

My Christ, He is the heaven of heaven,  
My Christ, what shall I call?  
My Christ is first, my Christ is last,  
My Christ is all in all

### I WILL NOT LET THEE GO.

I will not let thee go, thou help in time of need,  
Heap ill on ill,  
I trust thee still,  
E'en when it seems as thou wouldest slay indeed!  
Do as thou wilt with me,  
I yet will cling to thee;  
Hide thou thy face, yet, help in time of need,  
I will not let thee go.

I will not let thee go, should I forsake my bliss?  
No Lord, thou'rt mine,  
And I am thine,  
Thee will I hold, when all things else I miss:  
Though dark and sad the night,  
Joy cometh with the light,  
O thou my sun! should I forsake my bliss?  
I will not let thee go.

I will not let thee go, my God, my Life, my Lord  
Nor death can tear  
Me from his care,  
Who for my sake, His soul in death outpoured,  
Thou didst die for love to me,  
I say in love to thee,  
E'en when my heart shall break, my God, my  
Light my Lord,  
I will not let thee go.

*From Sacred Lyrics from the German.*

### THE THEOLOGY OF THE REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

In our last number we briefly adverted to the published views of the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, on the subject of the human nature of Christ. The following is an article on the subject, published in the *Presbyterian Magazine*, under the title of "THE APOLLINARIAN HERESY REVIVED!"

"It would seem as if the inventive power of Satanic intellect had exhausted itself in its efforts to mar and subvert the Gospel of Christ, during the first seven centuries of the Christian era. Few indeed are the errors, respecting either the work or the person of the Redeemer, which have not had their origin within that period. Knowing full well that the work of Christ depended upon His person, the gates of hell sent forth their mightiest champions against this corner-stone of the temple of truth. The wisdom of this world which is foolishness with God, endeavoured to retain its seat of power by effecting a union with 'the mystery of godliness;' and, as the fruits of such unhallowed nuptials, there came forth a vast progeny of Gnostic, Manichean, Sabellian, Arian, Monophysite, and Monothelistic heresies, all conflicting among themselves and all united against the integrity of Christ's person. Some of these denied both the proper divinity and proper humanity of Christ. Some admitted the one and denied the other. The Monophysites recognized but one nature, whilst the Monothelites held that there were two natures, and but one will. Differing from all these, yet enemies of the true doctrine, were the Nestorians, who separated the two natures of Christ, so as to make two distinct persons. In fact, every possible theory that could be framed out of the two elements of Christ's person was

framed and promulgated, with a zeal that kept the church, throughout the entire limits, in an almost perpetual blaze. Disappearing almost entirely in one century, a friendly hand would re-open its sepulchre, and deck anew its ghastly sepulchre and lead it forth for the admiration of men.

Such was the way in which "the mystery of iniquity" worked until the gathering darkness, driven by the four winds of the earth, inclosed and curtained as with a pall, the entire horizon of Christendom. Nor did this mystery, in this very form, cease its efforts even when the shades of that long mediæval night were parted and dispersed by the sun of the Reformation. The gates of hell muster their legions afresh for the conflict, and their commission is against the person as well as the work of Christ. What is the history of Socinianism and modern Arianism but a narrative of attempts on the part of the enemies of the Gospel to overthrow the deity of our Redeemer, and thus, by subverting the foundation, to destroy the super-structure of saving truth? The blighting influence of these kindred heresies in Europe and America is too well to require any portrayal in the pages of this Magazine. It is our purpose at present to turn the attention of our readers, and of the Church generally, to the resuscitation of an old heresy, effected within the last two months, here upon our own continent, and before our own eyes.

"In a sermon on Heb. 2: 14, published in 'The Independent' of the 17th November last, the Rev. HENRY WARD BEECHER advances the following views respecting the Incarnation: 'There have been revived from the mystic speculations and legendary lore of the Romish Church, impressions the most unwarrantable in Scripture, in respect to the complex nature of Christ. The Bible teaches just this: that the Divine Mind was pleased to take on itself a human body. We have no warrant in Scripture for attributing to Christ any other part of human nature than simply a body—nothing more.' The declaration (in the text) is clear and unequivocal, that it pleased Christ to take on him flesh and blood. He wore them. That is all there was."

We have said that this is an old heresy resuscitated. It is indeed a resuscitation without a modification. It differs from both the Eutychian and Monophysite heresies in that, whilst they admit of a real human nature, which, according to the former, was absorbed by the divine, and according to the latter was submitted to it as to constitute but one nature, it acknowledges nothing of humanity but the mere body. The ancient heresy with which it is to be identified is that of Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea: "He believed that Christ had no need of a rational soul, because the divine nature was competent to all the rational and free acts which Saviour performed: and he could see no reason why Christ must have two intelligent natures, and two free wills. He supposed further, that a rational human soul, as it was the seat of sinful acts, was liable to changes; and, therefore Christ, if he had possessed a rational human soul, could not have had an unchangeable, that is a sinless human nature. And he supported his opinion by the many passages of Scripture which speak of Christ's becoming man, in which the word *flesh* is used for the human nature; e. g. John

1: 14." See Murdock's *Mosheim*, Vol. I, p. 359, note 52.

How true it is that even in heresy there is but little that can be called progress! To the Bishop of Laodicea, and not the Bishop of Brooklyn—to the younger Apollinaris, and not to the younger Beecher belongs the credit or the sin of originating this dangerous heresy. So complete, indeed, is the docility of the pupil, that he copies not only the dogma, but even the fallacy whereby his Laodicean master would support it. He argues, as the Bishop did, from the fact that the scriptures teach that Christ had a body, that therefore he had no soul! It was this principle which controlled him in the selection of his text. Had Apollinaris occupied the pulpit of the Plymouth Church on the occasion which gave birth to the sermon in question, he might, perhaps have taken for his text John; 14, instead of the one selected by his imitator, but beyond this, the Laodicean would have felt neither the necessity nor the desire of a change. What could Apollinaris ask from any of his pupils more than this, "that Christ had no other part of human nature than a simple body—nothing more!" Had he entered the Church in Brooklyn on the occasion referred to, and heard the text announced, and this dogma deduced from it, and the ordinary doctrine denounced as a mystic speculation, or a Romish legend, he might well have consoled himself, and felt, in some measure, avenged of his adversaries, who, in the day of their power, had clothed his name with dishonor, and sent it down to posterity with all the infamy of heresy upon its head.

Having ascertained the paternity of this doctrine, let us examine its claim and its consequences. Mr. Beecher tells his congregation, from the pulpit, and the Church at large, through the medium of the press, that the Bible, in its teachings on the subject of Christ's humanity, ascribes to him no other part of human nature than a simple body. This position removes the subject at once from the region of human philosophy altogether, and submits the controversy to the decision of scripture. It is, therefore, simply a question of fact. Let the scriptures answer for themselves.

1. And in the first place we shall cite some passages which expressly ascribe a soul to Christ. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin," Isa. 53: 10 "O Lord, I beseech thee, deliver my soul." "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." Matt. 26: 38. "Now is my soul troubled." John 12: 27. "When Jesus had said thus he was troubled in spirit." John 13: 21. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." Acts 2: 27.

2. We would refer, without citation, to those passages in which He is called man and the Son of man. These passages are numerous, and are, of course, conclusive. Except Mr. Beecher will take the position, that the possession of the form of humanity entitles the being who wears it, to the name of man, he must admit, that the application of the title implies the possession of all that belongs to humanity. And surely that existence cannot be called man, which is destitute of man's noblest part, the soul! It will not do as an answer to this, to say that in Christ, the divine nature well supplied the place of a human soul, for where man's soul is excluded, and a different spiritual being