

more sound than the conclusion we now make of what God actually is from the conscience he has actually given to us—a conscience that, amid all the obstructions and obscurations of the inferior faculties in a nature which has gone into unhingement, speaks loudly for the obligations and against the transgressions of moral rectitude—and therefore for a God who, amid the anarchy of the lower elements in this lower world, still asserts with overruling voice that He loveth righteousness, that He hateth iniquity.

13. Let us here take the opportunity of explaining a term which occurs but rarely in any of the expositions of Natural Theology—we mean the Holiness of the Godhead. This is sometimes conceived of merely as Virtue in its highest possible state of exaltation. But this is not just the appropriate definition of it. It is not Virtue in itself—but virtue in relation to its opposite. The term Holiness suggests the idea not of perfect Virtue—but of that peculiar affection wherewith a Being of perfect virtue regards moral Evil—and so much indeed is this the precise and characteristic import of the term, that, had there been no evil either actual or conceivable in the Universe, there could have been no Holiness. There would have been perfect Truth and perfect Righteousness—yet not Holiness—for this is a word which denotes neither any one of the Virtues in particular, nor the assemblage of them all put together—but the recoil or the repulsion of these towards the opposite vices—a recoil that never could have been felt, if Vice had been so far a nonentity as to be neither an