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A PORTRAIT OF ROBERT SMITH CANDLISH
PART I

A PORTRAIT OF ROBERT SMITH CANDLISH

CHAPTER I

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

His Early Years

"The ancient and famous metropolis of the North sits overlooking a windy estuary from the slope and summit of three hills. No situation could be more commanding for the head city of a kingdom; none better chosen for noble prospects." Robert Smith Candlish, the subject of this dissertation, commenced his life in the "famous metropolis of the North," on March 23, 1806. Here too, in Edinburgh his energies were destined to be expended faithfully.

Robert was one of six sons and daughters born to James Candlish and Jane Smith Candlish. On his father's side he was connected with Galloway and on his mother's to Ayrshire - that part of the country closely associated with the name of Robert Burns. In fact, James Candlish was born in the same year as Burns, and both parents were considered his close friends. Burns called him, "Candlish, the earliest friend, except my only brother whom I have on earth, and one of the worthiest fellows that ever any man called by the name of friend." Robert's mother was one of the "six belles of Mauchline" celebrated by Burns.


She was the Miss Smith whom the poet praised for her wit, and who certainly possessed no ordinary intellectual powers.

Robert's father, with whom he shared many points of peculiar physiological resemblances, was a keen intellectual man, strong in his patriotic sentiments and devoted to the minstrelsy of Scotland. At one time he had considered entering the ministry, but being too speculative theologically for the church, and not being in complete agreement with the Confession of Faith, and too honest to attempt to teach others what he could not embrace himself, he chose rather the teaching of medicine as his vocation. Even as a student of physics in Glasgow College his "acknowledged powers of logic" were not without notice.

Edinburgh, at this time, was rapidly becoming the home of scholars and philosophers, and the center of a literary and scientific revival. Among others whom this great center of medicine attracted was James Candlish, early in the year of 1789. In his profession as a teacher of medicine, he was eminently successful and was even referred to as an authority twenty years after his death. It was while he was making a speech at the Royal Medical Society on the evening of April 28, 1806, that he was seized with a peculiar sensation in his head as if it would burst. Finishing his speech, he made his way home but lost consciousness later that night and died the next day – only

2. Peter Bayne, The Free Church of Scotland, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1893), p. 113
3. The Daily Review, October 20, 1873, p. 5
five weeks after Robert Smith Candlish had been born. With the burden of the entire home now solely upon her, Mrs. Candlish rose courageously to meet the new responsibility. With her calm gentleness and tender loving-kindness as a mother she combined the fatherly qualities of methodical habit and decisive authority. She was described as a "lady of somewhat majestic presence, grave and reserved in manner, although always kindly and courteous." And as an elderly lady she was noted for her "great vivacity and personal attractions including a brilliant pair of eyes." Another has pictured her as a "shrewd, large-hearted, and generous woman, with a remarkable adaptability of character to the changing circumstances of her lot, and with indomitable perseverance and energy, while her Christianity - the motive power of her character - gave strength and directness to her daily life." Although she had not come from a martyr's stock, she had come from the country of martyrs and heroes, and warrior in heart she met the coming struggle with unusual courage and wisdom. With the responsibility and duty of both a father and mother thus thrust upon her, she moved with her two sons and daughters to Glasgow, where, by keeping a girls' school and through practicing a rigid and

2. The Daily Review, October 20, 1873, p. 5.
Stern economy in the home, she was able to maintain herself and her children.

More than to anyone else, Robert was indebted to his mother for her tender love and Christian piety during his formative years. He greatly revered her, and according to those who knew them best, she was the greatest single influence in his life. Andrew Urquhart, whose friendship for Robert was life long and doubly strengthened by the fact that their fathers had been chums in college, refers to Robert's indebtedness to his mother in these words:

It always appeared to me that, more than to all his other teachers, he was indebted to his mother. He reverenced her with all the loyalty of the tenderest filial observance. And she was indeed in every respect worthy . . . I think of her as the grandest old lady I have ever seen. Most wondrously tenacious of well-ascertained facts, and singularly indifferent to hypothetical speculations, her intellectual perceptions were always clear and her practical logic indomitable. 1

It was at his mother's knee that Robert was brought up in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord." In fact, the whole family atmosphere was one of filial affection, blessed abundantly with the fruits of the old Scottish family order and understanding. His elder sister's love for him was very great, and she watched over him with tender care. Of a grave and serious nature she was devoted to studies, but merry moments with her little brother were times of relaxation. Robert retained always a love for her bordering on veneration.

Robert's brother, James, was a young man of highest talent and character who had followed his father's vocation in the field of Medicine. He had just been appointed to the Chair of Surgery in Anderson's College, Glasgow in 1829 when, like his father, his life was cut short in the beginning of great achievement. While James lived he was indeed the mother's pride and joy. One who knew her well says, "Mrs. Candlish had a very high estimate of her elder son, James, and he must, indeed, from all accounts, have been a young man of remarkable attainments and of rare promise. She remarked to me more than once, 'Robert was naething thocht o' so long as James lived!'" James was much taller than Robert, but like him, had a large well-formed head and broad chest. He too was devoted to the care and culture of Robert, and had a remarkable influence upon his young brother for he "lifted the shrinking youth from much of his inconvenient sensitiveness, and made him strong and fearless in the cause of truth."

His Education and Preparation

Unlike many of the children of well established homes, Robert received no formal education in schools until he entered the University of Glasgow. Perhaps this was due in part to the straitened circumstances at home, and in part to the fact that he was never robust as a young lad. As a result Mrs. Candlish watched carefully

1. Ibid., p. 6
over her "young Benjamin." Nevertheless, his education was in no way neglected or desultory, for under the loving eyes of mother, sister and brother it was made certain that he did his lessons well. That he thoroughly was prepared for secondary education under their instruction is evident from his achievements later at the University. An apt pupil, he responded to his home teaching with eagerness and alacrity.

As a youngster of eight he was described as "a peculiar, not to say queer-looking child." Miss Duncan, a fellow pupil of his at his mother's school gives this graphic picture of Candlish in his early school years:

We were at that time very much together, both at lessons and play. While the girls were engaged at needlework little Robert always sat on a low stool beside his mother, doing sums of arithmetic, of which occupation he never seemed to tire... His delicate fair complexion, his large forehead, and eyes with long eye-lashes, and the rest of his body so small, made him so peculiar-looking that people often stopped and asked whose child he was. 2

But if he gave the appearance of a delicate lad at eight, he soon acquired strength and readily participated in all the games and amusements of his fellow companions in secondary schooling.

October, 1818, according to the practice of the time, young Candlish matriculated at the University of Glasgow at the early age of thirteen. Similarly, his two close and eminent friends, Thomas Chalmers and Thomas Guthrie, had matriculated at the University of Edinburgh at twelve. During the entire undergraduate course of five

years, terminating in 1823 when he received his M.A., he distinguished himself by the record he attained and was known for his "general scholarship, his subtlety in argument, and his generosity and straightforwardness of character." He was a voracious reader and especially delighted in Shakespeare and other poets from which sources he was storing his fertile mind with knowledge and creative material to be used profitably in his future calling.

It has been said that "the strength of the Scottish Universities lay in the personality of their professors," and undoubtedly the personality of professors under whom young Candlish studied profoundly influenced the expanding and developing of his mental powers. Lord Ardmillan, a fellow-student of Candlish at the University, reported how Candlish's "power of reasoning and of forcible and impressive writing was yet more fully developed" under the inspirational instruction of Professor Mylne, Professor of Moral Philosophy. He was accepted as a "keen, eager, earnest student; very prompt and quick; and recognised alike by his professors and his fellow-students as a leader and a youth of power in the class." Another said that Professor Young noticed him a great deal in his Greek Class, and Professor Walker also

4. Ibid.
took a liking to him as a student. Although he did not rank the highest in his classes, his work in Latin and Greek received commendation and he was awarded second prize in the coveted Blackstone examination. Being well instructed in logic and philosophy, he received his share of honors in these studies as well. Many of his sermons and lectures, written in the active ministry, are full of close argumentation, and well illustrate the type of intellectual furniture young Candlish was developing.

If from his father he received his towering brain, his "powers of logic," and "his courageous fidelity to conviction," it may be still more to his mother he owed his clarity of expression and incomparable faculty for business which seemed to amaze many of those who knew him even more than his gift of speech. His ability and capacity for knowledge was known to his fellow-students, as well as to his professors, but combined with this taste for intellectual knowledge went a devotedness of character. For even as a boy of thirteen, there was with him, "without a trace of effeminacy, a purity of thought, an unconscious sanctity of character, that could not be forgotten."

Early in his college life he excelled in the fine art of debate which was to be so characteristic of his leadership in the church.

1. The Daily Review, October 20, 1873
His ingenuity and sharp discrimination often revealed distinctions which, even when stated by Candlish himself, were not entirely understood by his fellow-students. Of this very characteristic, Dr. Rainy, writing some fifty years later said, "Acute, rapid, and precise, he loved to disentangle the threads of a difficult and intricate argument; perhaps he sometimes loved too well to force upon the general mind the value of a distinction finer than it cared to see." 1 His biographers also said of him as a youth: "In him we observed the exercise of mental power, without the self consciousness of it . . . in his play of intellectual activity he did exercise an unassuming influence, and became a central object of attraction and source of incitement in the circles amidst which he came." 2 He never, however, sought to use his intellectual ability over his fellows except in order to defeat an opponent in an intellectual discussion or when a special subject needed to be settled. Thus even at the age of seventeen, he displayed an independence of judgment which he often exerted in later life to his own advantage and to the advantage of the Church. And in 1823 he entered the Divinity Hall in Glasgow where his keen logical powers, brilliancy and ease in argument soon carried him to the top of his class. In spite of his brilliance he never became pedantic nor reflected a love for praise. 3

2. Ibid., p. 18
No definite period can be fixed to mark the beginnings of his religious life, but it is suggested that he had a dominant and habitual spirituality so early as to have grown up with it to such an extent that it was as native to him as breathing. His life-long friend remarks that "from very early years, before I knew him, he had walked with God in the spirit of adoption," and had been very early "planted in the house of the Lord." That which was said of Guthrie might apply to Candlish: "He drank in the Gospel from his mother's milk."

Only occasionally he drew aside the veil and revealed his inner experiences. Even in later years he was reticent about speaking of his own spiritual experience, and it probably took great effort to write his mother while at Eton concerning a great religious difficulty through which he was passing, but which, however, "was neither vivid enough nor lasting enough to leave any traces upon his faith or his teachings." But in his distress of heart he turned to her and wrote entreating her counsel and help. With characteristic directness and simplicity she replied, "Robert, I cannot venture to solve the doubts and difficulties that occur to a mind like yours. My advice is to go

1. Bayne, op. cit., p. 145
2. Wilson, op. cit., p. 19
3. Ibid.
to your Bible and pray to the Lord for light, and you will get it." Even while at college he was not without his spiritual or intellectual struggles, yet their solution always seemed to come through prayer and Bible study. The early foundations laid in his home in Glasgow were built upon constantly. Habitually, before retiring for the night he would compose himself for his devotions. It is no wonder that early in life he gained an intimate knowledge of the Bible, and consistent with his acute logical mind a system of theology was taking shape. Through these early spiritual and intellectual struggles he came forth better equipped to cope with the practical needs and cravings of mankind. In later years he often was seen at his best in "exposition and practical appeal," and Taylor adds that he "was never so great as when he engaged in the analysis of some Scripture character, and the enforcement of the lessons which it conveyed to modern times."

1. Wilson, op. cit., p. 21

Although in early years he suffered a noticeable defect in his articulation, he was able, with great pains and with the help of Sheridan Knowles, the famous elocution professor and actor, to correct it. In fact Candlish learned a great deal from him that he later put into practice in his pulpit. It was Knowles who taught him to read and appreciate Shakespeare. Little wonder it was said "that to hear him read (the Bible) was equal to hearing a sermon from many other men, and not a few must remember how he read poetry."

During his college and divinity years, three powerful influences began to operate on the religious and ecclesiastical history of Scotland which were bound to affect him. M'Crie's Life of Knox and Life of Melville were published in 1811 and 1819 respectively. These works were widely circulated among the students and could not but help formulate Candlish's own thought. They brought the Church back again to the high principles and position of the Reformation and became a very effective and telling protest against the position of Moderateism which had for so long a time cramped and choked the religious life of Scotland. To M'Crie, says Wilson, "more than to any other we owe it that so many of the people of Scotland clearly apprehended the doctrine of the Church's autonomy, and recognized her obligation to act out what we had ascertained to be the will of her great living Head irrespective of what secular and civil authorities might do and determine."

2. Wilson, op. cit., p. 27
Still another influence which had its effect on the ministerial students and upon the life of the Church in general was the work then being done by Andrew Thomson of St. George's Church, whose place Candlish was destined to fill. By the use of pen and voice Thomson emphasised the inspiration and the sole and supreme authority of the Scriptures as the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. A facile writer he not only uncompromisingly proclaimed from the pulpit and public platforms the truth and credibility of the Bible during the great Aprocrphpha Controversy, but presented it also by means of the Christian Instructor.

In 1815, shortly before Candlish began his university work in Glasgow, Thomas Chalmers began his ministry in the same city and continued there for eight years. He was at once recognized as the greatest preacher of his time, but it was his evangelistic efforts which made such a profound impression on the life of Candlish and his fellow-students who soon would be called upon to lead the Church. Chalmers' ruling passion was that the Gospel of Christ might be heard by all, and he bent his efforts to provide an agency to carry the Gospel to every home. Through him many new preaching stations were erected; in no sense were they magnificent buildings but simply places where the message might be proclaimed and heard. During this plastic and formative period Candlish came into touch with another great name of the Scottish pulpit, Edward Irving, Chalmers' assistant. He never missed an opportunity of hearing him preach and enjoyed him as much as or even
more than Chalmers in those early days. Thus, in the providence of God, these influences worked together to help mold the future history of ecclesiastical doctrine and polity.

As far as records show young Candlish never mentioned either by word or pen exactly when it was he decided to make the ministry his life's work. Apparently no other calling was considered seriously at all. Every pious home in Scotland desired to have at least one of its sons in the ministry. Since James, his older brother, was following medicine, and, since too, there had been an indication towards the ministry even within the mind of his father, it is not surprising that there would be a somewhat natural inclination for Robert at least to consider the ministry. But no doubt can be entertained that he was uncertain of his high calling. His sense of being an ambassador for Christ with a personal commission to deliver God's message of salvation to sinners is everywhere present in his sermons. In his closing address to the students of New College, as Principal in 1870-71, he speaks as one who had never doubted the high calling of his vocation.

Like many Scottish students with limited means he was employed to a great extent in private teaching, "sometimes as much as eight or ten hours a day in addition to his studies." At the completion of

1. At one time Irving was taken for Chalmers. Cf. Daily Review, October 21, 1874, p. 5
his studies in the Divinity School he was recommended and went to Eton as tutor to Sir Hugh Hume Campbell of Marchmont.

As An Assistant

Formal studies and tutoring came to an end, and after two years at Eton he felt ready to return to Glasgow. In other cases, two such years in England would have done something toward modifying tone and manner, but this period "failed to give Candlish even the most superficial English veneering or to leave the slightest trace upon his mind and character." He returned to Glasgow with all his Scotticisms and without the slightest change in his tone or accent. As a "young and doubtless unspeakably awkward lad of twenty-one," he was licensed to preach in 1828, shortly before he became assistant to Dr. Gibb of St. Andrew's Parish, Glasgow, a member of the moderate party in the Church of Scotland. Unfortunately, however, his association with ministers of the moderate party caused grave doubts regarding the evangelical character of his ministry, even in the mind of one who later became his very close friend and fellow-churchman, William Cunningham. Sometime later when all his contemporaries were keen on promotion, the neighboring parish of Kilpatrick became vacant, and word reached Cunningham, then minister of Greenock, that Candlish, now the Bonhill assistant, was desirous of receiving the call. And

1. Catholic PresbyterIan Magazine, 4p., cit., p. 188
2. The Daily Review, October 20, 1873
although Cunningham himself had no interest in the parish, he is reported by his biographer to have said, "I'll take Kilpatrick, if I can get it, to keep out a moderate of the name of Candlish." But this accusation was without foundation.

At twenty-three years of age, as assistant to Dr. Gibb, who, besides being minister was also Professor of Hebrew in the University, the whole charge of a city congregation was thrust upon him in addition to preaching twice every Sunday. In a sense he did not enjoy preaching for Dr. Gibb in St. Andrew's; "it hung like a cold blanket about his neck." This is not to imply he was unhappy in the ministry, but because of his evangelical tendencies his sermons were in tremendous contrast to the moderate type of preaching familiar to the congregation. It was then, however, that a wonderful friendship began with David Welsh, minister of St. David's, and later Professor of Church History in Edinburgh University and an elder in St. George's - a friendship that became life-long. Candlish frequently was invited to preach for Welsh, and it was through his powerful influence that the young preacher was heard in Edinburgh.

Over four years had passed since he had been licensed and there were no prospects of the small rural charge which he coveted. Yet, in the providence of God, he was being prepared for the even


2. Wilson, op. cit., p. 38
larger field of service that was soon to open to him. He subsequently wrote a letter offering his services in Canada, but by the time of its favorable reception he felt a change of mind and was unwilling to leave.

Early in his ministry the pastorate was his prime interest. When he received the opportunity to teach Latin at the University of Glasgow, he rejected it in favor of the alternative offer of the assistantship at Bonhill, although the position at the University gave double the remuneration. Here again the entire pastoral duties of the pulpit and parish devolved upon him, and even at this early stage he manifested such qualities as to gain the high admiration, respect and affection of the people. At Bonhill he was characterized by his "devotion to study and to the work of his congregation, and attracted the warm love of his people." Not considered a popular preacher - first impressions were not always favorable - others of far inferior talents were called to pulpits in preference to young Candlish. Bell recounts his first impressions when Candlish was at St. George's.

My acquaintance with Dr. Candlish commenced in the close of 1834 or beginning of 1835. Returning after an absence of three years from Edinburgh, I found him minister of St. George's, where I had been a former hearer, from boyhood, of Dr. Andrew Thomson, and whom with most others who enjoyed that privilege, I regarded as a very great man, whose place no successor could be expected to fill. My first impressions, therefore, were unfavorable. The minister looked so young; he had an awkward way of habitually shrugging

1. The Christian Monthly and Family Treasury, op. cit., p. 275
up one shoulder, which gave him almost a deformed look; his voice often passed into a scream or even a screech, and his gesticulation was sometimes almost extravagant. But these peculiarities speedily ceased to be regarded, and very soon I felt with everybody else that a great preacher had appeared, and that a new era was coming in for the Scottish pulpit. 1

Though the ordinary run of listeners might not have been highly impressed at first upon hearing Candlish, one prominent dignitary of the Church of England was more than delighted with the sermon he heard on holiday. After listening to the young assistant he enthusiastically declared he had never heard such a sermon. Upon returning from a tour in the West Highlands he spent another Sunday in Bonhill just to hear the young preacher again. "Depend upon it, that man will become the leader of his Church yet," he declared. Sheridan Knowles, as was noted, opened to Candlish the appreciation and interpretation of the poets, and at Bonhill he began studying the great Barrow, and not without reward either. At Bonhill, also, he revealed his early interest in missionary activity and the spread of the Gospel in foreign lands. Bonhill church had been unaccustomed to hearing missionary sermons, so Candlish preached a special one on behalf of the mission to India with the result that the contribution from the parish was the largest in the Presbytery.

1. Wilson, op. cit., p. 40
2. Watson, op. cit., p. 17
In The Active Ministry

Under the outstanding ministry of Andrew Thomson the pulpit of St. George's Church had become "a central station of attraction from which the trumpet rang to rally the tribes for safety and defence." Thomson's name was associated with the evangelical cause - one who had "caught the mantle of the Brekines and Moncreiffs." Strongly sustaining the popular rights of the people, he laid great stress on the incontrovertible principle of the Church of Scotland that it had no spiritual head on earth but Christ. In the midst of his ministry, as he began to display the full strength of his physical and mental powers, his life was cut short.

It was no easy task to find a successor to such a strong-hearted spirit as Thomson. Candlish himself acknowledged Thomson's contribution to the Church when he wrote at that time to Andrew Urquhart.

Dr. Thomson's death must have created a great sensation in Edinburgh. He will be much missed by the Church. It is lamentable to think of so young a man being cut off in the very vigour of his talents and in the midst of so many gigantic plans and labours of usefulness. It will be hard to get a worthy, or even a not unworthy successor. Some of Glasgow cannons are expecting a summons, but which of them - except perhaps, Welsh - is in the least degree competent.

---

1. Daily Review, October 20, 1873
2. Bayne, op. cit., p. 40
3. Ibid., cf. p. 43
4. Wilson, op. cit., p. 40
It was not long before the choice was James Martin. Shortly after, however, he was sent South for a rest being unable to continue his responsibilities due to ill health. While South the Church began a search for a new assistant, and Candlish's name was introduced. His more than four years association with moderate ministers had caused unwarranted doubts to arise relative to his theology and evangelical tendencies. By means of a letter from James Mitchell of Glasgow to St. George's Session Clerk, these fears were somewhat allayed. He wrote:

I have not heard Mr. Candlish, so that I do not personally know his style or sentiments; but Mr. Urquhart, whom you have seen as tutor to my cousins, and in whose evangelical sentiments you have, I daresay, confidence, was so fond of him as a preacher, that while he was at St. Andrew's he used to sit under his ministry; and I have repeatedly heard that he is a forceful and eloquent preacher. 2

A letter from Chalmers, the beloved leader of the Evangelicals, confirmed the reputation of Candlish's high evangelical position. And Cunningham corroborated Chalmers' declaration in a letter to one of the elders which said,

You are aware that I was a good deal prejudiced against Candlish . . . but I must say that all I have heard since I came to Edinburgh has tended to remove prejudice and to make me confide in his sincerity. . . 3

1. Roxbrough, later minister to St. John's, Glasgow, was the first assistant to Martin at St. George's and upon his departure to a pastorate the position fell vacant.

2. Wilson, op. cit., p. 48

3. Ibid., p. 65
No sooner had he been called as assistant to Martin than Regent Square Church London, became vacant by the removal of Edward Irving. Young Candlish had created such a high impression of his ministerial gifts and character that he was now invited to become pastor of Regent Square Church. Anticipating losing him to the London Church, St. George's took immediate steps not only to retain his services but to call him to fill the vacancy made by the death of Martin. So on August 17, 1834 his ordination took place and his full ministry and further usefulness to the Church had begun.

The "Athens of the North," as Edinburgh often was called, had been for many years acclaimed for its high intellectualism and cultural advantages - a home of poets, philosophers and scientists. Poetry and song had proclaimed its absorbing history and picturesque beauty of rocky crags and quaint lochs and glens. Candlish, however, saw growing up within the city a flagrant acceptance of infidelity and believed the Church was in grave danger. Shortly after coming to Edinburgh he depicted the conditions with remarkable vividness.

The Church here is truly in danger. A radical magistracy, and an infidel or semi-infidel population urged on by our political dissenters, who seem to have merged their spiritual calling and their religious duties in the work of revolutionary agitation, and to have lost the Christian in the demagogue - these are formidable adversaries...

1. Candlish had preached in the Regent Square Church in the previous summer for a period of four Sundays.


3. Wilson, op. cit., p. 55
For the first four or five years of his pastorate he devoted himself to the positive work of the ministry and to the needs of the parish, preaching, visiting, and organizing occupying most of his time. At the beginning, however, great demands were made upon the new minister to preach and speak at various public occasions. For "no sooner was (he) . . . ordained than his ability as a preacher was universally acknowledged." Demands from the outside were heavier than customary, due undoubtedly to the prominence of the pulpit he occupied as well as the "vivid eloquence and intellectual force of his sermons." These demands were not limited to preaching alone. According to custom, leading ministers were asked to deliver courses of lectures on topics vital to the religious interests of the community. Speaking of Candlish's lectures on those occasions, Bell said: "Candlish invariably raised the question under discussion to a platform unwontedly high, and cast around it a glow of genius and spirituality quite new and unlooked for."

Shortly after coming to Edinburgh he married Janet Broch, whom he had met at Bonhill. With her meek and quiet spirit she was indeed a helpmeet to him all his days, blessing him with sons and daughters nurtured in the Lord. The happiest moments of his life were spent in the fellowship of his family. "No man," writes his

3. Wilson, op. cit., p. 59
biographer, "had warmer family affections or deeper enjoyments of the felicities of the home circle." He received strength from being in the society of his children and wife. They looked forward to having him with them as much as he did to being with them.

When Candlish entered the ministry the Established Church's system for settling a minister in a church was known as "patronage;" that is, an heritor responsible for the parish church endowment recommended the minister to fill his church when it became vacant. Usually, these patrons, as they were called, took into account the suggestions of the church leaders in making such recommendations. In the course of time, however, this system was much abused and ministers were forced or "intruded" upon parishes against the people's will. By the Veto Act of 1834, the General Assembly directed that no patron could intrude an unacceptable minister upon an unwilling congregation. The issue grew and in time became one not wholly limited to the problem of patronage or intrusion, but one in which the very life and spiritual independence of the Church was involved.

The struggle known as the Ten Years' Conflict was only a year old when Candlish entered the sphere of his ministry in Edinburgh. The subject under debate was familiar to him for as early as 1827, he had expressed his view in a letter, written from Eton, to Urquhart which read:

1. Ibid.
2. Infra, cf. Chapter IV of this dissertation on the brief history of the problem of patronage.
What has moved the Irvine Presbytery to oppose Patronage? The law as it is now administered, undoubtedly requires revision. But should patronage be altogether abolished? I think the sale of it should be rendered illegal. I mean that it should be attached to the land, and, if possible, I should like to see some more effectual check than there is at present on the part of the people upon its abuse. 1

After only a few years, the smooth course of his ministry was interrupted by events which took place in the Church of Scotland in 1839. "The contest at first was merely about patronage," said Lord Cockburn, "but this point was soon absorbed in the far more vital question whether the Church had any spiritual jurisdiction independent of the control of the civil powers." Just as the expansion of the Church had been Chalmers' original passion, and his determination for its freedom was caused by the subsequent perception and insight that without self government the Church and all the aims at extension would be crippled and paralyzed, so the whole efforts of his "lieutenant" were concentrated on his congregational work and the promotion of religion and piety in the city where he preached. He not only preached, he practiced what he preached, and the Church's struggle was his struggle. Into it with all his spiritual zeal, intellectual foresight and logical mind went Candlish to defend the independence

1. Wilson, op. cit., p. 34; Bayne, in quoting this, places in italics "more effectual check on the part of the people," and remarks that Candlish did not know where to put the stress, but he did!

2. Oliphant and Seaton, Thomas Guthrie. ("Famous Scots Series;" Edinburgh: Oliphant Anderson and Ferrier, 1900), p. 53

3. Candlish, Cunningham and Guthrie were referred to as the "lieutenants" of Chalmers who was the pillar of the Church.
of the Church of Christ.

When towards the close of the Assembly in 1839, it seemed that even the evangelical party would be divided by the third conciliatory motion, Candlish "rose from an obscure place and delivered a speech of such eloquence as placed him at once in the front rank of debaters." This speech brought defeat to those opposing Chalmers' motion and ranked Candlish as "one of the boldest leaders of the non-intrusion party." He had spoken in controversy for the first time and was seen as one of the "transcendent sort, a leader among leaders."

It was not long before his growing reputation was known the length and breadth of the nation as well as across the waters. The leading evangelicals saw in him a young man of promising ability and keen mental powers. This broader attention stemmed not only from

1. Chalmers had made the motion that the Auchterarder Presbytery be instructed at once to abandon all rights which the Church might have to the emoluments of that parish in conformity with the decision of the House of Lords, though not to conform to it by the further step of intruding the presentee; and that a committee of Assembly should at once be appointed to confer with the Government on the unfortunate deadlock which thus ensued.

2. Infra, pp 127-128


5. Bayne, op. cit., p. 131
his reputation as a preacher and pastor, but from the conspicuous part he played in the affairs of Presbytery and General Assembly—defending the Crown Rights of the Redeemer.

The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon him as early as 1661 by Princeton College, now Princeton University. This was in consequence of his bold and uncompromising effort to lead the Church in difficult days when Erastianism appeared to gain the upper hand. Writing to him concerning this honor, Nicholas Murray, then President of Princeton College said:

... our whole Church is awake to the importance of your conflict, nor do I know of a minister, elder, or layman in the length and breadth of this land who does not entirely sympathise with you and the beloved brethren who are so ready to hazard all, that the Lord Jesus Christ may rule as King in His own Church, which He has purchased with His blood... the title of Doctor of Divinity was conferred... to shew our estimate of your great services in your controversies, and to manifest to the world where, and on what side, are to be found all our sympathies... 2

In later years even the White House in America was cognizant of the position the Scottish Presbyterian Church had taken on the problem of slavery. When Lincoln was President of the United States, an overture of the Assembly on the subject of slavery, which Candlish had composed, was brought to his attention. In David Macrae's *Americans at Home*, a gentleman speaking to Macrae

---

1. In 1865 the University of Edinburgh honored him with the Doctor of Divinity degree also.

2. Wilson, *op. cit.* pp. 160-1
on the subject of slavery, said:

I remember how pleased Mr. Lincoln was with a reply made by the Scottish Presbyterian Church to the pro-slavery church in the south, and said to a friend, 'I must read you this paper, Newton; it seems of more than ordinary ability.' He commenced reading, but had not got half through it before the tears began to come to his eyes, so deeply was he moved to find that, in spite of all her apparent sympathy with the south, Scotland was still sound on the question of slavery. 'That,' said he, emphatically, when he had finished reading, 'is one of the most complete arguments against slavery ever I read. It puts the whole question into a nutshell.'

As new and greater complications arose in the Church more and more important responsibilities were thrust upon Candlish. The Strathbogie case developed into a problem similar to the Auchterarder situation. The presentee to Marnoch, in the Presbytery of Strathbogie, had been rejected by the whole congregation. The majority of that Presbytery (being moderates) determined to proceed with the presentee in spite of the rejection by the congregation, even in the face of suspension. The Civil Court intervened on their behalf and interdicts were issued against the use of their church premises. Notwithstanding the interdicts, Candlish and other ministers served the flocks of the suspended ministers, preaching to the people in open fields.

At this time Candlish had been nominated to the Chair of Biblical Criticism at the University of Edinburgh. Because of his pertinacious refusal to obey the court's interdicts, and the severe criticism levelled at him from Lord Aberdeen, the presentation was

1. Quoted by Watson, *op. cit.*, pp 95-96
withdrawn. Referring to Candlish the Earl of Aberdeen charged, "This reverent gentleman, this Professor of Biblical Criticism, if dealt with by the Court in the same way as other men would be immediately sent to prison where he would have leisure to compose the syllabus of the first course of lectures." Not letting the matter drop there, Candlish sent a crisp and powerful retort to Lord Normanby, Home Secretary at that time. Concluding his letter he wrote:

For myself, it is of little consequences whether I preach the Gospel at Huntly, or prepare lectures in the Carlton Jail. But your Lordship may rest assured that there is a principle in this question, and a power sufficient to stir the country to its utmost depths... There is the strength of the centuries in its pith and marrow, and in its veins the life blood of a nation accustomed of old to fear God and honour the King.

Stir the country it did, but not as some had predicted.

In the Assembly of 1841, when the Duke of Argyll's Bill was introduced, Candlish "melted and almost carried away the whole house by his persuasive and pathetic appeal" to the opposition to acquiesce in the bill and end the conflict. By this time he was well known in Parliament and at Court, and had a talent for forming friendships with men of the most diverse opinions.

All of Scotland became a battlefield between the parties, and

1. Wilson, op. cit., p. 90
2. Watson, op. cit., p. 55
Candlish was singled out to be the "Achilles of the fray."  Guthrie was more pictorial and Cunningham more learned; but it was Candlish who appreciated the people's cause as it was related to the Church. Through voice and pen he brought all his powers to bear on defending the spiritual independence of the Church, but disruption seemed inevitable. The Disruption, properly understood, was the people's movement, and Candlish took it upon himself to inform the people on the actions taking place. Earlier he had helped float the *Scottish Christian Herald*, and then with Hugh Miller as editor, he had been instrumental in the publication of the *Witness* Newspaper. Travelling to London, Cambridge, Ireland and into the Northern Highlands, he defended the Constitution of the Church of Scotland and the freedom of the people. But the Government was unimpressed and proceeded under the assumption that if a secession did come (which they thought most unlikely) there would not be more than twenty or, at the most, thirty ministers who would secede. This small group would be "led by wild men like Dr. Chalmers, Professor of Theology in Edinburgh University, Dr. Thomas Guthrie of Old Greyfriars and Dr. Robert Candlish of St. George's."

The die was cast. May 18, 1843 approached and with it the General Assembly of that historic year. Public interest was roused.

---

1. Bayne, *op. cit.*, p. 216
to a high pitch. Edinburgh was thronged with expectant crowds. Speculation ran high. After prayer, Welsh, the Moderator of the Assembly read the protest that had been prepared by the Evangelicals against proceeding further: certain rights and privileges sanctioned by the Government infringed upon the liberty of the Constitution of the Church and violated the terms of the Union between Church and State. Concluding his remarks, the Moderator moved toward the door of old St. Andrew's Church followed by Chalmers, Candlish, Gordon, Cunningham, Guthrie and others. The shout, "They come, they come, thank God they come," electrified the air. Over four hundred Clergy-men behind Welsh, Chalmers and Candlish made the decision to throw in their lot with the Free Church.

Exactly what part did Candlish play in the entire struggle? It was true that "no name in the whole protestant world stood as high as that of Thomas Chalmers." He was the respected "father," but it was the unanimous verdict that "no man has been so great a power in his denomination for a lengthened period, or been more identified with the inner springs and outward causes of all its movements than the minister of St. George's." His life was wrapped up in the history of the Free Church. In fact, one historian hazards the

1. Steward and Cameron and Bayne make the statement that over four hundred ministers left the Church of Scotland to form the Free Church. A. J. Campbell gives an exact number of 451, while others make the number 471


opinion, "that had it not been for Dr. Candlish there never would
have been any Free Church at all." If there were any question about
Candlish's position before, with the death of Thomas Chalmers in 1847,
Robert Candlish unquestionably was established as the leader of the
Free Church.

Cunningham, Candlish's close colleague, was appointed to the
office of Principal in New College made vacant by Chalmers' death;
and Candlish to Chalmers' Chair in Theology. Providence again
prevented his leaving the ministry of St. George's, for before the
call was fully prosecuted, Alexander Stewart, minister-elect to succeed
Candlish, died. Consequently, acting "with that instinctive sense he
had of what was right and the best thing to do," he delivered his
introductory lectures and then wrote the Senatus requesting a six
months leave of absence. At the close of the six months he formally
resigned his Chair, and was once again received by his congregation
on as loving a footing as before.

No sooner had the Free Church been organized than she was
brought into conflict with the Scottish heritors or land-owners. Many
congregations were refused sites for churches and manses and were
forced to worship in the open fields; others in barns, sheds or any-
where that place could be found. St. George's congregation entered

Journal, Vol. XXX (1861) p. 211. This periodical was not sympathetic
with the principles regarding church government and the manner of
accomplishing its goal, but it recognized in Candlish the true leader
of the Church.

2. David Maclagan, St. George's, Edinburgh, A History of St. George's
Church, 1813-1843 and of St. George's Free Church, 1843-1873,
(London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1876), pp. 105-106
their new place of worship known as "the Brick Church" on Castle Terrace - not a pretentious building, but sufficient until further erection could take place. When the site controversy arose, Candlish entered it "with his usual unselfishness and zeal and struck sledgehammer blows against those men who thus abused their power." By pen and platform, he rallied to the support of the Free Church congregations against the bigoted stand of the landowners. Anticipating just such a problem, Chalmers, backed by Candlish, launched what became known as the Manse Fund, for the purpose of building desperately needed manses for those standing loyal to the Free Church's principles. "It was a Herculean labour," said John Cunningham, "with no foundation but the liberality of the people."

When the ministers left the Establishment they did so without any promise of a livelihood. Such a condition was anticipated also by both Chalmers and Candlish with the establishment of the Sustentation Fund. Every minister was to draw alike from this central fund to which all Free Churches contributed. Candlish saw this need two years in advance when in the autumn of 1841 he declared,

There can be no doubt, I should think, that if God gave the ministers of this Church grace to be so faithful to our principles as to consent to the loss of their benefices rather than surrender the principle for which she is contending, - I cannot doubt, I say, that He will give us further wisdom to provide in some such way as this that the ministry through-

---

1. Watson, op. cit., p. 33

out the land should share in common from the free-will offerings of the whole people. 1

Coming from the pastor of the richest congregation in the Church this was indeed an uplifting note to those whose sacrifices might be far greater. In the first year of its existence, the congregation of the Free St. George's Church subscribed about ten thousand pounds to the purpose of the Church. By keeping silent, by merely permitting his friends to enjoy what would have been for them the luxurious joy of showering money upon him, Candlish could have been far wealthier than ever before. He did receive two hundred pounds extra from his congregation, but of this he returned fifty, and refused to take his share from the Sustentation Fund. No wonder Gordon called him "essentially an unselfish man."

The Educational question further faced the Free Church. It began when, at the Disruption, the Free Church felt bound to provide for the teachers joining in the action of the Free Church group. Candlish stood midway between two classes of educationalist who were agitating for additional teachers sponsored by the Government. Of these the party belonging to the Establishment sought an extension of the existing system on an essentially sectarian basis; while the other party, consisting of men of different denominations, sought for the

1. Bayne, op. cit., p. 245
2. Our Scottish Clergy, ed. by John Smith, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1847), cf. p. 119
establishment of a new system on a catholic footing. Candlish and the majority of the Free Church sought to alter the national educational system retaining its presbyterian character but withdrawing it from the control of the Established Church. Opposing the national education scheme, Candlish, having been a member of the educational committee before the Disruption, threw his support and influence behind the parochial scheme and became "the chief organizer and extender of the school system of the Free Church." The masters as well as the teachers of the schools could be from any denomination. All that would be required would be that they should undertake to teach the doctrines of the Shorter Catechism. As time went on he had to acknowledge that his policy was incapable of solving all the educational problems, and the national system of education became firmly established.

Allied with all these problems during the crowded post-Disruption years was the continued need for missionary expansion. Candlish threw himself with the deepest and most sincere interest into all missionary work - foreign and home. His early interest in missions, made evident at Bonhill, grew with the years. Under his influence M'Cheyne and Bonar were sent on their mission to Palestine. To this work and the

1. Thomas Guthrie and Hugh Miller did not agree with Candlish in the educational scheme. Both Guthrie and Miller favored the nationalization of the schools. On this issue an alienation took place between Miller and Candlish which never healed.

2. Vide, Candlish, Letter to the Most Noble the Marquess of Lansdowne on the Reform and Extension of the Parish School System in Scotland. (Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1850)

mission to India and Africa, the already over-taxed strength of Candlish was given. Throughout his whole ministry he was making speeches on missions - home and foreign. "I look to the working of this committee," he said of the Home Mission Committee, "as one of the most important of all operations in which the Church is engaged." It was his passion, his life work to "kindle the lamp of the gospel in lands where it had never burned, and to revive it in hearts and places where it flickered or had gone out." From the first he had been an enthusiastic supporter of the church extension scheme launched by the Church of Scotland to meet the needs of those without the services or influence of the Church. The greater part of the power and prosperity of St. George's was associated with its earnest and successful efforts in this home mission work among the masses - a matter to which Candlish gave his personal energy. Candlish's unrivalled pulpit powers were almost equalled by his successful efforts in the erection of new territorial charges. No fewer than five new churches were built from the original parish of St. George's. St. Luke's was the first of the territorial churches to be erected, and then came the Fountainbridge Church out of which grew the Barclay and Viewforth Churches. It was in 1865 that he proposed the suburb of Roseburn should be taken up by his people. This was done and in time the fifth territorial church was built and a minister called. He is further credited with

1. Watson, op. cit., p. 95

2. The Christian Monthly and Family Treasury, op. cit., p. 279
the foundation of the Foreign Missions Association through which the contributions to the great work of the Church in India were substantially increased.

To his extensive labors within the Church were added the continual oversight of his large and impressive congregation. His presence, personal influence and sympathy were felt everywhere - by his beloved elders and respected deacons and by each and every one associated with the church in the humblest capacity. He continued to live three lives in one - that of minister, theologian and church leader.

The later years of Candlish's life also were crowned with distinction. In 1861 honor came to him in the Moderatorship of the Free Church General Assembly, and in the same year he was appointed to succeed Cunningham as Principal of New College, which post he held in conjunction with St. George's Church until his death. When the Cunningham Lectureship was founded, he was appointed first lecturer and delivered his course on the "Fatherhood of God," which gave rise to considerable controversy.

Notwithstanding his very active and busy life he still found time to write, and was considered a "voluminous author." His acknowledged works amounted to some twelve volumes, but these are a small part of what he contributed in the shape of letters, articles,

1. Ibid., cf. p. 118
2. Sermons, cf. p. xx
pamphlets, addresses, lectures, etc. One review stated that he wrote "in a nervous English, more like that of a student who had devoted his hours to the study of our language than that of a leader in every evangelical enterprise." Another remarked that his workmanship for the press was done "like a master in Israel."

Suffice it to say, it would involve far more than a succinct biographical account to depict all the details of his self-denying work in respect to practically every phase of the Church. It is only because his life was so public that we have touched in passing on so many of the questions of that day. If the reader receives the impression that this brief account seems to depict the work of three men rather than one, the impression is correct. One writer said, as early as 1847, that "no man, be his natural powers ever so strong, could do one-half of the work well which the Doctor (Candlish) undertakes." His thirty post-Disruption years could be epitomized in these words:

At the time he is forming and perfecting a complicated ecclesiastical machinery, he is erecting manses, schools, and colleges; conducting Bible, missionary and benevolent

1. Cf. bibliography at the close of this thesis
2. Reformed Presbyterian Magazine, November 1873, p. 444
4. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 118
societies; presiding over a large metropolitan audience, and preaching in the provinces, almost every week; writing letters of business, and preparing parliamentary documents; publishing exegetical and practical theology; discussing the nature and extent of the atonement, and taking the lead in presbyteries, synods, and assemblies, and, of consequence, speaking on every public question . . . All we can say is — and it is surely a good deal — that he attempts more than any other man, and accomplishes much well. 1

Living "three lives in one" told even upon his strong constitution. Thriving on mental activity, his nervous frame weakened for the first time in 1860, whereupon the suggestion of a colleague was made in order to relieve him of some of the pressure which he had borne so many years. The Reverend J. Oswald Dykes of East Kilbride was called and shortly joined him. But within five years this relationship was terminated on account of Dyke's ill health, and once again Dr. Candlish carried on alone. When in 1870 it became apparent that his own health was suffering from the strain, he was tremendously relieved to learn of the appointment of Alexander Whyte as his assistant. Although several times it seemed that his relationship with St. George's would be broken, yet he was able to continue as its loving and faithful pastor for nearly forty years. For thirty of those years the unbroken vigor of his intellect and tireless service was devoted to his congregation and the Church at large. But now with the burden of the congregational work laid upon Whyte, Candlish was able to enjoy a little more leisure which he sorely needed those declining years so filled with illness.

1. Ibid.
But he retained to the end the brilliance of his intellect. Never in his life were his old skill and tact more illustriously displayed than in the great meeting before his last Free Assembly when he expounded the cause for Union. He gave evidence that he penetrated beneath the letter and caught the great spirit of catholicity. Through his efforts he "preserved from disruption, the church for which he had laboured for forty years..." Fatigued as he was from that last Assembly, he appeared in the pulpit the following Sunday, June 15, 1873, and delivered what was to be his last sermon to his people.

The ensuing summer he spent in England, but returned in the fall in a disappointing condition. Early in October he realized the end was approaching, and remarked to a friend who was visiting him,

> It is hard to realize the entire step between this life and the future. When I try to think of it, I always find myself still taking an interest in the on-goings of the world and of the Church after my death, looking at my own removal, and so on, and cannot realize an entirely new scene. There is so little revealed in Scripture, except that it is 'to be with Christ.' And I just think of Him.

At last, on October 19, 1873, his great life, full of love for his people and tender affection for his family came to an end.

> The funeral was as simple as a public funeral could be for one so honored and loved. Magistrates in their robes and ministers from various denominations and from all parts of the country gathered

---

1. Daily Review, October 20, 1873

2. Watson, op. cit., p. 157
to pay respect to one who had been so long a beloved pastor, preacher and church leader. Shop-keepers closed their shutters while the procession of over a thousand followed the casket. Other thousands lined the streets - not a few weeping. In the family plot under the shadow of the Political Martyrs' Monument they laid his mortal remains, but his soul was at last united with Him whom he had loved so well, and served so faithfully, and about whom he had preached so earnestly throughout his earthly life.
PART II

CANDlish AS A PREACHER
PART II

CANDLISH AS A PREACHER

Introduction

When Candlish began his ministry in 1829 (though not ordained until 1834) the evangelical revival which reached its apex in the second and third decades of the nineteenth century was beginning to make its impact upon the pulpit. The moderates had enjoyed their heyday and now felt the rising impetus of the evangelicals. These two groups clearly portrayed the two existing styles of preaching. On the one hand, the moderates emphasized ethical teachings to such an extent that they were apt to disregard the doctrinal themes. On the other hand, the evangelicals, although not silent on Christian ethics, stressed theological discourses emphasizing such doctrinal teachings as the fall, the cross, and the resurrection. Candlish characterized the style of preaching in the opening decade of the nineteenth century in these words:

Discourse on virtue generally, or on particular virtues in detail, - under a favorite plan of division setting

first, the nature of virtue, secondly, its obligation, and thirdly, some reasons for the practice of it, - formed the staple of pulpit oratory in the moderate school; while the evangelical minister, on the other hand, was chiefly occupied in the primary and elementary work of pressing upon the acceptance of his hearers the unrestricted and unconditional offer of immediate pardon, peace, and eternal life, through the blood and merit of Christ. Thus the line was sharply drawn. 1

But when Candlish closed his ministry in 1873, the scene had changed considerably. The clear cut lines drawn between the two schools had disappeared; moderatism no longer had a strong hold on the people; doctrinal differences had become a matter of fine distinction; and in the main the Calvinism of the Westminster Standards had become the accepted position of both moderates and evangelicals.

The main purpose of this section is to picture Candlish, the preacher, in action - in his parish, in his study and pulpit, and in platform controversy.

It cannot be denied that there was great diversity of opinion as to the procedure which Candlish followed in stressing the spiritual claims of the Church and the Headship of Christ, but there was little diversity of opinion as to the place he held in the Scottish pulpit of his day. No one had more enemies in the Church of Scotland than the St. George's pastor. Extreme and violent language was used to describe him by them without apology, but the general opinion of most

1. Lectures to Students of New College at the close of 1872 Session by Candlish in his Gospel of Forgiveness, (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1878), p. 158

minds—friend and foe alike—regarding Candlish as a preacher is expressed in the following words:

He was an instance of a man pushing his way into the very front of pulpit orators, in spite of many positive blemishes, by the pure force of his intellectual pre-eminence, spiritual insight, and impassioned fervour, and there were not wanting many imitators who thought that they had clothed themselves in the strength of their model when they had succeeded only in putting on one of his weaknesses. 1

A. Taylor Innes, Advocate, called Candlish, "One of the greatest of 1 living preachers," and a Baptist writer considered him "one of the most talented and popular preachers north of the Tweed." Blaikie, writing of the preachers of Scotland in the nineteenth century said, "Candlish, notwithstanding his absorption in Church work, for which he had an equally strong liking and capacity, had rare gifts for the pulpit. In him a subtle intellect, a vigorous imagination, and a tender heart produced results like no other man's preaching." 2

Dr. Buchanan, knowing Candlish for nearly fifty years, placed him among the "greats" of the Scottish preachers saying, at his memorial service, "under the wise and wonder-working providence of God, Robert Smith Candlish had, for six years, been left to exercise and mat-

1. Taylor, op. cit., p. 257
2. Quoted by Jean Watson, op. cit., p. 169-170
3. The Baptist Magazine for 1858, Series IV, Vol. XIX, p. 482
ure those rare gifts and acquirements, and those marvellous capacities of intellect and utterance, which, when he was suddenly called to occupy the pulpit of St. George's, made him burst forth upon the world as perhaps, take him all in all, the very greatest preacher of modern times."

Sitting under Candlish's ministry in Edinburgh, and in later years a close friend and elder of his pastor, David Maclagan, author of the history of St. George's wrote: "There will probably be no great diversity of opinion as to the place he held among Scottish preachers. The pulpit preceding and immediately following the Disruption was strong in our land; but towering above all our ministers in the best element of pulpit power and effectiveness, Dr. Candlish stood alone."

Lord Armillan said: "As a preacher Dr. Candlish was, in the opinion of all, thoughtful, striking and eloquent, with extraordinary grasp of mind and power of enforcement; in the opinion of many he was the best and the greatest of preachers." No one denied that Candlish had many faults in delivery, yet the power of his spiritual insight and emotional fire far outweighed his ungainly peculiarities. "Destitute of natural oratorical gifts and somewhat ungainly in his manner, he attracted and even riveted the attention of his audience by a rare

---

2. Daily Review, October 20, 1873
3. The Scotsman, October 20, 1873
combination of intellectual keeness, emotional fervour, spiritual insight and power of dramatic representation of character and life."

Perhaps the most unbiased picture of Candlish as a preacher came from an English writer some eight years after his death.

As a preacher, he stood by himself. Wealth of theological material, inexhaustible fertility of intellectual resource, exhaustive analysis of human motive, a plethora of expository thought, a richness and definiteness of intellectual conception, a rare sympathetic comprehension of the intricacies and self-deception of the human heart, and of the lines of thought on which other minds moved, a thorough belief in the theology which he taught, a frank and bold assumption without any reserve or arrières pensées of the dogmatic positions of a Calvinistic theologian, a remarkable subordination of a singularly speculative intellect to the great evangelical verities as he understood and received them, a rare and lofty conception of Christian discipleship as it might be and is bound to be, an unfailing return from the misty but tempting regions of metaphysical speculation to the central truths which concern life and godliness, a hearty love for the simplest forms and applications of evangelical doctrine, a profound contempt for vague generalities, and a genuine spirituality which restrained his intellect from over-rash excursions, gave glow and life to his arguments, and at times raised his style into a rugged eloquence - these were among the characteristics of a man who, for many years, was justly regarded as one of the greatest Scottish preachers.

---


2. The Catholic Presbyterian, op. cit., p. 196
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THE PREACHER IN THE PARISH

The Man

In personal appearance Candlish gave the impression of being somewhat peculiar, and it was not strange for one seeing him for the first time to smile at what he saw. This was true of his adult years as well as of his childhood. To depict him only in his prestige, power, and tremendous force as a leader of men, as a preacher of the Word and as a pastor of a large wealthy city church was to create a portrait of a man entirely different from what he really was. Often a strange audience would experience a grave disappointment arising from the high expectations accompanying such a prominent name. When in 1847 he spoke in Glasgow, those who heard him for the first time could not but ask: Is this the man who sways his congregation, that leads the Free Church to its present position, who is both preacher and theologian? What they saw was a slight man with a large head, "which for size would not have sat amiss upon the shoulders of a giant." It was because of this tremendous contrast between the height of his forehead and the diminutive size of his other features that his portrait was considered

1. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 114
2. Taylor, op. cit., pp 255-256
health." In his forty-first year one writer prophesied that "his feeble frame cannot long endure such labour ... His slender attenuated body cannot bear long the superhuman activity of a vigorous and restless spirit."

But as his work and labor increased his energy abounded. If he had a heart of gold, he was amply supplied with an iron frame housing a strong nervous system that sustained his irrepressible energy. He thrived on work. Nevertheless, Alexander Whyte believed that he had grown prematurely old under the tremendous work as preacher, writer and leader of the Church.

Precise and orderly in matters of business, this habit unfortunately did not extend to matters of dress. Alexander Beith, touring with him for three weeks in the Highlands, characterizes his personal dress in this droll description:

Dr. Candlish, with exceptional occasions due to circumstances, which came like angel's visits, appeared as if, in making his toilette, he had mistaken the dress of another for his own; or as if he had shot his person into his own dress, not caring nor considering whether the articles which composed it were put on straight or awry; or whether, when adorned after his fashion, his appearance should excite either admiration or amusement.

1. Quoted by Jean Watson, op. cit., p. 331
2. *Our Scottish Clergy*, p. 119
3. Barbour, op. cit., cf. 151
Often on the streets of Edinburgh Candlish was seen wearing gold-rimmed glasses underneath a large hat. His coat fitted loosely and the wide trousers habitually appeared some two or three inches short of reaching his shoes. Undoubtedly, this manner of dress was partly due to his utter abhorrence of any show or display. Concerned with neither social position or prestige, he was entirely self-conscious.

The first impressions, consequently, scarcely conveyed a true picture of the man. To know him was to know the warmth and sincerity of his friendship, his generous heart and the naturalness of his nature. Perhaps the noblest feature of so popular and yet so impulsive a man was "the singular purity and stainless quality of his character. This is confirmed by Principal Rainy, who succeeded Candlish as principal of New College, when he said that in Candlish there was "an utter freedom from everything sordid." In him, indeed, is discovered a pure spirit gaining victory and triumphing over any physical impediment, and, as it were, "mounting up with wings as the eagle."

Men prominent in public affairs of the Church are sometimes supposed to suffer in their piety. The activity of their public life often infringe upon their own quiet time for devotion. Yet, "Candlish had simply to be heard in prayer, ... to see, in the simplicity,

---


2. Buchanan and Rainy, op. cit., p. 48

3. Thomas M'Crie, The Story of the Scottish Church, (London: Blackie & Son, 1875), p. 531
fervour, and evangelic savour of his utterance, that amidst his multifarious public duties he was living in daily communion with God."

He was familiar with the secrets of the divine life, but he was not one to open up the secret chambers of his heart for public inspection nor one to flaunt his piety, being no more demonstrative in his religious life than he was in his affection. He was much like Calvin in his unwillingness to disclose or dwell on his own inner experiences or struggles. But this is not the only point of similarity. It is interesting to note that both had a great concern for the present and future welfare of the Church, and both did all that lay in their power for the promotion of unity. If both had acute and often accusing minds, both had a sympathetic outlook. Neither enjoyed controversy for its own sake. Both had architectonic minds and quickly grasped the real point at issue stripping away all irrelevant material and revealing in debate the heart of the argument.

Because of a certain hasty abruptness, he tended to repel people who made no attempt to see under the surface of his exterior. Like other acute minds, he saw so rapidly what was to be seen he occasionally became impatient with others who could not discern as quickly. Yet with all of his pointedness, which he so often exhibited

1. Reformed Presbyterian Magazine, op. cit., p. 104

2. Refering to the author (Candlish) of the volume, Life in a Risen Saviour, it was remarked that he must be a "Christ loving man, who delights to contemplate the Saviour, not only as the God man, and the man of sorrows but as an advocate with the Father . . .," and further that the writer has imparted an "unction, a richness, a devoted earnestness to his treatment." United Presbyterian Magazine, New Series, Vol. II, (1858), p. 408
before the Presbytery and Assembly, he possessed the gentlest and tenderest of feelings, for underneath a somewhat gruff exterior beat a warm and kindly heart. On one occasion as he was leaving his vestry to lead a weekly prayer meeting, news reached him of the loss by fire of the home and furnishings of one of his members. At the close of the service he made such a strong appeal that before the congregation left that evening enough money was subscribed to re-furnish another house for this particular family. And on another occasion when he was visiting a school in Edinburgh and examining the students, he was so pleased with a certain class that he mentioned to the young teacher his willingness to be of assistance to him should the occasion ever arise. Some time later Candlish received a letter from the teacher reminding him of his promise and telling him of a new position he was unable to accept because of the lack of a proper suit of clothes. He asked for a loan of five pounds, and by return mail Candlish sent a check for twelve pounds, expressing his gratification at being able to assist the young teacher and assuring him he would need the entire amount.

Naturalness characterized his daily life accompanied by a genuine humility. Brilliant as his ministry was, his head was never turned by it. It was his sense of failings and shortcomings in all his work and walk which kept him truly humble.

1. Thomas Smith in *The Courant*, October 20, 1873
2. Buchanan and Rainy, op. cit., p. 25
He delighted in helping people and was equally saddened when his abruptness had hurt someone. One of his children told of an incident when he had spoken abruptly to her - seemingly without a cause. That night, at bedtime, he visited her room, confessing his abruptness and seeking her forgiveness. No wonder father and daughter were bound closer to each other in love and understanding through such an experience.

His generous and forgiving nature is further illustrated by his taking the initiative in the healing of the alienation which occurred between William Cunningham and himself. It involved the college question - whether there should be three colleges or one. Candlish, "more closely in touch with the trend of opinion in the church" was for the building of the three colleges - in Aberdeen, and in Glasgow as well as in Edinburgh. Cunningham, believing that to build other centers of training at that time would jeopardize the whole ministerial training, advocated strongly the strengthening of the one college at Edinburgh first. A breach occurred which was lamented throughout the entire Church. The alienation ended, however, as suddenly as it began. Candlish’s generous heart was moved upon hearing of Cunningham’s failing eyesight. He wrote, "My dear Cunningham," in the warmest sympathy, totally ignoring the previous incident and making no explanations. Restless until he was assured how the letter was received, he asked Guthrie to speak to Cunningham.

1. Watson, op. cit., p. 38
and ascertain his reactions, and was overjoyed to learn that the estrangement was swept away. A month or two later upon learning that due to lack of funds Cunningham was hindered from visiting a German oculist, Candlish was instrumental in raising some seven thousand pounds privately for that purpose.

But behind his public life of debate, controversy, heated words and short tempers, there was a private life known only to his closest friends. One who knew him for nearly half a century called his private life one of the "simplest and most natural and most unpretending kind." From the incessant labors of the day he hurried home where he could rest with his family, and from whence he would go refreshed for the arduous task of the morrow. His meticulous habits, (apart from dress) found expression in the surprising manner in which he took notice of the household details. Sharing with his beloved wife the parental control, he was moved more to sorrow than to anger by any display of disobedience. When discipline was necessary, it was administered with a gentle voice and kindly hand.

Habitually he commented on the news to the family at breakfast, keeping them abreast of contemporary events. He looked forward to being with his family, but no more than they did in his being with them. When time permitted, he enjoyed an afternoon walking or romping

1. Symington, op. cit., p. 138 This amount seems excessive, but such was the alleged result.
2. Buchanan and Rainy, op. cit., p. 25
with his children, or perhaps he was found engineering a boating expedition or suggesting a picnic, and at these times he was always the youngest of them all. To those who knew him intimately his perennial youthfulness was refreshingly charming. Not only was he fond of his own but he enjoyed other children as well. On one occasion when the Kirk-session meeting was held in the home of Dr. Keith Johnston, elder at St. George's and geographer to her Majesty, Queen Victoria, Candlish, who had arrived in time for the meeting, was noticeably absent when the session began. Upon looking for him they found him in the nursery happily playing with the children. Lord Cockburn, writing in his Memorials summarized it all by saying, "In private life he is thoroughly good, unassuming, amiable, playful and contented."

Mention should be made of his subtle humor. When Principal, Candlish gave no lectures but confined himself to delivering the opening and closing addresses and to the examining and criticizing of the students' discourses. At these times he could be quite outspoken, but even so there was often displayed a facetiousness of manner. One recalls how Candlish "tomahawked" a student with the following remarks, delivered with the well-known burr, flash of eye and protrusion of underlip. "All I have got to say about the discourse is" (raising his voice) "that one half should be struck out, and " (lowering it again) "it doesn't matter which half!" Although little

1. As told to the writer in a personal interview by Professor R. Henderson, grandson of Dr. Candlish and Professor (Emeritus) of Scots Law at the University of Edinburgh
if any, humor is revealed in his speeches or addresses, away from the
pulpit or platform, with his family or friends, he was the life of
any party. Beith described him on his Highland tour as being "gay
as a lark." A current periodical recalled that "his playfulness,
his keen enjoyment of everything, the flashes of wit, the spouting
of poetry, the raid into the luncheon basket before the time, all
lent a charm to the scene" of an afternoon excursion with his wife
and children.

With all his playfulness of spirit he readily made the transition
to more serious and sacred topics. It was the genius of the
man to move from church courts, engrossed in controversy to the
quiet of a bereaved home; or to move from controversy to elevated
thoughts on great Biblical truths.

The Bible was the book for his family as well as his people.
With keen earnestness he probed to the very heart of the Scriptures,
and radiated the warmth of his love and reverence for the Book to all
his children. A favorite study with them was the Epistles of Paul.
They were read repeatedly and with each succeeding reading there was
an increased enthusiasm.

1. Beith, op. cit., p. 45
2. Christian Monthly and Family Treasury, op. cit., p. 280
3. His son, James, became professor at Trinity College, Glasgow,
and author of several volumes of theological works.
4. Candlish had his own thumb index system for rapid location of
particular chapters from which he desired to quote.
In this connection what he practiced with his own family he purposed to accomplish with the families of his congregation. To him the Word of God was the true instrument by which the heart-longings, frustrations and needs of his people were to be met. He had some very definite views regarding the use of the Bible in pastoral visitation. In a lecture to the Young Men's Christian Association he expressed some of these.

If indeed we deal with a weapon (the Bible) so admirably and exquisitely fitted to the various elements of force and of feeling, in men's nature, then clearly the more closely we have access to that nature and to its workings in particular minds, the better may be our hope of success. If by our instrumentality the word of God which we handle is to have its free and full force, we must assist in bringing it to bear, not on men congregated in masses merely, but on families apart and on individuals apart. Hence in all cases in which the word is running swiftly and working powerfully, there will be an increased earnestness in seeking for such private and confidential ministrations on the people's side, and an increased alacrity and delight in granting them on the side of the pastor: and not merely in cold and formal visitations, but in meeting and communing of two or three where reserve is laid aside and hearts are laid bare there will be openings for the most precise and pointed applications of Divine truth - opportunity of speaking a word in season.

The Pastor

For some thirty nine years the unbroken vigor of his brilliant intellect and untiring service were devoted to his congregation and to the Church at large. It had never been his ambition to minister to a large city church. The summit of his aspirations had been a quiet

country charge. But believing the call to St. George's was from God, he labored earnestly there as pastor "not out of fidelity merely, but obeying the most constraining impulses of his heart." Not only was he pastor to St. George's but also to the many ministers of the city. Every troubled minister knew that in Candlish they could find a willing helper and a sympathizing friend. Becoming at a leap the "prince of debaters," he acquired a tremendous influence over thousands of his own countrymen but yet never lost his hold upon the warm affections of his congregation.

As pastor he was greatly beloved, and his early years at St. George's were engrossed in the preaching, visiting and organizing work of his parish. He might have passed his life in the quiet discharge of his pastoral office had not the non-intrusion controversy, which resulted from the Veto Act of 1834, occupied a wider sphere of his labors. St George's had not experienced a great deal of pastoral work under the ministry of Andrew Thomson nor under that of James Martin. Consequently, in reality Candlish's primary concern was the parish, and to the very end it continued to be his chief concern although church courts claimed an enormous amount of his valuable time.

1. Symington, op. cit., p. 137
2. Supra, p. 25 and infra, pp 128-129
He carried on a regular system of visitation until his increasing responsibilities of public church business made this impossible. Alexander Whyte reported: “In the earlier years of his ministry, Dr. Candlish visited the homes of his people most assiduously, particularly in the poorer districts of his parish; latterly, to his great regret, his numerous occupations of a public nature — thrust upon him by the stern necessities of a troubled time — in a great measure prevented these domiciliary visits.” Nevertheless, just as there were few parishes in Scotland in which his clarion voice had not been heard preaching, so also there were few homes in his parish which had not experienced at one time or another the warmth and glow of his pastoral heart. He won the love and confidence of all his flock, bringing light and joy to the sickbed or comfort in time of sorrow and death. “The fearless champion ... became the gentle and subdued comforter in hours of suffering and trial.”

Contrary to popular opinion, his leadership in ecclesiastical affairs in no way unfitted him for the quiet congregational work except to take time which otherwise would have been devoted to pastoral visitation and study. As long as his strength permitted, to the very end in the presence of sickness and sorrow, "he continued to be greatly esteemed and prized as in the performance of any of his numerous duties." If like John he was a son of thunder,

1. Kirk-Session Minutes of St. George’s, November 2, 1873
2. Daily Review, October 20, 1873
3. Kirk-Session Minutes of St. George’s, November 2, 1873
he also was an apostle of love. He was as signal in his ministrations in the presence of sickness, death and bereavement as in the pulpit, platform or in church courts. "His feeling heart," writes Jean Watson, "his command of Scripture language, his common sense, and his perfect taste made him a son of consolation, as thorough, as in intellectual power, his eloquence and courage made him a son of thunder in the halls of high debate." His own life had not been without personal sorrow and bereavement, and through such experiences his sympathetic nature matured.

Every member, however humble, was able to count on his personal help and his pastoral counsel. Devoid of snobbery, especially that which might tempt some to be more charitable to people of means, he never displayed a greater interest in any man because of his wealth or position. Says a contemporary, "To the 'aristocracy' of used intellect he paid a hearty homage, but for the patronage of men of rank he had nothing but scorn." No troubled visitor, even during hours of study or rest, was ever sent away without some kindly word. Proud of him as their pastor, his flock was equally attached to him as their kind and sympathizing friend. The affectionate relationship

2. Watson, op. cit., pp. 167-168
3. Candlish had lost by death his sister, brother and two of his own children.
4. Catholic Presbyterian, op. cit., p. 188
which existed between Candlish and his people is displayed by a pastoral letter written by him on his birthday in the spring of 1872, just one year prior to his death. It also gives a rather concise account of his pastoral work during his years as minister of St. George's.

I stand in doubt this day, as to whether my active ministry among you has or has not come to a close. Some indications there are of a partial restoration of health, that may admit, to some extent, of my resuming duty. But I cannot say that these inspire me with much confidence. And the failure of mental vigour and elasticity, as well as of bodily strength, with which I have been visited, and am still affected, is apt to discourage anything like sanguine hope. It has been a ministry of some considerable length of time that I have been discharging among you; and in the commencement and continuance of it alike, I think I may trace, without undue presumption, some indications of a higher wisdom and a stronger will than my own. It was not originally my seeking. When I came to Edinburgh in February 1834, to be assistant to the saintly Mr. Martin, it was my hope that I might thus find my way to what was then the summit of my aspirations - a quiet country charge. The early interdict laid by the kirk-session on my entertaining any proposal of the sort, and the subsequent steps taken to secure my settlement in St. George's, were matters of surprise and wonder to me. The affair evidently was ordered for me and not by me. In little more than a year after my ordination and induction as minister of St. George's in August 1834, my health seemed so affected that I was fain to accept a presentation to a charge in this city, likely to be nearly as important, but less burdensome. (He then refers to other two instances of leaving the church and continues). I need scarcely say that on none of these occasions was I influenced by anything like a desire to be separated from you. I never had the slightest cause or occasion for such a feeling. Still in all of them my own purpose was hindered and

1. This letter is quoted quite extensively since it gives an insight into Candlish's heart and mind in respect to his pastoral relationship as well as appearing in no published volume on Candlish's life.
and thwarted. I remain among you, not certainly against my will, but yet in deference to events not under the control of my will. So far, my remaining was not my spontaneous choice, but my appointed lot. This is a thought which has sometimes comforted and cheered me not a little; and at all events, it may well lead both you and me, as our earthly connexion draws near its close, to look back upon it and review it as being of a somewhat different character from any that a merely voluntary association or agreement between us might have formed. . . The winter has seen a very chequered congregational history. Death has visited many of your families and it has been a heavy grief to me that I have been entirely prevented by pain and weakness and nervous prostration from seeing dear friends on their sick and dying beds, going with their remains to the tomb, or comforting by personal sympathy and converse surviving mourners and weepers. (Then he commends them to Alexander Whyte). For, in truth, such treatment that I have always uniformly met with at your hands, I suppose few ministers have ever had to acknowledge. I am not now to confess my faults and lament my shortcomings, excepting only to thank you once more for your signal forbearance and patience. I have been greatly hindered in my ministerial walk and work among you by being so early required to give myself so much to the public business of the church; my habits of study have been broken; my taste and capacity for visitation interfered with; and my whole manner of discharging duty has taken a character of uncertain fitness by no means favorable to steady toil and progress. How you have borne with me all through, I need not say. For many offences you have made large allowance. You have cared for me in weakness, and welcomed me back on partial recovery of strength. You have anticipated my wants and repeatedly come forward with unexampled munificence to set my mind at ease as to the care of my own health, and a due provision for my family . . . 1

In no part of his pastoral work was his interest greater than in his Bible classes, which he conducted to the very last. He had a disconcerting habit of pointing at people asking, "Can you answer

1. *Daily Review*, October 20, 1873
that?" And although people sat in fear and trembling lest they be called on, yet his classes were always well attended.

The rapidity with which he brought the congregation into working order was indeed a remarkable accomplishment. In fact, he was the spark behind every endeavor in the church, often attending choir rehearsal and suggesting various tunes, taking a warm and personal interest in the Sunday School being ready to assist either pupil or teacher.

Ever challenging his people, he expected and received from them full cooperation in any special effort. Not given to the use of sensational methods or appeals, he relied completely on his congregation to undertake any fresh enterprise. This was remarkably illustrated in the noticeable increase in contributions to foreign missions from St. George's Church. In this he received the full cooperation of his office bearers, for it was a recognized fact that no minister in the world had such a session around him as Candlish. No fewer than four Judges of the Court of Session, three Lord Provosts, three Professors of the University, the Procurator of the Church of Scotland, Advocates, Surgeons and other men of affairs were, at one time or another, among the eldership of the church.

Besides these prominent men at least seven Lords were seat-holders, as well as other men of high position. Sir William Hamilton, a faithful member (perhaps the greatest mind in all Scotland

1. St. George's contribution to foreign missions in 1840 was sixty-three pounds, eight shillings; in 1873, four hundred and eighty-three pounds. Cf. Maclagan, op. cit., p. 72
2. Barbour, op. cit., p. 610
at that time) always was arrested by "the subtle and logical processes of thought in Mr. Candlish's sermons." The Bruces of Kenna, one of the oldest and most esteemed Scottish families, and the family of Cleghorn were weekly worshippers. Not the least member of this unusual congregation was Principal Thomas Chalmers who delighted to hear the intellectual and high spiritual tone of Candlish's preaching. "Probably in no single church in Scotland has there been gathered during its history so great a number of remarkable men."

This is not to imply, however, that the church only courted families of prestige and position, for among its congregation were those from the poorer families in the city as well. Candlish was deeply concerned about these families and it was with those that he spent much of his early years of visitation. It was with these people in mind, too, that the territorial churches, referred to previously, were built and supported. Both before and after the Disruption university students were attracted to St. George's, for Candlish had a peculiar talent of being able to reach all types of people whether peasant or professional, whether men of rank or of low degree. After the Disruption forty-five New College students united with Free St. George's, and eternity alone will reveal the influence he had upon their lives, and, in turn, upon the lives of those to whom they ministered.

---

1. Maclagan, op. cit., p. 67
2. Ibid
Here too, he became a "father in God" to many young assistants, including Oswald Dykes and Alexander Whyte. Referring to Candlish, Whyte late in life called him, "that prince of preachers, that humblest minded of men, that father in God to me." Like many of his fellow-students in New College years before, Alexander Whyte had been powerfully attracted by the preaching of Candlish, and would boast on Monday mornings of the "incomparable preaching" he heard on Sunday.

It has been alleged that some students are often more impressed by the preaching in Edinburgh than by their college classes, for Edinburgh always has been a city famous for pulpit eloquence. But with W. G. Elmslie, student of New College during Candlish's Principalship, and later the esteemed Professor of Hebrew in the Presbyterian College in London, it was the reverse. His customary comment about a preacher whom he had heard the Sunday before was "middling," but with Candlish, however, he admitted that it was different, and that he preferred him to any other Edinburgh preacher. On one occasion he wrote:

At present I had sooner hear Dr. Candlish than anyone. He is so strong and honest, and wide in his sympathies. His address to the students was full of passion and feeling, and sympathy with the difficulty of believing some of our Calvinistic doctrine, such as eternal ruin, heathens' doom, etc. He went a very great length indeed and ended by saying it was too hard for him, and his heart drew him the other way, and all he could

do was to fall back on his loyalty to Christ. It was more a picture of his own heart's struggles than the Principal's address. 1

If the four weeks of April 25 to May 17, 1843, are indicative of Candlish's activities, he was excessively liberal in his time and efforts.

April 26 - Conducted prayer meeting
April 27 - Preached sermon for the Edinburgh Magdalene Asylum
April 30 - Sermons on Sunday at St. George's
May 3 - Conducted prayer meeting
May 4 - A sermon at St. George's
May 6 - Preached the annual sermon to Sabbath School Children
May 7 - Sermons at St. George's Sunday
May 10 - Conducted prayer meeting
May 11 - Preached a sermon on behalf of the Society for Propagating Christian knowledge in the Highlands and Islands.
May 14 - Sunday sermons at St. George's
May 17 - Conducted prayer meeting
May 18 - The Disruption

These four weeks, of course, include also, in addition to his pastoral work, the leadership he gave to the Church at large and the many business meeting he conducted at St. George's. In Candlish his elders recognized a gifted instinct for organization and willingly followed his lead.

Never idle, he readily accepted invitations to introduce ministers to their parishes, or to conduct memorial services of fellow-ministers no matter how far he had to travel. Thus, though only a few short months before his own death and weak in body, he delivered the memorial address for his dear friend Thomas Guthrie.

1. Nicoll and Macnicoll, op. cit., p. 17
He also travelled to Regent Square Church, London, to perform the service for his beloved friend James Hamilton. As a sympathizing friend and pastor he addresses the congregation with:

And now to you, the congregation of my brother 'greatly beloved,' what shall I say? I have come to share your sorrow and your joy: your sorrow, as I lament with you our great bereavement; your joy, as with you I follow our much-loved one into his quiet rest now, after all his labours in the bosom of the Eternal. 1

This was the pastor united with a people in the bond of love and good works. Here was a man whom the older members knew as neither aloof or conceited, as neither too old in his ideas or too young in his message. Here was a man who, the younger members felt, could speak their language, one who was himself like them - a sinner seeking God's guidance and deliverance. He was deeply human and his people knew it. He was not someone who did not understand their problems as he addressed them from the pulpit, but one who was experiencing the same struggles and frustrations as themselves. They saw in him a man, but a man who exalted Christ as Lord and Savior. They saw in him their priest - who spoke to God on their behalf - but a priest who also was tempted and tried. They saw in him a prophet - speaking to them for God - but one who himself had heard God speak to his own heart and mind. They saw in him their pastor - leading them through their problems and difficulties - but one who was himself following humbly the Shepherd of his soul.

1. Maclagan, op. cit., p. 149
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"He failed in no activity, but the pulpit was his throne." These words, written of Alexander Whyte, also could have been attributed to his predecessor. And it is the aim of this present chapter to show him in his throne; in particular, to set down in his own words his conception of the preacher's office, to see him in his study and pulpit, and to analyze more closely the finished product of his work.

The Preacher's Office

During his Principalship, as has been noted, it was his privilege to address the students of New College at the opening and closing of each session. On these occasions he spoke on subjects close to his own heart and relative to the students' future ministry. Two such addresses appear at the close of his volume of discourses, The Gospel of Forgiveness, published posthumously. That the preacher's office and function was uppermost in his thinking is evident from the subjects considered in these lectures, namely: the function of the preacher, and the preacher as a loyal ambassador. The preacher primarily has a definite and specific message to deliver on the authority

of Christ to the hearer, but a message that demands a reply. In other words, the preacher is an ambassador for Christ. This is, to be sure, the preacher's distinctive office and calling and Candlish never forgot it. He declared it was the preacher's function "to give instruction, to convey information, to investigate, elucidate, and explain difficult problems in theology and religion, as in other sciences and arts; - to open up the Scriptures, and unfold in an orderly way their inexhaustible fulness of grace and truth as containing, all throughout, the unsearchable riches of Christ; - to discuss controverted questions and establish dogmatical conclusions; - to be the expositor and defender of the whole truth as it is in Jesus." As the preacher is a man with a message, so the source of the message is the Word of God, the Bible. He believed the Scriptures should be approached without any doubt as to their authority but with confidence saying, "Thus said the Lord." No one held a more rigid doctrine of inspiration than Candlish, yet he emphatically contended that "any inclination to oppose or limit free inquiry, or free speculation in any line fairly open to human research should be resisted. Any dread - any jealousy or resentment of results should be repudiated."

The preacher, furthermore, is not alone in his work, but the Holy Spirit is working with him in his study, in his reading, thinking, composition and delivery of his discourse. In this the Spirit assists not only in the preparation of the discourse but in the preparation of the recipient as well. "At every moment," said Candlish, "when

2. Ibid, p. 475 Vide Appendix B of this thesis where his view of Scripture is considered briefly.
you are delivering the message to your hearers, the Holy Spirit is moving among them, upon them, within them. You speak; he works. And his working goes along with your speaking."

Candlish put a great deal of stress upon the fact that the message of Christ should be directed to men on a very personal and individual basis. Preaching must proceed on the belief that there is nothing like a "wholesale process" or "general amnesty," but that Christ deals with men individually. As a loyal ambassador of God, then, it was the preacher's task to make his message - a message of peace, pardon and forgiveness - a very vital and personal appeal. He refused to reckon on any gregarious and collective regeneration of humanity, and addressed himself to the conscience of men one by one, "that so the kingdom may at last come, whose citizens are all holy." This personal, individualistic character permeates his every discourse.

The Preacher in his Study

Candlish brought to his desk a keen intellect, an understanding and sympathetic heart, and a personal sense of the fellowship and communion of Christ. Intellectually, Candlish ranked with the best of his contemporaries. In fact, Hugh Miller, editor of the Witness,

1. Ibid., p. 468
2. Infra cf. p. 200, in theology section on Atonement
3. Candlish, Gospel of Forgiveness, p. 482
did not hesitate to consider his mental capabilities as fitting him par excellence for the Chair of Biblical Criticism at the University, which was denied him, and placed him second to none in all of Scotland. He wrote:

> It is now too late even for the bitterest enemies of Dr. Candlish to dispute the fact that, for at once versatility and profundity of talent - for that minute acquaintance with the knowledge and opinion of others, in which true learning consists - and that ability of forming new combinations of ideas, which constitutes originality of thought - he stands pre-eminent - second, at least, to no man in Scotland.  

From the beginning of his university days he was blessed with a natural logical faculty which became more highly developed by time and experience. His early interest and mastery in the use of logic left its hallmark on the boy and the man, for his sermons are replete with close logic each like a link in a strong chain. If he had a philosophical and theological mind, he also was known for his practical propensity - a rare combination. Like Cunningham he was versed in the facts of theology and the Scriptures which were solidly and clearly ascertained, but unlike Cunningham he also enjoyed his excursions into the speculative realm. He was keenly sensitive to the atmosphere of his age, and was in touch with the time in which he lived. Familiar with public affairs, he saw each problem in the context of his age and in the light of his interpretation of Scripture.

> Excelling in the delineation of human character, he knew the fire of tender love for the souls of men, and because he maintained

1. Quoted by Maclagan, op. cit., pp. 77-78
a deep conviction of the corruptness of man's nature he laid a
strong emphasis upon the power of the cross to cleanse, relieve and
heal. He may have been guilty of failing to entertain, or of not
preaching exactly what people wanted to hear, but his discourses
were what he believed, under the guidance of God, the people needed.
Unlike a student in a cloister, he had intercourse in daily life
with the peasant and the peer. His hand was on the pulse of the
people, not simply because he read widely, but he knew people because
he knew himself. He reveals this in one of his lectures to the
students of New College at one of their closing sessions.

But if I wish to learn what man is, or what is in man, for the purposes of gospel preaching and the delivery
of my message from God, I had better tarry at home than
range far and wide abroad. In that view, the study of
myself is my best way of studying mankind; and when I
bring the message to bear personally and particularly
on myself, - on my own sins and sorrows, and wants and
fears, and loves and hates, and hopes and joys - on the
manifold moods and experiences of my own soul, I am
equipping and accomplishing myself in the very best way
possible for wielding that message as my weapon in
dealing with all sorts of men and all sort of cases.
For in me, as in a microcosm, in my bosom, agitated by
every influence that can reach me from above, from
around, from beneath, all that is in any man may in a
sense be found. Observing the movements of my own
consciousness and conscience, in the search light of
God's holy word, I can understand and enter into all
the frames and feelings in others with which the
gospel has to deal. 1

From a daily familiarity with his Greek Testament he developed
a deepening religious experience. At his desk the things of the
spirit were invested with material form - the natural became the
symbol of the spiritual. Men were visualized in their true relationship

to God. No preacher of his day "set before himself a loftier ideal of personal holiness, or has insisted with greater vigour that the aim of the disciple must be nothing lower than the sinlessness of Christ." He knew the gracious and glorious privilege of union with Christ and of the blessing associated with this union. In all, he brought to his desk a life that was generous, buoyant, natural and sincere. The truth had so laid hold on him that it shone through his whole intellectual and moral being, through his affections and character. Preaching was for him the natural overflow of his religion.

Candlish chose the ministry because he had heard the call of God to his heart; because he had heard incredibly good news which he must share; because he knew Christ intimately and exulted in this friend and elder brother of whom he was immeasurably proud. Like Brooks he called no conviction his own until his mind and conscience had accepted it as true. Taking seriously the Biblical order, "I believe therefore do I speak," Candlish admonished his students to come to know both the heart of man and the heart of God by personal insight and experience through the teaching of the Holy Spirit. In this he was advising them to follow his own formula given in these words: "And so I learn to speak because I believe . . . to testify

1. Catholic Presbyterian, op. cit., p. 196 Wide p. 230, of this thesis


In a word, he was firm in the conviction - and it is illustrated on every page of his published discourses - that the truth must be first "digested," becoming a part of his own life and personality, before it could be effectively transmitted to others.

His study was filled with the tools of his trade - his books. The number and variety, and the quantity he managed to read in his busy schedule was surprising. Of standard volumes there were plenty, and all the current literature in both poetry and prose could be found on his shelves. Like Robertson of Brighton, he read profusely in world literature, but used such material rarely in the pulpit. No book, however, could take the place of his Bible.

By and large, his Bible became his one source book and supreme instrument in his discourse preparation. Across its stage walked every type of personality. Everything man was to believe about God and the duty God requires of man was revealed between its covers. For Candlish the Word of God "deals with all the various parts of our mental and moral constitution, as reasonable, responsible, active beings, and as beings subject also to emotions and passions. It has in it a sufficient power to convince the understanding, to convict

2. In contrast to men like Candlish, Milton denounced those ministers he heard "in his own day who posed as preachers though they had nothing to give, so 'the hungry sheep look up and are not fed.'" W.M. Macgregor, The Making of a Preacher, (London; 1945), p. 36
the conscience, to convert the will, to move and stir the heart."

The Bible, therefore, was the one sufficient tool in the hands of the preacher, interpreted under the guidance of the Spirit, which effectively brought men into an encounter with God in Christ. As all roads lead to Rome, so Candlish held that each and every passage leads to Christ. Said he to his students; "remember that all Scripture testifies of Christ."

His discourses are full of Biblical references, and his vocabulary reveals a remarkable acquaintance with the language of Holy Writ. He loved the Book; he knew the Book; and he preached from the Book. This is not to imply that his preaching promulgated only eternal truths and neglected the practical side of life. The two never were divorced in his thinking. "For Candlish," wrote Rainy, "everything in the Scriptures looks toward life and practice."

Another book familiar to him was God's book of nature, and his exhortations to his students clearly reveal his interest in the physical universe and its value for preaching.

Over the whole field of nature the preacher may roam; all things in heaven and earth are his - the sun, the moon, the still and starry firmaments, the cloudy sky, the rolling thunder, the raging waves, the quiet

2. Candlish, The Gospel of Forgiveness, p. 466
3. In one sermon alone, picked at random, thirty-two passages of Scripture are quoted either directly or indirectly. Candlish, "Spiritual Enlightenment," Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, cf. pp. 3; ff.
breath of spring; the green and tender grass, the flowers of the field, the trees of the forest, the lofty mountains, the lowly vales; the fowls of the air also, the beasts that roam the desert, the domestic tribes, - all the works of God are at your command, for illustration, ornament and appeal.

Although Candlish exhorted his students to use freely the whole field of nature in preaching, yet rarely did he appropriate it for his own sermons.

Thorough investigation has failed to bring to light any detailed account of the actual mechanics of his formal writing of discourses. Nothing is known of his daily routine, how long he was engaged in study at his desk, how he chose a text, how his subject was unfolded to him or any such precise information usually revealed in an autobiography or in personal papers. Candlish generally destroyed his correspondence, and consequently, there is little manuscript material available.

It is known, however, that in the early years of his ministry his mornings were spent faithfully in study, but in later years this practice was somewhat relaxed, not because he lacked the discipline of study but simply because his responsibilities in public church affairs became so pressing his study hours could not be guarded rigidly.

How he contrived, in the busy years of the Ten Years’ Conflict, to

1. Candlish, Gospel of Forgiveness, p. 465

2. In the library of St. Andrew’s University there are twenty-seven manuscripts comprising personal letters from R. S. Candlish to Dr. Mackintosh Mackay of Dunoon written between November 11, 1846 - March 6, 1852, all of which deal with committee problems in the Free Church Assembly.
uphold his high standard of preaching was a mystery to all his people. Only by his power of physical endurance, nervous energy, force of habit and methodical mind was he capable of maintaining his pulpit eminence. In later years some of his study and writing of necessity must have been done "on the wing," as both Spurgeon and Beecher tended to do by reason of their busy schedules.

That he had methodical habits is witnessed to by the order and neatness of his study. This is, of course, a reflection of his methodical mind. His desk was carefully ordered despite his large correspondence; all notes, discourses and books were filed away. One keen observer remarked:

Everything was in its right place, and could be found at once, and you might have fancied that you were in the quiet study of one who had few connections with the outer world, instead of the minister of a large congregation - a man on whom devolved the care of all the churches, and who was more or less involved in all the salient questions and discussions of the day. 1

His sermon preparation was supplemented by a thorough mastery of Barrow, whom he studied for his style and copious clarity. Both Chalmers and his assistant, Edward Irving, also played an influential part in the final product of Candlish's pulpit oratory, but he imitated no one. Speeches and debates on the floor of Assembly were never written, but discourses always, unless circumstances intervened, as once occurred when Candlish was preaching in London. The hotel

---

1. Watson, op. cit., p. 163 She also refers to the method Candlish adopted for keeping his materials, sermons, lectures, etc, readily available. He made pasteboard box folders or cases for each book of the Bible and deposited his sermons in their proper place as they were written, thus enabling him to locate any manuscript without difficulty.
in which he was staying caught fire, and the sermons he brought with him were destroyed. It is reported, however, that despite the loss of all his sermons, he preached none the worse. Later he frequently preached this discourse elsewhere using as his manuscript the printed copy which appeared in a current daily newspaper, finding the style and form grammatically correct.

Usually at the end of the week he would write his entire manuscript for the following Sunday morning service, perhaps hastily but not perfunctorily. This is exemplified by the following anecdote. About eleven o'clock one Saturday evening, Candlish sent Chalmers a message requesting him to preach for him the next day. Chalmers' reply was most characteristic: "Does the bit body think I can throw a sermon out of my sleeve like him?" Jean Watson, however, implies that few discourses, if ever, were put into writing that had not been worked over, cogitated upon at length in his mind. This is further confirmed by the small number of corrections found in his manuscripts.

All the while he penned his discourse he had before him in his mind's eye a real and living audience. People with problems, frustrations, needs and longings cried out in his imagination for answers, for help, consolation and encouragement. With this "shadow of a listening people" ever before him, the written page vibrated

---

1. Symington, op. cit., cf. 137
3. Thomas Smith in The Courant, October 20, 1873
4. Watson, op. cit., cf. p. 163
with life. Conflicts were met and won, individual needs were heard and answered, the sinner was personally and persuasively invited to come to Christ. In his lectures to his students he undoubtedly unveils the manner in which he approached the actual composition of his discourses.

In penning of your first sentence, conjure up for yourself listeners, hearers, real and imaginary; and throw yourself into the attitude and spirit of a witness bearer to them, the deliverer of a message to them. Let your solitary chamber be thronged with living faces, looking and waiting to hear what you have to say as Christ's ambassador to them. Write as if you were actually face to face with them, speaking to them as a man speaks to his friends. Sometimes you may set before you an individual to be appealed to and dealt with. To obviate all risk of a charge of personality, it may be safest and best to let that individual be yourself.

Types of Sermons

Generally speaking, Candlish followed the evangelical style of preaching. He was not, however, restricted to any one type of sermon, and among his published volumes of discourses are found examples of all kinds usually preached. This is not to say that any cut classification can be made of his discourses, for as a rule, each discourse displays elements of several types making no sharp distinction possible.

A discourse, to a large extent, for both Candlish and Chalmers

1. Black, op. cit., cf. p. 37
3. Textual, topical, ethical, devotional, doctrinal, biographical and evangelistic.
consisted of exposition and application. The exposition of the text or passage was depicted as the drawing of the sword from its scabbard. Thrusting home the application paralleled the cutting and thrusting movements with the sword. As Chalmers said, "It is not enough that the preacher preach the truth; the hearers must know for themselves that it is the very truth of God. The power does not lie simply in the truth, but in the truth perceived to be of God. When this point has been gained, then the power of preaching is the power of God."

No one category on the whole, describes Candlish's discourses except expository, or as Sangster calls them Biblical Interpretations. More especially does this apply to the discourses contained in his volumes on Genesis, the First Epistle of John and Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. In each Candlish "draws the sword and cuts and thrusts."

For his mastery in Biblical exposition he has been likened to the late G. Campbell Morgan of Westminster Chapel, London. In 1912 Campbell Morgan delivered a series of expositions on the Fourth Gospel in the United Free Church Assembly Hall, Edinburgh. One venerable elder of the Church who, in his younger days, had heard Candlish preach sat following the blackboard exercise of Campbell Morgan with approving interest. "This," said the elder to John Adams, "is the kind of thing we are needing in our churches today. These graphic outlines go into the very marrow of the truth. And

---

1. The Christian Witness, 1864, p. 375
personally," he added, "I have heard nothing like it since Dr. 
Candlish's day." Morgan was famous as a masterly Biblical expositor 
and a deeper understanding of Candlish is gained by this arresting 
comparison.

If Guthrie found the Gospel in the thirty-sixth chapter of 
Ezekiel, Candlish found the Law in the twelfth chapter of Romans. 
Believing that there was too great an alienation between moral pre-
cept and Christian doctrine in believers's minds, he delivered a 
series of ethical discourses, "to show how thoroughly the ethics of 
the Gospel are impregnated with the spirit of its theology." Divid-
ing his subject into three divisions, he shows the Christian in 
relation to God, to his fellow Christians - the Church or collective 
body of believer, - and the hostile world. His discourse, in this 
series, on "Brotherly Love" enlisted high praise from one of the 
most severe of critical journals.

To hear Dr. Candlish's discourse on Brotherly Love is 
not an everyday occurrence, ... We give our testi-
mony to the ability and Christian spirit, with which 
he executed this portion of his task. He speaks for 
all ages, and for all religious denominations with-
out distinction, and his discourse will be read and 
appreciated long after he has been removed from the 
field. 3

Clark, 1926), p. 71

2. Candlish, The Two Great Commandments, (London: T. Nelson and 
Sons, 1860), p. vi

p. 216
But one cannot segregate arbitrarily his Biblical exposition or ethical discourses from his doctrinal treatises. It is impossible to read any of his discourses without finding the theologian displaying his convictions in every exposition. He believed in the plan of Christian education through preaching; preaching doctrine so that men could remain in no doubt whatever, in an age of change, about fundamental truths to which the Church of Christ holds. To him doctrine was not something that had been formulated years ago, or something found only in dusty books, but rather something about which he felt deeply, and his own heart-felt belief was made contagious.

It was no mere gesture of kindness that Candlish was called to fill Chalmers' vacant chair of theology. Capable and keen, he would have carried on proudly the strong reformed theology of Calvin in Chalmers' stead. This is not to imply he had the same qualities as a professor that his venerated predecessor nobly displayed, but rather that he was recognized as the most capable to fill the vacancy in the Church at that time. One cannot read the sermons in his Memoir volume published posthumously, "without being impressed with the singular subtlety and grasp of thought and power of expression which they display." Especially noticeable in this volume is his ruling thought - the sonship of believers. Could it have been because he never knew an earthly father's love that his thoughts travelled in

1. Supra, p. 31
2. United Presbyterian Magazine, February 2, 1874, p. 52
theological paths of sonship? One is left to speculate on the extent to which this void dominated his mind and heart, but it is obvious that throughout his theological writings and doctrinal discourses his preponderant theme was the Fatherhood of God (in its limited aspect) and the sonship of believers.

Candlish was evangelistic but not to the exclusion of what Bushnell termed "Christian nurture." It has been claimed that in some churches a seeker for God may attend for months without hearing how to find Him. On the other hand, believers may attend other churches for scores of consecutive Sundays without learning how to live the Christian life. Candlish attempted to avoid both extremes.

If preaching means taking out of one's heart something hot and thrusting it into another heart, then Candlish was a master in preaching. His heart was aflame with his message. No discourse was devoid of his evangelical fervor but some could be classified distinctly as evangelistic—especially those in the volume _The Gospel of Forgiveness._

He presented the perfect freeness of the gospel offer of Christ to the sinner in all his sin, guilt and helplessness. He showed the unbeliever his bounden duty to embrace Christ freely placed at his disposal by the command and call of God in the gospel. An eminent example of a great preacher of the cross he painted vividly a loving Savior seeking the lost and rejoicing over one sinner that

1. Vide Introduction to Part III
repented.

His message was individualistic in nature. That is to say, each unbeliever was isolated. Writing in one of his sermons he says: "How personal and individual a matter is the religion of Jesus! There is no salvation in it for sinners in the mass; no wholesale amnesty or deliverance. Every one must stand alone." He struck home to the individual heart with the words of the prophet, "Thou art the man." Tearing to shreds all excuses or anything that would entangle or complicate, he made clear and inviting the gospel offer - the full, free, and faithful offer of Christ crying:

In with you; in, in, now my brother; even now come with me; come as I come, I, the chief of sinners, yea, let us both come with Christ our elder brother who came to call not the righteous but the sinner to repentance, and now cometh forth, by His Spirit, to bring us to the Father.

Mention has been made already of his deep convictions. Suffice it to say, much of the charm and power of his preaching lay in his own deep conviction of the sinfulness of the human heart and in the tenderness of his evangelical fervor and sympathy with which he pressed home the gospel message. One who heard him recalls, "He did not preach at the people, nor merely from an eminence to them; but he laid his own case side by side with theirs, his heart beating


2. Quoted by Hugh Martin of Free Greyfriars from a sermon (unnamed) by Candlish in Martin's sermon "The Chariot of Israel and the Horsemen thereof," A tribute to the Memory of Robert S. Candlish D.D., (Edinburgh: Maclaren and Macniven, 1873) p. 16
in sympathy with that of the poorest brother he was seeking to arouse
and bring to Christ."

Dismissing all generalities he pressed home the solemn warning
and the sacred promises. His eager outstretched arm pointed the way
within the veil and beckoned and besought sinners to be reconciled to
God in Christ. When he preached he identified himself with the
people, as is shown in the following excerpt:

Pain would I speak to you, not authoritatively, from the
elevation of this chair; but affectionately, from the
deep self-abasement of my own experience. Pain would I
appeal to you, as myself a transgressor, a sinner;
scarcely saved, by richest, freest grace; by special
miracle of mercy, as it were. Pain would I thus, as
not above you, but among you, one of yourselves, tell
you of God's ways; his ways of dealing with me; and
also, dear friends, with you; his bearing long with
us; his waiting long for us; his plying us with all
faithful warnings, and tender expostulations, and lov¬
ing calls; his graciously receiving us, his not up¬
braiding us; his casting all our sins behind his back;
his giving us his own blessed Spirit. Beloved breth¬
ren, hear his own voice, - 'Turn ye, turn ye, why will
ye die.'

In his work, Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century,
Henry C. Fish considers Candlish's discourse, "The Universal Charac¬
teristic - And he died," in his volume of Scripture Characters as a
"specimen of polished eloquence." Candlish himself did not regard
biographical discoures, such as are contained in this volume, as

ness, p. 422
3. Fish, p. 714
altogether "gospel sermons." He delivered them for the sake of variety, but hesitated in considering them as fair specimens of what preaching from Sunday to Sunday ought to be. "They should be judged," he urged, "by a somewhat more flexible and accommodating standard than I might myself apply to compositions professing to be the utterance of ambassadors for Christ, in the direct discharge of the commission, beseeching men to be reconciled to God."

Each of his characters in this volume is associated with a theme or title, for example: "The Universal Characteristic - And he died," (a sermon on Joseph), "Eli - His heart trembled for the ark of God," "Ahab - The long suffering of God," "Herod - Weakness growing into wickedness." In these discourses he delighted to draw picturesque and telling analogies. Thus, in his introduction to the discourse on Joseph he writes:

The succession of generations among the children of men has been, from Homer downwards, likened to that of the leaves among the trees of the forest. The foliage of one summer, withering gradually away, and strewn the earth with its wrecks, has its place supplied by the exuberance of the following spring. Of the countless myriads of gay blossoms and green leaves, that but a few months ago were glancing in the beams of the joyous sun, not one remains; but a new race, all full of brightness and promise as before, covers the naked branches, and the woods again burst forth in beauty and son, as if decay had never passed over any of their leafy boughs. So of men: 'One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth for ever.'


2. Ibid. p. 1.
Andrew Blackwood asserts that in the history of preaching the vast majority of sermons which have been classed as "famous sermons" have been topical discourses. Candlish, however, rarely deviated from his Biblical exposition to a topical discourse. Even at the initial services in the newly built edifice on Lothian Road he delivered a "gospel sermon" taking as his text Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest."

One of his few topical discourses, "Church and State," considered the problem of the visible and invisible Church and the relation of the visible Church to earthly authority. In compliance with the injunction of the General Assembly, on November 21, 1872, he preached another topical - or historical-topical - sermon on "John Knox and His Devout Imagination." In it Candlish shows how the man and his age were prepared mutually by God for one another - what Knox made of Scotland and what Scotland made of Knox.

Irrespective of the type of sermon, Candlish exhibited in all his preaching a graciousness and sympathy of heart. Startling the unbeliever, and giving counsel and affectionate consolation to the poor and anxious in spirit, he touched the hearts and conscience of his listeners. He called upon the faithful to walk with him before


2. Candlish, Church and State, (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1872)

God, yielding themselves in unceasing devotion to their Lord and Redeemer. Hugh Martin of Free Greyfriars summarized the range of Candlish's sermons when he declared:

I have never heard him equalled, or approached, in the variety and keenness, the skilfulness and originality of those unexpected and continually changing forms and methods in which the doctrines of grace were wielded, in his hands, in adaptation to the conflicttings of the flesh and of the spirit, - to the spiritual exigencies, wants, and fears, and difficulties of the poor and needy, to whom he was always so kind and good, - to the devices of Satan, - to the claims of Christ, - to the authority, and law, and grace of God, - and to the inward operations of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, in the hearts of those whom God has called into the grace of the kingdom. 1

Sermon Structure

The Text and Topic.— The great majority of his texts in his published sermons are taken from the New Testament, although Genesis and the Psalms yield a fair amount from the Old. Most of his printed discourses are accurate representations of his pulpit work since they were published in much the same manner as they were read from the pulpit with little or no corrections. 2 Yet they represent only a portion of the hundreds or even thousands that he must have written in the nearly forty years at St. George's.

He finds perfect freedom in the use of texts whether short or long. "Our Father," 3 is perhaps the shortest he ever chose, but on

2. His final edition of this work comprised two volumes of over four hundred and seventy pages in each volume.
3. Most of his discourses were "published nearly as they were delivered," The Two Commandment, p. xiv; see also Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, p. v. Those discourses published in his Scripture Characters, however, underwent much revision before publication.
occasion he would take two or even four distinct passages of Scripture as his text. At these times he would bring out the different shades of meaning in the various texts, all of which had a common denominator. Usually, however, he contented himself with one passage, or consecutive verses, or a full psalm. But he always had a text; no discourse is published without one. Even in the two topical discourses, "Church and State," and "John Knox and His Devout Imagination," he began with a text and explanation, and then proceeded upon the topic as stated.

Candlish had as many different ways of treating a text as there are books in the Bible. No one treatment can be described as "typical," and as a rule the text provided the proposition of the discourse. In "The Chain of Grace and Glory - Electing love and effectual calling," he takes the text from Romans 8:28-30, especially the words, "called according to his purpose." The following gives his proposition:

I propose to open up a little more fully and in practical detail, this 'calling of God according to his purpose,' in these two views of it: first in view of its nature as determined by its origin in the 'foreknowledge and predestination' of God, and, secondly, in view of its ultimate design and issue in the accomplishment of the Father's destination of the son to be 'the first born among many brethren.'

1. Candlish, Scripture Characters, p. 143
2. Candlish, The Gospel of Forgiveness, p. 82
3. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."
4. Candlish, The Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, pp 116-117
In his discourse, "The Shepherd of the Sheep," his text is from John 10:11-15. Here the text readily forms the proposition as well as the divisions. "Two things, therefore, come up for consideration: (1) The good shepherd in his relations as such, and (2) His work."

Henry Sloan Coffin writes that the most damaging criticism which can be levelled at any sermon is that the preacher was aiming at nothing in particular and proved himself an accurate shot. In no wise could this be attributed to Candlish, for he never failed to have a goal, and he took accurate aim by text, topic, proposition and precise divisions. Thus his objective was made clear and plain from the beginning, and he preached to win a verdict for Christ—a changed life in the unbeliever, a closer walk for the believer. In general "his chief aim as a preacher was to raise up a well-instructed generation of robust Christian men and women, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

If at times he yielded to the temptation of making the text a spring board for a favorite doctrine or theme when such only vaguely was suggested, by and large he remained true to the text and context, content to expound systematically word after word, and

1. "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep."
2. Candlish, The Gospel of Forgiveness, p. 53
to apply them to life here and now.\(^1\) Alexander Whyte graphically described Candlish's masterly handling of his text.

For be Dr. Candlish's text a word, or a clause, or a sentence, or a verse, or a paragraph or half a chapter, it was always his text indeed. And as his text he would always treat it. I see him now as he quietly and slowly gave out his text. And then he would visibly spread it out on his pulpit Bible, and would set himself to unwind and unravel its texture, filament by filament, and fibre by fibre, with the most minute analysis and the most practised exegetical skill. And then how he would address himself to the reweaving of it all again, and that into a rich web of evangelical doctrine. After which he would, as it were, shape and fashion and furnish out of it so many gospel garments wherewith to clothe and adorn his listening and believing people, till you can have no idea what a favoured and what a delighted and what an evangelical congregation Dr. Candlish had in St. George's of those great days.

Candlish kept "near to the big controlling truths"\(^3\) of Scripture, and was not one to ferret out sensational topics or subjects. On the whole, he clung to the main highway of his Calvinistic

---

1. Concerning his sermon on II Timothy 2:19 preached in Glasgow during the Spring Fast, the writer in the book, Our Scottish Clergy, expressed the opinion that "the sermon was attached to the text, and sat on it with tolerable grace, but it did not give the precise meaning of the apostle, who elsewhere shows what he means by the 'foundation of God,' which is certainly much more stable than the most stedfast believer; it is the truth, the promise, the oath, the Christ of God." p. 117. Nevertheless, the writer previously remarked of the same discourse that it was "unquestionably among the most popular and impressive of sermons we have heard." p. 115.

2. Whyte, Former Principals of New College, pp. 32-33.

3. Black, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 122
heritage. Old subjects, texts and doctrines were treated with fresh vitality consistent with his natural ability to make obvious the obscure, to make concrete and real the theoretical and allusive. Though he was able to treat a subject in the abstract, his general method in the pulpit was to make truths concrete - to reveal the grace and truth of God in a human life. He pictured men in their true relationship to God. Sin, forgiveness, the first and second coming of Christ "were brought so near that their magnitude awed the most listless."

Like Calvin, Candlish was not adverse to giving a series of discourses from a book, epistle or from a single chapter. His series on First John was delivered periodically over four years time, from 1860-1864; those on Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians were written and delivered at intervals during the years 1863-1869. The sermons contained in his volume, Life in a Risen Saviour, on the argument of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, were, however, delivered consecutively from week to week before 1859. If the sermon is the text expanded, so the topic is the text compressed. Candlish stated his subjects clearly and concisely without any attempt at being arresting or conspicuous. "Peter - The trial, infirmity and triumph of his faith," "The Divine Birth - The family

1. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 116
2. In his preface p. v and vi he says "I crave indulgence for some diffuseness, as well as for occasional repetitions, not easily to be avoided in a series of compositions for the pulpit, prepared often hastily from week to week, and all having therefore reference, more or less directly, to one theme." Italics added.

The Introduction.— Blackwood implies that in the nineteenth century the man in the pulpit was little concerned in gaining the interest of the people by the introduction of his sermon; their interest could be taken for granted. It is therefore understandable why Candlish's introductions were never meant to startle or especially attract. By means of them he oriented the text and prepared the ground work for the building or super-structure. There was always close harmony between the text and the introduction, but like his method of handling a text, each introduction was of a different type. In one aspect he remained consistent — he never began with a story or life situation.

That he could introduce his subject vividly and aim his arrow accurately is portrayed in the introduction of the discourse, "The Man Christ Jesus."

... One God for all. One Mediator for all. One ransom for all. And the ransom, the Mediator, Christ Jesus, is 'THE MAN'. Not a man of a particular colour, whether fair, or dark, or of Ethiopian dye. Not a man of a particular race, Jew or Gentile; of Shem, or Japhet, or

1. The Preparation of Sermons, p. 163.

of Ham. Not a man of a particular class or rank, whether of royal ancestry or of lineage proper to his birth in the stable of an inn. Not a man of a particular temperament, whether sanguine or morose, grave or gay. Not a man of a particular history, walking in a path apart. He is 'the man Christ Jesus,' everywhere, always, to every one, the same, the Man. Therefore they who love him, the man Christ Jesus, may well be exhorted to pray for all men.

'THE MAN CHRIST JESUS.' The very absence of all qualifying epithets makes the designation unique and solemn. There is a majesty about it which inspires awe. There is a grace in it which wins trust and love. It is not the holy man, the righteous man, the gracious man. It is not the man approved of God, who went about doing good. It is not even the man of sorrows. It is simply 'the man Christ Jesus.' How much there is in this bare and bald title, may the spirit show us!

In contrast to this long introduction which consists of three full pages in his discourse, "The Unity of the Spirit: The Bond of Peace," which was his last discourse delivered to the General Assembly of the Free Church in 1873, he "jumped" right into the sermon without any introduction. "Two questions may here be raised:

(1) What is to be kept? - 'The unity of the Spirit,' (2) How is it to be kept? - with endeavor in the bond of peace."

Between the two extremes there are introductions of every length, some entirely of an explanatory nature and others of analogy or contrast. Today's standard of sermon construction might find many of his introductions entirely too long and, at times, too explanatory, but for his own generation they seemed acceptable. Yet

1. Sermons, p. 2h The United Presbyterian Magazine considered this a sermon of great eloquence. February 2, 1874, cf. p. 58

his ability to hold his audience was not dependent upon his introductions, but he relied more upon the force of his arguments, the clarity of expression, his subtle dialectic, and the progressive movement of thought. Never content simply to gain the people's ear, he sought to enlighten the understanding, to touch the heart, and to bring men to Christ. Contrasting him with Guthrie, W. M. Taylor writes:

He had none of the pictorial or illustrative power of Guthrie, but his appeals had more searching character and a more incisive edge. He grappled at once with the intellect and the conscience, and made every one feel that he had to do with God. Listening to him at such a time was like being subjected to a sort of spiritual vivisection.  

It cannot be denied, however, that Candlish was capable of pictorial language, even though it was not native to his discourses as it was to Guthrie's. Take this for example: "It is true there is a tongue in every breeze of summer, a voice in every song of the bird, a silent eloquence in every green field and quiet grove - which tells of God as the maker of them all."  

The Sermon Plan.--- Candlish was content with the method and plan of the Puritans, adopting their formal divisions and confining himself to his text. Like Robertson, he made it easy for his hearers

1. Taylor, op. cit., p. 257

to see his plan. If the framework stood out boldly, it nevertheless did not detract from the beauty of the discourse as a whole. This natural methodical habit was carried even into his correspondence. But it was no mechanical plan, a "three decker" which would roll out from each text machine-like. He was confined to no mold, except as the text confined him. Often before proceeding on his discourse, the various ways the text could be treated were considered briefly and then laid aside to be replaced by the plan which would bring to light the doctrine or practical lesson he desired to illuminate. He came to the truth with such freshness and mastery of structure that no one could say upon hearing his text that he knew exactly how it was going to be treated. Each passage or text was discussed in line with its own framework. Sometimes two, three or four, and at one time as many as seven main divisions appear in one discourse. Consequently, no one plan or structure can be endorsed as typical.

The most successful sermon, that which moves the hearers most profoundly, is one which bears upon one point with an individual force. "Nothing is so fatal," remarked Newman, "to the effect of a sermon as the habit of preaching three or four subjects at once."

Unity is as indispensable to a preacher as to the artist or dramatist. Everything said has one purpose in view, in all the imagery, the varying and graphic words, the shades of thought secretly yet

1. Quoted by Blackwood, The Preparation of Sermons, p. 130
constantly refer the hearer to one outstanding purpose. Candlish's arrangement was orderly, his dialectical logic apparently irrefutable, and the meaning of the passage progressively developed. In general his discourses are characterized "by a lucid orderly arrangement, great logical force, a quick perception of the meaning of the passage under consideration, and a comprehension of the whole argument which renders the adjustment of each part of it comparatively easy." But, however, in some of his lectures (Cunningham Lectures) his distinctions are so fine and become so immersed in his logical web that some of the lucidity which characterizes his sermons is lost in his attempt to press his argument home to his listeners.

It was the perfect unity of his sermons which cast the spell on his hearers, and it is no wonder that clergymen, lawyers, doctors, litterateurs and students listened to him with enthralled admiration. Although his discourses were formally divided from the first sentence to the last, there was a close continuity and unity which satisfied and fascinated the mind. He always had a leading idea, and as he worked out its development the force of the preaching likewise increased and developed. The logical climax became in fact the emotional climax, so that there could be felt a beautiful blending of the reasoning faculty with the moving of the cords of the heart. Candlish excelled

2. The Spectator, October 20, 1873
in this unity of thought and plan, and his sermon, "The Lord's Short Work on Earth," delivered January 4, 1852, is a striking example of it. A most singular unity pervades the entire discourse displaying a pleading intenseness and a cumulative imagery, All in all, it is a discourse of true eloquence, and the importance of it justifies this long passage.

A great general principle of the Divine administration is here brought out. In the affairs of this lower world, whether as regards communities or individuals, however, protracted may be the course of discipline or probation through which they have to pass, there is for the most part a swift reckoning and short work at the last.

We may regard the moral government of God as made up of a great number and variety of separate processes, having respect to nations, churches, and families, as well as to individuals separately considered and taken one by one into account. These processes are all blended into one harmonious whole, carrying forward the steady march of the vast plan of Providence for regulating this entire earthly economy until the consummation of all things. Each particular process, however, of the sort of sectional and subdivided rule which God exercises over men, whether collectively or separately, from the history of the mightiest empire down to the vicissitudes of the very humblest of the human race, may be viewed as equally complete in itself with the one grand and comprehensive design, embracing the whole world throughout all its ages, which, reaching from the earliest date in time, awaits its full development in the final hour when time is to give place to eternity. And there is one law that would seem to be common to them all. When the crisis or catastrophe comes, the Lord makes a short work of it on the earth.

Thus in a tale, or a drama, a remarkable disproportion is often observed between the protracted period over which the action is extended and the hurried manner of winding up the plot at the close. The author gives himself the fullest scope throughout successive scenes, or successive volumes, for bringing out, in a variety of minute incidents, the characters of the persons concerned in his story, and the romantic and interesting turns of fortune that befall them. But as the end draws near, he becomes, as it were, impatient to have done with his task, and in a few brief and hasty strokes disposes of the whole throng that has
peopled his little world, and cuts short the work in all the ostenta-
tious righteousness of sublime poetical justice. Let the march
and movement of a mighty and majestic river be traced, as it rolls
in widening stream over miles of chequered and broken country,
now chafing itself amid rocks, - anon ruffled into ripples and
eddies and cross currents, - and again sweeping along in deep and
silent grandeur, free, copious, unembarrassed, and unimpeded. With
all its manifold vicissitudes, - amid light and shade, - field and
forest, - gloom and gladness, - it holds on its steady and pro-
tracted course, - tardily upon the whole, and even tardily, -
as if no violent crash were ever to be apprehended. But suddenly,
when its waves are at the stillest and the smoothest, the rapids
are abruptly reached; onward hurries the impetuous stream, in
deepening tide, with fearfully accelerated speed; until one resist-
less rush over the headlong precipice, as with thunder - roar and
lightning-flash, ends on the instant the entire career it has been
running; makes short work, indeed, of all its past flow of waters;
and clears the way for the new start and the fresh race that are to
follow.

After some such analogy as this, the providence of God over in-
dividuals, and communities, and the world at large, seems to pro-
ceed. Ordinarily its march is leisurely and measured. With noise-
less step and steady pace it advances slowly forward. Visitations
of chastening, or reproof, or encouragement, may be variously in-
termingled; tokens of long-suffering patience alternating with
muttered hints of impending wrath; signs enough and prophetic warn-
ings, if men would only give heed to them, of an approaching day
of decision. Still, upon the whole, things move on with a sort
of monotonous and weary uniformity in the beaten track. Men say, -
All things continue as they were; tomorrow shall be as this day.
Clouds may gather; but somehow they are always dispelled in time.
The distant howling of the tempest may be heard; but its fury dies
away; it passes over with but little scathe; and leaves the earth
as green and the blue sky as serene and smiling as before. Years
accumulate upon years in the individual man, until childhood's
smooth brow and flaxen locks assume the knitted firmness and dark
hue of manhood, and then pass into the wrinkles and grey hairs of
age; and still whatever griefs or joys may occasionally haunt the
memory, the course of like runs smooth, and there is but little
that speaks of sudden change. Centuries roll over a nation,
crowding its annals with many wars and tumults and revolutions,
but nevertheless leaving long spaces of tranquillity and repose
between, - beguiling the people into a sort of vague belief that
a conservative and restoring genius presides over their destiny, -
averting or turning to good the interruptions of the destroying
angel, and securing, in spite of outbreaks now and then, the con-
tinued and prosperous progress of the commonwealth in the end.
And so things go on, as for years or for ages they have been doing,
until the Lord's time, - his set time, - arrives. Then is the
hour of decision. The Lord comes to take a reckoning; to demand an account. He comes for the settlement of his controversy with the people; the winding up of the long unbalanced arrears of unacknowledged claims on his part and accumulated crimes on theirs. And as if he could not afford leisure for entering into the tedious maze of its complicated details, he cuts it short in righteousness. As if he were in haste to be rid of an ungracious and unwelcome task, he abruptly finishes the whole matter; crowds rapidly into the briefest possible space the penalties he means to exact and the vengeance he means to inflict; and so makes a short work on the earth. Such generally is the law of Divine Providence indicated in the text.

"The man without a goal seldom gets anywhere," says Charles E. Jefferson. "Laymen frequently stand nonplussed at the close of a sermon, not knowing what they ought to think or what they ought to do." Candlish may have opened his discourses with very little emphasis upon the introduction but before he concluded he had presented his message with such force and personal appeal that each individual knew without a doubt that his sermon had accomplished its purpose. Like the apostle Paul the chief aim of his message was to persuade men to be reconciled to God, and although at times he may have been soaring in the clouds of speculation or logical arguments, he always ended his discourse with a personal application firmly believing that his message was to be directed to individuals and not to any crowd as such. This very personal element is apparent in all of his sermons, but it is especially clear in the discourse on "The Sifting Question." In


concluding he says:

It is, in one word, to impress the solemn lesson, that Peter's noble confession, if it is to stand you in stead, and be of avail against your going away, must be personal and individual, and not collective or representative. It is nothing if you are merely one of the twelve in whose name and on whose behalf Peter makes it. It is everything if you make it yourself, each of you apart, for himself, for herself. 1

In other words his preaching sought to bring men and women into an encounter with God in Christ - to affect every vicissitude of one's life.

Application and Conclusion

For Candlish, his forte was the personal application of his message to individual lives and to the life of the Church. The unbeliever could not escape the divine call to make a decision and the believer could not turn away without having his heart warmed anew. A current periodical remarked concerning his discourses on Genesis, which are admirable for their practical appeal, that "no train of reasoning is ever introduced without some ultimate end of a practical nature." 2 In 1854 he delivered a discourse entitled, "The Sword of the Lord," on Jeremiah 46:6-7. It was given with reference to the war in Europe and is an excellent example of his analytical

2. The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, 1873, p. 112
3. "Oh thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? Put up thyself into thy scabbard, rest and be still. How can it be quiet seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against Ashelon, and against the sea-shore? There hath he appointed it." Jer. 46:6-7
skill in the exposition of Scripture and his force and fervor in its application. In a superb manner he connects the old prophecy with contemporary history and applies it to both the individual and to the community throughout the sermon. His concluding two paragraphs rise to sublime heights and finish on a triumphant note.

Finally, let men learn not merely to ask, as the work of judgment goes on, in the weariness and heart-sickness of hope deferred, "O thou sword of the Lord! how long will it be ere thou be quiet?" - not merely to utter a sort of querulous and effeminate cry for peace on any terms - for a cessation of judgment at any cost, - "Put up thyself into thy scabbard, rest, and be still," but to enter also, with manly resolution, into the spirit of the bold rejoinder, "How can it be quiet, considering what charge the Lord has given it, and where he has appointed it?"

How can it be quiet, that sword of the Lord? Has it not work yet to perform? Upon many an Ashkelon, upon many a sea-shore, has it not to do execution still? Quiet! How can it be quiet, so long as lawless ambition, sordid selfishness, base superstition, cruel tyranny and intolerance, blind fanaticism, bigotry, spiritual despotism, - and the whole brood of vampires that suck the best life-blood of society and of social man - retain their seats in the high places of the earth? Quiet! How can it be quiet, when nations are still trodden down under the iron hoof of military despotism and oppression? Quiet! How can it be quiet, while the wail of slavery resounds from Eastern Africa to the remotest American West? Quiet! How can it be quiet, while such things are done, and such scenes exhibited, in the cities and villages of civilised, - of Protestant Christendom, as degrade men, reasonable men, below the beasts that perish? Quiet! How can it be quiet, while people are left to perish for lack of knowledge - while the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty, - while the blessed Word and glorious Gospel of the living God are shut out from so vast a portion of the globe, - while giant heathenism still reigns in its abominable temples - while over all the east the false prophet still holds sway? Quiet! How can it be quiet,

1. In the review of this discourse the United Presbyterian Magazine observed: "We question whether anything that Dr. Candlish has ever written is superior to this brief discourse." 1870, p. 369
while Babylon stands? - Babylon! the mystery of iniquity, the mother of abominations; Babylon! the incessant plotter against the liberties of mankind, the sworn foe of light, the restless fomenter of strife; Babylon! whose minions and ministers are everywhere, disturbing all social relations, undermining thrones, stealthily stirring up sedition and murder, waging relentless war against the dearest interests of earth and the high authority of heaven? No peace with Rome survives! No rest, no stillness, no quiet, for the sword of the Lord, till the charge the Lord has given it against the Antichrist is fulfilled, and the loud cry rends the joyous, liberated air, "Babylon is fallen! is fallen! is fallen!"

Occasionally, as in his discourse, "The Shepherd of the Sheep," he used what John Henry Jowett called the "wooing note." After showing the voluntariness of Christ's death for his sheep Candlish appeals to the heart and conscience of the others not of the fold, confronting them with their unbelief and tenderly wooing them to hear not the voice of strangers but to hear the voice of Christ and follow him.

See your shepherd, Jesus on the cross. In the presence of earth and heaven and hell! He dares all powers above, beneath, around, to sift and try his life, his title to life, and see if they can detect in it any flaw. Man can find no fault in him. Satan has nothing in him - the Father is well pleased in him ... The Father's righteous wrath against your sin enters into his soul ... So he lays down his life for the sheep.

Oh! brethren, what a life is there laid down for you! what a rich ransom is paid for you! What poor sinner need now perish in his sins, now that such a sacrifice has been offered. ...
But it is entirely impossible to catalogue his conclusions. Some are brief, while others embrace over one thousand words. Sometimes the application is concentrated at the conclusion and sometimes it runs throughout the entire discourse. Sometimes it is directed to unbelievers while at other times it is applied to two or three groups. Occasionally he makes use of the contrast, at other times he employs an analogy. Rarely, if ever is an illustration used, although in one instance he deeply moved his audience by closing with the last two stanzas of Charles Wesley's great hymn, "Jesus lover of my soul."

This is our gospel to you sinners! We preach Christ. We hold him forth to you. We press him, as God's gift to you, on your instant acceptance. We do not ask you to receive the benefits of his redemption. We ask you to receive himself. He asks you to be his and let him be yours. He invites you, not to take good things out of his hands, purchased by him for you; but to take himself, to be one with himself. "Come unto me." "Abide in me." "Learn of me." Let me into your heart. Feed upon me. Let us be one; by mutual consent one; unreservedly, inseparably, thoroughly one. Then "all things are yours; whether Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come. All are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." Get Christ, and you get all. Keep Christ, and you keep all.

"Thou, O Christ, art all I want... etc.

Candlish could have benefited from others in the art of illustration, but many could have sat profitably at his feet to learn the art of application and conclusion. As Beecher puts it, Candlish's applications and conclusion were "the stretching out of the arms

1. Candlish, The Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, pp 64-65
of the sermon upon the hearts and lives of his audience. His vivid imagination coupled with his earnestness and singleness of purpose enabled him to bring his audience seemingly into the very presence of God. Dr. Alexander, an American minister, describing his own reactions when he heard Candlish wrote:

And then, when he appealed to the experience of the convert, and described the escape of the poor soul from the knotted meshes of the devil’s snare to the simplicity that is in Christ, I was completely overcome. I shook with violent agitation, and I don’t know how I could have sat still if my eyes had not relieved me. But I mused entirely unnoticed. Many were in the same condition, and the rest were unconsciously trying to catch every word. 2

Literary Style

There was little of the sublime or lofty flight of fancy in his literary style; little too of anything that was straining at effect, or unnaturalness. Like James Denney he was interested in making the "obvious arresting." Hence, his sermons (not always his lectures) display a clear, lucid style with an ability to get to the root of the subject. He acquired a mastery of the English language and a literary style that suggests no one model though he acknowledged his indebtedness to Barrow. Ordinarily he expressed himself in clear and plain English, but at times the more common

---

2. Quoted in Watson, op. cit., p. 63
expressions slipped into his discourse, for example: "It may look as if the wettest of all blankets were thrown over your burning seal." His language was not unconventional, but he was not adverse to using colloquialisms if it meant greater comprehension on the part of the people. He had an inexhaustible vocabulary and was never at a loss for words whether in writing or speaking. Hugh Miller, his close associate in the Ten Years' Conflict and editor of the Witness wrote of Candlish's word power in this manner:

The words pour in a continuous stream, fitting themselves with a singular flexibility to every object which they encircle in their course, insinuating themselves, if we may so speak, into the innermost intricacies of every thought; sweeping, with a steady certainty, along the lines of every distinction, however nicely drawn; and while thus exquisitely true in the mental processes whose findings they signify, modulating themselves as if by some such natural law as that which gives regularity and beauty to the crystal, into the combination which best satisfy the ear, and accord most tryly with the rules of composition as an art.

He was criticized at times, however, for some diffuseness in writing, which may have been due to his habit of extemporaneous speaking on the floor of Assembly, or it might be attributed also to his desire to guard against being misunderstood. But as he wrote his thoughts

2. "I use market language," said Whitefill of his own preaching, "the words must be plain and unmistakable in their meaning." Macgregor, The Making of a Preacher, p. 56
3. Daily Review, October 20, 1873
4. United Presbyterian Magazine, 1858, p. 410
rushed like water out of sluice gates bursting for freedom; each argument became a link in a strong chain. At times he was exceedingly subtle and to follow him was difficult; yet at other times, and in general, he was amazingly simple and his line of thought was most clearly defined. In fact he was as much at home when preaching to the humble and unlettered as he was when lecturing to the most profound thinkers. For the plainest and least educated his message found a way to the heart and conscience - a simple, searching fervent appeal; to the intellectual listener he won acceptance by his cultivated scholarship and dialectical reasoning. Apparently no one who heard him when he toured the Highlands with Alexander Beith had difficulty in understanding him for Beith remarked, "What had impressed me in Islay still more impressed me at Lockhelshead - his (Candlish's) wonderful skill in speaking with a simplicity of expression which made all that he said intelligible, even when the knowledge of English on the part of his hearers was very scanty."

His early style was more rhetorical than in later years; his sentences longer and more rounded, and what was true of his sentence structure was also true of his paragraph arrangement. He made full use of the question and the exclamation mark setting up in an opening paragraph of a discourse question after question, whereupon he would proceed to answer them one by one in the body of the sermon. One

1. Taylor, op. cit., pp 256-257
2. Beith, op. cit., p. 19
does not detect in his works any clustering of figures merely to gratify one's fancy, neither is it necessary to seek long for something solid. His discourses are not, however, devoid of ornament, but as one critic expressed it the "fruit" is not obscured by too much "foliage."

His (Candlish's) work will be greatly prized by the earnest Christian . . . what he longs for is easily discoverable. Unlike some works we could name, which have attained an immense popularity, the fruit is not concealed beneath an overwhelming mass of foliage, when every branch must be raised, and every broad leaf carefully scrutinized before it can be found. 1

In short, his literary style was truly his own without any trace of artificiality or pendency, but it revealed a natural expression of his full mind and heart in vivid yet cogent language.

His Delivery

"The power, passion and pathos of the living voice," writes Allan, "touch the heart in a way that the printed pages can never do. The pen may be mightier than the sword, but it is not mightier than the pulpit. Nothing can take the place of the preacher who with quivering lips and flashing eye and pleading voice declares a living message to living men." To study Candlish only by reading his sermons is to miss much of the personality that enlivened his message. His personality was such an integral part of his message that to miss the living voice, the oddities in manner and his pulpit conduct is to miss much of the full force and power of his sermons. His manner in the pulpit revealed

2. Allan, The Art of Preaching, p. 8
a highly nervous temperament which had caught all the impetuosity and
fire of the great Chalmers but little of his poise. This nervous
temperament kept him in "perpetual motion," as one who heard him wrote:
"One moment he cannot remain quiescent. During singing, when in the
pulpit he is all astir, and to this perpetual restlessness may be
attributed his excessive labour. Rest seems to be out of his province -
activity - excitement his very element." He maintained this nervous
manner even in later years for toward the close of his ministry at
St. George's two women visited the church and upon hearing him ex-
claimed, "Oh! such nervous varieties." Jones summarizes his peculiari-
ties candidly by saying, "Talk about mannerisms in the pulpit! Cand-
lish was apparently to mannerisms born." He is quick in adding, however,
that his mannerisms and eccentricities did not affect in any way the
power of his preaching. While at times he would work unconsciously
with his handkerchief as if he were trying to wring from it his
thoughts, at other times his hands would be raised high above his
head or perhaps be held behind his back. All the while he was speak-
ing (reading his discourse) an easy and copious flow of clear vivid
language fell from his lips. Even with these external peculiarities
he seemed to be rivetting the attention of his hearers and casting a
spell over them. Taylor leaves nothing to the imagination when, in

1. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 118

2. Edgar Dewitt Jones, The Royalty of the Pulpit, (New York:
Harper and Brother, 1951), p. 307
his Yale Lectures, he describes Candlish's pulpit manner.

He (Candlish) went up the pulpit with a hurried step, and running his fingers through his hair, he gave out the psalm in a defiant tone, as if he meant to let some one know that he would not be put down. When he came to the sermon, he indulged unconsciously in all manner of convulsive movements, twisting and writhing like one in agony. He clutched at his gown, he took hold of the Bible as if he would lift it and throw it at his audience, he grasped the pulpit like one who feared he was about to fall. But all this while he had been opening up his text in a manner so clear, so comprehensive, so suggestive, that as he proceeded, you forgot his eccentricities of manner and felt only the power of his words.  

Apparently this was the usual impression. His ideas were so vivid, his words so burning that his idiosyncrasies faded into oblivion, and at the close of a sermon it was reported that his attentive hearer "found hung up in the chambers of his imagination and graven often on the walls of his heart, a word picture which time never wholly effaced." Fifty years after Candlish's death the sound impression his addresses had created still lingered.

No one could sit under Candlish's preaching for any length of time without being captivated by the power of his eloquence. On his first visit to Scotland Charles F. Greville went to hear Candlish preach and his appraisal is worthy of note. "I went to hear the

---

1. Taylor, op. cit., p. 256
2. The Christian Monthly and Family Treasury, op. cit., p. 277
4. Charles F. Greville, English diarist and politician; a great grandson of the Fifth Baron Brooke whose works The Greville Memoirs appeared first in 1874
celebrated Dr. Candlish preach, and was exceedingly struck with him and with the simple and impressive service. He is very eloquent and I was able to listen to a discourse above an hour long without being tired, which is the best proof of the merit of the preacher."

Candlish spoke as a living man to living men about a message of life. He was a man truly in earnest, throwing his soul and body into his discourses which were more forceful and direct than was common in his time. Speaking as one strangely conscious of his awful charge and commission he depicted himself in every action to his listeners as a man who believed he was the holder of the key of life or death — and as such he must be deeply in earnest. His powerful example was indeed a great help in expelling from the Scottish pulpit "that dull, and stately, and cold orthodoxy which freezes as it falls from immovable statue — that phlegmatic indifference which makes men speak of life and death as they do of the common transactions of yesterday — and that interminable doctrinal and dogmatic discussion which has so long amused men hastening to their grave."

As has been noted, Candlish may not have had the pictorial or illustrative power of Guthrie, but he excelled in his appeals with their deep searching character and their sharp incisive edge. If in reading Candlish's discourses the faults of his manner are missed so too is his intense earnestness, his complete self-forgetfulness

1. From the personal notes of Professor Robert Henderson, grandson of Robert S. Candlish — quoted from The Greville Memoirs, July 29, 1849

2. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 117
and his glowing face as he looked up from his manuscript confident that he had won a conquest for truth.

"A cultivated human voice is the most wonderful, the most powerful, the most persuasive and the most musical instrument known to man." Seemingly one of the chief drawbacks of much of the nineteenth century preaching was the lack of color and pathos displayed in the voice. 2 Candlish manifested a broad Scottish dialect and at first it fell slowly upon the ear, but as he proceeded it gathered force and volume. Although it was adapted to close argument, to high debate in church courts - and on these occasions there was maintained a "hard rhetorical ring" - it could melt, soothe and sway the passions of his hearers. One current periodical made mention that his was a "clear full flexible and melodious voice, the compass and distinctness of which give the idea of the 'trumpet talking' of the apocalypse, and ranging from the clear heard and persuasive whisper, to the peal of crashing and revertible indignation." 3 By the proper modulation of his voice he was able to change within a sentence his tone from ringing clearness to sensitive poignancy. His deep yearning for truth was ever felt through the power, passion and fervor resident in his voice. It was often said that to hear Candlish read a chapter of the Scriptures was like hearing a commentary on the whole chapter. "The inflection, pause, force or pathos as the passage required,

1. Allan, op. cit., p. 20
were perfect — as one that playeth upon an instrument."

Prior to Robertson's time the reading of discourses in the pulpit was almost unknown in Scotland. Blaikie is of the opinion that it was under the moderate regime that the practice came into vogue. In his autobiography, Carlyle speaks of a minister named Lawson at Renfrew as "almost the only person who read in those days." Like Chalmers but unlike Guthrie Candlish read his discourses, although his speeches in debate never were. He would take with him into the pulpit a small manuscript from which he would read every word of his sermon, occasionally raising his eyes to some fixed point but never looking directly at the congregation. That he was not tied to such a practice and could in emergency dispense with any notes or manuscript whatsoever is evident from the following incident. Candlish was on his way to the extreme North of Scotland with a fellow-minister to speak on the subject of Biblical education. Having rested for the night enroute he prepared to leave in the morning whereupon the people, apprised of his presence, had assembled to worship and to hear him preach. Since he had already forwarded his discourses and had no manuscripts with him, he asked his companion to suggest a text. His friend suggested Psalm 119: 9. Candlish made no comment but proceeded to a church.

1. Maclagan, op. cit., p. 203
2. Blaikie, op. cit., p. 229
thronged with people. After opening the service, without a note before him and to the amazement of his friend, he announced his text as Psalm 119:9. Writing later of the incident his companion declared, "I really didn’t know how he could preach without reading, and more especially without preparation, but a more masterly discourse I never heard. He rivetted the attention of his congregation for more than an hour, and left them with all the impressions they had of his greatness as a preacher of the word, not only confirmed, but deepened."

Upon his students at New College he urged the great advantages of preaching without a manuscript. He knew the limitations of the paper and boasted he could preach without it. "I can preach both ways," he told his students, "and I assure you circumstances may arise in which you will be comparatively powerless if you are the slave of the paper. In Disruption times, when we preached in barns by the feeble light of a candle, or in twilight on the moors, of what service would have been our notes?" In later years, however, he rarely attempted to preach without a manuscript and when he did the old eloquence was diminished.

Sermons in the nineteenth century were of good length and took up the major part of the service leaving, therefore, relatively little emphasis on the remaining portion of worship. The time given by Candlish to his discourses did not deviate from the trend of his

2. *United Presbyterian Magazine*, February 2, 1874, p. 61
3. *Catholic Presbyterian Magazine*, op. cit., p. 197
day, but he did attempt to integrate with his sermons the psalms and prayers in order to emphasize one line of thought and teaching. When he was praying he seemed actually communing with God face to face as a representative expressing the needs and aspirations of his people to his Sovereign Lord. One who heard him was impressed by the power his prayers produced and declared, "Every passage of Scripture bearing on the particular subject of supplication appeared to be present in his thoughts, giving form and expression to his fervent petitions, in the most devout, appropriate, and beautiful manner." His petitions were those appropriate to public prayer, simple yet varied according to the needs of the soul. He prayed in such a manner that each supplicant felt the prayer was meant especially for himself. One of his contemporaries describing Candlish in prayer writes:

The singing being over, the preacher precipitately arose, and, leaning forward, poured forth a prayer remarkable for its simplicity, seriousness, and energy. Those who know Dr. Candlish only by his controversial discussions, can form no conception of the character of his devotional exercises. He confesses sin, not in general, not in stereotyped phrases - he thoroughly enters into the plagues of the heart and life. He seeks blessings, not in wholesale, indiscriminate, impractical, impossible manner, now too fashionable - he seeks them in adaptation and keeping with felt and acknowledged wants, and in the way prescribed and sanctioned by Heaven. His thanksgivings refer to real gifts and favours, which are also specified. In a word, his prayer indicated a deep acquaintance with the human heart, and with the fulness of blessing promised and communicated in answer to request. 3

1. His discourses averaged between forty-five hundred and sixty-five hundred words, and the delivery time ranged from fifty to seventy-five minutes.
2. From a letter by Alexander Gregory in Wilson, op. cit., p. 330
3. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 115
His prayers never were written, but this is not to say no preparation was made for them. For him it was a preparation of the heart in simplicity and silence. Having his soul in harmony with those of his people he was convinced that as he threw himself upon the Spirit his heart would pour forth the appropriate prayer on behalf of his people. His understanding, affections, and whole inner self were so steeped in Scripture from first to last, and so saturated by the divine Spirit that his prayers naturally became the result of the spontaneous utterance of a full heart.

One of the last pulpit memories, and one of the most impressive, took place when Candlish introduced the Hymnary into use in the church and quoted the first lines of Toplady's hymn—

Rock of ages cleft for me
Let me hide myself in thee

"The tenderness, combined with the animating hope and joy, with which it rung out," alleged one who was present, "were solemn beyond expression — the raising of the eye and the hand indicating more emotion than was at all common in him who so disliked any outward and visible manifestation of personal feelings."

To conclude, Candlish was not without faults and blemishes in his style and delivery. His eccentricities and mannerisms in the pulpit, already alluded to, must have detracted to some extent at least

1. "His public prayers were of the rarest, from their spirituality comprehensiveness, and variety; so that those who joined in them could not but feel that they flowed from an inward source so unfailing as fully to account for the strength, consistency and fruitfulness of his own outward life." Alexander Whyte in Minutes of Kirk-session of St. George’s, November 2, 1873

2. Maclagan, op. cit., p. 204
the stranger who wandered into the church. At times his quick mind would grasp a subject so rapidly and lay hold of certain beliefs so tenaciously that he was apt to neglect some of the lesser tenets. "He sees a subject in strong colours, and so states it, that subordinate topics are overlooked. Some parts of his picture are so highly wrought, that the shadow is obscure." At other times he would become so immersed in his subject, his ideas would come so rapidly, that he would find difficulty in stating a doctrine by itself without undergirding it with some theological or metaphysical theory. In attempting not to be misunderstood he would support a doctrine with arguments and clever analogies. In showing exactly what the doctrine did not mean and what it did involve he appeared to be "swinging from side to side of his argument, like a ship rolling in the tide." A. Taylor Innes, Advocate, writing in a journal in 1860 makes mention of a few of his shortcomings - shortcomings he says of "one who is undoubtedly one of the greatest living preachers."

... there is occasionally the logical sword play, which flashes... cutting the air but dividing neither soul nor spirit; the hard rhetorical ring and resonance, which is never wanting; even when the thought and feeling have for a moment sunk to a minimum; the text twisted in order to have the pleasure of putting it straight again; the ingenious explanation that explains nothing; the unaccountable reason for what requires no reason at all; and the admirable defense that makes you doubt the doctrine defended. 3

The theology of today may be less rigid than that of Candlish's

1. Our Scottish Clergy, p. 118


3. Ibid.
day, and the preachers less apt to be held to the manuscript, but
even now one finds a clarity of arrangement, a sanctity and spiritu-
ality of thought in his discourses delivered as they were more than
a century ago. They are examples of what expository preaching was
like in the mid-nineteenth century. There are few congregations today
which would endure an expository sermon lasting for anything like sixty
minutes or more as his did, nor would they appreciate sermons so de-
void of illustrative material. But on the other hand, his preaching
was "one in thought with and breathed the atmosphere of" his own
period, and in that he was truly "preaching to the times." He was
considered by his contemporaries as well as by some later critics as
one of the outstanding preachers in Scotland. Whatever one may feel
about his rigid Calvinism, his Puritan methods, his subtle arguments,
it must be recognized that as a preacher he epitomized the spirit of
the Free Church, he symbolized nineteenth century expository preaching,
and he nurtured a growing number of earnest laymen replete with an
intelligent knowledge of the Word.

1. Adams, The Christian Good of Scotland, p. 73

2. It is more than of passing interest to note that Jones in his
recent book on the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale
since 1872, when reporting on W. M. Taylor's lecture on The
Scottish Pulpit, refers in a paragraph or more to five renowned
preachers of Scotland. The five are Knox, Rutherford, Chalmers,
Candlish and Guthrie.
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THE PREACHER IN PLATFORM CONTROVERSY

It is not often that the same person who distinguishes himself as an eminent preacher also proves to be a prominent polemicist. Through no desire of his own Candlish found himself suddenly thrust into a church controversy, the result of which was instrumental in changing the course of much of the religious history of Scotland. Though he did not seek any responsibility in a dispute which he knew would foment untold friction, when such was laid upon him as one of the most prominent and promising leaders of the Church he accepted it as his appointed calling and gave to it his untiring service. By taking a brief glance into those Disruption days, and by observing Candlish against the background of heated controversy one is able to obtain a better understanding of the man, to gain an appreciation for his intellectual capacities and to detect those qualities which he, as a born leader, displayed in debate. The three chapters in Part Two, therefore, are not designed to be particularly exclusive; there is of necessity some over-lapping. The aim of this chapter is not to report on every speech Candlish delivered (in the thirty years he must have given as many speeches as sermons), nor to rewrite the ecclesiastical history of the Ten Years' Conflict and of the Free Church which followed. The purpose is, rather, to reveal, by examining certain debates, speeches, events and necessary history the characteristics of Candlish as a preacher in platform controversy.
In turning from his pastoral and pulpit relations to his public work, it was admitted that "he above all others represented the vis viva of the Free Church, and was the means of awakening and reinforcing it; he above any other stood connected with its impulse, its activity, its energy." From the day of his first speech in the Assembly he was destined, says Buchanan, "to exert perhaps a greater influence than any other single individual in the Church upon the conduct and issues of the eventful controversy." Chalmers had been the undisputed leader of the Church and Candlish, Cunningham and Guthrie were content to be his lieutenants. In the closing years of Chalmers' life he had come to depend more and more upon the leadership of young Candlish; in fact the entire Church had turned willingly to the young Edinburgh minister gifted as he was in organization, logic and debate. With the death of Chalmers in 1847, the leader's mantle fell without question on Robert Candlish. The morning after Candlish's death a daily paper came out with the following:

(Candlish) was the last of a great and powerful band of Scottish ecclesiastics who arose about forty years ago to shape and mould the ecclesiastical and political character of our country, and ever since the death of Dr. Chalmers he has been by far the most conspicuous public man in the northern kingdom. He has survived them all, Welsh, Chalmers, Gordon, Cunningham and Guthrie, . . . and he carries to the grave the strongest and keenest intellect in all Scotland. 3

1. Buchanan and Rainy, op. cit., p. 45
3. The Northern Whig, October 20, 1873
To sustain such a relationship as Candlish did to his Church required not only strong convictions and profound sympathies but also great and varied talents directed by his tremendous energy and burning zeal. He was indeed "a consummate man of business, a born lawyer, with a genius for elucidation and extrication," which could be equaled by few in Scotland. In the providence of God, at a time of crisis in the Church, there arose this "genius of a preacher, thinker, a man rarely gifted to mould and move his fellows by every form of speech, a practical guide of men and affairs." The church extension movement in general led to the memorable struggle which culminated in the Disruption of the Church in 1843. In particular patronage, directly or indirectly, was the source of most of the disputes and divisions that the Church experienced in Scotland since the Reformation.

Patronage began from early times and from reasons which on the surface seemed obvious. A man whose financial independence enabled him to initiate the building of a church naturally felt the prerogative of choosing the minister. Because it seemed most essential that churches should be built and accordingly endowed, wealthy landowners were encouraged in this project of founding churches by giving them special places in all solemn processions, by mentioning their names prominently in prayer, by reserving seats for them apart from the congregation, and by often sculpturing on the walls and in other conspicuous places their names and coat-of-arms. But after the Reformation

1. Daily Review, October 20, 1873
2. Buchanan and Rainy, op. cit., p. 45
the privilege of choosing the ministers was placed in the hands of the people. The First Book of Discipline declared that "it appertained unto the people and to every congregation to elect their minister." This, however, was never approved by civil law, and under the Regency of Moray Parliament clarified the issue and established the patron's rights, declaring that although the examination and admission of ministers was still the prerogative of the church, nevertheless "the presentation of laic patronages was reserved to the just and ancient patrons." Thus began the seesaw struggle. In 1592 Presbytery won the first round against Episcopacy but in 1612 Episcopacy became the victor. In 1633 the Covenant Assembly completely overturned the very foundation of Episcopacy and established Presbytery once again in Scotland. Just eleven years later patronage was abolished by law.

Ministers elected by the kirk-session of each congregation were admitted to Presbytery upon the approval and acceptance by the congregation. With the Act of Rescissory in 1660, this position changed. In fact all the legislature for the past twenty-seven years was destroyed and once again patronage returned.

As a result of a number of negotiations with the political leaders of the Scottish Parliament several beneficial and salving measures were issued. "It (parliament) abolished Episcopacy, repealed the statute by which the royal supremacy in the church had been established; restored the ministers who had been rejected in 1662;"

---

1. The First Book of Discipline, chapter iv, sec. ii In The Second Book of Discipline, the election was left "to the judgment of the eldership and the consent of the people." Cited in Cunningham, op. cit., p. 232

2. James VI Parliament I, chapter vii Cited in Cunningham, op. cit., p. 233
opened the way for the retention of such Episcopal clergy as were willing to conform to Presbyterianism; and legalized the Westminster Confession of Faith as that of the Scottish Church." This Revolution Settlement, as it was termed, protected the rights of the people in that they were at liberty to object to the proposed minister, yet the presbytery was the final authority in determining the validity of the objections.

With the Union of Scotland and England in 1707, the Act of Security appeared to settle the struggle once for all. It declared that the Confession of Faith and the presbyterian form of church government should "continue without any alteration to the people of the land in all succeeding generations." In short, special care was taken to retain the spiritual independence of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland in contrast to the supremacy exerted by the Crown over the Church of England. The problem of the spiritual independence of the Church for a time was settled. But within a few years an act was passed by the British Parliament (now affecting Scotland as well) by which, in the interest of the patron's living, presbyteries could neutralize or even overlook entirely the "call" by which the congregation signified its approval of a minister. This Act, commonly known as Queen Anne's Act, virtually re-established patronage, and contradicted in spirit and in fact the spiritual freedom and Christian democracy of the Church. In brief, the Act required and made mandatory "presbyteries

1. Taylor, The Scottish Pulpit, p. 14
2. The Act of Security of 1707
to receive any qualified persons presented to a parish, as presentees ought to have been before the passing of the Act; and it makes no reference to any call or consent on the part of the people." This caused great disquietude. The Treaty of Union of 1707 had been violated and the constitution of the Church of Scotland changed without consent of the presbyteries. In fact, it is to this enactment, alleges Fleming, that all secessions from the Church can be uniformly traced.

With the subsiding of the great religious excitement and enthusiasm so characteristic of religious life in Western Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the eighteenth century brought with it an indifference and scepticism in religious matters. Those earnest and uncompromising men who held the leadership following the days of Knox now faced the reality that another group, less independent than they, known as the moderates, were overpowering them and becoming the dominant party in the Church. Both the Reformation century and the Puritan century had been characterized by spiritual revolution, but now the wave seemingly had run its course, and as it were, the backwash brought with it a spiritually languid age. In describing the clergy at the beginning of the eighteenth century, McCosh believed it comprised "a somewhat heterogeneous mixture of covenanting ministers who had lived in the times of persecution; not sufficiently deep to induce


them to abandon their living; and a race of young men zealous for Presbyterian establishments, but only "half-educated and superficially accomplished." The moderate school was unlike anything that the Church had been or desired to be in the previous two centuries, and yet it was something of an innovation. Writes Blaikie: "We cannot with any reason call it a development; it was a reaction and a contrast. It was unlike the Reformed Church in theology, in life" and in its preaching. With the rise of the moderate party there arose some dissension among the people of the Church in Scotland. Over many of the congregations were placed "intruded" ministers, a number of whom the people were unwilling to receive. The languid and cold attitude toward religion did little to satisfy the hungry hearts of the people. With the decline of the evangelical spirit and the diluting of the supernatural in the gospel there followed consequently an intensification of naturalism.

But a "remnant" still remained faithful to their Reformed heritage. The dissatisfaction of several congregations could not be healed, so congregations singly and in groups of three or five withdrew from the Established Church of Scotland. No new creed or constitution was accepted, they simply wished to carry on, as they believed, the ideals as taught in the New Testament with the right to choose their ministers. One who thus withdrew was M'Crie whose monumental works revealed to the world his evangelical scholarship. His two volumes

2. Blaikie, op. cit., p. 216
3. Life of Knox, and The Life of Melville
played no little part in lighting the fires of the Evangelical Revival in the nineteenth century. Blaikie writes that "no man did more than M'Crie to clear the ancestry of Evangelical Scotland, and turn what had been counted its disgrace into a fountain of honour." Many churches seceded, but within the Established Church, cherishing a warm and sympathetic understanding with the seceders, were those who nevertheless considered it their duty to war against the moderates from within. These "highflyers" - as their opponents called them - who stood by the fundamental principles of the Church's constitution preferred to be known as the evangelical party, a term which had never really died out in Scotland.

Under the moderate party led by Robertson, Alexander C. Carlyle and Blair patronage was made absolute, the opposition of the people to settling an undesired minister was disregarded, and the "call" was reduced to a non-entity. Yet interesting enough, two decades after the Disruption, an about face was taken by other leaders of the same party when, at their own instigation the law of patronage, which had been their "sheet-anchor," was suddenly repealed.

The opening years of the nineteenth century saw the gradual rise of the evangelical party and the beginnings of the evangelical revival led by Andrew Thomson. As minister of the outstanding church in Edinburgh, Thomson - a strong evangelical, a master in the art of debate, with a keen and vigorous mind - formed a phalanx which gave

1. Blaikie, op. cit., p. 216
the opposition their first real organized resistance. He defended the
[great] spiritual independence of the Church by forceful arguments. But
at the moment that he was awakening to the full stature of his mental
capacities, and was being recognized as the ideal leader, his work was
cut short by sudden death.

The moderates continued to hold the majority vote in the Church
Assembly of 1820 and 1832 when the subject of patronage was again intro-
duced, but by 1832 their "hey-day" was about to pass from them. It was
in the Assembly of 1832 that for the first time the expression of "non-
intrusion" was introduced. James Begg made it clear in speaking for
the evangelicals that what they wanted was "non-intrusion" in the
settlement of ministers. This became a "watchword in the ranks of the
party, and a chief popular blazon on its banner." With the passing
of the famous Veto Act of 1834, the evangelicals took over the lead
for the first time in over a century. The Veto Act did not touch the
temporal benefits of the minister, but decreed that when a congregation
objected to the presentation of a minister by a patron their objection
should take effect.

Thus from the time of the Reformation the pendulum swung back and
forth, for and against patronage. The problem as it entered the nine-
teenth century carried with it nearly three hundred years of conflict
and strife. It was in the first stages of the nineteenth century that
Candlish entered the ministry, and his first appearance in the arena
of strife was associated with the famous Auchterarder case.

1. Bayne, op. cit., p. 57
Less than three months after the passing of the Veto Act the parish of Auchterarder became vacant. Mr. Young had been presented to the church by the Earl of Kinnoull, patron of that parish. All the male heads of families in the parish were opposed to the settlement with the exception of one individual. Acting upon the strength of the Veto Act only recently passed, which permitted congregations to reject an unacceptable presentee, the Presbytery did not proceed with Young's ordination. The Earl of Kinnoull subsequently brought an action in the Court of Session to have it declared that Presbytery was obliged by law to take Young on trial with a view to his becoming ordained. The Court of Session proclaimed it was outside the power of the Church to pass any such law as the Veto Act. The House of Lords sustained their decision when appeal was brought to them. At this point in the conflict the Assembly of 1839 met, and this case was consequently the most exciting item on the docket. Dr. Cook, heading the moderate party, was in favor of acquiescing in the decision of the law courts and thus accepting the Aristocratic yoke of patronage without conflict. On the other hand, the evangelical party, headed by Chalmers, with whom lay the sympathies of Candlish, strongly advocated the resisting of the decision, and thus asserting the spiritual independence of the Church. A third party arose, led by Dr. Muir, which advised a middle course. It was conciliatory to the law courts and yet it also seemed to defend the spiritual independent jurisdiction of the Church. With this third motion it appeared that a division would result within the evangelical party. Against this motion, which appeared to him a disguised betrayal
of the Church's independence, Candlish directed his maiden speech on
the floor of the Assembly.

In this tense dramatic scene Candlish received his "baptism of
fire" in ecclesiastical controversy. His reputation as a superb
preacher already was firmly established, but his "extraordinary talent
in debate and his rare capacity for business, not hitherto having
found any adequate occasion to call them forth, were as yet undiscovered
by the public, - probably," says Buchanan, "undiscovered even by him-
self." 1 Previously having been urged to be prepared to participate in
the Assembly debate, Candlish declined with all sincerity saying that
he was no speaker and could be of no use in debates. On the contrary,
the first efforts found him "abreast of the most practiced and powerful
orators, and as much at home in the management of affairs as those
who had made this the study of their life." 2

He approached the Moderator's chair "passing his hand through
his hair, as was his wont when he became excited," and ignoring the
less important confusions of Muir's motion, with clarity of speech and
accuracy of picture he moved to the heart of the question and began
striking his blows bringing the obscurities into prominence. Those
hazy phrases, indistinct in meaning and carefully hidden away by Dr.
Muir were exposed by Candlish's penetrating and acute intellect.

2. Ibid.
3. Quoted by Bayne, op. cit., p. 27
I have looked, and I do not find, from beginning to the end of his resolutions, one single word recognising the privileges of the Christian people. The reverend Doctor has pleaded for the power of the Church, - in its Courts, composed of its rules and office-bearer, - but without securing and carrying out, along with that power, the rights of the Christian people. And this, to my mind, is substantial Popery. It is a position which must go far to establish a system of spiritual despotism. In truth, it is only when the rights of the people of the Church of Christ are secured that the power of the ruling Courts can be safely pleaded; and it is then, also, that that power can be pleaded to its highest point ... For it is undoubtedly the right and duty of the rulers in the Church to moderate and control, with a high spiritual authority, the movements of all the other parties who act together in this matter.

There was no misunderstanding him. Concisely and succinctly he presented the Presbyterian position. The Church cannot be separated from the people nor the people from the Church. As his voice was heard throughout the entire Assembly Hall no one could deny that a mighty actor, with a "deep logical intellect, full of power and activity, acute in no common degree, clear and accurate," had stepped upon the stage and a new drama was unfolding.

One who heard him reported that his speech "combined subtlety of thought with energy of diction and drew all eyes upon him." With remarkable insight he felt the pulse and gauged the feelings of his countrymen, and with a true faith in the backbone of the national character he knew what cords to touch and to what memories and convictions to appeal. "If the trumpet," he cried, "give an uncertain

1. Buchanan, op. cit., p. 51
sound, if we merely assert the rights of the rulers of the Church, while we sacrifice or hold in abeyance the peoples liberties, it will be no wonder if we have not; we shall not deserve to have with us — the hearts or the prayers of one single man who is worthy of the name of Scotsman." Bringing his first speech to a rising crescendo he concluded: "We shall rally our countrymen once more now that the old banner is again broadly displayed — the banner on which we find clearly and fully inscribed — Caesar's crown indeed — but along with it and not less clearly or less fully — CHRIST'S CROWN; and underneath Christ's crown, and shielded by it — the purchased liberties of His redeemed people."

It is said that the crow has a very sensitive nerve between his eyes which enables him to discern food and pounce on it with machine-like precision, even when the food is two inches under the ground. Candlish in his maiden speech revealed this uncommon power of swift and decisive penetration — this faculty for discerning the root of the matter with unusual certainty and astonishing quickness. A. M. Symington refers to this quality in another instance when he remarks:

I sat for three years in a large committee, in the proceedings of which he (Candlish) took the keenest interest. When his deafness made him unable to hear the speaker, he would come nearer him, take a seat for a minute or two, then rise and go back to his place. The few sentences heard were quite enough to enable him to apprehend fairly, and to answer all the man had said.

1. Buchanan, _op. cit._, p. 53
2. Wilson, _op. cit._, p. 85
3. Symington, _Good Words_, 1881, p. 137
It was in replying to an argument that his penetrating powers were made especially prominent. The more confusedly the opponent wove the web, the quicker Candlish was to discern its purpose. Speaking in Glasgow on the measure of non-intrusion, amid repeated interruptions, he demonstrated once again his ability to penetrate beneath the surface and grasp the core of the problem. The opposition attempted to divert the main question of spiritual independence of the Church to involve the extent of the powers of the Church. Candlish perceived the tactics and forcibly re-established the main issue in the debate.

... That is the question that is now raised by some — a question as to the extent of power, but not as to the source of power. But the question which the Church has to entertain is not as to the extent of power, — not whether she shall be allowed ex gratia to perform certain functions as a Christian Church, but whether she holds these functions from Christ exclusively, or whether she will consent to have them from an earthly potentate. 1

His logical acumen would tear apart the opponents’ arguments, unrolling link by link the most difficult and complex reasoning constructed by another. By fashioning an elaborate and massive chain of reasoning himself he endeavored to influence the listeners in favor of his own convictions.

Closely coupled with his ability to penetrate beneath the surface was his aptitude in anticipating the thoughts and feelings of other men. He had an instinctive awareness when to ease up the reins of his leadership; a divination of the time at which concessions to the opposition should be made.

1. Wilson, op. cit., p. 249

The Earl of Aberdeen already had attempted to restore peace between the Church and the Court by the introduction of a measure which gave the people power to reject, for specified reasons, a presentee. This proved unacceptable and the Earl of Aberdeen concluded it would be impossible to satisfy the tense Assembly in 1851 with anything short of a revolutionary scheme abolishing patronage. When, however, the Duke of Argyll's Bill to establish non-intrusion was introduced, Candlish perceived that this was the opportune moment to make a concession and he resolved to support the milder measure of the Duke, whereupon he arose in the Assembly and made a speech which was described by one historian as "a rare masterpiece," and by another as "calm and conciliatory" in nature. It was so "full of conciliation, candour, and generosity," and "appealed so powerfully to all the better feelings of men's hearts," that it seemed the deadlock within the Assembly between the moderates and evangelicals might be removed by the unanimous adoption of the Duke's Bill. Although the unanimity he had hoped for was not completely realized, nevertheless, his speech became the influencing factor in carrying the motion to adopt the modified Bill of the Duke.

Again the old argument came up in that Convocation that the Church should repeal the Veto Act. Candlish had anticipated such a motion and was prepared to refute it. He indicated that the Church itself was ready to disregard the Veto if the rights of the people

1. Bayne, op. cit., p. 189
2. Cunningham, op. cit., p. 502
3. Daily Review, Oct. 20, 1873
involved in the "call" which embraced the principle of non-intrusion were recognized. Such a pledge, however, had never been given and consequently, according to Candlish, the Veto Act must stand. Because of the discord gradually seething within the Church he realized that eventually disestablishment would take place, yet he earnestly discouraged it, and rebelled at that which his mind contemplated. "Now, since we are prepared to consent that the State should cast us off — if we are prepared to do so, and if the State may at this moment be called on by a large and influential party to do so — let us boldly contemplate the thing as possible at least," said Candlish. At the same time there was maturing in his mind ways and means to meet the financial crisis an anticipated disruption would bring when ministers found themselves without churches, manses or incomes.

And we need not distress ourselves greatly, if that event should come respecting the means of our support; although there is not, as I hold that there is not, in the Voluntary principle, that which can fully and adequately meet the wants of a great population. But I do still believe in the voluntary liberality of those whose hearts God has opened in time of trouble, and will open still more. And here, sir, I say it is well for ourselves, for the country, for our opponents, that we should be seen in the attitude of men fairly calculating the question.

Let me add that I can conceive of the Voluntary principle being brought into operation in our Church, if such should be the event, in such a way as has not been tried in this country. Even our friends the Voluntaries, who have so strenuously advocated that principle, have not given it a fair trial. My impression is that our Voluntary friends do not know how to work it, and do not make the best of it. They do not adopt the apostolic rule that all things in this matter should be in common. I cannot doubt that in the early Church the system of ministerial support would not have been analogous with that system which leaves ministers to depend on their congregations, but rather . . .

1. Wilson, op. cit., p. 146
the system which unites the contributions of the faithful, and out of a common fund supplies the wants of the ministers.

That which was so predominant in the pulpit also was characteristic of all his work in church courts - his spirituality of aim. He persevered for the spiritual independence of the Church not for the sake of argumentation, but from a firm conviction that the Scriptures evinced such a position. This spiritual aim withheld him from drifting into the confines of mechanical routine and helped safeguard the Church from resolving itself into a shrewd business organization. According to Candlish, the Church - its every agency, assembly and committee, as well as its pulpit existed "for the sole purpose of raising up and edifying a generation of faithful men and (of) extending the frontiers of Christ's kingdom." While Candlish could surpass most men in unraveling tremendous problems, presenting subtle arguments in a powerfully convincing manner, yet it was this vitally Christian aim which penetrated and crowned all his work whether in the parish, pulpit, or on the Assembly platform. His mental endowment lighted up every subject it touched, but his spirituality of mind "gave to his eloquence, both in speeches and sermons, a lofty tone and peculiar power." He held men not only by the force and acumen of his argument, but also by a burning zeal for truth.

1. Ibid., p. 147
2. The Catholic Presbyterian Magazine, March 1881, p. 192
3. Wilson, op. cit., p. 326. Quoted from a letter by Alexander Gregory
It is a matter of universal acknowledgement that any speaker who exalts deep feelings must feel deeply himself. Cicero remarked that only passion makes the orator a king; that he himself had tried every means of moving men without success until his soul first became aflame with a mighty fire which he could not suppress. And Demosthenes' fervor and zeal so excited his listeners that they would grasp their swords and cry, "Let us go and fight Philip!" Candlish felt deeply that no earthly sovereign could usurp the place of Christ as the Head of his Church. His soul was aflame and he lighted a spark in others. Men became willing to give up their churches and manses in holding tenaciously to the principles for which he had contended and which he believed could not bear compromise. "His speeches were like trumpet calls for mustering of the hosts to battle and 'one blast upon his bugle-horn was worth ten thousand men.'" His powers of thought and speech were aroused to their highest pitch of activity by the excitement of the moment and the response generated by the listeners. He could have used this power for his own personal aggrandizement but his spiritual aim compelled him to channel it to the advantage and blessing of the Church.

Candlish's skill in business administration, both tactical and strategical, was illustrated in his management of large groups of men at the Convocation in 1843. His power to influence them in the direction of his own convictions was displayed remarkably in that secret gathering. A certain amount of jealousy among the evangelicals had arisen because of the excessive influence which Cunningham and Candlish

1. Allen, op. cit., pp 62-63
2. Taylor, op. cit., p. 255
3. Cunningham, op. cit., p. 523
seemingly wielded. Thereafter they did their work from the "wings" of
the stage. In this way they were able to arrange the necessary business,
cleverly extricate unimportant matters of discussion, and indirectly
influence the people to come to clear and concise conclusions which
would be accepted often unanimously. Candlish's propensity for business
was illustrated in the preparation of the Report of the Committee on
Arrangement and Order of Business. Peter Bayne describes the report
as "a model of brevity and sagacity in the laying down of rules, and
a masterpiece of comprehensiveness, lucidity, and accuracy, in stating
the subjects of discussion." Not a whisper of dissent was heard, not
a suggestion for improving the report was made. He had a love for rule
as well as a capacity for ruling and was always found taking a pre¬
dominate place in any vital issue. One writer believed he shone in
platform controversy even more than in the pulpit. "The subtle
dialectical power of which he was master found most congenial work in
dissecting the arguments of an opponent and laying bare the fallacies
beneath his statement, and also in seeking to convince others by most
subtle definitions and ingenious arguments that his position was right."
Because he possessed an intimate knowledge of men which enabled him to
discern to a great degree the fitness of certain men for particular
posts his opinion was sought after by the congregations of vacant
churches, so much so that it was feared such power and authority would
result in an "unrecognized system of patronage." "No Bishop of the

1. Bayne, op. cit., p. 255
3. The Catholic Presbyterian Magazine, March 1881, p. 19f
Church of England," proclaimed a daily press, ever "wielded the influence equal to that exercised by the simple pastor of St. George's Edinburgh."

Another believed that "the most conspicuous faults of his policy arose from his intense devotion to the Free Church."

No man, however, was more conscious of his faults and shortcomings than himself. His own constitutional impatience and defective hearing combined with a nervous temperament caused him to be restless and at times irritable and agitated. He grew impatient with foolishness, illogical reasoning or shallow thinking. He is pictured in the Assembly as seldom sitting still. Growing weary of curbing his energies and of listening to incessant wranglings he would twitch, change his position, make abrupt movements towards the front of the Assembly and the Clerk's table and then withdraw, writing hasty notes and just as hastily tearing them up again. Sometimes this nervous temperament yielded to a fiery temper which he was guilty of losing in the negotiations with Lord Aberdeen. He found great difficulty in yielding in controversy, and displayed a certain abruptness and pungency in manner which often offended, although those intimate with him testified to his singularly childlike, generous and noble" nature.

No man was loved more sincerely, yet no man was disliked more intensely. He possessed many intimate friends, yet he was considered by some as a recognized foe. He was followed by scores of his

1. The Northern Whig, October 22, 1873
2. The Original Secession Magazine, Vol. XV, 1882, p. 17h
4. Symington, op. cit., p. 137
fellow-churchmen and misunderstood by many others. In it all, a
daily periodical wrote, "He argued for what he believed was truth with
a logic few could equal, he contended for what he believed was right with
an energy and ability which few could resist." He wrote "his name
indelibly on the history not only of the Free Church, not only on the
Church of Scotland, not only of Scotland, but of Britain" as well.
And it is true that another history of his country could not be written
without recording his name with many of the other great names.

Whether one believes his position right or wrong, whether his
methods are subscribed to or not, it is acknowledged without a doubt
that he held an unusually prominent place in the Church as a preacher
in platform controversy. The negotiations in 1902 and the resulting
Church of Scotland which saw its birth in 1929, would have gladdened his
heart for although his life was so filled with controversy and strife,
which at times must have wearied him tremendously, there was nothing
he desired more strongly than unity among his brethren. Those
principles for which he so fearlessly and courageously fought are to-
day embodied in the Church of Scotland. Paralleling him with John
Knox may be elevating him to a superlative degree, but his biographer,
Jean Watson, felt that the part he played so well as leader of a
formative period in history is as established as that of "John Knox,
Alexander Henderson and Thomas Chalmers."

1. The Scotsman, October 20, 1873
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CANDLISH AS A THEOLOGIAN

Introduction

When the tumult of the Tractarian Movement had subsided, the reformed theology of the nineteenth century remained, but not without a growing opposition from those with Broad Church tendencies. With these tendencies emerged a less circumscribed view toward the Scriptures and a distrust in the position and methods of dogmatism. The center of the attack from the new school was aimed at the fundamental tenet of the older school, the sovereignty of God, the judicial element which was the regulative influence of the reformed tradition. Because of the increasing opposition to dogmatism, this judicial element was sure to receive the greatest blows from the opponents. The conflict was waged by various men of high character and outstanding attainment. In England, Frederick D. Maurice was prominent in the new school and his writings gained a sympathetic and enthusiastic reception. In Scotland the Broad Church Theology also had conspicuous representatives. One prominent name was that of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. Erskine advocated that God was Universal Father and that all mankind would be

1. Dean Hashdall, writing of this period in the English Church remarks, "At no period in the history of the Church of England have parties been more sharply distinguished than at about the middle of the nineteenth century." Hasting Hashdall, Principles and Precepts, selected and edited by H. D. A. Nagor and F. L. Gross; (Oxford: Blackwell, 1927), p. 155.
restored to him since a Father's love will attain its aim and end. A very close friend of Erskine and one who, like Erskine, had great sympathy with F. D. Maurice was John McLeod Campbell. In 1831 he was suspended from the Scottish ministry by the Assembly for preaching that an unlimited atonement of Christ assured all men of God's love to them. Campbell lived, however, to experience the time when he was universally esteemed for his religious scholarship. In speaking of J. McLeod Campbell's *The Nature of the Atonement*, published in 1856, and Bushnell's *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, published in 1865, James Denney writing in 1917 said, "It may be questioned whether anything has been written since to rival either as an interpretation of Christ's reconciling work purely through the idea of love."

Maurice and the Broad Church theologians considered it necessary to think first of God as Father, not as Sovereign Ruler as Candlish and the older school maintained. In his *Theological Essays*, first published in 1853, Maurice illuminates his theological position. In Candlish's *Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays* and especially in his Cunningham Lectures published in his volume on *The Fatherhood of God* he argues that God is revealed to original man primarily as a Sovereign Ruler and that man cannot know God truly as Father except as

they are in Christ who alone reveals the only true relation of the Fatherhood of God. From the time he entered on his ministry in 1832 until his death in 1873, his theological position was substantially the same. The entire body of Candlish’s writings (sermons, expositions, lectures and tracts) consequently is grounded in the fundamental principle of the Sovereignty of God. God as Sovereign rules by an unalterable law; men as creature is under subjection to this eternal law. This subjection to an eternal law is fundamental and vital and was expressed in the very nature of the relationship given to God’s creatures in Eden at creation. Moreover, in Christ’s mediatorial work on the cross what He finally and completely set were man’s obligations and burdens resulting from his relation to law.

Although Candlish insists that Christ’s work must be viewed in its forensic character, he was convinced that too many theologians had considered the forensic relation of justification to the exclusion of a more personal relation of adoption as sons. It was not enough to say that in Christ men is justified and sanctified. In distinguishing adoption from both justification and sanctification, Candlish sees in it the blessing which went beyond the legal aspect; he visualizes sonship as the crown and supreme privilege of the Christian’s experience, and he confesses that “the obligations of holiness are apt to be put in peril if Christ with whom my faith deals . . . is nothing more to me than a bringer in of a righteousness such as rectifies my forensic state and standing before God.” The relation and privilege of sonship in his

view transcends both justification and sanctification. In fact he prefers to adjust the order in the Westminster Standard, changing it from justification, adoption and sanctification to justification, sanctification and adoption. In this he is in agreement with John Owen who likewise treated sonship as the third and highest element implied in the communion of the saints with the Father.

In considering Candlish as a theologian this section endeavors to study him in the light of his own special theological interest—the Fatherhood of God. Besides comprising his Cunningham Lectures, this doctrine is the unifying theme for one of his sermon volumes, and also runs throughout his work on *The First Epistle of John*. In fact, his teaching on the Fatherhood of God infiltrates most of his sermons and expositions. Although a sufficient amount has been said relative to his early training to indicate the formative influences on his thinking, it appears true that his main interest in the Fatherhood of God as it is associated with the sonship of believers, was early born from his reading of Richard Treffry's *An Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ*. In his introduction to Dr. Kidd’s volume, *On the Eternal Sonship of Christ*, Candlish recognizes his indebtedness to Treffry, saying, "It (i.e. Dr. Kidd’s work) is a remarkable work in many views. It came under my notice in connection with my study


of the doctrine of the Sonship, long ago, when I was a student and probationer. The reading of Treffry's book started my thoughts in the line which they have since followed . . . It was through him (i.e. Treffry) that I became acquainted with the Treatise of Dr. Kidd."

Candlish further alludes to this same interest which began early in his student days, in his last volume of sermons, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers. "All that I mean by my title to indicate is that I have selected such as seem to me to bear more or less directly on what has always been a favourite line of thought with me, and what has formed the main topic in my writings;--especially in my Lectures on the Fatherhood of God and on the First Epistle of John." Hence the present writer believes he is justified in limiting this section to a study of the salient doctrines in Candlish's theology and their relation to his main interest, the Fatherhood of God. Because it is unlikely that Candlish's books will ever be read, except perhaps for his Fatherhood of God (which is not easily found today), and because of his subtle reasoning and meanings in the lectures, it is necessary occasionally to quote him extensively.

Apparently, even in the early part of the present century there were those who felt like Candlish that the evangelical doctrine of adoption had "been handled with a meagerness entirely out of proportion to

---

2. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. vi.
3. Although his sermons were characterized by their clarity of thought and dignity of style, his Cunningham Lectures do not display the same lucidity and elegance. In fact, he was criticized for their lack of definiteness.
its intrinsic importance, and with a subordination which allows it only a parenthetical place in the system of evangelical truth." In his Fatherhood of God he wrote concerning the lack of emphasis given to the doctrine:

For I cannot divest myself of the impression that the subject (of adoption) has not hitherto been adequately treated in the Church. In particular, I venture a critical observation on the theology of the Reformation. In that theology the subject of adoption, or the sainthood of Christ's disciples, did not, as it seems to me, occupy the place and receive the prominence to which it is on scriptural grounds entitled.

Including in his criticism the Standards of the Church, he further comments:

Take our own books for instance, our Confession and Catechisms. I never have had any scruples to affirm that their statements on the subject of adoption are by no means satisfactory. No doubt all that they say is true; but it amounts to very little. The answer in the Shorter Catechism is really, in substance, scarcely anything more than that adoption is adoption. In the other documents, the matter is handled fully, and there some of the privileges of the children of God are enumerated.

I hold then, therefore, to have virtually left the whole of that department of theology which bears on God's paternal relation to his people, and their filial relation to him, to a large extent an open question, or tabula rasa, so far as any formal verdict or deliverance of theirs is concerned.

Much of what Candlish affirms here is true, but the present writer is unwilling to say with him that the Reformation divines and their successors have left the doctrine of adoption an open question—a tabula rasa.

---

3. Ibid., p. 194-5.
4. Although Calvin, for example, does not devote a separate section of the Institutes to adoption, he does however refer in special instances
The Westminster Standards do face the question of adoption in the Confession and in both Catechisms. They elaborate the privilege of adoption as an integral part of the benefits enjoyed in this life and for all eternity received by those who are effectually called. They further trace the source of adoption to the divine sovereignty and grace of God and connect it to some extent with the person and work of Christ. But the Standards are relatively silent concerning the ground of the relation of Fatherhood. They are equally reticent in respect to the relation between Christ’s Sonship and the believer’s sonship.

Confession of Faith, chap. XII: All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his own Son Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption by which they are taken into the number and enjoy the liberties and privileges of the children of God; have his name put upon them, receive the Spirit of adoption; have access to the throne of grace with boldness; are enabled to cry, Abba, Father; are pitied, protected, provided for, and chastened by him as by a father; yet never cast off, but sealed to the day of redemption, and inherit the promises, as heirs of everlasting salvation. 1

The Larger Catechism, Q. 74: What is adoption?
A. Adoption is an act of the free grace of God, in and for his only Son Jesus Christ, whereby all those that are justified are received into the number of his children, have his name put upon them, the Spirit of his Son given to them, are under his fatherly care and dispensation, admitted to all the liberties and privileges of the sons of God, made heirs of all the promises, and fellow-heirs with Christ in glory.

The Reformers and later divines, in a sense, had enough to do to vindicate justification by faith alone, reasserting it in its right connection with the doctrine of the divine sovereignty which Augustine

had established. It is not surprising then that they should fail to enter the enquiry of adoption. This, Candlish acknowledges, is the reason for their comparative silence. And whether right or wrong in his position on the doctrine, he was indeed responsible for awakening an interest in this phase of theological reflection.

It was natural that with the new interest awakened by Candlish’s Cunningham Lectures on the Fatherhood of God, others should enter the field, making their contribution to the material on this somewhat neglected theme. Among those of Candlish’s contemporaries were J. B. 1 Heard, Charles H. H. Wright, and Thomas Crawford. Crawford was Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh University and was associated with the Established Church. Candlish had expected overwhelming opposition to his views from men sympathetic with F. D. Maurice’s and F. W. Robertson’s views. Because Maurice represented the left wing of the Broad Church School, it was natural that he should emphatically disagree with Candlish’s notion of fatherhood. But Candlish hardly expected the opposition with which he met from his own Calvinistic circle—especially


4. Maurice’s whole system of thought seems to spring out of his belief that the Son of God does not become the Head of humanity by the incarnation and atonement, but that He originally and by nature is the Head or Root of the race. In his own words, the “Son of God, and
Thomas Crawford. Like Candlish, Crawford was an honest and decided Calvinist, but he found much in the Principal's position from which he dissented.

In order to clarify the issue between Candlish and Crawford it must be kept in mind that there are three senses in which the Father-son relationship may be understood: (1) the general relation in which all mankind are involved in virtue of creation; (2) the special relation in which believers share by adoption in Christ; (3) the unique relation which the Eternal Son enjoys with the Father. Crawford argues for a universal fatherhood, while at the same time accepting, in some sense, the other two usages of the term. Candlish, on the other hand, denies a universal Fatherhood of God, acknowledging only one true fatherhood and one authentic sonship, conceived in the strictest sense, namely that which is enjoyed by the Eternal Christ with the Father, in which believers participate by adoption in Christ. Consequently there was an interesting 'passage-of-arms' between the two professors, which brought the controversial subject before the general religious public. Candlish's criticism of Maurice in particular is too brief and fragmentary to warrant a detailed examination of the differences between their views. Moreover, Maurice in replying to Candlish did not take the trouble to criticize him except in a brief introductory chapter to his

(cont.) not Adam, was the true Root of Humanity; ... from Him, and not from any ancestor, each man derived his life." (Theological Essays, [1893 ed.], p. 172). The Son of God is not only the agent in creation, not only supplies life to men, but is in all men—"Christ is in every man." (Doctrine of Sacrifice, [London, 1893], p. xxii). Candlish, by contrast, held with the majority of theologians of his day, that Adam was the root of humanity and that Christ was the root of a New Humanity. For an exposition of Maurice's theology, see Aloe Vidler, The Theology of F. D. Maurice, (London: S. C. M. Press, 1948).
volume on *The Gospel of Sacrifice*. It must be recognized that the real controversy was not between the extreme opposing views of Maurice and Candlish, but within the Reformed circle itself—between Candlish and Crawford.

It is of interest to observe how prevalent the problem has been which Candlish raised in his lectures in 1865. J. Scott Lidgett, in his illuminating volume *The Fatherhood of God*, remarks that “no doctrine of the relationship of God to man has assumed such prominence during the last half-century (19th century) as that of His Fatherhood.” It is not the purpose of this section however to attempt to resolve the problem, but simply to present Candlish as a theologian. We believe this is best accomplished when his doctrines of God, man, Christ and the Holy Spirit are studied in their respective relation to his views on the Fatherhood of God.

The position of Candlish on the Fatherhood of God can be reduced to six propositions:

1. On the basis of creation there is no true relation of fatherhood and sonship between God and man; God is Creator, Ruler and Judge only.

2. On the basis of creation the only relation subsisting between

1. For an account of a recent recurrence of a similar issue as that between Candlish and Crawford, the reader is referred to Appendix A of this thesis.


3. A later chapter is devoted to an appraisal of Candlish as a theologian, with special reference to his views on the Fatherhood of God.
God and man is that of a Creator-creature relationship; man is under law.

3. There is only one Sonship, in the strictest sense, and this is the relation existing between the Father and his Son Jesus Christ.

4. In the incarnation Christ revealed this ideal relation of fatherhood and sonship.

5. In the atonement Christ secured this Father-Son relation for all those who embrace Christ as Redeemer.

6. By the Holy Spirit working faith in them, believers come into union with Christ and become sharers in that Sonship which Christ enjoys as the Everlasting Son of the Father.
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THE IDEA OF GOD IN ITS RELATION TO THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

* The Doctrine of God

To his original creatures God reveals himself primarily as Sovereign Creator. In the incarnation He is disclosed as the Father of Jesus Christ and, by adoption, the Father of all who share Christ’s Sonship.

God’s original covenant stood secure because, in whatever form, it was established in Christ, by anticipation of his incarnation and atonement. But the old covenant resulted in servitude and bondage, while the new covenant, superseding the old, issues in freedom and sonship.

According to Candlish man can know God only as God desires to reveal and make himself known. In fact, it is the very nature of God to reveal himself; He is the communicating God and the communication is through his Eternal Son. Accordingly Candlish says, “This is the manner or condition of all the communications of himself which Jehovah, the Everlasting Father, makes to his creatures; - they are communications of himself through his eternal Son.”

To original man, and even to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, God revealed himself only as the Supreme Creator. Although God is eternally Father of his Son Jesus, and though the second person of the Trinity was active in creation, yet God was known originally as Creator only.


* The following is a summary of Candlish’s position on the doctrine of God. A similar abstract will appear at the beginning of each succeeding chapter.
Man cannot know God as Father, and God does not sustain the relation of Father to any of his mortal creatures, except as Christ in His person reveals God as Father and in His work makes possible the realization of the Fatherhood of God for all who receive Christ as their Redeemer.

As the Creator God maintains his creation; he "preserves and benefits his intelligent, as well as his other, creatures." As the Creator God is likened to a father, having fatherly characteristics, but is not in reality a Father to his creatures, as such. Yet, in so far as He is the Creator of all, if creation and fatherhood are considered synonymously, God may be conceived of as Father in a figurative sense. But inasmuch as no idea is conveyed of any permanent and personal relationship, there is suggested nothing more by the designation 'Father' than the idea of primeval causation or origination. Since, in Candlish's view, creation and fatherhood are not identical, he considers this figurative use of the term 'Father' as a positive abuse of the Name. Crawford, however, was unwilling to admit any misuse of the appellation. On the other hand Hugh Martin of Free Greyfriars favored the

1. Cf. chapter VII of this thesis.
3. Because God created man and because He acts towards man a fatherly part, Crawford accepted the position that whatever other relations God may sustain to man, He actually sustains the relation of Father or "some relation of which paternity is our fittest emblem." (Crawford, The Fatherhood of God, p. 14).
position of Candlish, but J. B. Heard, W. L. Alexander and J. McLeod
Campbell held that as the Creator God is the Father of all mankind.
According to Candlish, however, no filial relation existed between God
and original man; there stood only an eternal law. God's first word to
man was law, but His second word was gospel; He made himself known
first as the Sovereign Ruler and then as the Redeemer.

God is a divine Sovereign Ruler. Since he reveals himself to
his creatures as Creator, and since whatever God creates he must of
necessity rule, Candlish argues for the Reformed tenet of the absolute

1. In agreeing with Candlish, Martin believed that the problem became
more difficult if creatorhood and fatherhood were synonymous. God
says, 'Let us make man in our image', and if making man in God's
image is fatherhood, then says Martin, does it not involve three
fathers since the three persons in the Godhead were active in crea-
tion? (The British and Foreign Evangelical Review, Vol. XIV, 1865,
"Candlish's Cunningham Lectures", p. 714).

2. J. B. Heard affirmed that if God is not a Father He is equally not
a Judge, for why should one object to the use of one expression and
not the other. If language breaks down in the one instance then it
equally breaks down in the other. See Heard, op. cit., p. 367.

3. Alexander, in his volume St. Paul at Athens, considered the problem
in relation to an earthly father. If a child owes his life to a
parent and if the one who provides for the sustenance, protection
and well-being of the child is his father, then by analogy He who
is the real source of man's being, who likewise protects and sus-
tains him, expresses the same relation of Father. The term may be
a figurative one, but it expresses a reality and is so close an
expression that "it almost ceases to be a figure and becomes a
direct enunciation of an actual fact." (W. L. Alexander, St. Paul

4. For McLeod Campbell it is enough to say that God is the Father of
our spirits, and as such He sustains an original and abiding rela-
tion to all creatures. (On the Nature of the Atonement, 2nd. ed.,

to Gen. 3:15 that Candlish speaks of God making himself known as
Redeemer.
sovereignty of God. He is sovereign in both authority and grace. As Sovereign, God maintains his government by an inviolable rule. In speaking of rule or law Candlish remarks in one of his sermons, "The divine law is the assertion and vindication of the divine authority. There is a personal Lawgiver; a personal Judge; and he reckons personally with breakers of his law, as personal offenders against himself and his government." The sovereignty of God was manifested in choosing Abel and not Cain. Why Jacob was chosen and not Esau, Candlish is willing to allow as one of the inner secrets of God. But from the beginning there was only the Creator-creature relation.

It is however essential to God's very being that He should be a Father and that there should be a Son. This paternal relationship in the Godhead is antecedent to both creation and redemption; it is from everlasting. Hence, God is from eternity a Father and "has in his bosom, of his own substance and as his fellow, a Son whom he loves, and with whom, in the communion of the Holy Spirit, he is one." Since Christ is God's Only-begotten Son there is really only one true relation of Fatherhood and it is that which God the Father enjoys with Christ his Son. The idea of the true Fatherhood of God is fundamental with Candlish; it involves a personal and permanent relationship. In

1. Candlish, Sermons, p. 95.
4. Ibid., p. 436.
creation no such relationship existed. He is our Creator-God by nature, our Father-God by grace. He becomes Father only to those who embrace Christ as their Redeemer and who are enabled by the activity of the Holy Spirit to participate in the same Sonship which Jesus Christ enjoys with the Father. Consequently, Jesus, and He alone, knew God as Father; in Christ believers may enter into His experience of God as Father—the Father of a large and comprehensive family.

God reveals himself in three persons. In speaking of the Trinity in the introduction to Kidd’s work, *On the Eternal Sonship of Christ*, Candlish says, "The doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of revelation. It is a revealed fact, not discoverable by human reason—resting for its evidence on divine testimony." The nature of the Trinity is indeed a mystery; there is scarcely any assertion of it in the Scriptures, yet it is Candlish’s contention that this mystery, though not explicitly formulated, is implied in the redemptive acts of God. "Each Divine Person appears executing a distinct function." In reaffirming this position he in no sense minimizes the mystery of the Triune God, rather he feels that the three Persons in the Godhead become more intelligible as a reality when the "Father, Son and Holy Ghost are regarded as sustaining different, and distinctly defined, parts in the economy of grace." If there is no distinct work or office ascribed to the Father,

1. Candlish, *Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 84.
4. Candlish, *Examination of Mr. Maurice’s Theological Essays*, p. 434.
the Son and the Holy Spirit there is a danger of lapsing into Sabellian-

1. If, as F. D. Maurice held, all mankind are in Christ and only need to realize this fact, and if there is no real transaction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Candlish perceived a danger of lapsing into Sabellianism wherein the three Persons in the Godhead become merely "a threefold exhibition or manifestation of One Person, the Father." (Candlish, Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays, p. 37).

2. The only instance of Candlish's use of this Pauline expression is in his Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays. James Morrison, of Glasgow, accused Candlish of "plowing with a stolen heifer" when he uses such words but construes different meaning from that generally accepted. His view of a limited atonement would not permit the full Pauline use of the expression. (James Morrison, Vindication of the Universality of the Atonement, Glasgow, 1860).

3. Candlish, Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays, p. 432.
It is assumed that God is an intelligent being who has a definite moral character. Both his intelligence and his character are infinite and, as such, infinitely perfect. On this assumption Gandlish believes that if God is infinite in both character and being, all the "component parts" of his intelligence—"all its features or qualities or attributes—are infinitely perfect." Such perfection implies activity and demands exercise. Since God is essentially communicative, his holiness, justice, goodness and truth are therefore communicable. The quality of love in particular is "of very necessity bent upon communicating itself in grace and glory to one to whom it may say I and THOU - I GIVING, THOU RECEIVING." In one of his sermons he gives full expression to this quality of love.

God is love. It is a necessity of his nature; it is his very nature to love. He cannot exist without loving. He cannot but love. He is, he has ever been, love. From all eternity, from before all worlds, God is love. Love never is, nor can be, - never was nor could be, - absent from his being. He never is or can be God, - he never was or could be God, - without being also love; without loving.

I say without loving; actually loving.

For this love, which is thus identified with his very being, is not dormant or quiescent; potential merely; in posse; and not in esse. Love in God never is, never has been, like a latent germ, needing outward influences to make it spring up; or like a slumbering power, waiting for occasions to call it forth. If it were so, it could not truly be said that in himself, in his very manner of being, 'God is love' ... So 'God is love' before all creation; love in exercise; love, not possible merely, but actual; love forthgoing and communicative of itself; from the Father, the fountain of deity, to the Son; from the Father and the Son to the Holy Ghost. 3

2. ibid., p. 1. The capitals are Gandlish's.
In this doctrine of divine love Candlish is aligning with the traditional Augustinian view of the Trinity which finds expression even today in neo-orthodox circles. This doctrine is not incompatible with the biblical idea of redemptive love, although the manner in which Candlish expresses the doctrine makes it difficult to harmonize the two. To say that God is love sounds like a truism, but because Candlish was charged with failing to show the love of God as the originating cause of the atonement it is necessary to clarify his position. In replying to Crawford on this issue, Candlish writes:

I observe at the outset that it seems to me most important to distinguish the atonement, considered in itself, from the motive in the divine mind originating it, and from the mode of divine action for which it opens up the way. That, on the one hand, it springs from divine love, — fatherly love if you will, — the love of the eternal Father to his only-begotten Son, — love longing to have a household of sons in him, and to see him "the first begotten among many brethren" — and that, on the other hand, it issues in the actual accomplishment of the purpose on which his fatherly heart is set; — both of these things may be allowed or asserted, in perfect harmony with the most strictly legal and judicial aspect of the dread transaction of Calvary. And still the question will remain, how far fatherhood, as a real personal relation between God and any of the human family, either did or could exist, prior to that transaction and independently of it. 1

The importance of these quotations becomes apparent in the light of Crawford's judgment of Candlish's position. Crawford noted the care with which Candlish chose his expressions and concluded that in attempting to escape from ascribing to God a universal fatherhood Candlish makes statements which are impossible to be understood in any other sense than that the atonement originated in love; yet "not to sinners, but 'to His only-begotten Son', and that any love with which sinners

are eventually regarded by Him, is the consequence or issue of the atonement, and not its source." The guarded phraseology that Candlish used precipitated the charge that his position, instead of showing the cross to be the expression of God's universal love to mankind, made the cross the procuring cause of God's love to men. In denying this charge he affirmed that the whole plan of redemption originated in the love of God. But whether he denied the charge or not, his carefully chosen words and his manner of expression caused the majority of his contemporaries, including Wright who followed Candlish in respect to most of his propositions, to agree with Crawford. It was Crawford's contention that Candlish's over-cautious phraseology permitted no other conclusion than that Christ's atonement initiated God's fatherly love rather than revealing the universal love of God which existed from creation.

God is a covenanting God, "but the covenant is with his own beloved Son; and with Adam and Noah in Him. Hence it stands sure, being eternal and unchangeable." Candlish finds in the creation story the sure promise of a covenant, made later with Moses on Sinai, but having


2. Wright agreed with Candlish in most respects but he likewise censured Candlish at this critical point, agreeing with Crawford that it cannot be over-emphasized that Christ's atonement must be regarded as the "result and manifestation", not the "procuring cause of God's love." (Wright, The Divine Fatherhead, p. 12.)


Candlish always takes the expression "in Christ" in the literal and individualistic sense, to mean that the persons who are "in Christ" are the elect throughout all ages.
Its ultimate beginning with Adam and Noah. It is 'in Christ', by anticipation, that the Old Testament patriarchs could appropriate God's covenanting love as their portion. God does not deal with men according to his works, but according to His grace and mercy. In differentiating between the covenant of law and the covenant of grace Candlish writes of them as follows.

They are the law and the gospel; - the method of salvation by works and the method of salvation by grace; the one which says, Do this and live; and the other which says, Believe and live. And how are men connected with these two covenants respectively? By birth; in the one case natural; in the other, spiritual; or by promise. Under the first covenant, men are naturally, by their very coming into the world, placed. Under the second covenant, they have no standing by nature, but only through grace alone. 1

The doctrine of the two covenants is vital to Candlish's position and to his main emphasis on the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of believers in Christ. By nature the first covenant issues in servitude (servants) and is contingent on the issue of a probation. By nature the second covenant results in sonship (sons) and involves a secure and permanent position in the family of God. In this respect he follows in the line of seventeenth-century Covenant Theology which emphasized the doctrine of the two covenants and conceived of 'covenant' in terms of a legal contract requiring mutual consent.


2. In the sixteenth century Calvin believed that only one covenant constituted the instrument of redemption for all people in all ages. The conditions of the covenant were always the same. As Professor Dillistone points out, according to Calvin "there may have been, there undoubtedly were, differences in degree but not in kind, differences in administration but not in substance, differences in strength of the light but not in the reality of which the light was
The Idea of God in Relation to the Divine Fatherhood

Proposition: On the basis of creation there is no true relation of fatherhood and sonship between God and man; God is Creator, Ruler and Judge only.

From the outset two regulating principles are evident in Candlish's doctrine of the Fatherhood of God: first, that on the ground or platform of mere creation—considering God solely as Creator and man in his original state—there is no true and proper relation of fatherhood and sonship; second, that believers are sons of God only by their

(continues on the next page...)
participation in the sonship which Jesus Christ enjoys with the Father.

As Creator, God rules by an inexorable law; rule and government are necessarily implied in creation. Either God must rule and govern his creatures and the whole universe, or his creation exists independently of Him. When persons are involved, this government must of necessity be legal and judicial, absolute and sovereign. The importance of this is expressed in his own words.

This is a capital point in the argument from creation to government, which must be clearly apprehended and steadily kept in view. If it is as Creator that he rules and governs, - if it is as his own creatures that he rules and governs all things, all animals, all persons in the universe, - by whatever sort of law, by whatever sort of judgment, accommodated to their several natures, - it is not possible to conceive otherwise of his dominion than that it is of the thoroughly royal, imperial, autocratic kind. For it is the dominion of him to whom all creation belongs. It is the dominion of him who must, if he is to be God, be supreme over all. 3

1. How different this is from what his contemporary, Thomas Erskine, believed. In referring to Lucretius' gospel he wrote: "I have a great sympathy with the old poet, and am sure that he would have welcomed a fuller gospel, if it had been suggested to him, a gospel declaring that no inexorable laws, however just and righteous, but a Being whose righteousness is love, guides and rules the universe, and that His one unchangeable purpose in creating and sustaining man is to make him a partaker in His own blessedness by making him a partaker of His own righteousness." (Thomas Erskine, The Fatherhood of God Revealed in Christ, Edinburgh, 1888, pp. 137-38).

2. In dissenting from Candlish's view, Thomas Crawford maintained that rule and government may be implied in creation, but "mere creation, indeed though clearly enough evincing the right which God has to rule the things which He has made, cannot establish the fact that He does rule them, still less can it indicate the method of his rule." According to Crawford, God rules by law and by love; as Ruler and as Father. (Crawford, op. cit., p. 15). Candlish, on the other hand, builds his entire position on the fact that creation implies not only God's right to rule but His actual rule over his creatures by law.

God stands to his creatures, then, as a moral Ruler, their sovereign Lawgiver and Judge. Man is a subject, not a son. The true paternal relationship has no place in original creation, for in the concept of fatherhood is implied both a permanent position of the creature within the divine family, and the idea of chastisement rather than punishment. Since Adam lost his position he could have known no permanence in the family of God. Furthermore, God dealt with Adam, not as a disappointed Father.

In conceiving of the two relations—paternal and governmental—as mutually exclusive Candlish is emphatic in saying that "the notion of the Creator's government of the very highest of his intelligent creatures being anything else, in its principle and ideal, than simply and strictly legal and judicial, is as it respects the radical and essential relations of Creator and creature, an inconsistency; an intolerable anomaly; a suicidal self-contradiction." In his agreement with Candlish on this point Hugh Martin adds

1. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. 23. This is as near as Candlish comes to defining what he means by the term 'fatherhood'.

2. Crawford deprecates this unilateral conception. God in having brought creatures into being "will not forsake the work of his own hands." In giving them existence and imparting to them his own likeness God acted toward his creatures a fatherly part and it is reasonable to conclude, says Crawford, that He will not leave them orphans. The same love that moved him at creation will move him to watch over them with parental care and kindness and provide for them. And it will be his fatherly love that years after they when they become prodigal. Yet it is not inconsistent with that love, when the authority of His law is upheld by Christ's sacrificial work on the cross, for God to restore those who will to return back to his fellowship. As such God is both Ruler and Father. (Crawford, op. cit., p. 21.)

3. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. 17. When Crawford speaks of paternity he does not mean a literal and exact relation, the same as an earthly father to his children, but "only that it is a really subsisting relation, of which that of paternity is the most appropriate type." Whatever other relation is involved, the most fitting
that any coordination of fatherhood and moral government is impossible except under special sovereign arrangements, or except through the intervention of the Son.

One of Candlish's basic contentions is that there is a difference between ascribing to God "the characteristics of a father" and saying that He does actually, originally and universally, "sustain the relation of a father" toward mankind. The former expression, "the characteristics of a father", describes the attitude of the Creator toward His creatures, which is fatherly; but God is not said to be related to his creatures as Father. This is what Candlish means when he speaks of the "nature" of the relationship between God and man. The second phrase, that God does "sustain the relation of a father", defines the relation existing between God and man as a literal, permanent family-tie of paternity and sonship. It declares not merely that God is by nature fatherly, but that He is related as Father to mankind.

(cont.)

(1) term for Crawford is that of paternity. (Crawford, op. cit., pp. 13-14). Italics are his.

1. The reader should bear this distinction in mind in distinguishing between Candlish's position and that of Crawford, as well as when the terms "nature" and "relation", as Candlish employed them, are contrasted elsewhere in this thesis. Candlish accused Crawford of confusing the fatherly nature of God with the actual relation of Divine Fatherhood. Fatherhood implies, for Crawford, "the origination by one intelligent person of another intelligent person like in nature to himself, and the continued support, protection, and nourishment of the person thus originated by him to whom he owes his being." (Crawford, op. cit., p. 11). Although Candlish fails to give any explicit definition of what he understands the Fatherhood of God to mean, he is willing to accept Crawford's definition as indicating the fatherly character of God, but goes on to argue that even here Crawford confuses "nature" with "relation." Crawford's definition, according to Candlish, says nothing about a real relation subsisting between God and man.
This suggests the difference between fatherliness and fatherhood. Candlish readily admits that God possesses the characteristics of a father, but he rejects the view that He sustains the personal and permanent relation of a Father to his original creatures. He posits the question, Cannot God be kind and generous as a Ruler without being at the same time a Father? To affirm that God's causing our existence necessarily implies His fatherhood is to confound the notion of Divine Fatherhood with the idea of God's Creativity. If this be affirmed, then fatherhood is merely another name for creatorhood, whereas to Candlish it symbolised a genuinely personal and permanent relationship within the family of God.

In this connection Candlish admits that God is represented as Father among heathen writers, but here again it is the idea of Creator that is designated. The content of the biblical conception of the relationship of a son to a father is not present in extra-biblical writings. Even the teaching of the Old Testament, like that of other writings, does not suggest any permanent relationship in the idea of fatherhood.

God may be called father, simply as having caused his creatures to exist, and not as sustaining a really personal and paternal relation to them. That, I apprehend, is all that is actually meant in not a few of the passages usually cited... It is merely a creative fatherhood that is... claimed and challenged


2. Cf. footnote 2 on preceding page.

3. Brunner, in his *Christian Doctrine of God*, observes that "Zeus, indeed was called 'Father', and the name of 'Father' was often used to designate the Supreme Being. It is not the name of 'Father' in general, but the Name of Father, which the Bible teaches us to say, which constitutes the content of the revelation." (pp. 207-208).
for the Supreme . . . Even than however, as thus restricted, it conveys no idea of any permanent relationship. It suggests nothing more than the idea of primeval causation or origination.

2

At this point Wright is in sympathy with Candlish. In the Old Testament teaching, in Candlish's view, God sometimes claims a father's
eight of property, and a certain paternity is ascribed to Him as
choosing, constituting, redeeming and creating His people Israel, but
it is entirely a figurative paternity. Four Old Testament texts, however, admittedly teach, in the interpretation of Candlish, a relation
of fatherhood and sonship as practically available. That is to say,
they indicate that from the beginning the relation was contemplated as
the perfection of original man and that he was somehow aware of an
"anticipated" sonship, but to use these passages as evidence that the
relation of sonship and fatherhood was known as part of the Old Testament church theology is to misconstrue their obvious meaning.

Candlish buttresses this idea of the Old Testament teaching
with his understanding of the teaching of the New Testament and our
Lord's own words. "Adam the son of God," in Luke 3:38, can mean only
descent for Candlish, and not sonship. Paul's use of the pagen


2. In a careful examination of the Old Testament Wright concludes that
'Father' is used figuratively for teacher or master, is used as a
title of respect to kings, and is a name given to objects of wor-
ship. Sometimes the word 'Father' is used to designate the founder
of a nation; it is often used as synonymous with Creator, and for
one who nourishes or brings up others. But in all there is no idea
expressed of a universal fatherhood on God's part or an idea of
universal sonship on the part of man. (Wright, op. cit., pp. 45ff.)

3. Gen. 6:2; Hosea 1:10; Jer. 31:20; Mal. 1:6.
expression in Acts 17:28, "For we are also his offspring", is another case in point; there is simply an assertion of a common source, and a common origin does not imply, for Candlish, that a personal relation of fatherhood existed. He avers that in none of the Old Testament passages is there anything "like the assertion or implication of real and proper fatherhood and sonship as a relation subsisting personally between God and the individual man." When God is referred to as a Father in the Old Testament it is merely a conventional or rhetorical mode of speech. He does not find one reference to our Lord's using the title of Father with reference to the world at large or to men generally. Even the classic illustration from our Lord's teaching of the parable of the Prodigal Son is made to yield to his view. Summarizing his interpretation of the Old Testament relative to Divine Fatherhood Candlish writes:

On the whole, I am disposed to conclude that, so far as we can gather information or evidence from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the fatherhood of God was not revealed to the ancient church, either as a relation common to all his intelligent creatures generally, or as a relation belonging to the obedient angels and believing men specially; that any use made of the analogy of this relation as it exists among men, in the way of applying it to the dispositions and dealings of God, was little more than rhetorical; and that, in fact, there was great reserve maintained on the part of the great revealer with reference to this whole subject. 3


2. Ibid., pp. 130ff. "To my mind," says J. McLeod Campbell, "the expression, 'my son was dead, and is alive again', both accords with the great charge that faith implies, vindicating the strongest language in which its important results are ever expressed, and also fully recognizes our original and abiding relation to God as the Father of our spirits." (Campbell, op. cit., pp. 361-62).

Having drawn such a conclusion he later says in the same volume, "I do not of course mean that he was not the father of those who believed in his name; really and truly their father; as much so before as after the incarnation. I mean only that he did not see fit to reveal himself clearly and unreservedly in that character."

Candlish holds out strongly for a fatherhood based on personal relationship. This suggests at once the strength and the weakness of his position. Implied in his definition of adoption, as involving a permanent and personal relationship, is a conscious knowledge of God as a real and personal Father. In the last two passages quoted, however, he admits that the Old Testament saints could have had God as a Father without their being conscious of it. This seems to involve Candlish in an inconsistency, for he allows that God can be Father without His fatherhood being realized. Because of his one-sided emphasis on sonship by adoption he failed to see the other side of the truth, namely, that a personal relationship is implied in creation.

To recapitulate, the real question involved in the original fatherhood of God, as Candlish sees it, centers in the existence, or non-existence, of a "positively real and actual" Father-son relationship between the creature and the Creator.

It is not a question about the existence of a certain attribute in God, such as goodness, kindness, pity, sympathy. Nor is it a question about the sentiments and feelings which God may be supposed to entertain towards the beings whom he has made, and which he may express or embody in his actual dealings with them. The question is much more precise and

1. Ibid. p. 101. Italics added.
definite. It is about the existence of a certain positively real and actual relation of fatherhood and sonship between the Creator and his intelligent creatures ... We want not merely one who, in his other relations, acts as far as possible a fatherly part towards us; but one who is in fact our father.

As far as the doctrine of God is concerned, then, Candlish denies that any true relationship of fatherhood and sonship existed between the Creator-God and original man as creature. God is fatherly but he is not Father to his creatures, as such.

1. Ibid., pp. 14-15. Italics added.
CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN IN RELATION TO THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD
CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN IN ITS RELATION TO THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

The Doctrine of Man

Man, as a creature and not a son, as a subject under law, is made in the image and likeness of God—with intelligent responsibility—and has fellowship and personal communion with his Creator-Ruler. If obedient to God's law man would pass from his stage of probation as a creature to that of a son, with a permanent footing in God's family. But man transgresses God's law and because of his disobedience he is estranged from his Creator. Candlish concludes that the entire man is involved in this estrangement—in this fall—and his recovery must be nothing less than a new birth, a re-creation.

When God made man, Candlish believes, He made him a compound being having both body and soul, a living creature "with animal propensities and animal connections." He lives constantly as dependent on God for life. He was made under the law and was made to feel his dependence as well as to recognize his responsibility to his Maker. That man lived only as he received life at every instant anew from his Maker, is brought out by Candlish when he says, "Thus man, in paradise, could not live without God. He could not fail to recognize God as placing him in the garden . . . . He could not fail to recognize God also, as dispensing life to him continually and requiring from him continually a perfect obedience. Such is the true original position of man in respect of his Maker, a position of grateful and cheerful dependence."

2. Ibid., p. 42.
Creation speaks of man's nobility; God made him as the crown of his creation. As an intelligent creature he was exalted above the other creatures of God. That is to say, the counsels of the Godhead had respect to man; the image of God was reflected in him; the animals were subject to him and marriage and all its added blessings of society were ordained for him. Thus man's entire otherness from the rest of the creatures is noted by Candlish, but he does not conclude that there is therefore a natural relation of kinship between Creator and creature. Man differs from the other creatures but he is still nothing more than a rational creature enjoying fellowship with a Creator-God. There is even a sense in which this fellowship may be called personal. But because Candlish holds an abstract notion of the *imago Dei* he conceives of a person merely as one who is capable of intelligence and will. Although he agrees that the original relation involves a fellowship that can in some sense be called personal, because persons "capable of intelligence and will" are involved in it, this is not to say that any actual personal relationship exists on the basis of creation alone. Apart from union with Christ no real personal relationship is possible.

Man was made for communion and fellowship with God. "The only living and true God calls into existence creatures capable of standing face to face before him; beings like himself, whom he, as person, can address as persons; with whom he can have personal intercourse; to whose personal wills, intelligent and free, he can communicate and submit his


own will." Original man, though a creature and thus a subject, was capable of holding communion with God and of being raised from his "creation platform" to a higher one if he proved obedient. If, after the probationary period, he was found obedient, he would become a son, being placed on a higher platform in union with the Eternal Son. So Candlish emphasizes that it was man's original nature to speak with God, to have loving communion and fellowship with Him. But man's original position was not that of a son but of a servant. It was as Creator to his creatures, not as Father to his sons, that God first communed with men. By obedience to God's will this communion was promoted, by disobedience it was broken. This is brought out in one of his sermons.

For consider the divine ideal, if I may so speak, involved in the creation of man after the image of God, and in the footing on which it pleased God to place man towards himself. Evidently God contemplated obedience, or the keeping of his commandments, as the normal state or character of man. While that state or character continued, there was the best understanding between the parties; between God and man; they were on the best of terms with one another. There was entire complacency on both sides; each resting and dwelling in the other with full and unalloyed satisfaction. 2

One would imagine that, having published two volumes on Genesis, Candlish would speak at some length of man being made in the image of God. There is however a noticeable lack of clarity in his writings on this point. He acknowledges that man was made to reflect God's image and that "man stood forth, godlike and social, having under him, as in God's stead, all the creatures." 3 In so far as he understands the

1. Candlish, Supplementary Volume, p. 120.
expression, "the image of God" means that "man has a capacity of intelligence, an uprightness of condition and an immaculate purity of character—in his knowledge, righteousness and holiness." He goes on to say that this image of God stamped upon man is "an earnest of the heavenly superseding the earthly—the natural passing into the spiritual." But he is hesitant to commit himself further in regard to Adam's original holiness and righteousness. In fact, in one place he confesses that we know little or nothing historically of the righteousness and holiness in which Adam resembled God, yet he seems to countenance the idea that the image is known as it is characterized in the second Adam, the Man Christ Jesus. In his Cunningham Lectures he refers to the image of God in cold intellectual terms only, which Crawford could not accept. Had Adam not sinned it is Candlish's contention that a change would have taken place and his living bodily frame would have been brought into harmony with his spiritual and nobler nature; he would have become a son into which mould he had originally been cast. That is to say he was made as a creature in order to become a son. But, once again, Candlish rejects the view that to be made in the image of God implies that God sustains a Father-son relationship with his creatures.

3. Candlish, Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 132.
Created for communion with God, man through disobedience to God's will fell from this fellowship. In acting contrary to God's will, man perverted the true order of nature; in transgressing the law of God man himself was broken by it. He thus turned the divine image into its opposite. In this connection Candlish says, "Originally the divine life was imparted to man, the divine manner of living; for he was made in the image of God. But now that image being lost or broken and marred by sin, death is our portion, our very nature; death, a manner of being the reverse and opposite of God's; having in it no element of changeless repose, but tumultuous tossings of guilt, fear, wrath and hatred." To be told that the image is "lost, broken or marred by sin" still leaves one wondering whether Candlish held that the image was entirely lost or only broken and marred. In what sense does man still bear the image of God? We are left to conjecture on this, but he is clear in saying that sin involves an estrangement from God.

In a sense man fell because he attempted to make his life egocentric instead of permitting it to remain theocentric. "It was pure and simple insubordination and rebellion; the setting his will against God's; the proud refusal at the Father's bidding, to worship the Son." Hence, man fell out of the arms of God into the embrace of Satan.

Having been made the crown of creation man now became the curse of the earth. Candlish cannot depict sin apart from legal terminology. Sin is "the transgression of the law." "It is never anything else", he

---

1. Candlish, The First Epistle of John, p. 5. Candlish here apparently admits that original man had divine life in him, yet he denies any original kinship.
2. Ibid., p. 284.
says, "anything more, or anything less. It is in that aspect of it alone that it is judicially dealt with by God . . . . Even a son cannot sin otherwise than by transgressing as a subject, the law." Hence because sin involves a legal act of transgressing law, and the atonement meets the demands of law, he concludes that the atonement had nothing to do with restoring a filial relation. Although Candlish conceives of sin exclusively in legal terms he also includes in the structure of original sin such elements as unbelief, disaffection, and ingratitude.

Although Adam was created in the likeness of God he sinned and fell. Acquiring an habitual propensity to sin "he begat a son in his own likeness." This is surely an assertion of the Psalmist's doctrine: "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Apparently Candlish does not take the phrase, "he begat a son in his own likeness," to mean that all mankind being descendants from Adam bear the image and likeness of God. Rather, the sinful nature of Adam is passed to his son and in turn inherited by all his progeny, resulting in universal corruption. Mankind is "a race of respited criminals,

   Candlish deprecated the idea of F. D. Maurice, that "good feeling and good doing toward our neighbor (is) the essence and fulfillment of God's commandment." Candlish believes that Maurice fails to show the heinousness of sin. Sin involves estrangement from God. God says, "my son give me thy heart." This aspect he felt was absent from Maurice's teachings. (F. D. Maurice, *Theological Essays*, p. 17; Candlish, *Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays*, p. 78).

2. Gen. 5:3.

3. Psalm 51:5.

4. This interpretation is followed by present-day scholars—e.g., David Cairns in his recent Kerr Lectures, *The Image of God in Man*, SCM, London, 1953, p. 28.

over whom the righteous sentence of the holy and righteous God is suspended; that a dispensation of mercy may run its appointed and limited course." In this he does not deny that there is good to be found in fallen man, but this goodness is not characteristic of his nature but of his qualities and deeds, "which may be ascribed partly to their essential humanity and partly also to the dispensation of divine forbearance under which (man) lives." He nevertheless depicts the whole of man's nature to be corrupt. That is to say the entire man is involved in sin and nothing will meet his need but a change equivalent to a new birth. "The recovery must . . . consist in the entire man being renewed; the will subjected to the authority and law of God - the conscience quickened to the fear of God; - the heart reconciled to the love of God."

Man in Relation to the Fatherhood of God

Proposition: On the basis of creation the only relation subsisting between God and man is that of a Creator-creature relationship; man is under law.

Keeping in mind Candlish's two regulating principles—that there is no true and proper Father-son relationship in original creation, and that only by participation in Christ's Sonship do believers become sons of God—the doctrine of man teaches that men originally are not properly sons but subjects—subjects capable of knowing, loving and serving God. Although man is made in God's image and after His likeness, made to have

1. Candlish, Examination of Mr. Mourice's Theological Essays, p. 45.
2. Ibid., p. 128f.
3. Ibid., p. 110.
communion and fellowship with Him, and is placed on "the best of terms" with Him, and although God may manifest fatherly affections toward him, may even have personal intercourse with him, nevertheless Candlish argues that no relation of fatherhood and sonship exists. As creatures, men are "capable of understanding His will, feeling their free responsibility under it and receiving reward or punishment in terms of it," and in just this sense of intelligent responsibility men are distinct from other creatures. This was entirely too cold a conception of the image of God for Crawford. He was unwilling to admit that it could consist in anything so barely intellectual or so entirely judicial. "Beyond the bare fact of intelligent responsibility" the creature, in Crawford's vision, has the capacity of "knowing, loving, desiring, trusting, serving and enjoying" God. Whereas Candlish emphasizes the rational will in man as the distinguishing feature, Crawford lays stress on the human capacity to love.


In his original Cunningham Lectures Candlish fails to bring out these other important elements involved in the Imago Dei, and the reader, like Crawford, is left to draw his own conclusions. But cf. the Supplementary Volume, p. 10.

In this connection J. B. Heard remarks that "it seems to us a rash statement on the one hand to say that God being the Father of all men, will never cast off any of them as finally impenitent, which is the inference which universalism draws from the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. So it seems to us to be equally rash in the other extreme to reason backward, as Dr. Candlish seems to do, that since the Divine image is extinguished in those who are finally lost, that image was never fully impressed upon them, and that all that is meant of the creation of men in the image and likeness of God, is "the capacity of understanding the divine will and feeling a sense of responsibility under it . . . ." (Heard, op. cit., p. 368).
It is man’s obligation as a subject under a Sovereign to love God. This obligation is fulfilled "through the conformity of our nature to his (God's) nature in love," yet "that conformity is not itself the relation" of sonship. In another place he adds the following.

Love is an affection of the divine mind and heart, which may modify the character of any and all relations, but cannot of itself constitute any relation. Creation is a fact, constituting a relation, clear and definite; the relation of dependence and responsibility. The attribute of love in the Creator invests that relation with a character of bounty and beneficence which it would not otherwise of itself have had. But it does not constitute a distinct and separate relation. 2

Government by law and judgment must be kept distinct, in his view, from fatherhood, for justice is done to both conceptions only when they are kept separate and apart. As we have already pointed out, he acknowledges that there are indications pointing to a higher relation between the Creator and his creatures originally. In other words, there is an awareness of what he calls an "anticipated" sonship on the part of the first creatures. This anticipated sonship must however be kept posterior to that primal relation of creaturehood. God created man intending to adopt him into the family as a son, had he proved obedient under probation. As already intimated, man was made a creature in order to become a son.

No doubt his Creator, having intended originally to adopt and own him as a son, - after probation probably as a subject, may be pleased to draw near to him, even when upon probation he has failed and fallen in a way indicative of that original intention;

and may show his willingness to welcome him, on his return, with the fulness of the parental love and the parental blessing which he meant him from the first to possess; — for which indeed, I repeat, he made him.

But because man failed in his period of probation, sonship was denied him until the demands of the law were met in the Son Jesus Christ, and it is only then that believers, through faith, are enabled to participate in His sonship.

1. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. 26; cf. pp. 20-21. In this admission of an anticipation of the coming sonship as an element of the original state of man, Candlish unfortunately passed over a thought which might have been advantageously developed. (See Principal Rainy in Wilson, Memorials of R. S. Candlish, p. 620).
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THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST

IN RELATION TO THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

The Person of Christ

Christ is true God and true man, the God-man. As such he is both a Son and a subject under law. Since no divine fatherhood was known before the incarnation, and, since there is only one true relation of fatherhood and sonship - that which exists between God and his Son Jesus Christ - the incarnation shows that God can sustain the relation of a paternal ruler only in this ideal relationship. Because the Son shared the position of a subject Candlish concludes by converse reasoning that subjects can share the Sonship of Christ.

Because of man's illicit desire for independence he has created a miserable breach between himself and God; he has sinned in transgressing God's holy law. A divine-human Mediator only can "heal such a breach, end the long alienation, clear up for ever the sad misunderstanding, and bring the Creator and his guilty creature, the Father and his lost child, together again in love."1 In his view of Christ Candlish represents the traditional position of the two nature theory. The interesting thing is not the novelty in his theory but the implications he draws for his doctrine of divine fatherhood. Christ, who is eternally co-equal with God, is the One who discloses the identity of the Father to man. In consciousness of this unique relationship to the Father Jesus says, "All things that the Father hath are mine."2 It is Candlish's contention that Christ as the Son

1. Candlish, Sermons, p. 36
of God continues to retain his divine sonship even in the incarnation. In fact, it is only in the incarnation that the true relation of fatherhood and sonship is revealed. God is truly the Father of Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ is God's unique Son, in nature as well as in position. Through the incarnation this eternal Father-Son is brought within the range of human vision.¹

In his incarnation he was made man, not as fallen man is now, but as Adam was before the fall. Candlish found great difficulty in conceiving, without some reservation, of the Son becoming man.

That he could become what Adam was when he was first made in the image of God, involves no difficulty beyond what lies in the idea of the union of the two natures in one person. But that he should become what I am, when I am begotten in the image of fallen Adam born in iniquity and conceived in sin, —that theory exceedingly complicates the difficulty. And then, I never have been able to see how if the human nature of the Son of God had in it anything of the blight or taint which the fall has entailed on it as transmitted to us... he ever could have stood us in stead, as the Lamb of God offered for us without blemish and without spot; or in other words, as the Holy One of God taking our place and answering for us, by substitution, under sentence of condemnation from which, as it would seem, if he is really to do so, he must himself be free. ... I hold his manhood to be what unfallen Adam's manhood was.²

He was in the fullest sense a man for he hungered, knew weariness and other human limitations. He was distinct from other men in that he was without sin. Candlish enlarges upon this point in one of his sermons, saying "Christ is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from

². Ibid., pp. 56-57
sinners ... and he is so, not in conduct and character merely, but in his birth, in his very nature as man, the man Christ Jesus. He is man; the one only perfect man. ... He is the man, as God originally made man, perfect absolutely and indivisibly one and perfect.¹

As man, Christ was a servant, born under subjection to the sovereign law of God. In his own person he united both the highest prerogative of rule and the humblest obligation to do service; as one with God he rules, as one with man he is ruled.² As Candlish says in one of his sermons, "Christ, as a servant, did the will of God. His meat was to do the will of him that sent him, and to finish his work. As the Father gave him commandment, even so he did."³ Hence, Jesus as true man was revealed as the Son in a creature’s subjection - as a servant of God his Father.⁴ To be a servant, or a subject under his Father’s rule, was not incompatible with his sonship, but rather it was its very perfection.⁵ "He was ever, as the Son, distinct from the Father, and as the servant subject to the Father."⁶ It was as man, as a subject as well as a Son, that Christ learned obedience by the things which he suffered. His coming in the flesh was not simply

---

1. Candlish, Sermons, p. 32 Italics added.
2. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. 204
3. Candlish, Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 321
6. Candlish, The First Epistle of John, p. 94
an incident or event in history, but it has a special meaning in the
moral government of God. His coming "brought him, not merely into
the position of one made under the law, but into the position under
the law of those whose place he took."¹

Jesus is true God and true man, yet there is neither confu-
sion nor separation between his manhood and his deity. This is
beyond all question a great inscrutable mystery to all theologians
and Candlish is no exception.

The idea of the Eternal Son, the Maker, Lord and Heir
of all things, not only condescending to occupy for a
time the position of a subject, but consenting to make
that position his own inalienably and for ever, is very
solemn and awful. It is one from which the reverential
adorers of the Divine Redeemer may be apt, on its being
first presented to him, to shrink and recoil. And yet I
do not see how that conclusion can be avoided or evaded,
if the fact of the incarnation is admitted, together with
the doctrine founded upon it, - the doctrine of the in-
dissoluble union of the two natures in the one person of
the incarnate Son.²

In making a comparison between the Old Testament sacrifices and the
all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ Candlish writes of "this inscru-
table mystery" of the two natures:

"Behold the Lamb of God!" Contemplate him who is thus
introduced. . . . In him alone are united the unchanged
essence of the uncreated Godhead and the highest perfection
of created manhood. One with God, one also with man, he
has a standing before God as the representative man, the
second Adam, the Lord from heaven; he has a position in
the presence of God, a place in the favour of God, which

¹ Candlish, The First Epistle of John, p. 356
² Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, pp. 60-61
none can challenge—the full joy of which none can imagine. He is in the Father's bosom, his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased.\footnote{1}

The Relation of the Person of Christ
to the Fatherhood of God

Proposition: There is one sonship and this is the relation existing between the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. In the incarnation Christ revealed this ideal relation of fatherhood and sonship.

In assuming the original relation between the Father and the Son to be eternal, Candlish maintains that in this eternal relationship exists the only true concept of fatherhood. The incarnation brings this true relationship within the range of human perception. Perhaps the angels of God may have learned of this in some other way, but for man, Candlish firmly reiterates, the "incarnation is the clearest, brightest, most gracious and glorious exhibition that has ever been given, or . . . that ever can be given, of the divine fatherhood."\footnote{2}

When the eternal Son of God became man he also became a subject of God. In fact, as we have already noted, he was at once a Son and a servant. Candlish sees in this the peculiar wonder and mystery of the incarnation, that in the one person, Jesus Christ, is the union of the two relations—son and subject. As the man Christ Jesus, he is the Son of God in the same sense as he was before the incarnation.

\footnotesize{1. \textit{Candlish, The Atonement}, p. 145}

\footnotesize{2. \textit{Candlish, The Fatherhood of God}, p. 140}
He possesses two natures, but is one Person. According to Candlish, and he contends most emphatically for this position, there cannot be "two distinct relations of fatherhood and sonship subsisting between God and the Incarnate Word; the one proper to his divine, the other to his human nature." Candlish criticizes Crawford for dividing Christ's Sonship into two distinct relationships. God is Father not merely to a divine person but also to a human person — to one as truly man as he is God. On that basis, Candlish affirms "that the relation of fatherhood and sonship subsisting between the first and second Persons in the Godhead is not incommunicable; that it is a relation in which one having a created nature may participate." In fact,


2. Candlish accused Crawford of asserting a divided sonship. What Crawford does assert for Christ is two distinct sonships, or two distinct relations to God. If, as Crawford argues, when man was made in the image of God he became, to some extent at least, a son of God, then too, when Christ became man he took on all the characteristic properties and relations of man with the exception of what is sinful. One of the properties or relations was, however, to be a son of God. Then, according to Crawford, Christ was both the Son of God, and a son of God, one relation proper to his divine nature and the other proper to his human nature. Crawford explains his position when he says, "We apply to them (man and Christ) both, indeed, the same human analogy of sonship, because we can find no better analogy to represent them. But we are not to be held on that account as affirming that they are identical. On the contrary, we believe them to be in many respects greatly dissimilar. The one is a divine, while the other is a human sonship. The one is constituted by generation from eternity; the other by creation and providence in time. The one implies participation in the divine substance; while the other implies only conformity to the divine image. The one Christ sustains as His exclusive and incommunicable prerogative, being emphatically 'God's own Son', and 'the only begotten;' the other He sustains in common with ourselves as 'the second Adam,' 'the seed of the woman,' who behoved to be 'made in all things like unto His brethren.'" Crawford, The Fatherhood of God, pp. 218-219
"humanity actually shares in it, in the person of the Son of God, Jesus Christ come in the flesh.\textsuperscript{1}

If in Jesus these two relations are combined and yet distinct, then it is apparent, according to Candlish's argument, that as man Jesus is the Son of God and as man, he is also in subjection to his sovereign ruler.\textsuperscript{2} It is the incarnation which becomes the master key, unlocking the true relation of the Fatherhood of God. Only in and through Jesus Christ does God possess both a subject and a Son; only in and through Christ Jesus can God be known as both a Sovereign Creator and a Father. Involved in his position as a subject is the fact that, as such, Christ is under subjection to violated law and consequently he shares, by identification with mankind, their relation as fallen, guilty and condemned creatures. Since Christ participates in the relation of subjectship, this points to the fact that one can be a subject and son at the same time. It follows that all who experience release from condemnation under law, though subjects, are sons of God in Christ. They too are at the same time subjects and sons, sons as Christ is the Son; they participate in his sonship.\textsuperscript{3}


2. In refusing to allow two distinct sonships Candlish posits the following questions: Is Christ's human sonship to be now for ever? Or does it take the place of his eternal sonship or are the two sonships identical? If his eternal sonship is still attached to him, then to what extent? "\textit{Quid valet?}" He asks, "Is this not something like the heresy of his manhood being swallowed up in his divinity?" (Candlish, Supplementary Volume, p. 180)

3. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. 59
Thus it is in the incarnation that the communicability of the relation of sonship to the Father is disclosed. "I do not see how, before the appearance of the Son of God in his incarnate state," Candlish argues, "the possibility of such a combination, or the manner in which it might be effected, could be made clearly manifest, how it could be shown, at least fully, to the satisfaction of any created intelligence that the relation of proper sonship, and the relation of real and actual subjectship, might co-exist in one and the same individual person." Contending for his principle that man can become a son of God only by participation in the sonship which Christ enjoys with the Father, he concludes that Christ's "coming in the flesh demonstrates that it is possible for him who is naturally the Son, to be also a subject and a servant, as all God's reasonable creatures are. May it not, must it not be regarded as going far to demonstrate the converse also, that it is possible for those who are naturally subjects and servants to be sons, as he is - to enter somehow and to some extent into his relation to God as his Son, as he enters into their relation to God as his subjects and servants?"  

Although the root of Candlish's doctrine of the Fatherhood of God lies in his argument on the communicability of the divine sonship, he conceives of Christ's Sonship as a distinct position in the Godhead. As the Son, Christ is visualised as distinct from the Father; that is, there is something that constitutes the Son to be the Son and not the Father and something that constitutes the Spirit  

2. Ibid., p. 51
to be the Spirit and not the Father or the Son. And if the divine Son is distinct from the Father, then when other sons partake of Christ's sonship, there is no multiplication of persons in the Godhead, or any deification of saints, as some accused Candlish of teaching. In this connection he writes:

I do not profess to throw any new light on the mystery of the Trinity; nor do I wish to enter into the very subtle reasonings in which some defenders of the orthodox faith used to put forth their logical and metaphysical ingenuity. All I wish to show is this—that, upon any other than the Sabellian hypothesis, which virtually makes the distinction of the persons nominal and nothing more, there must be a separation of the Son's filial relation—not in fact, of course, but in idea—from his divine nature. His being the Son is something distinct in conception from his being God. That is enough for my purpose. For it follows that the notion of the relation being in some sort communicable, does not imply that the nature is so. It cannot be proved that, in holding the possibility of intelligent creatures being partakers of the Son's sonship, I must be convicted of holding the possibility of their being partakers of his essential Godhead. Of course I do not speak of his moral nature as the Son. My view is, that they partake of his filial character as well as his filial relation. But that does not make them partakers of his proper divinity.

1. An American theologian, in the early part of the present century, wrote in opposition to Candlish's view saying, "Unless the personalies of human sons are somehow absorbed into the personality of the Son of God, the affiliation of human sons by faith in Jesus Christ is the multiplication of persons in the Godhead. And further, it would amount to the deification, both ethically and metaphysically of every glorified saint." (Webb, The Reformed Doctrine of Adoption, p. 101h). It is unlikely, however, that Webb was acquainted with Candlish's Supplement to his Fatherhood of God, in which he attempts to draw the fine line of distinction between sharing Christ's divine nature and sharing in the position which Christ enjoys as the Son. Vide Candlish's quote supra, italics added

2. Candlish, Supplementary Volume, pp. 128-129. In opposition to the position of Candlish, Crawford evidently contends that Christ's sonship "must be regarded as something which is absolutely unique
What Candlish is saying is that in some inexplicable way the relation in which the Son as man stands to God his Father is communicated and made available to all who are in Christ. They do not share in the nature of Christ’s sonship but only in his filial position - his relation as Son to God. This is indeed a high doctrine and one must be exceedingly careful to make clear the distinction between the Creator and his creatures and between the Son and his sons.¹

(cont) and unapproachable by any creature. And though the sonship conferred upon His people may be in some respects strikingly analogous to it, yet in other respects the distance between them is so immeasurable that we dare not speak of them as substantially the same.” Consequently, “instead . . . of saying that by virtue of the incarnation a human being enters into the very relation of the Only-begotten to the Father, we ought rather to say that, by virtue of the incarnation, the Only-begotten, in respect of His assumed humanity, enters into the relations of man to God. The incarnation per se is not the communication of anything divine to humanity, but rather the assumption of everything human, sin alone excepted, into personal union with divinity.” (Crawford, The Fatherhood of God, pp. 197 and 205).

¹. The reader is referred to chapter IX of this thesis for a fuller discussion.
The Work of Christ - The Atonement

The atoning work of Christ is a revelation of the name and nature of God to all men and as such mankind is without excuse. Because man is estranged from God, because he has broken divine law, satisfaction must be made to God's holiness. The death of Christ accomplishes a real satisfaction of God's holy law and enables God to be just in forgiving sinful man. This atoning work becomes realized in man individually when he receives Christ by faith. But because all men in reality do not receive Christ, his death is not for all, but it is actually completed only for those who in the plan and purpose of God yield to Christ's substitutional work on the cross. In this regard the atonement is limited to those who are to be saved. By the resurrection from the dead Christ comes forth as a quickening Spirit to bring all those united with him into the Father's house and family to enjoy his very own relation. Through the atonement, consequently, God becomes Father to the believer.

The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice.— Throughout the writings of Candlish, and especially in his volume The Atonement, he is attempting to defend the old Calvinistic theory from the attacks of his own day. He leaves many loose ends in his thinking, and one cannot expect to find a thoroughly worked out doctrine. To the age in which Candlish lived there was something offensive in the very idea of a sacrifice that took away sin. To many of the cultured this seemed no more than a relic of paganism carried over from Israel into the writings of the New Testament. But the extraordinary emphasis laid upon the death of Christ in the gospel narratives, at least the proportion of space devoted to the last hours of Christ's earthly ministry should have been enough to make anyone hesitate to adopt this attitude.

1. Candlish understood the Calvinistic doctrine of the atonement to embrace: "That for whomsoever Christ died at all, for them he died efficaciously and effectually." (Candlish, The Atonement, p. 86)
Candlish certainly was aware of the climate of his age, but nevertheless he made bold to declare what he considered the "cardinal truth of Christianity" - the sacrificial death of Christ. Any consideration of his position must be in the light of the question, What is it that the atonement really accomplishes?

He notes the position which the sacrificial system occupied in the Old Testament. Most closely associated with the Old Testament rite of sacrifice was the idea of satisfaction - a satisfaction to law. In type the satisfaction must correspond to the nature of the law broken. As Candlish says, "Let law be the expression of the free-will of the subject. Let it be the assertion of right, and the imposing of duty. Then, when a breach of that law occurs, we instinctively feel that satisfaction is due. And to meet the case, it must be satisfaction bearing some analogy and proportion, in its nature and amount, to the law that has been broken." When the law broken was the ceremonial law, the Old Testament atonement was made by the sacrifice of an animal. In complying with these sacrifices the worshipper believed that through them his position was actually changed for the better; his standing before God was secured and the penalty of his sin was removed; the results were outward, not inward. By the identification of himself with the animal sacrificed, the worshipper was assured of the effectiveness of the sacrifice for him. Thus the

---

2. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 133
3. Ibid., p. 135
Levitical praxis represented, in effect, the participation of the worshipper in the sacrifice.

But when the law broken is a moral law, involving moral obligations, an animal sacrifice is inadequate to meet the demands. Candlish sees a striking similarity between the sacrifice of Christ and that of the Old Testament offering. Whatever has been established as to the meaning and efficacy of the Levitical sacrifices must be held applicable to Christ's atonement. Fallen man's religion has always been the same, his approach to God is always through a blood sacrifice. Whatever virtue and power lay in the Old Testament sacrifices, offered as satisfaction for the violation of law, the New Testament sacrifice must be represented as having the same virtue and power. Since the former was an expiatory sacrifice the latter is acknowledged to be identical in nature. But what is the distinctive value of the blood of Christ? In his death Jesus offered the only sacrifice that could ever satisfy a holy God, the voluntary and spontaneous sacrifice of a sinless man. As the God-man, Christ's atoning death was exalted above the Old Testament sacrifices. In the words of Candlish: "The transcendent excellency of his person, his own free choice and consent, the gracious concurrence of God his Father, signified by the presence and co-operation of the eternal Spirit; and the spotless, faultless innocence, righteousness, holiness, which the eternal Spirit secured

2. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 143
to him, in his birth as well as in his life, all combine to stamp a
character of infinite worth, value, and efficacy on this Christ.¹

To whom was this sacrifice offered? To God, says Candlish; it
is God—all the way through—active in the atonement. "God in
Christ, is dealing with sin."² It is God who gives his Son, it is God who
receives the sacrifice. "It is himself who does it and it is by a
ransom provided by himself, and offered to himself."³ Only a for¬
giving God can be a redeeming God. In another context, however, he
denies that Christ rescued men out of the hand of God by paying a
penalty to him.⁴ It is perhaps his intention to show that no third
party, evil or good, can possibly be involved in this real divine
transaction. Neither does Candlish consider the cross as something
to appease the wrath of an angry father. "The notion of the redemp¬
tion through Christ's blood being of the nature of a dealing on the
part of Christ, as the friend of sinners, with a being whose resent¬
ment he appeased and whom he persuades to relent, is as incompatible
with the divine prerogative in the forgiveness of sins as the notion
of its being a dealing with Satan to ransom them out of his hands.
God cannot be obliged, or bribed, or coaxed to forgive sins. If he
were, it would be no forgiveness at all."⁵ This, indeed, has a
modern ring about it, yet Candlish keeps the transaction within the

1. Candlish, The Atonement, pp. 149-150
2. Ibid., p. 326
3. Candlish, Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 24
4. Candlish, Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays, p. 229
5. Candlish, Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 20
principle of law and judgment. It may have its source in the sovereign grace and love of God, but its accomplishment is by a legal and judicial transaction. "It must have respect to men as legally and judicially condemned, and needing therefore . . . a legal and judicial justification."¹ In thus enthroning the legal demand Candlish conceives of satisfaction more as a mere infliction of a penalty which satisfies God's holy law, and his conception has a tendency to result in accentuating the negative rather than emphasizing the more positive element of Christ's obedience. When satisfaction is conceived of in such terms it becomes apparent that this view differs with the later and more dynamic notion of P. T. Forsyth. Forsyth sees that the only thing which could satisfy a holy God is a positive confession of God's holiness, not the mere infliction of a penalty. If holiness can be satisfied with anything less than an answering holiness, then there would be something more ultimate in God than his holiness.

An expiatory sacrifice is, for Candlish, one that satisfies the moral law of God - the law of holiness. Implicit in the idea of sacrifice is the thought of substitution. Before passing to this aspect of the atonement, however, it ought to be noted that what has been said about sacrifice and satisfaction goes with the doctrine of an objective, not a subjective, atonement. The cross is a real transaction, a forensic transaction, and in this respect at least Candlish saw it in a light similar to that in which Brunner sees it. Brunner sees the cross as representing "an actual objective transaction in which

¹ Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. xxxii
God does something, and something which is absolutely necessary.\footnote{1}

Although Candlish himself was not always consistent, he was well aware of the disastrous effects of the tendency to picture the atonement as an abstract affair going on over our heads, so to speak. But with the rise of subjectivism it is to be expected that in defending the objective aspect one might be guilty of an over-emphasis. He does place in strong relief the personal element involved in the atonement. It is not wholly forensic for individuals are participating in the transaction. In the Old Testament the worshipper was identified with an animal victim, but in the New Testament the doctrine takes on new meaning, for the sacrifice is the Lord Jesus Christ.\footnote{2} The new meaning of the doctrine is, that whereas the Old Covenant effected the outward standing, the New Covenant accomplishes an inward change as well as an outward standing. The sacrifice is Christ and by the work of the Spirit the believer is identified with Christ in his entire


\footnote{2} Candlish is inclined, when speaking of Christ as a sacrifice, to emphasize more the thought of the shed blood instead of his full active self surrender. Let it be observed that Candlish speaks of both aspects, but there is a greater stress on the "shedding of the blood". We are not denying the importance of the blood of Christ, but we believe that Professor Stewart has a point when he says of Paul's use of this phrase, "It is far more likely that the phrase 'the blood of Christ' stood simply as a synonym for the death of Christ, a synonym expressing in a peculiarly vivid and emphatic way the awfulness of the price at which redemption was purchased, and the absoluteness of the devotion with which the Redeemer gave Himself for men." (James, S. Stewart, \textit{A Man in Christ}, London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1935, p. 257)
work of redemption. United to Christ by faith the believer is taken up into the body of Christ. This is brought out fully in the words of Candlish:

I am one, not with a senseless animal, who can but fall unconscious under the sacrificial knife. I am one with him who says, 'I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore' (Rev. 1:18). I am one with him in his death, in its terrible reality, in its blessed efficacy. By the power of the eternal Spirit, and by my own consent, I am one with him; 'crucified with Christ.' And the life in which, for himself, that death was swallowed up, is as really mine as the death. For me, as for him, death under the sentence of the law - the death of guilt and condemnation, the death of being without God, forsaken by God, under the curse - is over for ever. He has endured it for me. I endure it in him. And the life - for he liveth still - is mine. With no dead victim, continuing dead, am I united and identified; but with Christ, the living Lord. And not outwardly, in a bodily fashion, but inwardly, with heart and soul, I am united and identified with him.

What then does the atonement really accomplish? It accomplishes a real transaction, says Candlish, a satisfaction of God's holy law; sin is dealt with in Christ, the curse of the law is met by the perfect sacrifice—Jesus Christ, and the cross becomes actualized in man when he individually rests on Christ his sacrifice.

1. For a fuller treatment of the believer's identification with Christ the reader is referred to chapter VIII of this thesis.


3. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 241
The Cross as a Completed Atonement—Christ the Substitute.—

In order for the Old Testament worshipper to be given a new standing a sacrifice was offered to satisfy the broken law. The animal sacrificed became the worshipper's substitute. Satisfaction is consequently intimately connected with the idea of substitution. Christ's atoning work is depicted by Candlish as likewise substitutionary in nature. But not only is His death of more intrinsic worth, it accomplishes far more than the sacrifices under the Old Covenant. The sinner either must satisfy the demands of the law—suffering the punishment and doom of his sin—or else find a sufficient and adequate substitute. Christ alone is the all-sufficient substitute; he who is without sin, who needed not to endure sin's curse, has become the surety and substitute for all who believe. No other theory will satisfy Candlish but one that presents Christ's work as substitutionary in nature.

Every theory that has been or can be proposed of the suffering life and cruel death of Jesus, the Holy One of God, apart from the recognition of his vicarious character and standing, fails, and must fail, to satisfy a simple mind. The whole story is a confused, inconsistent, inextricable, incomprehensible enigma; a dark riddle, as regards the government of God; a strange anomaly that shocks the moral sentiments of men. It is the doctrine, or rather the fact, of his substitution for you, which alone harmonises and hallows all.¹

What about the Redeemer's sufferings? If what Christ did was vicarious in any real sense of the word then he suffered the punishment that sin entails. It is presumptuous to inquire, says Candlish, as to the exact nature of these sufferings. Christ took

---

¹. Candlish, Sermons, p. 45
fallen man's sin upon himself to this extent at least, that "they were about him, they were upon him, they were his. He owned, he felt them to be his . . . making common cause with you putting himself in your place, he was in the midst of them, he was under them."¹ In the character of one "made under the law"², and "made sin for us,"³ he endured the sufferings due for sin; they were therefore, in the strictest sense, penal and retributive. And through his sufferings the full penal and retributive sentence charged against guilty sinners, whose place Christ took, was exhausted. It is enough to say that "the sweat in the garden—the cry on the cross—speak volumes."⁴ Words may be incapable of describing how Christ bore fallen man's sin, and the intellect may be unable to fully comprehend the unknown and unparalleled agony and suffering Christ endured, yet Candlish rests in this: that sin was borne by Christ to such an extent that if he had not risen from the dead sin would still be clinging to him. As James Denney puts it, "In His death everything was made His that sin had made ours—everything in sin except its sinfulness."⁵

Whether it was only one individual or an innumerable host, for whom Christ died, he could have suffered no more than what he endured for the elect. As a surety and substitute his sufferings were

¹. Candlish, Life in a Risen Saviour, p. 40
². Gal. 4:4
³. 2 Cor. 5:21
⁴. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 326
limited to those who would be saved. As substitute Christ "really and actually takes the place of the breakers of God's law, and consents, in their stead, to fulfil the obligations which they have failed, and must ever fail, to fulfil; and to suffer in his own person the penalty of their disobedience, taking upon himself their responsibilities, having their guilt reckoned to his account, and submitting to be so dealt with, in the character and capacity of their representative, as to meet that necessity of punishment which otherwise must have entailed upon them retribution without redress or remedy." Hand-in-hand with his thought of Christ as our substitute always goes that of Christ as our representative. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Christ is the second Adam; he is the Head of a new humanity. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." All who are in Christ are represented by him; he represents them, they are identified with him. There is a real oneness in this union with Christ, a oneness that is real, personal and vital. What makes this oneness real is the believer's faith; by faith he is united to Christ. "Christ and I are regarded and dealt with," writes Candlish, "as in the eye of the law one, because we are indeed one." His work is a completed work; man needs only to respond to Christ crucified and risen. This means that the completeness of salvation is inextricably

2. 2 Cor. 15:22
3. 2 Cor. 5:17
connected with a limited view of the atonement. "The certainty of (Christ's) work being effectual is infallibly secured, by their being a people given to him by the Father, and by his . . . being a service or sacrifice restricted to them." ¹

In attempting to illustrate the practicableness of his conception of substitution and representation, Candlish pictures himself preaching to a crowd of criminals in jail. He does not offer to them all an opportunity to go free. He does not even speak of a certain amount of atoning virtue that Christ has purchased for them by his death and resurrection, in the sense of a general store from which they may take what they need. "In a word", he says, "I present to them, not a general amnesty, or vague and indiscriminate jail delivery, proceeding upon the transaction which Christ furnished upon Calvary;-- but Christ himself, and him crucified, a present Saviour now, as well as then; having in his hand a special pardon and special grace for every one who will resort to him—and nothing for any who will not.²" Candlish contends not so much for salvation through Christ as salvation in Christ. Christ's atoning death and resurrection is that which effects reconciliation for individuals as such; it is not merely a means by which a treaty is negotiated.

There is no element in Candlish's thought of a world redemption or a racial salvation. The death of Christ did not change the relation of the race, of the world or of a mass of individuals. It has only to

---

2. Ibid., p. 233
do with individuals as such. God was in Christ, active throughout in the atonement, but not, in Paul's words, "reconciling the world unto himself." Rather, God was in Christ merely dealing with sin. The limited view of Candlish does not allow for anything more than salvation for individuals. It is undoubtedly because of this individualistic view of the atonement that Candlish had such a personal message to individuals. In his closing lectures to his students, when he was Principal of New College, he stressed this individualistic approach and his preaching is shot through with it.

What then does the death of Christ really accomplish? It effects a completed work of atonement by substitution for the elect in Christ but not for all mankind.

The Cross as a Revelation of God—Its Universal Aspect.—— Candlish does, however, acknowledge that the cross has a universal significance. "The cross, in itself, as an actual transaction and fact in history of the divine government, exhibits and reveals, not what God says, but what God is; and what in all his dealings with sin and with sinners, he necessarily must be." Such a revelation is necessary to confirm God's word. In fact, God's name,—his nature and his essential character—is revealed not merely in a verbal utterance, but in a great

1. In all of Candlish's writings there is only one use of this expression and the whole tenor of his position on a limited atonement can hardly allow for the cosmic significance of the cross.

2. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 349

3. Ibid., p. 321
stupendous work; it is proclaimed not in words but in an act by himself. As a manifestation of the name or nature of God, the cross introduces an element of necessity into God's actions.

Closely linked with this universal aspect of the cross in revealing the name or nature of God is the thought that through the cross a period of forbearance is extended to all. This period or dispensation of long suffering is "of the nature of a reprieve granted to criminals under sentence of death. . . . It is a sentence suspending judgment, indeed but still plainly indicating both the bitterness of sin and the reality of wrath to come." Hence, had it not been for this dispensation of forbearance, Candlish says on one page, none of the human family would have been spared even for a season. "For so far as appears from Scripture, his death is not less indispensible as a condition of any being spared for a season, than it is a condition of the 'great multitude, which no man could number' being everlastingly saved." But on another page he maintains quite strenuously the contrary idea. "My immediate object is to explain that we are not to connect the sparing of the earth, and of men upon the earth, in itself, and as a matter of course, with the death of Christ." There is undoubtedly a want of unity in these statements which needs elucidation.

4. Ibid., p. 186
The chief foundation stone of the entire theory of a dispensation of forbearance as connected with the atonement is quarried from the Apostle's expression in Romans 3:25 and 26.

But one thing Candlish is quite sure of and in this there is no apparent contradiction, that it is owing to the dispensation of forbearance that infants die. None would have died in infancy, but would have had to live out this earthly life until his actual as well as his original iniquity was full. In positing such an unusual assumption he says:

It is a blessed consequence or corollary which may thus be drawn from what I cannot but regard as an all but certain, if not even a self-evident, assumption. If there had been no atonement, there would have been no infant death. It is on account of the atonement that infants die. Their salvation is therefore sure. Christ has purchased for himself, the joy of taking them, while yet unconscious of guilt or corruption, to be with him in paradise. That any little children at all die, — that so many little children die, — is not the least among the benefits that flow from his interposition as the Saviour.

In holding this rather extraordinary view that Christ's atonement is the ground of infant death he is departing from the usual Calvinistic interpretation. This peculiar view is not based on Scriptural evidence, it is merely presumed by Candlish. The redeeming feature here, however, is that he did acknowledge that all those who died in infancy were numbered with the elect.

Not only does the cross initiate a period of long-suffering, but it also shows to the world the open heart of God the Father. In this connection Candlish writes, it is "the proof and measure of that

1. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 183
infinite compassion which dwells in the bosom of God towards each and all of his lost race of Adam, and his infinite willingness or rather longing and yearning desire, to receive each and all of them again into his favour.¹ How then can we account for any limiting of the atonement? Only by an understanding of the distinction between God's will of decree and his will of desire, says Candlish, can we reconcile his longing to receive all and his actual receiving only the elect. In so far as the will of the divine heart (his will of desire) is concerned the cross gives all manking—every single individual—an insight into the compassion of the Father. But it is the will of the divine mind (his will of decree), for ends and on principles yet unknown, that has decreed the salvation of the elect only. This is obviously an artificial and arbitrary distinction superimposed on Biblical thought, and implies a split-personality within God himself. This rationalistic conclusion betrays the weakness in his legalistic interpretation of the atonement.

Because the cross is a universal revelation of the name or nature of God the gospel call is universal. God calls man everywhere to repent, to turn and embrace Christ. Such a universal gospel call has its roots in the free sovereign grace of God. It is to attempt what is presumptuous and vain when one seeks to vindicate the consistency and sincerity of God in the gospel call by going beyond the assurance, that the man who will put God to the proof will find him faithful. Candlish emphasizes that the choice is with God rather than with man. This does not mean, however, that he chooses some to

¹ Candlish, _The Atonement_, p. 196
eternal life and others to damnation. God does indeed reject some but
his rejection of them is because of their rejection of him. In
recognizing the apparently insoluble problem constituted by a universal
free gospel offer to all men and the assurance of salvation to a limited
number, Candlish reminds us that the Calvinistic system does not profess
to solve the great difficulty involved in the adjustment of the relation
between the will of God and the will of man. "All that it proposes is,
to fix the position of the difficulty rightly; so that it shall not
interfere either with the sovereignty of divine grace in the whole
matter of salvation, from first to last, or with the responsibility,
the dependence, and free agency of man." He is convinced, therefore,
that the knot must be resolved as an exercise of the sovereign grace
of God, of which no account is fully given to man. But the mystery
of the limitation of the mercy of God must be placed not between the
work of Christ and the work of the Spirit, but at a point prior to
both of these works—in the mere sovereign good pleasure of God, the
Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Candlish may be guilty of apparent contradictions and inconsist-
cencies, but one could never charge him with a lack of evangelical
fervor in spite of his holding to a limited view of the atonement.

Writing with moving pathos he pleads in one of his sermons:

Oh that the Spirit would open your eyes here to see and
understand the real nature, the true character, of the
God with whom you have to do, the God who so pathetically
calls you. Oh! that the Spirit would give you such an

2. Ibid., p. 242
insight into what God is, as might at last make you apprehend how absolutely impossible it is that, being what he is, he can be wishing your destruction, how it is of the very essence of his nature and character that he must be willing your return to himself. 1

Some of his contemporaries who held opposite views pictured Calvinists as having pleasure and enjoyment in God's consigning all outside their little circle to hell. 2 But, retorts Candlish, it is exactly the opposite. "The temptation is all the other way. It is all in the direction of our tampering and taking liberties with the sovereign authority and grace of God, in accommodation to the weakness, and even the wickedness of men." 3

Thus the atonement, in its universal significance, speaks to all mankind of the name or nature of God; it is the foundation for the long-suffering of God from the time of Adam to the coming of Christ; it is the gracious reason why many infants are permitted to die, being taken from the evils of the present world; and it is the basis for the universal and unrestricted gospel call to all men and the assurance of a cordial welcome to those who believe. 4

1. Candlish, Sermons, p. 180
3. Candlish, The First Epistle of John, p. 523

While the death of Christ carries with it a certain universal element, this is not its primary purpose. It does convince men of the good-will of God; it is the grounds for the dispensation of forbearance of the judgment of God. But it does more. The cross actually accomplishes redemption for men; not for all men, Candlish says, but for those in Christ. This it does effectually. Christ is the substitute for those alone who actually embrace him as such. Those who receive Christ enjoy "a real and personal substitution of Christ in their room and stead, as their representative and surety, fulfilling all their legal obligations, and undertaking and meeting all their legal liabilities." Upon acceptance of him as their substitute, their covenant head and representative, upon their closing with or resting upon Christ, his people are absolved and acquitted. The Christ for which Candlish contends does not stand in a vague and undefined relation to all humanity, but is "considered as standing in a special relation to his willing and saved people; being literally their Substitute." In this respect the cross procures a limited atonement: "Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her." It is an

2. Ibid., p. 249
3. Eph. 5:25 ARV.
atonement limited to the "Church",¹ to the elect in Christ.

Hence, Christ serves his people, making all their misery and their guilt of estrangement from God his own, yet being himself without sin. In purchasing their release from condemnation, in redeeming them to be his own peculiar people, says Candlish, Christ "raises them out of the depths, out of which when for their sakes he had gone down into them, he has himself been raised. He makes them partakers of his own rising - his own resurrection. Nay more, he makes them partakers of his own nature."² In making this stress on an atonement limited to the Church, as we have already pointed out, Candlish does not see God acquitting some and rejecting others merely by a sovereign act of His will nor by any arbitrary arrangement. Being who he is God acquits or justifies the guilty and condemned sinner only when his punishment

1. Candlish nowhere develops a doctrine of the Church. One is left to gather his view from scattered references. Like Calvin, Candlish held that the Church comprises the elect of God throughout all ages. The visible Church was initiated at the call of Abraham. (Candlish, The Book of Genesis, Vol. I, p. 261). All the Old Testament believers were members of the "Old Testament Church". He conceived of the Church not merely as an assembly of believers but as a continuous historical unit. The members of the Church, whether under the Old or New Covenant, were members of the Body of Christ (Candlish, Life in a Risen Saviour, pp. 72-3). Christ loved the Church and purchased it with his own blood.

In one of his scattered references to the Church Candlish further observes, "it is the church which (Christ) 'nourisheth and cherisheth as his own body'. It is the church which 'he sanctifies and cleanc-ees with the washing of water, by the word; that he may present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.'" Ibid.
is borne vicariously by an infinitely worthy substitute. In asserting this, Candlish makes his position unmistakably plain: "By the very necessity of (God's) nature I perceive him . . . shut up to the acceptance of all who are in Christ — because their punishment has been actually endured, and all righteousness on their behalf has been fulfilled by him."¹ By the use of the hypothetical picture of a postponed atonement, Candlish strives to demonstrate that the cross has both a universal free gospel call and yet becomes effective only for the Church. In the picture below he attempts to envisage the cross in its actual application to sinners on earth.

Let it be supposed, he conjectures, that the cross has not taken place, has not yet been an accomplished historical fact. Let it be supposed that this atoning work is postponed until the end of time. Christ is conceived of as waiting until "his seed is actually made up" before he lays down his life for his Church. Let it be supposed further, that century after century Christ is proclaimed as the only Saviour of men to whom they must look in faith and receive eternal life here and now. This proclamation would thus be made to all men alike indiscriminately, it would be an unrestricted, unlimited free gospel offer to all to receive Christ as substitute. Even up to the moment before Christ would ascend the cross all might be assured that if they would but consent their sins would be borne on Calvary. Then Christ dies on the cross and is raised again victoriously over death and the grave. For whom does Christ die? "Christ has come — he has lived — he has died — he has risen again, an all sufficient surety and

¹ Candlish, *The Atonement*, p. 346
Saviour for all who will have him to be surety and Saviour for them."

Surely the "accident of date", Candlish declares, does not alter the essential nature of the cross so as to make its application to believers inconsistent with a universal offer. The cross ever stands before men's eyes as a revelation of the loving mercy of God to save all who will take Christ to be their surety.

In commenting on John 3:16, Candlish remarks that the giving of His Son was a display of God's good-will towards men, towards the human race. One of the main objects of this passage is to represent the Father's love to men as the source and origin of the whole scheme of salvation. He distinguishes, however, between the "love" (good-will) that God has for the world of men and the love he has for his own peculiar people in giving Christ to die for them. If no greater proof of love can be given then his laying down his life, and if his life is given for all, then, argues Candlish, what has Christ in reserve to demonstrate his affections for his people? Nothing! In other words, if Christ died for the world of mankind and not for the elect only, if those who believe have simply a common interest with mankind at large in the death of Christ, how can they claim and challenge all the abundant blessings of grace and salvation from the mere fact of Christ's dying for them? They can't, says Candlish, and we are thrown back on the assumption that the cross is a pledge of a special love to Christ's friends—to those chosen to be saved. We would have no dispute in acknowledging, with Candlish, that the atonement only becomes effective for those who believe, but we object on Scriptural ground

to limiting the death of Christ to the elect. It seems that the love 

God manifests towards men, all men, is shorn of its glory when Candlish 
says in effect that God does not give his Son for all—i.e. Christ 
dies only for the elect. Although Candlish admits that the cross is 
a revelation of the name or nature of God, and though he affirms 
that the very essence of God is Love, yet he could not bring himself 
to the height of the New Testament view that the cross is the supreme 
revelation of the love of God to all men. Many of his contemporaries 
and most modern theologians agree that the atonement is unlimited in 
its scope though not necessarily so in its realization through faith 
in the lives of men.

The Cross and Faith.— Since the death of Christ is effective 
only for the elect, the question arises, then, How does one become 
elect? In answering this question Candlish is consistent with the 
Westminster Standards. In order that Christ saves no one against his 
will He must have the consent or acquiescence of the individual to be 
saved. There must be on the part of the believer an active movement 
to avail himself of the all-sufficient atonement. Moreover, the 
individual must be assured that in accepting Christ as his substitute 
He will meet all his needs. The consent, the active movement, the 
assurance all come by grace through faith. Candlish thus understands 
faith to be the instrument by which a justifying righteousness is 
apprehended and appropriated. Faith is the instrument by which the 
cross becomes effectual to man. Abraham believed and it was accounted 
to him for righteousness. Faith is not the reason or condition for
for man's salvation, but merely the instrument in his salvation. "The power or efficacy of faith," Candlish says, "cannot be in itself; for, by its very nature, faith ever looks beyond itself, and borrows all from without; if it rely on itself, - on any worth, or value, or virtue, in itself - it ceases to be faith, - it becomes quite another act or exercise of mind. It is no longer faith in God, but faith in some good work of my own; it may be faith in my faith itself, and not in what my faith should grasp."¹ This faith is no mere human volition or bare conviction. It is above and beyond all human capacity. It is of God, of divine workmanship created by the agency of the Holy Spirit in renewing the whole nature.²

Candlish opposes any attempt to put the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit on the same footing—viz., the view that a sinner looks for salvation to Christ's work and the Spirit's work conjointly. "It is a great Scripture truth," he affirms, "that in the exercise of saving faith, Christ's work alone is objective and the Spirit's work wholly subjective: or in other words that while the Spirit is the author of faith, Christ alone is its only object."³ James Denney says something quite similar when, in speaking of faith, he remarks that faith "is just as truly the whole of Christianity subjectively as Christ is the whole of it objectively."⁴ A fuller

---

² Ibid., Vol. II, p. 237
³ Candlish, The Atonement, p. 227
consideration of faith in Candlish's theology will be found in the following chapter in connection with the discussion on the work of the Holy Spirit.

The Cross and the Resurrection.— It has been said that in the theology of Candlish the cross was the central message of Christianity. He may have a tendency to separate the cross from the earthly ministry of Christ, but he does not isolate the death of Christ from his resurrection. The efficacious character of the cross stands or falls on whether Christ was victorious over death and the grave. "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."¹ In the judgment of Candlish, "if it is true, in virtue of a fixed rule or law in the holy, moral government of God, that whoever would save sinners must save them by dying for their sins, it is no less true, that if he is to save them his dying for their sins must be followed up immediately by his rising again."² He must be one who can say of himself, "I am he that liveth and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore."³ If there is no resurrection there is no redemption; if there is no resurrection there is no justification; if there is no resurrection there is no eternal life for the believer. Mankind is still estranged from God. There is no one to present us to the Father. These views are emphatically expressed in the sermons of Candlish on First Corinthians Fifteen: "The truth concerning the resurrection is of

1. I Cor. 15:17
2. Candlish, Life in a Risen Saviour, p. 22
3. Rev. 1:18
"vital moment," he affirms, "it touches the very essence and heart's core of the gospel of Christ."

The Fatherhood of God

In Relation to the Atonement

Proposition: In the atonement Christ secured this Father-Son relationship for all those who embrace Christ as their Redeemer.

If the incarnation unveils the true relation of fatherhood, the atonement and the resurrection, for Candlish, procure this relationship for the individual believer. From his premise that there is no true relation of fatherhood and sonship as such existing between Adam and God, he argues that God dealt with Adam not as a Father to a son but as a Sovereign to a subject. He believes that there is no hint whatsoever of sonship in paradise. Adam is judged as an intelligent and free creature. His sentence is likewise not characteristic of fatherly discipline but of legal condemnation because he violated law. While it is granted that sin involves the overstepping by a subject of a Sovereign's law, this does not necessarily imply that no father-son relationship exists. As James Denney says, "even if in the light of the Christian revelation we describe the divine and the human personality as Father and child, we do not eliminate from their relation that universal element we call law."  


Candlish is convinced that the atonement, when viewed as a real transaction in which Christ becomes surety and substitute for men under the wrath of God, under legal condemnation, supports his view of the true Fatherhood of God. If before the incarnation there existed a true relationship of fatherhood and sonship between God and his creatures, it seems quite inconsistent with a father's character to ever permit, allow or look upon any of his children as ever entirely out of his family. If, as Candlish understands the word, sonship implies a permanent position, none of God's children could ever be finally lost. But, since man by his sin is estranged from God, is alienated from the presence of a holy God, is lost and dead in trespasses and sins, it is Candlish's basic belief that no relationship of sonship could have subsisted between Adam and God. In deprecating any thought that Adam enjoyed a filial relation with God, Candlish says, "Does (the cross) not tend to invest the father and filial relation with a very awful and impenetrable gloom, when it comes out that the father cannot receive back his erring children into his favour, otherwise than on the condition of his holy, first born-Son becoming a sufferer and a victim on their behalf?" He goes on to add that "all is clear and simple, however, if the substitutionary work of Christ is held to have reference to the purely legal and judicial relation as that originally subsisting between God and man. But the introduction of the relations of fatherhood and sonship confounds all."

1. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. 79 footnote
On the other hand, J. McLeod Campbell traces the atonement to the "Fatherliness" of God and denies that a father cannot be just. If as W. N. Clarke says, God's holiness and love "are of one spiritual kindred and by their very nature unite to form one perfect and harmonious character,"\(^1\) then Crawford has a point when he rejects the idea that any prior fatherhood and sonship confounds all in the atonement. "It is because God is a King and Judge that the atonement was required," writes Crawford, "it is, on the other hand, because God is a Father that the atonement is provided."\(^2\) James Denney expresses this in other words when he asserts that "justice is in no sense at war with mercy. The opposite of justice is not mercy, but injustice, and God is never either unmerciful or unjust. He is just when He exercises his mercy and He is merciful when He exercises justice."\(^3\)

Yet Candlish is persuaded that since the atonement has its root in the legal subjection of man to his Ruler, so also it has its best defense when the relation of subject is kept distinct from any other relation. This defense is seen especially when the legal subjection of man is "held to be the only primitive and natural relation, to the entire and utter exclusion, otherwise than by anticipation, of any relation partaking of the character of fatherhood and sonship."\(^4\)

---

Only when the cross is viewed as a purely legal transaction, and when man is viewed as a subject under the rule of a sovereign God, is it possible, according to Candlish, to reconcile the untold agony of the cross and the misery and shame of man’s guilt as borne by Christ. To say that the atonement, itself a satisfaction required by justice, originated in a heart of love such as could be characterized (though indefinitely and improperly says Candlish) as fatherly does not suggest to his mind that any filial relation subsisted before Christ revealed the Father or before men by union with Christ participated in his Sonship.

If there had been any fatherhood and sonship before the cross then surely something would have been said in Scripture about "filial sins" being covered or forgiven. The cross, Candlish argues, "suffices for rectifying the position of a subject who has transgressed the law of his ruler. I cannot conceive it can have any bearing on any other relation which sin may be supposed to have outraged or broken."

When a member of God’s family, adopted into Christ, sins, his sin is a transgression of the law and his only recourse is to rest upon the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.

Thus for Candlish the only doctrine of fatherhood that is consistent with an atonement in which Christ is surety and substitute is that which understands Adam’s relation to God as one of subjectship only, but a subjectship with an "anticipated sonship" as the reward for fulfilling obediently the period of probation. Subjectship tested,

   Crawford answers Candlish here simply by saying that the atonement cleanses from all sin, filial or otherwise Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
proved and perfected justifies the ideal sonship in which the original creature was cast. By disobedience man fell. By the obedience of one Son the law was fulfilled and satisfied. In Christ man becomes adopted as a son by regeneration. This, however, is a sonship dissimilar to anything that can be ascribed to original man. It is in this sense that Candlish regards the atonement as more than remedial.

If Christ's vicarious death and victorious resurrection procured for the believer a position merely the same as Adam enjoyed, and nothing more, then there is no security or permanency in it. For with Adam's position went a period of probation. But what Christ does achieve for his people, his "brethren", is a position higher than primeval man enjoyed; a position of sonship in which believers become partakers of eternal life, the life of God in them; a position that is eternal with the Father. In the atonement there is accomplished the "actual rectifying of a relation radically disordered," as well as "the introduction of something new." This something new is the distinctive or radical characteristic of sonship; it means a permanent position in God's family. Sonship as such puts an end to probation conclusively, and it secures permanence of position in the household of God.

---

1. In Candlish's judgment it is only after the resurrection that Jesus refers to his disciples as "my brethren". Because their sonship is procured by the cross and the resurrection, Christ, as their elder brother, can now take them by the hand up to the Father calling them "his brethren". Hence, "Go to my brethren and say . . ." Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, cf., pp. 239 ff.
2. Ibid., p. xxix
3. Ibid., p. 176
Before the fall "through a simple owning of the Son, in obedience to the Father's oracle, innocent men might have become sons, as on the same terms the holy angels did." But since the fall more is required. Christ who alone is the true Son with his Father must first bear man's guilt in the capacity of his surety and substitute. "Only through His taking their place as criminals," Candlish concludes, "can the Son admit them to be partakers with him in his place as the Son - only in that way can the Father welcome them as sons in him."  

---

1. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 12

2. Ibid., p. 13
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THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RELATION TO THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

The Work of the Holy Spirit—Union with Christ

The work of the Spirit is concerned primarily with generating faith in the believer and thus uniting him to Christ. By union with Christ the believer is identified with Him in all that is His. He is complete in Christ. This completeness involves the particular benefits of justification, sanctification and adoption. Adoption is conceived of as distinct from, yet simultaneous with, the other two benefits. Sonship is the crowning position in man's salvation.

From what has been said in the preceding chapters one might expect to find in Candlish a strong emphasis on the doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit, and such is the case. According to Candlish the actual realization of sonship is the natural and fitting climax to the Calvinistic doctrine of grace. "The essence or heart's core of that doctrine is the personal union of the individual believer to him in whom he believes." This union or identification begins at the cross and "it is there that the Holy Spirit effects, as it were, the junction."¹ The primary work of the Spirit is, therefore, to unite the believer to Christ.

---

¹ Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, p. xxxiii
Faith is the ground of union with Christ. In this work on The Atonement Candlish is careful to make clear, as has already been observed, that "Christ's work alone is objective, and the Spirit's wholly subjective." The atonement is a full and completed work, but it must be applied to man if man is to be saved. This application results from the activity of the Holy Spirit in believers. He applies Christ's work by working faith in the believer and thus unites him to Christ. The simple principle for which Candlish contends is that all the good an individual obtains through Christ comes from his being one with Christ; one with Him to such an extent as being a partaker with him in all that is his. "The work of the Holy Spirit is to unite me to Christ, to effect a close and indissoluble personal oneness between Christ and me. For this end he works faith in me. For the only virtue of faith is that it shuts me up into Christ, and that by it, or in it, I embrace Christ." In all this Candlish is restating the position of the Westminster formulae. The distinctive note in the position of Candlish on the work of the Holy Spirit lies in his conception of faith.

Brunner points out that after the century of the Reformers a tendency arose to conceive of faith as an assent to doctrinal statements, a belief that certain propositions were true. Unlike Chalmers, who saw in faith nothing more than belief, Candlish advances beyond

1. p. 227

2. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 55 Cf. also Candlish, Life in a Risen Saviour, p. 224

this intellectualistic view of faith. He understands faith to be not merely a weighing of the evidence submitted to the mind and drawing the legitimate or necessary conclusions; faith is not simply the belief in what God says because it is God who says it; it is not only the knowledge or belief of certain facts respecting Christ. Faith consists not in a belief of any definite proposition or creed but rather "in the committing of the soul, and the soul's interest for eternity to a divine person."¹

Faith is a "hearty acquiescence in God's proposal."² Faith involves an existential "leap". In speaking of faith as a decisive step of total commitment Candlish calls it "a leap, a venture . . . by which (one) is to pass over the great gulf."³ He pictures faith as casting oneself upon Christ with full confidence. It is not a leap in the dark, however, not a hazardous step into the void; but "as one would venture from a burning house into the arms of a friend standing below—to cast himself upon Christ."⁴ Again he finds expression in a similar image when he speaks of faith as an active movement, "a step which I personally have to take, a leap, as it were, from the tottering pinnacle of a burning ruin into unseen arms below."⁵

Although faith has an irrational element it is not essentially irrational. It has an intellectual content. Like Luther Candlish emphasizes the fiducial nature of faith. He makes faith "chiefly

---

1. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 205 Italics added
2. Ibid., p. 207
3. Ibid., p. 221
4. Ibid., p. 297
5. Ibid., p. 319
consist, not in the assent or credit given to what God reveals or
testifies, but in our embracing, with a fiducial reliance or trust,
Him whom God reveals.\(^1\) He considers confidence and consent, trust
and fiducial reliance, as not merely flowing naturally and necessarily
from faith but as forming the "very essence of faith". The connection
between the nature and function of faith is manifest only through the
medium of this trust or reliance, this unreserved casting of oneself
on Christ. To commit oneself to Christ is to possess him as one's own.
When we say man is justified by faith, we mean that which effects
union with Christ, and the whole nature of man, the moral as well as
the intellectual, is involved in the faith-union. "Faith is the act,"
he says, "of the whole inner man; our entire moral nature is concerned
in it. . . . Every faculty, every feeling, is taken up with Christ.
There is no unoccupied power of the mind within, at leisure to take
cognisance of the rest. . . . It is all direct dealing with Christ;
believing him; trusting him; embracing him; enjoying him."\(^2\)

Faith, as the gift of God, is not the cause of the new life
in man but the effect of it. In the initial motion of the soul, obeying
the call of God to believe and life, Candlish maintains that faith
comes from spiritual life, not spiritual life from faith. In experience,
faith and life are coincident; one cannot be conceived as existing
apart from the other. Still the question of the "sequence of causa-
tion is most important in the consideration of the origin of faith.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Candlish, *The Atonement*, p. 295

\(^2\) Candlish, *On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers*, pp. 156-57

\(^3\) In his own treatment of faith Candlish considers its origin last.
The Spirit works faith in man by renewing and re-creating the whole inner man. This is regeneration. It is God who bestows the power or capacity of believing. He does more than cooperate with man in the exercise of faith. He gives faith. Faith, therefore, springs out of the new creation. "Faith is the act of a renewed understanding, a renewed will and a revived heart."¹ The source of faith is the Holy Spirit who, as the quickening, regenerating and re-creating Spirit, enables man to believe, to embrace Christ by energizing him with new life and working faith in him. This, for Candlish, is indeed the Christian paradox.

I am to feel myself passive in the bonds of God and yet on that very account the more intensely active. I am to be moved unresistingly by God, like the most inert instrument or machine, yet for that very reason to be all the more instinct with life and motion. My whole moral frame and mechanism is to be processed and occupied by God, and worked by God; and yet through that very working of God in and upon my inner man, I am to be made to apprehend more than ever my own inward liberty and power.² Hence, faith is conceived of as a divine act implying the inward communication of a divine capacity.

Implicit in all that has been said of faith—embracing, receiving, grasping or appropriating Christ—is the element of personal encounter with Christ. "To call us graciously, God must come to meet us as he does in Jesus Christ; to call us effectually, he must come into us and move and work in and upon us."³ In a sermon

¹. Candlish, The Atonement, p. 322
². Ibid., p. 392 Italicics added
³. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 183
called "Faith Glorifying God" Candlish draws the distinction between faith as mere assent to dogma and faith as personal confrontation with Christ.

To believe that God is omnipotent, however strongly, with whatever full persuasion, when that belief is the mere admission of a dogma in theology, a general truth or proposition... will go but a little way towards strengthening or establishing you in that faith which glorifies God. But let me again remind you that the faith in question is believing God; not believing something about God, but believing God. It is a personal dealing of God with you, and of you with God. He and you come together; he to speak, you to hear; he to promise, you to believe; you to ask, he to give. 1

Union with Christ means identification with Christ. If the office or function of faith is to unite the believer to Christ, if faith is the instrument or means, the Holy Spirit is the agent in effecting a real, close and personal union with Christ. By faith the believer is made one with Christ, he is identified with Him; Christ and his people are really one. Scottish theology, and Reformation theology in particular, according to Candlish, makes all personal religion turn upon the principle of "oneness with Christ, real personal oneness with Christ (as) being the ground of identification of community of interest and joint proprietorship or heritage." Candlish traces the identification with Christ back to the old covenant. God's covenant, even under the old dispensation, was made not with many but with one—Christ. "It embraces other, besides Christ, only as they are identified with him." Abraham was so identified. In

1. Candlish, Sermons, p. 121 Italics added
2. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 55
fact, all the believers in the Old Testament were identified with Christ. In this connection Candlish interprets circumcision as bearing a similar spiritual meaning to that which baptism sustains in the New Testament Church—being the seal of one's engraving into Christ. Here again Candlish is, for the most part, reiterating the doctrine of the Westminster Divines. Circumcision was the initiatory seal of the covenant by which individuals become associated with the visible church. "The call of Abraham was initial step towards the foundation of a visible church."¹ By baptism one is made a partaker in the initiatory sacrament of the church.²

Every event in the life of the Eternal Christ involves a spiritual identification of the believer with him. It seems completely harmonious to Candlish that believers participate with Christ even in his virgin birth.

May not we, when we are born of the Spirit, be truly said to have union and communion with Christ in his being born of the Spirit. The same divine agent deals with the same human subject for the same holy end. He originates a holy human nature in the one case (Christ); he makes a corrupt human nature holy in the other case (believer). So in our new birth, which is the beginning of our holiness, we have union and communion with Christ in his holy birth.³

Even Christ's anointing is shared with his people through oneness with him, so that whatever is implied in Christ being anointed by the Holy Spirit is realized by the believer through "an unction from the Holy

---

¹ Candlish, Genesis, Vol. I p. 282
² Candlish, Life in a Risen Saviour, p. 92
³ Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 149
One.** "Thus we are christ's, as he is the Christ; Candlish avers, anointed ones as he is the Anointed One; the Lord's anointed, the Lord's christs, in somewhat of the same sense in which he is so. For we share his anointing; we 'have unction from the Holy One'."¹

Since the believers are in Christ—are identified with Christ—his death is their death, his burial is their burial, his resurrection is their resurrection. "You are in the same position in which you would be, if you had yourselves personally died the very death which Christ died, and risen again, undergoing the very resurrection which he underwent."² Hence, the believers are complete in Christ.³ What is Christ's is their's. They see sin as Christ sees sin; they know the love of God manifested to them as Christ experiences this same love. They become partakers of the divine nature, becoming of one mind with God and Christ.⁴

Union with Christ carries with it the gift of eternal life. By faith man enters into a heavenly life when he is united with Christ. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son."⁵ But this life is something more than one of endless duration, something more than the believer's surviving the

---

2. Candlish, Life in a Risen Saviour, pp. 303-4
3. Ibid., pp. 66-7
5. I John 5:10
endurance of death. It is a new quality of being. As Candlish says, "for it is as the Father hath life in himself that (Christ), on our behalf and as our head and representative, has life in himself. In that capacity he shares the Father's life; his manner of living is the same as the Father." Because the believer experiences a close oneness with Christ, that which is Christ's becomes the believer's, and because Christ shares the Father's life those in Christ participate in the same divine life. "We do not receive this eternal life of God from his Son; we share it with him. The Father's testimony is that the eternal life which he gives us is in his Son."^1

Union with Christ also involves justification. This union is "spiritual and mystical, yet real and inseparable; their being joined to Christ as their head and husband is effected by the gracious work of the Spirit . . . And it is a union so close, intimate, and personal, as to imply communion; or joint participation with him in what is his."^3 That is to say that the Church is complete in Christ. This completeness involves particular benefits, namely, justification, adoption and sanctification.

In considering these benefits, it has already been noted that Candlish takes the liberty to invert the order of adoption and sanctification, seeing adoption as the crowning act of union with Christ. According to him justification is union and communion with Christ in

---

2. Ibid., p. 49f.
his righteousness; sanctification is union and communion with Christ in his holiness; and finally, adoption is union and communion with Christ in his sonship. To this he adds, "surely (adoption is) the highest and best union and communion of the three."

Candlish was concerned that justification should not be viewed too forensically so as to represent it in a cold and merely legal aspect, "as if it were in fact a sort of legal fiction, or mere legal plea in arrest of judgment, like the putting in of some kind of security or bail; or as if it were a hard and dry balancing of legal claims and legal compensations." Yet, it seems that in his lectures on The Fatherhood of God he was guilty of just that.

It is only by adhering strictly to the legal and judicial character of the transaction - by viewing it as properly and literally forensic, both as regards God's treatment of Christ for us and regards his treatment of us in Christ - that we can see and appreciate the grace that there is in our justification.

Apart from union with Christ justification is a purely objective, inactive affair. It is the personal element that makes it more than a mere cold and legal act divested of divine awe or human sympathy. Instead of merely acquiescing in a legal or judicial transaction between the Father and the Son, let the believer experience God's justifying grace as a real and personal union with Christ. Candlish enlarges on

1. Ibid., p. 60.
2. Ibid., p. 41.
3. This is understandable somewhat by the fact that he was endeavoring to show the contrast between justification and adoption as between a legal act and one that is entirely of grace. As is typical of Candlish, in making the emphasis of grace in adoption he tends to overly stress justification as a cold and legal transaction.
this point in one of his sermons.

It is not my dealing with a work, a ministry, a service of doing and suffering, which may be called the righteousness of Christ; but my dealing with Christ himself. I am moved to embrace Christ, I abide with Christ, I am one with Christ. So thoroughly am I one with him, that I humbly challenge an interest and joint proprietorship in all that is his; and first and primarily in his justifying righteousness. 1

Consequently, even though justification is viewed as a forensic act, the benefits are applied only when the personal element becomes active, when union with Christ takes place. Christ is the believer's righteousness only as the believer becomes one with Christ, one in His death, burial and resurrection. In asserting the other aspects of justification as undoing the effect of sin, cancelling its guilt and reversing its doom, Candlish was equally concerned to stress that it means far more than just that. "We are when justified brought into a position in which we can never again be treated as condemned criminals, or doomed rebels; and can never again come under the judicial sentence of death for sin." 2

Union with Christ issues in sanctification, which is considered a gracious process of God, whereas justification admits of no stages or degrees but is a complete act in itself. The latter implies present and living communion with Christ in his righteousness; the former includes union and communion with Christ in his present holiness, in germ or embryo now, but in the future a growth of holiness to ultimate perfection in the heavenlies. In drawing the distinction between sanctification and justification he writes as follows.

2. Ibid., p. 128.
I cannot live upon a past justification. I am justified now freely by God's grace. But it is always as a perfect act, a full and complete sentence of acquittal and acceptance, that I grasp it in a new and fresh exercise of faith; having always a fresh and a new union and communion with Christ in his once for all completed righteousness. It is otherwise with sanctification. My union and communion with Christ in his holiness may indeed be perfect in germ or embryo, in virtue of my participation; in my new birth with him in his birth. But the germ, the embryo, must grow... on to ultimate perfection.

The process of sanctification begins when the Spirit regenerates the individual—when new life begins, life that is holy. The same Spirit who conceived a body in the Virgin, who originated the holy human nature of Jesus, is the same Spirit who in regeneration makes the corrupt human nature, of the believer, holy. In its negative aspect sanctification, viewed with reference to the evil to be undone, involves the dying unto sin, the "crucifying the flesh with its affections and lusts." As Christ dealt with sin by permitting it to slay him, so also the believer must allow sin to slay him, by becoming dead to it and being buried with Christ. On the positive side sanctification consists in reckoning oneself alive unto righteousness.

It is Christ's life that the Christian possesses, a life sanctified holy to the Lord. Believers become partakers with him in a holiness perfect in character from beginning to end. It is theirs united to Christ in sanctification, theirs in embryo now to be realized ultimately. This points to the ideal of the Christian life which is initiated and partially realized in this life. His view of believers' sonship would seem to lead logically to the notion of sinless perfection. Nevertheless he stops short of this conclusion. The new spiritual self cannot sin because it is identical with Christ, but the natural, unregenerate self

1. Ibid., p. 52f.
does in fact sin. Although in this Candlish is not departing from the prevailing Calvinistic view, this distinction between the theoretical and the practical life of the Christian creates an ethical tension.

Candlish envisages adoption to be union and communion with Christ in His sonship, in His filial relation to the Father. Of the three benefits—justification, sanctification, adoption—he understands adoption as the distinct privilege crowning the others. The inversion of sanctification and adoption in the order of salvation "assigns to adoption its proper place, as not a mere adjunct or appendix to justification, but a separate, distinct and peculiar privilege; the crown and consummation of our entire salvation." The Westminster Standards present adoption more as a corollary of justification and as preliminary to sanctification. But Candlish sees it as a joint result of both justification and sanctification. In virtue of the believer's righteous standing before God and in virtue of his identity with Christ in His holiness, the gracious act of adoption is reached. This is not to imply that in the ordo salutis the benefits are sequential, but only that adoption is the highest fulfillment of the Christian life.

Permanency of position is the distinctive characteristic of sonship. The believer, adopted as a son by the Holy Spirit working faith in him, shares actually in the sonship which Christ himself enjoys. And

1. Ibid., p. 59.
as the Son abides in the house forever, according to Candlish, so those who are "sons in Him" likewise abide permanently with Christ in the Father's house. Because the believer's position does not depend upon his hold on Christ but on Christ's hold upon him, his sonship is inviolable.

The Holy Spirit in Relation to the Fatherhood of God

Proposition: By the Holy Spirit working faith in them, believers come into union with Christ and become sharers in that sonship which Christ enjoys as the Everlasting Son of the Father.

In saying that the atonement rectifies the disordered relation and introduces something new, Candlish envisages the work of Christ as more than remedial. Man's creaturely position before the fall did not involve original perfection, unless it be maintained that perfection can mean being on probation. Since redeemed man was not placed again on probation as Adam was at first, but was given a distinctly new standing—a permanent position in God's family—the atonement must be more than remedial. This new standing is sonship. Fallen man is made capable of sonship by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Candlish sees, as already observed, a parallel between Christ's virgin birth and man's rebirth into the family of God. In Christ's human birth the Holy Spirit preserved his divine sonship so that it continued identically the same, notwithstanding his taking the form of a servant and the likeness of men; although a creature he was also the Son. If Christ, therefore, who is divine is enabled by the Spirit to participate in man's relation

to God as creature, by parity of reasoning Candlish argues that the creature, through the agency of the same Holy Spirit, is empowered to participate in Christ's sonship. This is the work of the Spirit in regeneration. As the Spirit generated Christ's humanity so that he might continue to be the Son, so the Spirit regenerates the believer's humanity enabling him to become a son. The Son of God became man in order that men might become sons of God. Candlish carefully explains that sinful man's nature "demands the application of some power or specific that shall avail to obliterate the stains of guilt, - to break up entirely the whole of the old inner man - to root out the seed of Satanic insubordination which is native and indigenous, and implant the seed of God, whence a new life of willing and obedient subjectship, compatible with highest and holiest sonship, may consistently spring."

In the case of Christ, the Holy Spirit effected his holy sinless birth; in the case of man, the Holy Spirit effects a new birth. The Spirit by working faith in man accomplishes union of the believer with Christ and thus secures for him absolution from guilt, and justification. As a "free subject" the believer is therefore capable of sonship. But it must be noted that Candlish distinguishes sonship from both regeneration and justification. He understands John, in his First Epistle, to teach that Jesus desired to identify believers with himself in His sonship. In regeneration there is communicated to the believer "God's seed", which makes his spiritual and mortal nature the same in character as Christ's. This regeneration makes the adoption real. He goes so far

2. Ibid., p. 111.
as to claim that adopted sons are "sons by nature", but this is true
only in a very "literal acceptation of the term." This means that the
believer is a son not by his own nature but by the nature of Christ.

According to Candlish there is really only one sonship and there¬
fore only one meaning to the term fatherhood. The true sonship is the
relation which Christ enjoys and in which His brethren participate in
Him. The true idea of fatherhood is that which Christ reveals in the
incarnation, in which through union with Him believers likewise partici¬
cipate. Consequently Candlish concludes that the Holy Spirit, in
effecting the new birth, also brings about a "community of nature" be¬
tween God and the believer. 3 If likeness or identity of nature is what
makes identity or likeness of relation possible, then to be "conformed
to his image" carries with it the idea of an identity of nature as well
as an identity of relation. In other words, believers through the work

1. Ibid., p. 151a.

2. Although agreeing with Candlish that the Spirit's work in regenera¬
tion is closely associated with evangelical sonship, Crawford de¬
clined to speak of the close affinity between Christ's virgin birth
and the believer's new birth. To consider such a close correspond¬
ence between the two births, to say further that believers are "sons
by nature", i.e., Christ's nature becomes their nature, Crawford
demed was to speculate too confidentially on the secret things of
God. Christ's sonship, Crawford says, "must be regarded as some¬
thing which is absolutely unique and unapproachable by any creature.
And though the sonship conferred upon His people may be in some
respects strikingly analogous to it, yet in other respects the
distance between them is so immeasurable that we dare not speak of
them as substantially the same." (Crawford, op. cit., p. 197).

3. Cf. II Peter 1:1; Heb. 12:10; Romans 8:28, 29.

of the Holy Spirit participate in the very sonship of Christ.

As regeneration involves an inward working of the Spirit on the individual, so justification denotes an outward judgment pronounced by God on the individual. Adoption is as much an outward act of God as is justification and both are connected with the all-important element of union with Christ by faith. Theoretically there is a sharp line of distinction drawn between justification and adoption. In the former, faith closes with Christ as the Righteousness of God given by a righteous Judge, while in adoption faith grasps Christ to be the Son of God given by a gracious Father. Although adoption and justification are distinguishable in the experience of salvation, according to Candlish, they are not disjointed. "We are not to conceive of them as successive states," he writes, "as if our state as justified subjects coming first gave place to our state as adopted sons following after. They are simultaneous states to be realized continually as such."

One of the distinctive aspects of Candlish's theology is that he elevates adoption as the crowning activity in man's salvation, giving it a place and character separate from justification—erecting it into

---

1. The argument is based on the assumption that the incarnation proved the communicability of the divine sonship to humanity in the person of Jesus Christ. Crawford is unwilling to allow this and affirms that there is no Scriptural evidence for the assertion that Christ's sonship was communicated to humanity in the person of Christ, nor is there any ground for the inference that follows, namely, that "the communicableness of this relation, as it exists in the Godhead, to ordinary human beings, is established by the fact of the Incarnation." (Crawford, op. cit., p. 211).

2. Candlish, Supplementary Volume, p. 135.

a distinct and separate article of belief and giving it a signal place of its own. This is brought out succinctly in his remarks when he defends himself against the charge of Osianderianism.

I believe adoption to be a different transaction on the part of God from justification as our standards teach. And I believe it to be in its own proper nature, not like justification, a judicial and legal adjustment of the Supreme Ruler's controversy with us as his guilty subjects, but something over and above that, indicating and giving vent to the overflowing of his fatherly love to his Son in the first instance — and then to all who are the brethren of his Son.

By saying that the believer's sonship is identical with Christ's sonship he does not deny a distinction between the Only-begotten Son and those who become sons by adoption. Candlish does not equate Christ's sonship with His deity. "There lies beneath the notion of sonship," he argues, "something distinct from the divine nature, considered simply in itself and as such;—something determining the Second Person to be the Son and the Third not to be the Son." Believers may participate in Christ's filial relation and character, but this does not make them partakers of His proper divinity. Believers, in adoption, participate in the relation of Christ's sonship, partake of his position as a Son, but do not share the nature of His sonship.

It was only after the resurrection of Christ that He was declared "to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness." Only then was Christ in a position to make His sonship available to His

1. Ibid., p. 167.
2. Candlish, Supplementary Volume, p. 135f.
3. Ibid., p. 129.
disciples. In commenting on John 20:17, "Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend to my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God," Candlish writes as follows.

I cannot but interpret the message to the disciples after the resurrection in accordance with this view. It is, as I have said, now for the first time that he adopts unequivocally this phraseology, and calls his disciples without qualification or explanation, his brethren. He never called them his brethren before. He did unquestionably keep up a certain distinction between himself and them. He was not able thoroughly to bring out his identifying of himself with them in their subjectship to be really, for them, complete redemption from its curse. But now this reserve is over. He can say, 'My brethren', with fullest, clearest, warmest welcome—welcoming them into his own very relation of sonship and subjectship combined. 2

In conclusion, Candlish attempts to consider the privileges and obligations involved in having God as Father. But instead of dwelling on the many privileges, he singles out one that gives sonship its radical and distinctive character, omitting the obligations entirely. "The peculiar benefit of sonship", he constantly reiterates, is that "it secures permanence of position in the household or family of God." 3 But Crawford argues against this being the peculiar characteristic of sonship. Apart from the sure grounds of the covenant of grace, adoption cannot be considered as having in it "any element of inviolable security", more than justification or the other evangelical blessings. "I cannot admit", Crawford continues, "that this evangelical blessing (of justification) stands on any different footing from adoption . . . .

2. Ibid., p. 125f. But Candlish fails to see that, whether Christ was in the habit of using the term 'brethren' or not, he always treated his disciples as his brethren. There are, moreover, two references in which Jesus distinctly calls them "brethren" before the hour of crucifixion—Matt. 15:10; Matt. 12:49,50.
3. Ibid., p. 176.
When we consider it (justification), not simply in itself, but in connection with the ground on which it rests, the perfect and all-sufficient righteousness of the Saviour, there is... an element of stability which warrants us to say, in the language of our Confession of Faith, that 'God doth continue to forgive the sins of those that are justified', and that 'they can never fall from the state of justification'.

In setting adoption apart from and above the other blessings of salvation Candlish felt it necessary to ascribe to it a characteristic all its own. But it should be noted that in attributing to it the distinctive element of permanency he not only detracts from the security held out to justified believers, but he fails as well to appreciate the significance of adoption as a life of freedom. He finds the master key that unlocks the mystery of God's fatherhood and the believer's sonship in the words of Jesus: "The servant abideth not in the house for ever, but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." But Jesus here emphasizes the freedom of sons in contradistinction to the bondage of slaves. In becoming free by the gospel the believer is entitled to all the privileges of the sons of God. Within this freedom security is to be found. But Candlish interpreted Jesus' words to mean that the believer's security is the ground of his freedom. In this connection it should be observed that St. Paul stresses freedom as basic when he says that adoption into God's family carries

with it "the glorious liberty of the children of God." (Rom. 8:21).

Along with this liberty of God's children comes a security and assurance that nothing can shake. But the important point is that security rests on freedom, not freedom on security. Because Candlish understood sonship primarily in terms of security he could not completely rise above the legal frame in which his thought was cast, even though he tried to conceive of adoption as something more than a purely legal transaction.

Although Crawford exposes the weakness of Candlish's position, especially with reference to justification, his own is not entirely adequate. Even though Crawford attempts to show that sonship by grace is higher than sonship by nature, his main contention—i.e., universal sonship by creation—would seem logically to minimize the distinctiveness of the New Testament doctrine of adoption in Christ. As W. B. Selbie says, a universal sonship on the basis of creation "implies a full realization of an already existing sonship rather than an adoption into sonship." What both Crawford and Candlish failed to see was that the distinctiveness of adoption in Christ, as well as the idea of security implied in justification, are each accorded their full significance when we locate the keynote of adoption, as the obverse side of justification, in freedom.

For Candlish, it is the fact of inviolability that describes the entire character of the relationship of fatherhood and sonship which exists between God and his children. It is this security that Christ

---

desires to share with those whom he is able to call his brethren—those who share his sonship—making them free as he is free. Every other conceivable relation may be violated but not the relation of sonship in Christ. Hence, the Spirit's role in the Fatherhood of God is that he works faith in the believer, initiating regeneration and uniting him to Christ. He is the "Spirit of adoption" who enables the believer to abide in Christ forever. Men are called as sinners, justified as subjects, and glorified as sons. If justification involves union with Christ in his righteousness, and sanctification is union with Christ in his holiness, adoption suggests union with Christ in his sonship and is, as Candlish sees it, "surely the highest and best union and communion of the three."
CHAPTER IX
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AN APPRAISAL

Any controversy has a tendency to accentuate the differences and to minimize the points of agreement. This can surely be said of the Fatherhood of God controversy between Candlish and Crawford in the nineteenth century. Actually they are in agreement in many essential points: in the reality of the fall, concerning the extent of human corruption, in the need of redemption and in redemption through the atoning work of Jesus Christ. They differ in their interpretation of man’s original relation to God, of Christ’s human sonship, of the distinctive characteristics of sonship, and of the relation of the Fatherhood of God to the atonement.

While Candlish said original man was a creature only, Crawford held man to be both a creature and a son. Crawford believed that Christ was the Son of God in virtue of his divine nature and the Son of God in virtue of his taking on human nature; but Candlish argued that Christ was the Son of God in virtue of both his human and divine nature. Again, Crawford affirmed that only Christ’s human sonship could be communicated to believers; Candlish declared that since relationship involved persons Christ’s divine sonship was communicated to those who by faith received the Spirit of adoption. Further, according to Candlish the Fatherhood of God for believers is the result of the atonement; in Crawford’s view the Fatherhood of God is the ground and efficient cause of the atonement.
Moreover, the distinctive characteristic of sonship, for Candlish, rests in permanence of position, while Crawford was not concerned to single out one privilege above the others.

Actually Candlish and Crawford were much closer to believing the same truth about the Fatherhood of God than Candlish, at least, was ready to admit. Crawford recognizes that the real issue between them could perhaps be reduced to a matter of terminology.

If in God's dealings with His intelligent creatures, there be (in Candlish's words) 'an evident excess and exuberance of bounty, far beyond aught that mere equity or justice on the part of a sovereign ruler could have dictated' - if 'the law of man's creature-relationship to his Creator be the law of love' - if he occupies with respect to God 'a high standing, which admits of intercourse on terms all but equal, and into which all conceivable kinds of mutual confidence, sympathy, and esteem may be infused' - and if, in fine, his relation to God be 'a very high and holy one, capable of indefinite development, and from the first admitting of the closest fellowship, altogether friendly, and having much in common with what is filial' - ... the question between us is reduced to an exceedingly narrow issue. 1

It seems apparent that there is little difference between Candlish's conception of the goodness and justice of God and that of Crawford. Both ascribe to God fatherly characteristics, but Candlish affirms as self-evident that those qualities of pitying, protecting, chastening, correcting etc. may, in their essential character, "be all classed as benignant offices of government and of government merely." It is Crawford's contention however that to attribute such actions and characteristics to "mere offices of government," and not to fatherhood, is to confuse the proper acting of an affectionate father with those

of a beneficent ruler.

It must be admitted that we are faced with an ambiguity of terms, with what appears to be a mere logomachy. What Crawford calls onship, Candlish terms creatureship. Yet both evidently imply the same thing. Although Candlish fails to define the term 'fatherhood' at the beginning of his Cunningham Lectures, it would seem that he was obliged to do so. Because of this there is a lack of precision in his doctrine of fatherhood. He nowhere says exactly what he means by the term. Apparently he reduces its meaning to two ideas: "Rightly understood, as it seems to me, the paternal relation, in the first place implies enjoyment by those towards whom it is sustained of a permanent footing in the family, as opposed to one that is contingent and precarious (John 8:35). And secondly, in consequence of its implying this, it excludes the idea of punishment so called; admitting only that of chastisement (Neb. 12:5-11)." Candlish unhesitatingly says that the human relationship of father and son does not always involve permanence of position. "A son's standing in his earthly parents' house is not absolutely and inviolably secure. He may go out, or he may be thrust out. . . . He may be tempted and may fall and too even irrecoverably." Consequently his idea of fatherhood involves more than that which is embraced in the human analogy. Crawford on the other hand accepts the human analogy as adequate to describe the

---

1. In his volume on *Scottish Theology* John Macleod expresses the opinion that the conflict was mainly a verbal one. (*Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History since the Reformation*, Edinburgh, 1913, p. 273.)


original relation of man to God. But Candlish accuses Crawford of confusing the two expressions, "nature" and "relation"—i.e., the quality of fatherliness with the relation of fatherhood.

It seems apparent that Candlish was under some sense of mission when he delivered his lectures on the Fatherhood of God. The old theology of the Westminster Confession had been under attack. One of its most vital points was in danger. If it were allowed that God is the Father of all men, if the very doctrine of the divine fatherhood were to form the ground and argument for the atonement, then the old Calvinism of limited atonement would be rendered untenable. He perceived that before long the entire scheme of the Westminster theology would collapse. Apparently believing that the doctrine of a limited atonement would stand or fall with the question of God's original relationship to men, Candlish—one of the keenest thinkers of his day—directed all his intellectual powers against the new school which held to a universal atonement. The position of Candlish in his Cunningham Lectures was considered by A. M. Fairbairn as "the last serious attempt to state and defend" the old forensic idea of the sovereignty of God as the architectonic principle of all theology. According to Candlish the "atonement has its root and sure foundation in the legal and judicial subjection of man to God as ruler, lawgiver and judge"; for Crawford the atonement

1. See last section of chapter V, supra.
2. W. E. Selbie considers Candlish the most logical of all the Calvinists (Selbie, op. cit., p. 76).
is rooted and grounded in the Fatherhood of God. Candlish holds that
the atonement resulted in a Father-son relationship for those who em-
brace Christ.

Although Crawford is right in his criticism of Candlish he him-
self is not wholly free from attack. There is a danger in Crawford of
separating too sharply the elements in the ordo salutis and in viewing
adoption as merely a corollary of justification. He fails to point out,
as will be emphasized later, that they are two different ways of under-
standing the same relation—viz., that one stresses the legal, the other
the personal, aspect. Candlish however was as guilty as Crawford in
failing to view the elements in the order of salvation as complementary
parts of a larger unity. In making sonship the crowning principle of
salvation Candlish builds such a polemic for adoption that he cannot
bring himself to acknowledge that any personal and intimate relation
was involved in God's making man in His own image. Actually each theo-
logian was maintaining different facets of the same truth. The error
of each lay in the one-sidedness of their views. Neither position would
satisfy biblical theologians of the present day. Recent scholars have
seen the impasse of such an abstract conception of the personal relation
of God and man, and seek a position which does justice at once to the
uniqueness of Christ's sonship, to the distinctiveness of adoption by
grace, and to the universality of the Fatherhood of God.

Although Candlish deprecated the idea that his doctrine of father-
hood was novel, yet it struck his contemporaries as unique both in what
he affirmed and in what he denied. The surprising element in what he
affirmed is that there is only one true fatherhood and sonship, and that
the sonship of believers is identical with the sonship of Christ, the only difference being that Christ's sonship was his by original right, and man's by participation in Christ. Yet Candlish qualified the identity of the relationship by saying that it is an identity of position, not one of nature. By this he means that Christ is the only true Son, and as the Son he alone is permanently related to the Father, for only He participates in the divine nature. If this be granted it logically follows that the only way in which a creature can become a son is to share in the sonship of Christ. A few of his own expressions will illustrate how Candlish constantly identifies the believer's sonship with that of Christ. "We become sons, as he is the Son." "It is as being one with himself that I would have this sonship. And if I have it as being one with him, it must be his own very sonship that I have." "It is your being called to nothing short of participation with the Son in the footing which he has himself in the house or household of the Father, as the Son abiding ever." "All that he has is yours. The perfection of his righteousness, the fulness of his grace and truth, the holiness of his divine nature, the riches of his divine glory, his blessed relation of sonship to the Father, the unction of the Holy Ghost wherewith he was anointed . . . ." "Whatever is implied in his being anointed with the Holy Ghost we are to realise in ourselves, as having 'an unction from the Holy One'. Thus we are Christs, as he is the Christ;
anointed ones, as he is the Anointed One; the Lord's anointed, the Lord's christs, in somewhat of the same sense in which he is so," And again, "You 'know that you are of God' in a sense and to an effect that Adam and Eve, with all their innocence, could not realise. By redemption, by adoption, by regeneration; as bought and begotten; you are of God; his own very sons, as Jesus is." In thus equating the believer's sonship with Christ's sonship Candlish was aiming extremely high. It seems evident that such a position calls into question the absolute uniqueness of the sonship of Christ in contradistinction to that of men. Any position which fails to allow for the singularity of His sonship must be found inadequate. If the teaching of Jesus in the Parable of the Vineyard says anything at all it certainly stresses the unique quality of Christ's sonship as compared with the status of servants. In no sense of the term were the "servants", who were sent ahead of the son, shown to be on any common footing with the "well-beloved son."

If what he affirmed astonished his contemporaries, what he denied was even more disturbing to them. He denied original sonship in created man and in this denial his opponents perceived a refusal to acknowledge the Father's universal love to mankind. The universal love of God most contemporary theologians were unwilling to impugn. Candlish does however make much of the idea that God is Love-itself and that He communicates

2. Ibid., p. 550.
His love, but this to Christ alone and to believers only through their union with Christ. In fact, the atonement is said to spring from divine love; not, however, love to the world or all mankind, but to the Only-begotten Son—"love longing to have a household of sons in him." The atonement results in God's communicating his love to those only who are in Christ. No theologian would deny God's special love to the Church, but most would also see in the cross the revelation of God's love for all mankind. No limitation should be placed on the value of Christ's atoning work, but only on the individual's realization of its benefits.

In referring to the community of nature between the individual believer and Christ Candlish argues that to be "conformed to the image of his Son" implies an identity of nature with Christ. It should be recognized that Candlish uses the term "nature" in more than one sense. In this passage he means that the believer shares the very nature of Christ's sonship, though not (as previously shown) the nature of his divinity. It is this "identity of nature" with Christ as the Son which "makes likeness or identity of relation possible and conceivable." 2 In his expositions on First John he further asserts that "it is upon identity of nature, proved practically, that the question of moral and spiritual parentage must ultimately turn." 3 As regards his use of the term "image", however, there is an inconsistency between his interpretation of the image of Christ in the believer and the image of God in the creature. Although he acknowledges that man was originally created in

the image of God, he is unwilling to admit that this "image" implies or suggests a universal fatherhood.

Although Candlish felt he was taking his doctrine of the Fatherhood of God from Scripture, one may question whether it was formulated after an analysis of Scripture or whether Scripture was used merely to support his presuppositions. It would of course be grossly unfair in view of the constant appeal that he makes to Scripture in support of his system, and of his doctrine of the Fatherhood of God in particular, to accuse him of deliberately twisting the language of the Bible to defend his own position. But in this connection it is interesting to notice that in his Cunningham Lectures he finds it "necessary to begin with what may seem to be a somewhat abstract and speculative inquiry." In his classic work on The Fatherhood of God J. Scott Lidgett remarks that the inconclusiveness of Candlish's argument results largely from the fact that he attempts "to discuss the question whether God is Father, or not, in the abstract instead of in the light of the revelation of the relations in which He stands to men, which is contained in the living concrete reality of our Lord Jesus Christ." Candlish begins with an inquiry "into the relations which God sustains towards his intelligent creatures generally," while Lidgett perceives that it is by the living reality of Christ, "and the relationships to God and mankind involved in it, that the Fatherhood of God must be defined, explained, and made

2. op. cit., p. 6f.
Candlish's treatment of the references to the Fatherhood of God in the Old Testament evinces the a priori nature of his argument. If the Old Testament usage of the Father-son analogy is a mere figure of speech or denotes, as he puts it, "nothing more than a kind of subjectship," then his major premise is correct. If on the other hand, as T. W. Manson points out, a divine fatherhood is strongly emphasised in Hebrew thought and God in his dealings clearly shows himself to be a Father responsible for the welfare of his children, then Candlish's basic premise stands in question. For Manson goes on to say that "when the word 'Father' is used as a name for God, it means primarily either that God is the fons et origo of human life, the Father of our spirits, or that he watches over and cares for men and women in a manner analogous to the paternal care of a good earthly father. The former is typical of Greek thought, the latter is characteristic of Hebrew, Jewish and Christian utterances." The fatherhood taught in the Old Testament is predominantly the latter type. Manson believes that the idea of fatherhood is already clothed with personal references prior to the Christian era, and he concludes therefore that when Jesus spoke of God as the Father, instead of introducing something entirely new (as Candlish would say) he rather took what was the accepted teaching of the prophets, psalmists and sages before him, lifting it up into his own teaching. From a very early period, consequently, the idea of fatherhood became central in Christian teaching and the supreme title for God.

1. Iddgett, op. cit., p. 7.
came to be, quite naturally, 'Father'. Overlooking these facts Candlish failed to perceive the personal content of the Creator-creature relationship in the Old Testament teaching.

Candlish also claims the New Testament in support of his view. He sees the Four Gospels championing his idea that God is "not the Father of mankind generally." He fails, for example, to understand the Parable of the Prodigal Son to teach that as a Father God lovingly awaits the return of his lost child. Instead he interprets it as Christ's defense against the accusation that he was too familiar with sinners. In the parable Jesus "puts it to his accusers to say whether he best sustains the character and does the part of the elder brother, by acting as he is wont to act, in the way that seems to them so objectionable, or by behaving, as they would have him behave, like the elder brother in the parable." It must be observed, however, that his own contemporaries as well as most scholars today agree with Lidgett who holds that the parable teaches beyond dispute "the universal Fatherhood of God." As Professor David Cairns writes, this one parable "quickly settles the whole matter . . . . Here the reference is quite indubitably universal."

In Candlish's doctrine of sonship, as based exclusively on participation in Christ, there are the seeds of a corporate conception of the Church. Although he has grounds here for breaking with the rigid

2. Ibid., p. 131.
3. Lidgett, op. cit., p. 36.
individualism characteristic of the century, he fails to draw the implications. Because of his narrow theory of the atonement he retains an individualistic idea of the believer's relation to God. But with such a strong emphasis on union with Christ one would expect an equally strong doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. Candlish apparently fails to see, as Wheeler Robinson points out, that the Church, not the individual, is "the chief organ of the Holy Spirit." As Christ became incarnate in the flesh so the Spirit becomes incarnate in the Church. We cannot separate fellowship with Christ from the fellowship within His Body. The primary field of operation of the Holy Spirit is the living community of believers, not the lives of self-contained individuals.

Although Candlish places stress on the activity of the Spirit in individual lives, bringing them into the family of God, he tends unfortunately to neglect the communal aspect of the Spirit's work.

Despite his inconsistencies it must be allowed that Candlish was, at least in certain respects, pointing in the right direction. If the controversy which he precipitated by his lectures awakened theologians to the need of a re-examination of the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, and if this re-examination motivated such works as J. Scott Lidgett's signal volume The Fatherhood of God, he has indeed rendered a valuable service to the history of theological thought. John Macleod is bold to say that Candlish's venture in the Cunningham Lectures on the Fatherhood of God to advance the bounds of systematic theology is his "chief contribution to the exposition of the Reformed Faith."

2. op. cit., p. 273.
Candlish laid stress on the uniqueness of adoption by grace in contra-distinction to the notion of sonship as the common property of all men by creation which he conceived to be an unbiblical idea. He understood believers' sonship only in terms of Christ's eternal sonship. This sonship of believers is revealed in the incarnation, procured by the atonement and applied by the agency of the Holy Spirit. He does however admit an anticipated sonship in the creaturely state of man which suggests an idea that might have been advantageously developed. His strong emphasis on sonship in Christ reminds us of the qualitative difference there is between man's natural relation to God and the peculiar relationship by grace. His view was a corrective of the prevailing tendency to postulate a sonship for all mankind such as the New Testament writers ascribe only to believers. He was not however blind to the providential concern of the Creator for all his creatures, even though he was unwilling to accept the human analogy of the father-son relationship as adequate to describe the creaturely condition of man.

A suggestive solution to this problem of natural and spiritual sonship is offered by J. M. Shaw's Elliott Lectures in which he distinguishes sonship in Christ from "childship" in Adam. He affirms that we are all children of God, being made in the image of God, but childship is not in itself sonship. He conceives of sonship not as a natural endowment like childship, but as a spiritual achievement that comes to be through living in fellowship with God and being born of the Spirit.


This distinction allows him to retain the idea of universal fatherhood and yet at the same time to recognize the superior position of adopted sons.

Because Candlish limited so rigidly the sphere of God's fatherhood he saw a contradiction in terms between fatherhood and sovereignty with reference to God's relation to primal man. But instead of there being any contradiction between the two ideas, they are in reality complementary. Neither can exist without the other; the absence of one imperils the existence of the other. A. M. Fairbairn makes this unmistakably clear in a discussion of God's primary relation to man. "The two ideas," he says, "of paternity and sovereignty are not only compatible, they are indissoluble; either can be perfect only in and through the other. The absolute sovereign without the father is a tyrant, a despot . . . ; the father without the sovereign is a weakling, a puppet or thing made rather than a maker . . . . Neither function, then, can be well discharged without the other." God must be known in a personal and intimate way in order that his sovereignty may be understood. At the same time his fatherhood can be understood only when we know God as our King. In other words there is no disparity between the two names, Father and Sovereign. "In origin they are simultaneous, in being coincident, in range coextensive, in ends identical." To call God Sovereign is not to imply that he does not love his children with a father's love. On the other hand to designate fatherhood to God does not mean that he

is unable to exercise wrath toward his sinful children, or that men living in sin are not his enemies and that a new birth is unnecessary. God is Father and as such he is a Sovereign. "The heavenly Father and the heavenly King are one and the same person," writes Manson, "and the Kingship and the Fatherhood are one and the same thing looked at from different points of view."

From a mid-twentieth-century perspective the similarities between Candlish and Crawford on the point in question are almost as apparent as their differences. Because the whole controversy was cast in too abstract a frame of reference it tended to point both men away from a vital and dynamic sense of divine fatherhood to a somewhat deistic conception. By very definition Crawford conceived of fatherhood as implying a mechanical view of man's origination, and any display of God's fatherliness was considered a natural result of his kindly benevolence rather than a creative activity of the Spirit of God. In fact, both Candlish and Crawford failed to see, as Lidgett points out, "that human nature is interpenetrated by the Divine, despite the fact of sin," that God is immediately present in all life, the creative power in every finite being. This fundamental continuity of the Creator and the creature is expressed clearly by Principal Baillie when he says that "we must acknowledge Him (God) . . . to be, of all realities, that by which we are most directly and intimately confronted." Again, "the

1. Cairns, op. cit., p. 49.
2. Manson, op. cit., p. 163f.
reason why it is difficult to regard the relation of man to God as merely a relationship between two beings who stand over against each other (and are in that sense wholly other) is that God appears in some sort to be present on both sides of the relationship."

The best representatives of present-day theology view the doctrine of adoption as intimately associated with the doctrine of justification by faith. The latter does not exhaust the full meaning of the relationship between God and the believer. While justification expresses the legal aspect, adoption refers to the personal side. The first pictures God as our Judge; the second, God as our Father. Justification suggests a prisoner standing alone to face charges and hearing the decision "not guilty—discharged." In adoption the picture is that of an orphaned child, cold, hungry and lost, being received into the warmth and intimacy of a family. As Professor Hendry has said, justification suggests dismissal while adoption denotes a life of admission. There is however no interval of time separating them, for they are two aspects of one and the same experience. In fact, adoption may be called a doublet of justification. Professor Stewart points out that Paul sometimes describes what happens in justification by the term adoption (υἱὸ Θεοῦ). The justified man becomes "aware that his relationship to God is that of a son to a Father. No longer is he an outcast or a hired servant: his place is in the family." Is it proper, then, to

1. Ibid., p. 234.
apply the phrase "sons of God" to all men, or, with Candlish, to those only who receive adoption in Christ? It must be recognized that modern biblical theologians say that Scripture speaks of the Fatherhood of God as universal. Even in the Synoptic Gospels fatherhood is a dominant theme and is spoken of independently of the character of men. In his recent Kerr Lectures Professor David Cairns of Aberdeen clearly shows the three Scriptural uses of the terms 'fatherhood' and 'sonship':

1. the Father-Son relation which exists between God and his eternal Son;
2. the relation in which believers share by faith and into which they enter in Christ;
3. the relationship into which all mankind enter in virtue of their bearing the image of God.

In conclusion, the problem hinges on whether we take universal fatherhood to imply universal sonship. Ultimately, it seems that this question cannot be resolved by logic, which Candlish constantly tried to do. It is an over-simplification to argue that since God is the Father of all, therefore all men are his sons. The problem is much more complex than this because in it we are concerned primarily with personal relationships, and these cannot be determined by logic alone. It may be granted that God is the Father of all men, but there is also a sense in which it is true that until men receive Christ by faith, until they respond to God's love, his fatherhood is not realized in them. Anyone may call God Father, but it is the Holy Spirit who makes

1. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke 11:13). Cf. Theological Word Book of the Bible, art. by O. S. Rankin, p. 93f.

2. op. cit., pp. hhff.
real and vital the relationship of the Father to his sons. To have God as Father in the highest sense springs from the work of the Spirit of Christ in the hearts of men: "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying Abba Father." As J. Scott Lidgett admirably states it, "the universality of the Fatherhood of God does not depend upon, or involve, an equally universal actual realization by men of the life of sonship."

1. Lidgett, op. cit., p. 163.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

As recent as February, 1952 a controversy was waged in the United States, from the pulpit and in the press, on this very issue—the Fatherhood of God and its corollary, the brotherhood of man.

Dr. James L. Fowle, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Chattanooga, Tennessee, official chaplain of Chattanooga and Co-Moderator for the year of 1952 of the Presbyterian Church in the United States,1 lighted the spark of the controversial fires. During Brotherhood Week the pastors of the city were encouraged to cooperate in the distribution of blood donor cards2 which contained the following pledge: "As God is the Father of all men, so all men are brothers. Because the gift of my blood may save a brother, I hereby pledge my contribution to the armed forces."3 Dr. Fowle took positive and vigorous exception to the statement, "As God is the Father of all men, so all men are brothers." Speaking from his pulpit he declared, "this is a unitarian creed. We in Trinitarian faiths do not accept it. We believe only in the brotherhood of men in Christ . . . all men are not brothers. The statement that they are is part of a creed and has no place in a patriotic appeal."4

The sermons delivered and the articles and letters written by representatives on either side of the argument received the widest dissemination. There were ministers from the same communion represented on each side of the dispute. The position which Dr. Fowle and those allied with him accepted were summarized in a daily press. "We believe", wrote Dr. Fowle, "that men have access to God through (Christ) Him; and that all who acknowledge Him as their Saviour and Lord become His brethren and ours. The great desire of the Christian Church is that all men may come to know Jesus Christ. . . . Only through a new birth, the birth of the Holy Spirit do they become members of the family of God, His sons and His daughters."5 The Opposition agreed with much that Dr. Fowle declared, but also acknowledged God as the Father of all mankind and a universal brotherhood. They believed that because God is the Creator of all, because all men are the offspring of God and because man is made in the image of God, all mankind have the same loving Father. One editorial interpreted the controversy as representing the old conflict between "American Liberals" and "American Conservatives." The editorial, however, acknowledged the fact that no such line of demarcation could be drawn and that many conservatives recognized the idea of the universal Fatherhood of God.

1. This Church is known as the Southern Presbyterian Church.
2. The Blood-donor program was sponsored by the American Red Cross and the U.S. Defense Department and supported by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.
4. Ibid.
APPENDIX B

Candlish considers the Bible to be "literally and verbally" the Word of God. "I cannot bring myself to believe," he says, "that when God meant to reveal his will to me ... he left these men to write without superintendence and an unerring oversight that would secure the literal and verbal accuracy of every sentence they composed; its being literally and verbally what he would have it to be, literally and verbally correct and true." He was content with the older view of revelation as a communication of information and doctrine, and believed that reason alone was insufficient without revelation. Because of the very nature of the oral revelation, being limited and gradual, given over a long period of time and adapted to specific human occasions, the communication of God must be guarded from inerrancy. In this he holds strongly to the verbal plenary theory of inspiration. As he says, "I cannot see how otherwise we have any guarantee for the accuracy of a revelation ... unless we have ... an unerring oversight." It is evident, from such an expression and other similar assertions, that his entire view of Scripture rests on the a priori assumption that God must superintend the writers of sacred history and revelation to their verbal inerrancy. Stating his position in this manner he attempts to substantiate it repeatedly by statements as the above and from references to the Scriptures.

Most modern scholars and many of Candlish's contemporaries affirm, however, that the Bible does not claim inerrancy. To say that the Bible must be forced into conformity with any Procrustean theory of inspiration appears to be, as it were, placing the cart before the horse. The theory of inspiration and authority must be formed from the teaching of the Bible itself. Great difficulty arises when the Scriptures are approached with a preconceived theory of what inspiration must be. As Marcus Dodd has so well said, "much injustice has been done to the Bible, and much harm has resulted to faith by allowing a priori conceptions of inspiration and its effect to rule." According to Candlish, moreover, there is no infallible word of God in the Bible unless the Bible itself is the Infallible Word of God. Either the Bible is in its entirety the Word of God and the external standard or else it is no standard or guide whatsoever. In this view he was at one with many theologians of his day. It is of interest

to note that he affirms the purpose of the Bible is "to testify of Jesus," and he believes that it is only when the Bible brings Christ speaking really personally to you "that the Bible, or any portion of it, is practically and influentially the word of Christ to you." Such an acknowledgement as this, and others are found frequently in his sermons, seems to indicate how Candlish almost breaks away from his rigid view of Scriptures. Nevertheless, all the Scriptures testify of Christ, even the most "Christless passages," as he calls them, when dwelt upon in the Spirit and prayed over will become God's living word to the believer at that time.

He assumes that an exceedingly large amount of knowledge of the fundamental articles of faith existed in a primeval revelation before the written word. The written word, as it seems to me, takes for granted such knowledge to a considerable extent, and proceeds upon the faith of it - supplementing it and correcting it often by allusions and hints, rather than formally teaching or communicating it, as if for the first time. I refer to such heads of doctrine as the being and attributes of God; the unity of divine nature, with perhaps some intimation of the plurality of persons in that unity; the guilt or condemnation of sin; the manner of its remission through a propitiatory sacrifice; the calling and conversion of sinners; the promised Saviour; the resurrection and final judgment; the eternal state. Many of his contemporaries could not agree with him in this view. It was not that they denied a primeval revelation, but they could not concur with him in respect to its content. They did coincide with Candlish however in recognising a gradual, progressive and limited revelation which shown brighter and brighter until its fullness in Jesus Christ. Candlish was nevertheless awake to the apparent inconsistencies and seeming discrepancies of the Bible, especially in connection with the use and free quotation of the Old Testament in the New, yet he concludes that when fuller light is given the Scriptures will stand inerrant. His one haven of security lies in his a priori idea of what he calls inspiration must include, which is an over all superintendence of the writings to guarantee the accuracy and inerrancy of every word. Instead of weakening the position of the authority of the Bible, however, modern scholarship has strengthened it and supported a more lucid interpretation of the Scriptures as the Word of God. Sir Frederic Kenyon, a conservative scholar, says "to put it briefly, we can abandon the 'fundamentalist' doctrine of the inerrancy of Scripture not merely without harm to its religious authority, but with a positive reinforcement of it."6

1. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, p. 230
2. Candlish, Sermons, p. 190
4. Candlish, On the Sonship and Brotherhood of Believers, pp. 236-7
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