest sense of the word--*i.e.*, the Second Epistle of Peter."

This is but one of many proofs that the tide has turned which in recent years has threatened to undermine the Christian faith. In the skepticism of the day there is nothing distinctive save that so many of its champions are men who are publicly pledged and subsidized to teach what they deny. It is only the unstable and the ignorant who are overwhelmed by a book like that above cited.¹² Neither the well-instructed nor the spiritual can be thus led to reject the Bible as a fraud and Christianity as a superstition. They can understand the difference between a Divine revelation and human comments and commentaries. To take a single example--they do not regard the Ussher-Lloyd Chronology in the margin of our English Bible as "equally inspired with the sacred text

11 Mr. Andrew D. White's "Warfare of Science with Theology," vol. ii. p. 388. This writer's appointment to the American Embassy at Berlin will no doubt call increased attention to his book. Real forensic skill is apparent in the use he makes of his great erudition; for, allowing for one important omission, his work is quite encyclopedic. His indictment of "theology" is overwhelming, and with much of it I am of course in thorough sympathy. But of *Christianity*, so far as appears from his treatise, he knows absolutely nothing. To him our Divine Lord is merely "the Blessed Founder" of the Christian religion--the Buddha of Christendom. Indeed, he belongs to that large class of persons who, without offense, may be aptly described as Christianized Buddhists.

12 "Warfare of Science with Theology."

itself."¹³ And while refusing to accept open-mouthed the wild conjectures of certain Egyptologists as to the antiquity of ancient dynasties, they recognize that the "conjectural periods" between the Deluge and the Kingdom must be largely extended.

If we eliminate the blunders of theologians and "reconcilers" on the one hand and the *theories* (as distinguished from the facts) of science on the other, a ponderous treatise like Mr. A. D. White's would be reduced to very small proportions. The whole "Mosaic Cosmogony" controversy is ruled out at once, and many questions which seem of serious moment shrink into the background or entirely disappear. Moreover, there is in Holy Scripture a "hidden harmony" unknown to those who ignore the scheme of type and prophecy which permeates the whole. This study is a sure antidote to skepticism. No student of prophecy is a skeptic. And as regards the typology of Scripture, which is the alphabet of the language in which the New Testament is written, there is not one of the rationalists who has given proof of possessing any knowledge whatever. Ignorance of the alphabet is a fatal defect in those who claim to expound the text; and this ignorance, which Hengstenberg deplored in his day, is still absolute in the case of all without exception who are seeking to prove that the Bible is but a human book. "Truth brings out the hidden harmony, when unbelief can only, with a dull dogmatism, deny."

13 "Warfare of Science with Theology," vol. i. p. 253.