

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

what is called the Publication Agency, in other words the undertaking to keep a list of those members of an Association who take in the Periodicals, the bringing them before the notice of those who have not previously known them, and the undertaking their regular supply. This work, unpretending as it sounds, is one that touches the very root of the question as to how we are to increase the funds of the Society, for all must feel that with increased interest will come increased funds, and the creation and maintenance of interest is not only to be accomplished by sermons and meetings, but by a more thorough use of the information which the Society prepares for all who are willing to read their most interesting Publications.

The great principle of gathering up the fragments comes into our subject. Our readers may remember the saying of John Wesley, that the reason of his never wanting was his never wasting, that he never even threw away a piece of paper or a piece of string; and this principle may find many applications in matters of Christian work. Children may be taught to utilize for the poor what would be otherwise thrown away. Scrap books for hospitals, or for the children of the poor, especially the "Text Scrap Book" now becoming so common, afford really interesting and useful work; even making "paper pillows" for the sick is a work by no means to be despised, especially if care is taken in the manufacture. At any rate we may be certain that if we adopt the principle of consecrating even our odds and ends to the Master's use, we shall not lack teaching as to how to do it best. "Lord what wilt Thou have me to do?" implies that He *has* something for each, and if we are coming to Him to know what it is we shall not be left in doubt.

JOHN H. ROGERS.

Reviews.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Ninth series of the Cunningham Lectures. By GEORGE SMEATON, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

IN these lectures Dr. Smeaton handles a theme the importance of which cannot be exaggerated, and, on the whole, in an edifying and instructive manner. There is no doubt that in modern times the office of the second Person of the Holy Trinity in the work of redemption has thrown

that of the third into the background—practically, if not theoretically. The tendency has been inherited from the period of the Reformation, when the great question was, How can man be justified before God? and the doctrine of St. Paul was asserted against the Pelagianism of the dominant Church. The Evangelical movement of the present century in England occupied itself chiefly with the same question. In proportion as it did so, it left other portions of the field comparatively uncultivated; so difficult is it for one age, or one school of thought, or one author, to assign its due proportion to every aspect of divine truth. Even in the volume of inspiration, it is only by combining and comparing its several portions that we arrive at a comprehensive view of the revelation which it contains. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is an example in point. Acknowledged in general terms by all Christians, it has by no means occupied the place in our theology, and in our preaching, which is its due; and while the title of the Gospel has specially attached itself to the atoning work of the Redeemer, the application thereof to individuals, the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit, has received comparatively little attention. Since the great work of Owen, we are aware of but few, besides the one before us, which has professed to give a systematic view of the subject.

Dr. Smeaton writes, for the most part, in an easy and perspicuous style. His pages are free from that terrible process of "word-painting," which is a feature of some modern popular productions, and which seems not unlikely seriously to affect the standard of literary taste. The true imaginative faculty is a precious gift, but a perpetual striving after effect falls upon the wearied reader. The multiplication of images, not remarkable for novelty, and the triteness of which is only disguised by unusual devices of style, is a very different thing from coruscations spontaneously thrown off in the heat of composition, or the steady glow which diffuses itself through the productions of a Milton or a Jeremy Taylor. The gorgeous clothing is too evidently a *purpureus pannus*, manufactured and applied from without, not emanating from a native impulse. It is refreshing, in these days, to meet with a writer on theological subjects who remembers that the perfection of style is to attract no notice to itself, and is content to express his thoughts in the language of Tillotson, Addison, and Berkeley.

We cannot, indeed, pronounce Dr. Smeaton a faultless model of composition. He occasionally employs words that jar upon an English ear, such as "exegeta," "dubiety," "errorists," "deleted," "premlial," "sopited," "deliverances" (in the sense of statements); some of which are perhaps owing to the author's nationality, and all of which might be exchanged with advantage for others. We are sorry to observe him endorsing the word "reliable," which, though contrary to grammatical analogy (for, as Dean Alford remarks, it ought to be reli-upon-able), seems to have established itself amongst us. Why should it usurp the place of the genuine English term "trustworthy"? It is probably to America that we are indebted for some of these importations. There is another class of words coming into vogue, against which we cannot but protest, even though Dr. Smeaton seems not indisposed to employ them, viz., those which are formed in imitation of the German, or indeed directly derived therefrom. We are becoming familiar with such terms as "output," "outcome," "outlook," and "standpoint;" and Dr. Smeaton adds "view-point" and "ground-thought." We venture to think that no such compounds can be found in our classic writers, and that their use indicates a growing indifference to purity of English idiom. Next to the Greek language the German is distinguished by its facility of forming compound words, and on its native soil the process is natural, and adds greatly to the copious-

ness of the vocabulary. Transplanted to some other European languages, at least those most commonly known, it proves itself an exotic which cannot be acclimatized. The French language utterly repudiates all such compounds; and although, from its remote affinity with the German, ours admits them to a limited extent, there is no occasion needlessly to multiply them. It may be affirmed that for every one of those mentioned a genuine English term, of the same import, may be substituted. But enough on questions of style; we pass on to the substance of the work.

Its title is "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," which hardly conveys a distinct notion of the contents. For it may mean either the Biblical testimony on the subject, or the form which the doctrine assumed under the influence of controversy, and which appears in the Creeds of the Church; this latter being its properly dogmatical form. Or again, it may mean what the Germans call *Dogmengeschichte*; that is, a history of the stages through which, in the lapse of centuries, the doctrine has passed, and the modifications it has assumed under prevalent theological tendencies. In fact, the volume comprises all three branches of the subject, the first division being concerned with the Biblical evidence for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and by inference of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost; the second, with its dogmatical expression in the Creeds of the Church; and the third, with its history since the Apostolic age. On the third division our remarks will be comparatively brief. The reader will find in the earlier part of it a succinct and lucid statement of the points respecting the doctrine of the Holy Spirit on which controversy arose in the early Church; which properly are only two, the equality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son as a distinct Person in the Trinity, and His procession; the point in debate, as regards the procession, being whether it is from the Father alone, as the Greek Church holds, or from the Father and the Son, according to the doctrine of the West. On this account it may be doubted whether the latter part of this division, which is chiefly occupied with an examination of Pelagian theories, properly belongs to the subject. For the Pelagian controversy under its various aspects, such as its successor the semi-Pelagian, the synergistic of the Lutheran Church, the Arminian of the Dutch and English Churches, and the rationalistic theories of modern Germany on this subject, is but indirectly connected with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Holy Trinity: it belongs rather to the general question concerning the relation of divine and human agency in the work of redemption. The "grace" for which Augustine, and Luther, and Calvin, and the Divines of Dort so earnestly contended against the advocates of a Pelagian doctrine of free-will, was simply *divine* grace without special reference to the Holy Spirit as the agent of its communication; though, no doubt, if the debate had proceeded to the further question, viz., To which Divine Person is this internal operation on the heart to be, according to the usage of Scripture, specially ascribed? they would all have replied, To the Holy Spirit. This was assumed in all these controversies; and the real history of the dogma concerning the Holy Spirit may be said to have terminated with the separation of the East and the West on the point of the Procession.

The first division demands a more extended notice than the third. We are bound to confess that the author's treatment of the Biblical testimony on his subject, particularly as regards the Old Testament, seems to us occasionally liable to exception. If the doctrine of the Holy Trinity expresses, as the Church has ever believed, not merely oecomenical relations towards fallen man, the Father electing, the Son redeeming, and the Spirit sanctifying, the Church; but eternal and ontological relations in

the Godhead itself, Father, Son, and Spirit being modes of Divine subsistence from all eternity; the Spirit must, of course, have existed under the old dispensation as essentially as He does under the new. Every good and perfect spiritual gift, every case of genuine saintship, from the beginning of the world, must be ascribed to His presence and divine operation; but this is a different thing from the further position that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost was so *revealed* before the coming of Christ, as that it may be plainly gathered from the notices of the Old Testament. We do not think that the evidence adduced by the Professor on this point is decisive. There is an antecedent probability that the revelation of the nature of the Godhead would keep pace with that of the Christian redemption, in which the three Divine Persons appear actively co-operating to a common result; and therefore would be incomplete as long as redemption was a matter of prophecy rather than of fulfilment; and such seems to be the fact. It is hardly safe, in the present state of Biblical criticism, to argue from the plural form Elohim (Gen. i. 26);¹ nor do we think that the Professor's interpretation of Gen. ii. 7 will commend itself to scholars. The "breath of life," which is said to have been breathed by God into its material receptacle, is not, in our judgment, the Holy Spirit in His hypostatical character, but that prerogative of man himself which distinguishes him from the brute creation; the *πνεῦμα* of the New Testament, the religious faculty or aspect of his soul, which otherwise would not differ specifically from the mere sensitive soul of an animal. Combining the "breath of lives," an emanation from God Himself—the expression is never used of the brute creation—with the "living soul"—which is often thus used—we arrive at the twofold aspect of the soul of man, the *ψυχή-πνεῦμα*, "the spirit-soul," as it is described in the New Testament—one and the same substance, but bearing a twofold relation—the term *ψυχή* indicating its relation to the lower sphere of visible things, the term *πνεῦμα* its relation to God. It is the human psychology, not the gift of the Holy Spirit, to which the inspired writer is here directing our thoughts. We must, in fact, take exception to the whole of our author's reasoning concerning the gift of the Holy Spirit to the first Adam (pp. 10-16). We know that man was formed in the image of God; that God pronounced this portion of His work, as well as the others, to be "very good;" that beings of perfect innocence, and qualified for divine fellowship, must have enjoyed the highest measure of that fellowship of which their nature was capable; but to maintain that our first parents formally received the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, apparently in the same sense and to the same extent in which He now dwells in the Church, seems to introduce into the sacred record more than it spontaneously delivers. But this is only an example of the tendency which appears throughout the volume, and which indeed is characteristic of the Calvinistic divines, viz., to introduce the religion of redemption into Paradise, and to identify the state of man unfallen with that of man restored in Christ. The truth is, we can form no clear conception of Adam's unfallen state, because we have nothing to compare it with—not, of course, with that of fallen man, but also not with that of regenerate man; for, *pace* the Professor, we must hold that regeneration is a higher gift than man's original righteousness, and the heavenly Paradise, purchased by a Saviour's death, a state superior to its predecessor of Eden. All we can say of Adam's original state is that it was, in its measure, a perfect one, but that it needed for its full confirmation a successful resistance to temptation; hence, in our opinion, the transfer of the terms "grace," "sacraments," and the like, to describe the religion of man's primeval state

¹ See Gesenius, *sub voc.*

is a mistake, and one which may lead to serious error. The term "grace" belongs to man's fallen condition. The formal gift of the Holy Spirit is always in Scripture connected with the ascension of Christ, not with the creation of man; and to argue that the Christian life is a mere restoration of the Paradisaical, and therefore that this divine gift belonged as fully, and in the same sense, to the first Adam as it does to those who bear the image of the second is, to say the least, to be wise above what is written. We fully agree with Martensen's remarks: "The first Adam stands in the background of the human race as an undefined shape enveloped in mist; as a dim recollection resembling that which we ourselves have of the first awakening from the unconsciousness of infancy; yet we are compelled to suppose that such a being and such a state existed, but we behold them with the eye of faith, as in a mirror and a dark word."¹

Our author quotes 1 Peter iii. 19, according to his interpretation, as a proof that the passage in Gen. vi. 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," etc., refers to the Spirit of Christ—that is, the Third Person of the Trinity. We are by no means concerned to deny that the Spirit of God did strive with the antediluvians; but we doubt whether the famous passage of St. Peter throws light upon that of Genesis. To say nothing of "the Gospel's being preached" to the antediluvians by Noah (Dr. S., p. 18), which to us appears an anachronism, the author must be aware that by most modern commentators the application of the passage to the preaching of Noah at all is, not without reason, disputed; and that the rendering "quickened by the Spirit," i.e. the Holy Spirit, is both critically and grammatically inadmissible. The best MSS. omit the article *τῷ* before *πνεύματι*; and, moreover, it is not the usage of Scripture to ascribe the resurrection of Christ to the Holy Spirit, but occasionally to Himself (John ii. 19), most commonly to the Father. Grammatically, too, the exposition is more than doubtful.²

The author treads on firmer ground when he passes on to the later books of the Old Testament. "The Spirit of the Lord" occupies a very prominent place in the Psalms and the Prophets, both as inspiring them for their office, and as the subject of prophecy. There can be no question as to the meaning of David's words: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue" (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), or of such prophecies as that of Joel ii. 28. He who is sent, or poured out, cannot be formally the same as the sender, however one in essence. But more than this can hardly be inferred from these expressions. The result of the whole seems to be: the Holy Spirit was operative before the coming of Christ, whether to qualify artificers of the tabernacle (Exod. xxxi.), or to inspire psalmists and prophets, or to carry on His ordinary work of sanctification. There were intimations, too, of His personality which, read with the light of the *New Testament on them*, convey a meaning; but the full revelation of His Trinitarian personality was reserved for the completion of redemption by the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. And with this accords the difficult passage in St. John's Gospel (vii. 39), to which Dr. Smeaton devotes some remarks: "The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." St. John does not

¹ Dog. § 78.

² "There is no indisputable instance," says Bishop Middleton on the passage, "in which anything is said to have been done or suffered by the Holy Spirit, where *πνεῦμα*, whether in the genitive or the dative case, is not governed by some preposition. But not only is the preposition here wanting, but even the article has so little authority that it is rejected by Wetstein, Griesbach, and Matthæi."—*Greek Art*, p. 430.

mean that the Spirit did not exist, or was not operative, previously to the event mentioned; but that He was not given as a matter of covenant until the Saviour had earned a right to dispense His gracious influences. Neither the promise to Abraham, the precursor of the Gospel method of justification; nor the covenant of Sinai, which was only a national one, and only connected with temporal promises; contained a stipulated gift of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was given to the ancient believers in consideration of the future work of Christ, certain in the counsels of God, though not as yet accomplished; but He was given in a sporadic manner, not as the characteristic agent of a whole dispensation, as the Gospel era is called specifically "the ministration of the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 8). It was Christ alone who earned the right and the power to confer the spiritual blessing in all its fulness, in the multiplicity of the gifts as well as the extent of the effusion. In this sense it may be truly said that the Spirit was not yet given as long as Christ was not yet glorified. And the full revelation of His Trinitarian relation to the Father and the Son corresponded to the full outpouring of His influence; which revelation, therefore, can hardly be looked for in the earlier records of inspiration. It is unnecessary to follow Dr. Smeaton in his examination of the New Testament evidence; his task here was comparatively easy, and he has performed it, on the whole, in a very satisfactory manner.

The second division of the book, as has been intimated, contains the properly dogmatical aspect of the subject. It is arranged under the following heads: The personality and procession of the Holy Spirit; His work in the anointing of Christ; revelation and inspiration; His regenerating work on the individual; His sanctifying work, also on the individual; and His work in the Church. The first of these divisions may be considered as virtually discussed in the examination of the Biblical testimony, for it is impossible to explain the expressions of the New Testament otherwise than on the supposition that the Holy Spirit is God, that He is a distinct Person in the same sense in which the Father and the Son are, and that He proceeds from both. The author has probably studied Anselm's masterly treatise, *De processione Spiritus S.*; we could have wished that he had presented to his readers some of the points on which that great theologian insists. The other topics may, we think, be reduced to two: the work of the Spirit in reference to Christ, and His work, extraordinary and ordinary, in the Church.

The work of the Holy Spirit *in reference to Christ*, or, as Dr. Smeaton calls it, "the anointing of Christ," is regarded by him as commencing with the incarnation. In this we are compelled not only to differ from him, but even to doubt whether his theory is not of suspicious tendency. We are not surprised at its appearance in his pages, for in fact the introduction of the Holy Spirit at this stage of the Saviour's history is characteristic of the Reformed divines as distinguished from the Lutheran, and, we may add, the general current of ecclesiastical tradition. The question briefly stated is this: Is the Logos Himself, as the Second Person of the Trinity, to be considered the active principle of the incarnation, or did the Holy Spirit, as the Third Person, intervene between the Logos and the humanity and produce the result? The point may seem a subtle one, and of little practical import; for it may be argued, as it may in all the external operations of the Trinity, that where the Holy Spirit acts, there the Father also and the Son must act; according to the Canon, "*Opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt.*" But it is never safe to deviate from the established usage of Scripture on these points. The result of Dr. Smeaton's theory seems to be to depose the Logos from active agency in the miracle of the incarnation, and to reduce Him to a state of unconscious inactivity. The

orthodox doctrine is that although the whole Trinity co-operates in works *ad extra*, yet special works "terminate" in special Persons, which must not be interchanged one with another, as if it were a matter of indifference to which the works are ascribed. Hence the ancient Canon above mentioned adds: "*Salvo tamen earum (Personarum) ordine et discrimine.*" Thus creation is a work of the whole Trinity, but it "terminates" in (is specifically ascribed to) the Father; sanctification is a work of the whole Trinity, but it "terminates in" the Holy Spirit; and in like manner, the incarnation was a work of the whole Trinity, but it "terminates in" the Son. That is, the Logos Himself is the active principle in the assumption of the humanity. Not the Holy Spirit, but the Logos, prepared (*terminative*) the body which He assumed.

Dr. Smeaton has reproduced Owen's theory on this subject, and it may be well to understand whither it tends. That able divine expresses himself thus (Book ii. c. 3): "The only singular immediate act of the Son on the human nature was the *assumption* of it into subsistence with Himself," as indeed it would be directly opposed to Scripture to say that either the Father or the Holy Spirit *assumed* the humanity. "All other actings of God in the person of the Son," he continues, "towards the human nature were *voluntary*;" whence it seems to follow that the assumption itself was an *involuntary* act. In order to vivify it, Owen, like Professor Smeaton, is compelled to introduce the Holy Spirit, in his Trinitarian personality, as "creating" the body of Christ in the womb of the Virgin. "The framing, forming, and miraculous conception of the body of Christ in the womb of the blessed Virgin was the peculiar work of the Holy Ghost." What relation, then, in point of time, did the assumption bear to the creation? If we make this latter to have had the precedence we approach the confines of Nestorianism; for on this hypothesis the Logos would have assumed a human nature already in existence, even though it may, in one sense, be said to have been created by Himself, since He and the Holy Spirit are one in essence. The only method of escape is to make the creation and the assumption not successive acts, but effected in one and the same instant, which, in fact, is Owen's explanation. The assumption was an "ineffable act of love and wisdom, taking the nature so formed by the Holy Ghost, so prepared for Him, to be His own in the instant of its formation, and thereby preventing the singular and individual subsistence of that nature in and by itself." But a creation and an assumption which are effected in the same instant seem to differ only in name. We say nothing as to the apparent inversion which the theory introduces into the "order of subsistence" of the Three Persons, or, at least, into the Scriptural usage, according to which Christ does not proceed from the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit from Christ.

We are not induced to retract our opinion by the passages which Dr. Smeaton has adduced in support of his own. The capital one is, of course, Luke i. 35, which is rendered in the authorized version, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee," as if it was the Third Person of the Holy Trinity who is especially alluded to. But the accuracy of the translation is doubtful. It is true that *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* does not require the article to constitute it a proper name; but the following words, "power of the Highest," without the article, and which are evidently explanatory of "Holy Ghost," impress an impersonal character on this latter term, which seems to signify the Godhead or the Divine essence in general. We agree with Olshausen on the passage: "*πνεῦμα* denotes the divine Being without reference to Trinitarian distinctions, which divine Being is *ἅγιον*, or holy" (Comm.); and, notwithstanding our author's reclamation (p. 72), we refer to Rom. i. 3, 4 as confirmatory of this exposition. The "Spirit of holiness," St. Paul's

expression, can, in our opinion, be understood only of the divine nature of Christ as contrasted with His human, not of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. "The contrast with *κατὰ σάρκα*," observes the commentator above quoted, "demands a reference to the Saviour's own person, consequently it is not the Third Person of the Trinity, but the deity of Christ that is spoken of" (Olshausen *in loc.*). And so another commentator, to whom probably Dr. Smeaton will pay more deference, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton: "According to the Spirit of holiness—that is, His divine nature" (Comm.). Dr. Smeaton asks (p. 118), "Are we to refer the unction to the humanity of Christ or to the Person?" meaning, we presume, by "the Person," not the whole compound person of Christ, but His Trinitarian relation, for otherwise how can the "humanity" be distinguished from the Person? If the whole Christ is meant, the humanity is part of the Person. Now it is obvious that the "unction of the Holy Spirit" is an idea as inapplicable to the Second Trinitarian Person, before the incarnation, as it would be to the First Person, that of the Father. The term can apply only to the incarnate Son, as, indeed, Dr. Smeaton seems to admit. "The unction is competent to Him only as God-man—that is, in both natures" (p. 119). Precisely so; and, therefore, it is not competent to Him as the *Λόγος ἄσαρκος*, or the Second Divine Person, from which it seems to follow that it is inapplicable to the act of the incarnation. With Dr. Smeaton's exposition of the "anointing," subsequently to that event, we can fully concur. The God-man, Christ Jesus, *i.e.* after the incarnation was, no doubt, anointed, in a special manner, by the Holy Ghost: the excellent gifts of the Holy Ghost were poured out on Him without measure; of which the visible sign was the descent of the Holy Spirit at His baptism, and the fruits, His miraculous powers (Acts x. 38), His superhuman wisdom—not the abstract attribute of omniscience, see Mark xiii. 32—and the human graces which were combined in Him as in no other partaker of our nature. These gifts, however, were different in kind from the mysterious operation of the Logos in the incarnation; they were such as might be, and in fact were, exhibited *in measure* by the Apostles and others, who were indeed temples of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. iii. 16), but could make no pretensions to a hypostatical union.

We are compelled to leave him again when he comes to the "third degree of Christ's unction," that which the Saviour is supposed to have received when He ascended to heaven. That Christ then "received gifts for men"—that is, the right to send the Holy Spirit to be His vicar upon earth, is unquestionable; but it does not follow from this that He Himself received any such credentials—He needed none such. Ascended to heaven, He was acknowledged Head of the Church, and Lord of this dispensation, to whom all power in heaven and earth, for mediatorial purposes, is committed (Matt. xxviii. 18).

The work of the Holy Spirit *in the Church* is, as we have said, either extraordinary or ordinary. Under the former head come the miraculous gifts of the Apostolic age—as described, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xii.—and the gift of inspiration. The former were needed as a visible sign of the fulfilment of Christ's promise; but having discharged this office, they are not, as Dr. Smeaton well argues, to be expected to reappear in the Church. They fulfil to us in the page of Scripture the same evidential function which they did, before Scripture was written, to the eye-witnesses. The gift of inspiration, for the formation of the Canon of Scripture, is the other extraordinary gift, of which we likewise expect no repetition. On this important subject we are glad to find ourselves in substantial agreement with the author. Under the term of inspiration he understands that "the Holy Spirit supplied prophets and apostles, as chosen organs, with gifts which must be distinguished from ordinary grace, to give forth

in human forms of speech a revelation which must be accepted as the Word of God in its whole contents, and as the authoritative guide for doctrine and duty" (p. 142); to which description no addition requires to be made. The author naturally contends against such modifications of it as that the Bible is not but contains the Word of God, and its insidious counterpart that "the men were inspired, the books were the result of their inspiration." Either theory tends to sever the divine superintendence from the act of writing, with which, according to our judgment, the gift of inspiration is to be specially connected. And thus not only would the writers have enjoyed no divine guidance as to what subjects they were to take in hand for the benefit of the Church, but we should have had no certainty that in the handling of the subjects selected the form of expression was a perfectly suitable vehicle of the thought. And we know that so closely are thought and language connected, that a slight inaccuracy in the latter may give a different turn to the former. In a word, the gift of inspiration, to be of any practical value to us, must include both the thoughts and their expression. Nor is this by any means inconsistent with the admission that the Holy Spirit, in this effective superintendence, made use of natural temperament and talents, and allowed each inspired agent to write from his own experience and in his own style.

Some of Dr. Smeaton's statements on this subject he will probably reconsider in another edition. He seems, as is not uncommon, to make miracles and prophecy the tests of inspiration (p. 142). There is no doubt that men inspired to write were often also gifted with these powers; but they cannot be considered a formal test. Many prophets, etc., wrought miracles who were never commissioned to write; and of several inspired writers, *e.g.* St. Mark and St. Luke, it is not recorded that they either prophesied or wrought miracles. Moreover, both the *false* prophets alluded to in Deut. xiii., and the Antichrist of the New Testament (2 Thess. ii.) are supposed to work signs and wonders: certainly not by the aid of the blessed Spirit, but still so really as, in the absence of any other test, to present a severe temptation even to the elect. As to the gift of prophecy, when our author says (p. 142) that "the great test of a true prophet was that the prediction came to pass" (Deut. xviii. 22), he must have forgotten for the moment that this very test is not denied in Scripture to the false prophets: "If there arise among you a prophet, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder *come to pass* whereof he spake unto thee," etc. (Deut. xiii. 1, 2).¹

Our limits compel us to hasten to a close, otherwise we should have drawn attention to several valuable remarks which the author makes on the ordinary work of the Spirit in the Church, such as regeneration and sanctification. It is hardly necessary to say that he insists on the true Scriptural meaning of regeneration as always signifying a moral change, and not a mere sacramental one, or the mere gift of a higher nature, in itself morally indifferent, and, as in the case of Satan, compatible with the greatest moral obliquity. This latter is actually the view presented by a distinguished convert to Romanism, previously to his change of religion. "Regeneration," he writes, "is a new birth, or the giving of a new nature. Now there is nothing impossible in the very notion of a regeneration being accorded even to impenitent sinners—regeneration in a true and sufficient sense, in its primary qualities. For the essence of regeneration is the communication of a higher and divine nature. The devils have thus a nature higher and more divine than man."² We hold it to be impossible that the Holy Ghost can convey the new birth, and

¹ "It is here supposed that professed prophets would arise, and 'give signs and wonders'; that is, predict remarkable events which would come to pass."—Scott, *in loc.*

² Newman, "Sermons."

not at the same time implant a seminal principle of holiness which will be sure to manifest itself. The idea of this divine Agent's communicating a merely higher nature, without a new bias of the affections, is in the highest degree repulsive. We have been struck with Dr. Smeaton's remarks on John iii. 3-6, as furnishing at least a plausible interpretation of a difficult passage.

We could have wished that the author had under this division devoted a lecture to the subject of the Holy Spirit's work in relation to the authority of the visible Church, as it is in some quarters asserted—one of great importance in the present day. What is the full meaning of the passages, "The law came by Moses; grace and truth by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17); or, "Who hath also made us ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. iii. 6); or, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (*ibid.* 17); or, "Thou art no more a servant, but a son" (Gal. iv. 7)? They deal with the great point so much insisted on by the Reformers, the distinction between the law and the gospel as dispensations. Romanism, whether in its fully developed or its incipient forms, rests on the assumption that the gospel is but a new law, or rather the old one with some differences; Christ the legislator instead of Moses; sacraments *ex opere operato* instead of empty signs; bishops, priests, and deacons instead of High Priest, priests, and Levites; the Mass, or "the unbloody" sacrifice, instead of the Levitical offerings. "If anyone," says the Council of Trent, "shall say that Jesus Christ was given to man as a Redeemer to trust in, but not as a Legislator to obey, let him be anathema" (Sess. vi. can. 21). Fatal words! which embody the errors of more than a thousand years. Wherever the gospel is regarded as a new ceremonial law, the work of the Holy Spirit becomes depreciated. His sanctifying influence is severed from His illuminating, and an official order, whatever its measure of holiness, is constituted the depository of divine truth. But, according to the Anglican Church, even "General Councils may err, and have erred," for the very reason that they are composed of men all of whom "are," or may be, "not governed by the Spirit of God" (Art. xxi.). The polity of the Church, instead of being the form into which the Church, under Apostolic guidance, threw itself out by an impulse from within, becomes a divinely appointed system of discipline, like the law of Moses, working from without inwards. The true, or as Protestants term it the "invisible," Church is no longer the real source of all that is valuable in the organization, or the practical fruits, of the visible Church, but a mere accident; the essence or true being of the Church residing not in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit but in visible notes, or an external succession. Christians are no longer "sons" but "servants," under the "beggarly elements" of a ritual system. The Holy Spirit is set aside in His sovereign and almighty operations, and legal prescriptions take His place.

But we must not further pursue a tempting topic. We have to thank Professor Smeaton for his valuable contribution to the subject, and to beg of him to believe that, if in some points we have been compelled to differ from him, we do not the less appreciate the general merits of his work; its high standard of orthodoxy, its edifying tone, and its freedom from the asperities which too often disfigure theological controversy.

E. A. LITTON.

James Nasmyth, Engineer. An Autobiography, edited by SAMUEL SMILES, LL.D. Author of "Lives of the Engineers." London: John Murray, 1883.

In his preface to this most interesting volume, Dr. Smiles tells us that twenty years ago, when he applied to Mr. Nasmyth for information

respecting his mechanical inventions, he received a very modest reply. "My life," said Mr. Nasmyth, "presents no striking or remarkable incidents, and would, I fear, prove but a tame narrative. The sphere to which my endeavours have been confined has been of a comparatively quiet order; but, vanity apart, I hope I have been able to leave a few marks of my existence behind me in the shape of useful contrivances, which are in many ways helping on great works of industry." On the modesty of Mr. Nasmyth's reply comment is needless. Among the "marks of his existence" which he will leave behind him is the steam-hammer, the most powerful of all modern mechanical inventions. But the general interest of his life was also underrated in his reply to the author of "Lives of the Engineers." It is justly remarked by a reviewer in the current *Quarterly* that Mr. Nasmyth's work as an engineer is indissolubly associated with his whole personal character and training, and a background of deep human interests lies behind his mechanical triumphs. "Some men's achievements seem almost accidental, due to no deliberate exercise of thought or will, and scarcely to be traced even to antecedent influences. But when it is clear that a man was born with a capacity for the special work he has fulfilled, when he has been trained to it by every influence of his childhood and youth, and when he has fought his way consciously to his end by a continuous struggle with difficulties, his life becomes a drama, and his professional achievements become secondary to his personal and family history. This is eminently the case with Mr. Nasmyth. It is the most curious part of his story," continues the *Quarterly*, "that the foundations of his career are laid deep in Scottish history, and that the accumulated influences and inheritances of four generations conspire to mould his character, his hand, and his eye. Nor is it only the influences of his own family to which he is indebted for his capacities and his success. As he tells the simple facts of his story, all the most characteristic elements of Scottish life are brought before us."

"A hundred years ago," says the *Quarterly*, "few persons would have supposed that Scottish life, in all its wildness and sternness, had been gradually nursing a breed of men who were to take the lead in some of the most important spheres of our national being, and to give a new impulse and new method to English capacities. But this is what Scottish history had been doing for several centuries, and especially since the Reformation. In modern scientific language, Scotland had been rendered a great accumulator of intellectual, moral, and muscular force; which, after the suppression of the last Stuart rebellion, was turned to practical purposes in this country and in the British Empire. 'How can it be possible,' said Wilkes to Boswell, 'to spend two thousand a year in Scotland?' 'Why,' said Johnson, 'the money may be spent in England.' It might have been asked to more purpose, what the Scotch were to do with the wonderful store of moral intensity, intellectual acuteness, and sound health which their hardy, struggling, and religious life of centuries had accumulated. But Johnson's answer would have been equally true. They could spend it in England; and to men like Mr. Nasmyth this country, with its ever-increasing demands for mechanical, commercial, and administrative ability, offered the very career for which they had been under so long a preparation."

The Autobiography opens thus :

Our history begins long before we are born. We represent the hereditary influences of our race, and our ancestors actually live in us. The sentiment of ancestry seems to be inherent in human nature, especially in the more civilized races. At all events, we cannot help having a due regard for our forefathers. Our curiosity is stimulated by their immediate or indirect influence upon ourselves. It may be a generous enthusiasm, or, as some might say, a harmless vanity, to take pride in the honour of their name. The gifts of nature, however, are more valuable than those of fortune; and no line of ancestry, however honourable, can absolve us from the duty of diligent application and perseverance, or from the practice of the virtues of self-control and self-help.

Whether the family legend given in Burke's "Peerage and Baronetage" is really "faithful" is a question which does not diminish the enjoyment of Mr. Nasmyth's narrative. The family crest is a hand holding a hammer; and the story goes that in the reign of King James III., of Scotland, an ancestor of the family, being worsted in a skirmish, had to take refuge in a smithy, where the smith disguised him as a hammerman. A party of the Douglasses entered the smithy; and in his agitation, being evidently suspected, the King's man struck a false blow with the sledgehammer, which broke the shaft in two. Upon this one of the Douglas party rushed at him, calling out, "Ye're *nae smyth!*" The hammerman snatched his assailant's dagger, and together with the smith, wielding a sledgehammer, turned on the Douglas soldiers, and some of the Royal forces happening to come up, a defeat was converted into a victory. For this service he obtained a grant of lands; and the armorial bearings consisted of a hand dexter with a dagger between two broken hammer-shafts, the motto being *Non arte sed marte*—"Not by art, but by war." These are the Naesmyth arms to this day; but the great engineer, as he relates, has reversed the motto (*Non marte sed arte*), and instead of the broken hammer-shafts he has adopted, not as his "arms," but as a device, the Steam Hammer—the most potent form of mechanical art. James Nasmyth is the great smith of his time.

To the formation of the Scottish character, as has been said, religion has most powerfully contributed. A branch of the Naesmyth family, settled at Netherton, in the reign of Charles II., being Presbyterians, held stoutly to their own faith. "To be cleft by sword and pricked by spear into a religion which they disbelieved was utterly hateful" to them. After the battle of Bothwell Brig, graphically described by Sir Walter Scott, the Covenanter Naesmyth, head of the Netherton Naesmyths, was condemned to death, and his property was confiscated. He had got away and saved his life, but the lands were gone. His descendants had to get their bread by honest labour. Michael Naesmyth, great great-grandfather of our engineer, born in 1652, was a builder and architect in Edinburgh; he was buried by the side of his ancestors in the family tomb in that ancient and memorable burying-place, Greyfriars Churchyard. His son Michael carried on the business. He was a man of much ability; but one element in his success is stated in a passage which has an interest of its own at the present time :

One of his great advantages in carrying on his business was the support of a staff of able and trustworthy foremen and workmen. The times were very different then from what they are now. Masters and men lived together in mutual harmony. There was a kind of loyal family attachment among them, which extended through many generations. Workmen had neither the desire nor the means for shifting about from place to place. On the contrary, they settled down with their wives and families in houses of their own, close to the workshops of

their employers. Work was found for them in the dull seasons when trade was slack, and in summer they sometimes removed to jobs at a distance from headquarters. Much of this feeling of attachment and loyalty between workmen and their employers has now expired. Men rapidly remove from place to place. Character is of little consequence. The mutual feeling of goodwill and zealous attention to work seems to have passed away. Sudden change, scamping, and shoddy have taken their place.—(P. 12.)

The father of our engineer, a distinguished painter, was born in 1758, in the Grass Market, at this time a lively place—the centre, in fact, of Edinburgh traffic. Opposite the house in which he was born was the inn from which the first coach started from Edinburgh to Newcastle. The public notice stated that “The Coach would set out from the Grass Market ilka Tuesday at Twa o’clock in the day, GOD WULLIN’, but *whether or no* on Wednesday.” The “whether or no,” it is presumed, was only meant as a warning to passengers that the coach would start, even though all the places were not taken. The painter Nasmyth, called “the father of landscape-painting in Scotland,” was also a mechanic and an architect; he had “a powerful store of common-sense,” and was an “all-round man,” of much ability and resource. His work-room, fitted up with all kinds of mechanical tools, was our engineer’s primary technical school, the very foreground of his life.

In 1817, when nine years old, James Nasmyth went to the High School, and he learned there to do his tasks, however disagreeable, with cheerfulness and punctuality. He left the High School in 1820. Among his school-fellows he had made several friends; and, through the sons of a large iron-founder, and of a practical chemist, he gained much practical experience. He not merely read about things, he “saw and handled,” he made his own tools; and bit by bit, as a learning lad, with his eyes wide open, and his hands ever ready, he became initiated into all the varieties of chemical and mechanical manipulation. The following observations are timely and instructive:

I often observe (writes Mr. Nasmyth), in shop-windows, every detail of model ships and model steam-engines, supplied ready made for those who are “said to be” of an ingenious and mechanical turn. Thus the vital uses of resourcefulness are done away with, and a sham exhibition of mechanical genius is paraded before you by the young impostors—the result, for the most part, of too free a supply of pocket-money. I have known too many instances of parents being led by such false evidence of constructive skill to apprentice their sons to some engineering firm; and, after paying vast sums, finding out that the pretender comes out of the engineering shop with no other practical accomplishment than that of glove-wearing and cigar-smoking!

The truth is that the eyes and the fingers—the *bare fingers*—are the two principal inlets to sound practical instruction. They are the chief sources of trustworthy knowledge in all the materials and operations which the engineer has to deal with. No *book* knowledge can avail for that purpose. The nature and properties of the materials must come in through the finger-ends. Hence, I have no faith in young engineers who are addicted to wearing gloves. Gloves, especially kid gloves, are perfect non-conductors of technical knowledge. This has really more to do with the efficiency of young aspirants for engineering success than most people are aware of. Yet kid gloves are now considered the genteel thing.—(P. 96.)

In the year 1829 James Nasmyth went up to the metropolis; he had an introduction to Maudsley, the great London engineer. Mr. Maudsley invited him to go round his works, and the wonderful machinery made him “more tremblingly anxious than ever to obtain some employment

there, in however humble a capacity." As they passed the steam-engine which gave motion to the tools and machinery, the man in attendance on it was engaged in cleaning out the ashes from under the boiler furnace, and, on the spur of the moment, James Nasmyth exclaimed to Mr. Maudsley, "If you would only permit me to do such a job as that in your service I should consider myself most fortunate." "I shall never forget," writes Mr. Nasmyth, "the keen but kindly look that he gave me. 'So,' said he, 'you are one of that sort, are you?' I was inwardly delighted at his words." After an inspection of his examples of handiwork, including a complete working model of a high-pressure engine, every part of which his own hands had done, Mr. Maudsley introduced the young Scotchman into his own private workshop. "This," said he, "is where I wish you to work beside me as my assistant workman. From what I have seen there is no need of an apprenticeship in your case."

The character of this remarkable man is summed up in the following passage :

It was one of his favourite maxims, "First, *get a clear notion* of what you desire to accomplish, and then in all probability you will succeed in doing it." Another was, "Keep a sharp look-out upon your materials; get rid of every pound of material you can *do without*; put to yourself the question, 'What business has it to be there?' avoid complexities, and make everything as simple as possible." Mr. Maudsley was full of quaint maxims and remarks, the result of much shrewdness, keen observation, and great experience. They were well worthy of being stored up in the mind, like a set of proverbs, full of the life and experience of men. His thoughts became compressed into pithy expressions exhibiting his force of character and intellect. His quaint remarks on my first visit to his workshop, and on subsequent occasions, proved to me invaluable guides.

Mr. Nasmyth was resolved that his wages alone should maintain him in food and lodging, and he therefore directed his attention to economical living; and as a moderate dinner at an eating-house would cost him more than he could afford to spend, he bought the raw materials and cooked them in his own way and to his own taste. He set to and made a drawing of a very simple, compact, and handy cooking apparatus. This drawing he took to a tinsmith near at hand, and in two days he had it in full operation. The apparatus cost ten shillings, including the lamp. The requisite heat, it seems, was supplied by an oil lamp with three small single wicks, though he found that one wick was enough. He put the meat in the pot, with the other comestibles, at nine o'clock in the morning. It simmered away all day, until half-past six in the evening, when he came home with a healthy appetite to enjoy his dinner.

I well remember (writes Mr. Nasmyth) the first day that I set the apparatus to work. I ran to my lodging, at about four p.m., to see how it was going on. When I lifted the cover it was simmering beautifully, and such a savoury gusto came forth that I was almost tempted to fall to and discuss the contents. But the time had not yet come, and I ran back to my work.

The meat I generally cooked in it was leg of beef, with sliced potato, bits of onion chopped down, and a modicum of white pepper and salt, with just enough of water to cover "the elements." When stewed slowly the meat became very tender, and the whole yielded a capital dish, such as a very Soyer might envy. It was partaken of with a zest that, no doubt, was a very important element in its savouriness. The whole cost of this capital dinner was about $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. I sometimes varied the meat with rice boiled with a few raisins and a pennyworth of milk. My breakfast and tea, with bread, cost me about 4d. each. My lodgings cost 3s. 6d. a week. A little multiplication will satisfy anyone how it was that I contrived to live economically and comfortably on my ten shillings a week. In the

following year my wages were raised to fifteen shillings a week, and then I began to take butter to my bread.—(P. 143.)

This handy apparatus Mr. Nasmyth has by him still ; and recently, he tells us, he set it in action after its rest of fifty years. It was in 1836, when he was twenty-six, that he removed to Patricroft, and built the Bridgewater Foundry. In 1840 he invented the Steam Hammer. When forty-eight years of age he retired from business. The story of his life is told in a kindly, genial, and winning style. A brief extract from his account of the steam pile-driver may be quoted :

There was a great deal of curiosity in the dockyard as to the action of the new machine. The pile-driving machinemen gave me a good-natured challenge to vie with them in driving down a pile. They adopted the old method, while I adopted the new one. The resident managers sought out two great pile logs of equal size and length, 70 feet long and 18 inches square. At a given signal we started together. I let in the steam, and the hammer at once began to work. The four-ton block showered down blows at the rate of 80 a minute, and in the course of *four and a half minutes* my pile was driven down to its required depth. The men working at the ordinary machine had only begun to drive. It took them upwards of *twelve hours* to complete the driving of their pile.

We hope that our readers will peruse this pleasing and most instructive Autobiography; and we therefore refrain from making further quotations. Our aim has been to whet the appetite; and in heartily recommending the book we can promise a real treat. It should be added that the volume is tastefully printed and bound.

Short Notices.

Not for Him. The Story of a Forgotten Hero. By EMILY S. HOLT, author of "Mistress Margery," etc. John F. Shaw and Co.

WE gladly welcome another of Miss Holt's charming historical stories. Every one of her stories, so far as we know, would be rated by an impartial judge as both interesting and instructive. The literary work is of no mean order, and the religious element is excellent, while the refinement of culture and good taste pervades the whole. Several volumes of the "Tales of English Life in the Olden Times" have been warmly commended in *THE CHURCHMAN*; and the volume before us will take a good place in this valuable series. The dialogues are bright and natural, and the graphic descriptions of life within and without the castle walls of knightly and noble families have a Scott-like impressiveness. It is evident that Miss Holt has taken great pains with her subject, and the accuracy of her word-paintings in the smallest details of social life is thoroughly to be trusted. All the characters are finely drawn; the chief of them, the "forgotten hero," is Edmund, Earl of Cornwall, the richest man in England, not excepting the King, at the close of the thirteenth century. What this Christian earl did for Protestantism, how he suffered at the hands of his bigoted wife, who became a nun, is well described in the delightful story, for which we tender thanks to the accomplished author.

A brief notice of the *Quarterly Review* was given in the last *CHURCHMAN*, with an extract from its review of "The Life of Lord Lawrence." A very interesting article commends Mr. Brocklehurst's book on Mexico.