

of any Scripture which is not. Any teaching, then, on the subject of salvation, in any one of its many branches, that is not in accord with this principle, can form no part of the doctrine of faith. Any interpretation, moreover, of those Scriptures that relate to salvation which is not in agreement herewith must certainly be erroneous. If it is correct to say of the principle of faith that it represents a good promised, given, and received wholly as a pure favour, then any teaching about salvation not in analogy with this must be false, and, so far as it exerts an influence, dishonouring to God, and misleading to men. All teachers of religion, therefore, ought to give the most earnest heed, for many reasons, to the doctrines they teach, and especially that all their teaching about salvation may be according to the proportion of the faith.

While purposing to avoid any argument on the principle of the *analogy of faith*, as this is generally understood, we cannot but think that this term, as found in Rom. xii. 6, has been sadly misunderstood. It is simply surprising how pertinaciously some writers endeavour to exclude an objective sense from the word faith in almost every instance of its occurrence. Mr. Haldane says here, "They were to speak according to the extent of their information or measure of faith." No teaching to our mind can be more fallacious, and, to dreamy minds, there is little that we can imagine that could be more pernicious. Like some other writers, he makes the *measure* of faith in verse 3, and the *analogy* of faith here, identical or equivalent in meaning. But is it consistent with common sense, or with anything else that is suitable to the understanding of testimony, to make measure and analogy mean the same thing whether as identical or equivalent? If the Greek word for analogy may mean proportion, does it, like measure, take this meaning as to absolute extent merely? Does it not most certainly mean a due proportion of one thing in its relation to another? Paul had spoken just before, in verse 3, of the measure of faith which God deals to Christian men, as the rule according to which they should esteem themselves. The subjective sense of

faith is, undoubtedly, to be taken there. Faith in this sense is itself the gift of God ; and not only so, but he deals the measure of the favour to every one as he pleases ; and, therefore, it may be observed in passing, it would seem that any teacher of religion must do violence to the truth taught there if he blames any man for not having this precious bestowment, or any Christian for not having it in larger measure. But because a Christian man is to esteem himself in relation to his fellows with soberness, according to the measure of faith which God has of pure favour dealt to him ; that he, if he prophesies, and does so according to the *proportion* of faith, is to be understood as so doing according to the measure of his information and belief, seems to us what one might imagine of the very madness of folly and perversity. As clearly as faith is subjective in verse 3, it is objective in verse 6. As clearly as the Christian man is taught by what rule within him to esteem himself among his brethren in the former verse, the Christian teacher is taught by what rule without him to prophesy in the latter. Nor is this making of the extent of the teacher's information and belief the rule of his prophesying or teaching a slightly harmful error. According to this doctrine what, for instance, might not mystics teach with authority ? Allow a hysterical mystic to prophesy, according to his bent, and to the extent of his information and belief, unchecked by a demand for agreement with the truths of the Word, and what proportions might not his prophesying assume ? To what on earth that is sober and true would it be likely to be proportionate ? What transcendently mystical notions, what spiritual monstrosities might we not be called upon to regard as the proportion of faith ? Perhaps the apostle had in his mind Isa. viii. 20 : " To the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Of the several other examples of the construction under consideration, it seems needless, for the present purpose, to mention but one more, namely, "*The*

*righteousness which is of faith.*" Mr. Haldane says, "The righteousness of faith is an elliptical expression, meaning the righteousness which is received by faith." Now there is no doubt that the righteousness of faith is received by believing, but it is an entire mistake to suppose that this is what is meant by that term. When anything is said to be, or to be done, from the principle of faith, or from that of works, believing and working, respectively, will always be supposed; but principle and practice are not identical even when they bear the same name, and they ought never to be confounded. "The righteousness which is of faith," does not mean that righteousness which is received by believing, but that which arises from the principle of faith, in distinction from that which springs from works.

Nor is this a distinction without a difference. The righteousness that is of law and that which is of faith are radically different. This truth does not seem to be generally understood. While it appears to be tolerably well known that the principle of works has no place in the righteousness revealed in the gospel, it yet seems to be very commonly supposed that righteousness itself must be pretty much the same thing, whether it arises from the principle of law, or from that of faith. Mr. Haldane, in expressing his own, may be taken as giving the general opinion on this matter. He says on Rom. x. 6—8, "While the language of the law is, Do and Live, that righteousness which it demands, and which man is unable to perform, is, according to the gospel, gratuitously communicated through faith." He makes, it will be seen, the righteousness which the law demands identical with that which, as he says, is gratuitously communicated through faith. A pretty general consent will, indeed, accord to the righteousness acquired by the Lord Jesus, from the superior dignity of his person, some notion, more or less vague, of a superiority over that which belonged to Adam in his upright state; but as to their power to justify, they appear to be regarded as identical. They are, however, in fact as different from each other as to their purpose and power as they are in respect to their source and principle.

The true distinction between these righteousnesses is one of great importance, and one which I do not remember ever to have seen or heard pointed out. Their sources or grounds, severally, are the principle of law and the principle of faith; Rom. x. 5, 6. The purpose and power of each are as different as the principles from which they spring. Through the righteousness which is of law a man "shall live," verse 5; through that which is of faith a sinner "shall be saved," verse 9. No theological blunder can be greater than that of representing the terms "shall live," and "shall be saved," as identical or equivalent. It is to the essential distinction, not only between the different sources and principles of these righteousnesses, but also between their purposes and powers, that the apostle here directs attention. "The righteousness which is of law," (without the article, denoting principle) is thus described by Moses, "That the man which doeth those things shall live by them." That is, in other words, that the righteousness which arises out of the principle of law will serve for the vindication of a man that has not transgressed, but that it will not, from its very nature, be of any avail to make a transgressor righteous. But "the righteousness which is of faith," (without the article, denoting principle,) speaks a different language altogether. This, personified by Paul, saith, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of [the] faith," (the article here denoting the great scheme of favour so designated,) "which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." No man, therefore, that has sinned can ever be justified in the sight of God through the principle of works of law, but only through this righteousness, which is of faith; and this is the distinguishing excellency of its purpose and power, a sinner—even the very chief of sinners, is made righteous, and so fully and for ever justified from all things. In sum, the righteousness which is of law, is, as to its purpose and power, available only to vindicate a man's title to his

standing, who has not fallen by transgression ; but the righteousness which is of faith, is, according to the word of the faith, designed, and possesses the power to justify the ungodly, and, by consequence, to raise the fallen, and to save the lost. It alone belongs to the righteousness of God, revealed in the gospel out of the principle of faith, to justify a sinner.

Two principal reasons are commonly assigned why, now, a man cannot be justified by the righteousness of the law. One of these is man's inability to render a perfect obedience ; and, therefore, according to that method there can be no righteousness forthcoming wherewith to justify. This is the interpretation commonly given to Rom. iii. 20, and Gal. iii. 16. Supposing that a perfect obedience were possible, then all, or nearly so, would be at a point that righteousness might still be by the deeds of the law. Few seem to have reached the truth that it is wholly beyond the province and the power of the principle of works of law to justify a transgressor. Few appear to understand that the province of this principle to justify is limited to law-abiding persons, and that its power, from the nature of the thing, cannot be exerted beyond a vindicating their title to what they already have. Most men miss the evident meaning of the apostle, when he says, "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." He speaks of the province and power of the *principle* : he is interpreted of the *practice* of the works of law. Nothing can be clearer than that if a man doeth the things of the law he shall live upon the principle of works ; but if he transgresses, his life is forfeited ; and in this condition, it is utterly beyond the power of the principle of works to give him life. See Gal. iii. 21.

The other reason alluded to is, that God has ordained another method than that of works of law for justification. No doubt God has ordained another method to justify, but the true reason why a man shall not be justified by works of law lies deeper than this notion. From this true reason arises the occasion for the introduction of another method of justification ; but the

reason itself is the nature of the thing. The only righteousness possible upon the principle of works of law is a title to the retention of a given state upon a perfect discharge of duty. If a sinner is to be justified, this must arise out of and proceed upon another principle altogether. On this point interpreters are very unsatisfactory. On the words, "The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith," Gal. iii. 8, Alford says, "God justifieth, not merely because the time foreseen was regarded as present, nor in respect of Paul then writing; but because it was God's *one* way of justification. He never justified in any other." No doubt this has been, and is, God's one way; but it should have been shown that this is his one way of justifying a sinner, not simply as a matter of selection, but from the very nature of the thing. If God is pleased to justify a sinner, it must be by a righteousness that is provided, promised, given, and received altogether of pure favour; and the "righteousness of faith," answers to all these necessary requirements. A like unsatisfactoriness is found in the Dean's teaching on Rom. iii. 20. He says the future tense, "shall be justified," implies possibility, but he, nevertheless, affirms that "The apostle does not *here* say that justification by legal works would be impossible if the law could be wholly kept." Where then, if not *here*, does the apostle say that justification by legal works is impossible? We have an exactly like saying in Gal. ii. 16; "For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified;" and the Dean, speaking for the apostle, says, "It is an axiom in our theology that by the works of the law shall all flesh find no justification." With submission, Paul said nothing of the kind. I will venture to affirm that nothing was further from the apostle's mind than any particular axiom in his theology in distinction from anybody else's. Clearly, what was present to his mind, his distinctive theology apart, was the self-evident truth of what he said from the very nature of the thing. That as all flesh had corrupted its way, by the works of the law all flesh shall find no justification, because

this is impossible from the nature of the thing. That the province and power of the principle of works of law cannot, from their nature, extend to a sinner. Would, however, that this truth were an axiom in the theology of all Christian teachers!

Among other examples which may be regarded as belonging to the same class as those now passed under consideration, are the "Mystery of the faith," 1 Tim. iii. 9; the "Shield of the faith," Eph. vi. 16; and the "Spirit of the faith," 2 Cor. iv. 13. From what has already been said on the others, it seems unnecessary to dwell at length on these. But I affirm with the utmost confidence, that the mind of God in all these places of his Word can never be understood by those who read and interpret "faith" in them in a subjective sense.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### OF FAITH CONSTRUED WITH PREPOSITIONS.

GENERAL consent concedes an objective sense to the word "faith" in some of its occurrences; but whether the concession extends so far as the truth demands is open to some question, and may justly form a subject of further enquiry. Alford, in Phil. iii. 9, has laid it down that when *pistis* (faith) occurs in the genitive, and is followed by a genitive article, an objective sense is decisive. Whether he has said as much for the nominative, the dative, and the accusative, I have not observed; but if not, why not? Why should not this be the sense when followed by a nominative, as in Acts iii. 16? Why not when followed by a dative, as in Gal. ii. 16? And why not when followed by an accusative, as in Acts xx. 21?

But as it seems that this enquiry about an objective sense may be facilitated by some observation taken of *pistis* (faith) when it is construed with a preposition, we will take that course, and begin with *ek* (out of.) The first occurrence of this construction is in Rom. i. 17,

where we read, "The righteousness of God revealed *from* faith;" and "The just shall live *by* faith."

It may be noticed in passing that the apostle is stating the ground of his confidence in the gospel of Christ; which is, that the righteousness of God revealed therein arises out of the same principle as that from which, according to the prophet, the just man lives. He found that the righteousness of God was revealed in the gospel, not according to the law of works, which represents the principle of due and desert, and according to which no sinner can be made righteous; but according to the law of faith, which represents the principle of a good promised, given, and accepted as a pure favour, and according to which, through the mediation of Christ, a sinner can be justified. Hence his confidence.

It may not be improper to observe also, that there seems to be a good deal of confusion of thought about living by faith. Imagining that justified by believing is the interpretation of "justified by faith," interpreters suppose also that to live by believing, conveys the sense of the words, "live by faith." Both interpretations are radically faulty. No doubt belief forms a part of what is comprehended in these words, "live by faith;" but it is also very certain that here, as in many other places, interpreters have given to the act of believing an importance immensely beyond its due. Have not also some of them been guilty of perversely blind-folding their learning while they have been restricting to the word faith in this, and in some other passages, the meaning of belief? Have they not felt that they were giving to the Greek preposition construed with the word in question a forced sense?

It is most clear that the true meaning is, that the just man lives *from*, that is, that his life springs *out of* the principle of faith, which, as we have said, represents and comprehends a good promised and given and received, as a pure favour. The elements of the just man's life are what Christ is made of God unto him, according to this principle. These are "wisdom, and righteousness,



and sanctification, and redemption," and they are living energies within him, making him wise and righteous and holy and free. As such he lives. He has in his existence the true elements of life. The Christian lives as Christ in the fulness and power of his mediatorial character lives in him. "I live;" said Paul, (Gal. ii. 20,) "yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by (in) the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Here "by," though representing a different preposition from that in the quotation we are considering, is a palpable intrusion, and seems to be introduced for the sole purpose of restricting to the word, "faith," the sense of belief. No doubt Paul did believe in the Son of God; but that is not solely, nor mainly, what he meant here. He said that Christ lived *in* him, and that he lived *in* the faith of the Son of God; and this is just what he meant. As the former was the wellspring of all that in him was living; so the latter contained him, was the sphere of all his activities, and comprehended all his desires and expectations.

It may be noticed further that we have in this passage, Rom. i. 17, three occurrences of the word faith, and therein an example of the difficulty, of which mention has been made, of knowing its meaning, in some instances, with certainty. Alternative meanings are a favourite resort of some interpreters when a difficulty presents itself. It may mean this, that, or the other. Any one of these will suit the context. All are in conformity with what is received as the truth. Take which you please; or, if it likes you, take all. But this is not interpretation. It is a putting on the fair face of Scripture testimony a nose of wax, and giving to whim liberty to use her plastic fingers to shape the form just as her humour may direct. Every word of God means something definite; and this is what is desired to be known and taught.

It is painful to impugn the critical judgment of men who have justly entitled themselves, as expositors of the Gospel, to the highest respect which one man

ought to feel towards and to pay to another; but fidelity to the truth of God must override all considerations of deference to our fellow men. Verbiage more puerile than is much of what has been written on the words, "from faith to faith," in the passage now under consideration, has never, perhaps, had accorded to it the dignity of critical interpretation. But, taking it for granted that the mere mention of some of the absurdities advanced will be sufficient for their refutation, we will only say that these words do not mean from the faith of God to the faith of man, whatever significations may be given to the terms, faith of God and faith of man; nor from the faith of preachers to that of hearers; nor from the faith of the Old to that of the New Testament saints; nor from the faith of the Jew to that of the Gentile; nor from a lower to a higher degree of faith in the same person. Mr. Haldane has got very near to, but has not quite hit the sense. He says, "The meaning, then, is the righteousness which is by faith, namely, which is received by faith, is revealed to faith, or, in order to be believed." No doubt the words "to faith" mean in order to be believed; but the words, "the righteousness of God revealed from faith," do not mean the righteousness which is received by faith, that is, by belief. The preposition (*ek*) "from," clearly points to an originating principle, in the word it governs, out of which arises the righteousness that is revealed. This principle is designated faith. According to this principle, which is that of a good promised, and given, and accepted, wholly as a pure favour, the righteousness of God is revealed to (*eis*) faith, that is, in order to be believed. Borrowing the thought from the expression of the apostle in Eph. ii. 9, "Not of works," we have a key that will open this lock with the greatest facility, and one which any person of the humblest capacity may use with complete satisfaction to himself. By putting the case before the eye in a sense precisely opposite, we shall bring the meaning within the comprehension of a child. Let it be supposed, then, that the righteousness of God,

revealed in the Gospel, was made known as arising from the same principle as the righteousness of Adam in Eden, and that of the Jews in Canaan, the passage would then read thus: *Therein the righteousness of God is revealed from works to works.* That is, it is revealed as originating from the principle of works in order to works. The reverse of this is exactly the apostle's meaning. The righteousness is revealed according to the law of faith, in order to faith; not according to the law of works, in order to works. This agrees with the prophet's testimony, "The just shall live from faith." This gives a solid ground of confidence in the Gospel of Christ.

On the next occasion the apostle quoted this testimony of the prophet (Gal. iii. 11), he introduced it to disprove the notion that a man is justified by law. His words are, "But that no man is justified by law (without the article) in the sight of God, it is evident; for the just shall live by [from] faith; and law (without the article) is not of faith." Here, then, we have again law and faith as two distinct and opposite principles, or laws of living, presented to us. In the case of these Galatians it would seem that they had been taught to understand and conform to the law of works as the rule of their justification in the Jewish sense. That is, that they must render obedience to the Mosaic as well as to the moral law. Those of them, therefore, that had been converted from heathenism submitted to circumcision, and they, with those that had been converted from Judaism, observed days, and months, and times, and years; and, indeed, seem to have conformed to the Jewish ritual very generally. The manners showed the men. They had "fallen from grace" in practice, and, therefore, in principle. They had abandoned the law according to which righteousness is a gift to be received, and had adopted that according to which a man is justified by a due that he has deserved, which, "in the sight of God," is impossible to a sinner.

Alas, that there are so many like them now! How many that bear the Christian name have yet to learn

that law does not spring from the principle of faith, and that a man is not justified from the principle of works! How many that teach, and that are taught, in this matter are as the blind leading the blind! How many are taught to make their peace with God! How many, if not under the Jewish ritual, are, nevertheless, under some other almost as burdensome and quite as unprofitable, labouring in vain to acquire for themselves an acceptance with God! How many are there that do not yet understand that the discharge of the least duty in the matter of justification, either in its acquisition or in its appropriation, would be the creation of a desert, and, therefore, would be fatal to the law of faith, according to which only a sinner can be justified!

On the third and last occasion the apostle quotes this testimony (Heb. x. 38), his object seems to have been to give the Hebrew saints, in their tribulations for Christ's sake, a mark to distinguish a true believer from a nominal one, and to encourage their confidence under their afflictions. Against all opposition, and under all oppression and persecution for Christ's sake, the apostle assured them, and he assures all others, that "The just shall live from faith." Apostates, he suggests, there have been and will be; and he declares that the soul of God will have no pleasure in them. When tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by all that are not supported by the principle of faith will be offended. Having started on the principle of works, and having this only for the mainspring of their action, the source of their consolation, and the assurance of their success, they soon act accordingly; they strike their colours, turn their backs from fear, and decline to destruction. "But we," he says, "are men of faith." This distinguished and precious principle is the source of our life. This is in us an unfailling energy, ever supplying a vital activity. This is a wellspring of strong consolation under the direst calamities suffered for the truth's sake. Every person of the Godhead is in this pledged and employed

on our behalf, and we have herein a divine security for the salvation of our souls.

We take it, then, that every earnest student of the truth must arrive at the conclusion, however this may be at variance with the commonly received interpretation, that in all the three instances in which the apostle has quoted the words of the prophet, "The just shall live by faith," it is not the power nor the act of believing merely that is to be understood by the word faith; but the whole principle so designated, in opposition to that of works. About Rom. i. 17, and Gal. iii. 11, it is inconceivable how any other conclusion could have sustained itself in credit for a moment in a reflecting mind; while Heb. x. 38, appears to bear this meaning only a little less clearly at first sight. But I am not only persuaded that this is the meaning of the word in these instances, I am equally convinced that the same sense belongs to it in Heb. xi. throughout. If by expressing this judgment I should earn for myself an unenviable distinction, I must bear obloquy with what grace I may, consoling myself with the recollection that public opinion has sometimes mistaken wisdom for foolishness; and, on maturer thoughts has changed its mind. However this may be, it is certain that whatever is the meaning of the word in the last two verses of chap. x., the same must belong to it from beginning to end of chap. xi.

According to my judgment, then, we have in chap. xi. 1, not an explanation of the nature of belief, but of the practical effect of the principle of faith on the believer's mind. Upon this principle the believer has a perfect persuasion of things hoped for, and a demonstration of things not seen, of which he has the testimony in the word of faith. Upon this principle these things come to have an assured existence in his mind, and he possesses them by anticipation. Upon no other principle could there be such results respecting these things, hoped for and not seen. Upon the principle of works, which the apostle had mentioned and still carried in his own and his reader's thoughts, all would be uncer-

tainty and doubt, and these would lead to their natural consequences in time of trial. Instead of a noble resistance, there would be a faltering and a drawing back.

How the apostle would have explained the practical effect of the principle of works in relation to things hoped for and not seen, it would be presumptuous to say; but we may be allowed to suppose, guided by his exposition of that of faith, that it might be in some such terms as these:—Now work is the uncertainty (*distasis*, the opposite of *hypostasis*, substantiation) of things hoped for, the problem (*problēma*, that is, in its figurative sense, namely, in our meaning of *problem*, the opposite of *elenchos*, demonstration) of things not seen. By this we should understand him to mean that the principle of works which puts all the good it embraces into a man's possession by the exertion of his own energies in fulfilment of certain required conditions, must have the practical effect of uncertainty in his mind, and this a leading to a faltering in his life. Whereas, on the other hand, as he teaches us, the principle of faith, which puts all the good it embraces into a man's possession as a thing of favour by the power of God, may well, and ought to have, the practical effect of certainty of mind, and this a leading to a constancy of life.

Moreover, that the word bears our meaning here is further confirmed by the design of the apostle throughout this connection. What was his design? Evidently it was to encourage these Hebrews, suffering for the truth's sake, not to cast away their confidence. In prosecuting this purpose he, in chap. x. 23, encouraged them to hold fast their profession without wavering, from considerations of the faithfulness of God; in verses 26—31, by the fearfulness of apostacy from the truth; and in verses 32—34, by the remembrance of what they had so nobly endured heretofore, and of their taking joyfully the spoiling of their goods on the knowledge they had of having in heaven a better and an enduring substance. Having brought these things under review he, in

verse 35, earnestly heartens them not to cast away their confidence on account of its recompense of reward. In verses 36, 37, he admits their need of patience, but assures them of the timely interference of God. Then, in verses 38, 39, as we have seen, he draws their attention to that great principle which is the source of the just man's life, an unfailing energy within him, and a fountain of comfort to him. In chap. xi. 1, he is still speaking for their encouragement. There is not the slightest break in his discourse. He did not take an extraordinary jump from a subject so thoroughly practical as that of comforting believers in their reproaches, losses, and afflictions, to one so recondite as a metaphysical disquisition on the nature of belief, or of what is commonly called justifying faith. Nay, but still pursuing his course, he taught these sufferers the practical effect of the principle to which he had drawn their attention immediately before, and afterward drew to the end of the chapter, and he confirmed this, his teaching, by bringing a cloud of witnesses to testify to its truth by their example. Nor is this subject discontinued until the end of chap. xii.

Dr. Owen says, "The subject spoken of" (that is, in chap. xi. 1) "is *faith*; that faith whereby the just doth live; that is faith divine, supernatural, justifying and saving, the faith of God's elect, the faith that is not of ourselves, that is of the operation of God, wherewith all true believers are endowed from above." So far as we know, the older interpreters are, substantially, of one mind with the learned doctor. But will the apostle's examples throughout warrant this notion? If this opinion breaks down in one of these examples, will it not justly prejudice it relative to the whole? Now while there can be no reasonable doubt that all those that are mentioned by name in this chapter, and many of those that are not, were believers in Christ by a supernatural faculty given to them, is it imaginable that all that are spoken of here, as supposed to do something by believing were such? Does not this notion, upon any reasonable interpretation of it, utterly break

down at verses 29 and 30? Surely there can be no doubt. But let the word be explained as the principle of faith, and there is no difficulty whatever.

Again, however slight at first sight the force of any argument that may be founded on the word "without," in verse 6, may appear to be, we are mistaken if, on consideration, there is not therein alone power enough to overturn the commonly accepted interpretation of faith in this connection. Nothing can be clearer than that "without" here is understood in the sense of *not having*. Neither, indeed, can it be otherwise understood if "faith" is to be considered as that particular faculty or power, so called, which is the gift of God, and is of the operation of God. But to understand "faith" here in this sense, requires the word (*chōris*) which is rendered "without," to take a meaning which none of the lexicons give to it, and which it does not receive in all New Testament usage. Nowhere else in the New Testament where this word is used can it take the meaning of *not having*, and we have the utmost confidence that it cannot take this sense here. We do not say that *chōris* does not mean "without;" but we do say that *without* must not, as its representative, be understood as *not having*. For *not having*, we should require *mē echonta*; just as in Eph. ii. 12, for "having no hope," in the subjective sense, we have *elpida mē echontes*. "Without" here can only be rightly understood as *apart from*, namely, a principle. Just, indeed, as it must be understood in "without law," (without the article,) in Rom. iii. 21; "without works of law," (without the article,) in verse 28; and "without works," in chap. iv. 6. Under the fall, and apart from the principle of faith, though as holy as Enoch, it is impossible for any man to please God. Now, all men being in the condition consequent upon having sinned, to him that cometh to God it is necessary that he should not only believe that God is, but that he has also BECOME (*ginetai*), a *Rewarder* of those that diligently seek him. A consummation this, in a world of sinners, respecting



the blessings of justification and salvation, that could only be possible upon the principle of faith.

But, further, there is a fact relative to the use of *chōris*, (without,) which has a most important, a decisive, bearing on the interpretation of "faith" in this passage: namely, *No noun when preceded by chōris ever takes a subjective sense, but always an objective.* At least, this is so in all New Testament use. Everyone who perceives the force of this fact will apprehend that, if what is here stated is so, there is an end to all dispute about the commonly accepted meaning of "faith" in Heb. xi., however confidently this may have been accepted, or widely, or long. It would be easy, by a reference to the opinion of some great man, or by a brusque remark, to brush aside, easier far than to confute, the argument for an objective sense of "faith" here, founded on this, it may be thought, unimportant word; but the more thoroughly this matter is investigated, if ingenuously, I am confident that the more conclusively will it appear that the opinion generally held about "faith" in the whole of this passage is a mistaken one.

In the greater number of the occurrences of the word *chōris*, my assertion will be undisputed; but there are three or four places where this word is found which may, at first sight, beget a doubt of the soundness of my position. One of these is Phil. ii. 14; "Do all things without murmurings and disputings." But outward expressions of dissatisfaction or displeasure must be the interpretation of murmurings here, and, indeed, everywhere else, not inward repinings. Not sentiment is intended, but action. Paul says, in effect, Do all things to one another and to all men, after the example of the meek and lowly One, without muttering any expressions of dissatisfaction or displeasure. We have, indeed, a subjective sense given to the word *goggusmos*, (murmuring,) in 1 Pet. iv. 9, "Use hospitality without grudging." Alford, however, rejects "grudging," and retains "murmuring." But granting, which, however, I do not, that *goggusmos* may receive

a subjective sense here, the argument about *chōris* will not be affected; for Peter does not use this word, but *aneu*. The explanation given by Trench (Authorized Version of New Testament, p. 21), is, however, no doubt, the true one. "Grudge," he tells us, had formerly, but has not now, the sense of murmur; and that, having lost this signification, "It no longer conveys to us with accuracy the meaning of the original" in 1 Pet. iv. 9. Respecting *dialogismōn*, (disputings,) Paul must be understood, as Alford decides, to have exhorted the Philippians to avoid disputings with men, not doubts in themselves.

Another of these places is 1 Tim. ii. 8, "I will, therefore, that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting," But *chōris*, (without,) retains here its true sense of *separate from*, requiring the meaning and conveying the idea, as Conybeare puts it, of an actual putting away of wrath and disputation; not the *not having* of wrath and doubt in the mind.

"Without preferring one before another," in 1 Tim. v. 21, must not be understood in the sense of *not having* the sentiment of prejudice; but *apart from* any act or appearance of preference.

The only other place which seems to call for notice is Heb. xii. 14, "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." What calls for remark here is the word "holiness." Little, however, requires to be added to Alford's observation. "*Agiosmos*," he says, "is not equivalent to *agiotēs*, but is the putting on of it and becoming *agioi*." That is, that *agiosmos*, (sanctification,) the word used here, is not equivalent to *agiotēs*, (holiness,) but that sanctification is the putting on of holiness and a becoming practically holy; and that, *apart from* following peace with all men, and the putting on of holiness, no man shall see the Lord.

Duly considered, it will clearly appear that a *local* sense belongs to *chōris*, (without,) when it is construed before nouns and pronouns; and that, in the place

under consideration, it answers exactly to the true *local* meaning of *en*, (in,) as its opposite. *Chōris pisteōs*, in Heb. xi. 6, (apart from faith,) is the precise local contrast of *en tautēi*, (in this, that is, *pistei*, faith, in verse 2.) We have a strikingly like example of the words *en* and *chōris* in John xv. 5. "He that abideth (*en emoi*) in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for (*chōris emou*) without me ye can do nothing." Apart from the true local sense of these two words, it is impossible to understand the mind of the writer in either of these passages. What the apostle means in Heb. xi. 2, clearly is, *In this*, that is, in this *faith*, locally considered, as the sphere of their life, *the elders were testified of*, or, *had a good report*. So, on the other hand, in verse 6, he as clearly means that the man who is apart from faith, objectively considered as a law of living between him and his Maker, and as the sphere of his life, he, being a sinner, cannot please God.

The only real difficulty in the way of our interpretation lies in verse 3. But truth has ever prevailed over difficulty, and it will overcome in this instance. Now it must be noticed that it is supposed that "faith" here means *belief*, and "worlds" the *material universe*. On this supposition the general opinion rests. This sense of "worlds" here is necessary to sustain the meaning usually given to "faith." "Worlds" *must* mean the material universe, because "faith" *must* mean belief. So it is thought. I doubt. Let us see.

It affords me a real satisfaction to be able to avail myself in this matter of the learning of one whose authority respecting the meaning of the word rendered "worlds" is beyond dispute; and the pleasure is even increased by the fact that he falls in with the general opinion of "faith" and "worlds" in this passage. While, therefore, his general teaching on the word translated "worlds" is received with docility and gratitude, his interpretation of Heb. xi. 8, is disputed with the earnestness of conviction in a matter of great importance.

Archbishop Trench in his most interesting and valuable *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Sect. lix., discriminating between *kosmos* and *aiōn*, says, "The first of these words our translators have rendered 'world' in every instance but one (1 Pet. iii. 3;) the second often, though by no means invariably so; for (not to speak of *eis aiōna*) see Eph. ii. 2, 7; Col. i. 26. It may be a question whether we might not have made more use of 'age' in our version: we have employed it but rarely—only, indeed, in the two places which I have cited last. 'Age' may sound to us inadequate now; but it is quite possible that, so used, it would, little by little, have expanded and adapted itself to the larger meaning of the word for which it stood. One must regret that, by this or some other like device, our translators did not mark the difference between *kosmos*, the world contemplated under aspects of space, and *aion*, the same contemplated under aspects of time."

Further on, speaking of *aiōn*, he says, "Like *kosmos* it has a primary and physical, and then, superinduced on this, a secondary and ethical, sense. In its primary, it signifies time, short or long, in its unbroken duration; . . . but essentially time as the condition under which all created things exist, and the measure of their existence." Here he cites a passage from Theodoret, which may be rendered, thus:—" *Aiōn* is not anything material, but an imaginary something which ever accompanies things that have a created nature. For it is called *aiōn*, from its being the interval that exists from the constitution until the consummation of the (*kosmos*) world. *Aiōn*, therefore, is the time that is inseparably yoked with nature by the Creator."

A little further on, speaking of Eph. ii. 2, the Archbishop says, "The last is a particularly interesting passage, for in it both the words which we are discriminating occur together. Bengel excellently remarking: (we give the translation of Bengel by Bryce,) '*Aiōn* and *kosmos* differ; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 12; iii. 18, 19. The former regulates the latter, and in a manner gives it form; *kosmos* is something more external;