

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

FIRST SERIES.
VOL. LVI.—No. 9. }

FEBRUARY, 1880.

{ FOURTH SERIES.
VOL. VI.—No. 9.

SOLOMON'S TEMPLE.

BY REV. J. W. HARSHA.

A TEMPLE is a sacred building, consecrated for the dwelling and service of some deity. The heathen built temples for their idols, and the only living and true God dwelt in the temple built for him at Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, about one thousand years before the Christian era. Hence, it is written, "The Lord is in his holy temple" (Hab. ii. 20), and there the tribes of the Lord went up to worship and keep their solemn feasts. Of that temple there is no reliable account, except that which is given by the inspired penmen, for no other was given until centuries after the temple was in ruins, and the account which we propose to give is taken from the Scriptures and from authorities founded on them. Jerusalem was the ancient city and capital of Judea, and so strongly fortified, both by nature and by art, that it was universally believed her gates could not be entered by the foe (Lam. iv. 12), yet they were entered, and the temple destroyed, and the citizens taken captive seventy years, where, by Babel's streams, they hung their harps on the willow trees, and refused to sing a song of Zion to the sport of their spoilers. After that time the temple was more than once rebuilt and destroyed, and the last time it was "forty and six years in building," by Herod the Great. To render false the prophecy, "There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down," Julian, the Roman Emperor, attempted to rebuild it, but was prevented by fire and earthquakes, making good the sacred prophecy. King David greatly desired to build that temple, but was not allowed to do so, because "he had been a man of war and had shed blood," and might say, with Aeneas, the Trojan hero,

"In me, 'tis impious holy things to bear,
Red as I am with slaughter, new from war;
Till in some living stream I cleanse the guilt
Of dire debate, and blood in battle spilt."

That honor was conferred on his son Solomon, whose reign was one of universal peace, and who, with all his wisdom, humbly engaged in the great work of building the temple (2 Chr. ii. 4-6). He calls it great, yea, exceeding great

IS PLYMOUTHISM ORTHODOX?

BY REV. JAMES HARPER, D. D.

OUR opinion on this point has been suggested, if not very emphatically expressed, in the preceding part of this essay. Whether it shall be adjudged orthodox or not, depends, of course, chiefly on the standard of orthodoxy which is recognized. With our subordinate standards, and with the word of God the supreme standard, Plymouthism, in its distinctive tents, we believe to be utterly incompatible. It might be better to content ourselves with this general declaration without entering into details, seeing our limits forbid any full or satisfactory discussion of the points at issue. Still I am unwilling to close this paper without offering a few thoughts on some of these, especially as there is reason to suspect that some, even in our own church, are considerably enamored of Plymouth sentiments and methods of operation. And inasmuch as the impression seems to exist in some quarters that between our views and those of Plymouthites there is little difference, unless in regard to church polity and order, we will aim in our few remarks rather to point out the disagreement between our system and that of the Brethren than to show directly that Plymouthism is at variance with Scripture, to do which properly would demand a treatise.

It is gratifying to know and acknowledge that on sundry important doctrines, the Brethren and we are at one. We are in general harmony touching the doctrines of the Trinity, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the guilt and depravity of man, the sovereignty of God, and of salvation by grace alone. Weighty however, as these doctrines are, they do not constitute the entire system of theology, and agreement in respect to them does not preclude serious differences on other questions of no slight moment.

The Plymouth theory of the church, its origin, constitution, order, and worship, is not ours. That there was a church before the Day of Pentecost described in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the Brethren positively deny; whereas, it is in different ways implied, and more than once directly declared in the Westminster Confession of Faith, that there was a church in Old Testament times, and before the incarnation of the Son of God. This teaching of our Confession, we think, is warranted by the word of God. That holy men lived before the coming of Christ, no one professing to believe the Scriptures can deny. That such men had been called out, effectually called by the Spirit of God, even Plymouthites, captious as they are, will hardly dare to deny. That pious men and others, who, though not pious, professed at least adherence to the true religion, were combined together by divine authority as a society for the observance and maintenance of religious ordinances—definite laws being enacted by the same authority touching the formal admission, the duties, and, in case of need, the excision of the members of this society—cannot, it seems to us, be fairly denied by any one who reads and respects the Old Testament Scriptures. But a society bearing these marks has

all the essential features of the Church of God in its visible form. The assumption of Plymouthites that the visible church consists of true believers only, has no foundation in Scripture, so far as we can see. On the contrary, the Scriptures warrant the principle laid down in our Confession, that the visible church consists of all those who profess, that is, credibly profess, the true religion, together with their children.

The principle enunciated by the Brethren is good, that the government, discipline, and worship of the church should be conformable to the model established by Apostolic authority. But in the application of this sound principle, the Brethren do not commend themselves to our judgment. With them, as with Congregationalists, all the members in full standing are rulers, and, what Congregationalists do not admit, all the members are equally entitled to officiate in public preaching and the administration of the sacraments. The practice of ordaining men to the eldership, which certainly prevailed in the Apostolic age of the church, the Brethren allege pertained rightfully to that period alone, when there were Apostles and other supernaturally gifted men to select such officers and convey to them miraculous endowments. With genuine Plymouth positiveness, Mr. Mackintosh writes; "Neither do we believe that men have any divine authority for their act when they set about making and appointing elders. We believe that when Paul, or Timothy, or Titus, ordained elders, they did so as acting by the power and under the direction of the Holy Ghost; but we deny that any man or body of men can act so now. We believe it was the Holy Ghost then, and it must be the Holy Ghost now."

As it is incompatible with our limits to enter into a close examination of the position here assumed by this representative Plymouthite, we must content ourselves with a few general strictures, expressed as briefly as possible. And first, if elders were needed, as stated officers in the Apostolic Church, and in all parts of it, among Jews and Gentiles alike, it may be presumed that they are required now, when the extraordinary supervision of Apostles has ceased. Second. If such an arrangement was meant to terminate with the removal of the apostles, it seems rather unaccountable that no warning should have been given against the attempt to perpetuate it. Third. Still more singular is it that the Apostle Paul should have left on record a very full description of the qualifications requisite for the office of the eldership, and of the deaconship, too, if either of those offices was meant to cease with the Apostolic age. Fourth. Among the qualifications declared necessary, the possession of supernatural gifts is not specified. Fifth. If even under the eye of the Apostles, the people enjoyed the privilege of selecting men to act as deacons and as elders, much more, may it be presumed, is that prerogative vested in them now, when no infallible guides are upon the earth. That deacons were chosen by the popular vote is clear; and that elders also were, can, we think, be satisfactorily established. Sixth. It is admitted that the Spirit of God alone can qualify men to be elders, whether ruling elders, or such as, besides ruling, may teach, and he, not we, can infallibly determine who are qualified for such posts; yet

he can guide professing Christians now in the selection of offices, as he did in Apostolic times, and that without any supernatural direction. There is no ground for thinking that the power of discerning spirits in a miraculous way was conferred on the multitude of the disciples whom the Apostles told to elect deacons; and yet the Apostles appointed and ordained to office those chosen by the multitude. It belongs not to us to make a true convert, or even to determine infallibly who is such; yet Plymouthites insist that only true converts should be admitted to full communion. Might we not retort virtually, and with much better reason, upon them, in the query which they put to us in relation to the choice of offices: "Why do you usurp the prerogative of the Holy Ghost?" Seventh. Plymouthites admit that there should be teachers and evangelists in the church, and yet that unbounded license is not to be given to these. They hold that the church has a right to sit in judgment on the teachings of any who claim a hearing in it. But is not this equivalent to saying that the church is vested with the prerogative of deciding what doctrine shall be taught in it, and who shall be the teachers? The bearing of this consideration on the point more particularly before us, is not difficult to perceive.

In the department of worship, particularly in the matter of psalmody, the divergence of Plymouthites from United Presbyterians is obvious; for, while the latter contend that the Psalms of Scripture alone are to be sung in worship, the former not only use uninspired hymns in that exercise, but even reckon the Psalms to be on too low and legal a plane to suit the exalted position of the New Testament saints. This we understand to be the proper attitude of Plymouthism in respect to the service of song; while it is probable some of the Non-exclusive or Open Brethren may admit the propriety of using in the worship of the present day the ancient songs of Zion. It is a puzzle to us to know how those who profess to be such close imitators of the Apostolic Church, can eliminate the Psalms from their worship, in view of positive apostolic injunctions to use them. For, the question at issue in this case is not whether or not the Psalms shall be used exclusively in formal praise, but whether or not they shall be used at all in this exercise.

Touching the great doctrine of the Atonement, we may say that if the view given of that subject in the Westminster Formularies is scriptural, that given by Plymouth authorities is unscriptural. The latter appear to hold, in substance, the governmental theory of the Atonement, which is to the effect that in the sufferings of Christ a general display is made of God's hatred of sin, in virtue of which display he can pardon sinners without giving any countenance to sin. According to this view, the atonement was not, properly speaking, a satisfaction to the retributive justice of God, but rather a contrivance to prevent the drawing of false inferences from the extension of pardon to offenders by God. That such is the Plymouth doctrine, we judge rather from their statements as to the ground of a sinner's justification, than from any direct declaration on the subject of Atonement. For the Brethren deny that the righteousness of Christ is imputed for justification, contending that it is "the righteous-

ness of God" that is reckoned to a man for his justification. And seemingly they mean by this that God can, without doing any injury to the interests of morality, acquit freely one who deserves punishment. Thus understood, the Atonement secures the salvation of no one, but meekly opens the way for salvation; or, in other words, it is not a price paid and accepted, on account of which the salvation of those for whom it was rendered is demanded by justice. How far this is discordant with the theory set forth in our subordinate standards, it is hardly necessary to show.

Furthermore, in consistency with their theory of the nature of the Atonement, the Brethren teach, though not very obtrusively, that it was made in the same sense and equally for all men; whereas our doctrine is that, while intrinsically valuable enough to procure the salvation of all our fallen race, it was not the design of the Father in giving the Son, or of the Son in giving himself as a sacrifice, that atonement should be made for any but the elect; that is, persons chosen out of our race to be saved.

Again, it may be noted that, according to the Brethren, the obedience which Christ rendered to the precepts of the law formed no part of his Atonement. They admit, indeed, that his example in observing the law is useful to us, and that, in order to make atonement, he needed to be holy; but then they hold that the Saviour as man was under the precepts of the law for himself alone, and not in our stead. What is commonly called the "active obedience" of Christ was no element of the satisfaction which he made for sinners, according to Plymouthites. Our doctrine is to the effect that Christ rendered positive obedience to the law, as well as bore its penalty, in his people's room. He was made, for their sake, under the law, and not merely under its penalty. Although it is true that by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified in the sight of God, yet it is also true that a curse rests on every one "who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." Entrance into heaven can be gained only on the basis of law-keeping. "If thou wilt enter into life," said Christ, "keep the commandments." And as we cannot keep the commandments, Christ kept them for us, so that the way into heaven might be sure to us.

Nay, according to the teaching of prominent Brethren, all even of the sufferings endured by Christ were not atoning. "None but those which he bore while on the cross, perhaps not all even of these, were expiatory in their design," say Darby and others. Now it cannot be denied that Christ was a great sufferer before he was nailed to the cross. The sufferings prior to those borne on the cross must have been either calamities arbitrarily inflicted, or chastisements, or vicarious penalties. Not the first, we think, for the justice and goodness of God alike forbid such causeless inflictions. Not the second, for Christ was personally the Holy One, and needed no amendment. Therefore his sufferings through life were a part of that penalty which he engaged to bear as his people's substitute.

As might be expected, the doctrine of the Plymouthites as to the atonement gives shape to their doctrine as to justification. Perhaps it would be more cor-

rect to say that the two doctrines affect each other mutually. The imputation of the righteousness of Christ for the justification of the sinner, we have already seen. they deny ; while moreover they deny that the obedience of Christ to the precepts of the law formed any part of his substitutionary or atoning work.

In some way, however, not very clearly defined, they teach that pardon comes to us through the final sufferings of Christ, while acceptance is a sovereign boon granted to us in Christ as risen. Now if Christ procured for his people pardon only, and not acceptance also, he cannot be called their Saviour in the deep scriptural sense of that term. On him, in the case supposed, their title to pardon may rest ; but their title to heaven, with all the change of character necessary to the enjoyment of heaven, they must derive from some other source. We hold that when a believer enters into heaven, he does so directly and entirely on the ground of Christ's obedience unto death. In the person of Christ as his representative, he has won a title to heaven. The grace that shines in his salvation appears in the plan whereby a surety to perform a perfect work of satisfaction in his behalf was provided. Christ saves him from condemnation to glorification. The Redeemer's meritorious work needs no supplementing, whether by the sinner himself, or by God in the form of a boon conferred over and above what the work of Christ merited.

Nor do we believe that, so far as meriting our salvation is concerned, the resurrection of Christ was of any account. It was the proper sequel and seal of his meritorious work. That work entitled him to resurrection. By rising from the dead, he proved himself to be the Son of God with power, and showed that in stooping to death he had conquered it, none of its ligaments or bars being strong enough to hold him. Proof was thus given to the world that the claims which the Son of God had undertaken to meet, had been by him discharged, and that with his sacrifice God was well pleased. Had he not risen, we must have come short of justification ; for the fact that he remained permanently under the power of death, would have proved that his vicarious work was not satisfactory. Had he not been justified, that is, declared to have met perfectly his engagements in our behalf, we could not have been justified. But his resurrection was his justification.

Therefore, can it be fitly said, that "he was raised again for our justification," without implying that his resurrection was the proper ground of our justification? Besides, having risen from the dead, and ascended to the Father's right hand, he ever lives to make intercession for his people ; and among the blessings which, in the exercise of this priestly function, he asks for them, not the least important is, that at the proper time his righteousness be formally reckoned to them as theirs in law, and thus that they be justified.

The Brethren, as we have seen, maintain that the believer is entirely freed from the moral law, is in no sense under it. This position we deem a false and dangerous one ; although it may assume the semblance of a high-toned, ethereal spirituality, and for a time appear to be innocuous. It is not a new doctrine. Before the Reformation, it was a favorite opinion among different parties of a mystical and fanatical spirit, and had borne melancholy fruit. At

the time of the Reformation it reappeared amid the general ferment, and again manifested its baneful tendency. During the Puritan struggle in England, it cropped out again, and about the year 1640, on the eve of the meeting of the Westminster Assembly, found an eloquent advocate in London—Dr. Crisp—whose sermons did much to give it currency. Among the Baptists in England, also, this doctrine has found supporters onward from the days of the Commonwealth till our own day; and, from all accounts, its history among them does not commend it.

In this matter, as in many others, Plymouthites have seized upon one part of the truth, and pressed it to an extreme, refusing to recognize the complementary, modifying truth. As vigorously as they, do we assert that the believer is freed from the law in its covenant form, so that he is no longer under its curse, or required to obey it as a ground of his acceptance with God; but along with this we hold that the believer thus delivered is under obligation, and an obligation deepened by the deliverance he has experienced, to regulate his life by the precepts of the moral law. Not in a slavish spirit is he to observe it, but in that of a child, which hates to do what is offensive to a loving and loved parent. Strictly speaking, indeed, the moral law never can be kept in a slavish or mercenary spirit; for that law requires us to love the Lord our God, with all our heart, and in proportion as such love prevails, will the slavish spirit be eliminated. True, indeed, believers are children of God; but are children to be lawless? Are they not bound to honor their father? And if so bound, are they not so far under law? Are not believers described in Scripture as servants of God? And are they not exhorted and enjoined to serve him “with reverence and godly fear”? And whereas Plymouthites make bold to say that the moral law, which is *summarily* contained in the ten commandments, is not broad and high enough for them, we are disposed to think they will find it to be comprehensive enough, when they see it in its proper light as spiritual in its character, and demanding perfect love to God and man.

On the subject of Sanctification, the Brethren and we are at variance. This I may at least say; and yet I have found it impossible to ascertain definitely and unmistakably what is the doctrine held by Plymouthites as to sanctification.

They speak of our sanctification being as complete the first moment we believe as it ever can be, and in so doing they seem to us to confound sanctification with justification. Now without stopping to dispute about the proper use of the word “sanctification,” we would ask in order to simplify discussion, “Is a man, the moment he exercises saving faith, as holy subjectively, that is in heart and life, as he can ever become, even though he should live in the world for many years afterwards?” If it be answered “Yes,” then we would ask, What is meant by the urgent exhortations addressed in Scripture to Christians to grow in grace; to set their affections on things above; to mortify their members which are on the earth; to put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, and to confess their faults one to another? We would ask, moreover, Are all Christians on an equality as to degree in personal piety?

If the answer, on the other hand, be that the believer is not as holy the moment he first believes as he ever can become, we would ask, How can he become holier in this life according to Plymouth views? His old nature, according to the teaching of the Brethren, cannot be improved. His new nature, according to the same authority, does not need improvement, being perfectly pure from its origin. Can there, then, be any growth in holiness, under these circumstances, in the sense, at least, of subduing evil passions and rooting out or weakening indwelling sin? We cannot see what room there is in the believer for such a process, if Plymouth speculations are true.

And here it may be said that the doctrine of the Brethren as to the two natures that are in the believer, the incorrigible depravity of the one and the perfect purity of the other, rests on a crude interpretation of certain expressions which occur in the Epistles of Paul and of John. Judging from Plymouth writings, one would almost conclude that the Brethren consider a believer to be a bi-personal being, or to be divided into two compartments, one of which contains all the sin, and the other all the holiness, that is in the man. It would seem, moreover, that however the division which embraces the sin may intrude on the department wherein holiness is enshrined, it is the wisdom of the latter to abstain from all incursions on its lawless neighbor. Thus Mr. Mackintosh writes: "If I am led to believe that regeneration is a certain change in my old nature, and that this change is gradual in its operation, then, as a necessary consequence, I shall be filled with continual anxiety and apprehension, doubt and fear, depression and gloom, when I discover, as I surely shall, that nature is nature, and will be nothing else to the end of the chapter." Again he remarks: "God expects nothing from the flesh; neither should we. He looks upon it as dead; so should we. He has put it out of sight, and we should keep it so. The flesh should not be allowed to show itself. God does not own it. It has no existence before him. True, it is in us, but God gives us the precious privilege of viewing and treating it as dead." Furthermore, he says: "No one who has not experienced it can conceive the intensity of anguish and the bitterness of the disappointment which a soul feels, who, vainly expecting some improvement in nature, finds, after years of struggling, that nature is nature still. And just in proportion to the anguish and disappointment will be the joy of discovering that God is not looking for any improvement in nature; that he sees it as dead and us as alive in Christ, one with him and accepted in him forever."

These quotations form a fair specimen of a great deal of the exposition and exhortation of the Brethren, in which certain expressions of Scripture are fastened upon and remorselessly pressed, to the neglect of all qualifying and explanatory expressions. There lies a sophism in the use which those men make of the word "nature." They contend that the old nature is only evil, and is incapable of improvement. In such an assertion, they must refer either to sin in the abstract—to the very being and personality of a man—or to a sinful bias of our being. If to the first, they beat the air; because we do not believe that sin in the abstract is an entity at all, or aught else than a conception. Neither

do we believe that sin in this sense is convertible into holiness. If to the second, they equally miss the mark; for we do not believe that in regeneration the essential being or personality of a man is changed. A man by regeneration and subsequent sanctification does not lose his identity; just as Adam after he sinned did not lose his identity or cease to be the same human being essentially that he had been before. If to the third, we demur to the assertion, believing as we do that a *man* may be changed from being an enemy to being a friend of God; that a new direction or bent may be given to his faculties, these remaining as to their essence unchanged; that from being dead in sin he may be made alive to God, yet in such a way that somewhat of his previous morbid condition may still cling to him. By regeneration, sin in the heart is dethroned, but not utterly expelled; unless, indeed, the instant of regeneration be the moment also of death. But though driven from the seat of habitual control, sin may continue as a rebel within the realm of the soul over which it once had sway, and we believe it does so continue in every case till the dissolution of soul and body. In regeneration, new life is imparted, but this new life is still feeble, being the life, so to say, of a babe, and has to contend with many opposing influences. A sick man has life in him, and you may say that the life he has, so far as it is life, is perfect; yet that does not hinder that the man, as such, may be sick. Just so when new life is imparted to the soul, all the distemper of the soul is not destroyed, but a principle of spiritual health has been introduced, which, under the fostering care of him who implanted it, will overcome more and more, and at length utterly cast out, the malarious poison of sin from the soul. A quibbler might contend that a fever can never be changed into sound health, for the two are opposites, and a fever must remain a fever to the end. But may not a man who has a fever be cured? And after his fever has been checked and the principle of health has begun to assert its power over it, may he not for a long time be in a state of convalescence?

Nor is Mr. Mackintosh, from whom we have quoted so freely, able to maintain consistency with his own assertions; for in the very same tract, some extracts from which have been given, he says, "The Lord Christ can make dead souls as well as dead bodies hear his quickening voice." This is simply to say that Christ can and does quicken souls dead in trespasses and sins. But the soul dead in sin is a soul with or of a sinful nature, a nature certainly as incorrigible as the evil nature or "old man" that is in the believer. Yet according to this writer's own showing, such a nature can be changed and improved. After this quickening of a sinner, has he two souls? Mr. Mackintosh must either answer "Yes," and so land in absurdity, or else he must modify his premises from which this unscriptural and absurd conclusion flows. The counsel which Mr. Mackintosh gives, to forget as far as possible the fact that we carry about with us a load of indwelling sin, may be very palatable to some, but we deem it very unsafe. The believer, while rejoicing even in the pardon of his sins, should bewail the corruption that still dwells in him, and seek grace for the mortification of sin in his members. Any teaching which would lessen our sense of the hatefulness of the sin that is in us, or lead us to

relax our efforts to eradicate or destroy it, is dangerous, and we are persuaded that the tendency of the Plymouth doctrine as to the two natures in the believer is of this dangerous character.

The survey which we have now taken may serve to show, although far from being exhaustive, that Plymouthism and United Presbyterianism are separated from each other by no inconsiderable gulf; and if this paper should have the effect of recovering any from the meshes of the subtle and specious Plymouth network, or of guarding any against falling into them, we shall not regret the labor expended in its preparation.

The three great illicit tendencies of our times in the sphere of religious thought are Rationalism, Ritualism, and Mysticism. The last is, perhaps, not the least dangerous of the three, and to it, we think, Plymouthism is affiliated.

“THE HIGHER LIFE”—PERFECTIONISM.

BY REV. J. T. COOPER, D. D.

HAVING disposed of the arguments on the other side, I shall set before the reader the grounds on which we rest our position that a state of perfection is, until death, unattainable by the Christian.

1. In proof of this position we urge the *explicit* declarations of the divine word. 1 John i. 8, “If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;” James iii. 2, “In many things we offend all,” or, as it may be rendered—*in many respects we all err*; 1 Kings viii. 46, “There is no man that sinneth not;” Prov. xx. 9, “Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?” These declarations of the divine word never can be reconciled with the idea of sinless perfection.

2. The fact that all men are and will be chargeable with sin, is evident from that prayer which our Lord taught his disciples. One of its petitions is “Forgive us our trespasses.” We must either conclude that that prayer was not designed for *all* the disciples of Christ, or that they are all chargeable with sin.

3. We adduce in proof of our position, the fact that the word of God very distinctly teaches us that there is a conflict in the hearts of all true believers between sinful and holy principles. We have this fact very distinctly set before us by Paul in the 7th chapter of his epistle to the Romans.

This strong proof is sought to be evaded in two ways by the advocates of the higher life.

In the first place, if they belong to the Wesleyan school, they allege that the Apostle is there exhibiting the struggle which takes place in the heart of the unregenerate sinner when he is *under conviction*. Such an exegesis, however, is wholly untenable. Not to mention others, there are two considerations which show that the Apostle is there speaking of himself as a *child of God*: