MISSOURI VALLEY COLLEGE
The Cumberland Presbyterian review.
ARCHIVES BV 4070 .C9 1890
3 7010 00054003 5

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN

REVIEW.

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE,

DEVOTED TO

THEOLOGY, AND THE DISCUSSION OF CURRENT RELIGIOUS, LITERARY, AND SCIENTIFIC TOPICS, AND QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH CHURCH WORK AND MORAL REFORMS.



VOLUME II.—1890.

NASHVILLE, TENN.:

BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

CONTENTS.

About Home. Rabbi Isidore Lewenthal, - - - - - - - - - 371
Agnosticism and Faith. J. I. D. Hinds, Ph.D., - - - - - - 503
American Mistakes. T. M. Hurst, - - - - - - - - - - 296
Art of Preaching, The. Wm. Adamson, D.D., - - - - - - - 7
Atonement, The. Rev. P. G. Rea, - - - - - - - - - - 435
Biblical Theology. Prof. R. V. Foster, D.D., - - - - - - - 71
Books Received, - - - - - - - - - - - 128, 256, 384, 512
Books Reviewed, - - - - - - 116–125, 246–253, 375–379, 505–510
Brotherly Love Has Continued. (Ed.), - - - - - - - - - 107
Change of the Sabbath from the Seventh to the First Day of the Week. Rev. M. M. Smith, - - - - - - - - - - 351
Chinese Puzzle, The. Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald, - - - - - - - 16
Christian Sympathy. Rev. W. P. Bone, - - - - - - - - - 363
Christian Culture and Education. (Ed.), - - - - - - - - 358
Christianity and Civilized Government. Rev. T. S. Love, - - - 89
Christian Unity *versus* Church Union. (Ed.) - - - - - - - 98
Christ's Baptism. Rev. S. H. McElvain, - - - - - - - - 114
Church and Progress, The. (Ed.), - - - - - - - - - 493
Church the Light of the World, The. (Ed.), - - - - - - 103
Church *versus* Souls. (Ed.), - - - - - - - - - - - 356
Cumberland Presbyterians in the Future. Rev. J. W. Laughlin, - 219
Did Jesus Rise From the Dead? Judge Thos. J. Freeman, - - - 33
Distributing the Minutes. Rev. W. B. Witherspoon, - - - - 245
Division of Labor in the Church. Rev. T. A. Cowan, Ph.D., - - - 364
Dogmatic Preaching and the Law Side. Rev. A. B. Buchanan, - - 499
Drummond Theory and Fatalism. Rev. B. Margeson, - - - - 201
Education and Citizenship—Morally. A. R. Taylor, Ph.D., - - 140
Eye and Its Ethics, The. Rev. J. D. Gold, Ph.D., - - - - - 286
Factors in Church Life. Rev. J. D. Gold, Ph.D., - - - - - 22
Faith. Rev. H. R. Crockett, - - - - - - - - - - - 116
From Death Unto Life. Rev. H. C. Bird, - - - - - - - 446
From What Does Christ Save? Rev. T. A. Cowan, Ph.D., - - - 502
Geological Time and the Age of Man. J. I. D. Hinds, Ph.D., - - 194
Hints to Helpers. R. G. Pearson, D.D., - - - - - - - - 83
How and Why Justification is by Faith. Rev. B. G. Mitchell, - - 210
Human Christ, The—A Glimpse. E. G. McLean, D.D., - - - - 172
Hymns of the Reformation Period. Rev. J. A. McKamy, - - - 190
I Do Believe. Chancellor N. Green, - - - - - - - - - 386
Inequalities of Human Life. Prof. R. V. Foster, D.D., - - - - 270
Infant Salvation. Rev. James Best, - - - - - - - - - 113
Infant Salvation. Rev. J. A. McKamy, - - - - - - - - 369
Is Preaching Work? (Ed.), - - - - - - - - - - - 489
Is Theology Progressive? (Ed.), - - - - - - - - - - 236
It is the Blood Applied That Saves. Rev. A. W. Hawkins, - - - 502

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. William Adamson, D.D., - - - - - - - 308
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. Rev. B. G. Mitchell, - - - - - - - - 475
MAN'S FALL AND DEPRAVITY. P. Axtell, D.D., - - - - - - - 244
MAGAZINE NOTES. - - - - - - - - - - - - 126, 254, 382, 510
MILLER, REV. JOHN, AND SOME OF HIS BOOKS. S. G. Burney, D.D., LL.D., - 415
MINISTERIAL DIGNITY. Rev. W. O. H. Perry, - - - - - - - - 109
MINISTRY OF SUFFERING. (Ed.), - - - - - - - - - - 239
MINISTERIAL EDUCATION. W. S. Danley, D.D., - - - - - - - 257
MISSIONS. Rev. W. T. Ferguson, - - - - - - - - - - 42
MISSION OF THE COLLEGE, THE. President Wm. H. Black, D.D., - - - - 318
MODERN EDUCATION IN JAPAN. M. L. Gordon, D.D., - - - - - - 1
MORALITY AND RELIGION. Rev. J. D. Gold, Ph.D., - - - - - - 505
NATIONAL HERO, THE. Charles Foster Smith, Ph.D., - - - - - - 59
NATURAL LAW AND FATALITY. Rev. B. Margeson, - - - - - - - 116
NEW SAVONAROLA, THE. D. E. Bushnell, D.D., - - - - - - - 93
NEW TESTAMENT COMMUNISM. Rev. W. B. Preston, - - - - - - - 328
ORDINATION OF UNQUALIFIED MEN, - - - - - - - - - - 430
ORGANIZATION AND INDIVIDUAL WORK. Rev. W. T. Ferguson, - - - - - 243
ORGANIC UNION OF ALL CHURCHES. Rev. F. T. Charleton, - - - - - 469
OUR POSITION; OR, CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS IN RELATION TO THE PRESBYTERIAN FAMILY. (Editorial), - - - - - - - - - - 226
PERFECT LOVE AND REMAINING CORRUPTION. Rev. J. L. Hawkins, - - - - 112
PERSONAL PREACHING. W. S. Danley, D.D., - - - - - - - - 365
POETICAL WORKS OF ALFRED TENNYSON. Prof. S. A. Link, - - - - - 181
POISONING OF POLITE LITERATURE. Rev. A. G. Bergen, - - - - - - 112
PREACHERS AND POPULARITY. Rev. J. L. Crawford, - - - - - - 498
PREACHER'S AIM AND WORK, THE. James Morison, D.D., - - - - - 164
PREACHER IN POLITICS, THE. J. S. Grider, D.D., - - - - - - 410
PREACHED WORD, THE. Rev. J. S. Howard, A.M., - - - - - - 300
PRESBYTERIAN CREEDS AND PULPITS. Rev. W. B. Farr, D.D., - - - - 393
QUERIES, NOTES, AND SUGGESTIONS, - - 109-116, 241-246, 362-375, 498-505
REDEMPTIVE RENOVATION. A. B. Miller, D.D., LL.D., - - - - - - 129
REGENERATION. Rev. J. H. Tharp, - - - - - - - - - - 368
SHAMS IN RELIGION. Evangelist R. G. Pearson, D.D., - - - - - - 455
SHALL IT CONTINUE? (Editorial), - - - - - - - - - - 362
SIN AND ITS ORIGIN. Rev. J. T. A. Henderson, - - - - - - - 114
SOME HINTS TO POOR CHURCHES. Prof. T. W. Galloway, - - - - - - 280
SOME PHASES OF AGNOSTICISM. Thos. J. Freeman, LL.D., - - - - - 336
SPURIOUS IMMORTALITY, A. (Editorial), - - - - - - - - - 102
STUDY OF THE VISION OF OBADIAH. Prof. W. W. Martin, - - - - - 343
STUDY OF JAMES AND HIS LETTER, A. Rev. J. G. Patton, - - - - - 461
THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS FOR ALL STUDENTS. Rev. R. J. Beard, - - - - - 243
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM AND EDUCATION OF THE MINISTRY, THE. Rev. A. G. Burrow, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 485
TRUE PREACHER, THE. Rev. D. S. Bodenhamer, Ph.D., - - - - - - 464
TWO IMMORTALITIES, THE. Rev. J. D. Gold, Ph.D., - - - - - - - 24
UNJUST DISCRIMINATION. Rev. J. M. Keeton, - - - - - - - - 110
UNPARDONABLE SIN, THE. F. R. Earle, D.D., - - - - - - - - 500
USE GOD'S WORD FAITHFULLY. J. B. Mitchell, D.D., - - - - - - - 367
WASTED STRENGTH. Rev. T. A. Cowan, Ph.D., - - - - - - - - 241
WERE THEY SAVED? Rev. J. R. Morris, - - - - - - - - - 242
WHAT? HOW? WHY? WHITHER? J. I. D. Hinds, Ph.D., - - - - - - - 373

WHY AM I A PRESBYTERIAN? Rev. W. H. Berry, - - - - - - - - 151
WOMAN IN CHURCH WORK. E. T. Bowers, D.D., - - - - - - - - 398
WORSHIPING OF TRUTH. Rev. J. L. Hughey, - - - - - - - - - 111

BOOKS REVIEWED.

ASOLANDO; FANCIES AND FACTS (Browning), - - - - - - - - - 251
ASPECTS OF THE EARTH (Shaler), - - - - - - - - - - - 247
BELIEF IN GOD (Schurman), - - - - - - - - - - - - 508
BIBLE STUDIES FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT (Pentecost), - - - - - - - 118
CHARACTER AND COMMENT (McCoun), - - - - - - - - - - 125
CONTINUOUS CREATION, THE (Adams), - - - - - - - - - - 118
DYING AT THE TOP; OR, THE MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CONDITION OF THE YOUNG MEN OF AMERICA (Clokey), - - - - - - - - - - - 379
ELEMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY, THE (Compayré), - - - - - - - - - 505
ENGLISH MEN OF ACTION SERIES, THE (Macmillan & Co.), - - - - - - 248
EUROPEAN SCHOOLS (Klemm), - - - - - - - - - - - - 118
EXPLANATORY AND PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY OF THE NOTED NAMES OF FICTION (Wheeler), - - - - - - - - - - - - - 117
EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE: THE PASTORAL EPISTLES (Plummer), - - - - - - 253
EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE: JUDGES AND RUTH (Watson), - - - - - - - 375
GENERAL HISTORY FOR COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS (Myers), - - - - - 121
GOD AND LITTLE CHILDREN (Van Dyke), - - - - - - - - - 377
GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE (Burton), - - - - - - - - - 507
HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE UNITED STATES (McCoun), - - - - - - 123
HISTORY OF ART, A (Goodyear), - - - - - - - - - - - 248
HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, A (Brodrick), - - - - - - 123
LIGHT ON THE PATH; OR, THE WAY HEAVENWARD (Kirk), - - - - - - 250
MENTAL EVOLUTION IN MAN (Ramanes), - - - - - - - - - 119
NATURAL RELIGION (Müeller), - - - - - - - - - - - 379
OUR REST DAY (Hamilton), - - - - - - - - - - - - 122
PELOUBET'S NOTES, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 117
PETRINE CLAIMS (Littledale), - - - - - - - - - - - 121
PLEASURES OF LIFE, THE (Lubbock), - - - - - - - - - - 124
RELIGION AND SCIENCE AS ALLIES (Bixby), - - - - - - - - - 120
RIVERSIDE LIBRARY FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, THE (Bramford), - - - - - - 246
SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE, THE (Cobb), - - - - - - - - 125
SELECT LIBRARY OF THE NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 506
SERMON BIBLE, THE: PSALM LXXVII. TO SONG OF SOLOMON (A. C. Armstrong & Co.), - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 116
SERMON BIBLE, THE: ISAIAH TO MALACHI (Armstrong & Co.), - - - - - 376
SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND, A (McCarthy), - - - - - - - - 124
SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY (Strong), - - - - - - - - - - - 249
TEN COMMANDMENTS, THE (Boardman), - - - - - - - - - 253
THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT (Müeller), - 123
WINNING OF THE WEST, THE (Roosevelt), - - - - - - - - - 252

41375-7

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

Vol. II. JANUARY, 1890. No. 1.

MODERN EDUCATION IN JAPAN.

NEARLY thirty years ago a young Japanese stood on the shore of Yedo Bay watching the foreign men-of-war anchored there. What his feelings were he himself described a few years later in broken English:

"While I looked one reflection came upon my heart, that we must open navy because the country is surrounded by water, and if foreigners fight to my country, we must fight to them at sea. But I made other reflection, too, that since foreigners trade, price of every thing get high, the country get poorer than before, because the countrymen do n't understand to do trade with foreigners. *Therefore we must know to do trade, and we must learn foreign knowledge.*"

Here, in the burden of this patriotic young heart, we find the explanation of Japan's remarkable progress. Not one, nor one hundred, but thousands of young men saw, as by intuition, that Japan had no safety in attempted isolation; that her only salvation lay in intercourse with foreign nations and the acquisition of foreign knowledge. And in Japan, more even than in other lands, what the young men think the nation soon comes to think.

Foreign intercourse was secured by treaties; foreign commerce by opening ports for trade; and by sending young men to the schools and colleges of the West, by importing experts in all branches of science, and by establishing a National School System, Japan has in a most wonderful way been stretching out her hands for foreign knowledge. That great progress has been made is widely known in a general way. And yet more definite and detailed information concerning Japan's educational system can

hardly be without interest to the readers of this REVIEW, and to the multitudes in America who are sincere friends of Japan.

A word may be said in passing as to the old education of Japan. It consisted mainly of the study of the Chinese language and literature, and was practically confined to the young gentlemen of the *Samurai* class. The sons of farmers, mechanics, and tradesmen were, to a limited extent, taught writing and arithmetic. In the comparatively few girls' schools, instruction was given in sewing, letter-writing, and "the duties of women."

Immediately upon the restoration of the Mikado in power in 1868, a Board of Education was established; and it is a proof of the nation's earnestness, as well as of the difficulties which have been encountered, that in the succeeding twenty years the Department of Education and the Educational System have each been remodeled eight times.

In the early years the government planned for the thorough education of the few alone; later the education of the masses came to be regarded as a necessity. This doubtless came about as a result of the Educational Commission which accompanied the Iwakura Embassy in 1872; and it is an interesting fact that the young Japanese* whose words are quoted at the beginning of this paper, and who under the impulse to "learn foreign knowledge," had eight years before run away from his native land, and was at that time, a student in Andover Theological Seminary, was chosen as the official guide and interpreter of the head of this Commission, and accompanied him in his study of the schools and school systems of America and Europe.

As an evidence of the reforms effected, and of the high ideal entertained, I quote the following from an imperial edict issued at the time: "Although learning is essential to success in life for all classes of men, yet for farmers, artisans, and merchants, and for women, it has been regarded as beyond their sphere; and even among the upper classes aimless discussions and vain styles of composition only were cultivated, from which no practical use could ever be deduced. Much poverty and failure in life are owing to these mistaken views. *It is intended that henceforth education shall be so diffused that there may not be a village with an ignorant family, nor a family with an ignorant member.*"

* Rev. J. H. Neesima, President of the Doshisha School, Kyoto.

In the spirit of this the government has been earnestly laboring ever since. A system of common schools was soon inaugurated, and a limited number of middle schools (high schools or academies) and normal schools were established. A little later a university with departments of law, medicine, science, and literature was organized. Later an engineering college was added.

Four years ago Viscount Arinori Mori, whose lamented death by the hand of an assassin is still so fresh in all our minds, was made Minister of State for Education, and the reforms instituted under his direction are greater, perhaps, than those made under any other administration. In the present system the school age is fixed at from six to fourteen years of age, and parents and guardians are required to send every child to school for at least four years. In this course the time is given mainly to the study of Japanese and Chinese reading, writing, and composition; but arithmetic, geography, and *morals* also receive attention. Then follows a grammar school course in which the elements of science, drawing, singing, English reading, needle-work for girls, etc., are added to the foregoing. According to the latest official reports which I have been able to obtain there are 28,283 of these schools; teachers, 99,510; pupils, 3,097,235. The annual expense, in 1886, was $8,186,709, silver.

Above these come the ordinary middle schools which are established and maintained by the different prefectural governments. These have a course of five years. The subjects of study are: Ethics, Japanese and Chinese history and literature, English, French (or German), history, mathematics, natural history, physics, chemistry, writing, drawing, singing, and gymnastics. In some schools agriculture, commerce, and some of the industrial arts are also taught. In 1886 there were thirty-eight of these schools in the empire. Probably ten thousand would be a low estimate of the number of the pupils.

Next come the seven higher middle schools. These have a three years' preparatory course in which all the pupils pursue the same studies; then follow two years during which the pupils are divided into five different sections according to their purpose to enter the scientific, literary, engineering, medical, or legal departments of the university. The first of these schools, located in Tokyo, is the only one yet thoroughly organized. The instruction given

probably equals that of the best colleges in the United States. The instructors include both Japanese and foreign professors, among the former being graduates of the best Western schools. In the university the college of law includes three courses: English law, French law, and politics. Each extends through three years. The college of medicine embraces a course in medicine (four years), and one in pharmacy (three years). The college of engineering includes the seven courses of civil engineering, mechanical engineering, naval architecture, electrical engineering, architecture, applied chemistry, and mining and metallurgy—each three years. The college of literature includes four courses: Philosophy, Japanese literature, Chinese literature, and philology—three years each. The college of science embraces the seven courses of mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, zoology, botany, and geology.

Few, if any, institutions in America equal this in the completeness of its appointments. Not only are there hospitals in connection with the medical department, there are also separate laboratories for the several courses of anatomy, physiology, pathology, materia medica, hygiene, etc. There are also an astronomical observatory, a seismological laboratory, a marine laboratory, botanical gardens, etc. The library contains one hundred and eighty thousand volumes. The professors, many of whom have doctor's degrees from foreign universities, number ninety-two; the pupils, eight hundred and seventy-five.

There is also a system of normal schools, which in view of all the difficulties, seem to be doing most excellent work. The best of these, the higher normal school of Tokyo, I recently visited, and saw unmistakable evidences of thorough organization and management. These normal schools number fifty-seven; teachers, seven hundred and forty-one; pupils, seven thousand seven hundred and seven.

In addition to those mentioned there are commercial schools, naval and military schools, agricultural schools, a school of telegraphy, etc.

Such, in brief outline, is the present educational system of Japan. If one were to start out to criticize, it would not be difficult to find points to attack. Many teachers are doubtless incompetent intellectually, and unworthy morally. There is, too, a lack

of thoroughness, an inevitable result of the rapid growth of the system, and the attempt to cover too much ground. Still, the wonder is not that there is a lack of perfection, but that so much has been done, and done so well.

In a moral point of view the schools are not satisfactory even to the Japanese. In recent interviews with gentlemen of high position in the department of education, I was surprised and deeply impressed at the spontaneous confession that the problem of moral education was the most difficult one they had to deal with. This is difficult in the United States where we meet only the Jewish and Christian religions, and various shades of unbelief; how much graver here where the throne is founded on one religion, Shintoism; the faith of the people largely fixed upon another, Buddhism; the older scholars admirers of the morality of Confucianism; and Christianity, with its high claims, more and more coming into favor with the younger and more intelligent classes of the people! Under such circumstances religious instruction in the schools becomes difficult, if not impossible; and one can see why "a basis of ethics" is such an important question in Japan.

Do we not see here an unexampled opportunity for the Christian Church? What the government can not do directly and publicly in the schools, we may and ought to do by the preaching of the gospel. Religious liberty, now given by the constitution, calls upon us as never before to give the gospel to those who are not only *free* to hear but in large numbers *eager* to hear also.

Do we not see, too, in all this, an indication of the kind of men and women needed for mission work here? The thought prevails, to some extent at least, in our schools and Churches, that "any body will do for a missionary." This can be true only in the sense that any body will do for a minister at home. In earlier days missionaries went to the ignorant tribes of Africa and the degraded peoples of the Pacific Islands, people with no education, no written language even. I would, by no means, undervalue the work of the noble men who have gone to them, learned their language, reduced it to writing, and created for them a literature. Their task was a gigantic one; their work one of Christianity's conquest. But, in view of Japan's condition, educationally, to think of the work here as similar to theirs, is surely to confound things which are essentially and radically different.

The missionary here must, at times, speak to those who have a university education. More frequently will he be compared with the foreign scholars—scientific experts—in the government schools, some of whom will not hesitate to declare that Christian ministers are men of small intellectual caliber. Constantly will he be obliged to meet here, to an extent unknown even to city pastors in America, an infidelity which is an outgrowth of higher education.

Is not, therefore, the same divine wisdom which, for work in Macedonia and Achaia, in Ephesus and Rome, chose the acute, learned, and logical Saul, also calling to the strongest young men and women in our schools and colleges to choose Japan as the field of their life-work?

M. L. GORDON.

Kyoto, Japan.

THE ART OF PREACHING.

NO ONE can read the Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, without at once perceiving that to make known the message of God in uttered speech, is the primary and most important duty of those who are called to be ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ. The great commission given by the Head of the Church to all who give themselves to the ministry of the word is, "Go into all the world and preach." This is the standing order of the Church militant. Ministers are, by earnest and prayerful application, to make the truth of God their own. It is to be hid in their hearts; to become part of their thoughts, feelings, and life. It is to remain in the inward and secret recessess of their nature till it leavens the whole being, and then out of the fullness of the heart the mouth is to speak. In this way the divine will, purposes, and thought are to be made known, saints are to be edified, and those who are afar off are to be brought nigh.

"Faith," says Paul, "cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." In this method of establishing the kingdom of heaven among men, there is a profound philosophy which is either not understood, or, if understood, ignored by many in these days. They say the age of preaching is past; and the time for education, science, literature, and the press generally, has come. It was all very well, it is affirmed, to preach in former times, when books were few and dear, printing unknown, or comparatively unused; but now, when the agencies for the promotion of all branches of knowledge, religion among the rest, are multiplied, the pulpit must lose its ancient power, and preaching its influential place.

Such averments, however, are utterly unsupported and unphilosophical. Jesus Christ understood this age, all ages, when he said, "Go preach the words of eternal life." He knew the wants and conditions of mankind in the mass, and in the individual, and how best they could be met and changed for the better. And his wisdom is displayed in adopting the means divinely adapted to the securing of the spiritual regeneration and education of the race—means which can never become obsolete so long as the living

voice remains the vehicle of the expression of the divinest life of which the soul of man is capable.

As it has been beautifully said, "Christianity is a word or thought of God which is destined to become the thought of man." This thought contains life and power, which can be best communicated from the original source through the human spirit as it reveals itself in spoken language. Nothing can transcend the influence which one person can exercise upon another by means of earnest and thoughtful speech. It is this personal dealing with the hearers, which gives preaching the pre-eminence over every other way of making known religious truth. The press, therefore, can never take the place of the pulpit, and the printed page can never wield in the sphere of religion the influence of the spoken word. By means of the latter, spirit can almost penetrate into spirit, and can commune so intimately that the speaker and the hearer are made partakers of the one life, peace, and joy.

This will become more apparent if we consider the nature of a sermon. What is a sermon? This question is not so easily answered as some imagine. It is easy to determine what a lecture, essay, treatise, or speech is, or should be, but with the sermon it is different. There seem to be ten thousand different ideas as to what a good or bad sermon is. Amid all this confusion, contradiction, and opinion, it is difficult to find one's way to the truth on the subject. If this be doubted, let the doubter pay attention to the remarks of his fellow-worshipers the next time he goes to hear one who is, by repute, a great preacher.

A friend told us that on a recent Sunday he went along with two other friends to hear a stranger, a preacher of name and fame, in Free Saint George's Church, Edinburgh. As they retired, without any design they compared notes. One said, "It was no sermon, only a spoken essay." Another said, "It was either too deep or too confused for me." The third said, "It was a really good discourse," and a fourth was overheard to say, "He is an able man, but I did not like the sermon." The like criticisms may be heard any Sunday, and almost at any church, for it is one consolation which all ministers may have, that each one is an able preacher in the estimation of at least some people. "Taking our minister all in all," say some in every church, "he is the best preacher we hear."

This diversity of opinion concerning good or bad sermons springs from the different conceptions entertained as to what a sermon should be. Each person speaks as he is affected to the preacher—as he is impressed by what he has heard. But all are not and can not be right in their judgments. There must be some definition of a sermon, which is, at least, approximately correct. What is that definition? I answer, a sermon is a religious discourse, uttered words, by means of which the preacher speaks to the spiritual nature of man of things pertaining to the spiritual life and world—of God, his character and relations; of Christ, his life, work, and love; of the kingdom of heaven and its laws; of the powers and beings of the world to come; of man, his nature, sins, possibilities, duties, and destinies—in a word, of the facts and doctrines made known in the sacred Book by inspiration given. A sermon is such a discourse, and is to be delivered in such a way, as to lead man, through faith in the gospel, to the position and character of a child of God and the conscious possessor of eternal life. It must be the human instrument, by the divine blessing, of all this, or it is not a sermon. Those sermons, therefore, which are divinely used to accomplish these spiritual results in the largest measure, are the great sermons; but those which fail to work out these ends are poor sermons, no matter how thoughtful, eloquent, and beautiful they may be.

There is, then, a broad and deep distinction between a sermon and a lecture on literature, science, politics, or philosophy. In the case of the latter, the appeal is made, almost if not altogether, to the intellectual part of the hearers' nature. In the case of the former, the appeal is, ultimately, to the spiritual element of man's being, "to every man's conscience in the sight of God." If asked why the sermon is addressed, ultimately, to the conscience, it might be answered in the words of Paul, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

The spiritual and moral condition of the soul determines the whole man, and this condition must be dealt with by the preacher. This he can not do except he makes known spiritual truths, and seeks to obtain a lodgment for them in that region of man's nature which is beyond the merely intellectual. There is such a region, and it is deeper than that in which the thoughts of the

political, scientific, and philosophical thinker move. What a difference between the spirit and thoughts of such men as David, Isaiah, John, Paul, and those of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Seneca! What a difference between the Gospels and the Epistles of Paul and John, and the writings of Kant, Hegel, Mill, Spencer, and Hamilton! What a difference between the teachings of the inspired writings and those of Calvin's *Institutes* or Hodge's and other systems of theology! And, especially, to mention preachers only who are on this side the Atlantic, what a difference between a sermon by Spurgeon, Farrar, Parker, or Liddon, and a political address by Gladstone, a literary lecture by Morley, or a scientific deliverance by Huxley!

This distinction seems to me vital. The pulpit has to do with the spiritual, and the intellectual is only its servant. Its strong-hold and peculiar power lies here. So long as it is faithful to its trust, and proclaims the whole counsel of God, it will remain a source of light and power, and no other agency can take its place. But if the religious and spiritual are forgotten, or subordinated to philosophy, science, psychology, or politics, the peculiar glory and power of the pulpit will be gone. It must decay. It is no match for the platform, the teacher's desk, and the press in these regions. Let its utterances, however, be sermons, religious discourses, dealing with the facts and doctrines of revelation, salvation, and eternal life, and it never will be feeble. As it becomes more spiritual, earnest, fervent, it will grow in influence and be a center of ever-increasing light and upbuilding power.

That the sermon may accomplish the spiritual and ethical ends contemplated, it must not only be the unfolding and enforcement of the truth of God as revealed in the Bible, but must, at the same time, have a style and spirit all its own. I classify these two things together, not because they are the same, but because they are closely related. The style to be adopted must be such as will allow the proper spirit to be embodied, and, so far, the spirit must determine the style. When the preacher sits down to prepare his sermon he should be in a very different frame of mind from that in which he would write an article for a magazine, even though the subject was theological. The literary frame of mind is not the preaching frame of mind. Neither is the literary style the style which should be adopted when the facts, duties, and doctrines of

religion are expounded and impressed on the hearts of the hearers. That which is necessary for the press is not what is wanted for the pulpit. What is written for another's reading will not be of much value for oral delivery. The calm, stately march of thought and expression which is much prized in a book, is not the tread which, in the pulpit, will alarm Satan. The kingdom of heaven is not established by either well-rounded periods, correct literary style, or by a process of ratiocination. It cometh by impassioned oratory, burning thoughts in words of fire, and inspired prophetic deliverance. Those who preach after this manner have ever been the preachers who have moved and blessed men, and pulled down the strongholds of the devil.

Man is not all head, or all heart, all thought, emotion, or action. He is all those in combination, and is an instrument of many strings, all of which must be touched before the music which satisfies the heart of the heavenly Father can be produced. It is said Dr. Chalmers, at his desk, was as much moved in spirit as when he poured forth his glowing paragraphs to the crowds which hung on his lips. Out of the furnace of his heart, kindled by meditation and prayer, the fire came which made his words and sentences glow and burn. Those who give themselves to their work in the spirit of this great Scotch preacher will ever be kings among men. They shall ascend their pulpit with a soul filled with the Holy Ghost. They shall feel that they are commissioned to speak for God to men—ambassadors of Christ. Their pulpits will become a throne, and men shall bow before the truth they utter as the trees of the forest before the tempest. Such preachers will never fail. Though obscure and unknown to fame, they will be lights in the world and the salt of the earth. They shall, in all relations, advance the rule of the true King, whose kingdom is righteousness, peace, and joy.

From what I have said it will be seen that I think that preaching can only be permanently effective, in these days, when the preacher keeps within his proper sphere, and delivers the message of God in its own spirit. The day was when the pulpit was the chief educator of the common people. It had, consequently, to take a greater breadth of subjects than it is required to do now. Politics, even party politics, questions of society and State, required to be discussed by the minister; and in some cases this he

did with right good-will. This, I repeat, does not require to be done now and should be avoided. The newspaper press, the platform, the pamphlet, and the volume can attend to these things with greater practical effect than the pulpit. Its work is to deal with the fundamental principles which underlie all life. Its politics are of the higher order; its relation to trade and trade disputes is to inculcate, with all the authority of heaven, the golden law of love; its sociology is to preach purity, temperance, and a judgment to come; its philanthropy is to declare the abiding obligation to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and to treat the poor as if they were Christ; and its evangelical mission is to seek and save the lost. Keeping on this elevated religious platform it will ever be a mighty reforming force, which, when carried out in active life, will lead to the regeneration of society, the proper arrangement of all human relationships, and the passing of just and beneficial laws. This is the practical and ethical side of religion. It is intimately bound up with the more spiritual side; indeed it draws its strength and inspiration from spiritual ideas and life. The preacher only does his duty when he preaches doctrines practically and practice doctrinally. This is the aim of most preachers at the present hour; and so long as it continues to be, the pulpit will ever remain an indispensable factor to a progressive civilization.

There is nothing in the present age especially antagonistic to the power of the pulpit. If it is in a waning condition, the fault lies entirely with those who fill it. That they are not what they should be will be admitted, by none more freely than by themselves. The reasons of their weakness can not be discussed here and now. Neither is this the place to discuss the present mode of educating young men for the ministry. Much could be said on this subject, and will require to be both thought and said erelong, if the preacher is to hold his own in the eager competition for the ear and attention of the public. It is a significant fact that some of the most powerful and popular preachers of the day were not trained in our theological schools. A modification must be made in the present system in the direction of separating the professional theologian from the preacher. A man may be the one who can not be the other, and what God has not joined no one should attempt to unite. Meantime, the occupiers of the pulpit have its

future in their own hands, and they should do their best to make their work as thoroughly efficient as possible.

This they can do: (1) By *using in their discourses plainness of speech.* Scientific nomenclature should be avoided and philosophic jargon eschewed. The subjective and objective, the ego and non-ego, the categories and the antinomies will not be heard of. The revelation of God ought to be expounded and enforced in words of simplicity and lucidity. All Christ's utterances were plain and simple, and on this account, paradoxical as it may appear, all the richer and profounder. (2) The words uttered from the pulpit *should be dignified.* This is increasingly necessary on account of the moral culture of the body of the people. The other day a clergyman, who spoke with knowledge, said he knew positively that many working men were led to forsake the Church on account of the rude and strong language used by preachers when discoursing on the most sacred and solemn doctrines of the Christian religion. Where such language is employed the art of preaching is degraded. Religion can only be rightly taught in language and thought elevated and tender, in a style becoming the theme, and calculated to make the lowest and most groveling realize that it elevates and sanctifies the whole man, and makes him fit for a noble life here and for the service of heaven. (3) *Sympathy must pervade the divine message*, deep, pure, and sanctified sympathy, before it will accomplish its mission. This sympathy enables the minister to gather up his congregation into his heart and feel all their joys, sorrows, weakness, temptations, and sins, as if, they were his own. Out of this condition of soul he can minister to the young as if he were young, to the aged as if he were old, to the sad as if he were under a dark shadow, to the tempted as if he were tried by fire, and to the sinful as a man of like passions with themselves. A preacher without sympathy is like a lamp without oil, a well without water, or a flower without beauty or fragrance. Sympathy is the power of gravitation in the moral world, and without it words and sermons will not secure attention, nor will they subdue the stubborn will or melt the hard heart. (4) *The thought and the language of the sermon should be largely Biblical.* To avoid Scripture representations of truth and language tends to weakness. The Bible, when quoted in a sermon, gives it a flavor as of the aroma of heaven, and a power which transcends

the human as much as the heavens are above the earth. Theodore Parker, who had not the high conception of the Bible generally entertained, said that the words of Scripture made the better part of all sermons. He who honors the divine word will be honored by Him from whom it proceeds. (5) Added to these things and permeating the whole *there must be the Unction of the Holy Ghost.* This is a spirit rather than any thing else, and is not easily defined. It springs from the love of God shed abroad in the heart, and gives efficacy and warmth to all that is said. Some call it Christian pathos. Others say it is gravity and warmth united. Others describe it as a light that warms and a heat that illumines. A writer [M. D. Membrini] who has studied the subject says: "Unction is that in religious subjects which in poets has been called enthusiasm. Thus unction exists when the heart and the powers and the spirit have been nourished and embraced by the gentleness of divine grace. It is a mild, delicate, loving interior, profound, attractive sentiment. Unction, then, is this calm, gentle, nourishing warmth which is, at the same time, luminous; which enlightens the spirit, penetrates, interests, and nourishes the heart, and which is communicated from him who has received it to the hearts and souls which are fitted to receive it also." There is, in this, a certain abandon experienced by the preacher, and for the time being his nature is flooded by a spirit of tenderness, benevolence, and reverence not its own. He is one in his desires, aims, and emotions with his divine Master, and speaks as an organ of the Holy Ghost. As he utters them, common words become sacred symbols, and plain sayings enter the ear of the audience with an influence which is more than human.

Sermons delivered by those who possess the characteristics here enumerated are spiritual forces more potent for revolutionizing the thoughts and feelings of the world than all other forces put together. Without them there would be no hope for humanity, and the upward and onward progress of the race would be arrested.

One word in conclusion about what are called "great sermons" and "great preachers." There is no desire to detract from those so designated. This question, however, may be put: May it not turn out after all that the really "great preacher" may not be looked upon as great by his own generation? There are hundreds, *if not thousands, of faithful and successful preachers,* men who

understand and practice the true art of preaching, of whom the world knows little or nothing. These are workmen who need not to be ashamed, and who are really worthy of the name of great preachers. To them the world owes much, for under their ministry its hardy sons have been so trained in morality, reverence, Bible knowledge, and religion, as to be able to stand unabashed before kings. When the end, and beginning, and what lies between, are manifested, it may be discovered that the great sermons have been preached to comparatively twos and threes, and not to admiring thousands. All who are called to this holy vocation should more and more magnify their office whether they may be great or common. The Master and the world need all kinds of preachers, and not those only who are specially endowed. Each should preach according to the measure of his ability and the grace vouchsafed to him. When this is done to the fullest possible extent, the pulpit need not fear any rival nor will its influence be counterwrought by any foe.

WILLIAM ADAMSON.

Edinburgh, Scotland.

THE CHINESE PUZZLE.

THE Chinese Empire contains nearly four hundred millions of souls, about one fourth of the human race. The question of its conversion presents the hardest and grandest enterprise that demands the thought and challenges the faith of Christendom. The change in the immemorial policy of China, forced by the new conditions that have changed the international relations and commercial interests of the world, has made the Chinese question one of profound interest to all thinking persons. Ethnologists, sociologists, political economists, philanthropists, and Christian propagandists have their eyes turned upon these hundreds of millions of our yellow-skinned kinsfolk who during the next fifty years are to be the beneficiaries of all that is best in Christianity or to become its most obstinate and dangerous opposers. The policy of isolation is as impossible to them as that of indifference and inaction is to us. The railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, the steam printing-press, the American common-school system, have been admitted into China. Immobile as he is, the Chinaman can never be what he was before, nor turn backward the revolution that has begun. Fronting them across the wide Pacific as we do, with communication by steam with all their sea-ports, and with special reasons why their emigration should pour its mighty volume hitherward, it is not strange that the Chinese question should arrest the attention of the Christians who pray, as well as of the demagogues who would make political capital out of them, the tradesmen who would coin money out of them, and the dreamers who will sit still and look at them with open-mouthed wonder until some sudden development in the history of this marvelous people shall rouse them to a realization that they belong to the new era when science and commerce proclaim anew the gospel of the brotherhood of humanity.

As yet there is no fixed policy in this country with regard to the Chinese. The action of our government has varied according to the varying impulses of our people with regard to them. When the tide of Chinese immigration first began to pour into California,

almost every body was delighted at the promised accession of cheap labor for domestic service and agriculture. The first outcry against them was raised by the Irish. The monopoly of Irish women for household work was broken by the coming of the pig-tailed heathen, and it was natural that the invasion of these competitors should be deprecated and denounced. But the Chinamen kept coming in larger and still larger numbers, until the effects were felt among all classes of people. It was amusing to see how the tone of the public changed. The shrewd New England tradesman, the horny-handed white field laborer from the West, the Italian or Portuguese fisherman, the skilled mechanics from everywhere, all joined in the protest against a further influx of these men, who could work with the precision and regularity of machines, and who could live on next to nothing, and who persisted in being industrious, economical, and heathen. There was real alarm on the part of many thoughtful and conscientious persons. There was much simulated concern on the part of agitators, great and small, who saw in the Chinese question a political bonanza that might make the fortunes of the demagogues who would work it first. The Chinese kept coming, and the agitation against them became more general and more violent, until all California was in a whirl of excitement. Whatever else they were for or against, every political party had an anti-Chinese plank in its platform. The candidate who was loudest in his denunciations was surest of a nomination and got the largest vote on election day. Once or twice San Francisco seemed to be in imminent peril of an anti-Chinese rising that would sweep the "Chinese quarter" with fire and bludgeon. It was a popular *furore* that swept the masses and that silenced the thoughtful few, who kept cool and considered the question in its larger and more permanent relations. Dennis Kearney became the oracle of anti-Chinese sentiment and the hero of the Sand Lots. The vote of California in a presidential election was pivoted on the records of the opposing candidates with regard to the Chinese question. On the adoption of the new constitution the vote of the State was practically unanimous in favor of a restrictive policy toward Chinese immigration. A solitary voice might be heard now and then protesting against what it termed an anti-Christian sentiment, but it was unheeded amid the raging storm of passion and demagogism. During all this time the Christian Churches of California continued

their efforts, with more or less zeal, for the evangelization of the Chinese in their midst. That their success was small is not surprising. The Christianizing influence of a few missionaries and Sunday-school teachers was counteracted by the brickbats of the hoodlums, the howl of the Sand Lot orators, and the denunciations of the newspaper press. The Chinamen had no reason to feel that they had come into a Christian love-feast. Christianity presented itself to them under conditions that were bewildering and repulsive. They could not distinguish clearly between the temper and acts of the many who voiced the general sentiment of the community and the few who spoke and acted in accordance with the higher ethics and gentler spirit of New Testament Christianity. On the other hand, it was not strange that the Chinese did not grow in popularity on further acquaintance. With a few notable exceptions the Chinese immigration was from the lowest dregs of the Empire. Their women were the most degraded of their kind, imported and sold into slavery for the vilest purposes. They huddled together in masses of festering impurity, tenaciously clung to their idol-worship and heathen practices, and from time to time enacted tragedies that showed that, phlegmatic and machine-like as they seem to be, they are, when roused, capable of awful explosions of passion. In cold-blooded cruelty and vice they sink into depths that are appalling. So mutual acquaintance between the American and the Chinaman did not enhance mutual esteem. They saw each other's worst side under the worst possible conditions. The result is that the Californians have a poor opinion of the Chinaman as a neighbor or citizen, and the Chinese have a poor opinion of the American as a religionist. This prejudice and misconception is not universal. The more intelligent of the Chinamen in California know that the wild ferocity of the mob does not reflect the spirit of true Christianity. Well-informed Americans know that the coolies and prostitutes that have been imported in such large numbers from China are not fair specimens of that wonderful race. The contact between the two races in California, though thus far productive only of friction and trouble to both, may yet work out results that will be compensatory in ways not now seen by us. This is God's way. The leaven of larger views and a more brotherly spirit has been deposited in the minds and hearts of both Caucasians and Mongolians who have met in California, and that leaven

will spread according to a divine law and in fulfillment of a divine promise.

The policy of restriction of Chinese immigration is right and necessary. It is best for us and best for the Chinese as matters stand. The assimilating power of the nation is already overtaxed. No thoughtful patriot doubts that this is so. A danger confronts us which every body sees, but which nobody has yet told us how to avert. European immigration, unrestricted, has laid a burden on us under which we stagger. Unrestricted Asiatic immigration would break us down. In California, where the weight of it would be most felt, the unanimity of popular opinion has led men of candor on this side of the continent to investigate the facts and to consider the question calmly, and now they are enabled to understand the demand that the gates shall be closed. There is no room on the Pacific coast for a non-assimilable heathen population such as would rush in if the restrictions were removed. The American labor system would be destroyed by it, social life would be polluted, and social order would be imperiled. It is a question of self-preservation, in the presence of which gushing sentimentalisms and vague declamation go for naught. The men in New York, Boston, and Chicago who groan and rage because of the evils and dangers of unrestricted European immigration need not play the Pharisee toward California when she seeks to arrest the yellow tide of Asiatic immigration that threatens to inundate that fairest land upon which the sun shines. The Southerner, who regards the race problem in his own section with a thoughtfulness and solicitude suited to its gravity and delicacy, will not indulge in hasty denunciations of his fellow-citizens in California who seek now to prevent a trouble which their posterity may not be able to cure.

The cloud, rising out of the sea, now no bigger than a man's hand, may overspread all the heavens, and its thunders may startle the world. The negro question, in the earlier stages of the controversy, might have been settled at a nominal cost without the shedding of a drop of blood. A temporizing policy, begun with the formation of the government, culminated in a catastrophe at which generations to come will shudder. The Chinese are not wanted on the Pacific coast, and it is right to say so in unmistakable language. It was wise to act promptly. It was also merciful. Race exclusion is better than race conflicts. It has already been said

that a restrictive policy on our part is better for the Chinese themselves. This seems to be too obvious to need any argument. A non-assimilable element in the body politic must always be a source of perpetual irritation. Chronic irritation of this sort ordinarily ends in bloody collision. All China and all the world is interested in the maintenance of a Christian civilization by this nation. If a wise, far-seeing Christian statesman were now on the throne of the Chinese Empire he would deplore the deluging of this land with an unmanageable heathen population as the most terrible of calamities. The fact is, the present rulers of China seem not disposed to encourage emigration to this country, and will be likely to meet us half way in any practicable and equitable arrangement to keep emigration and immigration within proper limits. That they will be satisfied with the one-sided, unjust, and contradictory legislation with which this whole question is now complicated no one need expect. That they will adopt retaliatory restrictive measures is to be feared. Chinese human nature at bottom is human nature after all, and the *lex talionis* is written deep down in every human heart. It will require wiser statesmanship than is common, with the touch of a loftier code of ethics than we have usually seen in international affairs, to avert disasters that have already been bargained for in the excesses of passion-blinded mobocrats and the follies of mob-intimidated statesmen. The Chinaman is slow and patient, but he has a good memory and staying qualities. If we have any really fine statesmanship among us, now is the time for it to show itself. If there are among our rulers those who have a genius for blundering, the Chinese question affords them ample opportunity to exercise their malign gift. The demagogue who wishes to "make a record" for the lowest elements of the lowest wards of our cities; the statesman who wishes to do something daring and dazzling; the diplomatist who is too cunning to be wise—all these will find in the Chinese question a temptation hard to be resisted. This is the critical time when we should welcome the appearance of a statesman able to discern what ought to be done, possessed of sufficient ability to arrest the attention of the nation, and with a character lofty enough to command the confidence of the good men of all parties.

This whole question is attended with difficulties, but they are not invincible. Political economy seems to pull one way and

Christianity another. Self-preservation seems to demand a policy that looks narrow and selfish when viewed in the light of the gospel that teaches the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Candor and courage would solve the problem which cowardice and duplicity have created. Give the true reasons for the policy of exclusion, which will show that it is best for both nations. Moderate the hardships attending the inauguration of such a policy by all the means at the command of a Christian nation. For once let the spirit of true Christianity control diplomacy. Thus may our peril, under the overruling providence of God, be made subservient to the salvation of China. A national opportunity or a national disaster is wrapped up in this Chinese question. Which shall it be?

Nashville, Tennessee. O. P. FITZGERALD.

FACTORS IN CHURCH LIFE.

EMERSON, in his excellent essay on "Behavior," says, "There is always a best way of doing every thing, if it be to boil an egg." That this "best way," suggested by the New England sage, may become the property of the race, is the aim of our law, medical, business, and theological schools. Indeed, in every branch of art and practice we find men and women busily engaged in trying to unearth the fundamental principles upon which success in their life-work depends. Even the barbers, it is said, have special magazines devoted to the elucidation of the underlying principles of the tonsorial art.

This is the age of the "reign of law." Never was there a time in the world's history when eternal principles, upon which men may feel safe in life and practice, were so much in demand. I have always felt sorry that the excellent Duke of Argyle failed, in his fifth edition of the *Reign of Law*, to give us his long-promised chapter on law in religion. "Further reflection," he tells us, "only confirmed me in the feeling that this is a subject which can not be adequately dealt with in such a form."* He means, of course, the abstract form, pretty much like that in which Professor Drummond has treated the subject. This, of course, would be difficult for the Duke or any body else; but surely he could have written as brilliantly on law in practical religion as he has on "law in politics." He is a Christian man and a most practical one at that. I hope he may yet give to the ecclesiastical world the result of his scientific observations in practical religion and church life. We have had a work on "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and, just recently, I notice one has been published on "Natural Law in the Business World." What we greatly need just at present, however, is a carefully written book on Business Law in the Ecclesiastical World.

But it is my object in this short article, not to suggest topics for new books, but to take up the humbler task of giving from

* Reign of Law (Fifth Ed.) iv.

personal observation what seems to me the most important factors entering into the life of a Church.

The first thing which usually confronts a newly organized congregation is the locating and erecting of a place of worship. I shall not attempt to show how a weak congregation may accomplish this feat, further than to say that the policy of our Board of Missions in rendering assistance through a general church-erection fund seems the proper one. But a far more vital question than *how?* is *where?* The financial ability to build a church is a small matter when compared with the business-sense ability required in properly locating it. It seems not to be generally admitted, judging from the location of churches, that the destiny of a congregation is largely sealed when the building site has been selected. Such, however, is the case; and when we look at it in a business way the whole matter is plain. A successful business man said recently that had his bank been located one door either way from where it is, he would have been much less successful. He went on to explain how his present location was his natural environment. And to leave our environment is to court death, physiologically and ecclesiastically. It is a well-known fact that an awkward location is often the chief cause of the failure of business firms. A few feet of difference in situation would not infrequently add materially to the coffers of the merchant. A church is recognized as our "Father's business" house, where men come to "buy the truth." And yet how few congregations seem to realize the importance of the simple business-like principle that a good location is of the most vital importance! I once knew an organization that struggled between death and life for years, because of the inconvenient and awkward position of its house of worship.

Should a newly formed congregation accept, as a gift, a lot situated just anywhere, and thereon erect a church? Would an ordinary man of business do this? Who has failed to observe the undesirable location of many of our churches? Common sense would seem to indicate that the door of the sanctuary, like that of any other business house, ought to be so situated as to arrest the attention of the masses of the people. When Paul visited a new city he invariably betook himself to its most populous center that he might win the attention and hearts of the seething masses. Imagine that sensible apostle stealing away into some

back street and there declaring the glorious gospel of the blessed God. "We must 'go,' not 'wait.'"* The masses will never come to us; we must go to them. We must build our churches and plant our flag in their very midst. Why should a church house be located on the outskirts of the town, or in the most out-of-the-way corner of the county? Each society would do well to inquire prayerfully, "Is this business concern of the Lord so situated that it can 'sell the truth' to the greatest number in this community?"

Again, the architecture of the church has much to do with the success or failure of the worshiping congregation. This may seem to some rather a strange factor in Church life, but it is nevertheless a real one. The people—and churches are built for the people—in these days of gracefulness in public buildings generally, are not likely to have their attention arrested by a house that looks like a barn or a goods box. Ruskin's criticism on the Grecian temple might apply most fittingly to the main part of many Christian edifices: "A great long marble box with a half dozen pillars at one end of it and the same at the other,"† the difference being that we have neither the marble nor the pillars. It must not be forgotten that the tasteful church-like building is often cheaper than the ordinary box-like one. Church houses should differ from school-houses in external and internal appearance. The masses of the enterprising people of to-day are apt to conclude that a people who are so crude in architectural and æsthetic taste as to build unsightly and inconvenient churches are to be shunned rather than affiliated with. We have only to consult our own feelings in this matter to verify the truth of this statement. Carlyle's peculiar feelings, on the first sign of St. Paul's, London, are pretty much the feelings of humanity generally. There is a craving for the fitness of things in almost every mind. The church of God should be a delightful place, so that, like David, every body will be "glad" to go up to it.

The internal arrangements should be convenient and attractive. Every thing should look so airy and refreshing that each weary heart, burdened with the week's cares, may feel the holy sanctuary to be a rest and a refuge. In a church in an enterprising

* Phelps' Theory of Preaching, page 577.

† Lectures on Architecture and Painting, p. 36.

young town there were wooden boxes half filled with saw dust to accommodate the tobacco users of the congregation, and other things were in slovenly harmony with these unclean "conveniencies." The members complained that their young people were fast leaving them and attending the new churches that were springing up in the village. I attended one of these new churches, the one that was said to have captured most of the young folks, and I very soon discovered the factor of life in it and of death in the other. A lovelier little sanctuary I never entered. There was an air of restfulness and peace in every corner. It was as scrupulously clean as any parlor, and neatly carpeted throughout. Any one would feel naturally stimulated in such a place to contemplate the good, the true, and the beautiful. The other house was entirely repulsive to such heavenly emotions. The pulpit Bible was covered with dust and likewise the pews. There was not a thread of carpet, and it is safe to say that the floor had not been washed for a year. In every corner of the building cobwebs could be distinctly seen. Now just imagine the utter incongruity of a minister preaching from such a pulpit, in such a church, and to such a people, that cleanliness is next to godliness! This is above all ages the dispensation of clean homes and cultivated taste. Woe betide the Church that has failed to realize this truth and to keep step with the people! Our young people are taught in our public schools the God-given principles of hygiene and refined taste, and they will certainly seek pleasant and tasteful surroundings in the public assembly. David could worship God anywhere, but he was peculiarly "glad" when his feet turned toward the sacred temple on Zion's hill, which was unsurpassed for external and internal loveliness. God has always been jealous about the cleanliness and order of his house. Dirt and disorder will certainly retard the worship and growth of any Church. If every congregation would scrupulously obey the divine injunction—"wash and be clean"—we would have more living organizations and fuller sanctuaries.

The indifference of the average congregation to music shows that many Christians fail to recognize one of the most uplifting and attractive factors in modern Church life. Indeed a careful and prayerful study of the ancient temple and its services would be an excellent help to modern Churches. We find that God's chosen people had congregational singing schools conducted by regularly

appointed teachers and leaders in Church music—"such as taught to sing praise."* What wonderful songs, and what a grand choir and orchestra! "And God gave to Heman fourteen sons and three daughters. All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God, according to the king's order to Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman. So the number of them with their brethren that were instructed in the songs of the Lord, even all that were cunning, was two hundred fourscore and eight."† Nor did this choir and orchestra monopolize the praise service. "All the people" felt it to be their duty to enter heartily into this part of the exercises of the holy sanctuary: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel forever and ever," they sang on one occasion, "and all the people said, Amen, and praise the Lord."‡ "Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee."‖ "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting, and let all the people say, Amen, praise ye the Lord."§ It is simply astounding that any one, in view of the divine warrant for instrumental music in God's services of old, can now be found to object to that feature in the service of praise. And it is not less astonishing that the ordinary worshiper, in view of Scripture example and precept, can sit with closed lips during this part of the exercises. "The power of song" is no mere poetic phrase. What would our revival meetings amount to if there were no singing, or if the singing were left to a choir only? It is the full chorus that gives life and volume to revival singing. And why not carry the same policy into the ordinary exercises of the sanctuary? If it is necessary for life in the one instance must it not be equally necessary in the other? "The very idea of Church music," says Hoppin, necessitates a full chorus, or united song."¶ It is the imperative duty of every member of the Church to join in the singing. There is absolutely no excuse, for every one may attend the choir practice, and if he have no ear for music, he can, at least, make a joyful noise unto the Lord. A Christian has not done his duty until he has made a determined effort to carry his part in the praise service of the sanctuary. "Hallelujah" is, indeed, an imperative command to the worshiper—an in-

* 2 Chron. xxiii. 13. † 1 Chron. xxv. 5-7. ‡ 1 Chron. xvi. 36.
‖ Ps. lxvii. 3. § Ps. cvi. 48. ¶ Pastoral Theology, p. 309.

junction to praise God. This beautiful imperative is from the Hebrew word *halal*, which means to praise: *hallelu* is the imperative form of the verb and means *praise ye*, while the suffix *jah* is an elliptic form of J(ehov)ah, and the entire word is *praise ye Jehovah*. A congregation must comply with this heavenly mandate or die. There is no alternative. Praise is one of the most prominent and vital factors in Church life. A man who had formerly been a poor drunkard happened to attend religious services. At the door he was arrested by the swelling chorus of a sacred song; and, as he afterward told us, before he was aware the tears were coursing down his face and he had surrendered his stony heart to God. That same man is, to-day, one of the main pillars in a Church I could name. If we can not preach the gospel we can all tell it in sweetest song. We have heard it more than hinted that more people were led to Christ by Sankey's singing than by Moody's preaching. There must be something in it, for the Holy Spirit is terribly in earnest in his exhortations to Christians to sing Jehovah's praises.

Another powerful factor in congregational life is the well-known principle of exercise. Many illustrations, physiological and psychological, might be adduced on this phase of the subject. The inactive hand becomes the withered hand. Exercise is essentially necessary to the best health. The athlete must be alert. Brain tissue is made and mental faculties are strengthened by continuous strain of thinking. Not only "as a man thinketh," but also as a man exerciseth in any field, so is he in that field. This holds strictly true of Church life. But how much exercise does the average Church afford its membership? A little dumb-bell performance once a week? How would a man feel, physically, if he sat perfectly still all the week and on the seventh day exercised for an hour, morning and evening? Or, how would he thrive on exercise once a month as many ecclesiastical organisms seek to do? Can sheer life, not to say rugged health, be maintained by such a course? Daniel and David, we are told, had their spiritual athletics three times a day—morning, noon, and night. Besides the family altar, secret prayer and daily Bible study, there must be daily exercise in the practical avenues of Christian work. There should be no moss on the church house door steps. The Church should be actively at work, in a public way, nearly every night in

the week—every night if possible. This activity may be kept up by a young people's society of Christian endeavor, a normal class for Bible study and general intellectual improvement, a teachers' meeting, a Church prayer-meeting, cottage prayer-meetings for which the members are entirely responsible, two or three Sunday-schools in the outlying school-houses near the church, the home Sunday-school, and the other regular services of the sanctuary. On the Sabbath the congregation ought to read the opening lesson audibly with the pastor, also repeat with him, in like manner, the Lord's prayer, and join heart and soul in singing and listening. Every body should be happy and smiling on the Lord's day morning. Remember it is the day on which Christ rose victorious over death and the grave. What an inconsistency, to celebrate such a day in a dingy church with a lifeless service!

Acts of benevolence also afford a fine field for the Church's immediate activities. Such work has a hallowed effect upon a congregation, and no Church is wide awake that allows such work to be done by secret and secular societies. The work of such societies is all right when not within the immediate parish of a Christian Church. But, certainly, a Church of Jesus Christ ought to blush to leave its legitimate work to be done by the secular arm. There is no other way, perhaps, by which the people will be drawn into a Church more certainly than by the exercise of such Christ-like acts of mercy. People must love us before we can do them any good. When the stranger comes he ought to receive a hearty greeting and a royal invitation back again. Every member ought to be on the alert for such. A few moments, also, at the close of each service should be spent in Christian salutations.

A case in point will illustrate the effect of such an exercise. In a certain parish there was an old merchant who had not attended religious services of any kind for a great many years, and he was bitterly opposed to attending any church. He had been set down as altogether unreachable. The pastor finally prevailed with him to come just once. He came, and the warm greeting and the hearty welcome he received captured him. He finally became a member of the Church and one of the pastor's most attached and inseparable friends. Often, afterward, he pointed to the church building and said that when he went to that church every body was so glad to see him and made him so welcome that he could hardly

get away. A Church exists for the dissemination of warmth and love — peace on earth and good-will among men. A "stiff" Church commits suicide. It may have dignity, but it is usually the frigid dignity of a corpse.

Another evident element in a Church's life is the mutual attachment of pastor and people, and especially between the shepherd and the lambs of the flock. There is an important art in recommending the pastor to the love and esteem of the children, and this every Church member ought diligently to cultivate. No parent ought ever to criticise the minister before the children. It surely must be self-evident that the Church's life depends upon the young people—it feeds upon them. To place a barrier, then, between the child and the pastor is to cut off the Church's natural supply and run the awful risk of ruining the child forever. One of the most hallowed sights on earth is a little flock, pastor and people, dwelling together in unity and love, the pastor lovingly helping the lame and gently carrying the lambs in his bosom, the sheep all willingly following, and jealously careful of the reputation of their shepherd. A pastor and people are like husband and wife—they can not live together without mutual confidence and love.

The intellectual side of each Church must be carefully nurtured and developed. There is no partition running through a human being, cutting his soul up into different sections, some to be cultivated and the others to be permitted to grow up in weeds. It ought to be the endeavor of pulpit and pew to develop in the Church a completely rounded manhood and womanhood. A mutual improvement association, a young people's guild, or a normal class for Biblico-scientific studies in connection with the teachers' meeting, are all helpful in bringing about this much-to-be-desired end. Nothing, positively, can be done with a Church that will neither read a book nor think a thought. As Dr. Adamson truthfully remarks: "There is an intimate connection . . . . between what is thought and what is done."* The heart is reached through the head. We must "know the truth" ere freedom reaches the soul. Without knowledge we would have nothing to believe. For, as Dr. McCosh has stated with his usual cleverness, "Knowledge, psychologically considered, appears first, then

* Knowledge and Faith, preface.

faith."* Mr. Spencer says the unknown is the proper domain of faith, but how can we have faith in that which is not known? Such would be an utter impossibility. It must be evident, then, that in order to strong faith in our Churches, and therefore an abundant life, there must be furnished the people a solid objective basis in definite knowledge. Besides, narrow-mindedness and narrow-heartedness are intimately associated.

If we knew more we would be apt to do more. What is the trouble with the missionary and other enterprises of the Church? May it not be said to be largely ignorance of the overwhelming demand for these agencies? Ignorance is the great stultifier of all progressive movements in Church and State. It invented the thumb-screw, the fagot, and the cruel Inquisition. Ignorance, in our circumstances, is a mortal sin, and the abettor of iniquity continually. That Church is not doing its duty, then, that is not thoroughly organized for the elimination of this common foe.

There are a few well-known business principles upon which even our "Father's business" depends for success. The first of these may be said to be enthusiasm. It is universally admitted that a man will be a failure in a business in which he can not be enthusiastic. None but enthusiasts need expect to accomplish any thing for God or man. Tell us that a man can really believe the awful doctrines of Christianity and not be almost frantically enthusiastic! Christ was looked upon as a subject of fanaticism, Peter was drunk, and Paul was mad. Enthusiasm, now as of old, ought to have Christ for its center and glorying. This holy unction ought to be conspicuous in all Church meetings, that men may be swept within our circle by the glow of our ardor. The membership should always see to it that the house is packed, for who ever heard a poor sermon in a full house? There is a magnetism about a crowd, and especially for the preacher. "The listening numbers," says Bridge, "heighten the impression by the sympathy and enthusiasm which they excite."† General Booth, of the Salvation Army, in an excellent article on "Enthusiasm," has this to say: "Enthusiasm is good for the enthusiast. . . . . Enthusiasm is valuable in its influence upon the crowd; . . . . the crowd find an irresistible something about men and women who are manifestly in earnest; . . . . enthusiasm is necessary to perseverance in hard

* Intuitions of the Mind, page 170. † Christian Ministry, page 173.

work. . . . . To drive out the strange gods that to-day command the honor and devotion which are due to the one Almighty Savior, and to disciple all nations for him, demand an amount of self-denying and painstaking effort such as enthusiasts alone can put forth."* We ought to be as "fervent in spirit serving the Lord" as in serving ourselves. Let such enthusiasm be manifest in all our Churches and a youthful pulsation, which no magic elixir can produce, will be felt in the sleepiest and deadest community.

Punctuality is also taught in our business colleges as a prime factor in all success. Let the services begin at the appointed minute and stop at the right time. Many do not seem to know how much of the life is drained out of a service by the advent of the stragglers. It is apt to worry the preacher and those who love the quiet restfulness of the morning hour. A good rule for a slow people is for the minister to be in the pulpit at least five minutes before the time, anxiously awaiting the arrival of the minute to begin the services. This secures the effect and power of example, which is the loudest and most effective kind of preaching. The pastor ought to lead the way in this as in all other reforms. He ought to subscribe liberally to his own salary, have the collection basket passed into the pulpit to him that he may make his offering with the people, and lead, generally, whenever money and energy are required.

Regularity is akin to punctuality. If a business man is not regularly in his office ruin will be the result. No business man allows weather or trifles to keep him a day or an hour from his store. And a Church member ought to wade through the same cold and rain to the meetings of his Church through which he would go to his store or office. The life of the Church depends as much upon a rigid compliance with this business rule as does the success of a store or a bank. We have in our Church a covenant to this effect, and every one at once recognizes it as a plain business axiom.

I must not close this article without some reference to one of the most vital factors in Church life—the financial. How many Churches keep a regular set of books? How many have a special finance committee? A Church that has no definite financial policy is badly crippled. The accounts of the Church ought to be short

* North American Review, June, 1889, page 743.

and punctually met. Fancy a Church existing as a witness against all dishonesty, while it is itself irreparably in debt to the coal or wood dealer, the janitor, and the pastor! Is such a profession worth any thing to the community? A Church to do its best work must be free from debt. A preacher to do his best work must know that his Church is honest, that he "owes no man any thing," and that his children are fed. A minister should never lack "the sinews of war." He does not, and must not, work *for* money, and yet he must work largely *through* money. One reason why Peter preached such a powerful sermon on the day of Pentecost was because the eleven "stood up" with him (Acts ii. 14). There is no way by which a people can stand by their pastor, and hold up his hands more effectively than by seeing that he wants for nothing. A shoe-maker will work more cheerfully with a dollar in his pocket. A pastor naturally feels, when his people cheerfully support him, that his work among them is duly appreciated. He will by such encouragement, other things being equal, do better work and much more of it. A Church, most certainly, stands in the way of its own life and growth that is illiberal and stingy with its minister. "The liberal soul shall be made fat;" especially is this the case when that liberality is exercised toward a humble pastor who is recognized by his people as the representative and ambassador of the court of heaven and their royal Master.

And yet, in all this, we must not forget the crowning factor of all—the baptismal gift of the Holy Ghost. Through this anointing our methods will be sanctified, and a glorious life vouchsafed. The world and self must be shown a back seat in the Church that would truly live.

J. D. GOLD.

Gibson City, Illinois.

DID JESUS RISE FROM THE DEAD?

THIS question is the one of more vital interest to the truth of our Christianity than all others. Concede the fact of Christ's resurrection as proved by an overwhelming preponderance of testimony and weight of reason based on the historic facts, and his religion stands accredited beyond all doubt. Add this fact to the other facts of his strange and wonderful life as sketched by the evangelists, and no man can doubt that a supernatural power was embodied in the Galilean which gives the sure guaranty of a divine mission. If his mission is thus divinely accredited, we need to be no further assured of the truth of his teachings. "When a man has a message from Heaven, he need not ask whether it be true." The source gives it indubitable credit.

That the apostles hinged the truth of the gospel they preached on this fact is beyond question. It was the burden of all they taught, from Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost down to the end of the chapter of their lives. Indeed, it is a well-established historic fact that they all perished, with the exception of St. John and possibly St. Thomas, by cruel deaths in defense of the truth that Jesus had risen. In a word, if Jesus did not rise from the dead, then, as Paul says, "Your faith is vain and ye are still in your sins." The teachings of a dead Christ would come to us with no more authority than the teachings of a dead Socrates, and would only commend themselves to us for their purity and wisdom, but they would have no sanction to enforce them on our obedience. A man may adopt or reject freely the teachings of any mere philosopher and no one can say he has sinned. But he who refuses to obey the words of a man accredited by divine power may well feel that he has something to answer for.

I find great difficulty in the selection of the material for the argument. There is so much to be said that it is more difficult to push aside considerations of weight and only seize those vital to the issue than on any other theme I know. I will try to select such arguments as, if conceded, leave the issue without doubt.

That Christianity had a beginning all concede, and that it began to be about the period assigned, to wit: in the first half of what is known as the first Christian century, no one denies. In truth, without this fact the story of the civilized world for about the last eighteen hundred and fifty years could not be understood at all. Christianity in its multiform phases, as part of the life force of these ages of the world's life, enters so largely into all that makes history that the most embittered skepticism is compelled to concede its existence as a pervading and, in most cases, a dominant force. Our great American republic is not a more certainly existent power now than Christianity has been for all the period stated. We account for the latter by the facts, and they meet the case: A set of colonies of Great Britain, a difference of opinion kindled into a heat that brought a great contest, a seven years' war after a Declaration of Independence, a treaty recognizing that independence. Thus the conditions of our colonial existence account for all we see. Can we find a like basis for our Christianity; or, rather, will not the resurrection furnish such a basis? Will it not account for the subsequent facts? Will any thing short of this give a fair account of what followed the life of Christ on earth and still continues to be?

Let us address ourselves to this question. Let us look at the facts and see what they tell us. We have the case of a young man in the humble walks of life, a son of a mechanic, himself working at the trade of his father. Suddenly, "when he began to be about thirty years of age," he commenced under peculiar circumstances a public career as a teacher. I stop here to say that the circumstances attending the beginning of this career, as given in the Gospels, make such a state of abnormal facts so outside all the general life or thought of the people of that age in Jerusalem or Judea, that it is beyond human conception to have invented them. To give congruity to them, such as we find in the inartistic narratives of the Gospels, was beyond the capacity of any four men that then lived or have lived since, on the assumption they are inventions either of that or any subsequent age.

But to the history. This young man gathered about him twelve men in the ordinary walks of life, imbued solely with the notions and spirit of the age; and, after teaching them for over three years probably, they had been totally unable to conceive any

higher idea of his mission than that he was a person extraordinarily endowed, a wielder of miraculous power, and one who filled their conception of a Messiah, the long-hoped-for deliverer of the Jews. They had no more conception of the spirit of his teaching, of his religion as one that was to give a new heart and a new life and to assume form as a mighty power in the world over the hearts and consciences of men—of Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the world—than had the masses who attended on his ministry and listened to his strange doctrines. Like the masses, they were mainly impressed with his peculiar power, and, like others, followed him largely, but in a somewhat nobler sense, for the loaves and fishes. This is evidenced in all that is written by them after his death. They tell us how they disputed, a short time before that event, as to which should be greatest in his kingdom, which should sit on his right hand and which on his left. In the story of the two who met him on the way to Emmaus we learn how they had hoped it was "he who should have restored Israel." That hope was now gone, evidently. He was dead, and they had no conception of his return to life again. Luke records the fact that the first question they asked on meeting him after his assured resurrection was, "Master, dost thou restore the kingdom to Israel now?"

Jesus had been crucified after an entry into Jerusalem, in which the people showed what they expected, as they threw the branches of the trees along his pathway and cried, "Hosanna!" The apostles felt as the people did, only with more attachment to his person from intimate association, and with higher personal hopes of the result. They fondly dreamed of being princes and counselors in his kingdom, when the hated Romans should by his power be driven out, and the throne of David and Solomon restored; when all nations should flock to Jerusalem and do obeisance to the new King in Israel. Alas! all these dreams were dead, and the statement that it was "he we had hoped should restore Israel" is one of utter despair. There was not a ray of hope in it.

This is made more evident by the fact that Peter and his associates, who had formerly followed that business, had gone to their occupation as fishermen; and Jesus found them thus engaged. They no doubt remembered his person kindly, but probably felt a keen sense of chagrin at the failure of his mission. They thought probably they had made fools of themselves; had been led into a

few years of absurd folly. The fact that they all fled when he was arrested shows that their attachment was based, as I have suggested, on worldly hopes, and would not bear the strain of danger. That they were not in the spirit to be made martyrs of is certain. Peter, who in the garden of Gethsemane was willing to fight, no doubt relying on Christ's miraculous power, and believing that it would be exerted at this crucial period of time, deserted as soon as he found his Master in the hands of the officers of the law. It is true he followed with the crowd to the trial to see what might happen, but when charged with being one of his disciples he bitterly denied it, and at last swore it was not true. It is true he felt ashamed of this afterward, which was very natural; but the fact that he went off to his fishing nets indicates that he felt no very deep contrition about the matter, and desired to get back into the old line of business as soon as possible. He was probably as brave, and as true to his Master, as any of his brethren. Certainly the others are very little heard of, and none of them show more of the martyr spirit than he did. The fact is, they had none of it; and in writing the short histories we have of the circumstances they do not pretend that they had.

The assumption of the skeptic is that Jesus remained dead—was never seen by them again. On this assumption, with the plain facts before us, what sort of a gospel would these men have preached if they had dared to speak at all? It would have been a set of confessions of disappointed hopes and of having been deceived and misled. They would have justified their mistake by pointing to his strange power of working miracles, and said, "We, it seems, expected too much from him; but as to you, the people, you expected a great deal yourselves. Remember that triumphal procession in which you spread your garments along his path, that the hoofs of the animal on which he rode might not touch the ground. We were mistaken; so were you. That is all of it."

What else could such men have said? They were not devotees who would be willing to take personal risks for a dead man. They would not even stand by him in his hour of humiliation and trial while he was alive. Surely when dead—crucified at the hands of the officers of the hated power that ruled over them—the power they had hoped to see him drive out of the land—they would not be more earnest in his support. Any man who will undertake out

of these facts to deduce the conclusion that these men would have dared death, or any danger at all, in support of the cause of a dead Master must get the basis of his conclusion from a kind of human nature of which we have no knowledge. No such case can be found in the records of time.

What changed all the views of these cowardly, or, at any rate, disappointed, chagrined, and despondent men, and started them out on what, from any human point of view, was their strange, wild attempt to set up a kingdom in the hearts and consciences of the people that in time should dominate the world? What put it into their hearts to be brave, and to stand up as Peter did, with the others around assenting to what he said, on the day of Pentecost, and to denounce the lately-maddened and blood-thirsty mob for "having, with wicked hands, slain the Lord of life?" How did Peter get courage to tell them to their faces that they were murderers? How was it that he and his companions took no risks of the kind when the arrest was made? Whence this radical and astounding change of conduct on the part of men under such surroundings? When Jesus was alive, but under arrest securely, they had all fled incontinently, but now, this beloved Master and leader being dead, these same men came forward to charge his murderers with his death and to face them with the accusation.

But a still stranger thing they proclaimed—that it was the duty of these people to believe in this crucified teacher *now*—dead as he was by the hypothesis—and actually to be baptized in token of public profession of allegiance to him; and that whosoever believed on him should be saved. No such conduct can be conceived of as natural or human in connection with the facts I have given, and on the assumption of no resurrection they are all the facts of the case.

This change must be accounted for on some rational ground. We must have a cause adequate for every result. The resurrection and forty days' sojourn by Jesus among these apostles, and his appearance at one time "to above five hundred brethren at once," most of whom remained, when Paul wrote, though, as he naturally says, some were dead—"had fallen asleep"—will account for the change. It will abundantly do so, but nothing else we know or can think of will.

Stranger still, these men, in the face of danger such as over-

took their Master, commenced to proclaim his right to command the obedience of his murderers, and demand that they should believe on him on the basis of the assertion that he had actually risen from the dead. They declared that they had seen him, and had a command from him to proclaim pardon and remission of sins on earth in his name, to call on the people to join with them and brave the Roman and Jewish authorities by recognizing his supremacy over them, even to death in any form it might come. Stephen's death and Paul's persecution tell the story of what they endured and dared. When the authorities warned them that they must cease to speak in his name they simply defied them by saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men," and went on with their preaching. When they were scattered abroad by the persecutions stirred up by Saul of Tarsus and his friends they went everywhere preaching the resurrection and the power of a new life. Some strange, mysterious impulse had taken possession of them, which had transformed the men, and changed all their views of Jesus and his religion, and started them on a line of thought and on a conception that all his teaching while among them had failed even to give them a hint of. At any rate their minds had never taken in such a thought as that which now seems to have absorbed their very lives. Whence this new view and new and strange courage? Forty days' sojourn with Jesus as he is depicted in the Gospels after his resurrection from the dead will account for all these wonders, but nothing short of this, or something else supernatural and equally as definite, will.

The teachings of these men are such that skeptical writers generally, if not universally, concede their honesty. They certainly taught a standard of devotion to truth that has never been so persistently and consistently taught in all the world's history by any one else. They assert the resurrection of Jesus as a fact. They do not go into personal details to vindicate their assertion. It is evident they were so certain of it that they never once thought of arguing the matter. They simply testify as witnesses, and say, "We saw him, and he was with us forty days, and we know him if any body does, and you know us."

Strange as it seems, when looking at it from the point of view of that day, and considering the surroundings of these men, they succeeded in making many thousands of these people believe their

story, and the believers became strangely transformed men and women, and organized themselves into congregations, and began, in the face of persecution and death, to live new and strange lives for Jews, and actually succeeded in giving form and shape and birth to a new era in the world's history. These eleven disciples, ordinary men, with a Jewish convert, Paul, who had at first persecuted this new way and sought to stamp it out by chains and death, have so left their impress upon the world's history that the teachings of that dead Master have gone into the life of the world, and whenever men and nations have moved onward and upward in the highest progress they have marched along the pathway marked out by that Galilean carpenter. Whenever they have tended downward it has been by departing from the spirit of his teaching and life as left on record by these men. Is it a fact that he is dead yet? The only attempt at explanation of the facts that presents any plausibility is to say that these men, after the death of their Master, reflecting on his teachings, somehow caught their true spirit, and were strangely enlightened by such reflections, and thus reached the higher plane of the gospel as they afterward preached it.

The first answer to this is that they are honest, simple writers, and they tell us of no such experience. They could not have written the story truthfully without telling us this if this was the true explanation. They tell us that their new views and faith, and all they commenced to do—all they did—was based on the fact that Jesus had risen from the dead, and that they were witnesses to the fact, and were ready to die for the truth of what they said. They claimed to act under a commission from the risen Jesus, a command to go into all the world and preach the gospel, backed by the promise that whosoever believed in him should be saved. So they went, and so they preached, and baptized their converts in the name of the risen Christ.

If this was not all true the means of contradiction, by which they would at once be confounded, were at hand. The body had been buried hard by Jerusalem in a tomb hewn out of the rock. A band of Roman soldiers had been asked for to guard it from being stolen away by his disciples. They could tell what the facts were. The history says they were suborned to say his disciples had stolen the body away while they slept. A Roman guard was not

likely to sleep while on duty. But if the body was stolen, it must have been done by these very men who were proclaiming him risen from the dead. No one else had interest enough in it to have done so. They knew where the body was hid, if it was stolen. Can any man say that, from the character of these men, from what they preached, from the manner in which they lived and taught others to live—from all we know of them—that they were capable of such an act as stealing and hiding the body of Jesus and then propagating the falsehood of his resurrection? Such men do not so act. No men without prospect or promise of worldly promotion, gain, or success ever invented such a story, much less were ever willing to die to prove its truth. Find eleven such men to-day and I will yield the point.

But this last theory involves the fact that the body was gone. These men say they met him alive and learned new views of his mission in forty days' frequent converse with him. Their after lives correspond with the truth of this statement. The stealing of the body and hiding it away does not comport either with their characters or common probability. It is inconceivable that such men, or any men, should have ever devised so clumsy a scheme, and then have lived lives so holy and taught lessons of truth so pure, basing it all on a falsehood, known by them to be such.

It is said that the people of that age believed in the miraculous, and were easily imposed on by this story. But the resurrection was not, as a fact, believed in at all by the Sadducees, one of the leading sects of the Jews. The general belief of the masses was no doubt expressed by one of the sisters of Lazarus when she said she knew her brother would be raised up at the last day. But that Jesus, after his crucifixion, would rise from the dead was not a thing believed in by his apostles, or even dimly expected by them, is certain. That the Jewish people would have been ready to credit such a thing in reference to the man they had so despised as to join in the cry, "Crucify him!" is absurd. They had determined, under the influence of the priesthood and other leaders, that he should be put out of the way as a disturber of their peace; and were as sure they had effectually disposed of him when he was taken down from the cross dead as people ever were of any thing in this world. That these people could have been induced to yield large credence to the story of the resurrection is one of the things

that can never be accounted for, except on the assumption of the most overwhelming testimony which their leaders were unable to meet or gainsay.

In view of all this, is it not true that, if any fact in history is fully and indubitably established by a fair preponderance of testimony, it is the fact that Jesus rose from the dead? Therefore, the Christian religion stands accredited as a message to man from the world above, and rightly demands the acceptance and obedience of all men everywhere. Much might be added to this argument, but I have only endeavored to summarize the leading points of the case as presented by the records, and draw from them the natural and logical inferences that inhere in them. I think they form sufficient grounds on which to say that the salutation of the Eastern Church on one of their feast days is true: "Jesus has risen indeed."

THOMAS J. FREEMAN.

MISSIONS.

And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.—Mark xvi. 15.

At the time of man's fall God promised a deliverer. Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of that promise. For long ages God was preparing the way and putting into operation the forces by which the promise might be carried out. In the fullness of time Christ came, and by his death and resurrection consummated the plan of redemption. While Jesus was yet on earth he gathered about him a few men, to whom, after careful instruction as to the nature of his kingdom and the work to be done, he gave the great commission, "Go ye into all the world." This has been called the war-cry or marching orders of the Church. Jesus, having closed his earthly ministry and being about to leave the scene of his earthly life for his heavenly throne and crown, himself put into operation the first missionary forces of the Church, and commissioned the first missionaries, thereby putting the missionary stamp upon his Church.

The extent of the commission is world-wide; "all the world" and "every creature." This was spoken by a Jew, and to Jews, a people who, by the command of God, were exclusive. The Jewish Church was not a missionary Church. For fifteen hundred years it had been kept in seclusion, and its members had imbibed the idea that they were God's peculiar people, and that the other nations were but so many hindrances to the progress of the true faith. The thought that the Gentile world would be converted to God never entered their minds. It was some time after the ascension of Christ and the baptism of Pentecost, some time after the disciples had begun to preach, before they realized that they were to preach to any except Jews. With startling effect the command came to them, full of import which they did not then understand. It was throwing open the door of the Church to the whole world. Into all the world they were to go and preach the good news to every creature. This message comes ringing through the ages to us, and is in as full force now as when it fell from the lips of the

divine Man; for two thirds or more of the human race are yet without the knowledge of Christ.

The fundamental principle of Christianity is a gospel system of grace for every man. Man was created in the image of God. Sin defaced that image. Adam was a representative man. When he fell the whole race went down with him. Humanity went down with the first sin. Redemption is for the rescue of the fallen race. The whole race was involved in the fall of Adam; 1. Because a clean thing can not come out of an unclean. Like begets like. The first man having become unclean his posterity would also be unclean. 2. Each human being, coming to the years of conscious moral choice and action, falls anew for himself, and by a voluntary course of sin adds to the fall of the race his own personal fall. The whole race is thus doubly ruined, and redemption appeals to the whole race. Had none of us personally sinned, being sinners only because our representative was a sinner redemption would have been representative, and we would be saved absolutely by Christ. But as we chose to sin it is also necessary that we receive redemption by choice. Herein lies the power of Paul's argument in Romans x. 14–17: "How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" etc.

The foregoing statements suggest four reasons for the world-wide preaching of the gospel: 1. The whole race of man is fallen. 2. Redemption is provided for all. 3. Choice is the condition of salvation. 4. Preaching is necessary to a choice. These are fundamental facts of the kingdom, laid down by the King himself. The rescue provided is co-extensive with the ruin, and preaching is God's appointed means of bringing the rescue face to face with the ruin.

The field is the world. For convenience's sake it may be divided into the Home and Foreign field.

The Home Field.

A recent English writer, speaking of the value of religion to America, says, "It is an old saying that monarchies live by honor and republics by virtue. The more democratic republics become, the more the masses become conscious of their power, the more do they need to live, not only for patriotism, but for reverence and self-control, and the more essential to their well-being are those

sources whence reverence and self-control flow." Thoughtful observers of our own and other lands recognize the fact that the severest strain upon our national life is yet to be met, and probably by the next generation. How far we shall be able to assimilate to our national life and institutions the multitudes who press to our gates from all foreign shores, how far the conservative and home-loving habits of this new population shall balance the spirit of restless adventure, the love of money, and of power, how far the spirit of deference to wholesome laws shall restrain the feverish social agitations imported from other lands, are questions which hold the attention of thoughtful patriots to-day. Herbert Spencer declares, "America may reasonably look forward to the time when she will produce a civilization grander than any the world has ever known." There can be no doubt but the great Westward-moving stream of Anglo-Saxon civilization will find its home on this continent. But we must not be insensible to the fact that this confluence of waters may make a whirlpool, and that these very elements of our strength, unless harmonized, may furnish the explosives for our downfall. Never did a nation have such a dizzy prosperity; never was so imperatively demanded a corresponding moral development. Patriotism is strong here; but more than patriotism is demanded. Shall there be a national conscience strong enough to bind and blend the social and moral diversities that enter into our life, and hold us firm to the principles upon which our government was founded?

The Christian Church should be heard in answer to that question. The gospel is to teach the people reverence for authority, both human and divine, and that just regard for the rights of others which alone gives the highest control. The Church must elevate, encourage, and purify the common life with the consolations and aspirations of the gospel of Christ. This is the patriotic duty of the hour. A Church to plead for law, and obedience, and hope in every township in the land will be the best defense against enemies abroad and social discontent and infidelity at home. History gives no reason to believe that a republic not thoroughly grounded in religion will long survive assault from without or agitation from within. And thus to preserve the nation with the salt of religion, and make it a kingdom of God among men, the Church must not only be built, but become a vital force in all grades of

the national life. The great cities of our country have become the centers of a vast population. It is estimated that one fourth of our entire population live in the cities, and the tendency of the people of the rural districts is constantly to drift into these centers. Cities are the cess-pools of vice and sin of every kind. The worst elements of society are gathered there. They are the seat of the rum power, that mighty engine of evil. It is here that anarchy, communism, political corruption, and debauchery are fomented. In none of these cities are there church accommodations for more than one fourth of the population. In them are many thousands of people who could not if they would—and many of them would not if they could—attend church. Here is work for the patriotic Christian people of our country—to evangelize the unevangelized portions of our large cities.

But we should not confine our work to the cities. The center of our population is fast moving toward the Mississippi. There are those living who will see it cross that great river. Never before has such an army moved as is now moving for the occupation of the central basin of this continent. Whole States are occupied in a day. Cities spring up as by magic, and in a day become the centers of teeming populations. Men and women are there from every nation on earth. This host looks like the strangely blended and inharmonious multitudes of the Crusaders on the plains of Esdraelon. How is this disharmony to be overcome? How is there to arise from this multitude the unity of a homogenous national life? Constantine saw the white cross above the mingled colors in the plain below. Let the Church set up the banner of the Cross in the midst of this multitude of people and they will become one. The problem of this age to America is a religious problem. To solve it the spirit of evangelism must take hold of the Church; an ambition, not for great Churches, but for a living gospel in every city and hamlet of our country. That we may know the demands of our rapidly growing Great West, I call attention to the following statement of Dr. Thwing in the New York *Independent:*

"At the present time the imperativeness of the call is made evident by the specific reports of home missionary superintendents in several Western States. In these reports it is said that nine of these States alone call for more than two hundred new ministers

each year. Wisconsin asks for twenty-five new men at once, North Dakota twelve, and South Dakota twenty-five. Superintendent Wiard writes: 'We could organize fifty new Churches before the snow flies if we had the men to supply them.' Iowa asks for twenty-five more men, and Minnesota twenty-one, each year. It is said that in Nebraska there are sections of country forty miles long without a minister to preach in them. Children grow up without ever seeing a minister. Women must pray over the dead. These appeals of frontier life are pitiful. Twenty new men are needed at once in Colorado. There is a demand for ten missionaries in one county alone. Kansas calls for ten, Missouri six, Illinois twenty-six, and tells of twenty-six pastorless Churches. The figures given refer particularly to the Congregational Church. The other denominations are as illy supplied. The cry comes from these quarters, 'The people for the Churches, but no ministers to gather them in.'"

What is the Cumberland Presbyterian Church—for which we boast our love and devotion, and of whose doctrines, toward which the whole Presbyterian Family is now tending, we feel so proud—doing to supply these waste places? The answer comes reverberating back to us from the mountains, plains, and valleys of the Great West with its magnificent possibilities, "Nothing, or next to nothing."

Foreign Field.

According to the best computation, the inhabitants of the world number fifteen hundred millions. Of these, ten hundred and forty millions are heathens and Mohammedans; the rest, four hundred and sixty millions, are nominally Christians. Of these, probably one hundred and twenty-five millions are adherents of the Protestant faith, but not more than thirty-two millions evangelical Christians. It is a well-known fact that the Catholic and Greek Churches are Christians but in name, and that the countries where these Churches predominate are as much missionary ground as pagan countries.

To these more than one thousand million unevangelized people of the globe, Protestant Christendom sends sixty-two hundred and thirty messengers of the Cross. To these should be added about thirty thousand and three hundred other workers, heathen

and Mohammedan converts, the first fruits of missions, making a total missionary force in the foreign field of about thirty-six thousand five hundred and thirty persons, of whom five sixths are converts from heathenism. But in connection with the foregoing statement we are met with the startling fact that there are vast districts yet unoccupied, absolutely without a mission or mission station. Kurdistan, with three millions; Afghanistan, with eight millions; Anam, thirty millions; Africa, north of the equator and west of the Nile basin, fifty millions; and Thibet, Mongolia, and Arabia, with their teeming millions, are some of the lands that are yet to be possessed in the name of Christ. But in countries where mission work is begun there are vast districts unoccupied. Siam, with from eight to ten millions of people, whose king, the friend and patron of the missionaries, is the most intelligent ruler in Asia, has a few Baptist and Presbyterian missionaries, and these constitute the sole force at work to bring these millions to Christ. There are in Siam single cities of over two hundred thousand inhabitants where there is not one mission station, or even one evangelist. The same is true of China, Japan, Africa, and every heathen country in the world.

Stanley traveled seven thousand miles in Africa, from the great lakes in the east to the Congo, and did not find one native Christian. And Mr. Stevenson, of the China Inland Mission, a few years since traveled a distance of one thousand miles through Burmah and China, and for five hundred miles north and south of his line of travel only one mission station existed. There are vast districts in these nominally mission fields containing millions of people without a single person to break to them the bread of life. In this home country you can not find a town or settlement on our most remote frontier where there is not at least one pious person to whom the people can go for counsel and instruction concerning the soul. A missionary superintendent went to a group of hamlets on the Rocky Mountains where there was neither church nor Sabbath-school, but there he found a poor widow, whose humble home was the gathering place for prayer-meetings; and there was not a soul in that village who did not know where to go for counsel. But think of the teeming millions of these unoccupied districts in heathen lands, where not one person can be found capable of pointing out the way of life.

How vast the field! How great the work to be done! And yet it is thought possible, says Dr. Pierson, to reach this vast field with the gospel before the close of the present century. It can be done if the Church will only engage in the work with the energy of the Spirit and with the enterprise of a true consecration. God has pledged his word: "Lo! I am with you." With his mighty presence in the Church the work can be done.

The Obligations of the Church to Evangelize the World.—The language of the Great Commission is, "Go ye into all the world." As long as any part of the world is destitute of the gospel this command remains in full force. But this command is the mere application of a principle antedating and underlying it, namely, that the strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. Rom. xv. 1–3. I can not do better on this subject than to quote the following language of Joseph Cook. He says: "Because I do not believe in a probation after death, therefore do I believe in sending the gospel to all men before death. As by a pillar of fire should we be guided by the definite declaration that we shall be judged according to the deeds done in the body. We know nothing about another opportunity for men in an intermediate state, therefore will we send missionaries to them in our present state. In pagan, as in Christian lands, now and always, our peace with God depends upon our similarity to him, hating what he hates, and loving what he loves; and everywhere and always there is a dissimilarity to God—a dissimilarity which tends to permanency of character. Over all the world it is equally true of all men and women that to be happy they must be saved from that sin which condemns and curses every one. If I possess a Christ who alone can save from sin, and from the inevitable and invariable consequences of sin, my responsibilities toward other men are simply immeasurable. Three hundred millions of women hold the Buddhist belief that they will re-appear on earth after death as bugs and all manner of vermin unless they are extraordinarily good, in which case they will be born again, this time as men. The money we give to send the gospel to these—our yearly offering to missions—will not pay the liquor bills of the United States for three days. Protestants give ten millions annually to evangelize the heathen. What is ten millions in comparison with what we can do? Some one has said that this nineteenth century will seem to

those coming after as an amusing century, and nothing in it will amuse our posterity more than our absurd conceit that we are doing great things for the world. It is because we have so slight a conception of the visible needs of the heathen. Out of the sixty-three millions in Bengal, ten millions so utterly depend upon the current harvest that for it to fail is for them to perish. Thirteen millions more do not know, except while the mangoes are ripe, what it is, the year round, to have a full stomach. In China, sixty dollars per year is wealth beyond the reach of myriads. In India, many millions of men have to support life, each man on less than fifteen dollars a year, multitudes of widows supporting existence on one dollar a month. Their bodily poverty is but a type of their spiritual penury. If they live on the extreme edge in temporal, how much more in spiritual things? . . . . There is not now one ordained missionary for a million heathen. Surely there should be one for every fifty thousand. Remember that the population of the world is increasing more rapidly than the increase in missionary effort. It ought to be the law of every Christian in the world: 'For every five dollars I expend upon self I will give one dollar to the spread of the gospel.' Although we send the gospel to the heathen, we are sending them an infidelity which is more bitterly hostile to Christ than is heathenism. What with hereditary and imported unbelief there, it is essential that we should send our ablest men as missionaries. The longer we delay, the harder will be the work to be done. The more penurious we are now, the heavier will be our expenses in heathen lands hereafter. In the last lines written by Longfellow he expresses this sentiment: 'The day is breaking everywhere, and God deliver us from dawdling at the dawn of such a day.' Stronger words to express our obligations to the heathen world could not be used, except as we find them in the Inspired Word."

Success of Missionary Work.

I would call attention to the marvelous success of missionary operations among the destitute and degraded as an evidence that God approves the work. Dr. Storrs, in his address before the late meeting of the American Board, said: "We have had great success in all our work. Why, think of it! Eighty years ago this board was formed. The whole earth was shut against it. . . .

Now the whole earth is open, except, they say, Turkistan. There were three hundred converts, on an outside estimate, from heathendom when this board was started. Now there are three millions. . . . More copies of the Scriptures went into circulation last year than were in existence in all the world at the beginning of this century. That looks like success—success for the past, a reward; success for the future, a prophecy. Meantime the missionary spirit is widening. Two hundred missionary societies, or nearly that, are engaged in the work, and the time is coming when every Church and every Christian will have a practical part and share in, and an enthusiastic devotion to, this great work."

In the South Pacific lies a narrow strip of land known as New Zealand. The most degraded barbarism and brutality prevailed among the inhabitants. Polygamy had no limit, except a man's ability to procure wives. The people were sunken to the lowest depths of savage life. They were the worst of cannibals. They drank the blood of their enemies as it flowed on the battle-field, and then roasted the dead bodies and feasted on them. They had so few virtues that many Christians doubted whether there was any thing in them that could be used as a basis for the gospel. They were not idolators, for they were sunk so low in barbarism that they had not even the invention to construct a god, and they had no objects of worship. The first missionaries were sent there in 1814. In 1827, their mission-houses having been burnt, the whole mission force was driven from the island by the natives, barely escaping with their lives. Up to this time not a soul had been converted. But a seed of truth had taken root in the heart of one of their chiefs, who, in October of the same year, invited them to return, which they did the next year. Two years of seemingly fruitless labor followed. But few listened to the missionaries. Even the chief who invited their return neither attended their services nor encouraged them in any way. But in faith the missionaries labored on, and in 1830, sixteen years after the work began, there were signs of good. Greater numbers attended their services and paid attention to the truth. Two of the greatest warrior chiefs declared for Christ. The whole community was startled. God's Spirit was at work. The people came forty miles to hear the gospel, and multitudes turned to God. As soon as the missionaries learned to speak the language they taught the

people to spell and read, and books were printed in their language. In 1840 this new religious literature was introduced, and within two years the press had printed five thousand Scripture lessons, three thousand spellers and readers, and sixty-nine hundred catechisms. The members gathered into the Church numbered thirty-three hundred. No sooner did these people embrace the gospel than they began to send it to the destitute. A great missionary meeting was held, lasting three days. One whole day was consumed in missionary addresses, sixteen of which were made by converted natives. All eyes wept as these converted cannibals told of Jesus, who had saved them from their vile degradation and bestial passions to tell others of his love. Thus the work goes on in New Zealand.

The Baptist Missionary Society, which undertook the work among the Telugus of India, came nigh abandoning it at one time, so hopeless it seemed to them. But God was preparing a workman for this field in the person of a Mr. Clough, a civil engineer, who was strangely called to this work. He said that God would there give him ten thousand converts. It seemed the wild fancy of a dreamer. The Baptist Board hesitated to send such a fanatic into the field. But he persisted, and was finally sent. He preached the gospel to this people. It took root in hearts prepared for it by the Holy Spirit. Multitudes turned to the Lord, and between June and December of 1878 ten thousand converts were baptized. The work still goes on, and those who have studied its progress among this people have said: "It is without parallel in the history of Christian missions in heathen or civilized countries." Over two thousand souls per year have been gathered in since the first awakening in 1877. There are now thirteen central stations and two hundred and five out stations in this mission. There are thirty-four Churches, with a membership of twenty-five thousand. Besides a high school and theological seminary there are one hundred and eighty mission schools and four thousand pupils. And all this is the growth of eighteen years.

About fifty years ago the Wesleyan Methodists of England began mission work in the Fiji Islands. The people were vile and degraded. Polygamy and cannibalism were practiced to a fearful extent. Now in the Fiji Islands there are 9 white mission-

aries, 3,505 native preachers, 268 chapels and other preaching places, and 27,097 native Church members; 47,718 pupils attend the day and Sunday-schools, and 101,150 attend public worship. Behold what God hath wrought among this barbarous people! A nation has been born at once. "Instead of the thorn, the fir tree came up; and instead of the brier, the myrtle; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." Let us rejoice that the gospel is the mighty power of God, and what has been accomplished by it in turning the nations to Christ is but a prelude to what is to be done in the near future.

The World Open to the Gospel.—The whole world is now practically open to the gospel. Africa, with its two hundred million souls; China, with three hundred and fifty millions, and India, with two hundred and fifty millions, are practically in reach of the gospel. Turkey, Persia, and Japan, with their teeming millions, are filling up with mission Churches and schools. Europe and South America are beginning to see that a better Christianity than the Romish Church has furnished them is needed, and the missionary is welcomed among them. The whole world being open to the gospel, the grandest day of opportunity for the kingdom of God the earth has ever seen has dawned. This is purely of God. In the last fifty years the barriers which have hitherto kept the gospel confined to certain channels have been removed, and the Church has the opportunity to take the gospel to these benighted nations and make them servants to do the bidding of the Great King. Who can doubt that there has been a providential interposition in all this? Nothing like it has ever before occurred in the whole history of the world. It is the greatest miracle of the ages. Obstacles seemingly insurmountable have suddenly disappeared. All the lines of Providence are converging on one point—the Word of God universal in the world. All the course of history for the past five hundred years bears on that fact. The discovery of this continent, a succession of discoveries and inventions unparalleled in human history, the colonization of this country from Protestant lands, our free republic, our free Christianity—every thing bears on this one result, world-evangelization. This one word deserves to be written on the banners of the Church. It is the immediate and imperative duty of every Christian to become a herald of salvation, to bring the gospel of Christ into contact with every human soul in the shortest possible time. God's idea of civilization embraces the whole family of man. That family consists of fifteen hundred millions of souls, more than one half of whom have never yet had a copy of the Bible or seen the face of a missionary. The supreme question of the hour is how to bring the thirty millions of evangelical Christians in the world in contact with the one thousand millions of the human family who have never yet received the gospel. Our first duty is to Christianize these millions, and culture, political liberty, and industrial improvement will follow; but none of these products of Christian civilization will come to stay until Christianity has taken root, and then they will come. President Angell, in speaking of China, said: "The great empire will not receive your locomotives and telegraphs until she has bowed the knee to your Christ. She will not yield her ancient civilization until she has surrendered her religion. Schools and civilization must be the spontaneous outgrowth of the Holy Ghost in the souls of men. The tree must be planted before the fruit can be eaten."

Dr. Moffatt, after twenty-six years of missionary work in South Africa, says: "Much has been said about the civilization of savages before Christianizing them. This theory has obtained prevalence among the wise men of the world, but I have never yet seen a practical demonstration of its truth. We, ourselves, are convinced that evangelization must precede civilization. It is very easy in this country of high refinement to speculate on what might be done among crude and savage men, but the Christian missionary, the only experimentalist, has invariably found that to make the fruit good, the tree must be good. Nothing less than the power of divine grace can reform the hearts of savages, after which their hearts are susceptible to those instructions which we teach to adorn the gospel they profess." Rev. James Chalmers, after twenty-one years among cannibals, declares that he has never seen a single person who has been civilized without Christian influences. He holds that "the gospel is the only true civilizer," that "if this were all, it is worth while to send Christian missionaries to the foreign field."

As bearing on this part of the subject, I give a few extracts from a recent address by Dr. R. S. Storrs. He says: "So it may be that our missionary work may have a power in it that is to reach forward

into future centuries. We are not trying to extend a sect, ... but to renew, as far as we can reach it, the moral life of mankind, ... so making politics possible, abolishing tyranny, banishing barbarism, calling a halt to the march of oppression, and making a people competent and determined to form their own institutions and manage their own affairs. We try to secure the intellectual advancement and elevation of mankind, especially through the power of the Bible, the most educating book in the world. . . . . We mean by the Bible to make the truth of God so present to the minds of men that the intellectual level of the race will be lifted. We mean to make social life harmonious and happy. We mean to make all prosperity more legitimate and more abundant than it has ever been before, or ever will be again except as the power of the gospel is beneath and behind it. Our work assists commerce. This is not our first work, but it is a work which goes on with all the propagation of the gospel over the earth. Commerce and the gospel go together. There is no tribe so recent or so ancient, no tribe so remote or so degraded, that the gospel does not seek it and that commerce will not gladly reach out far for access to it. They go together. Not that our missionaries go out for that purpose—they do not barter life for gold. . . . . But wherever their errand is, and wherever their teaching is felt, there the way is opened for a widening commerce. Intensity of conviction carries them where the commercial agent gladly follows, but would not lead. Who opened Africa? Moffatt and Livingstone, Christian missionaries. Who opened the interior of China? Christian missionaries. Who were the first in New Guinea and New Zealand, in the Navigator Islands, now famous in the world as Samoa, in the cannibal islands of the Pacific, where shipwrecked crews were slaughtered and eaten? Everywhere Christian missionaries; and the commercial agent follows after. . . . . So Christianity helps commerce everywhere; and Christianity has the right to require that commerce shall help it and shall not hinder it. Christianity has the right to demand that the agents of commerce on foreign shores shall not be men of loose life and vicious manners and infidel spirit, and that commerce shall not debase the nation which it is trying to lift, by helping the opium traffic in China, and by pouring millions of gallons of the vilest liquors into Africa. Every dollar won by a traffic of that kind ought to burn in a man's hand like a bit of the

infernal asphalt which is the pavement of hell. Riches so acquired simply reek with the blood of immortal souls; and Christianity would be false to its trust if it did not remonstrate and condemn; and civilization and commerce are false to their trust if they do not in this sympathize with the gospel of our Lord and of his Christ."

Now, what can be done to carry on the work of world-evangelization? First of all, a spirit of consecration must prevail in the Church. Missions must be regarded as a business—the only business ever yet divinely committed to men. Men and women with a burning passion for souls must be willing to consecrate themselves to this work. There must also be developed in the Church a spirit of enterprise by which ample means and facilities may be provided to carry on the work. It is the scandal of the Church of to-day that it is giving so little for the evangelization of the world. There needs to be an entire reconstruction, not only of our system of giving, but of our idea of giving. The most princely sums given to the Lord's work are shamefully inadequate to the demands of the work on our hands, and greatly disproportionate to our ability and expenditures on other things. The whole Christian Church is giving but ten millions per year for this great work. The combined armies of Europe alone can bring into the field over sixteen millions of men, and cover the seas with fourteen hundred vessels of war. The annual expenditures of these governments to maintain these armies and navies are said to reach the enormous sum of nine hundred million dollars—all this in a time of peace, simply as a preparation for international conflict. And yet, the entire Church has in the foreign field for carrying forward the work of redemption, including men, women, and native helpers, less than fifty thousand laborers, and spends but ten millions of money. That is, Europe has three hundred and thirty three times as many soldiers, and spends nine hundred times as much money each year as the entire Church of Christendom can muster of men and money for the war against sin and Satan. If there was a spirit of consecration to this work in proportion to its needs and the ability of the Church, these figures would be greatly changed. The Church of to-day should give to the extent of downright self-denial. The Salvation Army, to help forward an onward movement, gave, in one week, fifty thousand

dollars, by simple self-denial. They impose it upon themselves to limit their supply of food to realize the needed sum. Our conception of the ethics of giving should be changed. Giving should be regarded as the highest privilege of the soul. We should be enamored with it as one of the most delightful exercises in which the soul is permitted to engage. Instead of considering it a burden and a disagreeable duty which must be performed, we should regard it as a luxury, a very delight of the soul.

That we may have some idea of large giving for the good of others, I would call your attention to a few incidents. Princess Eugenie of Sweden, some years ago, found an island off the coast where there was a large number of cripples, many of them incurable. That she might do something for these wretched people she sold her crown jewels and built them a hospital. She did it, she said, for Christ's sake. She not only built and furnished the hospital, but she gave herself to the work. Into the house she had built she went day after day, God's ministering angel to these deformed and loathsome cripples. A poor woman, whom she had led to Christ, said to her just before her death, "I bless God for sending you to this island; but for you I never would have learned to love Jesus, and my soul had been lost." She died, leaving the hand of Eugenie covered with her tear-drops. When she looked at her hand, and saw those tear-drops glistening in the sunlight, lifting her eyes to God, she said, "O my Savior, I sold my jewels for thee, but I see them all restored, and how much more beautiful they are than when I formerly owned them!" A Jew in Europe recently gave forty millions for the benefit of his race. A Roman Catholic lady gave three millions to the Catholic University at Washington; and another renounced her right to three millions that she might devote her life to God, as she thought, in a convent. And a member of the Baptist Church in one of our large cities gives ten thousand a month to the church-erection fund of his Church. Our methods of giving for missions must be wholly reconstructed. Where we now give cents we should give dollars. The Church must awake to the fact that it has not yet begun to sacrifice for Christ.

The Church now has the opportunity to carry the gospel into all the world. Doors which for long ages have been closed against the gospel are now open. We have but to go in and possess the

land. It is also Satan's opportunity. And while the Church is waiting he is improving the time. As these countries open, the emissaries of Satan enter upon their crusade of infidelity and immorality, debauching the people with strong drink. In the meantime, what is the Church doing? Nothing, compared with the magnitude of the work to be done. It is estimated that since the death of Christ fifty successive generations of human beings have passed away. Thus twenty-five times the present population of the globe have perished without the gospel; and, as yet, the entire Christian Church sends to the foreign field but six thousand laborers, and spends but ten millions per year in giving the gospel to the nations. From this sleep of death the Church must awake, if the command of our Savior to evangelize the world is ever carried out. It is estimated that twenty thousand men and women must be sent from the home Church to evangelize the heathen world alone, to say nothing of the millions in Romanist, Mohammedan, and Greek Church communities, who are as destitute of a pure gospel as the heathen world itself. To furnish these laborers and the money to sustain them, the Church must make sacrifices and practice self-denial on a much larger scale than it ever has done. But above all, the Church must turn its eyes to God and pray. The Savior taught his disciples to pray the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into his harvest. There is still need for prayer for this end, and that the Holy Spirit may be poured out upon the whole Church, baptizing it with the missionary fire as at Pentecost.

If the Church will turn its eyes to the Lord, it will see many signs of the coming victory. Upon the very summit of the Pagan world, in the midst of the shade of death, God has placed his signal. The banner of the cross, burning in the rays of the Sun of Righteousness, is waving there, and even now Satan's kingdom is giving way, and a glorious victory will be soon won for Christ. Says Dr. Storrs: "Our country has done much fo r mankind in the hundred years of its history, celebrated last April; but it has put no single or accumulated force into the development of a pure civilization, into the advancing prosperity of mankind, from the beginning until now, which is comparable to the force that it has put into the world through the Christian missions of the various communions uniting in this sublimest enterprise and

going forth with the New Testament in their hands and the love of God in their hearts and the hope of glory shining in their faces to illuminate the nations. We may not see it; but I believe the child is born who will see the time when commerce and Christianity, equally earth-embracing in their aims, and advancing in majestic harmony, shall possess the whole earth; when the ships of Tarshish shall be foremost, as in the prophetic vision, in bringing their sons from afar, their silver and their gold with them, to the city of our God; when 'holiness to the Lord' shall be upon the bells of all those swift horses of the modern commerce whose race-course is the ocean, which go trampling the waves under their feet; when the revolving wheels in every railway and of every steamship shall have the living spirit of truth and of grace within them; when the trumpets of commerce which are wakening the world on every barbaric shore to new ideas, to new aspirations after wealth and culture and liberty and law, shall carry to all those tribes the message of the angel of Bethlehem, shall carry the mighty story of the Son of God in the world, shall carry the great argument of the Pauline epistles, shall carry the final prophecy of the New Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God, and becoming on earth a tabernacle in which God shall dwell with men. God hasten it in his time, and unto him be all the praise."

W. T. FERGUSON.

THE NATIONAL HERO.

"WE must have a revival of patriotism," more than one thoughtful man has been heard to say lately. If this be true, what is the best method of cultivating love of and pride in the fatherland? The old Greeks had the good habit of telling over and over again the heroic deeds of their ancestors in order to kindle and nourish the sacred flame of patriotism, and since then all nations that have had a past have done the same. We are too close to the Civil War period to see things calmly, to judge impartially, to forget all the trial and stress and suffering. Southern men, it is true, are beginning to recognize that Lincoln was second only to Washington, and Northern men to acknowledge that the nation's greatest soldier was Lee. But only the unprejudiced on either side see thus clearly. The whole nation can, however, join in admiration of its founders, and the unusual attention now bestowed on American history is sure to produce good fruits. The volumes of the "American Statesmen" series, especially, are not only giving us correct history, but they are proving a fine school for patriotism. It is to one of the biographies of this series that we are indebted for the suggestion of writing, as well as for most of the facts in this paper, namely, "George Washington," by Henry Cabot Lodge.

Mr. Gladstone is reported to have said in a recent speech, "It is no extravagance to say that although there were only two millions of people in the thirteen States at the time of the Revolution, the group of statesmen that proceeded from them were a match for any in the whole history of the world, and were superior to those of any one epoch."

It might be difficult for any one except a Virginian to give the reason why, but it is at any rate a fact, that Virginia furnished far more than her quota of the remarkable group of Revolutionary statesmen. Mr. Roosevelt (in his "Gouverneur Morris," page 325) goes further and says, "Virginia stands easily first among all our commonwealths for the statesmen and warriors she has brought forth; and it is noteworthy that during the long contest between the nationalists and separatists, which forms the central fact in our

history for the first three quarters of a century of our national life, she gave leaders to both sides at the two great crises—Washington and Marshall to the one, and Jefferson to the other—when the question was one of opinion as to whether the Union should be built up, and when the appeal to arms was made to tear it down, Farragut* and Thomas to the North, Lee and Jackson to the South."

It is furthermore remarkable that so many of Virginia's early great men came from the single county of Westmoreland, "the prolific soil that grows Presidents," as Governor Barbour, of Virginia, used to say, in allusion to the fact that Westmoreland county furnished three of the first five Presidents. "What Boston was to Massachusetts," says Magruder in his "John Marshall," "Westmoreland was to the other counties of Virginia; the birthplace and home of the Washingtons, the Lees, the Masons, the Taliaferros, the Marshalls, the Madisons, the Monroes, the Graysons, the Roanes, the Beverlys, the Bankheads, the Balls, the McCartys, the Blands, and the Carters, it became a sentinel on the watch-tower of liberty—the herald to announce the approach of danger."

It was not so remarkable, perhaps, that Virginia's statesmen belonged, as a rule, to what is called the gentleman class. That had been true of most of the great statesmen of all the leading countries of the world. It was eminently true even of democratic Athens; not less true, of course, of aristocratic and imperial Rome. It had been true of France and Austria and Prussia and England. It was certainly true in the Revolutionary period of New York and South Carolina, as well as of Virginia, and doubtless of other States. "From the slave-holding aristocracy of Virginia came," says Mr. Lodge, "with the exception of Patrick Henry, all the great men of that State who did so much for American freedom, and who rendered such imperishable service to the republic in law, in politics, and in war. From this aristocracy came Marshall and Mason and Madison, the Lees, the Randolphs, the Harrisons, and the rest. From it came also Thomas Jefferson, the hero of American democracy: and to it was added Patrick Henry, not by lineage, or slave-holding, but by virtue of his brilliant abilities, and because he, too, was an aristocrat, by the immutable division of race."

It would be an interesting question, now, to consider why the

* Mistake; Farragut was a Tennessean by birth

so-called upper classes have produced most of the great statesmen of the world. Genius has shown itself in other respects no respecter of persons. From Homer to Burns, and from Burns to Joel Chandler Harris, the Muse has touched the lips of the humble quite as often as of the high-born infant. The humbler class has furnished, too, not a few of the world's great generals: Marius, Murat, Jackson, Grant, Forrest, and many others. The main reason is, doubtless, that in most countries the career in state-craft has been practically closed against all but aristocrats, or at least has been hedged about with greater hindrances than other careers. In those States at the time of the Revolution where there was a powerful aristocracy, as in Virginia, South Carolina, and New York, this class naturally put forward the public men. Even in that day it was different in democratic New England; and as democracy has spread over the rest of the States we find that birth has had little to do with the making of statesmen. Witness Webster from Massachusetts, Clay from Kentucky, Calhoun from South Carolina, Andrew Jackson from Tennessee, Lincoln from Illinois, Stephens from Georgia, and Garfield from Ohio.

Another characteristic of the Revolutionary statesmen was their high culture. Washington attained his pre-eminent position amid a group of men distinguished above all the statesmen of this country, not only by their mental endowment, but in the fact that a large majority were college-bred men. There were a few striking exceptions, it is true, like Roger Sherman; but of all the group the greatest had the smallest educational opportunities.

One other group of great men, limited neither by age nor clime, Washington belonged to. It has been often remarked that the greatest statesmen and generals of the world, the doers *par excellence*, have been generally silent men. "Carlyle," says Mr. Lodge, "crying out through hundreds of pages and myriads of words for the 'silent man,' passed by with a sneer the most absolutely silent great man that history can show." Conspicuous in that august list of mighty men of war and state-craft are, besides Washington, our own Lee and Jackson, as well as Grant; Cromwell and Wellington in England; Napoleon in France; Frederick the Great and Moltke and Bismarck in Germany; Julius Cæsar in Rome; Hannibal in Carthage; Pericles in Athens; Moses among the Hebrews.

Mr. Lodge, like all the later biographers of Washington, is hard upon Weems. If there was any thing left before of the Weems myths Mr. Lodge demolishes it. He has studied Washington's career very minutely for years, and he tells us there is no evidence not only for the plant-bed episode, for the cherry-tree and little hatchet, for Washington's refusal to fight at school, but even for the colt-breaking. In the first place, Weems was "mendacious," if not a regular liar. He published himself as *rector of Mt. Vernon parish*, though there was no such parish. He may have preached once, possibly oftener, to a congregation when George Washington was present, but that is all. Hence we must receive what the scribbling parson says *cum grano salis*. Furthermore, the story of the initials in the plant-bed, by which Washington's father inculcated in the little George a profound belief in God, is taken bodily from Dr. Beattie's sketch of his son, published in England in 1799. The only authorities for Weems' stories of the cherry-tree and the refusal to fight at school are "a lady" and "a good old gentleman," who remembered the incidents; but, with the light thrown by "Mt. Vernon parish" and the plant-bed episode on Weems' character for historical fidelity, the "lady" and "good old gentleman" can hardly be accepted as competent witnesses. Then the colt story, which Mr. Curtis tells, was a century old when he told it, and there is not even a "lady" or a "good old gentleman" to vouch for it. The episode of the cherry-tree and the colt-breaking might have happened, of course, only there is no evidence that they did. As to the story of the refusal to fight and lecturing his play-mates on the sin of fighting, we can be quite sure. Washington was a most unfortunate selection for the hero of such a goody-goody story. This same Washington, son of an "imperious woman, of strong will," the Washington in whose compression of the mouth and indentations of the brow the actor Bernard read, in 1798, the evidence of an "habitual conflict with and mastery over passion," is said not only to have refused to fight a boy at school, but to have allowed himself to be knocked down in the presence of his soldiers in 1754, and thereupon to have begged his assailant's pardon! This mild Washington of Mr. Weems is the same man who some years later wrote to the major of his old regiment, who had been excluded from the public thanks on account of cowardice at the Great Meadows: "Your

impertinent letter was delivered to me yesterday. As I am not accustomed to receive such from any man, nor would have taken the same language from you personally without letting you feel some marks of my resentment, I would advise you to be cautious in writing me a second of the same tenor." Some years later still this patient Washington, when covered by the gun of a poacher, "dashed his horse headlong into the water, seized the gun, grasped the canoe, and, dragging it ashore, pulled the man out of the boat and beat him soundly."

This self-contained Washington once during the war, as Judge Marshall used to tell, sent an officer to cross a river in quest of information about the enemy by which the morrow's action was to be guided. When the man some time later brought word to the general, who was meanwhile impatiently pacing his tent, that the dark and stormy night and the ice in the river had prevented his crossing, "Washington glared at him a moment, seized a large leaden ink-stand from the table, hurled it at the offender's head, and said, with a fierce oath, 'Be off and send me a *man!*'" It is needless to add that the officer crossed the river and got the information.

Another anecdote of the same character is told by Colonel Reese, of Nashville, to whom it came by oral tradition from a senatorial ancestor of his. Washington, it seems, was one day after dinner, at which several ladies and gentlemen were present, reading some attacks of the opposition newspapers on him, when, losing his temper, he struck the table a terrible blow with his hand, so that the glasses rattled and the ladies started up in alarm, and swore that he would not stand it any longer. After pacing the floor for a few moments he became calm and excused himself. Such a man could hardly develop out of Weems' good, cool-blooded prig of a boy.

Chancellor Garland, whose recollection covers half the period since Washington was a boy, gives a description of Virginia schoolboys of his day, which is doubtless equally true of those of the period seventy-five years earlier. Advising the students one morning never to wear pistols, on the ground that it was a practice worthy only of cowards and bullies, and liable to lead to serious results when the blood was hot, he said, "When I was a boy, we used to get mad and fight, but we fought fair. We struck straight

from the shoulder, and one got the other down and pommeled him till he cried, 'enough!' And a fellow would have been disgraced who struck his prostrate foe after he said 'enough.' We used to fight in that way," said the old gentleman, warming up with reminiscences of the first quarter of the century, "and I have yet to see that there was any great harm in settling difficulties after that fashion."

Not only was Washington high-tempered, but he was a thorough boy in at least one other respect; he fell in love early and often. One of his school-mates, who was wont to speak of him as unusually studious and industrious, recalled one occasion when he surprised his playmates by "romping with one of the largest girls." It is quite certain that by the time he was fourteen he was deeply in love with Mary Bland, his "lowland beauty," as he called her, and even wrote verses to her. Old tradition identified the "lowland beauty" with a Miss Grimes, also of Westmoreland, and there are some "dear Sally" letters extant, so that possibly he changed the designation with the girl. Here is the style in which the sixteen-year-old lover wrote to a friend: "My place of residence at present is at his Lordship's, where I might, were my heart disengaged, pass my time very pleasantly, as there is a very agreeable young lady in the same house, Colonel George Fairfax's wife's sister. But that only adds fuel to the fire, as being often and unavoidably in company with her revives my former passion for your Lowland Beauty;* whereas, were I to live more retired from young women, I might in some measure alleviate my sorrow by burying that chaste and troublesome passion in oblivion; I am very well assured that this will be the only antidote or remedy."

But the heart of our melancholy young gentleman was already unfaithful to his "Lowland Beauty," whether he knew it or not, and for a time it was this same sister-in-law of George Fairfax, Miss Mary Carey, whose image occupied his mind. This affair continued, off and on, for some years. But certainly not later than his twentieth year he had found another girl to his taste, for he wrote to William Fauntleroy at Richmond, that he hoped for a

* "The 'Lowland Beauty,' Mary Bland," says Mr. Lodge, "married Henry Lee, and became the mother of 'Legion Harry,' a favorite officer and friend of Washington, and the grandmother of Robert E. Lee, the great soldier of the Confederacy."

revocation of the cruel sentence inflicted by his sister, Miss Betsy. In 1756, at twenty-four, when he made, as Colonel Washington, his first trip to Boston, he fell in love at short notice with a New York heiress, Mary Philipse. On his way home he again tarried in New York for the sake of this fair lady, but the women evidently had at that time no idea of the brilliant future in store for the young Virginian, and we are left to infer that the New York heiress rejected the future first President. It is two years before we hear of another love affair, but this time he was to meet his fate. In the spring of 1758, as he was on his way with dispatches to Williamsburg, he stopped one day to dine with a friend, and met there Martha Custis, a widow, "young, pretty, intelligent, and an heiress." Of course this was too much even for an Indian fighter. The horses were brought out in the afternoon, but the young people talked on, and the horses finally went back to the stable. The next morning he rode away, but on his return paused at the White House and plighted his troth with the fair widow. He had been a fickle lover, perhaps, but the stately lady whom he married January 6, 1759, found him constant in his devotion to the end.

As to Washington's generalship, Mr. Roosevelt, in his life of Gouverneur Morris (p. 52), contrasting the soldiers of the Revolution with those of the Civil War, says: "As a mere military man, Washington himself can not rank with the wonderful war-chief who for four years led the army of Northern Virginia, and the names of Washington and Greene fill up the short list of really good Revolutionary generals. Against these the Civil War shows a roll that contains not only Lee, but also Grant and Sherman, Jackson and Johnston, Thomas, Sheridan, and Farragut, leaders whose volunteer soldiers and sailors, at the end of four years' service, were ready and more than able to match themselves against the best regular forces of Europe."

Mr. Roosevelt is, doubtless, right in his comparison, and yet Washington was a geat general. Like William the Silent, he lost most of the battles he fought. Raw militia, such as he had in great part, could not be expected, especially when inferior in numbers, to hold their own with disciplined British regulars. But the wonder is that his army did not go to pieces after the battle on Long Island, or amid the sufferings of Valley Forge. There were some brilliant feats of generalship. Of the Boston Campaign he

rightly said, "To maintain a post within musket-shot of the enemy for six months together, without powder, and at the same time to disband an army and recruit another within that distance of twenty odd British regiments, is more, probably, than ever was attempted." And yet he accomplished it, and drove the enemy from the city. Frederick the Great is reported to have called the Trenton Campaign the most brilliant of the century. Of the Monmouth Campaign Frederick said, "Clinton gained no advantage, except to reach New York with the wreck of his army. America is probably lost for England." But it is neither Boston nor Trenton nor Monmouth nor even Yorktown that stamps Washington as the great general. It was holding that army together after defeat and amid the most terrible destitution and sufferings. "His cardinal doctrine was that the Revolution depended upon the existence of the army, and not on the possession of any particular spot of ground, and his masterly adherence to this theory brought victory, slowly but surely." His greatest feat of generalship, as of statesmanship, was holding the army together, keeping the superior British forces confined to a limited area; teaching Congress by endless letters what to do; begging, entreating, threatening this body, as well as the State governments, as the need of money and supplies became more and more urgent; striking a blow now and then to keep up the courage and patriotism of his countrymen. Nobody has, perhaps, ever seriously doubted that the fate of the Revolution was all the time in the hands of this one man, and its success is his work, in a measure that can rarely be said of one man. Nothing could daunt the heaven-sent deliverer—not defeat, not lack of supplies, of money, of munitions of war, not disbanding troops, nor plots against himself, nor treason.

It will probably never be accurately known just how great a part Washington had in the framing of the Constitution. We know perfectly well that he knew that the salvation of the country depended on the adoption of some form of government stronger than the articles of Confederation. We know from a remark of his reported by Gouverneur Morris, and made probably just before the convention opened, how he felt: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what

we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

But Washington was not a talker. He had sat silent for fifty-one days in the convention which declared war and made him Commander of the Revolutionary forces, and yet Patrick Henry had said of him then, "If you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Colonel Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on the floor." Now, he presided over the Constitutional Convention, and from May 25 to September 17 spoke but once (in behalf of Gorham's amendment). And yet Mr. Lodge, after thoroughly investigating the whole subject, thinks—an opinion shared by Mr. Bancroft in his History of the Constitution—that, "without the influence and the labors of Washington the Convention of 1787, in all probability, would have failed of success."

As first President of the United States, Washington had, of course, greater difficulties than could ever beset any of his successors. Every thing had to be settled. There were no precedents. All depended on the good sense of the Chief Executive and his advisers. He began by choosing the ablest Cabinet that ever assembled around any President at the National Capitol. Good sense and patriotism and the loftiest and most unselfish motives characterized all his public acts. He did not escape criticism, of course. Only a weak man and a weak policy ever does that. A bitter opposition soon developed, but he never swerved from what he conceived to be the path of duty. "He judges well," said Pericles, "who accepts unpopularity in a great cause." Washington had accepted unpopularity in the Revolution, and he accepted it with the like equanimity during his administration. But time always brings his revenge to the really great and honest man, and most men have long ago acknowledged what Mr. Lodge so well says with regard to the administration of our first President: "When Washington went out of office, the way was open to the Western movement; the dangers of disintegration by reason of foreign intrigues on the frontier were removed; peace had been maintained, and the national sentiment had had opportunity for rapid growth. France had discovered that, although she had been our ally, we were not her dependent; other nations had been

brought to perceive that the United States meant to have a foreign policy all their own; and the American people were taught that their first duty was to be Americans and nothing else." He might have added that Washington, in his appointments, set the highest example for the proper conduct of the civil service.

How did the great man look? His pictures do not, as a rule, it seems, exhibit the strong man we expect to see. Here is the description Mr. Lodge gives of him from contemporary testimony: "Over six feet high, powerfully built, and of uncommon muscular strength, he had the force that always comes from great physical power. He had a fine head, a strong face, with blue eyes set wide apart in deep orbits, and beneath, a square jaw and firm-set mouth which told of a relentless will. Houdon, the sculptor, no bad judge, said he had no conception of the majesty and grandeur of Washington's form and features until he studied him as a subject for a statue." Mrs. John Adams thus describes to her husband the appearance of Washington when he assumed command at Cambridge: "Dignity, ease, and complacency, the gentleman and the soldier, look agreeably blended in him. Modesty marks every line and feature of his face. Those lines of Dryden instantly occurred to me:—

> 'Mark his majestic fabric! He's a temple
> Sacred by birth, and built by hands divine;
> His soul's the deity that lodges there;
> Nor is the pile unworthy of the God.'"

Captain David Ackerson, of Alexandria, Virginia, thus describes, in 1811, Washington's appearance, as he saw him three days before the crossing of the Delaware: "Washington had a large, thick nose, and it was very red that day, giving me the impression that he was not so moderate in the use of liquors as he was supposed to be. I found afterward that this was a peculiarity. His nose was apt to turn scarlet in a cold wind. He was standing near a camp-fire, evidently lost in thought and making no effort to keep warm. He seemed six feet and a half in height, was as erect as an Indian, and did not for a moment relax from a military attitude. Washington's exact height was six feet two inches in his boots. He was then a little lame from striking his knee against a tree. His eye was so gray that it looked almost white, and he had a troubled look on his colorless face. He had a piece

of woolen tied around his throat, and was quite hoarse. Perhaps the throat trouble from which he finally died had its origin about then. Washington's boots were enormous. They were number thirteen. His ordinary walking shoes were number eleven. His hands were large in proportion, and he could not buy a glove to fit him, and had to have his gloves made to order. His mouth was his strong feature, the lips being always tightly compressed. That day they were compressed so tightly as to be painful to look at. At that time he weighed two hundred pounds, and there was no surplus flesh about him. He was tremendously muscled, and the fame of his great strength was everywhere. His large tent when wrapped up with the poles was so heavy that it required two men to place it in the camp-wagon. Washington would lift it with one hand and throw it in the wagon as easily as if it were a pair of saddle-bags. He could hold a musket with one hand and shoot with precision as easily as other men did with a horse-pistol. His lungs were his weak point, and his voice was never strong. He was at that time in the prime of life. His hair was a chestnut brown, his cheeks were prominent, and his head was not large in contrast to every other part of his body, which seemed large and bony at all points. His finger-joints and wrists were so large as to be genuine curiosities. As to his habits at that period I found out much that might be interesting. He was an enormous eater, but was content with bread and meat if he had plenty of it. But hunger seemed to put him in a rage. It was his custom to take a drink of rum or whisky on awakening in the morning. Of course all this was changed when he grew old. I saw him at Alexandria a year before he died. His hair was very gray and his form was slightly bent. His chest was very thin. He had false teeth which did not fit, and pushed his under lip outward."

This is evidently meant to be a truthful description, notwithstanding minor inaccuracies, as, for example, the color of his eyes.

Washington's fatal illness was, as is well known, sudden and short. He took cold from riding in the snow and rain December 12, 1799, and died two days later from *œdematous laryngitis* (then called *quinsy*)—that is, he was slowly strangled to death by the closing of the throat. The principal remedy tried was bleeding, which did no good, of course. He was seriously ill only twenty-

four hours, and realized at once that the end was near.* He gave his will into the keeping of his wife, gave minute directions about the disposition of his papers, and when nothing more was to be done, calmly awaited the end. "I die hard," he said to Dr. Craik, "but I am not afraid to go." He died as he was in the very act of counting his own pulse.

As to his religious faith, Mr. Lodge says, "He had been brought up in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to that Church he always adhered; for its splendid liturgy and stately forms appealed to him and satisfied him. He loved it, too, as the Church of his home and his childhood, and yet he was as far as possible from being sectarian, and there is not a word of his which shows any thing but the most entire liberality and toleration. He made no parade of his religion, for in this as in other things he was perfectly simple and sincere. He was tortured by no doubts or questionings, but believed always in an overruling Providence and in a merciful God, to whom he knelt and prayed in the day of darkness or in the hour of triumph with a supreme and child-like confidence."

If this paper, which makes slight claim to originality, induce some of its readers to turn to Mr. Lodge's two excellent volumes, and then perhaps to go still further in the study of the life and character of our national hero, it will fully accomplish its purpose.

Vanderbilt University. CHARLES FORSTER SMITH.

* Dr. F. H. Hooper gives (in a foot-note, Vol. II., page 296, of Lodge's "Washington") the following interesting statement as to the disease: "Washington's physicians are not to be criticised for their treatment, for they acted according to their best light and knowledge. To treat such a case in such a manner in the year 1889 would be little short of criminal. At the present time the physicians would use the laryngoscope and *look* and *see* what the trouble was. (The laryngoscope has been used only since 1857.) In this disease the function most interfered with is breathing. The one thing which saves a patient in this disease is a *timely tracheotomy*. (I doubt if tracheotomy had ever been performed in Virginia in Washington's time.) Washington ought to have been tracheotomized, or, rather, that is the way cases are saved to-day. No one would think of antimony, calomel, or bleeding now. The point is to let in the air, and not to let out the blood. After tracheotomy has been performed, the œdema and swelling of the larynx subside in three to six days. The tracheotomy tube is then removed, and respiration goes on through the natural channels."

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

1. Preliminary Remarks.

There is a vast amount of popular ignorance in regard to the Bible, and yet it is also true that no book is more universally read or studied than it is.

There are many right ways of studying the Bible, and no way is the best to the exclusion of all other methods. The Bible is a many-sided book, and he who restricts his gaze to one side can never see it all. It tells us a great many things, and he who reads it simply in general can not know much about it. The jurist, for example, does not read the constitution of the State merely in a general way; he reads it much and carefully, in order that he may ascertain its bearings on the particular statute or other matter which he may have in hand from time to time.

Nor do we like to read or study a book without knowing its title. We like to know in advance what it is about, and so natural and proper is this desire that we could scarcely be induced, ordinarily, to buy a book whose title-page is gone. The title of the Bible is not "THE BIBLE," for that expression means simply "the book." If the Bible had a title-page, what would it be? for the Bible is evidently one book, and it evidently has one paramount object in view. I should think if the reader would ascertain what this paramount object is he would then have discovered what to many is the lost title-page of the Bible. Some books have two titles, a short one and a longer one. Now, it seems to me that the title of the Bible might be correctly stated thus: "The History of Human Redemption; or, The History of God's Purpose to Redeem Man, and of His Dealings with the Race to that End." And I think that if we were to study every part of the Bible with this fundamental idea of redemption in our minds it would seem to us to be a more interesting and intelligible book than it could otherwise be. Nor is it a difficult matter to so express the titles or central thoughts of the several books of the Bible as to readily see the natural relation in which they stand to the title of the whole. Thus, in its relation to this redemptive idea which gives us the

title for the whole Bible, the title of the book of Genesis may be regarded as "The Seed of the Woman Bruising the Serpent's Head," for it is a great mistake for us to suppose that the serpent's head did not begin to be bruised until Christ came in the flesh. The bruising began at once, and was kept up through the centuries, and will be kept up until he and his seed are overthrown. The object, then, of the inspired writer of Genesis in recording the account of the creation and the fall was that he might make an intelligible and orderly approach to his subject, which appears in iii. 15. The chapters and books which follow on to the end are the history of the development and fulfillment of this promise, moving in line with the development of the human race, and chiefly the Israelitish branch of it.

From this point of view it is easily seen also that the title of the book of Exodus is "The Messianic, or Redemptive, Calling of Israel" to that special work of receiving and taking care of that truth whereby God would redeem man. In like manner the title of Leviticus is "The Outward Means, Conditions, Agencies, and Occasions of Reconciliation with Him." And in general, if we wish, from this point of view, to know what the title of any book in the Bible is, we have only to ascertain in what relation it stands to the foregoing title of the whole, and in no case will this be difficult to do.

It is not my purpose, however, to discuss here the various methods of Bible study, some of which are excellent, while others are more or less faulty; some superficial and easy, others more difficult, but also more fruitful of good results. It is my purpose to discuss briefly one of the methods or sciences—for it may also be called a science—known as biblical theology, a name which ought not to be offensive even to the common reader, for what is biblical theology but, to state it in general terms, the orderly presentation of the teachings of the Bible concerning God and his purpose and plan of redemption?

2. Definition and Scope.

The term "biblical" is in this connection used in a kind of technical sense, whereby it is not meant to be implied, of course, that the ordinarily so-called systematic theology is not in another sense quite biblical. Systematic theology, however, is constructed in reference to the state of Christian thought and affairs at the

time of the writer, and is bound to take more or less formal heed to the voice of the Church as expressed in creeds and rulings of ecclesiastical councils. But biblical theology as such has nothing to do with creeds as such, nor with the present, only in so far as its form may to a greater or less extent be determined thereby. It seeks the truth of revelation, not so much in its adaptation to the wants and phases of the Church at the present time as in its adaptation to the ancient people of God, to whom it was revealed in the first place.

A systematic theology or Christian dogmatics there must be, of course, but it is only a systematic exposition of the creed and the voice of the Church, founded, in the view of the writer, on the sacred Scriptures. But, whatever may be the prepossessions of the writer of a biblical theology, this branch of theological science itself is supposed to deal only with the Bible, unhampered by allegiance to any other confession. It builds on the postulate of a central thought in the whole Old and New Testament revelation, viz.: the divine purpose of redemption; and it seeks to trace within the period of the biblical history the movement of that purpose toward its consummation. God spake unto the fathers "by divers portions and in divers manners" (Heb. i. 1), and the object of biblical theology is systematically to exhibit and discuss this revelation of God as it was actually made from time to time.

But God revealed his will and purpose not only by means of the words which he spake through prophets and apostles, but also by means of the facts or historical occurrences recorded in the Bible. Biblical theology, then, is the historical exhibition of the religion in its entirety, including doctrines, worship, and events, as set forth in the canonical books of the sacred Scriptures. It conducts its discussion apart from any confessional point of view, though the results of its inquiries may, of course, be quite in harmony with the creed in so far as the latter may express itself. It abides mainly in the Bible times, seeking to know the course, and the contents, and the significance of God's revelation to his ancient people primarily in its relation to that people themselves. This must be first known before its relation to the subsequent Church can be fully apprehended and appreciated. Only thus can the fundamental importance of the Old Testament in its relation to the New, and hence to ourselves, be made clearly visible.

Biblical theology, then, would seem to be easily distinguishable from what is commonly called systematic theology or Christian dogmatics. The latter has a by no means unimportant place in theological science and literature, but it can not, and it should not, lose sight wholly of the Confession and of the aspects and demands of the organized Church and the times. Biblical theology has system, but it is not "systematic;" and, on the other hand, systematic theology ought to be in harmony with the teachings of the Bible, but it is not "biblical" in the proper technical sense in which the word is used.

3. Method.

That is, upon what principle or plan is biblical theology constructed? Its method is historical. It seeks to reproduce or exhibit the process whereby religious knowledge attained its growth, as found in the Bible, using the books of the Bible for this purpose according to their presumed chronological order. It shows how religious knowledge was added from time to time to what was already in the possession of God's people or had been previously revealed. It shows the laws of the development of the biblical religion from the germinal principles in the beginning to the completion of the revelation in the Christ of the New Testament. But the growth or development which biblical theology traces is a supernatural growth. It is not possible to explain it on merely natural grounds, and hence it can by no means be regarded as the mere outcome of the striving of the so-called religious genius of the Hebrew people.

But biblical theology is also inductive in its method, because it ever seeks the unity which exists in the abundant diversity of biblical times, authors, types of doctrine, etc., and, by comparing one with another, reaches its conclusions. It examines the statements or passages severally and together, treating the biblical revelation as embodied in divine deeds and institutions, as well as in words or verbal statements of doctrine and precept. In short, it embraces all the essential factors of the history of the kingdom of God as set forth in the Old and New Testaments.

4. Sources.

The primary sources of biblical theology are, of course, the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Protestantism rejects both the Jewish and Christian apocryphal writings,

while the Roman Catholic Church retains the former, attaching to them a secondary authority. Other sources of information, such as contemporaneous secular history and the religious records of peoples lying outside of the sphere of revelation, are to be consulted by way of collateral illustration. The biblical religion is one among a great variety of religions, all of which possess a greater or less number of features in common, as, for example, the recognition of the existence of a divine Being to whom man is in some way responsible. But a true biblical theology recognizes the religion of the Bible as a supernaturally revealed religion, and as being the only one that is so revealed. And it is its province not only to ascertain, systematize, and discuss the contents of this religion, but also to distinguish what is peculiar to it from what it has in common with other religions.

But while the Old Testament is the chief source of the data and subject-matter of Old Testament theology, it is necessary for us to have a right view of the Old Testament itself. It is not to be regarded merely as the record left to us of the religious views and practices of the ancient Hebrews, in the same sense as the Zendavesta may be regarded as the record of the religion of the ancient Persians. The ancient Hebrews did and believed many things which the Old Testament did not allow, and it required from the very outset more than one belief and practice which they were extremely slow to accept—which was, indeed, directly opposed to the persistent national tendency. This is an obvious fact, and it helps to prove that the Old Testament religion was by no means the mere outcome, as some rationalists have affirmed, of the simple gift and fondness of the Semitic people for religious matters.

It is the province, therefore, of a true biblical theology to distinguish not only between the religion of the Old Testament and that of heathen nations, but also between the natural religion of the masses of the Hebrew people and that which was furnished to them, and through them to us, from above and in a supernatural manner.

So, also, the revelation of the New Testament is to be distinguished from the contemporary uninspired Jewish theology in the midst of which the New Testament form of religion was developed. But a thorough understanding, in so far as this may be

possible, of that which lies immediately on the outside of the sphere of revelation will enable us only the more clearly to perceive and appreciate the peculiar excellency of that which is within. Such works, therefore, as throw light on these outside but immediately adjacent matters are to be regarded as useful collateral sources of information, as, for example, Rawlinson's "The Religions of the Ancient World," Lenormant's "Occult Sciences of Asia," Krehl's "Religion of the Pre-Islam Arabs," Movers' "The Phœnicians," Renouf's "History of the Egyptian Religion," Weber's "System of the Old Synagogue Palestinian Theology," Shurer's "Jewish People in the Time of Christ," such parts of the Talmuds and Targums as have been made accessible, the "Sacred Books of the East," edited by Professor Max Müller—in short, the whole of contemporaneous history, whether within or immediately without the sphere of revelation.

5. History.

Biblical theology, as do all other branches of study, has a history; and neither as a science nor as a method of biblical study can its present state and its present claims be known unless its history is also known. As an independent branch of the theological discipline biblical theology is a modern science, and its growth, like that of the physical sciences, has been gradual, and like them it has not yet reached perfection. No works were written on this subject, strictly so called, by the early Christian fathers, nor does the Bible seem to have been studied by them according to any method which biblical theology employs. The early fathers resorted largely to the inspired writings both for their opinions and for the proofs of them. By the later fathers, however, the writings of the earlier fathers and philosophers began to be much quoted, a tendency which becomes very apparent in the sixth century, until finally Christian theology became almost exclusively speculative and mystical, the rulings of popes and councils becoming in all cases the rule of faith, and the Bible virtually a dead letter. It being universally taken for granted that the voice of the Church was in all things the voice of God, or, in other words, in harmony with the Bible, of course there could be no such thing as biblical theology in the strict sense, much less in the scientific sense which recognizes it as a distinct organism. The theologians for the most part spent their time either in dreaming mystic dreams or in seeking rational explanations and proofs of certain doctrines which in the very nature of the case admitted of no rational explanation, but were purely and solely matters of revelation.

But the revival of learning, particularly the study of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, which begun in Germany about the middle of the fifteenth century, soon prepared the way for the close exegetical study of the Scriptures without which the great Reformation of the sixteenth century would have been impossible. Roger Bacon, indeed, long before this revival of learning (1291), was well acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek, and exercised a lasting influence in favor of the study of the original languages of the Bible. But he was not distinctly a Scriptural interpreter, and still less a writer of theology from the strictly biblical point of view.

To Nicholas Lyra, however, who died in 1340, belongs the honor of being the first Scriptural exegete who employed in his studies the original languages. He wrote a commentary on the whole Bible in which he sought first of all the literal sense—a fact the more worthy of mention because, *first*, it was by no means the custom in those days for those who wrote on the Scriptures to seek after the literal sense; *second*, because it is plainly impossible to have a biblical theology without first having a biblical exegesis based upon a thorough study of the literal sense, for biblical theology is to a great extent simply an orderly arrangement and discussion of the results of biblical exegesis; and *third*, because Luther, who may be called the father of the Reformation-theological exegesis, made such use of the hints which Lyra's work offered him that the Roman Catholic pun, "If Lyra had not lyred Luther had not danced," has become an oft-quoted saying. In a certain important sense it is true that if there had been no Lyra there could have been no Luther. The close exegetical study of our English Scriptures may be regarded by some as dry and impractical, and the similar study of the original Scriptures may be regarded by some as even more so, but it has been a very blessed thing for the Church and the world that Luther and many others did not think so.

But while Luther contributed much to the superstructure, rather to John Reuchlin and Erasmus belongs the honor of laying the exegetical foundation of biblical theology. They were the

"eyes of Germany," the former contributing more to facilitate the study of the Old Testament in the Hebrew than any man of his day, while the latter was not less influential in the department of New Testament Greek study, thus contributing largely, and perhaps unwittingly, to the release of the scholarship and religion of the day from the shackles of scholasticism and the spirit of speculation. The birth, not only of a more biblical theology, but of biblical theology as a distinct branch of theological science, could be only a matter of time. But it could develop nowhere but on the soil of Protestantism, and it could scarcely have failed to develop there.

But the new-found freedom and facility of Bible study, secured by the Reformation, was abused; it being hardly less difficult in the Church than in the State to preserve the true mean between license and tyranny. This very abuse, however, became the third step in the growth of biblical theology. The Bible was studied more diligently during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than it had been for a thousand years; but in the estimation of many it came during these two centuries to be studied as a mere store-house of proof-texts, ministering mainly to the polemics of ecclesiastical creeds.

> The Bible was the book in which each his dogma sought,
> The Bible was the book in which each his dogma found.

The unity of the Scriptures was to a great extent lost sight of. The Bible was studied, not as a whole, but here and there in those places where it was supposed to teach the preconceived opinion. The Bible is the only rule of faith, the only authority above conscience. As rules of doctrine, held in due subordination to the Bible, creeds are of great value and use; and the theologians who gave to the world the great creeds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rendered a service which no one can despise. But men were no longer as loyal to the voice of the Church as they had been, and hence the polemical dogmatism of the times naturally resulted in a twofold reaction, Pietism on the one hand, Rationalism on the other. The influence of the one, at first especially, was wholesome; that of the other, never so, except indirectly. The originators of Pietism were John Coccejus, a Dutch theologian who died in 1669, and Philip James Spener, who established what

he called a school of Biblical Theology in Halle in 1694. The former was professor at Leyden, and did much to free the Reformed Church from the tyranny of scholasticism, and taught her to give heed to her true character and work as emphatically a Bible church. His system of the Covenants as set forth in one of his principal books (1648) was the first attempt at constructing a system of biblical theology. Nor was it a mere accidental and unintelligent attempt. He purposely arranged his system under the biblical categories, or heads, and purposely built it on an orderly study of the Bible as a whole. In all these respects he occupied substantially the same ground as the Pietists. He was, however, a firm supporter of the mechanical theory of inspiration, and represented the whole Old Testament as a mirror in which we may have an accurate view of the events which were to happen under the New Testament dispensation to the end of the world—a theory which would not now be regarded as satisfactory even by the most conservative thinkers.

Spener was also penetrated with a conviction that the theological method of that age did not meet the demands or wants of the Church, and that it was not suited to form good preachers and teachers of religion. He therefore recommended banishing the various subtle inquiries, and the polemical mode of treating theological questions, and urged in place of these a purely biblical and practical statement of the doctrines of faith. He was a devoted Lutheran, and duly appreciated the value of the creed, but he labored strenuously, and not without effect, to vindicate the importance and authority of the Bible as our rule of faith over the creed and the outcome of a mere philosophical course of reasoning. He recognized, as every student of the Bible must do, that that which is logical is not always that which is biblical or theological.

A. H. Francke was the contemporary and fellow-laborer of Spener. He urged the young men of his day to acquire a thorough mastery of the fundamental helps in Bible study, particularly the languages, and he illustrated the value of such knowledge in his own evangelical and biblical work, for he was himself a master. But he also insisted that the knowledge of such helps was only a means to a higher end which is the right understanding of the *subject-matter* of God's word, and that to this end we should industriously supplicate God for the enlightenment of the

Holy Spirit. Could Pietism have remained thus it would have been well for biblical theology; and I know of the biographies of no German evangelical workers and scholars which might be read with more edification by the student of to-day than the biographies of Spener and Francke. But their method of dealing with the Bible degenerated in the hands of their followers, becoming to too great an extent allegorical and mystical, confounding the true explication and use of the Scriptures with mere application and suggestion. It should be borne in mind that we can not know what the Scriptures as a whole, or in any given passage, mean for us, unless we know in advance what they meant or were intended to mean, for those for whom they were written in the first place.

The other reaction was Rationalism; and so radical and permanent has its influence been upon biblical theology that it can not be unmentioned even in this brief sketch of the history of Bible study. As the tyranny of Roman Catholicism has produced its sons of evil, so Rationalism is the wayward offspring of the freedom of Protestantism. It originated largely with J. S. Semler who died an old man at Halle in 1791. He says of himself: "I certainly would not make our poor little reason the mistress of our faith"—that is to say, there are certain revealed facts which I surely would not reject merely because my reason can not understand or explain them. But he sowed baleful seeds which grew only too rapidly and luxuriantly. Van Oosterzee calls him the leader of the German Neological school and a representative rationalist. He had many followers in his own land and the winds have blown the seeds over the seas.

But rationalism was met on the other hand by a vigorous supernaturalism in the writings of such men as Storr, the Flatts, Steudel, Knapp, Hugstenberg, Neander, Tholuck, Schleiermacher, Harms, and others of more recent date. It is not necessary to give the list of books here which have been written by representatives of the two schools respectively, and which lie more or less nearly in the line of works in biblical theology. The number of systematic treatises by English and American scholars is very limited, though not a few excellent monographs have been produced, and the list is rather rapidly increasing.

While the rationalistic school, since the days of Semler, has contributed much to biblical study and to the development of

biblical theology, it has caused the supernaturalistic to contribute perhaps even more. Rationalism in the hands of some of its representatives rejects miracles and prophecy and the whole divine element of the Scriptures, and of course its biblical theology is influenced, and its method formed, accordingly. Supernaturalism affirms the presence of the divine element, and emphasizes it, and maintains that that which is not explainable by human reason is not therefore to be regarded as contrary to human reason. The human mind could not reason its way to all that was needful to be known, and hence a Bible, written or unwritten, and supernatural in some of its aspects, was necessary. The Bible does not speculate. It says what it has to say in a concrete and practical manner, stating its facts and its doctrines as matters to be believed rather than to be justified in every instance by our processes of reasoning. Young and immature students should read works of the rationalistic school with great caution. No intensity of rationalism can ever kill the truth, but it may kill the young man.

6. *Dangers.*

Biblical theology is the offspring of Protestantism, and in no other than the free and fertile soil of Protestantism can it ever flourish. The history of its origin and rise to a distinct place as a recognized branch of theological science is not the least interesting chapter in the internal history of the modern Church. But while Protestant freedom and activity have given to the world this and many other phases of biblical and theological study, would it not be well for Protestants themselves to hold ever vividly in mind the fact that liberty is not license? The Church, including the Protestant branch of it, still has a rightful voice, as indeed it must ever have. He who works within the pale of the Church, and under its auspices, necessarily in so doing surrenders a part of his freedom to the Church. If Protestantism should ever degenerate into an excessive individualism, then may be justified the often repeated accusation of our Roman Catholic friends that Protestantism is nothing but "a rushing into a bottomless pit" of negations, discords, and confusions. Nothing is so harmless as the pure truth, nothing is so valuable, nothing more desirable; and many truths are yet at the bottom of a deep well, their luster so dimmed that they can not be easily identified. But there is nothing hid save that it should be manifested; neither was any thing made secret

but that it should come to light. And yet it is also true that it would be a sad day for the Church, and hence for the world, if Protestantism, in its bounding freedom and eagerness to unveil the truth, should swing loose from all its historical landmarks, and the word "traditional" should become only a term of reproach, and we should no more have respect for the gray hairs of the once mighty Past. *In medias res tutissimus ibis.* The middle way is the safest; and if Protestant biblical study, whether in its narrower or more comprehensive sense, would achieve its best results for the Church and the world, in this way it must walk. Nothing should be labeled "Truth" until it is known to be truth; and nothing that has long, and apparently on good grounds, been received as true should be labeled as false until it is known to be so. He who walks in the presence of mystery should walk cautiously, and he who stands in the vicinity of the Cross should do so with bowed and uncovered head. These are no places for other than reverent and circumspect utterances.

Of the various branches of Christian theology, biblical theology in one or more of its chapters and aspects is attracting, perhaps, the most attention at the present time; and its investigation, if pursued in the spirit of honest inquiry and reverential recognition of the Holy Scriptures as the word of God, is destined to produce the best results. Theologically our age, happily, is irenical, Bible searching in catholicity of spirit being its prominent characteristic. God grant that it may ever be so; and yet may he also grant that men may ever reverently regard the Bible as the book which not only *contains* his word, but which in a certain true and important sense *is* his word.

R. V. FOSTER.

HINTS TO HELPERS.

I. USE GOD'S WORD.—Human arguments are not to be substituted for revelation. "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." (Jeremiah xxiii. 28.) Remember the Bible is sufficient furnishing for God's workmen. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.)

II. BELIEVE GOD'S WORD.—Your own faith in the inspiration and adaptation of the Bible must be implicit. "For the word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow; and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. iv. 12.) In dependence upon the Spirit bring the Bible to bear upon the conscience. "And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." (Eph. vi. 17.)

III. OBEY GOD'S WORD.—To help others either to come to Christ or to make progress in the Christian life, the teaching of the word must be accompanied by obedience to the word. "And the Lord shall establish thee an holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways. And all people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord; and they shall be afraid of thee." (Deut. xxviii. 9, 10.)

IV. REMEMBER GOD'S WORD.—Do not forget that we have no power apart from the Spirit of God. "But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv. 49.)

V. DIVIDE GOD'S WORD.—Ascertain the condition and difficulties of the inquirer and then so divide the Scriptures as to give him that part which is adapted to his trouble and calculated to remove it. "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman

that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." (2 Tim. ii. 15.)

VI. FOLLOW GOD'S WORD.—Follow its instruction in leading souls to Christ. "Then Philip opened his mouth and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." (Acts viii. 35.) Tell no man he is saved; let each one settle that question for himself; nor urge any one to make public confession before there is heart trust. "For they have healed the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace." (Jer. viii. 11.) Follow the example of Philip, in reading to inquirers the Scriptures, that they may by them settle the question of "assurance." "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life." (1 John v. 13.)

VII. HEED GOD'S WORD.—Never enter into a controversy with a person in the inquiry room. Avoid side issues and theological hair-splitting. "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes." (2 Tim. ii. 23.) Speak in a spirit of meekness and gentleness. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." (2 Tim. ii. 24, 25.)

VIII. APPLY GOD'S WORD.—Apply God's word in arresting the thoughtless, convincing the careless, rebuking the scoffer, resisting the obstinate, instructing the ignorant, reproving the frivolous, correcting the mistaken, warning the deferring, encouraging the despondent, and in comforting the penitent. "And the Lord said, Who is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season?" (Luke xii. 42.)

EXAMPLES.

The Thoughtless.—"I never thought much about salvation." "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." (Isaiah i. 3.)

The Mistaken.—"I never did any thing very sinful." "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (1 John i. 8.)

"My heart is not wicked." "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" (Jeremiah xvii. 9.)

The Ignorant.—"I do not understand these things." "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart." (Eph. iv. 18.)

The Deferring.—"I expect to be a Christian sometime." "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" (Heb. ii. 3.)

"I can not come until God's time." "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near." (Isa. lv. 6.)

"I do not feel any interest now." "Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness." (Eph. iv. 19.)

"I do not want to act hastily." "Exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." (Heb. iii. 13.)

"There are some pleasures I can not give up." "Rejoice O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." (Ecc. xi. 8.)

The Skeptical.—"I don't believe your Bible." "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John xii. 48.)

"Christ is a wonderful man, but no more." "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by ME." (John xiv. 6.) "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, *ye shall die in your sins.*" (John viii. 24.)

"How do men KNOW there is a hell?" "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matthew x. 28.)

"God is too merciful to punish." "In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with ever-

lasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. i. 8, 9.)

"None will be lost eternally." "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. xxv. 46.)

The Complainer.—"There are so many hypocrites in the Church." "So are the paths of all that forget God; and the hypocrite's hope shall perish; whose hope shall be cut off, and whose trust shall be a spider's web." (Job viii. 13, 14.) The Lord of the unfaithful servant "shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites." (Matt. xxiv. 51.)

"My case is a peculiar one." "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." (Romans iii. 22, 23.)

"Why does God permit so much suffering?" "Shall he that contendeth with the Almighty instruct him? He that reproveth God, let him answer it." (Job xl. 2.)

"There are too many churches." "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.)

The Moralist.—"I believe in every man doing his best." "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii. 8, 9.)

"I have always lived an upright life." "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not." (Ecc. vii. 20.)

"I think God will give justice to all." "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." (Psa. ciii. 10.)

The Despondent.—"I am such a great sinner." "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." (1 Tim. i. 15.)

"You do not know what a great sinner I have been." "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." (Isaiah i. 18.)

"I have resisted so long." "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." (Heb. iii. 7, 8.)

"I have tried before and failed." "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Romans iv. 5.)

"My sins are too many and great." "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John i. 7.)

The Backslider.—"I have been so unfaithful." "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? and he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep." (John xxi. 17.)

"I have wandered so far." "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck, and kissed him." (Luke xv. 18–20.)

"I am so unworthy." "And his son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet." (Luke xv. 21, 22.)

"I am worse than one who has never been forgiven." "Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings." (Jeremiah iii. 22.)

The Convicted.—"I have prayed so earnestly to be saved." "And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." (Luke vii. 50.)

"I do not know what to do." "And brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. (Acts xvi. 30, 31.)

"How may I know that Christ accepts me?" "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God that ye may know that ye have eternal life." (1 John v. 13.)

"What evidence will I have?" "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Romans viii. 16.)

"Will there not be a different feeling?" "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself." (1 John v. 10.)

"What do you mean by believing?" "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. (John i. 12.)

R. G. PEARSON.

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZED GOVERNMENT.

"CHRISTIANITY is the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ." Civil government is a combination of citizens or civilians, with laws to control them. In a sense these two things are synonymous, both having the idea of direction, protection, safety. They are both founded upon principles of right. The first is inherent and divine; the other is an emanation and political. Paley says: "Whilst politicians are disputing about monarchies, aristocracies, and republics, Christianity is alike applicable, useful, and friendly to them all."

As the whole contains all the parts, Christianity is far more and better than civil government, because it includes this, together with many other elements necessary to the complete and final happiness of man. The first code of civil law of which history gives account was of divine enactment, and applied to both Church and State or nation.

Whatever may have been the wise purpose of the Almighty Father and Ruler of nations in thus blending Church and State in the introduction of each, we now recognize the American principle—that State is completely separated from Church, but not completely separated from Christianity. The famous ordinance of Congress in 1787—now more than one hundred years old—for the Northwest Territory, declares: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." That is the language of a great national document, showing that our government is not cut wholly loose from Christianity, though it is cut wholly loose from any Church as an organization of Christians.

The Church, in its various organizations, is only the embodiment of the opinion of men as to what is God's policy or plan. Christianity is the true essence of all needed government. It is not the Church, nor is the Church Christianity. The Church and State must be separate to secure the purity of the one and the impartial administration of the other. But Christianity and the

State (civil government) must be combined in order to have a mutual, healthy perpetuation of both.

"Whatever makes men good Christians makes them good citizens. Our fathers came here to enjoy their religion free and unmolested, and at the end of two centuries there is nothing upon which we can pronounce more confidently, nothing of which we can express a more deep and earnest conviction, than the inestimable importance of that religion to man, both in regard to this life and of that which is to come." As the nation's good rises above State and party politics because of its more general application and benefits, so our Christianity must rise above all civil polity because of its universal application and unbounded benefits to humanity everywhere, in time and eternity.

The Christian, then, is a twofold citizen, owing allegiance to God's divine government and to his civil government, for God is certainly the author and governor of both. The Christian, therefore, owes allegiance directly to both, and through them to his God. From the Christian's point of view, both are for man's elevation and God's glory. His motto in each department of Jehovah's realm should be, "The greatest good to the greatest number," and "With malice toward none and charity for all." With this view, then, which is certainly reasonable, danger may and often does arise from our subordinating the greater to the less. In other words, we may sink the Christian into the civilian, and thus ignore God's right to reign in our lives as well as in our hearts. But as the less is contained in the greater, we should elevate the civilian into the Christian. To *do* in overt life what our heavenly Father would have us *be* in heart would certainly bring the greatest good to all with whom we have to deal.

This is emphatically a time for the agitation of reform, both in civil and Church circles. There has been no upheaval of moral and reformatory sentiment since the organization of our government a century ago that called for more serious consideration by the whole people than that now aroused by reason of our imperiled institutions. This condition of things arises, no doubt, from the growing and largely controlling influence of the immoral and corrupt elements of society and government. Our boasted democracy, the rule of the majority, and our no less boasted republicanism, which holds that every one shall think, speak, and vote as he

pleases, has led to a preponderance of individual and party selfishness rather than to wise and charitable consideration of our obligations to the higher laws of God and humanity. This idea and practice of separating Church and State have led us largely to ignore the divine, Christian principles of right in our allegiance to civil authority. Designing politicians, who seek official distinction for its honors and emoluments, have taken advantage of this tendency and weakness of the common citizen, and make all higher and nobler interests of humanity yield to their selfish and unpatriotic ends. While we admit the fact of happy exceptions, it is palpable that our government—county, State, and national—is largely controlled by ungodly, and often even by immoral, men. It is a common saying that "good men will not seek office because our government has become so corrupt." Thousands of good and loyal citizens will take no part in politics because they have to vote for bad men if they vote with a party. This is true. What is the remedy? Let Christian men and women come to the front, work as they believe, vote as they pray. Our first allegiance is to God; second, to the family; third, to our civil government—not through blind party zeal, but for the country's broadest and best good.

"If I were speaking to you as politicians," says Joseph Cook, "I should be obliged to say that, as such, you can not be expected to reform the nation. The change we seek is too great to expect of any thing except the Christian Church, *resolved to do right.* The great Methodist denomination officially affirms that the liquor traffic can never be licensed without sin, and that license, high or low, is vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy. The Presbyterian body will not admit a rum-seller to Church membership. If we could lift the entire body of Christians in the United States to this Methodist or that Presbyterian level, there would be, as I believe, no political party that would dare face the public sentiment that would be aroused. The Church has the power to lift its membership to that height of intelligence and righteous resolution. You Christians have the power to throttle the serpent that is throttling the Laocoon of our civil prosperity. History will justly hold the American Church responsible if ever the dram-shop oligarchy rules the republic." And what is said of this gigantic evil may be said of all other national crimes—such as Sabbath desecra-

tion, gambling in its various aspects, the social evil, and political perjury and bribery.

The only safe and righteous course for the Christian is, to take his religion with him everywhere he goes, as well as to church—that is to say, go nowhere, and do nothing unless on Christian principles. Take your religion with you into politics, into your social circles, and business relations. It is the Rev. Sam. P. Jones who says, "Leave your feelings at home when you go out, and then they will not get hurt." I would say, take your religion with you wherever you go, and then you will not get hurt, nor will you hurt any one else.

"When Dr. Joseph Parker of London, was crossing the Atlantic," says Joseph Cook, "he was accustomed often to sit at the bow of his steamer and contemplate the vastness of the ocean by night as well as by day. His habit was noticed by several frivolous people on board, and finally one young dandy walked up to the preacher in his solitude and said, 'Dr. Parker, Dr. Parker, what do you see?' *Nothing but God*," said the Doctor. And the young man walked away silent. Let Christians in this American Republic, sitting at the cut-water of reform, when they are asked by politicians what they see in this general conflict for righteous law, answer, *Nothing but God*. Follow him! and let God take care of the results. . . . . The supreme duty of politics as of the Church, is to echo God. We have all lived to see our Republic brought safely through political conflict, foreign and civil war, delivered from many threatening dangers. If the righteous principles which actuated our fathers, from the pilgrims of Plymouth on down to the present time, have vouchsafed God's blessings and presence, why should we doubt his guidance in the future as in the past? But he will grant this only on conditions that the political conscience of the nation be educated on Christian principles, and that too, largely by the Christian Church. Make no compromise with evil. Do right, and let God take care of consequences. 'Ye are the light of the world—ye are the salt of the earth.' Thus Jesus speaks. We must heed his voice." (Read Romans xiii. 1.)

T. S. LOVE.

THE NEW SAVONAROLA.

"HISTORY repeats itself." So runs the trite proverb. And the adage, as read by the populace, runs not wrong. Indeed, among those reputed for their philosophy there are some who hold this proposition as an axiom. Without doubt there is plausibility at least in this judgment, for certain it is that many events of to-day remind us of those of other days, and future events may remind their observers of those of to-day. Some of the earlier and later pages of our life history will certainly read very much alike, so that casual readers will stoutly affirm that they were printed from the same plates. But only in a suggestive or reminiscent way can it be said that history repeats itself. Real history is never revised. Real history never turns back, but, like the brook, "flows on forever."

It goes without saying that in no accurate sense can we say, for a rule, that one event in history is the repetition of an antecedent event. The Mosaic history has never been repeated, albeit there have been many events which suggested, in a memorial way, that unique epoch. But there has been but one Moses, and there will never be another. And so of all that radiant line of the "beacon lights of history" by which the historico-biographical highway of the human race has been lighted up from the beginning until now. As not one of those unique souls has ever really fallen out of the galaxy of stars, but remains fixed, luminous, and imperishable in the great firmament, so they need not be repeated or duplicated. Other souls as white and clean may dawn out into the studded sky and add their own unique luster to the lighted highway over which mortals walk upward toward him who dwelleth in light which no man can approach. But each new soul is after a new pattern, and is only like itself.

Thus, when it is heralded around the world, from the land of Cavour, of Garibaldi, of Gavazzi, that in the old city of Lorenzo the Magnificent the spirit of that immortal hero, Savonarola, surnamed the "Martyr of Florence," again walks among the gay Neapolitans, and the voice that has been hushed for nearly four

centuries is again heard in Florence, we need not be misled. Words were never more prophetic than those with which the friendless but dauntless friar sent his memorable salutation to Lorenzo: "Tell him that he shall go, but I shall remain." That prophecy is in process of fulfillment yet. Lorenzo has passed away, but Savonarola remains.

But who is this that issues from his cloister, and lifts of a sudden his resistless soul, scepter-like, above the Italian people, so that, in token of their measureless esteem and their boundless enthusiasm, with high acclaim they surname him Savonarola? Not Girolamo Savonarola, but Padre Agostino da Montefeltro. "Who is this man?" asks a British journal, and very briefly answers the question. The paragraphs which I here transcribe are more romantic than romance itself:

"Who is this man? All sorts of tales are abroad about him. He is a widower, who, in despair at losing a beloved wife, took to the cloister. He is a Garibaldian who has exchanged the red shirt for the monk's cowl. The truth, however, seems to be even more romantic. Some twenty years ago a young Italian of good birth became enamored of a beautiful girl, and the course of true love, as usual, not running smooth, in a fit of burning and headstrong passion, the impetuous Agostino cut the knot and ran away with his idol to Switzerland. The rash pair were rudely aroused from love's young dream by the appearance of an altogether matter-of-fact personage, the brother of the young lady. He seems to have fallen on Agostino with his sword in the good old slashing style; but Agostino, it appears, could also play the swordsman, and, in the desperate encounter which followed, the girl's brother fell, pierced to the heart by the hand of her lover. What went with the young lady is not told, but Agostino, overcome with terror and remorse, seems to have fled to a Franciscan monastery, and there sought pardon and expiation for his crimes by twenty years of devotion, rigid seclusion, and severe penance. His extraordinary qualities, the vigor of his intellect, his taste for learning, and, above all, his eloquence, did not escape the notice of his superior. About four years ago he was ordered to preach at Bologna. After his very first sermon he was hailed by the populace as a Second Savonarola. He went to Florence last year, and was carried almost daily in a litter—for at that time he was very ill—into the Duomo. The whole of Florence was soon at his feet. The local journals employed numerous short-hand writers, and within a few hours of their delivery his sermons were hawked about the streets and devoured as greedily as Luther's tracts."

An Italian journal thus describes the man, and a well-executed portrait on a cover page of an English translation of his sermons verifies the description:

"Father Agostino is in the prime of life. He is now in fair health and in splendid oratorical form. His head is broad and finely formed, his features clear cut but strong, his mouth sweet but firm. A smile, said to be irresistible in its geniality and tenderness, is wont to play about his lips as he first surveys the eager, upturned faces of the vast congregations which flock to him. How long will it be before Rome stones this latest of her prophets?"

Of Padre Agostino as a preacher it is said further, "His sermons being constructed on strictly logical principles—one unbroken chain of argument running through them all—he is in the habit of beginning each discourse by a recapitulation of the propositions enunciated in the discourse of the preceding day and this he does with marked and careful emphasis, a studied monotony of voice, as if he were repeating a lesson by heart, leaning forward upon the pulpit rail, and looking straight in front of him. Then he announces what will be the subject of the discourse of the day, and begins to preach. In an instant voice, attitude, expression—all are transformed. His utterance, as rapid and pellucid as the torrent of a mountain stream, is seconded by the gestures of a born orator. His attitude, which at first sight seemed in his Franciscan habit as rigid and immovable as that of a statue, becomes at once animated and pliant, while every line of the countenance bears witness to the profound inward conviction of his soul. . . . At the end of the first period he has won all the hearts of his audience. Without ever losing its virile, incisive character, his voice easily lends itself to paint the fond picture of home life, to pity suffering, to brand iniquity with righteous indignation, and, as if divinely inspired, to soar into the very presence of God. "Rapt in profound interest, breathless, intent, the people follow him, drawn upward irresistibly by the golden thread of his eloquence. Step by step he raises them up the ladder of faith, till, with a firm but reverent hand, he can lift the veil of the unseen and infinite and bid them look within. Thence, with sudden alternation from that supreme height, he turns their gaze back upon the world. With accents of the deepest tenderness he speaks of the sorrows of mankind, and counts, as it were, one by one the tear-drops of humanity.

There is one stern word of warning to recall their responsibilities to the great and powerful of the earth; and then to the poor and needy, to those who weep the bitter tears of misery, with darkness in their lives and despair in their souls, 'Lift up your hearts,' he cried, 'lift up your hearts; you are God's own people. He has chosen you for his own possession.' And those who are hanging breathless on his words feel that at that moment God is very near to them. A thrill of rapture runs through the vast congregation, which, but for a feeling of reverence, would, like the thunder of the distant cataract, burst forth in a transport of applause." Thus eloquently and admiringly one of his own countrymen, after hearing him often, speaks of this wonderful preacher.

In Rome, for forty days in Lent he spoke every day to from four to five thousand persons. The effect of his discourses is thus described:

The large church of San Carlo, in the Corso, was thronged, crowds being unable to gain admission. It has been found necessary to give the monk a military guard. The people accompany him in crowds to his hotel, and he is often compelled to show himself on the balcony before they will disperse. His sermons are interrupted with the sobs, the laughter, and even the applause of the congregation. All the usual conventionalities of the Church are laid aside. The instant he appears in the pulpit murmurs of "*Eccolo! Eccolo!*" (There he is! There he is!) run through the assembly, and at every pause, "*Bene! Bene!*" or even "*Bravo!*" are distinctly audible. The Father's efforts to repress these outbursts have proved useless, and so he has given it up. The people are simply carried away by his eloquence—old and young, high and low. He is commonly called the new Savonarola: let us hope he will not work out his legend.

Of his sermons I had hoped to transcribe some illustrative paragraphs but the space allotted me will not allow this. A single example must suffice. It is the peroration to one of two polished and powerful sermons delivered at Rome, on the Divinity of Christ. After marshalling the resistless array of proofs of our Lord's divinity he concludes:

"Nor are the centuries without speech and language of their own, to bear witness to the truth. Take the first three centuries, and there you find the apostles and saints of God, holy men like Timothy and Titus, and their faithful disciples. All these fall down before Christ and worship him, saying:

Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ;
Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father.

"Then follow the fourth and fifth centuries, with Constantine the Emperor, the learned Fathers of the Church—those who wrote the Apology for the faith—and they take up the hymn of praise:

Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ:
Thou art the Everlasting Son of the Father.

"Throughout the centuries which succeed, during the iron age of the barbarians, as they rush upon the heels of the other to complete the destruction of Imperial Rome, the monks preserve in their monasteries the strain of praise, to burst forth again in the Middle Ages in many a noble cathedral; or from their lives and their deaths the triumphant fact:

Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ:
Thou art the Everlasting Son of the Father.

"In like manner the sixteenth century, with its revolutions, its schisms, its wars, its disaster, its great and noble saints: the seventeenth with its scientific discoveries, its philosophy, even the eighteenth with its load of carnage and crime—all pass beneath the all-saving gaze of Christ; all bring their tribute of praise to his footstool, and in some form or another acknowledge him to be the Lord. Finally, the nineteenth century, which dawned upon war and tumult, and the heated passions of men; but which is closing in cynical indifference—look at it well as it moves onward with its great armaments and vast armies, its fields of battle, its inventions and discoveries, and mark that, whether it will or no it bears witness to the kingdom of Christ upon earth.

"How many more centuries there will be I know not; but this I know: that 'Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure; they shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.'"

D. E. BUSHNELL.

EDITORIAL.

CHRISTIAN UNITY *VERSUS* CHURCH UNION.

Some time ago, a leading secular journal referred to the following statement as a proof that "the tendency to Christian union is disclosed in unexpected quarters:" "In a remote country village, at an agricultural meeting of a thousand persons this summer, the declaration of one of the speakers that in such a village neighborhood there should be but one church was more immediately and warmly applauded than any other remark of the day. It was certainly a declaration in harmony with the spirit and practice of the early Christians."

There might be more than one interpretation of the applause alluded to. A remark in favor of short sermons and short religious services will elicit the applause of many mixed audiences; but it is not certain that the feeling which prompts such applause is always hopeful or right. It may grow out of a lack of interest in the whole subject of which sermons treat. So a lack of interest in religion—a feeling that churches should cost as little and occupy as little time and attention as possible—may make some people applaud the idea of making them as few as possible.

Certainly some towns and neighborhoods have too many churches. Where there is room for but one, it is unwise, as well as out of keeping with "the spirit of the early Christians," to attempt to maintain two or three or half a dozen. We can all point to communities where Christians, by dividing their meager forces into opposing squads, have through rivalries and jealousies almost choked out the life and power of religion. It is a sad departure from the spirit of the gospel to think more of sect than of souls, to labor harder to make denominational proselytes than Christian disciples.

But, in the past, the worst hurt has come to Christianity, not through the multiplying of sects, but through the spiritual apostasy and corruption and deadness resulting from the centralizing of power in one all-embracing and all-swaying organization. In the Middle Ages a wide-reaching Church union was realized under the sway of the Romish hierarchy, but who will say that it was not the dawning of a day more hopeful for real Christian unity when the Reformation in Germany and England and Scotland broke this vast outward union into denominational fragments? Who will say that preservation of ecclesiastical oneness in Russia through the suppression of all dissenting bodies promotes real Christian unity? If in Italy and Austria and

France, where the Romish Church has hitherto held almost undivided sway, half or two thirds of the people were strict Baptists and ardent Methodists and independent Congregationalists and orthodox Presbyterians, would not we count the division a gain for Christ and his cause? Is not England more prosperous, more alive and efficient religiously, more truly Christian, with half her population in dissenting Churches than if all the people clung rigidly to the Established Church, or yielded passively to its claims? Dissent in Great Britain has given the world Presbyterianism and Methodism and Congregationalism. Could the Church have spared Knox and Wesley and the Pilgrim Fathers?

Now and then religious writers and ecclesiastical councils bemoan the divisions of Christendom, and propose plans for merging all the Churches into one world-embracing organization. But history proves that too much consolidation, because it so often means slackening of effort and apostasy and deadness, is more dangerous than too much division.

The important thing is not to muster the whole race into one ecclesiastical army, or to get all to wear the same Church livery, or adopt the same forms, or bow down to the same pope, or acknowledge allegiance to the decrees of the same council or general assembly. Large resources and numbers, a full treasury, splendid temples, costly institutions, great orators in the pulpit, and eminent philosophers in the schools, are not the end which Christian disciples are to seek through the organization which we name the Church. One thing Christ has commissioned us to do—to win and save souls. Two or three, as truly as a hundred or a thousand, meeting in his name and working together to carry out this great commission are a holy Church. It matters not whether the organization was formed yesterday by believers who never knew the touch of Episcopal or Presbyterial hands, or handed down from priest to priest through the centuries; for the genuineness and the holiness of a Church do not depend on its age or its ancient history. As has been wittily said, "the apostle that succeeds is in the true line of apostolic succession." God chooses and honors the lamp which shines best now, not the one that has been longest lighted. The Church which is most effective in the divine work of soul-saving and soul-developing is the holiest Church, and, in the measure that this divine end is lost sight of and fails, the organization claiming the name ceases to be a Church. The true Church, therefore, has not one organization but many, the light shines not from one earthly center, but bursts forth in new places and ever-changing forms.

The tendency of life is ever toward diversity of form. The living tree keeps putting forth new branches. We should not expect or desire to see the number of Christian denominations greatly diminished. While the gospel continues to be a living force in the hearts of men and women who think earnestly and independently, there will ever be

diversity and complexity in written creeds and outward forms and organizations; but if under all these forms there is, as there should be and may be, the inspiration and power of one and the self-same Spirit inbreathing love and zeal for Christ and souls, results will be reached through diversity which would be unattainable under the constraint and unwieldiness of a universal organic union.

We freely admit that wherever the merging of two or more organizations into one will give new life and inspire new activity, enlisting new workers and enabling them to reach larger results, union should be encouraged and sought after. But, since the usual tendency of massing ecclesiastical forces and the centralizing of wealth and influence and numbers has been to promote "ease in Zion," with resulting spiritual declension and failure, we should not be too indiscriminately eager for every proposed union, or too dolefully lachrymose over "the divisions of Christendom." While we should not cease to pray and work for the spiritual oneness of all disciples, we may comfort ourselves in view of denominational divisions by three facts which all history attests:

1. A rich and powerful Church—especially an unopposed and all-swaying Church—is in danger of lapsing into neglect and inefficiency. The goad of persecution, the stimulus of rivalry, is needed even in Christian work. At no other time has the gospel been such an active power as in the ages when its advocates were weak and persecuted. When persecution and opposition cease, when hardship and self-denial are no longer required, when the Church and its ministers receive worldly honors and rewards, then the true work of soul-winning declines and gradually fails. Even denominational rivalry may stimulate to wholesome activity. The ministers and members of one Church are aroused to more active efforts by the knowledge that another Church made up of consecrated and zealous people is at work in the same field. Of course it may be said that love alone ought to inspire us, but in our present imperfect state we need other wholesome stimulants. The saying of Lyman Beecher applies in this as well as in other things: "Old Adam and grace will do twice as much as grace alone."

2. An all-embracing Church would be likely to become a bigoted Church. We often hear of sectarian narrowness, but the true nursery of narrowness is in a country where no sect but the ruling one is tolerated. Where is bigotry more uncompromising than in Russia, where outward Church union is most strictly maintained? No class of religionists are narrower than Roman Catholics who live where no other Church but theirs is known; but we find even Romanists, when brought into contact with the Protestant denominations in England and America, growing more liberal and tolerant. This seems to demonstrate the good effect of diversity in Church organization. More than one Church is needed to keep Christians from lapsing into narrowness and bigotry.

3. But the worst evil—the root of all other evils growing out of the consolidation of wealth and rule in one Church—is the spiritual apostasy, the religious degeneration which it ever tends to produce. Riches and popularity do not promote piety and devotion. The earnestness and spiritual power of a Church often seem to decrease in the ratio that its worldly wealth and outward influence increase. The obscure sects that through self-denial and persecution preach the gospel to the poor seem now, as in all former times, to be the most earnest and persistent embassadors of Christ, if not his truest disciples. A hundred years ago the Methodists were hardly more honored or less persecuted than are now the soldiers of the Salvation Army, or than was the sect of the Nazarenes in Paul's time. There seems a perennial necessity for those who go back to the simplest forms of truth and the most primitive methods of imparting it, and willingly go down to the lowliest and most debased to lift them up; and as success brings wealth and numbers and worldly importance, there is a tendency to depart from primitive consecration and to slacken self-denying activity. When spiritual health and activity decay through wealth and numbers and self-sufficient pride, the surgeon's knife of God's providence brings a merciful schism by which are cut off from the overgrown organism diverse and humbler fragments that take on new forms and new activity, and revival comes sometimes not only to the new organizations but to the old. Such was the great schism that came to Germany under Luther, to the English Church under Wesley, and to the Presbyterians in Kentucky and Tennessee under McGready and Ewing.

In every country where one single ecclesiastical organization has been able to establish its sway, securing uniformity of creed and form and polity, laxness of spiritual interest, formality, pride, and worldly self-sufficiency have resulted. This was and is true in Russia and Mexico. It is largely true in those parts of Europe where Lutheranism is the one prevailing form of faith.

If it be said that the result of organic union under the sway of corrupt forms of belief like that held by the Romish and Russian Churches is not a fair criterion by which to judge what would be the effect of the organic consolidation of Protestantism, we may reply that the Greek and Roman Churches were not originally corrupt; but their primitive purity was gradually destroyed as their power and importance and worldly sway increased. Similar causes would probably produce a like effect in an all-swaying or wide-swaying Protestant Church, for Catholic and Protestant human nature are much the same. We need not, therefore, be too much cast down, though some well-meant efforts to secure organic union fail, and even though there are neighborhoods here and there burdened with too many Churches.

J. M. H.

A SPURIOUS IMMORTALITY.

A writer in the *Open Court*, a paper published in Chicago, discusses the subject, "Soul-life of Animals and Plants." The thought of the writer seems to be that there is no such thing as an individual soul which exists as an entity separate and apart from the life of animals and plants. A paragraph may serve to illustrate the mode of reasoning adopted by this writer. He says:

"The soul of man is the result of the total development of organized substance from its first beginning and through all its phases of transformation. Man is the sum of all the memories of his ancestors. In the man of to-day all the memories of the past continue to live, as naturally as the child continues to live in the youth and the youth in the developed man. Death vanishes, when we thus conceive mankind as one grand totality, as a huge wave sweeping onward across the ocean of life. The wave in its progress incessantly lifts other particles of water and leaves the old ones behind, yet it remains the same, and ever must remain the same, in its onward career. The wave is not the water, although it consists of water; it is a special form of motion in water. Humanity is not the matter of which men's bones and muscles consist. Humanity is a certain form of life—a form of motion that sweeps over the ocean of matter. The material particles of which humanity now consists are left behind—they sink back into the ocean—but humanity continues to progress, it continues to live, and remains the same through all the changes which the material parts of living substance have to undergo. By humanity we do not understand the clay of which man is made, nor even the life which moves the clay, but the form of life in the clay—his soul; and the soul lives, even though the body may die."

If this means any thing it means that humanity is an entity, and that its continuance here is its only immortality. There is no such thing as an individual soul which lives after the body dies. It is only a part of the great and mysterious thing which we call life. The life of the animal and plant culminating in man is the only soul known to our author. This theory makes the doctrine of the soul's creation and separate identity a myth. There is no life for the individual. The individual man dies, but his life goes on in the life of the race. Each man plays his little part and disappears, never to return again. The onward sweep of the mighty currents of life leave human bodies to decay by the side of the great, mysterious stream, but the soul ceases to be, or rather becomes a part of the mighty ocean which is denominated humanity. Men are but bubbles on the wide waters which forever flow, bringing to the surface new forms and manifestations. It is this that we are asked to believe is immortality. Now, look at what we have, according to this nonsense. In the first place, immortality of man is possible

only in case each individual man continues to live forever, maintaining his conscious identity. If this be not true, no man living need have any care for his future. His conduct can add nothing to and take nothing from the bliss of his own existence hereafter, for he is to have no such existence. He is to be a part of a great whole which is no more conscious of itself than the ocean is of its individuality. Then, again, there is nothing better established in physical science than that this earth, with all its life, will cease to be in the course of time. Then what becomes of immortality? If the life which we here live is to be swallowed up in the great tidal waves that bear us on, and the whole is to disappear as the world and our solar system pass away, what shall become of those "grand and glorious goals that now, in our ideal aspirations, we dimly can presage?" This is the theory of an evolutionist. It is the best that can be done for our humanity. It need not be said that such a teaching contradicts all the facts of revelation. It ignores revelation as mythical and puerile. It not only contradicts revelation; it destroys the doctrine of man's future existence. It makes preaching a farce and undermines the very foundations of good morals. If there be a God, individual man is related to him as a responsible being who shall give an account for the deeds done in the body. If men are not to continue to exist as individuals they can not be held accountable before any divine tribunal before which they shall appear. Think of bringing a wave of the great ocean of life to judgment! Such is the philosophy of evolution!

D. M. H.

THE CHURCH THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD.

Many years ago a distinguished man in our Zion was remarking somewhat upon the corrupt state of the Church in the middle ages of the Christian era, acknowledging and lamenting it. Having done so with frankness, he followed it up with the statement, "And yet the Church then was better than the world." It gave a new direction to the thoughts of the present writer, as it had seemed to him impossible for any thing to be worse than the moral condition of the Church at the time of, and for five or six hundred years preceding, Leo X. What with the practice of vice in its horrid forms in the very seat of the papal authority and the reign of worldly ambitions for place and power among ecclesiastics of all grades; what with the lowest ideas of moral purity among the teachers of religion themselves; what with the prevalence of superstition and ignorance in the minds of the people who adhered to the Church; and with the reformatory force of spirituality so very low as to present scarcely one cheering ray of hope on all the wide scene of darkness, what was there to make ground of comparison and to use the word "better" concerning the Roman Catholic Church?

The Church had the oracles of God, although hidden away in dark cloisters, chained to some spot where an occasional and unusual monk could read, and sometimes did read, it. There were rare spirits here and there on earth, "like angel visits, few and far between," but still there were some whose hearts were burning for the coming of a purer day. At least, the formal teachings of Christianity, to a degree, were dispensed among the men of the Church. The world, as it lay outside of the unfaithful Church of Christ, was altogether dark. We can find nothing at all that relieves the dreadful picture of the moral condition of the nations. Further, it is evident that the Church was better than the world, because elements of truth, of purification, of redemption, however secretly, were yet really at work until there dawned a bright day, preceded by John Huss, John Wickliffe, Savonarola, Wessel, and others.

In its fidelity, purity, and devotion to God the Church is a real light amidst the corruption of human society. To such extent is this true that even to a very considerable degree the men of the world feel and reflect the virtues of the followers of Christ. They are influenced by them unawares. The term "light" means illumination. The Savior gives us this use of the word. "Ye are the light of the world," says he. Light is that peculiar something which makes something else manifest. It is by the light that all nature comes to our sight. It is by the light of the sun reflected from a myriad of objects that we see the things that exist around us. Not the direct, but the indirect, rays of light bring to us a thousand images and sensations of beauty and existence. It also shows all the scarred, blasted, and deformed places and things around us. Otherwise we should go through life with no proper idea of the difference between beauty and ugliness, between darkness and brightness, between the external greatness and littleness of things.

The Church of Christ is not the light of the world as an organization, because there are many organized bodies as perfectly constituted as it is. Its influence in this respect may have only a proportion of good effect as suggesting the value and power of united effort. It may show the world how men in union, with a certain set of principles of action and a certain definite aim in view, may work out their object grandly. But this may be done by the same sort of organization with any thing else than beneficent results. It is the moral character of the individuals of the mass of the Church which constitutes the essential element called "light" by our Lord. When the Church had its greatest power of organization, as under Hildebrand, Innocent III., or Leo X., it had its days of greatest corruption and moral shame. It was begirt with organic force and disgraced with moral littleness in God's sight. We do not attribute this to organization itself, but rather to the unfaithfulness of the men who bore the honor of headship and leadership without having the true Christian character which preserves the

Church from corruption and gives it spiritual usefulness among men. Alliance of temporal powers with purely ecclesiastical functions is a fatal evil to the Church, particularly where unrestrained by a counteracting force of lay statesmen. It is, for illustration, fortunate for the Church of England that the House of Commons is the great ruling body in the British Empire. Catholic Italy, and even Catholic Europe as a whole, sees that temporal power is evil in the hands of the Pope and the other leaders of the Roman Catholic Church. Philip the Second and the Duke of Alva were the fiery exhibition of fanatical religion joined to tremendous political forces. The cry of horror and sorrow has not yet ceased to rend the ear of human liberty and human sympathy out of the desolated homes of the Low Countries by the German Sea. The world will never fail to send up its "Amen!" and its "Gloria in excelsis!" whenever it thinks of the broken ships and wrecked purposes of the Great Armada of Spain, which set sail for Protestant England, not so much to humble Elizabeth as to destroy the Church of the English people, because it was Protestant against Rome and Philip II. at once. Protestant England is to-day more certainly and more distinctly working out the true destiny of the organized force of the Church than any other European nation by the very fact of the constitutional liberty by which the individual members of the Christian bodies of that great country can bring moral force to bear upon men through intelligent Christian conviction and worthy Christian lives. We do not now cite the influence of the Church as a body for illustration, but call attention to one or two directions of that powerful individuality in effective union. Look at the British and Foreign Bible Society, originated and maintained since 1804 by individual friends and lovers of the word of God for the publication and dissemination of divine truth in many languages over the earth. See the fact that the untrammeled freedom of faith has translated the Scriptures into two hundred and fifty or more tongues and dialects, so that doubtless at this time it is possible for a thousand millions of the human family to read the Bible in their native languages. In 1780 Robert Raikes began his system of Sunday-schools, and pressed the value of the organization upon the attention of individuals until the hearts of piety and zeal in England responded and accepted the institution. From the small seed planted at Gloucester, one hundred and ten years ago, a tree has grown whose fruit and shade have blessed millions, and whose benefits have increased with the roll of the years, until the present actual results are nearly twenty millions in Sunday-schools.

It is true, we believe, that in the republic of the United States, where the life and glory of Christ's religion depend so nearly altogether upon the free association of individuals for its power, Christianity has reached in the modern age its highest popular development. Why is this true? The active movements of all progressive forces are

here intimately associated with, if not originated from, the inspiring energy of Christian truth. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things," says the great apostle to the nations. Is there not a wealth, a world of thinking in this list of subjects? The eight themes or divisions of reflection here given include about all that the life of men contains or stands related to. Set the minds of men to searching for truth in nature, in morals, in mind, in history, in sociology, in immortality, and at once the energy of all possible ability is drawn forth in effort to arrive at the causes, meanings, relations, and ends of things. This naturally involves the utilitarian connection of correlated forces, so that men say, What can be done with this? And the next thought is practical, and they say, Let us apply it. Christianity thus asserts itself as a mighty motive power, turning physical, mental, moral forces in wise directions toward wonderful developments. It does more than this, for it gives character, quality, as well as quantity, of thought, because it puts the word "honorable," "venerable," or "reverend" in immediate relation with the word "true," and makes it stronger by the great forensic or constitutional term "just." No business or pursuit or pleasure of man that has not in it the elements of honor and justice is properly a subject of man's serious thought; but if it has these characteristics it is worthy of earnest and profound thought, for the reason that these elements of the nature and relations of things are preservative of right, guaranteeing substantial good in the interests of mankind. The moral element is distinctly injected into this system of thinking by the word "pure," so that high regard is had for man as a being superior to mere animal nature and possessing a nobility, yet delicacy, of character to be held in due respect and carefully guarded. This allies itself with whatever touches the immortality of man and suggests the growth of every grace which belongs to the perfection of his essential being. How aptly the apostolic mind and inspiration joined with this the whole realm of taste, and that means art under the preceding rules of thinking! "Lovely" is the suggestive term of inspiration here, and includes every beautiful thing in nature and in art, from the bursting seed to the burning sun, and from the simplest sketch to the most magnificent creations of genius. The last three subjects of thought in the apostle's list seem to carry us yet higher, if possible, and afford strong incentives to the noblest and most exalted thinking.

Now, when the simple word of God is placed in contact with the spirit of man under free conditions of intelligent apprehension, is it not manifest that the guidance of divine truth in all human investigations and in all human action has a tendency to elevate and ennoble the order of man's work and to give it hope and strength for great results?

Under the idea of liberty, there is the great element of law, and therefore the law of liberty in Christian doctrine is a cardinal principle of true life and progress, never to degenerate into license and anarchy, nor yet ever to solidify into iron inflexibility. This, of course, is always subject more or less to the imperfections of our nature, but, by the very constitution of God's truth and moral government, the action of his Church is more certainly powerful and radiant when free under civil protection to exercise all the functions of the apostolic code of morals and manners, so that in our glorious country the planting, the germination, the growth, and the fruitage of the seed of Christian truth have been most auspicious and most satisfactory. The light of the Christian system of salvation has cheered the sad hearts of millions, and the action and reaction of Christian example in life and in death have made the world feel that it were worth while to live and to die to serve such a Master as Christ and to trust such a Savior as Jesus. The gracious and natural result has been progress, large progress, and substantial holding of that which has been gained, and thus the true result has come where the true opportunity has been afforded the shining of the true light. The Church labors for real liberty and real opportunity, and the realization of these under God's blessing brings the richest benefits to men sitting in darkness and the shadow of death. This is certain: Given the free truth and free opportunity, and the Church stands forth the exemplary light of the world. M. B. D.

BROTHERLY LOVE HAS CONTINUED.

Among the early impressions about the affairs of the Church which the writer received was one made by a conversation which occurred between a venerable Scotch uncle and a visiting neighbor. It was in 1861, when the war spirit was in full blast all over the country. This uncle, an elder in a Kentucky Church, in whose thoughts the good of the Church was ever uppermost, had taken deep interest in the proceedings of the General Assembly that had just adjourned. He told with particular pride of the part taken by Dr. Milton Bird, whose powerful appeals in behalf of unity and good-will had told so effectively in holding the Church together. What Dr. Bird had said, as described in this conversation, was soon forgotten, but the text of his opening sermon at the Assembly—"Let brotherly love continue"—is remembered. This conversation, overheard incidentally by a listening boy, has had much to do in shaping his spirit and policy since he has himself come to participate in Church affairs. What those noble men held in such high esteem has ever seemed a prime characteristic to be preserved and practiced by a minister of Christ's gospel.

Some months ago the daughter of another venerable elder presented

the writer with a copy of the *Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly*, printed in 1861. It contains the full text of Dr. Bird's opening sermon preached at St. Louis from the above text. The coincidence gives peculiar interest to this sermon, though it was preached more than a quarter of a century ago. A single paragraph will suggest the trend of thought and spirit in this almost prophetic discourse: "In God we trust and follow our conviction of right. In his providence he has cast the lot of some of us in the North, others in the South, East, and West. The destiny that comes upon us is not in the control of our will. Still, we can continue in brotherly love and kindness and preserve the bonds of Christian brotherhood unbroken. Let no root of bitterness spring up among us to destroy the dearest and sweetest ties of brotherly love, which have hitherto kept us in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. That which has convulsed our beloved country and inflamed it with the war spirit should not be suffered to drive the plowshare of ruin over the Church. In our relations as brethren, let the good principles and pure spirit of Christianity continue to connect us as one body. Our doctrinal status is conservatism. We have so far possessed the vitality of a conservative spirit. Unity and integrity have marked our history from the beginning, and we want these glorious characteristics to distinguish it to its end. This is what all true Cumberland Presbyterians want. We have had it hitherto; why not have it in time to come?"

This glowing appeal, fresh from a great heart of love, touched a responsive chord in the breasts of kindred spirits in that Assembly and throughout the Church. Years of strife, a time that tried men's souls, did not suffice to divide the Church, although it rent sister Churches asunder and they are divided still. So fervent has been the spirit of brotherly love in our denomination, and so potent the conservatism in doctrine and practice as described by Dr. Bird, that so soon as the smoke of battle cleared away Cumberland Presbyterians of all sections began to fraternize in close fellowship, and soon not a trace of sectionalism remained in any part of the Church. Our history in this regard is an honorable one in the ecclesiastical world. We have reason to rejoice that our usefulness as a Church has not been impaired by any exhibition of strife before the world. In all the lands of earth there is not to-day a more thoroughly united people. Nor is there one whose history contains more evidences of the ever-present hand of a guiding Providence. No less plainly is the pillar of cloud before us to-day. The past is made brighter and grander by reason of obedience to the apostle's injunction. Its remembrance will help to make our future what it ought to be. "Let brotherly love continue."

W. J. D.

QUERIES, NOTES, AND SUGGESTIONS.

There is in our Protestant Churches some difference of opinion about the exact nature and functions of the ministerial office, and especially about a preacher's relations to other Christians and the ordinary affairs of society and business. Should ministers of the gospel be regarded as a sort of priestly caste separated from ordinary human beings? Should they wear a distinctive garb and assume a peculiar ministerial air, tone, and manner? Should they have special privileges accorded them, and be judged as to their conduct, and measured socially, and dealt with financially, according to a standard that does not apply to other people? Are they members of a separate and superior order, "lords over God's heritage," or but fellow-servants in God's work? No doubt they are to be "ensamples to the flock" and leaders in Christian work; but do they differ from others except in their larger or differing tasks and their heavier burdens of responsibility? We have two communications bearing on this theme. Here is the first one:

MINISTERIAL DIGNITY.

Legitimate questions for discussion in the REVIEW are: What are the elements of that dignity that properly belongs to the true minister of the gospel? and, How much importance should be attached to the necessity of securing and maintaining such dignity? The solution of these questions is not an easy task. We can readily find a variety of illustrations, from the minister whose bearing and deportment when out of his regular work never indicate that he differs from Christians in the humblest walks of life to the one who is so far from the masses that he may be regarded as absolutely unapproachable.

The writer has in mind one of the best educated ministers of the Church who, in private circles, is only a common man, and seems to lose nothing by his apparently undignified bearing; another, one of the most efficient and most popular preachers of the Church, is specially kind to every one, sociable and unreserved, exhibiting but little of what the world calls dignity; still another, who is just as fine a scholar and just as popular, always carries with him an element of dignity not seen in the others, at the same time creating in his brethren a slight suspicion that he is conscious of his superiority over others, and, to many persons, appearing to be almost unapproachable. No difference can be discovered in the popularity and usefulness of these three men in their several fields, yet they differ very greatly in what is called dignity. Judged from these practical illustrations, we ask: What are the elements of true dignity? and, What value shall we assign to it?

W. O. H. PERRY.

Mere dignity of manner soon loses its power to inspire respect or reverence unless it is rooted in dignity of soul and of deeds. If preacher or layman is noble and Christ-like within, and brave and manly and loving in what he does, true dignity will unconsciously shine through his actions and speak in his words: but an assumed impressiveness, a constrained and hollow affectation of loftiness, soon becomes repellant or ridiculous. Kindle the fire of worth and true dignity in your soul and your life, and the shape of the outward flame will take care of itself. The truest dignity, like the truest eloquence and grace of gesture, is not studied but spontaneous and natural. But a minister would better go about on the highest stilts of assumed and unnatural dignity than to run to the opposite extreme of vulgar familiarity and irreverent lightness. Studied dignity is better than studied or unstudied buffoonery. Stilted but reverent phrases are better than irreverent slang.

The next communication touches another branch of the same subject and calls up another important matter:

UNJUST DISCRIMINATION.

1. Clergymen are denounced and hounded to the day of their death for offenses tolerated and excused in laymen. God has but one standard of morals. It is the same for laymen that it is for clergymen. The duties of ministers differ in some respects from those of the laity, and wherein the offices differ there is a difference in responsibility. The standard of practice is too low among laymen. How shall it be raised higher? By preaching the true doctrine that there is no difference—all must obey the same strict commands of God.

2. Sins that are condemned in women are tolerated in men. In the sight of God's law "there is neither male nor female." The world and worldly-minded members of the Church drift away from the standard of God and make the views and customs of men their law. Why should not our boys be expected to be as pure as our girls? Is it not just as moral for our girls to chew tobacco, smoke cigarettes, swear, drink whisky, visit brothels, and debauch themselves as it is for our boys? It most certainly is; yet our boys can do all the things here named and still receive our unbounded sympathy, pardon, and love, while our girls, for the same offenses, are banished from society, denied any share in our kindness or interest in our labors, and are left without any hope of redeeming themselves. Such discrimination is not only unjust, but most pernicious in its effects. Let it go abroad from the pulpit and the home that "there is no difference." Let it be known on the house-tops that what is the standard for the girl is also to be the unvarying standard for the boy. Let it be known and advocated among men that unchastity on the part of woman is no greater an offense against God and decency than the same sin on the part of man. Let it be understood that such an offense by man or woman is a crime against God as grave in the one case as the other. The remedy for such unjust discriminations and such grievous immoralities is plain preaching. Let the pulpit teach the people plainly what are proper moral distinctions.

J. M. KEETON.

Though custom and prejudice sometimes prevent us from seeing it, yet pastors and private Christians, men and women, are really subject to the same moral law and should be judged by the same social standard. But this truth should be preached in the interest, not of laxity, but of greater strictness. Ministers are not to excuse themselves for doing doubtful things because these things are condoned in laymen, but laymen are to govern themselves by the stricter code which they apply to clergymen. Women are not to descend into the doubtful freedom accorded by corrupt custom to men, but men ought to learn womanly purity. But, in such matters, custom and prejudice warp the judgment: and, while we easily see other people's prejudices—those of the opposite political party, or of the rival Church, for example—we fail to discover that our vision also is warped and distorted. Your narrowest neighbor sees some things with clearer eyes than you do; none of us see as God sees. A correspondent calls attention to the danger of being thus blinded in our worship.

WORSHIPING IN TRUTH.

To worship in *truth* is as important as to worship in Spirit; and yet the truth is buried in the rubbish of so many conflicting dogmas that, with our minds naturally disposed to prejudice, it is difficult to know when we have the truth. We sometimes believe the traditions of our fathers to the sacrifice of the truth, and follow the interpretation of Scripture which has been given us, let it contradict the truth never so much, rather than what the Bible actually teaches. To confess the truth would in some places subject the confessor to being cast out of the synagogue. The character of God has been so wofully misrepresented that many would hardly know him by his true character. The unknown God is ignorantly worshiped. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not know the truth."

J. L. HUGHEY.

To look at things from another's point of view is a good way to cure ourselves of prejudice. There is gain in reading the views of our opponents. It is well also to give some attention to general literature; and there are some things even in the field of fiction that ministers can not afford to be ignorant of. But in getting the good we must watch against the evil. Therefore, the warning in the following communication is timely:

THE POISON OF POLITE LITERATURE.

"Polite literature" is the term used by many writers of the present day to represent the writings of the *belles-lettres* class of authors. Of course, no human literary production contains all truth, and not every author designs to teach moral truth, much less the truth of the Bible. In nearly all the works of this class of writers there is something to be admired; something beautiful, inspiring, and helpful to thoughtful readers. But it is sad to note that too often there is that also which poisons the mind. How sad that brilliant and charming novelists like George Eliot and Count Tolstoi, thoughtful essayists like Emerson and Carlyle, and gifted poets like Goethe and Matthew Arnold should not only fail to teach the pure morality of Jesus Christ, but in some instances deny the supernatural and reject the teachings of the Bible.

We can have patience with a writer who does not assume to teach moral truth, but when an author purposely introduces into his writings the leaven of unbelief or the more positive forms of disbelief he exposes himself and his productions to the just criticisms of his Christian readers. These insinuations of unbelief and these subtle suggestions of disbelief are the sources whence come the corrupting influences of our so-called polite literature. Manifestly he who reads such productions must be constantly on his guard. He must be independent of them as sources of religious instruction. Christianity has its roots in a divine revelation, and not in the literary productions of this or any other age. Christianity is infallible because it is derived from an infallible source. Hence, we should go to the Bible for our knowledge of the true religion. No product of the human mind can be more trustworthy than the human mind itself. Any man-made system of religion will be as perfect as its author, and no more so. The Bible is the word of God and the "only infallible rule of faith and practice." We should read the productions of these gifted writers, but not for the purpose of fixing our religious beliefs. A good rule is: Read no unwholesome or unsettling book.

A. G. BERGEN.

Among the contributions to this department are several on questions on doctrine and Bible interpretation. One calls up the doctrine of Christian perfection:

PERFECT LOVE AND "REMAINING CORRUPTION."

The divine command is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Is it *possible* in this life for one to fulfill the highest demands of this law of love? Our Confession of Faith says: "When the sinner is born of God he loves him supremely, and steadfastly proposes to do his will; yet, because of remaining corruption, and of his imperfect knowledge of moral and spiritual things, he often wills what in itself is sinful."

Again, "Those who, in their obedience and love, attain the greatest height in this life still fall short of that perfection which the divine law requires." According to this language, no one loves God to the extent of the demands of the law. Dr. Mark Hopkins said: "He who has a *perfect* love of God can have no more hatred of any of his creatures than God himself has." Paul said: "Now we know in *part*." With our limited knowledge of God and our want of a perfect conception of his love to us, and of the relation of Christ and believers, can we love the Lord and fulfill the demands of the moral law as we shall when "this mortal" shall have "put on immortality," and when we shall see "face to face," and know even as also we are known? Is it possible for any one, during his mortal life, to love God perfectly?

L. J. HAWKINS.

Though it may be difficult to find an answer to the question here propounded which will be satisfactory to every body, it is well to ask it if we are thereby stirred to daily efforts to solve it in our own lives by striving to be transformed by the renewing of our minds, that we may "prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

Another writer calls up a theological question which has puzzled Christian thinkers since the days of the fathers:

INFANT SALVATION.

Protestant Christians almost universally believe that infants dying in infancy are saved. It is the faith of far the larger part of these that in order to be saved infants must be regenerated; that they are saved through the merits of Jesus Christ. When are these infants who die before the years of moral accountability regenerated? Are all children in a saved condition and heirs of everlasting life during the years of childhood? If so, what of those who grow to manhood and womanhood and are not then Christians? Were they once in a regenerated state, heirs to a heavenly inheritance, but lost their heirship after they became adults? That would be the worst kind of apostasy. It would make it necessary for every person living to adult age to be regenerated the second time in order to be saved. The truth seems to be that no children are regenerated until they come to die, and that all children dying in infancy are regenerated in death, or at the time of death, by the Holy Spirit, and saved through the atoning efficacy of the blood of Christ.

JAMES BEST.

Perhaps no better solution of this question than the one here presented can be given. We are sure that the little ones that have gone from us are safe, for "of such is the kingdom of heaven," though theologians may not agree as to how they are saved.

A question of Bible interpretation affecting the much-discussed theme of water baptism is the subject of our next letter:

CHRIST'S BAPTISM.

"What was he (Christ) baptized for?" "He was baptized to induct him into his priestly office." Was Jesus a priest after the order of the Aaronic priesthood? Psalm cx. 4: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent; thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedeck." And in Revelation v. 5, he is called "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David." Why was he baptized by John? "For thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," says Jesus. Was "righteousness" the law concerning the Aaronic priesthood? Who will point out the law or "righteousness" which it became him to fulfill in his baptism? Was Jesus not a Levite? Was not John a high-priest? Was his mother not of the daughters of Levi or Aaron? Was not the mother of Jesus a cousin to Elizabeth, and hence a Levite? As a Jew, did not Jesus fulfill every jot and tittle of the law of Moses? Did he not perform the functions of the office of the Levite when he went into the temple and took charge of it and drove out the money-changers, as he did during each return of his order in the three years of his public ministry? Had he performed functions unauthorized by the law of Moses, would not the Jews have gladly seized the opportunity to condemn him? Did not Jesus silence the Jews when they demanded of him his authority for performing certain duties and functions in and about the temple, which usually were performed by the Levites in their course? (Matt. xxi. 23–27.) The answers to the foregoing questions seem to be very apparent and to point to the following conclusions: 1. Jesus, being a Levite, was ceremonially cleansed according to the law of Moses, which was necessary prior to entering the public service as a Levite. Being at the time of John's baptism of proper age to enter upon his public ministrations, he was then and there set apart to his office by John, the high-priest, and thus he "fulfilled all righteousness." 2. The mode or manner of the application of water to Jesus by John is thus made clear, for the law of Moses settles it beyond dispute. (Num. viii. 6, 7.)

S. H. McELVAIN.

Next we have an echo from a query suggested in our last number. It comes from an octogenarian correspondent who has been long known as one of the leading preachers and thinkers of the Church:

SIN AND ITS ORIGIN.

In the October number (page 498) of the CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW we find this: "A veteran pastor calls up a deep question connected with the origin of evil—original sin;" and then the editor asks, "Who will answer his question?" It is a question which has puzzled many ministers and other persons who have not studied the Bible with sufficient care to learn its teachings on this subject, or whose studies have been under the influence of a theological postulate having no proof from the Bible. To clear this question, however, from all perplexity it will be necessary to find out in the first place what sin is. A clear and well-defined idea of what sin is will help us greatly in finding a proper answer to the question under consideration. Let us go to Webster in the first place: "*Sin, n.* Transgression of the law of God; moral deficiency in the character." This corresponds with all the definitions found in the Bible. In it, it is said, "Sin is the transgression of the law." (1 John iii. 4.) Again, 1 John v. 17: "All unrighteousness is sin." These several definitions all make sin to be an act—an act of the mind—a volition or act of will. If sin be an act of the will it is not an organism. Sin, therefore—being an act of transgression of the law of God, the eternal and immutable rule of right—may be committed by doing that which the law forbids or refusing to do what it requires. In either case it is an act of the sinner or actor.

Now, so far as angels are sinners, and as to the first act of transgression of the great moral law by which they became devils we are not informed in the Bible. Doubtless this occurred before the creation of man. But as to the first sin among mankind we have a clear history in the third chapter of Genesis. But a puzzling question arises here. Some suppose that Adam, by the sinful act of eating the forbidden fruit, changed his moral nature, and then transmitted a sinful nature to his posterity, so that all his descendants come into the world with a sinful nature which is the source of all sinful acts. This is a theological assumption without Bible proof. There is not a text or passage in the Bible that says or teaches that man has a sinful nature, "*and that by an order of things which God has established.*" If this be so, and this sinful nature be the source, the origin of sin, then it is as clear as light that God the great Creator of angels and men, is the originator of sin. Such an assumption comes very near blasphemy. God is love, but he hates sin, because it is violation of the pure, eternal, holy, just, and good law under which man and angels were created. Angels and men had power to obey the law, as well as power to violate it. Man being created in the image of God—a free agent—could have kept the law, and ought to have done so; but he did not; and the fault is his own, and he can not be excused by any plea of a sinful nature. This subject might be elaborated to great extent.

J. T. A. HENDERSON.

In another letter a thoughtful pastor presents a suggestive query about a Scripture verse:

FAITH.

What is the meaning of "faith" as found in Hebrews xii. 2: "Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith?" Is it that state of mind or heart which brings a person into saving relation with Christ? or is it the truth believed? or does it refer to the trust exercised by Jesus, as human, in God his heavenly Father? If the latter, then does not this passage present Jesus as the

most complete and perfect model of trust in God? Does not this view best harmonize with what precedes and what follows the verse mentioned?

H. R. CROCKETT.

Leaving the answer to this question to those who make a specialty of critical and expository Bible studies, we close the list of contributions for this number with one on the nature of law.

NATURAL LAW AND FATALITY.

We are told that Plato wrote over the door of his study, "Let no one enter here who is ignorant of Geometry." Aristotle is credited with saying: "If motion be not understood we can not but be ignorant of nature." May we not say in addition, Let no one enter nature's sacred precincts as a teacher of her great truths who is ignorant of *Natural law*—who has not obtained a clear conception of what is meant by that term? Pope says:

"Nature and nature's laws lay hid in night,
God said, let Newton be, and all was light."

But this gush of poetic enthusiasm needs some qualification. Much darkness remains because men are ignorant of the nature of natural laws. Some men, it seems, never will learn that a law of nature is neither a potent force, nor an acting entity; and, that it necessitates nothing, *does* nothing, and *is* nothing but the manifestation of God's method, or the constant and regular order of his procedure, in producing and maintaining the beauty, order, and harmony of the universe. The natural laws do not force the Creator; nor do they act independently. It is contrary to the nature of a metaphor that it should possess the properties of a triangle; but not more so than it is contrary to the idea of natural law that it should necessitate the Ruler of the universe to any particular course of action. Law is simply a revelation of that course of action which God has decided to pursue. Natural law, then, does not, either in the natural or spiritual world, imply fatality. Government by law, in either world, excludes the possibility of fatality. Mr. Drummond's critics are, therefore, misled by their inattention to, or their ignorance of, what is meant by "*the laws of nature*," else they would not suppose that "His fundamental principle of identity means fatality."

B. MARGESON.

The editor solicits contributions for this department from all the readers of the REVIEW.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE SERMON BIBLE: PSALM LXXVII. TO SONG OF SOLOMON. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway.

The publishers of this series and of that of the Expositor's Bible are doing useful service to the sound literature and to the pulpit of the present times. It is somewhat difficult to give the reader of this notice a just view of the contents of this volume. It contains short, striking, and suggestive thoughts on forcible passages of the books within its scope. It has a vast variety of quotations from able and skillful authors and manifold references to Bible texts, so that the passages noticed are not consecutive, but selected and deemed of peculiar interest. A pastor would probably find the work very useful in the matter of suggesting subjects, texts, and points of thought for sermons and discussions. The mechanical work is certainly well done, and the price ($1.50) is very reasonable for so substantial and large a book. We are pleased to see such literary and mechanical results.

AN EXPLANATORY AND PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY OF THE NOTED NAMES OF FICTION, including also familiar Pseudonyms, Surnames bestowed by eminent men, and analogous popular appellations often referred to in literature and conversation: By William A. Wheeler. Nineteenth edition with an appendix by Charles G. Wheeler. Houghton, Mifflin & Company, Boston and New York.

This valuable book of reference whose main design is to explain the allusions which occur in modern standard literature to noted fictitious persons and places, including mythological allusions, was first published in 1865. The author contributed to Webster's Dictionary in 1864 the "Vocabulary of the Names of Noted Fictitious Persons and Places," but the work before us, though based on this vocabulary, contained in its original form nearly seventeen hundred new articles. The present edition, published in April last, has an appendix by Charles G. Wheeler, nephew of the author, covering the literature of the quarter of a century that has elapsed since the work was first issued. This dictionary is chiefly designed to elucidate English and American literature but it also contains many noted names from other modern literatures. It is a well-known and standard work, and should be on the table of every minister of the gospel as well as of every student of English literature.

PELOUBET'S NOTES. The well-known Commentary on the Sunday-school Lesson. Explanatory, Illustrative, Doctrinal, Practical, Suggestive. With Illustrations, Charts, Library References, Suggestions to Teachers, and two finely Colored Maps. Price, $1.25; Interleaved Edition, $2.00; French Morocco, Limp, Round Corners, Gilt, $2.00: By Rev. Dr. F. N. and M. A. Peloubet, W. A. Wilde & Co., Boston Mass.

The idea of issuing an annual comprehensive commentary on the Sunday-school lessons, bound in a convenient and handsome volume, originated we believe with Dr. Peloubet. These volumes have proved most helpful to thousands of teachers and students of the Bible, and they have a permanent value which makes them well worth preserving in the library of every pastor or teacher.

EUROPEAN SCHOOLS: OR, WHAT I SAW IN THE SCHOOLS OF GERMANY, FRANCE, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND. By L. R. Klemm, Ph.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This is volume twelve of the "International Education" series published by the Appletons. The author spent ten months traveling in Europe and visiting the schools of that country. He kept his eyes open, and has presented in this book an abundance of facts and suggestions which will be exceedingly valuable and helpful to the teachers of our country. He gives descriptions of appliances, apparatus, buildings, etc., and also of the methods of teaching. The book is written in a pleasing, entertaining style, and is illustrated with a great many cuts. The matter is confined to industrial and common schools. We heartily recommend the book, and would like to see it in the hands of every teacher in the land.

BIBLE STUDIES FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT, covering the International Sunday-school Lesson for 1890. By George F. Pentecost, D.D. A. S. Barnes & Company, New York.

The Sunday-school Lessons for this year embrace selections covering the whole record of the Lord's life in Luke's Gospel; so this volume will have a permanent value as a continuous commentary on that book. The method of treatment is clear and methodical, the style is lucid and attractive. We can heartily recommend this volume to teachers in our Sunday-schools.

THE CONTINUOUS CREATION: An application of the Evolutionary Philosophy to the Christian Religion, by Myron Adams. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1889.

This is a work in which the reader will meet with surprises on almost every page. He will be astonished at the reasonings and conclusions of the author, and yet he will be impressed with their reasonableness and simplicity.

The author is a minister, pastor of the Plymouth Congregational Church, at Rochester, New York. His book shows that he is not disposed to let Church creeds and theological dogmas prevent his recognizing what there is of true worth in the philosophical and scientific thought of recent years. He realizes that religious thought is now passing through a revolution which will require us to modify materially many ideas which have been handed down to us from our forefathers.

The argument of the book is based upon the premise that the theory of evolution in its widest sense is true; that all things now existing including human life and human institutions and even religion itself, are the result of a process of development; that the immediate and only cause of this development is the continuous and immanent action of the divine energy, manifesting itself in every phenomenon of nature, mind, and soul; and that nothing could exist for a moment without the sustaining power of God's will.

In order to carry his theory to its logical conclusions, the author is compelled to discredit many of the time-honored articles of Christian belief, such as the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, the fall of man, and the actual occurrence of miracles as commonly understood. He holds that the Bible is not an infallible book, but simply a record of religion's gradual growth; that the writers of the book were not inspired, but that the men whose history it records were.

The most interesting chapters and those in which the argument is at its best are those on "The Continuous Creation," "The Idea of God," "The Problem of Evil," "Resident Forces," "Philosophy and Faith," "Prayer," and "Faith and Intuition."

While we are not prepared to adopt all of the author's views, we recommend the book as an exceedingly suggestive one. It will be quite useful, if it does nothing but show that the theory of evolution is not essentially atheistic, and that true religion has really nothing to fear from well-established scientific theories.

MENTAL EVOLUTION IN MAN: Origin of human Faculty, by George John Romanes. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1889.

Dr. Romanes' work on "Mental Evolution in Animals," is already well known. It was, however, but preparatory to this, the greater and more difficult work. The proposition which he attempts to prove is that the human mind differs from the animal mind only in degree and not in kind. If this proposition be proved, and the general theory of development be accepted, it naturally follows that the human mind can be no exception to the continuity of evolutionary progress.

The greatest difficulty in the way of the evolutionist has always been the gap between man and the lower animals. The persistent and earnest search which has been made for the last twenty years for the missing link has been but poorly rewarded. So little has been found indeed that many biologists, and among them Wallace who with Darwin was the pioneer in the doctrine of development, have come to the conclusion that human intelligence could not have come in the natural course of evolution. Physically, man differs so little from the higher animals that most biologists are willing to concede the development of the human body. The final contest is, therefore, over the mental and moral man. It is to the task of deciding this contest that our author devotes himself.

In carrying out his argument, Romanes finds it necessary to reclassify certain psychological acts which have heretofore been confused. He shows that there is a class of acts or states intermediate between what are commonly called *percepts* and *concepts*. These he calls *recepts*. To this intermediate group are referred those acts in both men

and animals which involve a rudimentary process of reasoning without self-consciousness. A recept includes what is common to several percepts. The forming of recepts is a sort of an unconscious generalization. Thus an animal forms the idea of "something good to eat," "something dangerous," etc. Aside from the author's argument, his minute investigations into the psychological processes among animals and children furnish a most valuable contribution to science.

The argument is that as animals convert percepts into recepts, man goes just one step farther and converts recepts into concepts in exactly the same manner. The weak point in the argument is that self-consciousness, which is essential to the concept and at the same time is that which is peculiarly characteristic of man, is not accounted for satisfactorily.

By no means the least interesting part of the book is that devoted to the discussion of language. It is traced back to the tone and gesture languages of uncultivated savages, and then to the sign and tone language of animals. Here also, as in the case of self-consciousness, the argument fails.

After all, speech, self-consciousness, and the moral sense constitute a barrier between man and the animal which is impassible. If they have been developed, it must have been through an agency above and outside of nature. Indeed, natural processes explain nothing. We can no more explain gravitation than we can consciousness. We know no more of the real cause of chemical action than we do of thought. In the last analysis, we are driven to the hypothesis of an Omnipotent Will lying back of all phenomena. This is none other than God himself. Upon this ground all science and all philosophy must ultimately meet.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE AS ALLIES; or Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge: By James Thompson Bixby. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1889.

The author of this little volume of 226 pages attacks the question of the conflict of science and religion on entirely new grounds. He justly claims that we need not expect to find in detail exact correspondence between the teachings of science and the written words of revelation, because of the fallibilities of interpretation on the one hand, and the imperfect state and advancing condition of scientific knowledge on the other. He claims that there can be no real conflict between science and religion, because they occupy spheres which are exclusive of each other—viz.: the spiritual and the material. The antagonism has been the result of ignorance. Religion and science have both claimed to possess exclusive information and, consequently, a rightful sovereignty of knowledge. Each must allow to the other the right of authority within its sphere. He then gives an inductive proof of the two essen-

tials of theism—the existence of the soul and of God, arriving at the conclusion that science and religion are fellow-laborers in the divine service. This is one of the best books on the relation of science to religion that has been published. Its argument is logical, sensible, and sound. It deserves wide and careful reading.

A GENERAL HISTORY FOR COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS: By P. V. N. Myers, A.M. Ginn & Company, Boston, Mass.

Knowledge was never before so widely disseminated as now, readers and students were never before so numerous. But not even those who devote their whole time to study can minutely explore all fields of research or read voluminous treatises on all subjects; and there are multitudes thirsting for knowledge who can get but a taste of it by snatching from the hours of daily work and duty a little leisure for intellectual culture. It is clear, therefore, that we need both for students and others brief and comprehensive treatises on the different branches of science and literature.

To pack the history of the human race in all its branches from the earliest dawn of knowledge to the present time into an easily handled volume of 750 pages is certainly a difficult task. Of course only the outlines and a few of the most striking facts and events can be given in such a treatise; but a work of this kind is useful as a book of reference even to those deeply read in history, and it is almost a necessity to beginners to enable them to get a grasp of the whole subject and to read more voluminous treatises intelligently. The volume before us, therefore, supplies an essential need. It is based on the author's "Ancient History," and "Mediæval and Modern History," and embraces in briefer form all that is contained in these two volumes. The author's method is set forth in the following extract from the preface of "Mediæval and Modern History:" "My aim has been to deal with the essential elements, not the accidental features of the life of the race. The book, therefore, gives prominence to the virtues rather than the vices of men. It concerns itself mainly with those phenomena and institutions which are the expression of the permanent tendencies of the developing spirit of humanity." We can heartily recommend the work, and the two volumes of which it is an abridgement, to all who want comprehensive text-books on history embracing in systematic arrangement the old facts and the results of the latest discoveries and researches.

THE PETRINE CLAIMS: A Critical Inquiry, by Richard Frederick Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This compact treatise is made up of a series of articles which appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review* (Episcopal), London, in 1878–

1884. It is not a discussion of theological issues but deals solely with "the legal aspect of the claim laid by the papacy to sovereign authority over the Church universal." This papal claim as stated by the author is that the Roman Church is not merely "the mother and mistress of all Churches, the largest and most authoritive portion of the Christian body, . . . but that she is the *whole* Church; . . . and that all other Christian bodies are mere sects and schisms from the unity of the one body of Christ." The object of the book is to show that this claim is not warranted by any divine charter contained in the Holy Scripture, and that the primacy of Rome was not so recognized and approved in the ancient Church or so exercised and accepted through the centuries as to add a title by prescription to the supposed scriptural charter.

The various phases of this controversy—scriptural, historical, legal, and critical—between papal Rome and the rest of Christendom are thoroughly discussed in eight well-written chapters. Those who wish to study this question exhaustively will find this volume very helpful.

OUR REST DAY: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND CLAIMS: With Special Reference to Present-Day Needs. By Thomas Hamilton, D.D., Belfast.

This is a Prize Essay. The Sabbath Alliance of Scotland offered four prizes of one hundred, fifty, thirty, and twenty pounds respectively, for the best four essays on the Sabbath, which should be sent to them within a limited time. Over two hundred and forty essays were lodged with the Secretary, and the committee of five learned divines, who examined them, unanimously decided that the merits of this essay called for the first prize. Its title well indicates its contents and its method. Where so much has been written on the Sabbath, we do not expect, on opening a new treatise on the subject, to find any thing particularly striking by reason of fresh materials or novelty of treatment. The literature of the Sabbath question is immense, and one who is at all versed in it will scarcely tarry long, in reading the discussion contained in this essay on the origin and history of the holy day. Where we most need help, nowadays, is in making application of the Sabbath-observance principles which we hold, in adjusting ourselves to the varied relations and duties of our complex civilization. And it is along this line that we may derive valuable hints from the treatise before us. It will prove useful in assisting many to solve the Sunday question, as it relates to such matters as preparations for the Sabbath, Saturday night shopping, Sunday trading, the opening of museums and picture galleries and libraries on Sunday, Sunday traveling and excursions, Sunday street-cars, Sunday mails, Sunday social gatherings, etc. To friends of the Sabbath we commend the perusal of this book. It is published in this country by Wilbur B. Ketcham, 71 Bible House, New York. Price 75 cents.

A HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. Brodrick, D.C.L., Warden of Merton College. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company.

This condensed history of the University of Oxford possesses the merit of having been written by an accomplished scholar, one officially connected with the University, who had access to a large storehouse of facts. It was no small task to give in succinct form a clear and impartial history of such an institution, one of such weight and influence, and one which has passed through seven centuries of such varied experiences. While the author does not fail to tell us of the rise, growth, and influence of the various colleges, the founding of libraries, and the social and intellectual life of the University, the greater portion of the book is devoted to the part the University has played in politics and religion. The author closes with an account of the "Oxford Movement," the Neo-Catholic Revival, and with a statement as to the state, influence, and character of the University under Queen Victoria.

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE UNITED STATES. By Townsend McCoun. Cloth, $5\frac{1}{2}$ by $7\frac{1}{4}$ inches, 43 maps, $1.00.

No method of studying history is more rational or improving than that by progressive maps. The maps in this volume unfold the progress of discovery, and picture the struggle of the European nationalities for ascendency on this new continent, and show the progressive development of our great republic. The first map is that of Toscanelli drawn in 1474, eighteen years before Columbus sailed from Palos westward. It shows what were the guesses of those who lived in the fifteenth century concerning the size of the earth and the nature of the lands across the western seas. The maps which follow show how, from the crude outlines of the first explorers, the knowledge of these new coasts and islands and continents gradually reached form and certainty. The author defines the office of historical geography in the realm of political history to be the drawing of a map of a country as it appears after each of the different changes it has gone through and the pointing out the historical causes which have led to the changes on the map. This is well done in this little volume. We recommend it to all students and teachers of the history of our country.

THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. Delivered at the Royal Institution, London, during the month of March, 1887, by F. Max Müller. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 75 cents.

The subjects of the three lectures are "The Simplicity of Language," "Identity of Language and Thought," and "The Simplicity of Thought," making a very interesting book. Its central thought is, We can not think without thinking in words, which Professor Müller regards as a very important proposition, and which if proved will

revolutionize the science of thought. The book has an appendix made up of a correspondence on the subject between the author and Francis Galton, the Duke of Argyll, and George J. Romanes. The writer of this notice can not see that Mr. Müller's view of the question has the important influence on the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures which has been attributed to it by at least one reviewer. By words the author does not mean mere spoken or written signs, but symbols of any sort; and whether such was actually the fact or not, it is quite conceivable that the holy men of old might have been inspired as to what they should write without being inspired in their choice of words in which to write it. It may be possible for the mind to think without thinking in words of any kind, but it does not seem to us possible for it to present the result of its thinking to its own consciousness without first vesting it in an image or symbol of some sort. And I do not know what my mind is doing unless what it is doing is addressed in some way to itself as conscious.

THE PLEASURES OF LIFE: By Sir John Lubbock, Bart. M.P., D.C.L., LL.D. New York: John B. Alden, Publisher.

We may say of this small book that it contains much wisdom and sound advice. It is written from the point of view of a man of letters and of practical philosophy. The author pleads for the happiness of human life because of our advantages in the midst of society such as an Englishman of the present day may enjoy. The argument is a good one, taken from the duty of happiness, the happiness of duty, books, friends, travel, home, science, and education. There is much learning in these pages, yet much beauty and truth in simple language. From the author's position as a man of science we might not expect it, but in a list of names of a hundred valuable books, as he puts them, he mentions the Bible first. It is followed by a wonderful variety.

A SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND, from the earliest times to the present day: By Justin H. McCarthy. New York: John B. Alden, Publisher.

Whoever wishes to read a Catholic history of Ireland, in which all the innocence, truth, beauty, and goodness are on the side of the Catholic, and all the crime, oppression, falsehood, and shame are on the side of the Protestant, will do well to read this book. It is a record of wretchedness and wrongs, and when one has read a while he closes the book with a feeling of genuine sadness over the misfortunes of a gifted race, but the exceeding bitterness running through every page arouses a serious doubt of the justice of the cause it represents, and a question as to how far a fair-minded reviewer would go toward presenting quite a different view.

CHARACTER AND COMMENT. Selected from the Novels of W. D. Howells. By Minnie Macoun. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York.

We know that it is the fashion of late to speak lightly of W. D. Howells' fiction. His plots, it is said, do not deserve the name, and his chapters are sometimes tedious and prosy, and he talks and causes his characters to talk about things which the reader is not interested in. But for us there is a charm in this writer's panoramas of life. True, when the story is finished you feel that completeness has not been reached. The procession of events on which the curtain has been lifted shows no signs of ending until the curtain suddenly falls, and you are left wondering what would have appeared had you been permitted to look a little longer. You have not been treated to a complete drama, but you have looked on a section of the endless march of life, and into the thoughts, and motives, and hearts of the people who have been made to pass before you.

One of the best charms of Howells is the wise and witty sayings he puts into the mouths of his characters. In the volume before us Miss Macoun has, with admirable taste, culled the very best of these aphorisms and witticisms. He who wants the cream of Howells' writings without any of the skim-milk can not do better than purchase this dainty little volume.

THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE, AND OTHER PLEAS AND DISCUSSIONS: By Frances Power Cobb. Boston: George H. Ellis.

The title is happily suggestive of the contents of this volume of 243 pages. There are six essays, three of which are Pleas and three Discussions. By the former is meant an argument in which the author seeks to win the reader to her way of thinking on the topics in hand, "The Scientific Spirit of the Age," "The Education of the Emotions," and "Progressive Judaism." By the latter is meant a setting forth of views, *pro and con*, on the relation of knowledge to happiness, the real character of our common processes of thought and the respective claims of town and country life. The titles of the latter essays are, "Thoughts about Thinking," "To Know or not to Know," and "The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse." Regardless of the other five papers, all of which are of high merit, the first not only furnishes the title, but also gives tone and character to the volume. Granting all that science may justly claim for her achievements, the author combats the assumption of science to put religion "on sufferance only," to form the chief basis of intellectual education or to dictate the true standard in art or in morals.

Granting all the achievements which science has won in the realm of physical discovery, all its enormous contributions in many ways to the well-being of man, it still remains true that if science "only fosters

our lower mental faculties while it paralyzes and atrophies the higher; if Reverence and Sympathy and Modesty dwindle in its shadow; if Art and Poetry shrink at its touch; if Morality be undermined and perverted by it; and if Religion perish at its approach as a flower vanishes before the frost, then must the assertion be denied that 'nothing can advance human prosperity so much as science.'"

That such is the tendency of much that is seen in the modern scientific spirit the author undertakes to prove. Her argument is based on right premises, the reasoning is lucid and the force of her plea is irresistible, unless there be a lack of faith and reverence for the Infinite in the mind of the reader. "Science has given us many precious things, but she takes away things more precious still."

The plea for the right education of the emotions, through the contagion of good and noble sentiments, in the home, the school, and in social relations, is one of the best sections of the book and is unsurpassed in its line.

MAGAZINE NOTES.

Besides two serial stories, "The Tragic Muse," by Henry James, and "The Begum's Daughter," by Edwin Lassetter Bynner, now running in the *Atlantic Monthly*, that magazine has in the last three months published short stories by Octave Thanet and Charles W. Chesnutt. There have been historical studies by John Fiske, Edward F. Haywood, Eben Greenough Scott, and Albert G. Browne, and poems by T. B. Aldrich, C. P. Cranch, Edith M. Thomas, and others. These numbers are specially rich in essays on political economy, and on literary and social themes. The editorial department and book reviews are admirable.

Under "Topics of the Time," the *Century Magazine* gives from month to month brief but interesting and suggestive editorial articles on living themes. Each number of this magazine contains not less than one hundred and fifty pages of the choicest matter, consisting of essays, discussions, stories, poetry, and sketches by the best writers. Among the good things promised in the current volume are a series of "Present-day Papers," by leading clergymen; also, a series on "The Nature of Revelation," by Professor George P. Fisher.

Harper's Magazine leads all others in the variety and excellence of its pictorial illustrations. The December number has six charming short stories.

In the *Quarterly Review* of the M. E. Church, South, for January, Rev. J. Thomas Pate gives the "History of Sunday-schools." In the December number Professor J. Forster Smith, of Vanderbilt University, has a curious and interesting discussion of "Honorary Degrees." This is one of the best quarterly magazines that comes to our table.

Lippincott's Magazine presents each month a complete novel by a leading author. The story in the December number, entitled "All He Knew," by John Hubberton, describes the adventures and trials of a released convict.

The Chautauquan (T. L. Flood, Meadville, Pa.) has assumed the regular magazine form, and presents more than its usual variety of interesting and instructive reading matter.

Scribner's Magazine begins its seventh volume with the new year. Though sold at twenty-five cents, while the other leading monthlies are sold at thirty-five cents, it seems not inferior to its rivals. It has steadily improved since the issue of the first number.

Rev. Edward L. Houghton, in the *Universalist Quarterly* for October, discusses the "Philological Argument for the Inspiration of the New Testament." This number has also an able discussion of "Evolution and Religion," by Rev. James Eastwood. Under the head of "Presbyterian Unrest," the editor writes about the proposed revision of the Westminster Confession.

"The Minister's Mental Outfit," by J. H. Allen, in the November *Unitarian Review*, is a paper well worth reading. In the December number Celia Parker Woolley writes on the "Effect of the Higher Education of Woman on her Religious Belief," and Francis E. Abbott, in the leading article, defends "scientific theology" as "the ground of all liberal religion."

With the October number the publication of the *Presbyterian Review* was discontinued. This last issue is one of the ablest of the series of forty numbers. It contains articles on the revision of the Westminster Creed by Drs. Schaff and DeWitt, a discussion of the Atonement by Professor Ransom B. Welch, and a number of able editorial articles.

We welcome to our table the first number of the *Quarterly Review* of the United Brethren in Christ. It is printed on heavy paper, in clear type, and is a handsome magazine, with an interesting variety of contents. In an article entitled "Why We Exist as a Denomination," Rev. T. D. Adams sets forth the peculiarities and excellences of the doctrine and usage in the Church which he represents.

The successive numbers of the *Popular Science Monthly* contain such a variety of articles of scientific and every-day interest that it is difficult in these brief quarterly notes to give our readers a just idea of the value of this publication. Some of the articles in the issues of the last three months which would be of special interest to our readers are "Evolution as Taught in a Theological Seminary," "Education in Ancient Egypt," "Israelite and Indian," "Plain Words on the Woman Question," and "New Phases of the Chinese Problem."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Some of the volumes in this list have been discussed by us in reviews more or less extended. Others will receive such notices hereafter. The receipt of all books or pamphlets sent the CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW will be promptly acknowledged, and important works will receive more extended notice.

From A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, New York.—*Systematic Theology*. A compendium and commonplace book designed for the use of theological students. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. *The Human Moral Problem*. An inquiry into some dark points connected with the human necessities for a Savior. By R. R. Conn. *The Beginnings of Ethics*. By Rev. Carroll Cutler, D.D. 324 pages. Topical index. $1.25. *The Pastoral Epistles*. By Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham, England. 435 pages. $1.50. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. By the Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, B.A., Headingley College, Leeds. 460 pages. $1.50. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. By the Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D. 399 pages. $1.50.

Macmillan & Co., London and New York.—The following volumes of "English Men of Action" series (60 cents per volume) have been placed on our table: *Monk*. By Julian Corbett. *Strafford*. By H. D. Traill.

Midland Publishing Company, Madison, Wis.—*Treatise on Divorce*. By Charles Caverno. ("Social Science" series, No. 2.)

Ginn & Co., Boston.—*A General History for Colleges and High Schools*. By P. V. N. Myers, A.M.

John B. Alden, New York.—*A Tent by the Lake, and Other Poems*. By D. J. Donahoe.

Fords, Howard & Hulbert, New York.—*Unto the Uttermost* (a volume of sermons). By James M. Campbell.

D. Appleton & Co., New York.—*European Schools*, or What I Saw in the Schools of Germany, France, Austria, and Switzerland. By L. R. Klemm, Ph.D.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.—*Character and Comment*. Selected from the novels of W. D. Howells. By Minnie Macoun. *The Continuous Creation*. An application of the evolutionary philosophy to the Christian religion. By Myron Adams.

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York.—*Bible Studies From the New Testament*, covering the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1890. By George F. Pentecost, D.D.

Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.—*Wilfred*. A story with a happy ending. *The Imitation of Christ*. By Thomas á Kempis. Now for the first time set forth in rhythmic sentences, according to the original intention of the author. With a preface by H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L. $1.50. *Unknown Switzerland*. By Victor Tissot. Translated from the twelfth edition by Mrs. Wilson. $1.50.

Roberts Brothers, Boston.—*History of the People of Israel*. By Ernest Renan. Two volumes. I. Israel till the time of David. 362 pages. II. From the reign of David to the capture of Samaria. 445 pages.

From W. A. Wilde & Co., Boston.—*Peloubet's Notes*. A Commentary on the Sunday-school Lessons for 1890. Cloth $1.25.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1890.

VOL. II. No. 2.

REDEMPTIVE RENOVATION.

MAN'S intelligent operations are carried forward by the use of means adapted to ends foreseen and chosen. The execution of an intelligent plan may occupy many years, during which numerous agencies, employing a great variety of materials, converge to a common end for the execution of which the whole process was chosen, directed, and modified as required in view of the result sought. Beside one of the main streets in the city of Pittsburgh, numerous workmen are engaged in the erection of a vast structure to be used as a post-office. As the writer passed the spot several years ago, the workmen were making a great excavation; at a later period, they were engaged in driving into the floor of the excavation trunks of great trees which grew in distant forests; now they are lifting great hewn stones to their destined places on walls already very high, and when various other stages of work have been passed through, the last stroke of skilled labor will complete in wood and stone and iron what was at first purely an ideal of the architect. It is to our purpose now to note that this grand process, involving the labor of thousands of free agents, materials so varied in kind and vast in amount, and the employment of mechanical forces so numerous and diverse, goes forward under the control of intelligent mind. In its present unfinished condition, the great structure indicates in a general way that it exists for a purpose. When it stands complete in all its parts, and polite officials are daily delivering mail to the thousands of comers, a sane man could not fail to see in the building the design, or *final cause*, for which it was erected.

"Every house," says Paul, "is built by somebody," from which he evidently concluded that the world in which he lived could no

more have come to be as it is than a house could come to be without a builder; and hence his sublime and rational conception, "He who built all things is God," "God that made the world, and all things therein." The evolutionist tells us that we look upon a universe of "methodical and regulated" changes. The authorship of the forces by which these changes are carried forward he confesses his inability to know. But design, or final cause, being apparent everywhere, physical forces operating according to general and invariable laws must exhibit only the modes by which omnipotent intelligence executes its designs. Not only has God given the earth to the children of men, to be their habitation, but it bears innumerable proofs that through vast cycles of time it was being fitted for its destination. Grant the geologist all the millions of years he asks for the great transformations through which our earth has come to its present condition, the proof is nothing impaired, that the vast evolution, always working from the lower to the higher, is the execution of an end foreseen and chosen, and now realized in this fit habitation of rational creatures. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

As a survey of the execution of vast plans in the material world begets the conviction of a superintending Intelligence, wise and good and all-powerful, equally does the survey of the Bible scheme of the renovation of humanity through a personal divine Redeemer force upon us the conviction that this great scheme, now working before our eyes, holding on through the centuries with ever-augmenting energies for future achievement, must, alike in its conception and in the spiritual forces that bear it forward, have sprung from the bosom of God. In fact, in this great renovation God comes nearer to us, and reveals himself more clearly and fully to us, than in the works of creation, justifying the conception of the poet that

> God in the person of his Son
> Hath all his mightiest works outdone.

To believe that such a scheme, involving the conception of God and humanity in a personal Redeemer, promulgating a system of morality approved as faultless by human reason and the conscience, harmonious in all its parts, and endowed with inherent power to go on working through all time in ever-widening circles of influence,

seems to us the most marvelous credulity! As man's redemption is the central idea of the Bible, so is Christ the central idea of man's redemption. "In Christ" it is that God is "reconciling the world unto himself." The great mystery revealed in the gospel is God's "will, according to his own benevolence, which he purposed in himself, in the dispensation of the fullness of the times to gather together all things under Christ, both things in the heavens and things upon the earth, even under him;" and this Christ God "hath exalted at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all government, and power, and might, and lordship, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath subjected all things under his feet, and appointed him Head over all things for the Church, which is his body, and the fullness of him who filleth all with all." As in Christ is manifested the fullness of the Godhead, so in the church, as far as it exhibits his spirit and his teachings, is manifested the fullness of Christ; and by the instrumentality of the Church in bringing to the world the knowledge of the fullness in Christ, God is carrying forward the great redemptive renovation of humanity.

Upon the completion of his farewell address to his disciples, his hour being at hand—the hour of death and of expiation by death—Christ offers audibly to the Father the sacerdotal prayer, declaring therein that the words the Father had given him he had given to his disciples; and these disciples he commanded, after his resurrection, to go and teach all nations these words the Father had spoken to him, and he had spoken to them. Of the book containing these words of Christ, including "other words afterward given through men in the Spirit, during a period of time which is represented to us by the books of the New Testament," which were "finished in that period, and have since received no addition," a writer whose work is justly pronounced "one of the best fruits of biblical study in modern times," thus speaks as to its contents and its renovating power:

> It begins with the person of Christ, and the facts of his manifestation in the flesh, and the words which he gave from his Father; and accustoms us by degrees to behold his glory, and to discern the drift of his teaching, and to expect the consequences of his work. It passes on to the body of the Church, and opens the dispensation of the Spirit, and carries us into the life of his people, yea, down into the secrets of

their hearts; and there translates the announcements of God into the experiences of man, and discovers a conversation which is in heaven, and a life which is hid with Christ in God. It works out practical applications, and is careful in the details of duty, and provides for difficulties and perplexities, and suggests the order of Churches, and throws up barriers against the wiles of the devil. It shows us things to come, the course of the spiritual conflict, and the close of this transient scene, and the coming of the Lord, and the resurrection of the dead, and the eternal judgment, and the new creation, and the life everlasting. . . . . It dominates the restless course of thought, and is ever being interpreted by experience and events. It is an authority which survives when others perish, and a light which waxes when others wane. By it, as the instrument of God for the education of men, nations are humanized and Churches sanctified. And yet more real and lasting than these are the ultimate results which it secures. An elect nation is being gathered from among us, and an eternal Church prepared which shall supplant all transient and provisional societies in that day for which the whole creation waits.*

What, then, comprehensively, is the renovation which the gospel scheme, originating in heaven, working for and in man, accomplishes for those who receive its benefits? The basic truth on which rests the doctrine of gospel renovation of humanity is contained in the numerous Bible declarations that man is fallen, depraved, dead in trespasses and sins, in will not subject to the law of God, and, in consequence of the moral state thus variously expressed, as under condemnation, and justly liable to the penalty of the violated law divinely ordained for his observance. The student of man's moral condition finds the fact of sin there, as certainly as the geologist finds fossils in the rocks. Individual experience, daily observation, and human history corroborate the teaching of Edwards, that "there is in the nature of all mankind a very evil, depraved, and pernicious propensity, making it manifest that the soul of man, as it is by nature, is in a corrupt, fallen, and ruined state." This state of depravity and condemnation involves the alienation of man's will from the will of his Creator, the result of the voluntary act of a being endowed with self-consciousness, a knowledge of good and evil, and the power of self-determination in view of the higher and lower impulses from his sensibility. The Pauline argument for justification by faith in Christ as the only

* "Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament," by T. D. Bernard, A.M.

justification possible to man proceeds upon the major premise that "all have sinned." Those who have experienced the spiritual renovation through the gospel, are described as quickened and raised out of this state of sin and exposure to wrath into newness of life in Christ. "And you, likewise, he raised from death to life when you were dead in transgressions and sins; wherein once you walked according to the course of this world, and obeyed the ruler of the powers of the air, even the spirit who is now working in the children of disobedience; amongst whom we also, in time past, lived, all of us, in fleshly lusts, fulfilling the desires of our flesh and of our imagination, and were by nature children of wrath, no less than others. But God, who is rich in mercy, because of the great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sin, called us to share the life of Christ. . . . . For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God has prepared that we should walk therein."

The doctrine of sin as taught in the Scripture receives profound significance as verified in universal human consciousness and conduct. The law which requires man to love God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, his moral judgment pronounces reasonable and good, in view of the relation he sustains to his God, and of the adaptation of that law to his own well-being. Everywhere from the heart goes up a ceaseless petition for the realization of a good it has not found, but for which it feels it has a capacity; and along with the petition for a better state is associated the sense of a need of moral renewal. While philosophers, from Plato to those of the present, speak of what they call a metaphysical sentiment for "the absolute, the immutable, the perfect—a need felt more particularly by devout minds, but which all men, without exception, experience in some degree or other, and which they endeavor to satisfy as best they can;" but this need is far less tangible and less potent than the sense of moral unfitness and moral impotence under which man everywhere groans. "Humanity suffers from a double evil," says Janet, "most real and poignant: pain and sin," against the latter of which he has "but the feeble defense of free-will." "It would seem," continues the same author, "that we are the masters of the universe; but experience shows, on the contrary, that we are the feeblest among its creatures; often does the will succumb; and Kant himself, despite his stoicism,

asks whether indeed a single act of virtue has ever been accomplished in the world. . . . . We love what is good, and we do what is evil; we impatiently desire happiness, and meet with nothing but wretchedness. Such is the contradiction Pascal points out with such incisive eloquence. This contradiction must be removed. Hope and trust in a supreme and benevolent Being must ransom us from sin and pain." To every human being there comes at this point the question which most of all concerns him as a creature endowed with capacity for perfect bliss or remediless woe: Is there, or is there not, a way by which he may rise out of this state of sin, suffering, and death, into the ideal good for which he yearns? If the appeal be to man's own reason or to the world about him, but an empty echo mocks his inquiry. On all sides he is hemmed in by hopeless impotence, and, despite his lamenting and yearning, is doomed, with the creatures about him, to suffering and death, "until one vast tomb—the gulf of blind matter from which they issued—swallows them all up again." Over against this cheerless "void whereto atheism reduces us," is the blessed assurance that "Christ has brought life and immortality to light," and that out of the present moral discord of this world of sin "there can come a reign of wills holy and just, bound to each other by respect and love." Well may every subject of this renovation, who has "fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us," take up the language of the redeemed Paul, "*Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!*"

The Scriptures seem to teach, in passages numerous and plain, that through the sufferings and death of Christ, and conditioned on them as being in some sense vicarious and expiatory, the subjects of redemptive renovation are regarded in that new relation to law termed *justification*, involving the idea of the removal of condemnation, and of the forgiveness of their sins. No part of the subjective renovation, justification is declared an indispensable, as well as an inseparable concomitant of that renovation. "And whom he called, them he also justified." "That is," says a popular commentator, "absolved them from guilt, and freed them from condemnation, discharging them from their obnoxiousness to divine wrath." And to provide the consideration in view of which the divine mercy could pardon sinners with justice to the ends and claims of moral government, is presented as of the very essence of

the mystery of godliness which brings salvation. Hence, speaking of those who believe in Christ, Paul declares, speaking of "another way" of justification: "But they are justified freely by his grace through the ransom which is paid in Christ Jesus. For him hath God set forth, *in his blood to be a propitiatory sacrifice* by means of faith, thereby to manifest the righteousness of God, ... that he might be just, and (yet) might justify the children of faith." (Rom. iii. 24, etc. Conybeare and Howson.)

It is not to our purpose to insist on any theory of the atonement. Suffice it to say in passing, that over against the Socinian doctrine, that "Christ came as a messenger, not to reconcile God to man, but only to reconcile man to God, by embodying a visible proof of God's love; over against the low views of the inspired word which disposes of the many plain passages embodying the idea that Christ's work was truly atoning and vicarious, by ascribing them to the coloring which the writers' minds had received from the Jewish sacrifices, it is better, whatever of mystery may beset the great truth revealed, to hold fast the form of doctrine delivered to us by the fathers, touching the atonement, and, reverently accepting the plain teaching of the inspired word, to believe, with a devout student of that word, "that the sufferings of Jesus Christ have not merely reconciled man to God, by testifying God's love, but have verily reconciled God to man, by removing . . . . the obstacles which prevented God from showing mercy to man." On this rock of truth, on which the majesty of moral law is displayed to the universe, and the ends of the divine government secured, is founded the church of God, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

"Propitiation and atonement, reconciliation and redemption, are words which express the restoration of the broken relations with God, as accomplished by the work of the Mediator. Those who receive Christ Jesus the Lord are thereby in a state of grace. Sin no longer divides and estranges them from God. He has returned to them, and they to him. Thus, in each separate soul are established beforehand those relations with God in Christ which shall hereafter glorify the community of the saints, in the day when 'the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it,' and 'God himself shall be with them, and shall be their God.'" (Bernard.)

Turning now to the subjective side of Christ's work for humanity, we may profitably glance at the specific stages in the renovation which transfers a soul from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of God:

The Scriptures declare that Christ died for all men, and that, as one of the results of his mediation, the quickening power of the Spirit is given to men, so that all who receive the gospel offer of salvation have power to accept that salvation. Thus, all are alike responsible for the treatment the gospel call receives at their hands, its acceptance determining them to the blessedness of heaven, its rejection leaving them to the fearful consequences of their sins. Only upon this power to accept the gospel can we base the responsibility Christ and his apostles continually asserted of those to whom the offer of salvation came. At the very inception, then, of the soul-renovation that fits for the kingdom of God, is the call to a step involving voluntary choice of the gospel by the soul seeking renewal. The command which heralded the approach of the gospel dispensation, and prepared men for it, was, "*Repent* ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Similarly, to some "who trusted in themselves that they were righteous," Christ declared, "Except ye *repent*, ye shall all likewise perish." Taking up the call to the same gospel, Paul everywhere preached "*repentance* toward God." It has long been our conviction that in the ordinary pulpit instruction and exhortation "repentance" is represented too much as a matter of the sensibility, whereas the Greek work translated by *repentance* signifies a rational, voluntary act of a responsible agent, a choice of a new course of conduct believed to be right, and the turning from a course believed to be wrong. The obligation to *repent* is, in short, not an obligation to feel much sorrow or even a little sorrow for our past sins, but the obligation to choose the law of God as the rule of action, and to accept Christ as an atoning sacrifice for sin, and as the pattern and guide in holy living. How many souls have been kept out of heaven by the stumbling-block of "waiting for more feeling!" True is it, indeed, as the Bible declares, that "godly sorrow worketh repentance"—or, as Macknight translates it, "worketh out a change of conduct"—but sorrow is not of the essence of the repentance required unto salvation. The violation of moral law is sin, and sin brings to the soul sorrow and self-condemnation, and these become a motive to

repentance—that is, to the choice of a different course—but only a selfish motive—the desire to be rid of what is not agreeable. When in the control of himself as to the impulses to action of which he is conscious, a man voluntarily and with full purpose of heart turns away from following in the line of impulses that are unworthy of his moral endowment, and sinful, and chooses the law of God as the supreme rule of his life, such a one truly repents. Such repentance, and only such, is in harmony with the command to repent, and with the association of the idea of responsibility with the requirement. Whether repentance is attended with much "feeling" or little "feeling" will depend on the mental constitution of the subject of it, his education, his past life, his bodily state, etc. What we insist upon is that true repentance is essentially *choice*, not feeling. From this view it follows that at the very threshold of the entrance into life eternal, through the gospel renovation, responsible man, lifted up into a new probation by the gracious dispensation of the Spirit, holds his everlasting destiny in his own bosom—a doctrine asserted over and over, from Genesis to Revelation. Having truly repented, one is *converted*, that is to say, the result of the new choice implied in repentance is that the one so repenting is "turned about"—that is, "converted," as to the direction of his life in view of moral law.

The subject of the true repentance (*metanoia*), conscious of need of help to realize the blessed end he has chosen, by faith lays hold of gracious influences whereby there comes to him the great renovation designated the new birth—regeneration—*paliggenesia*. This radical change within the man is ascribed directly to God as its author, "born of God" and "born of the Spirit" being specific designations of the agency concerned in the change. When referred to the power of the word, it must be understood that in an instrumental relation the word effects the change. Here, then, we reach a stage of renovation in the individual certainly ascribed to divine agency as secured to man through the mediation of Christ—a moral and spiritual renovation, a rising from death into life, from sin into holiness, that is specifically and exclusively of the gospel's power upon the world—a "power of God unto salvation."

The subjects of the new birth are "babes in Christ," and before them is a required growth to the stature of men and women

in Christ Jesus, the development, into its fullness, blessedness, and perfection of the new life divinely imparted. In this progressive renovation the believer experiences continual need of appeal to the fountain of all grace for the renewing of mind which proves the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God, and that while the outward man perishes, the inward may be daily renewed. On the one side, the subject of the renovation is daily repenting, trusting, obeying, employing the means of grace; and on the other, he who has begun a good work in the believing soul is carrying it forward "until the day of Jesus Christ." So it is that in the kingdom of heaven in this militant state, men and women are commanded to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth," thus rising into larger attainments of knowledge, experience, discipline, and holiness, for companionship with the just made perfect.

But those who have repented, who have been born again, who have perfected holiness in the fear of the Lord, will not pass into the fullness of their inheritance as sons of God until they experience another, and most wonderful renovation, for which renovation they groan within themselves, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." In this renovation, to occur on our Lord's second appearing, in a moment, when the trumpet shall sound, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (the then living) shall be changed. That sown in weakness shall be raised in power; that sown in dishonor shall be raised in glory; that sown a natural body shall be raised a spiritual body; for the corruptible shall put on incorruption, and the mortal shall put on immortality. Transcendent renovation! And this physical renovation shall have yet a wider sweep, as we may infer from our Lord's words (Matt. xix. 28) in which he assures his followers that "in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory," they too shall be sharers in the glory then revealed. Passed into heaven, this Son of man shall there remain "until the times of restitution of all things," including, as we elsewhere learn, the renovation of the material creation so far as required to render it a fit abode for the redeemed. Looking into the closing paragraphs of the Apocalypse, for an account of the final consummation of this redemptive renovation, we find the beloved disciple carried in prophetic vision into the midst of the closing scenes, declaring, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the

first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

In hope of this moral renovation, life is grandly optimistic. Aside from it, every possible view is hopeless pessimism. A life so frail, so evanescent, with no prospect but eternal extinction at its close, is not worth the cost of its manifold sorrows and sufferings. But the hope of deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the light and liberty of the children of God fills the soul with joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing flee away. Stung by conscious need of purification, the greatest genius most pathetically laments the "disease, bondage, death" which fall on men from the "boundless upas, the all-blasting tree of evil." "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory," triumphantly exclaimed one who had counted all things but loss, that he might win Christ and the life eternal. Transformed by grace, with God and peace within, and heaven with all its bliss in prospect, the soul may say, as it waits through the days of its pilgrimage:

My life flows on in endless song;
Above earth's lamentation
I catch the sweet the far-off hymn
That hails a new creation;
Through all the tumult and the strife
I hear the music ringing;
It finds an echo in my soul—
How can I keep from singing?

What though my joys and comfort die?
The Lord my Savior liveth;
What though the darkness gather round?
Songs in the night he giveth.
No storm can shake my inmost calm,
While to this refuge clinging;
Since Christ is Lord of heaven and earth,
How can I keep from singing?

I lift my eyes, the clouds grow thin,
I see the blue above it;
And day by day the pathway smoothes,
Since first I learned to love it.
The peace of Christ makes glad my heart—
A fountain ever springing;
All things are mine since I am his—
How can I keep from singing?

A. B. MILLER.

EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP—MORALLY.

THE various social and industrial questions now agitating our country have brought forward a large and patriotic body of men and women as advocates of a more intelligent and a more aggressive education for citizenship. It embraces the three phases of individual education—physical, intellectual, and moral. Each phase, particularly the first and second, has its enthusiastic advocates as being the panacea for national ills. Some think that with the physical, including industrial training in general, and intellectual, including history and civil law, the moral will come as a natural consequence. That morality is dependent upon the physical and intellectual condition of a people goes without saying, and yet few realize how vital is this relation; how far away from ordinary temptations a high conception of the dignity of manual labor lifts one; how independent the possession of rare skill in any craft makes a man; how essential to right conduct is an education that develops the intellectual faculties and gives one a commanding view of things and their relations to us; how brave in doing right things one becomes, when able to reason them out for himself.

But while it is true that physical and intellectual education are essential to the development of a high moral life, it is just as true that they do not always produce it. Alcibiades, probably the most transcendently gifted in mind and in body of all the Athenian youth, brought himself into disgrace even in that loose age by his shameless amours and debaucheries. Abelard, one of the most eloquent prelates that ever donned the gown, betrayed the confidence of an innocent girl. Bacon, endowed like a god with profound insight into the mysteries of the universe, sold himself for paltry gain. Rousseau and Voltaire, the keenest wits, and shrewdest reasoners in a long line of illustrious Frenchmen, were grossly venal and corrupt. Lord Byron, the king of English poets, was scarcely less than a princely vagabond. Aaron Burr was possibly the most brilliant man of his day, and Herr Most, steeped in bad whisky and red-handed communism, is not wanting in purely intellectual

strength. In whatever field we enter—literature, art, politics, science, commerce—great learning and unrivaled skill are found coupled with unblushing immorality and unrestrained indulgence. "The polished mind, the skillful hand," are ever ministering to the behests of man's baser nature. Art disdains not to adorn the palace of a dissolute Louis XIV., Song refuses not to join in the bacchanalian revelry of a prince of the royal blood; Science hesitates not to ally itself with the enemies of our holy religion; and divine Philosophy in unseemly garb, gives aid and comfort to them that walk with her whose ways are death. So basely does man use Heaven's best gifts when the heart goes wrong.

The place and function of moral education is to give right conceptions of duty and secure faithful obedience to its behests. No knowledge is worth striving for which is not founded in the right, no activity worth attaining which is not consecrated to its service. Hand and head are meaningless without the heart. Only as the warm blood pulses from its fountains, does man really become a living soul.

. . . . . .

Looking out over our country to-day, great, magnificent—the queen of all nations and of all times, one can not but tremble for the future as he realizes how blind is the public conscience with reference to corruption and iniquity in high places, and how low is the stardard by which the average man or woman measures private virtue.

We are not to sit down and mourn over this unfortunate condition of affairs, but the rather to awaken to a conception of the magnitude of the task, and of the responsibility resting upon us. In no other country are the laws, the traditions, the sentiments of the people so overwhelmingly in sympathy with the work of the instructor in public and private morals. However debauched privately one seeking public preferment may be, he knows full well that it can only come by a simulation of integrity, and by at least an ostensible championship of the great moral institutions of our country.

The necessity for moral education in itself has never been questioned, but the necessity of moral education for citizenship has ever been as important a problem. The bloody pages of history, the sickening details of misrule and oppression, the unblushing

betrayal of most sacred trusts, the terror and despair which hung like a pall over the peoples of Europe for a thousand years, called for a reform in politics as well as in morals and religion. Every grant that has been wrung from an unwilling tyrant has been a concession to the demand for the recognition of inalienable and God-given rights; has been a concession to the demand that those who rule shall administer the affairs of State according to the principles of morality and justice. But education for citizenship does not mean education for judgeships, senatorships, and presidencies only; it means education for participating in the privileges and blessings of the government. It should not be forgotten that morality on the part of the governed is just as essential as on the part of those who govern. The most wise and beneficent man in the universe could not bring peace and prosperity to subjects in whom the sense of honor and virtue is dead. Charles Kingsley well says that Julian failed in his great effort to restore the glory of the Roman Empire because of the dead heap of frivolity, sensuality, brutality, and unbelief which blocked his way.

Education for citizenship means an education for discharging thoroughly and well the public duties which the sphere one occupies, however humble it may be, demands. The moral side of this education recognizes and exalts the sense of obligation which rests upon all. It strives to kindle within the youth a love of virtue, a love of country, and an ardent ambition to serve his country faithfully. It must ever be borne in mind that the truly moral man is usually the good citizen as well. Given the man of sturdy, upright character and industrious habits, and you have the loyal citizen. An education which secures the first has already secured the second. Carlyle says that private virtue from which public virtue springs is the sole cause of national prosperity.

What constitutes the moral man? In language easily expressing it, a moral man is one who is imbued with high ideals of right, and who succeeds fairly well in realizing them in his own life. He is a man of peace, sober, discreet, chaste, honest in his dealings with his fellows, brave in defense of his convictions—loving his neighbor as himself. Now what constitutes the good citizen? The possession of all the virtues named, and the same loyalty to State as to individuals; the appreciation of the State as a great public good, worthy of the love and support of all; an intelligent

understanding of the fundamental principles of government and of the doctrine of human rights; an acquaintance with the history of one's country, and with the vital questions of the day; a ready obedience to law; an abiding affection for his country and its institutions. The good citizen must be a stanch supporter of good order and even handed justice, one who is awake to every enterprise that will increase the general prosperity and promote the public weal, and who ever zealously guards the nation's faith and the nation's honor. An education for citizenship must then secure all of these in its subjects, and must secure them in generous measure.

These, then, being the objects, what are the forces that aid or retard their realization? The home, the school, the Church, the public press, public sentiment, and public practice—these, when in full harmony, wield a mighty influence for good. The average boy or girl has a profounder respect for public sentiment than for the injunctions of father or mother. Law itself, which is but the expression of public sentiment, is a great educator. The properly trained youth has a great reverence for law. As he becomes acquainted with the laws of his country, they mean right and justice to him. Violators are real criminals in his sight, and he always expects their punishment. During the years in which he is controlled largely by authority, no one thing exercises a more powerful influence over his character than the manner in which the civil laws are executed. If they be rigidly enforced, he grows up with a profound respect for authority, and for the dignity and sacredness of all law. If otherwise, the effect is to beget contempt, not only for law, but for all that it represents; justice loses its majesty, right its might, and equity its sanctity. The demoralizing effect of the loose administration of the best of laws is well known. When notorious criminals go scot free, when immoral men are elected to responsible judgeships, when sentences remain unexecuted while inhuman and mysterious villainies are not fathomed and great wrongs stand unredressed, the moral sense of all classes and all ages is blunted. The executors of our laws have a great responsibility in that they not only apply them to particular cases, but that they mold the morals of the rising generation as well. The vices of men occupying responsible positions, and of our social life have a gilding that makes them dangerously attractive to youth. An education for citizenship must take into account the

potency of all the subtle forces that lie hidden in the world-life around us. The temptations of business and professional life, the seductive allurements of politics, the mazy whirl of society, and the daily round of toil and drudgery make up the rank and file of the forces with which we have to contend.

Moral education, whether in the home or in the school, must pursue practically the same general methods. From obedience to the authority of parent or teacher the child rises to the recognition of the authority of society and of the government. It also builds notions of right and wrong for itself, and learns to follow the dictates of an inward monitor—a monitor whose authority finally becomes higher than that of kings and empires. How to make this transition safely and successfully is the great problem of moral education. Three things are necessary to the development of a high moral sense: 1. The enlightenment of the conscience that it may clearly discern right and wrong; 2. The quickening of the sense of obligation; 3. The establishment of high motives for right doing.

Every parent and teacher must discard the old idea that the power to distinguish between right and wrong is a God-given instinct, full fledged at birth, and recognize the fact that the child must learn what is right, just as he learns any thing else, that morality is a matter of education and not of inheritance, and that its processes are very like other educational processes. The child accepts moral truths on the authority of his superiors just as he accepts truth concerning the physical universe. He learns to reason them out for himself just as he learns to reason about the world around him. He analyzes and studies the actions of men just as he analyzes and studies the action of the physical forces. He lays down principles and laws here just as clearly as in any other branch of human knowledge, and through an enlightened insight of his own determines his line of conduct. The education for citizenship on the moral side simply extends the line of inquiry to embrace one's duties to his government. It should seek to enlighten the youth on all questions affecting his relations to the general public. With the same earnestness with which he strives to find out his duty to himself, to his neighbor, and to his God, should he be moved to learn his duty to his country. He should be taught to apply the same tests to public as to private virtue;

should in all possible ways be made to appreciate the blessings of a free government, and to understand how solemn a responsibility rests upon him as the recipient of the right of suffrage.

An education for citizenship must exalt the idea that a government has no higher claim to existence than this: *That it may establish justice;* that no law for the advancement of any enterprise whatever which disregards sacred rights, should be placed on the statute books; that it is the duty of the government to secure to every man the unquestioned possession of his property, the sacredness of his fireside, the inviolability of his person, and the utmost freedom of conscience; to administer public affairs in such a way as to afford him every possible facility for developing whatever gifts nature may have bestowed upon him; and that the duty of the government is the duty of every citizen of that government.

An education for citizenship must fix firmly in the mind the responsibility of the voter for elevating and retaining immoral men in positions of public trust. It must insist that the citizen who knowingly casts his vote to continue in power a party which has become notorious for its corrupt practices and its flagrant disregard of vested rights, is guilty of a great crime; that, though he may not share in the profits, he is equally culpable with the men whom his vote helps to plunder the public treasury; that it is the duty and the privilege of every one to keep himself informed as to the character and policy of the men and parties who seek to direct public affairs. No principle is more fully settled than that to have good laws you must have good men to make them and good men to execute them.

The youth must be taught to regard the public treasury as set apart inviolably for public purposes; that diverting it by legal enactment or otherwise for the sole benefit of a single man or set of men is in plain Anglo-Saxon, highway robbery, and that all peculation with public funds is a gross betrayal of a high trust. The sentiment must be developed that a public servant should consider himself under even greater obligations to fidelity in the discharge of the duties of his position, be it high or low, than he would be to an individual employer; that he should guard public interests even more zealously than he guards his own. We have too many men whose private lives are reputed as spotless, and yet who are

reliable supporters of the worst kind of political jobbery; men who would blush at the suggestion of the dishonorable treatment of a neighbor, and yet who would not hesitate to steal, or profit by the stealing of the franchise of a great State.

A great point will be gained when our education fully recognizes the fact that communities have certain "inalienable rights", as well as individuals, and that no beneficent government exists which ignores either. Our education must seek to define the rights of each. It ought to teach that though the law does not define and punish slander against a community, the traducer of the good name of a city or a State stands condemned in the eyes of all good men as unworthy the name of citizen; that he who, for personal spite, private gain, or party vantage, misrepresents and maligns the people among whom he lives should be branded as an unmitigated scoundrel or publicly posted as a pitiable imbecile.

A prominent politician once said that to be successful in politics one must become a moral coward. This reflection on our political system can only be successfully refuted when our education makes the youth believe, really and truly, that it is more honorable as well as more desirable to be defeated in a contest for office than to succeed at the sacrifice of integrity and manhood; that the man who turns his back upon principle for the sake of gain or preferment not only degrades himself, but disgraces his country; and that no honors lie easily which are won by fraud and chicanery.

In some way the idea must be implanted that office-holding is not the chief end of man; that there is no task more thankless, no business more uncertain, than that of trying to serve the public. When our youth can understand the uncertainties of political life they will not be in such rude haste to stake their all upon it. I would not have a youth think that the ambition to serve his country in some public position is not a laudable one, but rather by lifting his conception of its responsibility I would make the ambition more laudable.

An education for citizenship must show upon whom lies the responsibility for the selection of jurors, and must demand that every obstacle be removed which stands in the way of securing an intelligent, impartial, incorruptible jury. It must make every youth feel how necessary to the preservation of our liberties is the

absolute purity of the ballot-box. Its decisions, however obnoxious, must be accepted and sacredly respected. The majesty of law, the law of his country, was the all-engrossing theme that inspired the life of Webster. It is this which makes his masterly speeches incomparable texts for the education of American citizens. It is our duty to teach the youth to call things by their right names and to understand what those names mean; to give them abiding conceptions of loyalty and fidelity and to show them their priceless value. These are but a few of the many things pertaining to their duties as citizens upon which they must be enlightened.

But with enlightenment must come also the quickening sense of obligation—of personal responsibility. Every boy and girl must be made to know that though he is but one in sixty millions, he is one of his country's sovereign rulers; that the nation's virtue, the nation's integrity, the nation's honor, are as the virtue, the integrity, the honor of its individual citizens; that a nation's sense of right and justice is the sense of right and justice of its individual citizens; that a prudent, frugal, intelligent, vigorous, loyal, God-fearing people have made our country what it is to-day, and that its continuance is assured only as the same virtues characterize the people of the future. The teacher is not wanting in examples. History teems with proof, statesmen of every age and clime attest it, and the very structure of our institutions demands it.

The fundamental defect in teaching morals generally is the failure to awaken and build up right motives for doing right things. The *act* signifies every thing—the *motive* nothing. Now, every act performed merely on account of the pressure of surrounding circumstances is good only in so far as that particular act goes. There follows little or no personal benefit to the doer. He grows no stronger, no better for it. Its repetition under other or even under *similar* circumstances is not assured, and the will is at the mercy of every fitful wind that blows. Some people imagine that because they have kept out of the penitentiary they have succeeded in living correct lives, but they must be taught to measure themselves by other standards than that. A child who bestows charity simply because others are doing it, will hardly grow up to be a generous-hearted man. One who tells the truth merely to escape punishment, will not become a shining example of its sacredness. One who is honest only through fear of public disgrace, will

scarcely make a safe custodian of the public funds. One who plays the peace-maker merely because his friend may get whipped, will not develop into a sturdy champion of good order. One who shapes his conduct merely to preserve the good opinion of his fellows will, as he grows older, find a multitude of ways in which he may privately indulge his evil propensities. One who is taught to think much of his reputation and little of his character will not shed much luster on the name of American citizen. That all are moved more or less by such incentives I freely concede; that, in the early stages of their growth, children may not be able to appreciate higher motives, I also concede; but it still remains true that higher motives can be inculated and that it is a matter of vital importance that the utmost vigilance should be used to supplant these lower motives by such as will make up a substantial and enduring character.

The child must be taught to love and to serve his country not only for the security it gives him in the possession of his property or in the pursuit of his daily avocation, not only for the blessings of a quiet fireside and the enjoyment of the right to participate in the affairs of government, but for its glorious history, its fearless championship of the rights of the down-trodden and the oppressed, and because it stands as the representative of all that is greatest and best in the world's struggle for liberty and equality. Its battle-fields must mean more to him than the sudden charge, the roar of artillery, and the shout of victory; its institutions must mean more to him than the mere formal creations of a proud state; they must mean to him the final triumph of right over wrong, of oppression over tyranny, of justice over misrule—the high noon of peace and good will among nations. He must learn to love his country for what it cost, for what it represents, for what it promises to future generations and to the world.

Now all this is to be brought about by the educational forces already mentioned, but the responsibility lies more particularly upon the family and the school. It has often been said that our political campaigns are great educators of the youth in the principles of government. Alas for that country which depends for the education of its youth in the rights and duties of citizenship upon the average political orator, moved by hope of party gain and unscrupulous as to facts and methods. A patriotic education must be

acquired at other places than at the hustings. The froth and sputter and powder of the average political meeting is not patriotism!

The Jewish mother was required to repeat the story of Israel's deliverance to her children and they in turn to theirs. Does any one doubt the effect of this upon the vitality of that people? So every American mother should not feel that her duty is done until she has told her children the story of her country, until the names of its heroes have become household words, and until they have pledged her to love and cherish its institutions as their lives. No home should be wanting in books of history, in pictures or in song, that may aid her in this patriotic endeavor. Natal days, memorial days, and national anniversaries of all kinds should bring out the old flag—for no home should be without a flag of some kind—and should recall again the nation's illustrious achievements in peace and in war. On that day in spring-time when the scarred veterans with feeble steps and uncovered heads gather round the graves where their fallen comrades lie sleeping and lovingly strew them with flowers, every household in this broad land should in grateful remembrance contribute its share of chaplets and garlands.

The school-room should take up in a more formal way all of the work mentioned. The teacher should feel that the boys and girls under his care are already citizens of a great republic, and that if they fail to become worthy patriots his mission has been in vain. Fortunately our reading books are not wanting in selections which may serve as texts for many a talk on the virtues which build and sustain republics. Our text books of history glow with tributes to the valor of the sturdy champions of freedom. Our national hymnology itself is an education and an inspiration to patriotism.

And after all, what is an education for citizenship on the moral side but education in patriotism in the best sense of the word? What so fully begets fidelity to country, and such a country as this, as fidelity to virtue? What system of ethics stands infinitely above all other systems in its ability to transform the man "of coarse exterior and lawless mien" into the honest yeoman and the faithful citizen but the Christian system? Where shall we go to learn of the virtues that insure peace to our land and liberty throughout its borders save to the Book of books?

This is a Christian land. Its soil is impregnated with the blood of martyrs of civil and religious liberty. Its independence was

achieved by men who recognized themselves as the instruments in God's hands for the establishment of a beneficent system of government. Its laws receive their highest inspiration from Sinai and Galilee. Its existence and perpetuity are dependent on the Christian home—an institution embracing more elements conducing to good order and exalted manhood, human happiness and national loyalty, than are found in all the other forces of this world. All that is noble in our nation's literature, in its art or song, is but the fruitage of Christian life and Christian culture. Like a silver thread Christian ethics permeates the web and the woof of every phase of our national life, social and political. Our greatest orators reserve for it their highest encomiums; our State and national legislatures open each day's session with prayer; every regiment in the army, every ship commissioned by our government has a chaplain under national pay; our marriages are solemnized, and our dead are buried by a Christian clergy. Millions of mothers nightly fold tiny hands and train infant lips to say,

Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep.

Such mothers are the hope and the life of American womanhood—the noblest type of divinity that ever ministered to man. Shall the teachers to whom these children are intrusted for six of the best hours of the day, and for at least ten of the best years of their lives, fail in responding heartily and loyally to the earnest prayers of these faithful mothers? Shall the precepts or practice of our schools fail to assist boys and girls in reaching up to a worthy manhood and womanhood? Shall we be content to teach an insipid morality, a lifeless code of ethics to the children of the Republic? Shall all that has made our civilization glorious be banished from the school-room?

It is high time that it should always and ever be known that while our public schools must be sacredly non-partisan and non-sectarian, they must never become non-American; that while they shall not be controlled by any one party nor by any one Church, they shall ever be controlled by the genius and the spirit of American institutions; and that their highest function shall continue to be the development of those virtues which make men brave and true, and *patriots*—incorruptible and invincible!

A. R. TAYLOR.

WHY AM I A PRESBYTERIAN?

THE reader should understand that the words Congregationalist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian are designations of systems of Church polity, and not names of creeds or theological opinions. A proof of this is the fact that Calvinism is embodied in the Episcopalian creed, while many Episcopalian ministers, especially in the past, have been Arminians. It is well known that John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, favored the theological views of Arminius while he was an active priest in the Episcopal communion. In like manner the other names have been used to designate bodies of people that differed widely in doctrine. For example, the Irish Presbyterian Church is Calvinistic, while the Presbyterians of Antrim Presbytery were Socinians in belief. In the United States, Presbyterians are largely Calvinists, but not exclusively so, for that body of Presbyterians which had its origin in Cumberland Presbytery (hence called Cumberland Presbyterians) have a non-Calvinistic creed. Historic Presbyterianism has no connection necessarily with Calvinism or Arminianism. It existed before either, and its simple and perspicuous doctrines may be formulated as follows: It recognizes—

I.—The divine and exclusive headship and sovereignty of Jesus Christ.

II.—The Bible the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

III.—The Abrahamic covenant the charter of the Church, its privileges, etc., being extended to Gentiles as it was to Jews.

IV.—The Presbyterian polity under which the covenant was administered in preceding dispensations is of divine appointment, and goes with the covenant as the polity under which it is to be administered now.

V.—Baptism—that is, the cleansing with water ceremonially by affusion—is now the seal of covenant relation, and is to be applied to believers and their infant children.

VI.—The gospel—that is, the offer of pardon—is to be preached to all with assurance of eternal life to every one who truly believes in Christ.

Now, I call the foregoing the historic doctrines of the Presbyterian family, because Presbyterians, whether Calvinists or not, have invariably preached them. I do not mean that they exclusively have preached these doctrines, for some of them have been taught by other denominations. But no Church has ever held *all* of them except the Churches we call Presbyterian. In this article, therefore, what I may say of Presbyterianism is to be understood as relating mainly to polity, but may be understood of doctrines also under the limitations I have given. This explanation is necessary to guard the reader from misapprehension, since the creeds of Presbyterian bodies as we now have them are of modern origin. With the understanding, therefore, that I am discussing a polity rather than a system of doctrine, I am a Presbyterian—

1. *Because Presbyterianism varies least from the primitive Apostolic, and therefore divine, model.*

It is known to Bible readers that the Church, prior to the giving of the law at Sinai, was governed by "elders of the people." The adding of the law at Sinai, "because of transgressions until the seed should come," did not materially change the polity of the Church. While the Aaronic priesthood, as a type, directed the mind of the worshiper to Christ, the great High-Priest, the people still continued to be governed by their "elders." This polity continued up to the time of the Savior, and was crystallized in the synagogue of the Jews. As the Church of the Christian dispensation is but a continuation of the Church of former dispensations, it was natural that the form of government which had existed for hundreds of years should be continued. Accordingly, we find that the early Christians held to the same polity and customs that had always been recognized by the Church except the rite of circumcision and the types of the law, these passing away by divine appointment. The Christians of the apostolic age did not change the polity of the Church.

The following Scripture facts, I trust, will make this clear: Christ was a minister of the circumcision (Rom. xv. 8); he taught in the synagogues (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 2); and this was not an occasional thing but it was a *custom* (Luke iv. 16; John xviii. 20); during his ministry he made and baptized disciples (John iv. 1, 2); his followers were called Nazarenes—that is, followers of Christ the Nazarene (Acts xxiv. 5, with Matt. ii. 23); the first

Christians were found in the synagogues (John xvi. 2; Mark xiii. 9; Acts xxii. 19; xxvi. 11); the persecution of these Christians was persecuting the Church of God (Gal. i. 13; Phil. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 9); the Pharisees of the Savior's day shut up the kingdom of Heaven —that is, abused their ecclesiastical authority (Matt. xxiii. 2,3,13); on this account they were deprived of the kingdom (Matt. xxi. 43); there is but one spiritual seed and body (Rom. iv. 16, with Gal. iii. 16, and Eph. iii. 6); the Church was not destroyed by the change of dispensation (Rom. xi. 1–5, with Zech. xiii. 9). In the formal separation which took place by divine command, the son of the bond-woman—that is, the nominal believer—was cast out (Gal. iv. 29, 30); this, of course, left the son of the free woman, the true believer, in full possession; hence, the Christians were commanded not to neglect the assembling (*synagoguing*) of themselves together (Heb. x. 25); "if there come into your assembly (*synagogue*) a man with a gold ring, etc. (James ii. 2).

Primitive Church polity being the same as the Jewish polity, it becomes necessary to ascertain what the polity of the Jews was. The reader is invited to consider the following:

"But that order might be preserved there were in every synagogue some fixed ministers to take care of the religious duties to be performed in it, and these were by imposition of hands solemnly admitted thereto. The first were the elders of the synagogue who governed all the affairs of it and directed all the duties of religion therein to be performed. There are in the Scriptures of the New Testament called *archisynagogai*—that is, rulers of the synagogue. How many of these were in every synagogue is nowhere said. But this is certain, they were more than one; for they are mentioned in Scripture in the plural number in respect of the same synagogue; and at Corinth Crispus and Sosthenes are both said to be chief rulers of the synagogue, though it is not likely that there was more than one synagogue in that city. Next to them (or, perchance, one of them) was the minister of the synagogue that officiated in offering up the public prayers to God for the whole congregation, who, because he was the mouth of the congregation delegated from them as their representative, messenger, or angel, to speak to God in prayer for them, was, therefore, in the Hebrew tongue, called *sheliah zibbor*—that is, the angel of the Church. And hence, it is, that the bishops of the Seven

Churches of Asia are, in Revelation, by a name borrowed from the synagogue, called the angels of the Churches. For as the *sheliah zibbor* in the Jewish Synagogue was the prime minister to offer up the prayers of the people to God, so also was the bishop the prime minister to offer up the prayers of the people to God in the Church of Christ. The bishop, indeed, did not always officiate in his ministry, because in every Church there were presbyters under him who often discharged this duty in his stead."—*Prideaux's Connection*, Vol. II., page 26.

The reader is invited to examine this extract closely and see what Dean Prideaux, of Norwich, an eminent Episcopalian, states concerning the Jewish Synagogue and the early Church. I summarize as follows:

The Jewish Synagogue was (*a*) the assembly of God's people; (*b*) it was governed by presbyters or elders; (*c*) it had an angel or messenger who was the officiating minister; (*d*) the service consisted chiefly in singing psalms and reading and expounding the Scriptures.

The Church of Christ was (*a*) the assembly of God's people; (*b*) it was governed by presbyters or elders; (*c*) it had an angel or messenger who was the officiating minister; (*d*) Prideaux does not state what were the services, but they are known to have been singing, reading, and expounding the Scriptures.

The reader can see what a close and almost perfect parallel Prideaux draws between the Jewish local assembly and the local assembly of the Apostolic Church. The references to Scripture already given afford an emphatic corroboration which precludes any doubt of his correctness. Here, as it respects the local assembly, we have Presbyterian polity pure and simple—that is, a bishop or officiating minister and a plurality of elders to each local Church. The opposite of this is found in the Prelatic and Episcopal bodies of Christendom, for they have a plurality of Churches to the bishop, and this, not as a thing incident to inchoative Churches, but as an essential feature of their system.

Read one more extract from Prideaux's Connection, Vol. III., page 48, note: "There were two sorts of Sanhedrims among the Jews, one of twenty-three persons in every city, and one for the whole nation, of seventy-two persons, sitting in Jerusalem." Jahn, in his "Biblical Archæology," Section 245, explains as to the

character of the intermediate court. He says: "The courts of twenty-three judges were the same with the tribunal mentioned in John xvi. 2, which merely tried questions of a religious nature and sentenced to no other punishment than 'forty stripes save one,'" (2 Cor. xi. 24).

Mr. Wesley, Works, Vol. VII., page 311, concedes the *official* and *functional* equality of bishops and presbyters in the following language: "Lord King's 'Account of the Primitive Church' convinced me many years ago that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain." In an article entitled "Why am I an Episcopalian?" published in the *North American Review*, September, 1889, Canon Farrar concedes that *episcopos* and *presbuteros* are in Scripture interchangeable, and, while we have a good deal on the score of expediency and efficiency, one looks in vain for a biblical argument in favor of Episcopacy. If the reader will bear this in mind it will obviate the necessity of a further reference to authorities, for surely what such eminent Episcopalians as Dean Prideaux, Canon Farrar, and John Wesley concede to be the truth will not be disputed by others.

Summarizing these biblical and historical facts, we have the following: (*a*) The local assembly, synagogue, or Church governed by a bishop, messenger, or angel, and a bench of elders or presbyters; (*b*) a superior court of twenty-three, which was confined to ecclesiastical causes; (*c*) a supreme court for the nation consisting of seventy-two persons; officially these persons were priests, scribes, and elders.

Now, in the foregoing, we have the great principles of ecclesiastical polity laid down. These principles are few and simple, and in number may be reduced to three, viz.: (*a*) The government of the local assembly by a board of officers chosen by the people; (*b*) the right of appeal to superior courts in all trials; (*c*) the right of appellate jurisdiction and supervisory control by these superior courts. These principles are not only biblical, but they are in eminent accord with sterling common sense. Even those Christian bodies that are non-presbyterian in polity unconsciously concede the utility if not the scripturalness of these principles. Lay delegation in Episcopal bodies is an open concession to the first principle of Presbyterianism—that is, the right of the people to

representation, and thus to a participation in government. The forming of Associations in Congregational bodies is an equally frank concession to the other principle of Presbyterian polity—that is, the right of supervisory control. The Episcopal form of government, it seems to me, gives undue emphasis to the supervisory power, and lay delegation is an effort to correct this defect. On the other hand, Congregationalism exalts the local assembly and ignores a supervisory power in theory, and the Association is superadded to correct its defects. As to both these bodies, the features I have mentioned as being concessions to Presbyterianism exist not as fundamental principles of Church polity, but as accidents, while in Presbyterianism they are fundamental and essential. Lay delegation is an after-thought in Episcopal bodies. With our Congregational friends, Associations are simply emasculated supervisory courts. In the Presbyterian Church we have (*a*) the local assembly governed by an official board of its own choosing; (*b*) the right of appeal guaranteed; (*c*) supervisory courts with appellate jurisdiction, whose decrees in pursuance of their authority are as binding upon every loyal Presbyterian as are the decrees of the inferior court.

The principles which were recognized in the Church when the Savior was here on earth—the principles which he recognized himself in his public ministry by conforming to them—the principles recognized by the apostles in a similar way, we recognize now, and cling to Presbyterianism because it varies least from the primitive, apostolic, and therefore divine, model.

2. I am a Presbyterian *because history justifies this high claim of Presbyterianism.*

It is impossible for us now to ascertain the precise time when Christianity was introduced into Scotland. It is generally conceded by writers of Church history that it was accomplished before the close of the second century. God often by his providence prepares the way for coming events. Thus before the advent of Christ all the nations of the world were gathered into one vast empire. Universal peace prevailed and one official language was recognized. In like manner he prepared to protect the Church of Christ. Before the advent of the Savior a part of the British isles was subjected to the Roman power. The great Celtic race, originating in Asia, had spread through Asia Minor, across Europe

even to the extreme western boundary of Ireland and Scotland. Thence the tide of emigration turned back upon itself and strengthened this Celtic highway across the continent. The Apostle Paul spent at least a part of his ministerial life with the Celts of Asia Minor. His epistle to the Galatians is a standing proof of this. Later in life he visited Rome and perhaps Spain also. Thus the way was prepared. In order that the Church might be saved from papal fury in subsequent ages the conquering arm of the Roman was stayed at Adrian's wall. Beyond this wall a safe retreat was provided for the Church of Christ. So far I have not deemed it necessary to cite authorities in support of facts alleged, since these things are not disputed. What I wish to present further will be developed in a series of propositions with proof appended.

First. Christianity was introduced into Great Britain within or very near the apostolic age.

Thus Tertullian declares, "Those parts of Britain that were inaccessible to the Romans had become subject to Christ." Tertullian Adv., Jud. C. 7.

Tertullian lived A.D. 160–216, or later. This carries us back to within sixty years of the apostolic age. Making all necessary allowance for rhetorical exaggeration, Christianity must have been established in Scotland for many years prior to this statement. This testimony, allowing it any proper weight, carries us within the shadow of the apostolic age if not into that period.

"The power of the Lord is also with those who in Britain are separated from our orb, and those in Mauritania, with all under the sun who have believed in his name." Origen, 6th Homily.

Origen was a contemporary of Tertullian and lived A. D., 185–252. He was in all probability a resident of Palestine when he wrote this, and the fact he states must have existed long prior to his day.

"But that they (the apostles) should preach the name of Jesus to all; that they should announce his marvelous works in country and city; that some of them should take possession of Rome itself, the head and queen of cities; that others should occupy the kingdom of the Persians; others that of the Armenians; others that of the Parthians; others even that of the Scythians; that some should have penetrated to the ends of the earth and the country of the

Indians; and others should have crossed the ocean to those islands called British: such things I will not believe to be according to man, nor to be in the power of persons of no weight or standing, least of all to be performable by cheats and tricksters." Eusebius, Demonst. Evangel. Lib. 3, C. 7, page 112.

Eusebius closed his Church history with the Council of Nice, A.D. 324. This will give the reader some notion of the age in which he wrote. He was born A.D. 270 and died A.D. 340. He was one of the most learned men of his time. Observe that Eusebius says some of the apostles "crossed the ocean to those islands called British." Whether he means one of the twelve or simply a companion or helper of the apostles, an apostolic man such as Titus and Timothy, is immaterial. The language shows that the gospel was preached in Britain very near if not within the apostolic age.

Theodoret was born A.D. 386 and died A.D. 457, aged 71. His church history begins A.D. 324, and ends A.D. 429. He says:

"These our fishermen, publicans, tent-makers persuaded not only the Roman subjects but also the Scythians, Sauromatæ, Indians, Persians, Særae, Hyrcanians, Britons, Cimmerians, and Germans to embrace the religion of Him who had been crucified." Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, Opp. tom. IV. Series IX., p. 610.*

In the Council which met at Arles in France by order of the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 314, three bishops from Britain were present.

"It is certain that the tidings of the Son of man crucified and raised again under Tiberius spread through these islands more rapidly than the dominion of the emperors, and that before the end of the second century churches worshiped Christ beyond the wall of Adrian." D'Aubigne, History Ref., Vol. V., p. 19.

"Christianity was introduced into Britain at an early period in all probability, however, not through Rome, but from the East by means of the Mediterranean commerce carried on through Gaul. It is known that the latter country had numerous Christian congregations in the second century. The most probable tradition ascribes the adoption of Christianity in Britain as an established religion to Prince

* The reader will find this and the foregoing quoted matter and much more of a similar character in a small work entitled "The Ancient British Church," by William Lindsay Alexander, D.D. The author's conclusion as to the "essentially episcopal character" of the government of this ancient Church is decidedly far-fetched. Otherwise the book is valuable.

Lucius or Leuer, Maur (the great light), who flourished some time in the second half of the second century." Students' Hume, p. 15.

These quotations are sufficient to show that Christianity was established in Scotland within or very near the apostolic age. All the writers agree that this was accomplished before the close of the second century. The Apostle John lived to A.D. 99, and doubtless there were many inducted into the ministry in his day that lived for many years after his death. Mr. Hume tells us that Christianity was the *established* religion of Britain by the close of the second century. Tertullian declares that Scotland had become subject to Christ. This was so well known that apologists in their works made use of it as proof of the truth of Christianity. The fact was neither doubtful nor obscure. Origen, Theodoret, and Eusebius refer to it as well known. If the reader will consider the great difficulty of supplanting an old religion by a new one, and make allowance for the immense distances to be traveled and the slow method of accomplishing journeys in that age of the world, he will see that my first proposition is true.

Second. This Church thus established in Scotland sprang from an Eastern source and never had any connection with the Western, Latin, or Roman Church.

"The peculiarity of the later British Church is evidence against its origin from Rome, for in many ritual matters it departed from the usage of the Roman Church and agreed much more nearly with the churches of Asia Minor. It withstood for a long time the authority of the papacy. This circumstance would seem to indicate that the Britons had received their Christianity either immediately or through Gaul from Asia Minor." Neander, Volume I, pp. 85, 86.

"But as the Britons had not received their Christianity from Rome but directly or indirectly from the East, they had not been used to reverence the Roman Church as their mother church nor to place themselves in any relation of dependence upon it. Their long separation from the rest of Western Christendom had naturally served to strengthen in them the spirit of ecclesiastical freedom. They had, moreover, from the most ancient times, given a different form to many parts of the ritual from that which prevailed in the Roman Church; they differed for example in the time of observing Easter, in the form of tonsure among the clergy and in the mode of baptism." Ibid., Volume III., pp. 16, 17.

For brevity's sake I forbear further quotations. The reader can find statements corroborating those given, in Neander, Volume III., p. 23; Milman's Latin Church, Volume II., p. 296; D'Aubigne's History Reformation, Volume V., pp. 29, 30, 60. As to the Easter festival, the Scotch held with the Asiatic churches and repudiated the Roman custom. This is a demonstration of its non-Roman origin. For proof the reader is referred to the following writers: Prideaux's Connection, Volume II., p. 475, *et seq.*, Eusebius' History, p. 208, and Buck's Theological Dictionary. The Greek names that occur in ancient Scottish history—that is, Constantine, St. Andrews, etc., point to the same truth.

Third. The churches thus established in Scotland were Presbyterian churches.

The reader should understand that in ancient times the countries now known as Scotland and Ireland were inhabited by a people called Scots. Ireland in ancient times was called Scotia and the name Scot was carried from that country to the country now called Scotland. See Prideaux's Connection, Volume II., p. 481, *note*.

According to Archbishop Ussher, Palladius was sent over in A.D. 431, by Celestine, Bishop of Rome, as the first bishop of the Scots.* Whatever else the statement of the Archbishop may mean, it is evident that one object of this mission was to *introduce* Episcopacy. Again, says Archbishop Ussher in referring to the Irish Church, "We read in Nennius that at the beginning St. Patrick founded 365 Churches and ordained 365 bishops, besides three thousand presbyters," or elders.†

Here we have in the primitive Scotch Church *one* bishop and *eight* elders to each Church. The *official equality* of these servants of the Church is directly asserted in the teaching of Columba, the Irish—that is, Scotch missionary to Scotland. (D'Aubigne Hist. of the Reformation, Vol. V.) The same author tells us that "Synodical Assemblies regulated the affairs of the Church." Mr. Green, in his "History of the English People," tells us of the establishment of Christianity in Britain and Ireland long before the invasion of the pagan English (page 57), of the uprooting of Christianity in Roman England by these pagan invaders, and the subsequent restoration of Christianity by Irish—that is, Scotch

* See Hetherington's History of the Church of Scotland for quotations and references, page 10.

† Ibid, page 11.

missionaries, of their labors among the Picts of Scotland, the Frisians of the northern seas, of their monasteries in Burgundy and the Appenines, and of the labors of St. Gall near lake Constance (page 58). He tells us how the ancient Irish and Scotch Church opposed bitterly the Roman emissaries in the north of England, of the council of Whitby and the adherence of the king to the cause of the Romans and of the abandonment of the country by the Irish missionaries and their return to Iona rather than acknowledge the authority of the Roman Church (page 64). Then, to make assurance doubly sure, he tells us "The Celtic Church in its own Irish home took the clan system of the country as the basis of Church government" (page 65). Mr. Green is "Examiner in the School of Modern History, Oxford." What he means by the *clan* system is not exactly clear. Perhaps he means the one bishop and eight elders of Archbishop Ussher. Perhaps this is another name he has for Presbyterianism. At all events the clan system was not identical with Episcopacy. When the Roman Church was once more established in England in 668–690, he says (page 65), "All ties between England and the Irish Church were roughly broken."

It is true Mr. Green tries, contrary to fact, to reduce the points of difference to trivialities, but he admits that this Church, far from originating from Rome, steadfastly refused to acknowledge Rome's authority, and that its leaders abandoned their homes in preference. Though defeated in England they did not succumb, but invaded the very strongholds of the Roman Church and questioned her claims in public controversies. D'Aubigne's Hist. Ref., Volume V., pages 29, 30. Even so late as A.D. 800 we find these controversies still raging. (*Ibid*, page 64.) The Culdees, as they were called, the descendants and representatives of this ancient and primitive Church of Ireland were deprived of their privileges at St. Andrew's in 1297. Widely as the Romish authorities extended their power they were never able to extinguish "the purer faith and simpler system of the ancient Culdees, especially in Ayershire and perhaps, also, in Fife." (Heth. page 22.)

The pedobaptist character of this Irish and Scotch Church is proved by the universal prevalence of infant baptism as shown in Wall's History, and particularly by the testimony of Pelagius so

well known to scholars. Neander says this Church differed from the Roman Church in the mode of baptism (see extract above). Now the Roman Church, as immersionists themselves show, in this age practiced immersion. Moreover the Irish version of the Scriptures renders *baptidzo* by *baiste*. The common derivative *baisteach*, which means rain, shows unequivocally that effusion was the practice. I have not space to give reasons for believing that the Waldensian Church was the result of the labors of Irish missionaries. Their similarity in doctrine and polity can not be denied.

Now, briefly summarizing the foregoing facts we see: (*a*) that the Church under the former dispensation was governed by "elders of the people;" (*b*) this polity was in force in the days of the Savior, and was recognized by him and his apostles; (*c*) it was recognized by the Christians after the ascension of our Lord, and is the only form of Church government ever indorsed by an inspired man so far as we can learn; (*d*) this polity, briefly, is (1) the sole headship of Christ, (2) a plurality of bishops or elders in each local church, chosen by the people, (3) the association of these local assemblies under supervisory courts; (*e*) this was the polity of the ancient Irish and Scotch Churches which were established within or near the apostolic age; (*f*) it was the polity of the Culdees of Scotland; and was continued by them until the Reformation period, and their representatives in modern times are found in the Presbyterian Churches of the world.

3. I am a Presbyterian *because Presbyterianism is in accord with liberty and progress.*

Writing of this Church in its earlier history, Green says:

> While the vigor of Christianity in Italy and Gaul and Spain was exhausted in a bare struggle for life, Ireland, which remained unscourged by invaders, drew from its conversion an energy such as it has never known since. Christianity had been received there with a burst of popular enthusiasm, and letters and arts sprung up rapidly in its train. The science and biblical knowledge which fled from the continent took refuge in famous schools which made Durrow and Armagh the Universities of the West.—Hist. English People, p. 58.

Of the energy and aggressiveness of this Church, he says:

> "For a time it seemed as if the course of the world's history was to be changed, as if the older Celtic race that Roman and German had swept before them, had turned to the moral conquest of their conquerors, as if Celtic and not Latin Christianity was to mold the destinies of the Churches of the West. When politics and superstition in A.D. 664 struck hands in Northumbria and won the day against this primitive and apostolic Christianity its missionaries sadly retired from the scenes of devoted labor, recognizing it to be their duty *to suffer* as well as to do the will of their Master."—Page 58.

Of the failure of this Church in this region, Mr. Green says:

> "As the Roman Communion folded England again beneath her wing, men forgot that a Church which passed utterly away had battled with Rome for the spiritual headship of Western Christendom, and that English religion had for a hundred years its center not at Canterbury, but at Lindisfarne. Nor were men long to remember that from the days of Aethelfrith to the days of Ecgfrith, English politics had found their center at York. But forgotten or no, Northumbria had done its work. By its missionaries and by its sword it had won England from heathendom to the Christian Church. It had given her a new poetic literature. Its monasteries were already the seat of whatever intellectual life the country possessed. Above all, it had been the first to gather into a loose political unity the various tribes of the English people, and by standing at their head for nearly a century to accustom them to a national life, out of which England, as we have it now, was to spring."—Page 69.

Thus the Presbyterian Church laid broad and deep the foundation of English liberty and glory. Her heralds of the Cross won the savage Celts from Druidism to Christianity, and in subsequent years yoked the heathen conquerors of England to the chariot of Christ. Her seminaries of learning were like stars of the first magnitude in the long, dark night of mediæval ignorance. Her Cædman sang the first great English song and baptized English literature with the spirit of poesy. Her sons were and are by birthright devotees of learning and freedom. In modern as in ancient days she displays the same zeal for liberty and progress, and whether we turn to the Presbyterians of the continent in the dawn of the reformation or to the Scotch-Irish of North Carolina, whose manifesto became the harbinger of political independence to the colonies, her history is the same. While I accord to others full freedom to follow their inclinations and wear whatever name expresses them, I can ask for myself no higher earthly privilege than membership in the Presbyterian family as one loyal to its interests, true to its historic doctrines, and proud of its glorious achievements.

W. H. BERRY.

THE PREACHER'S AIM AND WORK.*

THE motto of the illustrious Grotius, who was one of the greatest economists of life's fleeting moments, might be appropriately engraved on the portals of every school or study, of every material or intellectual workshop: "*Hora ruit.*" The little time that is allotted for our work is rushing past us. We no sooner begin our task and sow some seeds than we see the end of the season looming solemnly in view. It would be in vain to sit down and bewail the shortness of time or the necessities of our position. Achievement will be all the sweeter and dearer if, eager to "scorn delights and live laborious days," we triumph over our disadvantages.

One thing is on our side—we have, or at least we may have, pure and lofty aims. That is of infinite moment for giving tone to the best part of a life-time. The aims of men are very varied. Some are in the direction of what is low. The aims of others descend still farther, and are in the direction of what is baleful and vicious. They terminate in injury done to society in general, or the infliction of injustice, oftentimes irreparable, on individual members of society. The aims of many others, though not vicious on the one hand nor ignominiously low on the other, wheel round continually into the moral whirlpool of which self is the center. Such aims, to say the least of them, are far indeed from being the outcome of the love that "seeketh not her own." They are thus far from being *Christian*. They have no wings wherewith to soar into the bright, clear atmosphere of heaven. But when men and women are Christians—Christians, indeed, in whom is no guile—then from the root of their moral being there springs a growing life of good which rises, and still rises, until its branches reach up far above selfism, waving toward heaven, and yet drooping bountifully toward earth with weighted wealth of fruit.

If theological students do themselves justice in the motives that actuate them before they begin their preparatory studies and after they complete them, their aims, from first to last of their career,

* The substance of an inaugural address by the Rev. James Morison, D.D., to the students of the Evangelical Union Theological Hall, Glasgow, Scotland, 1889.

will never be low, though lowly; never mere ingulfments of self-consideration; they will be lofty and ever soaring higher still. This is something of very great moment. The true student of theology has his aims rising up within him toward God. Not he alone, indeed, as I have indicated. Very far from it. Every Christian, who is Christian indeed, is characterized and ennobled and sanctified by the same aims. The student of theology has no higher style of aim within his reach. But if he do not, by an act of willfulness, turn himself upside down in moral character, he is helped by the very fact that he is a student of theology toward aims which rise up to God. "Whatsoever ye do," said the great Apostle Paul, "do all to the glory of God." It is given unto all to aim at the glory of God. There is a sense and a way in which even we, though so exceedingly little in the universe, can and may "*glorify* God." So far as reflected rays of divine luster are concerned, rays gilding the intelligences of the universe and thence glinting upward again and ministering to the satisfaction of the great Father in his great family—so far as such rays of glory are concerned—we may add to them, and therein is our Father more and more glorified. Such and so grand may be, and should be, our aims.

But there is another aspect in which we may consider the aims, which it is our privilege, as students of theology, to cherish. It is closely affiliated to the view which I have already exhibited. Still it is distinct. It is our privilege to have our aims rising up toward Jesus Christ. As Jesus Christ himself teaches us, "He and the Father are one." Thus our aims go entirely in one direction when they rise either to the Father or to the Son. If difference there be it is only this: that Jesus Christ seems to our spiritual senses to be somewhat more palpable and comprehensible, because somewhat more human though not more humane, than the Father. He is really more human. Emphatically so. He is the self-hiding mystery of God in man and of man in God. "He is God manifest in the flesh," self-manifestive in man. As such he reveals the Father, and is the Way to the Father.

Our aims consequently when they go up to the Father get up most readily and most directly when they ascend by way of the Son. And exceedingly important it is for our aims, and for the sum total of our moral character as determined by our aims, that they should

be not in words only, but in the most sensitive element of our consciousness, the infinite spiral that is within us, as a constant aspiration toward Jesus Christ. "To me to live is Christ" is the noblest motto of the noblest life that, next to the life of Jesus Christ himself, was ever lived on earth. Nay, it should scarcely be said that the noble apostle's noble life was lived outside the life of Christ. It was in a very high and just sense, though not metaphysically, lived inside the life of Christ. The apostle felt, as it were, absorbed into Christ. He was "*in* Christ"—consciously and voluntarily "living and moving and having his being" in Christ, even as we all involuntarily, and whether consciously or unconsciously, live and move and have our being in God, being beset behind and before, within and without, on our right hand and at our left.

He is no true fellow of the Apostle Paul and no true Christian who does not aim at least to be able to say in sincerity, "To me to live is Christ." Christ, we are assured by the apostle, died "one for all, that they who live should live not to themselves, but to him who died for them and rose again." You see the utter unselfism of the Christian's aims—"One died for all that they who live should live not to themselves." You see the definite direction which is taken by the Christian's aims, as he ascends *with* them and *in* them. "One died for all that they who live should live to him who died for them and rose again." Such aims in life are incomparably more important in students of theology than all Greek and Roman, all English and Oriental lore; and it is one of our high privileges as students of theology that there is nothing in our calling, when it is ingenuously cultivated, that is fitted to pull us down in our every-day aims. There is much on the contrary, so far as the real work of our profession is concerned, that is calculated to stir us up to soar and still to soar. It is a possibility for us to be ministrant to Jesus Christ, and in our ministry to add thrill upon thrill to the satisfaction and rapture of his heart, as he sees in our life and in our labors the glorious results of the travail and agony of his soul. When I speak of our Savior seeing in our labors some of the results of the intense anxieties of his soul, I touch upon other high aspects of our aims besides those that have reference to the direct ascent of our thoughts, our desires, our purposes, to God and to Christ. Our aims, if we are true to the genius of our calling, will go out wistfully and lovingly to our fellow-men around us. And in thus going out they will not only go away from ourselves—they will go up. There will be *elevation* in them. They will not descend; or if in some cases they may be legitimately represented as descending, it will be after the manner represented in the beautiful Greek paradox: They will "descend ascendingly."

We could not be true students of Christian theology and true heralds of the Christian gospel if, in our intercourse with our fellow men and in our labors among them, we sought not them, but theirs. It would be mere selfism were we to endeavor to gain rather their applause than themselves. It would be ignobler selfishness still were it our grand secret aim to use them for our comfort and convenience. Our comfort, indeed, must no doubt have some place in our desires and aims. So must our convenience. We can not shake ourselves entirely free from material relationships; or with impunity dismiss our desire for enough to eat and to drink and wherewithal to be clothed legitimately and decently, for modest objects of elegance and beauty. This is unquestionable. As inhabitants of God's earth and as citizens of society, we have a right to seek for ourselves some fair proportion of the riches of nature on the one hand and the products of human labor and skill on the other.

But still there is a kind of hierarchy in men's legitimate aims, a spiritual grading or gradation; and to put that first which should be last, that hindermost which should be foremost, or to treat that as transcendent or supreme which should be put down and held down as subordinate, would be to reduce morals to absolute chaos. Never can it be well with the minister of the gospel unless he can sincerely say, "I seek not yours, but you." It must—if we would not be guilty of inverting the holy pyramid, the hierarchy of moral aims—it must be ever a higher wish and purpose with us to minister to our fellow men than to get them to minister to us. "All things," says the Apostle Paul to his Corinthians, "are for your sakes." All things that the apostle did, all things that he suffered, were done by him and endured, not for his own sake, but for theirs. "I live," said this noble man to his Thessalonians, "I live"—enjoy existence and am content—"if ye stand fast in the Lord." What a grand antithesis to selfishness! It is ours to take our position in the sacred gradation beside the apostle. It is ours—at once our

duty and our privilege—to make it our aim to be helpful to our fellow men. We are to seek, in other words, to be helpful to them in respect to the great moral principles whose peculiar function it is to control the varied experiences of life terrestrial, and thus to make ready for life celestial. In being thus helpful to our fellow men we use work as a ministering servant to worship, and employ the contents of the second table of the law, translated from their merely negative into their positive import, to render adoringly service to the contents of the first. Such are the loftier of the aims which it is befitting in us to cherish in reference to our work as students of theology. Nearest to us is the aim that terminates on our fellow men, so far as it is possible for our influence to extend to them. Beyond that aim is the still loftier one that goes up to Jesus Christ, our glorious Savior, and terminates on him. Higher still, if higher be a possibility, is the aim that rises *direct to God*, and thus terminates in the living center of all those infinities whose circumferences are nowhere, but whose centers of glory are everywhere.

All the principal aims that are open to us terminate, you perceive, not on things but on persons. We have aims, as we have seen, that terminate on the persons of our fellow men, and thus penetrate into hearts wonderfully capable of emotional thrill. We have aims that terminate on the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that thus penetrate into his most tenderly sensitive heart, so peculiarly and exceptionally capable of emotional thrill. We have aims, too, if we be at all in the spirit of our profession, that rise soaringly aloft till they alight on the person of the great Father of all, and touch with some sweet thrill or other some chord of harmony or other in his infinite and infinitely sensitive heart.

But there are, in subordination to these aims and as ways and means by which they may reach their nobler ends, other aims that have to do with *things*, but which you can not afford to overlook. Others may seek in the prosecution of ordinary business avocations, and quite apart from special literature, to glorify God and to glorify Jesus Christ, and to benefit, with a view to their ultimate glory or glorification, their accessible fellow men around them; but it devolves on us as professional theologians and heralds of the gospel of salvation to lift up our voices, sparing them not, that we may speak and publish to our fellow men words selected carefully from the great "world of words"—words, even all the words of this

spiritual life of ours—words of truth and soberness—words, too, of evangelical significance and of evangelical enthusiasm and devotedness. We are to go forth as teachers and preachers by means of words. We are likewise to be ensamples to the flock—ensamples by means of *works* as distinguished from *words*—ensamples molded into spiritual symmetry and beauty by the power of the unique and sublime objects that are couched in the themes of our preaching and teaching.

Professional preachers of the gospel and teachers of theology are in these days more than ever expected to have the mastery of *words*, and to be possessed of such a fair amount of scholarship as will enable them to make intelligent use of the words of the original New Testament in particular, and also of the Hebrew Old Testament. The teaching that is expected from us is emphatically biblical. The persons who form in all our churches, and in all churches that have any sympathy with us, the backbone of our strength, are lovers of the Bible; hence they desire to have that word carefully and accurately interpreted, that they may be helped to grasp its teachings and to combine its utterances into unity. Much as they may esteem their pastor, especially if he be good and wise and scholarly, still it is not so much *his* ideas that are interesting to them and to be deferentially received by them; it is the ideas of the inspired writers themselves which all the best members of our churches long to understand; hence the immense importance of having in general a vein of exegesis of greater or lesser diameter running through our pulpit discourses. But in order that there may be such a vein it is needful that we should be able to make intelligent use, in some scholarly way, of the original languages of the Bible. A fair acquaintance with New Testament Greek and Old Testament Hebrew should surely be deemed indispensable in professional preachers of the gospel and teachers of biblical theology.

The philosophy of theology, and even of the gospel of God's universal grace, is also in its own place indispensable. Without it we should be rudderless on an immeasurable ocean of innumerable waves and wavelets of speculation; hence the necessity of balanced and systematic theology. And as the true theology must fight the false theologies that assail it, and that, too, in the spirit of defense, not of defiance, we need more or less of polemical theology. We

need, moreover, historical theology, for the life of our Lord Jesus Christ is emphatically a history; and there is a history, not yet completely written out, of the biographical books in which the evangel of his life is recorded. There is, too, a history of all Paul's epistles and of the other New Testament documents. There is a history likewise of all the Old Testament writings; and wider still, there is a history of all the divine manifestations of grace and mercy from age to age in all parts of the world, and a corresponding history of those varied human responses to God's revelation of himself that constitute *religions* and *religion*.

Closely connected with historical theology is apologetics, that department of theology which, after having, as the result of broad and candid investigation, obtained evidence of the soundness of the foundation of the gospel, stands immovably on the defensive, with the shield of faith on its arm. It differs from polemical theology chiefly in this respect, that the shield is its prominent weapon. Its armor thus is the shield and the sword, the shield first; whereas the armor of polemical theology is the sword and the shield, the sword first. As the Hebrews talked of *lives* instead of life, so in these days of literary subdivisions we have theologies *in* theology. "Who is sufficient for these things?" The difficulties that face us seem almost to frown upon us, rising up before us like Alps beyond Alps. The responsibility at times is overpowering and all but appalling. This is more particularly the case when we take into account the fact that, as the gospel is no detached thing, separated from theology, so theology itself is no detached thing separate from science and from universal scholarship and culture. In the case of professional theologians and professional preachers of the gospel who have to appear before the same people week after week and year after year, wide culture is indispensable for the creation and maintenance of wide and lasting moral influence; for doubtless all that is logically true and all that is æsthetically beautiful, as well as all that is ethically good, links itself on to God and God's gospel.

Who is sufficient for these things? We should have no hope of success at all, but should be utterly dismayed and driven into despair, were it not that we are encouraged to look aloft from the depths of sincere humiliation and to exclaim, "Our sufficiency is of God." Through Christ strengthening us we shall be enabled,

within the humble sphere of our evangelical exertions, "to do all things." There is a species of omnipotence in faith. Let us bear in mind that, as in their infinite area of operation Christ and his Father have worked together "hitherto," so must there be in our little human sphere or microcosm the synergism of Christ and ourselves. Many are the voices that rise up within the depths of our self-consciousness, or that come down from the heights that overshadow and overawe us, saying, "Why stand ye idle?" Work, work, for the night cometh on apace, when no man can work. Work, for it is God who, beforehand with us as ever, is already working in us "to will and to do of his good pleasure." May we all approve ourselves "workers that need not to be ashamed;" and when our work of faith is ended and our labors of love completed, may we receive from the pierced hands of the Master his coronation-blessing, while there drops from his lips the sweetest possible meed of approbation, "Well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord."

JAMES MORISON.

THE HUMAN CHRIST—A GLIMPSE.

THE world is in a tempest of speculation. He is to be pitied who has not made some port of safety, and moored his craft to some solid pier. No man is what he ought to be till his opinions are settled and he knows what they are—what he believes and why he believes it. A well-defined and consistent belief strengthens one, and enables him to feel the ground beneath him, and it is only when we can touch the bottom that we can brace ourselves against the current.

But we need more than an intellectual standard. We are practical beings and need a standard of conduct. We naturally seek for this in the lives of others, and the study of history helps the thoughtful in the search. Its recorded failures warn him, and its successes give him courage. In conduct men are naturally imitators. They measure the good they do by what others have done, and judge their faults by those of their fellow men. Therefore our characters are what they should be only as our standard is perfect and we succeed in efforts to reach it. If this be true, how essential that the standard of our conduct be a high one?

History contains the record of one perfect character. I shall speak of him as a man, and endeavor in reverently looking at him to apply the same rules which are necessary to benefit us in the study of any other classic life. His influence has impressed itself on history. His teachings have lighted up the world's path of progress. His character has given character to modern civilization. The fact that his life is principally contained in writings which Christendom holds sacred renders the character of Jesus of Nazareth no less of historical interest, and detracts nothing from it as an example of what men should try to be by emulating the best of those who have lived and done good in the world.

Our habit of thinking of him as more than man too often prevents us from appreciating him *as* a man. Aside from the splendor with which our ideas of his divinity naturally encircle him, he stands forth before us in the light of history a perfect man, and the example of human conduct which he embodied in a life given to

thoughtfulness and introspection, is reasonable—entirely consistent with the soundest philosophy and severest experience.

Human nature is the same everywhere and always, whether developed in Jesus to perfection, or moving in the cramped and smaller sphere of our finite souls. The cardinal principles of ethical law and mental action are no arbitrary rules. They come like heat from combustion—like the glitter from the diamond. They come from mind and morals, the essential product of their very being. They must be the same therefore, whether evolved in Christ's perfect manhood or working in hearts like ours, and what was necessary to perfect them in the perfect man can not be dispensed with in us. Our natures must retain their identity forever, and the laws that now control them must remain the same, working on toward the perfection of human character, till, purified and freed from every uncleanness, the soul shall reflect in its future state the love and glory of its God. Goodness and justice and truth and moral beauty are not one thing above and another thing below the skies. Human nature, in its progress over the high road of experience, is not subject to one code of conduct in my life and to a different code in the life of Christ, but the humanity he came to benefit and lift up to God must display the Creator's glory, if at all, according to the same laws and principles of life which controlled the perfect Man. Our bosoms throb with the same high motives that moved his breast. He was a man, perfect, and his perfection made him more of a man instead of detracting from his nature as such; and if more of a man, more thoroughly governed by the same laws of ethics and experience which he prescribes for us.

Students of history find interest in other characters. The heart warms toward the weeping Andromache at the tomb of Hector. The death of Socrates is grand, and Cæsar's touching. We follow Hannibal as he returns to Carthage and weeps over its ruins. Why not on the same principle be interested in the life of Christ? Why not follow him to the Garden of Sorrow while no one is near to help him bear his crushing burden? Why not go with him through the shadows of the Wilderness of Temptation, and there learn lessons of him to help us bear our own? Study him while in suffering he was preparing for his work. Let us draw near that we may know what he underwent. For forty days the Human

Christ tasted no food. Hunger hollowed his cheeks and plowed great furrows in his face, but his humanity struggled on. Satan came with a heart full of evil and a tongue of deceit. Hear him; "Thou art the Son of God. Why suffer so? The power of God is sleeping in thy hand. Put it forth. Command these stones to be made bread." But no. "Man shall not live by bread alone." A lesson greater than Hannibal's is this. Our Examplar was learning by experience how to succor the tempted and give them strength—teaching the student of history to live by every word of hope and promise coming from the mouth of God.

But see yonder temple tower. The appeal now is not to the hungry half starved man. The Tempter's aim is higher. He challenges now his very confidence in God. "Prove him. Prove that everlasting love. Art thou not his Son, his delight? Cast thyself down from hence. His angels shall bear thee up, and not a single rock shall bruise thee." Nay, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Thou shalt not abuse his mercy and misuse his love.

Come higher yet and see the Human Christ and the Tempter on the mountain top. Around them as on a map the kingdoms of the world are spread, and all their power and rule shall be His—all their wealth and glory—for one single obeisance to the enemy before him—one single acknowledgment of a fallen angel's dignity and might. It *was* a trial. That ambition of which we afterward hear, leading him to look for "the joy set before him," the recompense of his reward, swells his human heart. "Tempted in all things" like other men, he differed from them only in the absence of sin. There is one way for him to inherit the possessions of the world, and he must follow that. "Get thee behind me Satan. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Here was a battle in which the humanity of Jesus of Nazareth was tested. The Spirit had not led him from the crowded banks of Jordan for nothing, and many who study his life underestimate the trial he was called to undergo. Too prone are we to allow our faith in his divinity to lessen our ideas of what he bore as a man. Jesus of Nazareth was a man like other men, "in all points tempted like as we are." His human heart throbbed in a breast full of powerful human emotions, each gathering strength from the very perfections of his nature. Hunger's

torture was more exquisite since it had, so to speak, more mental material to involve in its physical results. Ambition was more potent, for it had more perfect and refined motives to which to appeal. Hope of reward was stronger, for his powers of appreciating it made it so. His sense of dignity was more acute, because he was more perfectly a man. The whole of his humanity was tried like other men's, the trials being greater in proportion to their field of action—their flames glowing hotter by virtue of the more abundant and refined fuel his nature could afford them. That perfect human nature suffered; not his divinity, for that could not suffer; nor, therefore, could it nor did it afford strength to the other component of his marvelous being. In the wilderness of temptation his divinity broke not the force of one single appeal, nor bore for his humanity one single burden, for then that divinity would have made him less a man.

These two natures, the divine and the human, were unified into one, but separate and distinct each from the other, the one only increasing the capacity and refining the perfections of the other—enhancing therefore its ability to receive, to suffer, to be itself, but giving it no strength independent of its own perfections. Therefore the human nature of the only perfect man in history differed from all other human natures simply in its perfections. Instead of being less human, and thereby less subjected to influences from without by the communication of divine strength, the divine only entered it to make it more perfectly human, as caloric enters the steel of the artisan, as knowledge and cultivation enter the intellect of the student—both refined, neither changed. The same emotions that we feel throbbed in his human breast. Hollow-eyed hunger lost none of its horror because he looked a perfect human nature in the face. The cup he drank of sorrow's hand, praying for it to pass, was no less bitter because a perfect human nature pressed it to its lips. The hope of reward allured him no less than it allures us, for it appealed to our nature perfect in him. His very perfections enhanced his susceptibility. His purity and holiness laid his soul more open to impressions than others less perfect can ever be. No sin had colored it, hardening with its precipitate the immaculate interior of his heart. His nature was our nature developed to perfection, and with that perfection came all the cognates of refined susceptibility. As a deadly centipede,

crawling on the rosy cheek of infancy, leaves a dark red mark of poison behind it, and now across the face of a dead cold corpse withered with age and putrefaction, and none of its loathsome track is seen—so temptation blistered with its hot breath his sensitive and perfected nature, leaving scarce a trace on ours, so calloused are we with sin. That human nature was as the fur coat of a newly-plucked and perfect peach. The tiniest insect's wing can brush it and leave its trace—the hardest storm can not touch its nectar or impair its flavor.

The development of that perfect nature followed the same shining track of ethical law which all must go over to reach moral education and refinement. This one perfect character with which the study of history acquaints us, attained his perfected experience under a tuition of suffering in which every resource of his beautiful nature was taxed, and all the tender and refined susceptibilities of his soul were tempted. That mighty earthquake of temptation, in the midst of which the Human Christ stood alone, made all of his perfection tremble by its giant force. Angels themselves delayed their ministerings till it was over and its last shock was borne, and then like new strength to us when trials are past—like new life to the flower after the storm—like purity in the air after the lightning's flash, while he held communion refreshing and sweet with his Father, "angels came and ministered unto him."

Often do we find the Human Christ thus alone in prayer, making the examples of meditation and self-knowledge plain before us. Often does he send his followers to their fishing while he goes alone into the mountain solitude. Many starry midnights looked down upon him in the desert, his knees knit to the ground in prayer, his soul seeking new strength and aid to bear his heavy burden.

I must walk, therefore, the same road with him. I must be educated as he was. I must learn in the same school of experience where he studied that he might give me tuition. I must mount the wine-press of self-communion, introspection, and solitude if I would fill the measure of duty that is before me, and develop my strength of mind and heart.

Every perception, every impression made through the five senses, is but the gathering of new material to be wrought in the mysterious workshop of the mind into new creations, new thoughts—polished, symmetrical, beautiful, brought out like jewels from the lathes and planes and grindstones of the intellectual lapidary. Such is the power of the intellect, the mind immortal, the god-like reason—distinguishing man above all the works of God, and giving him power above the rest to "impress upon matter a permanent sign of his thoughts." It leaves the cricket on the household hearth, and rises in majesty almost divine to tread the orbits of the stars. From so small a thing as the mysterious air-pump in the hollow of the house-fly's tiny foot it gets new conceptions of the wisdom of the Creator. It climbs the ladder of calculation to claim kindred with the sky, laying its beams of computation from star to star, grasping in its arms the sun himself, weighing his every pound. It points its telescope to heaven at the summer solstice, and again at the winter one, draws a line across the orbit of the earth, finds the angle at either end, and enables a schoolboy to tell the distance to the sun. With a belt of steel it brings the ends of the earth together. It tunnels the ocean with a thought. It wreathes the lightning into a ribbon, and ties it about the brow of every capital in civilization.

Such is the human mind. It needs education, drill, and culture. It needs restraint and oversight, and moral and mental aliment, and hence the necessity of the tuition of solitude; hence, the philosophy of the example of the Human Christ. It is a complex something. It thinks and concludes. It garners knowledge for new conceptions, and forms conceptions from new knowledge. But more: it loves, it admires, it aspires—reaches out after things beyond it, and is restless for progress in some direction, good or bad. It is supplied with ears, as it were, and eyes—emotions, which, like the tympanum of the physical ear, supplying each sound with life and character, like the retina of the eye, imparting to outward objects beauty and color in proportion to its own perfection—give to every perception a character for good or evil, just as the mind is sound or diseased. The songs of birds, the bleating of happy lambs, a band of gentle, docile sheep, a brave, beautiful dog—all nature voices the teaching of happiness and the character of nature's God; and you and I give color and force to every thing it says, just in proportion as our moral perception is healthy or diseased.

That moral vision—that "sixth sense," so susceptive of impression from "the true, the beautiful, and the good"—should we not keep it chaste and sensitive by vigilance and watching? Every beauty in the sunbeam is an inner beauty—a perception. Every blush on every flower, and all the music of the birds, the sublimity of nature, the glory of the landscape—these are moral results instead of physical facts. Their reflections on the inner man are the sources of the pleasure they afford us, and if the mirror is stained, unkept, and broken, the pleasures are forever gone. Once in my boyhood, when Andrew Johnson was President, I was a guest at the White House, and in the gloaming of the evening I walked through the National Conservatory. Beauty was there in rarest forms. The brightest colors and most delicate tints trembled on the breast of exotics from every country on the globe. The twilight deepened, and one by one the tints were fading. This smaller rose was paling—and that—and that—till finally I could see no beauty anywhere. Why? Had some genii wasted the national flower-garden? Were the roses gone? No. Daylight had gone, and with it every color. Not hidden, but gone; for color is only present where present light-rays are reflected from a surface. These colors could live only in the sunlight, and when it was absent color was impossible. The tints of beauty were reflected in pictures on my retina. The perception was carried through my optic nerves to the intellect, and when the picture could not be painted there I lost the pretty sight, and the pleasure subsided. So in morals. Let the daylight of God go out, let in the gloom of discontent, cease to care for and encourage that inner and finer perception, and lo, a dimness, a darkness, like unto which human blindness is a noonday, and human paralysis activity, will cover the moral man like the gloom of Erebus. Every beauty shall fade from the garden of the heart, and all the music of nature voiced in the works of God will die on the sound-waves of an atmosphere where no moral ears shall hear and enjoy it.

The mental constitution is such as to preclude two subjects of concentrated thought at one time. The mind needs to address itself to individual ideas, analyzing even these into their component elements before it can appreciate them as they demand. Hence, the utility of that pattern which the Human Christ affords us—

the necessity, amid the whirl and whiz of a thousand things in this day of mental activity and business push, for us now and then to go alone into the home of meditation, and learn in solitude the lessons which only the thoughtful can ever know. Here, and here alone, can one pick his motives to pieces and eliminate the evil which they all contain; here only can we lay each thought and desire like Rabsheka's letter before God, and ask his blessing in a secret prayer; here can we leave haste behind us, and remember that our fellow-pilgrims are but men. O the profound metaphysics of the Sermon on the Mount! Here in solitude—in the quiet closet of the soul—can we hear that still, small voice of conscience, so small and yet so accented and clear, like a fly's foot-fall on a pane of glass distinguished only by the microphone, and appreciated but the more highly on account of its delicate echoes. Here, and only here, can each one prosecute that earnest work of introspection which alone can cast a light along the path of duty, and guide a man to the profoundest knowledge of life—the knowledge of himself. The Human Christ found it necessary, and so will we if we ever reach the goal of human destiny, a well regulated manhood.

Habits of solitude and introspection are essential to enable one to do himself justice. Every man is a twofold being, a social and a solitary one. Here he fits himself for social life, and then in that larger sphere constantly gathers new material for solitude and thought. Observation is the vineyard boy, and meditation makes the wine. In that busy outward world where men move and trade and drive, each gathers the grapes of rich experience, and then in the wine-vat of meditation each goes alone to press the juices out. And now refreshed and strengthened by the rich viands his labor has afforded him, he joins again the circle of his fellows—buoyant, forcible—ready to impart his own vitality to others, and make all who come into the sunshine of his life feel as if they were in the refreshing breath of a summer morning.

The wisdom of the ages hangs about this thought like a mantle from the shoulders of a prince. The fact that it has been abused into the idea of a monastery and a *quasi* holy seclusion detracts nothing from its gracefulness. Fire is no less a good servant in the grate because it is a cruel master in the attic. Meditation as much as it is neglected has a place in the economy of human ex-

perience which nothing else in this life can fill. We owe it to self now and then to enter the precincts of our inner life, and shutting out the world, to uncover the faults which we fain would think are dead. We know they are but sleeping with the anesthetic of forgetfulness. Command them that they file in melancholy line before you. Review your failings yet again till you know them so well as to avoid them hereafter forever. Recuperate thus your wasted strength and gather up your energies, strained and shattered, for more courageous effort. By such habits of introspection we school our inner sight and hearing lest experience and nature should teach in vain lessons we can never learn, and show us beauties we can never see nor hear.

Be it ours therefore to unbolt the rusty lock and swing the door wide open and enter the chambers of the past; to walk among the shades that stand like sculptured busts along the niches of its broken walls; to count them, admire them, breathe into their marble lips new life, and wake the latent chords their fingers only can touch. Not that their sight should make us melancholy. No. Bitterness is there, and disappointment, and no smiles of welcome greet us from their stolid unmoved features. Blighted Hope is there, her face all covered with the scars of our mistakes, her eyes both out with weeping. Sorrow is there, her somber shadow falling across the vision of memory and clouding the present and the future. Mistake is there, her hand pointing wrong. Broken fragments of misguided efforts are scattered at her feet. But there is a lamp in every hand along that crumbling wall—a lamp of usefulness, a light of blessing; and through the arches of that ruined roof—above the gloom of its darkest recess—over the grave-stones of dead aspirations—its holy sheen is falling like a pencil of sunbeams through the broken windows of that ivy-crowned Temple of the Past.

E. G. McLEAN.

POETICAL WORKS OF ALFRED TENNYSON.

NO POET of this era is worthy to take his stand by the side of Alfred Tennyson. Some have written more, but the work of no other has been so uniformly good. He has not merely excelled in artistic finish, but more than others he has possessed the true poetic fire. Gosse says: "He has not headed a single moral reform." Neither did Shakespeare; but Tennyson has made it impossible for slovenly work to be received as art. By his cleanness and faith he has thrown discredit on much that was unsavory and materialistic. A few years ago Edmund Clarence Stedman intimated that interest in Tennyson's poetry had waned even during the poet's life-time. If such were the case, then, which is doubtful, that interest has been greatly revived by the publication of "Demeter and Other Poems" in the Laureate's eighty-first year. Tennyson's fame has reached its present maturity through much adverse criticism, which has at times amounted to jeers. When Homer nods it is more cried against than when weaker men stumble. The tide of criticism now sets full in his favor. His latest book meets great favor at the hands of the reviewers, and the most of them take this opportunity to express the highest estimate and appreciation of the life work of a man who, in all probability, in this volume sings his *Nunc Dimittis*. It might as well be stated here that of all Americans who have written upon Tennyson's work, the most appreciative is Henry Van Dyke in his recent work, "The Poetry of Tennyson." Few more readable books of criticism have been written. No true Tennysonian can afford to miss this entertaining work, which the author refuses to call a collection of critical essays. Of Tennyson as a poet Van Dyke says: "In the future, when men call the roll of poets who have given splendor to the name of England, they will begin with Shakespeare and Milton, and who shall have the third place if it be not Tennyson?" The book reviewer of the New York *Independent*, understood in this case to be Maurice Thompson, says: "The space between his first slender volume of verse (not counting that written in connection with his brother Charles) and the one now before us, is filled with the richest gift of

song received by English letters since Shakespeare let fall his pen." The same writer thinks, all things considered, "no poet has ever surpassed, perhaps none has ever equaled, him as a lyrist."

But it is said "the time has not come for the final estimate of his work." This is a truism constantly uttered with reference to contemporaneous writers, but the statement is not so true now in the day of a thousand critics as it was a few generations ago, when a Jeffrey, a Wilson, or a Lockhart might hope to formulate the judgment of mankind, in which judgment prejudice, not merit, often determined. Then a few friends might make or a few enemies mar, for a time, an author's fame.

Now a literary venture may fail for lack of being properly brought out, but when once widely circulated it has so many readers who have no interest in the personality of the writer, who, without the glamour of partisanship, compare such work with all which has gone before, that the estimate may be considered made up before the death of any writer who has been before the public so long as Tennyson. He has so lived apart from his fellows that personal considerations have had little to do in shaping the judgment of his contemporaries. His writings are passed upon as coldly and criticised as sharply as if he had been dead five hundred years. In view of these facts it is difficult to see how any future age can discrown him.

In 1827 "Poems by Two Brothers" was published. The names of the authors were modestly withheld, but they were Charles and Alfred Tennyson. The volume made no stir, yet the younger brother was the future laureate. He was at this time eighteen years of age. His father was the Rev. George Clayton Tennyson, rector of Somersby. Alfred Tennyson was educated by his father, and in due time entered Trinity College, Cambridge, where in 1829 he gained the Chancellor's medal with his poem, "Timbuctoo."

The youthful poet made bold hazard in 1830, when he issued in a thin volume "Poems Chiefly Lyrical, by Alfred Tennyson." Byron had defied the critics and sprung into fame, but the critics were by no means dead. They still sat upon their thrones in London, and especially in Edinburgh, hurling their thunders at the offending heads of presumptious young poets. Gray in his Elegy tells of those whose birth was so humble as not to secure even a frown from "fair science." The bait was hardly enough in this

case to awaken the great critics, but the effort was praised by Leigh Hunt. That was enough. Was he not under the ban as the arch heretic—the leader of what some critics chose to call the "cockney school?" John Wilson, the Christopher North of Blackwood, set to work to demolish the dainty poems and their author. In a short time after the publication of this review the poet put forth the edition of 1833. This was the only answer Tennyson made. The volume of 1830 contained fifty-three poems, many of which were omitted from later volumes, but among these were some which foretokened the true poet. "Claribel," "Mariana," "The Poet," "Ode to Memory," and "The Deserted House" were among the best of this collection. "Mariana" is strong for the poem of a youth, but contains a somberness at first supposed to have been borrowed from Byron. However, the same spirit has so often revealed itself in Tennyson's writings that it is now regarded as a Tennysonian characteristic.

The edition of 1833 was really published in December, 1832, and contained poems which will not suffer by comparison with the best lyrics of the Elizabethan age. The poet had not changed his style at the bidding of his critic, but it was richer and his flights took wider range. Some of the pieces were "The Lady of Shalott," "The Miller's Daughter," "Oenone," "The Palace of Art," and the dreamy "Lotos Eaters"—in all thirty pieces. Of these "The May Queen" sang itself into all hearts. Stedman says of this volume: "More dewy, fresh, pathetic native verse had not been written since the era of "As You Like It" and "A Winter's Tale." He had full command of musical meters; every detail was carefully wrought out, and all the slovens in versification put to shame forever. A new era had come. Poetry was still to be the best thought, but henceforward it must have the best form possible. One of these poems came to be taken as the life philosophy of the poet to such extent that it was held against him when, a few years ago, he accepted a peerage which twice before he had declined. This poem is "Lady Clara Vere De Vere," and the doctrine which runs through all the poem may be summed up in the stanza:

> Trust me, Clara Vere De Vere,
> From yon blue heavens above us bent
> The grand old gardener and his wife
> Smile at the claims of long descent.

Howe'er it be, it seems to me
'T is only noble to be good.
Kind hearts are more than coronets,
And simple faith than Norman blood.

The "grand old gardener" is Adam, the father of us all, and is so written in the first and last editions of Tennyson's works. In a survey of these earlier poems E. A. Poe, himself one of the greatest masters of lyrical verse, pronounced Tennyson "the noblest poet that ever lived." In quite a different vein was a writer in the *Quarterly* for July, 1833, supposed to have been John Gibson Lockhart. In a most exasperating way he attacked and held up to ridicule the young poet's works. He overlooked no weak point. It is hard to find a severer and more searching review. It cast the pall of silence over the poet for ten years. However, the criticism was not lost. When Tennyson brought out his poems in two volumes in 1842 he had evidently read his critics and given good heed thereto. While others had been utterly crushed or goaded to the pitch of determined resistance under the lash of the reviewer, Tennyson pruned, revised, and omitted. In these volumes he first showed that skillful handling of blank verse which has given him a distinctive and pre-eminent place among English poets. During the ten years of his silence his name had been almost entirely withdrawn from the public, but his poems had quietly won their way until it became the fashion to speak of him as a great poet.

The new publication took the public by storm. These two volumes contained the best of his previous poems, much improved in many cases, as well as such masterpieces as "Dora," "The Gardener's Daughter," "Godiva," "Ulysses," "St. Agnes," "Sir Galahad," and others. "Morte d'Arthur" opened the first volume, and is now a portion of the "Idyls of the King." Stedman says: "'Dora' is like a Hebrew pastoral, the paragon of its kind, with not a quotable detail, a line too much or too little, but faultless as a whole. Who can read it without tears?" "Locksley Hall" has become so fixed in literature that when the author, "sixty years after," made an addendum the public resented it as almost a profanation.

"Break, Break, Break" and "Flow Down, Cold Rivulet, to the Sea," enduring songs, are in this collection. Hardly any poet ever chanted a grander strain than that in "Sir Galahad." In Mal-

ory's "King Arthur" this knight only of all the Round Table was found worthy to wear the white shield with the red cross as he rode in search of the Sancgreall, or Holy Grail. In this matchless poem, which will bear reading aloud many times, Tennyson describes the deep religious fervor and joy with which the "maiden knight" pursued his quest. The lover of good poetry who has not made a study of this poem is to be congratulated that so much pleasure yet remains in store for him. Lest a copy of the poet's works should not be at hand, stanzas fourth, sixth, and seventh are given:

Sometimes on lonely mountain meres
I find a magic bark;
I leap on board; no helsman steers;
I float till all is dark.
A gentle sound, an awful light,
Three angels bear the holy Grail;
With folded feet, in stoles of white,
On sleeping wings they sail.
Ah, blessed vision! blood of God!
My spirit beats her mortal bars,
As down dark tides the glory slides,
And star-like mingles with the stars.

. . . . . .

A maiden knight—to me is given
Such hope, I know not fear;
I yearn to breathe the airs of heaven
That often meet me here.
I muse on joys that will not cease,
Pure spaces clothed in living beams,
Pure lilies of eternal peace,
Whose odors haunt my dreams;
And, stricken by an angel's hand,
This mortal armor that I wear,
This weight and size, this heart and eyes,
Are touched, are turn'd to finest air.

The clouds are broken in the sky,
And thro' the mountain-walls
A rolling organ-harmony
Swells up, and shakes and falls.
Then move the trees, the copses nod,
Wings flutter, voices hover clear;
O just and faithful knight of God!
Ride on! the prize is near!
So pass I hostel, hall, and grange;
By bridge and ford, by park and pale
All-arm'd I ride, whate'er betide,
Until I find the holy Grail.

"Morte d'Arthur" marked the beginning of a new era with the poet, and, as it has turned out, with poetry as well. Poe had announced as a principle that great poems must be short; on the other hand, admirers of Tennyson were calling for a sustained effort. His short poems were so peerless that all other models, for the time at least, were obliterated, yet the world demanded a longer and higher flight. Perhaps this must be attained to satisfy the poet himself. "The Princess," published 1847, seems to have been an effort in that direction. While this is a great poem in many particulars, his admirers felt, and time proved, that he could do better. Shakespeare did not take the trouble to invent his plots, but took such as he found ready made, and hung his mighty thoughts upon them. Tennyson attempted more. He invented his plot. Experience showed him a wiser way, and he, too, learned to look to tradition and history for his subjects. "The Princess" he calls a medley, and represents as a story told by seven gentlemen about a Princess who set out to free her sex by founding a university for females, from which hated man and all his influences should be excluded. The pupils were to be taught to hold themselves free from all entanglements with man, the tyrant. The Princess rejected with utter disdain her wooer, the Prince, to whom she had been betrothed by her father. Finally, when the Prince was brought into the college desperately wounded and nursed back to life by the Princess, then she loved—

> Her falser self slipt from herself like a robe,
> And left her woman.

"The Princess" was received with favor and extensively read in America. At least it was a notable contribution to the "emancipation-of-woman" question just then beginning to be agitated. Three songs found in "The Princess" will be sung after many other songs have been forgotten. These are: "Sweet and Low," "Ask Me no More," and "Blow, Bugle, Blow." The year 1850 showed Tennyson at his best again, and many think at the best he has ever reached. Hardly any elegiac poetry will ever be written which will surpass his "In Memoriam." Arthur Hallam, a son of the historian, had been a college mate and the closest friend of Tennyson. The poet speaks of him as

> Dear as the mother to the son,
> More than my brothers are to me.

Young Hallam died suddenly while traveling on the continent of Europe. Eighteen years after Tennyson published "In Memoriam." During this time the poet had reflected upon his loss—Doubt and Faith had held conflict—Destiny and Immortality had passed in review—issues of Time and Eternity had presented themselves for adjustment. These questions are handled with the inspiration of a poet and the ken of a philosopher. Taine, the French critic, does not think well of "In Memoriam," but confesses to a love for a poet who teaches men to forget the solemnities of Eternity in the gayeties of the Present. Of the poem under consideration, Stedman says: "In it are concentrated his wisest reflections upon life, death, and immortality, the worlds within and without, while the whole song is so largely uttered and so pervaded with the singer's manner that any isolated line is recognized at once. This work stands by itself; none can essay another upon its model without yielding every claim to personality and at the risk of an inferiority that would be appalling." It may be said in passing that the poem is not a mere treatise upon these themes, but abounds in chaste beauty and rare imagery.

In November, 1850, Alfred Tennyson was appointed to the office of Poet Laureate, left vacant by the death of Wordsworth. Never was honor more worthily bestowed. While a few great names, such as Ben Jonson, Dryden, and Wordsworth, are found on the roll of Poet Laureates, the office has frequently been bestowed for political rather than literary reasons, hence in a list of fourteen names many can not now be found in the cyclopædias, and some were openly ridiculed at the time. In the case of Tennyson the man and poet brought honor and dignity to the office. The new Laureate was soon called to exercise the duties of his office in preparing "The Ode on the Duke of Wellington." This has some good lines, but Tennyson has never been happy in national poems. "Maud," published in 1855, is an effort of this kind, in which he attempts to justify England's part in the Crimean war. He says: "It is better to fight for the good than to rail at the ill," but he never got the world to believe that fighting to sustain the Turk in his oppression of Christians was fighting for good. "The Charge of the Light Brigade," Tennyson's most spirited war poem, is not so fine a battle picture as Campbell's "Hohenlinden." In 1859 "Idyls of the King" was published, and ten thousand copies sold in

six weeks. This volume contained four idyls. Sir Thomas Malory wrote in the fifteenth century, and Caxton printed in his black letter, the legends of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table. Milton had thought of using this material, but chose "Paradise Lost" instead. Others at different times had entered the field, but the Laureate found it a rich one. After the publication of "Idyls of the King" there could be no lingering doubt of his being a great poet. He added other idyls from time to time until 1872. Of one of these, "The Holy Grail," published in 1869, forty thousand copies were ordered in advance.

While this series was in progress other work was not neglected. The pathetic poem, "Enoch Arden," published 1864, has been the source of many a tear. The entrance of Tennyson upon dramatic work was marked in 1875 by the publication of "Queen Mary: A Drama." This was met by a chorus of disapproval. He as usual gave no heed to critics, but in 1877 brought out "Harold: A Drama." In 1884 he brought out "Becket: A Drama;" thus dramatizing three important periods of English history. Although George Eliot said, "Tennyson's plays run Shakespeare's close," the public has not so decided. Perhaps a comparison, scene by scene, with Shakespeare's less important historical dramas might give a higher estimate of Tennyson's work, yet in these it is evident the Laureate's own true afflatus is wanting.

"Demeter and Other Poems" astonished and delighted the admirers of Tennyson a few weeks ago. In this he gives us again a taste of the lyrics of his youth and the strong blank verse of his mature manhood. We trust this may not prove the dying flicker of the candle which burns at its brightest a moment and then expires. His work during the last decade has been unequal in merit, but his last volume would have made a young man famous. The poet's life has been pure in word and deed. The derelictions of some literary men have been so great that their defense constitutes a literature of itself. Tennyson needs no defenders. Not only so, but there breathes through all his work faith in God and humanity. The stainless King Arthur keeps his purity, and though his life is marred and his realm is broken by the sins of others, the soul that has resisted and conquered sin passes in triumph to the end. The unselfishness of Dora, the self-sacrifice of Enoch Arden, the love for her people shown by Godiva, present the poet's view of the possibilities of our human nature. How the grandeur of the race appears in Gareth, Enid, Bedivere, and Galahad! None of the miasma of materialism which tainted so much of the literature of the preceding generation creeps through the pages of England's latest Laureate. He has been a devoted student of the Bible. Van Dyke collects three hundred direct references to this inspired book in the writings of the poet. Tennyson's faith in its teachings and in the life to come is shown in the gem which closes his last volume:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea,

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark;

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

Like some majestic cathedral rising slowly and built of fitly wrought stones, the beautiful structure of his work has been more than sixty years in reaching its grand proportions, but fair indeed is the building.

S. A. LINK.

HYMNS OF THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

THE Reformation found the Church in possession of some of the finest specimens of Christian hymnology. Preceding ages had been fruitful in the production of hymns and of sacred music. The Church, however, had made a vast depository of itself, in which were stored away out of reach of the people not only learning and sacred literature, but also hymns and sacred music. These great productions of the poets and musicians of the Church were denied to the people and reserved only for the privileged few.

Eight or nine centuries before the Reformation this great depository had been unlocked by Gregory the Great, and for a time access to these stores of sacred song was secured to the people, and these rich treasures of music being adapted to the wants and capacity of the people, thus secured for them a prominent part in the service of song. Congregational singing was, however, soon supplanted by the choir and singing priests. Though the famous Gregorian chants and the other peculiarities of the music of the first pope were retained in the public services of the Church, the people were deprived of any part in their rendition. So at the time of the Reformation the knowledge of hymns and sacred music was confined to the priests and choirs. More than this, that which was used in the public service of the Church, owing to its being in Latin, an unknown tongue to the people in nearly every country, fell far short of being an aid to devotion or a message of tenderness and truth to the soul.

It has been remarked of the peculiarities of the hymns of middle ages "that the joyful, jubilant tone of the Ambrosian and Prudentian hymns was no longer prominent; they are set in the key of mystic fervor. Begotten in the cloister, they ring with the soft and subdued but ardent tones of contemplative devotion. The singers linger near the cross and gaze upon the suffering agonies of its scenes rather than breathe the clear air of the resurrection morning or celebrate the triumphant exaltation and reign of Christ. Some of these hymns were by the most subtle theologians and devout saints." The use of sacred song among the people had been

revived to a limited extent by those forerunners of the Reformation, the "Lollards of England in the fourteenth century, and the Hussites in Bohemia in the fifteenth century."

Martin Luther, with a wisdom peculiarly his own, very quickly recognized the value of sacred songs adapted to the use of the common people. This recognition was expressed by him in a letter to a friend early in his work. He wrote: "It is my intention, after the example of the prophets and ancient fathers, to make German psalms for the people; that is, spiritual songs, whereby the word of God may be kept alive by singing. We seek, therefore, everywhere for poets." Jerome had said in the fourth century: "One can not go into the fields without finding the plower at his hallelujahs and the mower at his hymns." Luther's thought forecasted something similar for Germany. Nature had made him a lover of music, and had also endowed him with a fine voice. This had readily secured him a place in the monastery choir at Erfurt. "Thus he had been led on to cultivate this art of which he was passionately fond and to fit himself for the great work of creating for Germany and for the world a new and most effective cultus—the evangelical church song."

It fell to Luther to contribute largely to this new movement. His hymns ran up into the hundreds in point of numbers. Among the early hymns which he gave to the people were those of Huss, which had been used in Bohemia with such effect. Associated with Luther in the production of hymns were Johann Walther, Joseph Klug, Valentine Babst, Justus Jonas, Eber, and Michael Weiss, all of whom occupy honored places in German hymnology. These hymns were at first printed on leaflets and scattered far and wide among the people, by whom they were eagerly sought and committed to memory. "These hymns were caught up by traveling singers and carried from village to village and sung into the hearts of the German people." "Many of these hymns were properly religious ballads, written to suit popular melodies, and set in other cases to simple and telling tunes composed expressly for them. The first hymn book of the Reformation was printed at Erfurt in 1524. Three others were issued within the next six or seven years. So popular did these hymns become that it is said not less than four printers in Erfurt alone were entirely occupied in printing and publishing them. They were sung everywhere,

permeating the public mind with the great truths of the Reformed doctrine and baffling the artifices of the priesthood. Whole villages and towns were thus won over to what was called the 'new religion,' but which was in reality the old doctrine of the Savior and the apostles; and the roads of Germany which had so lately swarmed with men and women on their way to buy indulgences now echoed with the joyful stanzas of the Reformers." More particularly of the character of these hymns it has been said: "They were vehement and intensely passionate, richly laden with the great truths of the gospel expressed in the rugged and idiomatic tongue of the Fatherland, level with the popular mind and adapted to the people's wants."

They were joyful and confident outbursts of manly and unwavering trust in God. The key-note of all these hymns was struck by Luther in his noted hymn, "*Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*"—"A mighty fortress is our God." His whole personality breathes through this triumphant trumpet blast which bade defiance to Satanic and human foes. This hymn has been called the "Marseillaise of the Reformation"—the battle song of the Church militant, going forth conquering and to conquer, in its terrific conflict with the hierarchy of Rome. Kästlin says: "This hymn is Luther in song. It is pitched in the very key of the man. Rugged and majestic, trustful in God and confident, it was the defiant trumpet blast of the Reformation speaking out to the powers in the earth and under the earth, an all-conquering conviction of the divine vocation and empowerment. The world has many sacred songs of exquisite tenderness and unalterable trust, and also some bold and awe-inspiring lyrics like *Dies Irae*, but this one of Luther is matchless for its war-like tone, its rugged strength, and martial-inspiring tone."

The consideration of the character of the Reformation hymns anticipates in part their great and far-reaching influence. "The infectious frenzy of sacred song" was co-extensive with the Reformation. Audin, the Catholic biographer of Luther, says, "His hymns had prodigious success; the Latin hymns ceased all at once, and in the divine service nothing else was heard but the harmonious stanzas of the reformer." Cardinal Thomas-a-Jesu wrote in the sixteenth century: "The interests of Luther are furthered in an extraordinary degree by the singing of his hymns by the people of

every class, not only in schools and churches, but in dwellings and shops, in markets, streets, and fields." Cardinal Cajetan, one of Luther's great opponents, said of his hymns, "By his songs he has conquered us." The Roman Catholic theologian, Conzenius, of the seventeenth century, wrote, "Luther's hymns have destroyed more souls than his writings and sermons."

The utter powerlessness of the papacy before this great outburst of sacred song was demonstrated in a variety of ways. Coleridge has said: "Luther did as much for the Reformation by his hymns as by the translation of his Bible."

The influence of sacred music was realized not only in Germany, but it made itself felt also in France and Switzerland. The Reformed Church, though, did not move so rapidly in the production nor in the use of hymns as did the Lutheran. English hymn-writing began at a later period. These Reformation hymns not only performed the great part assigned them at the time they were written, but they became the foundation of the Church's richest hymnology. Germany to-day possesses not only a more voluminous but a richer hymnology than any other country. In 1786 Ludwig von Hardenberg prepared a list of 72,732 German hymns arranged in alphabetical order. It is supposed that the number now can not be far from one hundred thousand. Dr. Hatfield, the author of "The Poets of the Church," writing of the German hymnology, says: "No other hymnology in the world compares with it in its ample stores, in the abundance of its productions, and its exhuberant wealth of thought and expression."

J. A. McKAMY.

GEOLOGICAL TIME AND THE AGE OF MAN.

THE question as to the length of geological time and the date of man's appearance upon the earth is one about which there has been the wildest speculation. All of the interest in the first question is centered in the answer to the second. Man is at once the culmination and the explanation of all things terrestrial.

Since the discoveries of Cuvier made it certain that the creation of the world did not occur, as was popularly believed, just six thousand years ago, opinions have vacillated from one state of uncertainty to another. As in the dusk of the evening an unfamiliar object may appear as a pigmy near by, or as a giant in the distance, so the date of creation has wandered back and forth, and even to-day has not a fixed place.

When it became a recognized fact that the creative days were indefinite periods of time, human chronology acquired a new interest. As might have been anticipated, the supposed date of man's creation receded, *pari passu*, with the general lengthening of geological time. It has been variously estimated at from fifteen thousand to four hundred thousand years. The difficulty is that we have been attempting to measure the wrong way. It is a remarkable fact that, while we have been looking for the geological ages to measure the life of the human race, it has so turned out that the duration of the human era has become the measuring rod for geological time.

Geological data are not such as to give accurate determinations of the length of periods. Every estimate is at best but an approximation. The calculations which I am about to make must be so regarded, and yet I contend that they are nearer to the truth than most of the estimates which have heretofore been made.

Geologists are now pretty well agreed that man made his advent into the world during the closing centuries of the Glacial period. Some have claimed an earlier date, but the evidence which they can produce is very meager and unsatisfactory. The geological evidence on the question is about as follows:

1. Rude flint implements, evidently of human origin, are found more or less abundant in the glacial drift of all countries, and in the river gravels of the Champlain epoch.

2. Fragments of human skeletons, particularly skulls, have been found in caves and elsewhere associated with the bones of animals known to belong to the Glacial and Champlain epochs.

I can not in this paper enter into the detailed proofs of the foregoing propositions. For these the reader is referred to the geological text-books and special works on the antiquity of man. For the purposes of my present argument I shall assume that their truth is conceded.

That man's appearance upon the earth does not antedate the Glacial epoch is evident from the following facts:

1. Neither human skeletons nor implements of human origin have been found in pre-Glacial rocks, although they have been diligently searched for.

2. All the implements found in the Quarternary rocks (Glacial, Champlain, and Terrace) are of the very rudest workmanship, indicating the most primitive possible condition of mankind.

We may then pretty safely conclude that the infancy of mankind was cradled in glacial ice, and, if we can determine the date of the disappearance of the great ice sheet, we thus ascertain the time when man appeared upon the earth.

The most celebrated estimates of the length of time since the Glacial epoch are those of Lyell and Croll. Lyell based his calculations upon the rate of recession of the Niagara Falls and the length of the gorge below. He made it about thirty-five thousand years. He has been followed by most geologists until quite recently. Croll's estimate was based upon his astronomical theory of the cause of glaciation. According to this theory the Glacial epoch began two hundred and forty thousand years ago, lasted one hundred and sixty thousand years, and ended eighty thousand years ago. The geological facts of to-day render Croll's theory untenable, and also tend to show that Lyell's period is much too long. Later geologists, such as Prestwich, LeConte, Winchell, and Wright, contend for a period not exceeding ten thousand years. The probability is that even this estimate is too large.

The most reliable geological data from which to make time calculations are found in the eroding effects of running waters. The

conditions, however, and the rate of erosion are so variable that it is quite difficult to get facts from which reliable estimates can be made. In this way the sedimentary deposit in river bottoms and in lakes have been used. Knowing the rate of deposition and the aggregate amount of the deposit, the time required to make the deposit is determined. For example, we know that almost the whole of the sedimentary deposit of the Mississippi river bottom from Cairo to its mouth has been formed since the close of Mesozoic time. Lyell estimated that for the accumulation of the delta alone at least sixty-seven thousand years have been required. Such estimates, however, are almost useless in the determination of the length of geological periods. The data are too uncertain. They are at best but the rudest of guesses.

A much more reliable source of information is found in river gorges and waterfalls. The reliability of such information depends upon the following facts:

1. Many of the river gorges and most of the important waterfalls date from the Glacial epoch.

2. The conditions which have prevailed during the formation of such gorges can be determined with some degree of accuracy, since they depend chiefly upon two things, viz.: the hardness of the rock and the volume of water.

3. The rate of recession of waterfalls can be determined with some degree of accuracy.

The two falls which afford the best opportunities for observation are the Niagara and the St. Anthony. The Niagara River owes its existence to the fact that the old outlet of the upper lakes was filled up by the glacial flood. The present river gorge has then been formed since that time. The falls were originally at the edge of the escarpment near Queenstown, and have since receded to their present position. From the whirlpool extending to the northwest is a pre-glacial river channel completely filled with glacial drift. The whirlpool itself represents an unfilled portion of this ancient channel.

To determine approximately the age of the gorge, it is only necessary to know the rate of recession of the falls. This was estimated by the French geologist, Desor, at one foot a century. This would give the gorge an age of some three million seven hundred thousand years. In 1841 Sir Charles Lyell and Dr. James

Hall examined the gorge and came to the conclusion that it was not more than one foot a year. This would reduce the age of the gorge to about thirty-seven thousand years.

In 1842 Dr. Hall had a map of the falls made from an accurate survey. Similar maps were made in 1875 and 1886. These surveys show that the falls are actually now receding about five feet a year. Indeed, during the eleven years from 1875 to 1886 the central portion of the horseshoe fall receded more than two hundred feet. At a rate of five feet a year the gorge would be formed in a little over seven thousand years. This is on the assumption that the rate of recession has been uniform. We have seen that the whirlpool is in a portion of a pre-glacial channel. There is also reason to believe that a portion of the gorge above the whirlpool coincides with a pre-glacial channel. If this be true, the recession in this part would be more rapid and the seven thousand years will be diminished to some extent.

Again, the volume of water which flowed through the Niagara River during the centuries which immediately followed the Ice Age must have been much greater than at the present day. This also would shorten the age of the gorge. Thus all things considered, we see that seven thousand years may be taken as a safe estimate of the time since the Niagara gorge began to form, and the probabilities are that this period is too long rather than too short.

Remarkably similar results are obtained from the St. Anthony Falls and the gorge of the Mississippi below Minneapolis. Here the old channel of the river has been filled with drift, and since the retreat of the ice sheet a new channel has been formed from the present falls at Minneapolis to the junction of the Mississippi and Minnesota rivers at Fort Snelling, eight miles below. These falls were first visited by the Jesuit missionary, Hennepin, in 1680, and were described in the Amsterdam edition of his works printed in 1704. Carver, another Jesuit missionary, visited them in 1776 and made a sketch of them which was published in 1778. Many sketches and photographs have been made from time to time. In 1856 artificial barriers were introduced which materially changed the rate of recession. According to Professor N. H. Winchell, the distance through which the falls had receded during the one hundred and seventy-six years that elapsed between Hennepin's visit in 1680 and the year 1856 was one thousand and eighteen feet.

This would be at a rate of nearly six feet a year. The gorge has therefore been formed in something over seven thousand years.

Many other falls and gorges have been investigated with similar results. Calculations based upon the deposits in lakes and rivers and upon the rate of growth of peat beds, though somewhat less certain, lead to like conclusions.

It is thus seen that geological facts do not now warrant us in giving to man a greater antiquity than from seven thousand to ten thousand years. Indeed, a very slight change in the data might reduce it to six thousand years, thus bringing it in exact accord with the biblical chronology. It must be remembered, however, that the chronology of the Bible is itself somewhat uncertain, and that the geologists are not required to make their estimates agree with it. Where both are but approximations all that is necessary is to show that there is no marked disharmony. This, I think, has been successfully done.

We may now ask the question, How long is geological time? No certain answer can be given, but we are in a position to place limits to it. It is quite sure that most of the estimates that have been made are far too large. With the utmost recklessness it has been assumed that hundreds of millions of years have been required for the development of the earth. We will approach the question from two sides, checking our geological calculations with known physical data.

From approximate determinations of the bulk of the earth, its mean temperature, theater of radiation of heat, and the mean temperature of interstellar space, Sir William Thompson calculated that since the earth became cool enough for life to exist upon it only twenty million of years could have elapsed. If this be true all geological time must come within this period.

Having determined the length of post-glacial time, which we will assume to be seven thousand years, we have only to find the ratio of this to pre-glacial time in order to know how long it has been since sedimentation began upon the earth. We can, perhaps, best ascertain this ratio by comparing pre-glacial with post-glacial river gorges. Of the latter we need but mention the two discussed above. Of the former almost every river furnishes an example. The gorge of the Mississippi, two to ten miles wide, one to three hundred feet deep, and extending from Cairo to the mouth of the

Minnesota River, a distance of more than six hundred miles, has been mostly formed since the close of the Carboniferous Age. The Grand Cañon of the Colorado River is three hundred miles long and from three thousand to six thousand feet deep. The Merced River, with its Yosemite Valley, flows between granite cliffs three thousand to six thousand feet high, and the cañon of King's River reaches the remarkable depth of seven thousand feet. These are only a few of the thousands of examples that might be mentioned. Most of these valleys, too, have been formed since the beginning of Mesozoic time.

Now, when we compare these wonderful valleys of erosion with the insignificant gorge of the Niagara, which could only be formed by a mighty river in seven thousand years, we may get some conception of the length of geological time. Exact comparison is not possible, yet an example or two will be at least suggestive. On the supposition that the conditions were similar, we may propose the simple mathematical problem: If the Niagara gorge, seven miles long, one hundred and fifty feet deep, and one thousand feet wide was formed in seven thousand years, how long would it take to form the Colorado Cañon, three hundred miles long, five hundred feet wide and three thousand feet deep? And how long for the Mississippi gorge, six hundred miles long, twenty thousand feet wide and one hundred and fifty feet deep?

Solving the first question, we obtain a period of three million years, and as we know that the Colorado has cut its channel mostly since the beginning of the Tertiary period, we may safely regard this as only one tenth of geological time, making the whole thirty million years.

From the second example we find a period of twelve million years. The Mississippi channel, however, dates from the Carboniferous Age or earlier, including one half to one third of geological time. Thus again we get a period of some thirty million years.

These are but little more than guesses. A slight change of conditions might make the numbers twice or only half as large; yet they harmonize well with Sir William Thompson's physical calculations, and render untenable the estimates of those geologists who assign to geological time a duration of hundreds of millions of years.

It is furthermore a fact that the latest investigations in philol-

ogy and anthropology assign to man a very recent origin. Thus philology, anthropology, and geology are meeting with one accord and locating the creation of man very near to its historical date. This is what really might have been expected, because, whether man came into existence by evolution or by special creation, as soon as he acquired speech he would begin to make history, and man without speech would not be man. I submit, then, the proposition, in full confidence that future discoveries will prove it true, that even written history on monument and in ancient book carries us back to the very infancy of the human race.

J. I. D. HINDS.

THE DRUMMOND THEORY AND FATALISM.*

THE Canadian *Methodist Quarterly* for July, 1889, contains an article by the Rev. John Morton, in which he undertakes to prove that Mr. Henry Drummond's famous book, "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," teaches the doctrine of fatalism.

A careful reading of the article has resulted in the conclusion that Mr. Morton does not understand the nature of law. For this reason, he has utterly failed to comprehend the meaning of the term, "natural law." But in this misunderstanding he is not alone, even among scholars and thinkers.

"It is so difficult," says Mr. Drummond, "to keep out of mind the idea of substance in connection with the natural laws, the idea that they are the movers, the essences, the energies, that one is constantly on the verge of false conclusions. Thus a hasty glance at the present argument on the part of any one ill-furnished enough to confound law with substance, or with cause, would probably lead to its immediate rejection. . . . . The vital principle of the body is a different thing from the vital principle of the spiritual life. Biogenesis deals with *bios*, with the natural life, with cells and germs, and as there are no exactly similar cells and germs in the spiritual world, it might be urged that the law can not therefore apply, which is as true as if one were to say that the fifth proposition of the first book of Euclid, applies when the figures are drawn with chalk upon a blackboard, but fails with regard to structures of wood or stone." (p. 49.)

Mr. Drummond's critic has not kept out of his mind erroneous ideas of the natural laws, consequently he has arrived at false conclusions in regard to the logical consequences of the Drummond theory. Certainly Mr. Morton ought to know that government by law, in either the natural or the spiritual world, logically excludes the idea of fatalism. Government by law implies an intelligent forethought on the part of the governing power, also that the ruler is

* Drummond's Natural Law. A critique. By Rev. John Morton, Congregational Church, Hamilton, Ont.—The Canadian *Methodist Quarterly*, July, 1889.

greater than his own laws, and can suspend or change them at will. Whether He will ever choose to do so depends upon, and may be known only by, Himself. It is not thinkable that the Governor of the world should be bound by His own laws to any given course of action.

In such a case the laws would constitute the Supreme power that governs the universe, instead of simply displaying the methods by which the Creator proceeds in controlling all that exists.

Fatalism implies a power tnat controls all *things* and *beings*, not according to known laws, but rather without law. It is an imaginary blind chance, or a supposed arbitrary power, which ignores all law.

Fate has meant different things among different peoples, and at different periods in the world's history. Now, among philosophical materialists, it means, "An immutable law which is said to pervade and to harmonize all existence." But it is not very difficult to see that this imaginary "immutable law" is only a figure of speech which the Materialist has substituted for the God of the Theist, and which his ever active imagination has endowed with *power* to "pervade and harmonize all existence." This immutable law, then, is simply a confused metaphor that modern ingenuity has substituted for the fatalism of the Epicureans, which was identical with chance

To charge the author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," with teaching fatalism, therefore, is an error not altogether excusable. A law has no substantial existence, any more than parallels of latitude or the lines which are supposed to mark the orbits of the planets. These exist only as mental conceptions. A law of nature has no other existence.

The law of Biogenesis, as expounded by Mr. Drummond, is that mental conception which men of science now have, by which it is known that there can be no life in the natural world without the touch of antecedent life. Experiment and observation have led to the discovery of this truth, and continued investigation, failing to find any variation from this regular order or method of reproduction in the physical universe, the mind conceives it to be a law of nature that all life is from life. Certainly we ought to be able to see that such a manifestion and revelation of God's way of producing life, of which the human understanding takes cognizance

is widely different from a force, a substance, an entity, or any kind of an energy.

The law of Biogenesis moves nothing, governs nothing, pervades nothing, "holds sway" nowhere, harmonizes nothing, and is nothing more than that which the mind has discovered when it has obtained the knowledge that there can be no life without the touch of antecedent life.

This law of Biogenesis, Mr. Drummond says, is found in the spiritual world. And he has proved from the Bible that there can be no spiritual life in us without the touch of antecedent spiritual life. It is the same law in both worlds, but it does not imply fatalism in either. Mr. Morton's failure to understand the nature of natural law at the start, has been the reason why he has made many "men of straw," and pleased himself by knocking them down with such facility. But he has not struck a single blow at the real man which ought to have been before him. He has simply gratified himself by combating the errors which his own mind had created under the misguidance of wrong conception in regard to the natural laws.

Turning to his article we find the following notice of the title of Professor Drummond's book: "But the title, 'Natural Law in the Spiritual World,' is new, new, at least, from a Christian philosopher; for when we unfold the phrase and fill in the omitted words, we read: Natural law holds sway in the spiritual world, which is not far from saying, natural forces, in which natural laws inhere, hold sway in the spiritual world." (p. 241.) It would be difficult to imagine greater injustice to an author than is thus done to Mr. Drummond, in misconstruing the meaning of the plain words which constitute the title of the book under review. This, we are satisfied, was not intentional. Mr. Morton evidently understands neither "natural forces," nor "natural laws." To "hold sway" is to govern, to rule, to overpower, to influence, and to guide. Natural law, therefore, does no such thing as to "hold sway" anywhere, not even in the natural world. And Mr. Drummond knows the nature of the natural laws too well to suppose that they "hold sway" in the spiritual world. The title of his book simply means that natural law, undistorted by false definitions and conceptions, has been discovered in the spiritual world. If life is the subject, then "*omne vivum ex vivo*" is true of it in both

worlds. If degeneration is the thing thought of, then, "neglect" secures it alike in the natural and in the spiritual realms. The observation of these facts led to the discovery that at least some of the same laws which are found in the natural world obtain also in the spiritual world. Just where the fatalism comes in I am not able to see.

Mr. Morton repeats his misconstruction of the book's title as follows: "Taking him, then, as our guide, we find the underlying principle to be that natural law holds sway in the spiritual world." The frequent repetition of our critic's pet phrase, "holds sway," proves conclusively, that he has utterly failed to comprehend the meaning of the term, "natural law." There is nothing in Mr. Drummond's book to justify the construction which his critic has put upon its title. In his introduction Mr. Drummond says: "In its true sense, natural law predicates nothing of causes. The laws of nature are simply statements of the orderly condition of things in nature, what is found in nature by a sufficient number of competent observers." On the following page he says: "The natural laws sustain nothing, originate nothing."

These quotations show that nothing could be further from Mr. Drummond's thoughts than the idea that the natural laws "hold sway" in the spiritual world, or anywhere else. The expression is not pertinent at all when applied as in Mr. Morton's critique. We are also told that Mr. Drummond teaches that "the laws by which God governs a stone or a star, are the identical laws by which he governs a soul. And as necessity rules in the realm of matter, so, if this theory be true, necessity rules in the realm of spirit." (pp. 243, 244.)

Thus it is assumed that necessity and fatalism are the logical consequences of the theory under review. But I confess my inability to perceive any such teaching in the book, or any necessity for such logical deductions in considering the theory which it advances. I do not remember that the author of the theory professes to find any application in the spiritual world for the law of gravitation, nor for several other laws that may be observed in connection with the stones and stars of the material universe; but I do remember that he says: "One thing is certain, and I state it pointedly—the application of natural law to the spiritual world has decided and necessary limits." (p. 12.)

If Mr. Morton had read this passage with careful attention, he would have found out that the author of it does not teach that all the laws in the natural world are found also in the spiritual world. He only professes to have discovered some of them there, and principally those which apply to life. It is not at all probable that he expects to find the law of gravitation there.

But does his theory imply that necessity rules in the realm of spirit, or in any other realm? Perhaps his lay sermons, in which he attempts to explain the laws already discovered in the spiritual world, contain the best answer that can be given to this question. His arguments are consistent and logical, and do not, so far as I am competent to judge, imply any interference with man's free agency. Let the reader of this article read the book, and judge for himself.

On page 245, our critic continues thus: "We are to take it, in the strict scientific sense, that, as dead matter has no power to lay hold of life, in like manner the natural man is helpless. But if the natural man is hermetically sealed in the same sense, what are you to make of his responsibility? I can not accept this fatalistic theory." But is it a fatalistic theory? Does not the last sentence of the quotation assume the point which is to be proved?

Mr. Drummond says, speaking of the law of Biogenesis in the realm of the spiritual: "The breath of God, blowing where it listeth, touches with its mystery of life the dead souls of men, bears them across the bridgeless gulf between the natural and the spiritual, endows them with its own high qualities, and develops within them these new and secret faculties, by which those who are born again are said to see the kingdom of God." (p. 66.) Is not this perfectly scriptural? It is not said nor implied that there are no conditions for man to comply with in order that this "mystery of life" may touch his soul and lift him into the realm of the spiritual. There is no intimation in the chapter on Biogenesis, or elsewhere in the book, that the repentance and faith of a sinner have nothing to do with bringing about the salvation of his soul. Natural law is not a power or a force to *necessitate* either a moral agent or any thing else. The necessity and consequent fatalism exist only in the minds of those critics who are ignorant of the true nature of natural laws. To those who do understand their real nature, their presence in the spiritual world creates no logical

necessity for thinking of fatalism, any more than does the New Testament statement of a fact which shows that the apostles once received spiritual life in the same way that the first man, Adam, received his natural life.

Moses says: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." (Genesis ii. 7.)

John says of Jesus: "He breathed on them, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost." (John xx. 22.)

In these passages we have an example of God imparting spiritual life in the same way that he gave to Adam his natural life. Yet no one dreams of fatalism. But when Mr. Drummond tells us that God produces life in the spiritual world in the same way that he produces natural life in the natural world, and dignifies the conception by naming it "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," the cry of fatalism is raised at once. Why not charge the great apostle of the Gentiles with teaching fatalism? He says: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii. 8, 9.)

Dr. Adam Clarke, who was no Calvinist nor fatalist, says in his comment on this scripture: "When this gospel reached you, you were all found dead in trespasses and dead in sins; therefore it was God's free mercy to you, manifested through Christ, in whom ye were commanded to believe; and having believed by the power of the Holy Spirit, ye received, and were sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise; so that this salvation is in no sense of yourselves, but is the free gift of God, and not of any kind of works; so that no man can boast as having wrought out his own salvation, or even contributed any thing toward it." I hesitate not to say that there is no more fatalism in the Drummond theory than in this scripture as interpreted by the greatest anti-Calvinist that ever wrote a commentary on the Bible.

But Mr. Morton's own theology seems not altogether without fault. It approaches dangerously near to Pelagianism, as will be seen in the following quotation. Speaking of the Drummond theory, he says: "It means, in the strict scientific sense, that he"—the natural man—"belongs to an order of soul which is absolutely destitute of any holy germ. . . . The idea of God is a spiritual idea; may be said to be the germ of all spiritual life, for by it the soul grows into God." (pp. 244, 245.)

If this is sound theology, is it not strange that Jesus did not say to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man have the idea of God, 'which is a spiritual idea,' he can not '*grow*' into the kingdom of God." This "growing into God" from the bare possession of the "idea of God, which may be said to be *the germ* of all spiritual life," is either Pelagianism or something worse. But our critic says: "It is contrary to the showings of comparative theology, which has found spiritual germs in every religion; and it is contrary to the truth that the idea of God is a universal possession." What does Mr. Morton and comparative theology mean by "holy germs" which every religion and every man is supposed to possess? We suspect that he would not stand a very good examination on the doctrine of "total depravity."

Turning again to Mr. Morton's remarkable "critique," we find him saying: "Whoever heard of dead matter being blamed for not becoming a plant or an animal? No; the theory which asserts that man is hermetically sealed against the spiritual plays into the hands of those who teach that we are what we are of necessity, and that whatever is is right." (p. 246.) Of course no one thinks of blaming dead matter for not doing that for which it has no capacity. And Jesus did not blame the Jews for not making themselves spiritually alive. He simply said: "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." (John v. 40.) He blamed them for not doing what they could do—come to him by faith. Had they thus come he would have bestowed upon them spiritual life; but he could not or would not bestow that life on unwilling or non-co-operating moral agents.

The poor leper who went to Jesus to be cured could not go and take the healing power and cure himself with it; that was hermetically sealed against him; he had no power to reach it. He could only go asking and trusting, with the hope that it might be the Savior's good pleasure to heal him—and he was healed. So must the "natural man" do. He can not go and claim salvation as the reward of his own good works—the door of the spiritual world is hermetically sealed against all such efforts as that. Nor can he obtain admittance by penitent tears and untiring zeal in self-mortification. But he can ask and believe:

Could my tears forever flow,
Could my zeal no languor know,
All for sin could not atone—
Thou must save, and thou alone;
In my hand no price I bring—
Simply to thy cross I cling.

Every man must approach God as the publican did when he said, "God be merciful to me a sinner." Then God will impart unto him that touch of life which will lift him up into "the kingdom next above him." Man has not power to climb up into the kingdom of God, but he has power to show his willingness to be placed there by divine grace. There is no fatalism in all this. Yet this teaching is perfectly consistent with natural law in its application to moral agents, either in the natural or the spiritual world.

The life of a plant and of a man are both sustained by God, and he requires of the man co-operation, but demands nothing of the plant. We must not overlook the fact that natural law has to do with man in the natural world without robbing him of his free agency; and why should it not have to do with his spiritual life without necessitating any of his acts? In the realm of the natural, man must obey the laws of nature to live, yet the life is Godgiven and by God preserved. There is no fatalism here; and there is no need to think of any in the application of natural law to his spiritual life. "If motion be not understood," says Aristotle, "we can not but be ignorant of nature." In like manner, if the natural laws be not understood, we can but be ignorant as to the results of their presence in the realm of the spiritual or anywhere else. Take the following sentence from Mr. Morton's critique as an example: "It is a blunder, therefore, to represent the spiritual as being under physical law, which is always and everywhere necessitating." (p. 248.) So relevant are Professor Drummond's own words as a reply to this that I quote them again: "It is so difficult to keep out of mind the idea of substance in connection with the natural laws—the idea that they are the movers, the essences, the energies—that one is constantly on the verge of false conclusions." Yet all careful and competent thinkers ought to know that a law of nature, being neither a power, a force, nor any kind of energy, and not even a substance, can not in the very nature of the case necessitate any thing. It would be exceedingly unphilosophical,

if not ridiculous, to speak of the supposed lines which mark the orbits of the planets as necessitating the present motion of the planets in these orbits, but not more so than it is to talk of "physical law which is always and everywhere necessitating." And it would be just as correct in philosophy to speak of a complete vacuum taking up a mountain and casting it into the Pacific ocean as to talk of physical law necessitating any thing anywhere. Let no one, therefore, be alarmed because of the presence of natural laws in the spiritual world. They are perfectly harmless, at least so far as necessity or fatalism is concerned.

It may not be out of place here to remark that Mr. Drummond does not speak of "physical law" in the spiritual world, but "natural law" is the term he uses. In substituting the former phrase for the latter Mr. Morton creates some confusion in his own mind as well as in the minds of his readers. It does not seem to me to be nearly so dangerous to evangelical religion to talk of natural law in the realm of the spiritual as it is to say: "The idea of God is a spiritual idea; may be said to be the germ of all spiritual life, for by it the soul grows into God." Men do not grow into the kingdom of God—they are born into it. "Marvel not that I said unto thee ye must be born again."

B. MARGESON.

HOW AND WHY JUSTIFICATION IS BY FAITH—PHILOSOPHICALLY CONSIDERED.*

FAITH is a universal principle. Spiritual existences of whatever character or order are so constituted, so impelled by the self-moving tendencies of their being, as to be shut up to an exercise of faith. Unbelief is not a want of belief, but is as truly an exercise of the soul, a trusting, as is the faith of the most devout worshiper. For faith, philosophically considered, is the expression of the soul's activities, or life, a positive self-submission to one particular course of effort, and a consequent self-withholding from all others. The self-withholding is as much an act of will as the self-submission. The self-submission to God or the good, the trusting in God, means the withholding of confidence from all other beings unworthy of it, while the withholding of such confidence in God means a self-submission to some other being, or supposed good, other than the supreme good. Thus we may view faith under two relative aspects, either as positive or negative. Faith and unbelief, though specifically different, are generically the same, both being positive acts of the will, differing only as their objects differ. In the light of these principles it is evident that it is as impossible for an intelligent spiritual being to exist without faith as it is for an animal to live without breathing. No faith—no life, no effort. Again, faith is not a condition arbitrarily imposed by the Creator, but is a natural and philosophical requirement growing out of the nature and dependence of all finite spiritual being, and consequently is necessary to the maintenance and development of all spiritual life, whether that life be normal or abnormal; hence faith as an exercise of the mind is the one thing above all others that is instrumental in forming human character and in determining human destiny. This it does necessarily. This view of faith explains why such prominence is given to it in the Scriptures.

So far from faith being a mere arbitrary requirement on the part of the Creator, as the infidel would have us believe, it shows

* This article is the complement of the article, "How and Why Faith Purifies the Heart," in the REVIEW for October, 1889.—B. G. M.

conclusively that God would not have acted consistently with the inherent laws of the human mind had he failed to make it thus prominent in his plan of redemption. But this will appear the more evident as we advance.

These statements and conclusions bring us more immediately to the subject of this article. First, a word in reference to method. As justification is the converse of condemnation, an inquiry into the how and why of condemnation will the better enable us to appreciate the how and why of justification. An indirect method of the solution of a question is frequently easier and more satisfactory than a direct one.

Essential to a correct soteriology is a correct psychology. One must be studied in the light of the other. But unless we study the soul in the light of the end of all creation we shall certainly fail of a true psychology. A mistake here is fundamental and fatal, especially in an attempt at the philosophy of human salvation. In the light of this end, which, like a great beacon, gleams along the dark and dubious way of human research, let us begin our investigation.

All creation, both animate and inanimate, is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end. This is true unless we conceive of God as creating without a purpose. But this would be sheer atheism. That purpose, whatever it was, is the end to which all creation is a means. So far, then, this view of creation is utilitarian in that all creation is made to conspire to one specific, all-controlling end. But what is that end? In the light of the teachings of the New Testament that end is the dissemination of God's excellency and love as manifested in the well-being and happiness of his intelligent creatures. God's love yearns for self-manifestation. "God is love." As God's holiness consists in the unswerving integrity of his purpose or will to the demands of his infinite love, the divine law may be defined as the rule of action by which the ends of his infinite love may be attained. Abstractly considered, this rule may be called the law of right. As this rule is but the expression of a graciously formed purpose, then, concretely considered, it is God's will. As a mere rule, the law of right is only a means to an end, and not an end in itself. Again, as the end of creation is the self-manifestation of God's love in the highest possible degree of happiness in the moral world, it follows that

the moral creation, including the law of that creation, is a means to an end. As a means creation was voluntary and not necessary. But when once chosen it necessarily imposed limitations upon the Creator. The law, therefore, is self-imposed upon the Creator, but upon the creature it is imposed by absolute fiat. But it should be remembered that the imposing of the law upon the creature by absolute authority of the Creator was not strictly arbitrary, only so far as the bringing of the creature into existence was arbitrary. This act, of course, was arbitrary, but not in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word. The law as it refers to the Creator is voluntary, but as it refers to the creature it is necessary. And yet creation obtaining, either in purpose or in fact, it logically follows that God must act in harmony with the law of creation, otherwise he would not be in harmony with himself.

Now, if the purpose to create imposed a limitation, a kind of necessity, upon the Creator, what was that limitation? That limitation could be no other than that the creation must be in harmony with the end determined upon and subservient to that end. This much admitted, how could the Creator do more or less—I would speak reverently—than to impose upon his creatures, spiritual as well as physical, the law of their end? That he did this in the physical universe is conceded by all. But it is only the spiritual with which we have to do now. It is certainly true that at the self-same moment when spiritual entities (or substance) were created the principles or laws of their being were impressed upon them, so that the laws of spirit are necessarily inherent in its very essence, are concreations of it. On this hypothesis the moral intuitions of right and wrong, virtue and vice, conscience, etc., find an intelligent solution. So far as we can reason all spiritual entities are the same in essence, one in kind, as to their attributes, however much they may differ in degree in the strength and perfection of these attributes. From this it would naturally follow that all newly created spiritual beings, whether men or angels, were alike impressed by the creative Hand. One of these universal impressions, or spiritual instincts, is the love of happiness or desire of well-being. This is an ever-present desire. But the limitation of all finite existence and the laws of spiritual life are such that without action in perfect harmony with the purpose of the Creator this much-desired well-being can not be attained. This purpose of the

Creator is expressed subjectively in the concreated laws of spirit, the law "written on the heart," just as the purpose of the architect is seen in the special plan of the completed edifice. To manifest his excellency and love in the highest possible happiness of his moral creatures was the end or purpose he had in their creation. In harmony, therefore, with this end, and subservient to it, he created man. But it may be asked, In what consisted this harmony in the instance of newly created man? It may be replied that in newly created spirits this harmony is rather potential than actual; that is, newly created man possessed the spiritual instincts which, had they been normally directed, would doubtless have led him to the spontaneous choice of his higher good.

But it may be urged, Was not man endowed with righteousness and true holiness in his creation? Just here all are not agreed. Without emphasizing contrary views, I shall give what I conceive to be the true philosophy. If by "righteousness and true holiness" we mean virtue, then certainly man was not thus created; for virtue or holiness is not a concreation of spirit, but is the voluntary product of free-will. Newly created man possessed all the potentialities and susceptibilities of mere non-acting spirit (if we may so conceive of spirit); that is, of spirit before it actually and actively realized its potentialities and susceptibilities. It is certainly unphilosophical and misleading to predicate moral qualities of newly created spirit. There can be no moral quality till there has been moral action. No moral action—no character, no virtue, no vice. Accordingly, then, we can not predicate character of the newly created Adam. All that we can say with philosophical exactness is that he was upright. He was a spiritual entity, possessed of intelligence, sensibility, and will, which formed the basis of moral character, but that was all. He had never exercised these, hence he had no character, either good or bad. He possessed powers and susceptibilities, and upon the exercise of these depended his character. It is a false and fatalistic philosophy which teaches that God can arbitrarily impart character or moral quality to free, intelligent spirit. Character or moral quality is the product of the free exercise of will. Spirit, by its own activities, forms its own character. If its activities be in harmony with the purpose and laws of its being, as determined and arranged by the Creator, then its character is good.

Now, it should be remembered that the voluntary drift of the soul, the positive expression of its activities or life, is faith. As I have shown, for the soul to exist without faith is for it not to exist at all. It must believe. Its activities must either be directed upward or downward, Godward or self-ward. Consequent upon this activity, or effort, or faith is an ethical effect upon the soul of which we may predicate moral character or quality.* If the faith has been a right one, a properly directed effort of the soul, one in harmony with its creative impulses, the quality is good and the character is in positive harmony with the end of the soul's creation. But if the faith has been a wrong one, an improperly directed effort of the soul, one in disharmony with its creative tendencies, the quality is bad, the character is out of harmony with the end of the soul's creation. It thus appears again that character is the necessary ethical effect of faith, faith being the divinely-imposed law of the soul's good or evil. As the faith, so the moral quality, so the character.

In the light of the foregoing principles let us inquire into the first involvement. So far as we know to the contrary, the first man up to the time of his temptation and fall had never put forth a deliberate moral act of the will, or at least he had not been forced to exercise the power of a decidedly contrary choice. We suppose up to this time he had rather followed the instincts of his unfallen nature, so that we can predicate nothing positive of his character; or rather that his activity had been such that moral quality could not be affirmed of it. There was nothing to approve or disapprove except that as a part of creation he was in harmony with the end of the whole, and hence was pronounced "good." Two possible courses of action lay open to him as to all free spirits: either of consecrating himself to God—which consecrating act is the active element in faith—and thus forming a character in harmony with the laws of his being and in obedience to the end of his creation; or of directing the activities of being self-ward and downward, and thus forming a character at war with the inherent, concreated laws of his nature, and utterly subversive of the end of his creation. He chose the latter, and in perfect accord with the laws of spirit a bad moral quality was induced; or more specifically, following his

* For this principle at greater length see the writer's article in the REVIEW for October, 1889.

act of unbelief, which, as we have seen, was a misdirection of his soul-activities, a wrong faith, was a condition, state, habit, or ethical effect, which, theologically, we denominate depravity. This moral effect, depravity, necessarily resulted in a deprivation of the good which the law of the soul's creation was intended to conserve. This state of deprivation or loss of good is termed condemnation. Philosophically considered, condemnation may be defined as the necessary correlate of the ethical effect of faith, which ethical effect we have seen to be moral depravity; but theologically considered, it may be defined the legal complement of depravity, a legal state determined by and necessarily growing out of a moral condition.

From this it is seen that condemnation is not the effect of an arbitrary, judicial fiat of the Almighty, but is the necessary result of a purely natural and philosophical process. To be sure, this process is in harmony with the laws of a divine ordaining, because these laws inhere in the soul's constitution, being a transcript of the divine will as expressed in the purpose of the soul's creation; so that whatever falls out to the soul as the result of obedience to or disobedience to these laws is of the divine ordering. It is true, also, that condemnation is by faith; that is, faith is the antecedent of which condemnation is a legal sequent. True, it is a wrong faith, yet a faith nevertheless, as has already been shown.

Another principle elucidated by the foregoing is that the legal grows out of, and is determined by, the moral. That is, the soul is not depraved because it is condemned, but it is condemned because it is depraved. Just as in the natural body an unhealthy physical condition normally results in the deprivation of the blessings of good health, and that, too, just in proportion to the unhealthful physical condition. So also in the supernatural, or spiritual, the unhealthful moral condition normally results in the deprivation of the blessings of spiritual health, and that, too, just in proportion to the unhealthful moral condition. In both cases the natural and moral conditions are not only antecedent to, and determinative of the consequent physical and spiritual deprivations or condemnations, but actually graduate them. This principle—that the legal grows out of the moral—is the only one known to philosophy and morals by which the legal state may be equitably determined. To reverse the process is to turn philosophy upside down. Good moral quality given, the law approves, or

justifies; bad moral quality given, the law disapproves, or condemns. This is natural, normal, just.

We are prepared now for an examination into the philosophy of justification. I have dwelt at some length upon the approaches to to the main question, hoping thereby to make the solution of it much easier and more satisfactory. It is sometimes necessary in the examination of a problem to examine minutely into the principles underlying it, and this frequently furnishes a short and easy solution of the main question. So it is in the solution of this question. All we have to do now is to apply the principles that have been elucidated.

The gospel finds the human soul in a depraved and condemned state. In order to its salvation there must be a change of faith, a properly directed effort of its activities. By a continued misplacement of the soul's confidence an abnormal state, or habit, has been induced. This result came about in perfect obedience to the law of faith, though it was a wrong faith. If, therefore, this moral state, or habit, of the soul is to be removed there must be a change of faith. But as long as the soul believes the course it is pursuing to be its greatest good it will necessarily continue therein. For if the intellect be not enlightened there can be no desire for a different course, and consequently no corresponding act of the will. This the gospel recognizes, and provides a remedy in the word and the enlightening and quickening influences of the Holy Spirit. Without these influences the soul could do nothing else than continue in its state of abnormality. Now the Spirit by revealing the truth unto the intelligence occasions proper desires and lays the ground for a possible acquiescence of the will. The soul, thus enlightened and quickened, by its own free, according act, yields submission to the Father, begins its activities in harmony with the concreated laws of its nature, and in perfect obedience to the end of its creation. Consequent upon this consecration or faith, there is a change in the moral quality of the soul, a metaphysical or ethical effect which I have elsewhere* denominated spiritual purification, or regeneration. It is seen that this renovation is the result of a purely natural and philosophical process, and yet at the same time it is a work of grace, inasmuch as it is by the quickening and enlightening influences of the graciously given word and

* See October REVIEW, 1889.

Spirit that this renovation is made possible and effective. This ethical effect of faith, or this spiritual purification (Acts xv. 9), necessarily results in a state of restoration to the soul of the good which the law of its creation and consequently the law of God was intended to conserve. This state of restoration of the good is termed justification, which, philosophically considered, is the necessary correlate of the ethical effect of faith; but considered theologically, it is the legal complement of regeneration, a legal state determined by, and growing necessarily out of, a moral condition.

It is evident from the principles maintained in this article that the philosophical necessities of the human soul are such that if justification obtains at all, either to the fallen or the unfallen, it must be by faith. For faith is the logical antecedent of which justification is the legal sequent; or as already defined, faith is the metaphysical condition of regeneration, and justification is the legal complement of regeneration. So that when faith obtains all obtains, and when faith is wanting all is wanting.

I conclude with the following observations:

1. Justification is not the effect of a special arbitrary, judicial fiat of the Almighty, but is the result of a natural and philosophical process in exact obedience to a divine ordaining. Yet it is none the less a supernatural work in that the word and Holy Spirit are the initiative and occasioning agencies—none the less an act of God's own willing, wherein are forgiven the sins that are past and in which are restored to the soul the joys of an endless life.

2. As the moral character, or condition, so is the legal state. That is, the legal grows out of, and is determined by, the moral. This is a fundamental principle in philosophy. Hence, regeneration logically precedes justification, the former being the moral antecedent of which the latter is the legal correlative.

3. Faith has two sequents, viz., regeneration and justification, one moral and the other legal.

4. Faith, regeneration and justification are so logically related that they are separable only in thought and not in fact. Hence, to talk of a soul as regenerated and not justified, or as justified and not regenerated, is only to confuse the mind with evident impossibilities.

5. The doctrine of justification by faith as it is taught in the Holy Scriptures is not a merely arbitrary imposition on the part of

the Creator, but is the only doctrine in perfect harmony with the laws of spiritual existence. The present constitution of the human soul being as it is, justification can be obtained only by faith.

6. He who believes God would be chargeable with injustice and arbitrariness were he to condition the destiny of a soul on the simple act of faith, and that he who thus believes is guilty of a blind credulity, is himself guilty of a blinder credulity, and exposes his utter ignorance of the true philosophy of the human soul.

7. A special judicial fiat of the Almighty is not necessary to secure the rewards of obedience or to inflict the penalties of disobedience; but the law is a concreation of man's moral nature, so impressed upon it that inseparable from the law's violation is its penalty, and immediately consequent upon its fulfillment is the reward of obedience.*

B. G. MITCHELL.

* It should be noted that when we speak of the penalties of disobedience following immediately upon the violation of moral law, we mean the penalty in kind and not in degree. So, also in reference to the rewards of obedience. Eternity will intensify the degree of the penalties of the disobedient and enlarge the rewards of the obedient.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS IN THE FUTURE.

I STOOD one day on a pier in New York harbor and watched a tug-boat take a huge steamer out to sea. It was a Cunarder, full rigged, with the white smoke rolling lazily from her stack, and hundreds of passengers on board waving adieus to friends still on the shore. Other vessels lay in the harbor, and it seemed that with difficulty the tug guided the magnificent ship out to an open sea. But when the vessels were passed and the Narrows cleared the tug loosened its hold, the old steamer unfurled her sails, the smoke from her stack changed color and the white foaming waters were left in the rear as the ship cut the waves on her lonely voyage to the distant port.

What if the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is the tug God has sent to bring the old Presbyterian ship out of the narrows into a wide open sea? When she shall have been brought to the point beyond her objectionable and obstructing doctrines may she not prove herself, more than ever before, a vessel sea-worthy, magnificent and helpful, on whose deck there will be found increasing hundreds and thousands of ransomed souls sailing to that other world where all the good and noble find rest and home?

This year marks the eightieth anniversary of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church! What victories these years have achieved! There are those who think our organization was a mistake; that our fathers were hasty and that they perhaps would better have remained in the Presbyterian Church. But this thought comes only from those who are not conversant with the circumstances and who are not acquainted with the results of the work. Our fathers were a feeble minority I know, a mere handful. It seemed like a futile effort to attempt to build up a new Church. The Presbyterian Church was strong and held the ground; she had organization and wealth and prestige; but the action taken by the New York Presbytery a few weeks ago in reference to the Westminster Confession, and the tendency shown at the last meeting of the General Assembly looking toward a shorter route to the ministry than by way of a long college and seminary course, show

that Cumberland Presbyterians were right and Presbyterians wrong just eighty years ago. We were in the minority then and are in the minority still. But minorities are the great powers of the earth. Any body can follow with the multitude, but when men stand up almost alone for a great principle, it is because they have iron in their blood and an overmastering confidence in the truth.

Judaism was strong and was the dominant party—the party in which dwelt the Spirit of the living God—yet Christianity came out of Judaism and came out at first in the minority. Romanism was strong and powerful, it was the Church of the day and what there was of good in the world was found within its pale, yet Protestantism came out of it and came out in the minority. The breaking waves dashed high on a rock-bound coast when a hunted minority sought freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Less than half a hundred homes were hewn out of the forests, but they organized a colony and that became the Mother of our Republic with its sixty million souls.

Luther was grieved to the heart at the thought of leaving the old Church, but when the sins of Tetzel and of hierarchy Tetzel represented became so flagrant he was compelled to set his foot upon the evil saying, "Here I stand, I can not do otherwise, God help me." John Wesley could not endure the idea of seceding from the old English Church, but when his efforts to have a "Prelate sent to America to look after the people called Methodists" failed, he withdrew, and there is not a Methodist in all this wide world who is ashamed of Wesley for doing what he did.

When the Presbyterian Church in Tennessee refused to approve of revivals, or to listen to the call for men without a college drill to preach the gospel, and disbanded the Presbytery that did approve of such a course; after a four years' effort at reconciliation and a night of prayer, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was born. It is true we have not reached the standard our fathers aimed at. We have not accomplished as much as we had hoped for. There have been many difficulties in the way. It must be remembered that ours was a Western field and that we did not have the accumulated wealth of years behind us. But in spite of these difficulties how marvelously have we succeeded! Through faith and hope and courage we have gone on and on, and now in our eightieth year we can see the causes that made our existence a

necessity disappearing as the snow and ice disappear before the spring-time sun.

But now what of the future? Shall we consider our work done, or is there not something we may yet accomplish? Is the mission of our Church at an end? Shall we go begging some stronger and older Church to take us to her sheltering fold, or shall we buckle the armor on anew and bend every God-given power to the upbuilding of his cause in whose service we have been engaged? We will be of service in the future and receive recognition in the ecclesiastical world in proportion to the consecration and efficiency we show in our Church work. Enterprise is one of the signs of the times. It is something every business man must have, something every organization or corporation must have to succeed. A city, however rich or endowed with natural advantages, must have enterprise or be left behind in the race; a man, however talented, without enterprise will fail. And a Church without enterprise is a Church without life, and will sooner or later be among the things of the past.

There are certain things which cities must do if they would fill the measure of expectation. There are internal improvements, there is paving of streets, making of sewerage, advertising of advantages—all of these things are in the line of city enterprise. There are certain things the world expects of business men if they are to be ranked as enterprising. There is a watching of the market, a clearing of stock, a shrewdness in buying, a suiting of stock to trade, and a tact in general arrangement. Churches also have certain lines of action which are just as important in carrying on the work assigned to them as the lines on which cities or business men must proceed. Churches are for the spread of the truth, for the building up of humanity and for the exhaltation of Christ. And there are certain lines on which they must work in the accomplishing of these ends. There are schools to be equipped, men to be educated, churches to be built, boards to be patronized, souls to be saved, and a keeping abreast of the times in general Church work. When this is done to the full extent of a Church's ability it will fill the place assigned it in the ecclesiastical world and receive all the recognition it deserves.

The future ought to find Cumberland Presbyterians emphasizing the virtue of applied Christianity. The past has been replete

with theoretical Christianity; let us give our attention now to the practical. Each age has its own problems to solve. Sometimes these problems are theological, sometimes they are political, sometimes social. This is certainly an age of social problems. How shall we bridge the gulf between the Church and the people? How can capital and labor be made more co-operative? What shall be done with this mass of foreign emigrants that comes to our shores every year? How shall the colored man of the South be educated? How shall this problem of the liquor traffic be solved? These are some of the questions that are presenting themselves to-day for solution.

When we get to heaven and tell the people of the sixteenth century about the age in which we live, they will look at us with amazement, and yet there are problems crowding upon us to-day for investigation whose proper solution will make the coming century as much unlike ours as this is unlike the sixteenth. The air is full of thought, and the philosopher of history is busy with his prophesies as to what the future will reveal. We are not contending to-day with muscle and sword; we are not contending with thumb-screw and prison bars; we are dealing with heart and brain. Within this arena have stepped some of the ablest intellects the world has seen, and the result of the conflict is watched with eager, anxious hearts by men on both sides of the Atlantic.

Let the few remaining years of this century find Cumberland Presbyterians laying aside all differences—ecclesiastical and theological—and applying the principles of our religion to the social problems of the day. The Bible is a book of principles, written for all men in all conditions, in all ages. And when men have learned to apply its principles to social evils the difficulties that now confront us will be removed. The principle of doing unto others as we would have others do unto us is a remedy for social wrongs than which a better has not been found. How to apply it is only known when we have caught the spirit of Him who first taught it. Let Cumberland Presbyterians emphasize it. Bring it to the front. Let such prominence be given to this thought by preacher and by people that in store and in shop, in bank and in market-place, there shall be constant effort by men and women, touched by Christ's love, to do unto others as they would have others do unto them.

Again, the future must find Cumberland Presbyterians favoring Christian union; not in the sense of losing our identity as an organization, but in that broader, deeper, richer sense of Christian fellowship. We are not quarreling now, we are not debating, all that belongs to the past. We have come to recognize the fact that men may hold different opinions in reference to some particular tenet in theology, and yet be united heart and hand in the spread of the truth. Let us be charitable; let us be honest; let us be fair. And when we reserve to ourselves the right to think, let us not withhold that right from others. There may be unity of heart, unity of thought, unity of purpose, along with diversity in belief. We may be in fullest sympathy with all co-operative movements in the proclamation of gospel truth, and still not lose our individuality.

"Go ye into all the world and preach my gospel to every creature" must be the inspiration of all Church work. Our methods may differ, our conceptions of the "Word" may vary, but our purpose must be the same. Nineteen centuries have gone since this command was given. It has not yet been fulfilled; and the lack of Christian unity has done much to hinder its fulfillment. In rural districts, in cities, and in towns all over this country, are souls destitute of gospel privileges simply because Churches have been more zealous in building up their individual organizations than in the spread of the kingdom of God. Now, if in the future Cumberland Presbyterians can magnify the advantages of Christian unity in such a way as to bring about a federation or co-operation of Churches, they will have done much toward bringing the gospel within reach of every class of people.

"A great army is marching toward one point, and Sherman is leading it, but there is not room on the road for all the army to march abreast, and one army corps under McPherson, another army corps under Schofield, another under Thomas, take separate roads; and I follow McPherson, another follows Schofield, and you follow Thomas; but we are all following Sherman. Now, if we all have one common end in view, if we are all inspired by one common aim, one common purpose, we shall all share at last in one common victory."

But the future, as the past, must find Cumberland Presbyterians exalting Christ. He must be the center of all our thought and

work. He must be the inspiration of every enterprise, his glory the object of every life. The world is redeemed only in proportion as it receives him. The Bible is valuable only in proportion as it reveals him, and work will be accepted only in proportion as it honors him. When the king lay dying, he asked that the attendant might bring to the sick chamber his crown. When it was brought, he took it in his pale, emaciated hands, and looked it over and over, and then handed it to the servant, asking him to lift it up so that he could see it; when the servant had raised it as high as he could reach, the king said, "Raise it higher," and then the servant, with his knee on the royal couch, raised it still higher; and the king said, "It has been the desire of my life to raise that crown as high as possible in the estimation of my people; it has made me what I am, and has made them what they are; without it we would have been powerless and unknown."

Here is a thought for Cumberland Presbyterians. It is the cross of Christ that has made you what you are. Now, raise that cross higher in the future. Higher, still higher; and when you have exhausted your every power, drop upon your knees, and still higher will go that emblem of love, of strength, of victory.

J. W. LAUGHLIN.

EDITORIAL.

OUR POSITION; OR, CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS IN RELATION TO THE PRESBYTERIAN FAMILY.

In his preface to a volume published about 1845, Rev. Robert Donnell mentioned that Cumberland Presbyterians had been "remiss in not giving a more general circulation" to their doctrines through the printed page, as other Churches were accustomed to do. This was not for lack of literary ability, but, as Mr. Donnell said, because "their fields of operation had been large and white unto harvest, and had required the active and constant labors of all their preachers." He further explained that their minds were more occupied with a desire to "fraternize with other denominations" than to show the differences between them. This latter spirit is laudable indeed, but it is the sacred duty of every Church to preserve its history, to expound its tenets, and so to indoctrinate its people that they can give a reason for the faith that is in them. If they are right, they will thus propagate the truth; if they are in any respect wrong, their error will sooner die. Actuated solely by this spirit, the writer presents these pages, having no desire to parade the views of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to the disparagement of any other. The distinctions here drawn are made in no spirit of sectarian bigotry. Such a spirit exists nowhere in the denomination, for its supreme characteristic is now and ever has been the broadest possible fraternity with all the true followers of Christ. This fact the history of the Church abundantly proves.

Amid the revival scenes of the first decade of this century the sentiments were generated that gave birth to the denomination in 1810. Thoroughly evangelical, eminently self-sacrificing, and consecrated to a single purpose—that of saving souls—its ministers have gone to and fro preaching the word. Not primarily to found a new sect, but that they might have liberty to preach the gospel in its breadth and simplicity as they believed it, these noble and heroic men established and perpetuated the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. By many they have been misunderstood, and, therefore, misrepresented. In the progress of affairs, however, it is transpiring that the successors of those who refused to fellowship the founders of this Church are proposing to do the very thing for which these men were ecclesiastically condemned. Not in a spirit of boasting is this fact

recorded, but simply that the part which this denomination has performed in its sphere in behalf of liberal Presbyterianism may have due recognition. What the founders of this Church did amid jeers and opposition eighty years ago is now welcomed with applause by great metropolitan audiences. When the smoke of friendly conflict has cleared away, the verdict of the historian will put the Cumberland Presbyterian Church where it belongs. It will then be recorded that this Church has nobly served in the very forefront with those who have wrought out the triumphs of liberal Presbyterianism in this country; while the wonderful work it has done in evangelizing the masses of the people will be remembered and spoken of to its praise. Meanwhile, they who have so goodly a heritage may well thank God and take courage, and proceed in faith to the fulfillment of whatever mission is appointed them by the great Head of the Church.

THE ESSENTIAL POINT OF DIFFERENCE.—The issue upon which Cumberland Presbyterians finally came into a separate ecclesiastical existence is sufficiently indicated by the following contrast between the philosophical speculations of John Calvin and the plain teachings of the word of God:

JOHN CALVIN.

"Those persons whom the Lord, in order that they may be the organs of his wrath and examples of his severity, has created to contumely of life and to destruction of death, those persons, I say, in order that they may come duly to their end, he, one while, deprives of the faculty of hearing his word; and, another while, even by the very preaching of it, the more blinds and stupefies.

"So he directs, indeed, his voice to them; but only that they may be the more deaf; he kindles light before them, but only that they may be the more blind; he propounds doctrine to them, but only that by it they may be the more stupefied; he applies the remedy to them, but only that they may not be healed."

"Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he has determined in himself what he would have to become of every individual of mankind; for they are not all created with similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or to death."

THE BIBLE.

"As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live."

"Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

"And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come, and let him that heareth say, Come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

"Turn you at my reproof; behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you. Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded it; . . . . For that they hated knowledge and did not choose the fear of the Lord; . . . therefore shall they eat the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices."

"The Lord . . . . is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

A similar contrast between philosophical speculation and Scripture truth appears in the following statements of doctrine:

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

"These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished.

"As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. . . . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

"Elect infants dying in infancy are saved."

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CONFESSION.

"God, for the manifestation of his glory and goodness, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordained or determined what he himself would do; what he would require his intelligent creatures to do; and what should be the awards respectively of the obedient and the disobedient.

"Though all divine decrees may not be revealed to men, yet it is certain that God has decreed nothing contrary to his revealed will or written word.

God the Father, having set forth his Son, Jesus Christ, as a propitiation for the sins of the world, does most graciously vouchsafe a manifestation of the Holy Spirit with the same intent to every man.

"This call of the Holy Spirit is purely of God's free grace alone, and not because of human merit, and is antecedent to all desire, purpose, and intention on the part of the sinner to come to Christ, so that while it is possible for all to be saved with it, none can be saved without it."

"All those who truly repent of their sins and in faith commit themselves to Christ, God freely justifies," etc.

"All infants, dying in infancy, ... are regenerated and saved."

HISTORICAL PARALLELS.—Soon after the first presbytery of our denomination was organized, this heroic band of self-sacrificing men issued to the world, by way of defense, the following declaration:

"The founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, in their licensure and ordination by the Presbyterian Church, were permitted to 'except the idea of fatality,' as they believed it to be embraced in the doctrines of unconditional election and reprobation, and an atonement limited to a definitely elected number, as taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith. Subsequently having for this been cut off from the parent Church, in fixing a standard of doctrines for the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which they organized, they adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, modified in the following particulars:

"1. That there are no eternal reprobates.

"2. That Jesus died, not for a part only, but for all men, and in the same sense.

"3. That all infants dying in infancy are saved.

"4. That the Holy Spirit operates on all the world, on all for whom Christ died, in such a manner as to render all men responsible, and, therefore, inexcusable."

Eighty years pass by and the largest presbytery in the denomination from which the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church were cast out, for the reason just named, meets day after day to discuss the propriety of modifying the Westminster Confession, and by a vote of more than two thirds adopts the following paper:

"We desire only such changes as seem to us urgently needed and generally asked.

"1. We desire that the third chapter after the first section be so recast as to include these things only: The sovereignty of God in election, the general love of God for all mankind, the salvation in Christ Jesus provided for all and to be preached to every creature.

"2. We desire that the tenth chapter be so revised as not to appear to discriminate concerning 'infants dying in infancy,' or so as to omit all reference to them."

How nearly this comes to what our fathers did with the Westminster Confession we do not undertake to say, but that it proposes a severe revision must be evident to all. To have assumed to do this has been the ecclesiastical crime for which the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has had no forgiveness from such as consider it a sacrilege to touch the "time-honored standards."

Rev. Finis Ewing, one of the three founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, argued that "the great decree of God which concerns man's salvation is, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned.'" He further said, "If words have any determinate meaning these are conditions on which our salvation depends. Here then is a *revealed* decree. Men may talk or say what they please about secret decrees, purposes, predestination, election, etc., but we have just seen the decree of the Bible; the predestination, the foreordination, and election of the Bible." He then argues strongly that there can be no *secret* decree contrary to this *revealed* decree, so men may write and preach and reason and philosophize and put interpretations on doubtful passages as they please, but the fact stands that while the Scriptures teach that "God is a mighty sovereign, possessing the right to work where, when, how, and on whom he will, yet it is nowhere definitely stated that God chose some to eternal salvation, except on the condition of faith and repentance."

Observing even in his day a restiveness under the "hard points" of the Confession Dr. Bird made a prediction nearly a half century ago which, in the light of passing events, amounts almost to a prophecy. He says: "We would feel no surprise if the doctrine of *general atonement* and *conditional election*, at no distant time, becomes one of the grand stand-points and rallying cries of Calvinists in the United States." (He might have said of the whole world.) "Then," said he, "we will have Calvinism strained off from its metaphysics. There is evidently a progressive element and a spirit of contemporaneous construction in the Calvinistic family. This has increased the differences among them in the exposition of their doctrines. They are splitting the backbone of Calvinism. And when they come to the work of reconstruction they will stand with us on the intermedial ground."

In the light of these prophetic words we can appreciate the bearing of what Dr. John Hall said the other day in a speech opposing revision: "Let us look at an historical statement. The Cumberland Presbyterians state the substance of section 1 in chapter 3. They make a second section, just such as our committee recommends, and omit all the rest. My authority for this statement is Dr. Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom." They leave out all the knotty points of Calvinism. Then they give an explanation and plea for this, just such as the brethren have given here. If we believe this and adopt this report, then we must go to them and apologize, and ask for reunion. The points in which the Cumberland Presbyterians revised were very like the points suggested in the report. They leave out six sections of chapter 3. They deny eternal reprobation. They deny that Christ died in any sense for a part of mankind in any particular way. They teach that all infants are saved and that the Holy Spirit 'operates on the world as co-extensively as Christ has made the atonement.'"

This is a full and fair statement of the essentials in which we have revised the Westminster Confession and it is all the more interesting since it comes from a Presbyterian of so much eminence. Whether their similarity to the proposed revision by liberal Presbyterians is so exact as Dr. Hall claims is not a matter of consequence here. The prevailing trend of sentiment now in this progressive and powerful body of Presbyterians is certainly similar to that which prevailed in 1810, when Cumberland Presbyterianism had its birth, and where now it prospers with rapid growth in the soil of a free gospel to every one who will repent and believe.

In 1847 Rev. Laban Jones proclaimed the distinguishing characteristic of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to be: "The doctrine of an impartial salvation, designed alike for all men, proposed to the world of mankind, intended in its provision as much for one man as another." Concerning reprobation, or preterition, he said: "This doctrine will not harmonize with the perfections of God. Though it may be no obstruction to the apprehension of the sovereignty or justice

of God, yet it certainly is a serious impediment in the way of readily and fairly conceiving of the benevolence, the mercy, and the compassion of God."

The writer of this has searched through many hundreds of pages to discover what leading Cumberland Presbyterians have said about the Westminster Confession. He gives it as his judgment that no Cumberland Presbyterian has ever put on record any utterance regarding that Confession that can compare in severity with the following from Dr. Parkhurst, of Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York: "The love of God stands out *on the face* of the gospel. In the Confession you have to *hunt for it* in order to find it. The center of gravity of the Confession does not coincide with the center of gravity of the gospel. If now we are going to retain this preterition idea in our Confession, then we must be true to it in our preaching as Presbyterian ministers, and on occasion declare it in all frankness. We shall be obliged to address our congregations somewhat after this manner: "My friends I am sorry to say it, but as a Calvinistic Presbyterian I am bound to say it, that Christ did not die for all. There is a certain amount of fatalism in the case. Some men are damned, and not only that, but congenitally damned; damned before they are born, hated of God even in the moment of conception."

In the light of these astonishing developments of the past twelve months it surely can no longer be said that Cumberland Presbyterians have departed from the faith in eliminating every tinge of apparent *fatalism* from their creed. Nor can they be charged with sacrilege because they have revised the Westminster Confession. In common with the advocates of revision in every other branch of the Presbyterian family they revere that Confession, in its entirety, as one of the noblest documents of the kind that has ever been written in behalf of the truth. With a few sections eliminated and others slightly changed, it was their creed for seventy years and its essentials, except such as contravene the gospel of love to the whole race are at the basis of its creed now. But this venerable document contains forms of statement that are not justified by the word of God; it belongs to the past; and is not the form of creed demanded for of to-day.

OUR PRESBYTERIANISM.

The men who had been cast out as doctrinally unsound petitioned earnestly for re-admission on some honorable basis and waited four years in vain. They then organized "Cumberland Presbytery," and among the regulations adopted was the following, which shows they had not departed from the Presbyterian standards, except in one particular:

"All candidates for the ministry, who may hereafter be licensed by this presbytery, shall be required before such licensure and ordination

to receive and adopt the Confession and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church, except the idea of fatality that seems to be taught under the mysterious doctrine of predestination. It is to be understood, however, that such as can clearly receive the Confession without any exception shall not be required to make any."

To those who were in sympathy with them they issued an address containing the following paragraph, which breathes a loyal and loving, yet heroic and independent spirit:

"This step at first view may alarm some of you; but be assured brethren, that although we are not *now* united to the Presbyterian Church by the external bond of discipline, that we feel as much union in heart as formerly; and we would further assure you that we have not set up as a party, inimical to the general Presbyterian Church; no; we ourselves are Presbyterians, and expect ever to remain so, whether united to the general body or not. Permit us further to inform you what we do know to be an incontestable fact—that is, there are a number of ministers who are kept in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church, who have deviated infinitely more from the Confession than we have done. One can boldly deny the imputation of Christ's active obedience to the sinner in justification and publish it to the world—another can deny the operation of the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration; and yet, we, who only object to the unqualified idea of eternal reprobation, can not be indulged in that objection."

One of the most eloquent preachers in the South, of any denomination, was Rev. Robert Donnell, D.D., who was also recognized fifty years ago as probably the foremost expounder of Cumberland Presbyterian doctrine. The following statement of the doctrine of salvation by grace would hardly be challenged by even the most rigid Calvinist:

"The plan of the Bible is grace and duty. God calls; the sinner must obey the call. God makes known the plan of salvation, the sinner must accept it. Then God justifies, adopts, renews, sanctifies, and glorifies. The scheme of salvation originates with God and is carried out in man's agency. The system is gracious and personal accountability is secured. Election in the first instance was sovereign, gracious, and free; choosing all men to a day of mercy. Personal election turns on the choice of the sinner elect through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. And thus free moral agency is sustained. God receives all the glory of faith; and man, all the damnation of unbelief."

A Cumberland Presbyterian author already quoted thus defended the Church in the early days of its history against the charge that in revolting from extreme Calvinism it had gone over to Arminianism. "Because we thus speak and vindicate the divine character for equal and general benevolence, some charge us very unjustly with denying the absolute sovereignty and omnipotence of God, or the entire

gratuity of his favors to guilty men; which fundamental truths no people have more constantly taught than Cumberland Presbyterians."

When the question of admitting the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to membership in the "Alliance of the Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System" was under discussion at Belfast, the issue was thus stated by Dr. Martin in the opening speech, criticising the doctrinal position of the Church: "While there are sections on the Decrees of God, Preservation of Believers, and Christian Assurance, there is an omission of any statement concerning the great, fundamental, vital, precious, glorious doctrines of the Election of grace and Predestination to life of those who were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world." Another speaker opposed the admission of the Church and among other things said: "It is generally understood, and I think correctly, that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has eliminated from its creed the doctrine of the Unconditional Election of God's people to eternal life and the means thereof." Granting these things to be true, *and they certainly are*, the claim of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to a place in the great Presbyterian family is not thereby vitiated. So the Belfast Council decided.

One of the leading participants in that discussion was Rev. Dr. Calderwood, professor of Philosophy in Edinburgh University. In a speech that thrilled that vast assemblage the occupant of the chair once filled by Sir William Hamilton said, as he held the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession in his hand: "This Church sprung up in a season of revival from opposition to a hyper-Calvinistic form of teaching which many brethren and which I myself could not follow or adopt, and which I should ask to be delivered from, if I were held responsible for it in the Church to which I belong." (The United Presbyterian Church of Scotland.) "It seems to me," continued Dr. Calderwood, "that a large amount of the development in the belief of this Church has been gathered round about the questions whether man be a free-will agent, and if he be, how his free-will stands in relation to Divine Sovereignty. I am not able to gather that this Church denies or doubts the Divine Sovereignty in Grace." He then quoted, approvingly, the sections of the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith bearing on this doctrine, and declared his adherence to them as against the necessitarianism of Jonathan Edwards. Prof. Charteris, of Edinburgh, objected to the phraseology of some portions of the Cumberland Presbyterian creed, but said concerning the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty, "Few of us could desire any fuller statement of the true doctrine than is found in Section 40 of this creed: 'This call of the Holy Spirit is purely of God's free grace alone, and not because of any good foreseen in man, and is antecedent to all desire, purpose, and intention on the part of the sinner to come to Christ, so that while it is possible for all to be saved with it, none can be saved without it.' In the points where we differ from them—where they have chosen to differ from us—one can see that their whole aim is to commend the ways of God to man, and to gather penitent sinners round the foot-stool of our heavenly Father's throne. How can we possibly have any words but those of welcome for those who hold by that noble creed—for a noble creed it is—and who are giving all their powers to the spread of the blessed gospel of Grace and Love on which their articles show that they love to dilate? There can be no essential difference between them and us."

In striking and strange disregard of the section of the creed just quoted by Dr. Charteris and of other similar sections, Prof. Chancellor, of Belfast, said the Cumberland Presbyterian Church "stigmatizes the doctrine of God's sovereignty in matters of grace and seeks to expel it from their Confession of Faith." Dr. Moore, of Texas, a delegate from the Southern Presbyterian Church, in the same strain and with still greater emphasis said, "There can be no doubt that these Cumberland brethren have distinctly and avowedly renounced what we call the doctrine of Grace, and the Election of Grace, and the Sovereignty of God. There can be no doubt about that."

This charge, made through a remarkable misapprehension of the facts of history and the meaning of language, was thus refuted by Dr. E. D. Morris, of Lane Seminary:

"This Church has stood for eighty years in the position of an independent section of American Presbyterianism, and has never once sought organic union with an Arminian body, but from the first has been seeking fellowship with other Presbyterian Churches in this alliance. As to the recent revision of the Westminster symbols by this Church, I am prepared to say, as one who has for many years taught first historical and then dogmatic theology that, although inadequately Calvinistic, this revision can not be regarded by any one as in any just sense an Arminian document. There is too much Calvinism in it to justify any such affirmation. What the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has been trying to do, in all its revisions, is to eliminate from the Westminster Confession, not Calvinism proper, but what it regards as *fatalism*, embodied in the phraseology of our symbols." Toward the close of this great debate, which continued with intense and increasing interest for four hours, Dr. Brown, of Paisley, Scotland, said with much emphasis: "I am here on this floor to say that as far as I am concerned I do approve of the changes these brethren have made."

Rev. Dr. Storey, of Rosneath, one of the leading minds of Scotland, also said: "I commend in the highest sense what these brethren have done. It is a broad principle of liberty that a Christian Church should revise its standards and reconsider its formulas, and I welcome these brethren to our alliance as having done, in the exercise of that liberty,

that which I consider one of the highest prerogatives, and may become one of the most imperative duties, that any Christian Church can exercise. . . . I prefer to say that I anticipate the time when all the Churches of this alliance will have the grace and wisdom given them to do what the Cumberland Presbyterians have done."

In a similar strain spoke Dr. Monod of France, Dr. Chamberlain, of India, and others.

It is gratifying to record that when this great debate closed and the delegates (eleven in number) from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church were invited to seats in the Council, they were welcomed most cordially, not only by the overwhelming majority that favored their admission from the first, but even by most of those who had opposed it. Since then the representatives of the Church have at all times been treated with the utmost Christian consideration and brotherly regard.

In his admirable exposition of Cumberland Presbyterian doctrine Dr. Milton Bird (in 1856) gives the appended paragraph, which is as good Presbyterianism as any one in any branch of this great family can reasonably desire. So far as any one may hold Calvinism and divine sovereignty in grace to be synonymous it has enough of the former and certainly all that the Bible will allow. "Power to become the sons of God must include effectual grace. But to whom is it given? 'As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.' So we see that receiving Christ, or believing on him, is the condition of his effectual calling. This view of the doctrine harmonizes with the Scriptures. It accords with the doctrine of general atonement. It agrees with the accountable free agency of man; and is consistent with Supreme agency. Salvation by grace begins and ends with God. But it is not effected without the concurrence of man's agency." (The Doctrines of Grace, page 234.) This is as much of the Calvinism of the past as ought to be preserved; and we venture the prediction that it is as much as the Presbyterianism of the future will desire. It is precisely what the Cumberland Presbyterian Church believes, and is the platform on which every Presbyterian who repudiates the "horrible doctrine" of reprobation must stand. This is "the election of grace" that Paul taught the Church at Rome.

CONCLUSION.—Surely nothing more is needed to establish the fact that, as the founders of our Church said when the first step toward our ecclesiastical autonomy was taken, "we are Presbyterians." What our denomination has done stands as a part of the history of the Presbyterianism of the world. Considering two things, the record of our Church must fill no inconsiderable part of that history and in coming years the unprejudiced historian will accord to the Church a place of honor such as can not be expected in these days of conflict

as to truth and struggle for progress. One of these is the marvelous growth of the Church from its small and insignificant beginning, with only three members and not a house of worship, nor a school building or college in all the land, to its present proportions, with one hundred and sixty thousand members and its equipments for great and useful work. The other is the historical fact that before the Presbyterians of Scotland, of England, of Australia, of France, or of America began even to discuss the grave question of revising the creed, the founders of our Church quietly accomplished it. And not only so, but after the lapse of seventy years they have, with wonderful unanimity, provided for themselves a short and simple creed, such that they can place in the hands of *all* their members and to every sentence of which ministers and laity can alike subscribe. This plainer and simpler statement of doctrine is in no material sense a departure from what our standards were before. Having been with the revising committee at each of its sittings the writer can bear testimony that in re-casting these statements the constant aim was watchfully to guard against any departure from what had been the doctrines of the Church from the beginning. Whether our Presbyterian friends revise the standards or frame a new creed, or both, let us hope that they may be divinely guided. As a part of the same family we are deeply interested in whatever will promote the glory and success of our common Presbyterianism. Wherein the result proves them to be more thoroughly Presbyterian than our own Church we will gladly recognize the fact and will rejoice in the wisdom of what they have done. Being bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh every success achieved by Presbyterians anywhere is in a vital sense our own, and must in the end inure to the good of all.

Cumberland Presbyterians do not pretend to claim that theirs is the best possible statement of the views of liberal Presbyterianism, but they do insist that it is a vast improvement over the hard and repulsive features of the Westminster standards. They have no particular zeal for forms of statement, caring more for the essence and spirit of the creed and the practical work of the Church. When, therefore, the time comes for formulating "a short and simple creed" to which all Presbyterians may subscribe, it will be found that Cumberland Presbyterians are both generous and fraternal toward all other branches of this great household of faith. They will also be found to be true then, as they have ever been, to the essentials in government and doctrine that constitute the "Concensus of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System." Whatever the future may have in store for our several creeds, Cumberland Presbyterians can never take a backward step on the great question of salvation in Jesus Christ made possible for every human soul.

W. J. D.

IS THEOLOGY PROGRESSIVE?

Theology is "the science of God and his relations to his creatures;" or, according to Prof. Shedd, "a science that is concerned both with the infinite and the finite, with God and the universe." Science is "knowledge duly arranged and referred to the general truths and principles on which it is founded;" or, as defined by Aquinas, "the knowledge of the qualities aud relations of an object." Theology, then, is our knowledge of God stated systematically. We can conceive of it being progressive in two ways: First, by an increase of knowledge, finding out more about God; second, by a truer arrangement, a better systematizing, of what has already been found out.

Is theology progressive in the first of these ways?

Of course we understand that truth is not growing any truer; that the character and attributes of God are not changing; that the gracious revelations of the Bible remain ever the same. The gospel of salvation through Christ, of atonement and forgiveness, the solemn facts of human responsibility, of retribution, providence, and judgment, of heaven and hell, while we may learn more about them, change not in their essential nature. In like manner the facts and principles underlying other sciences, which all admit to be progressive, are changeless. The laws of gravitation of chemical affinity, of the vital forces in plants and animals, are ever the same, and yet men are learning more and more about the nature or workings or results of these laws; that is, astronomy and chemistry and biology are progressive sciences. If theology is not also progressive it must be either because we have found out God to perfection, or because we are barred by the limit of our capacity, or by some fixed decree, from learning any more about him; that is, it must be that we have either mastered the subject, or reached the allotted limit of human knowledge concerning it.

It is evident that we have not mastered the subject. While there are so many unsolved mysteries concerning God's works who will claim a perfect understanding of God himself? We have hardly learned the a b c of the secrets of the sun and the stars; we have hardly turned the first leaf in our study of electricity and magnetism and that deeper mystery, the thing or force we call life; and shall we claim complete knowledge of the nature and thoughts and purposes of the Source and Maker of all these things? Surely, if theology is not progressive, it is not for the first reason named; we have not mastered or exhausted the subject; all the truth about God is not known.

But have we reached the limit of human capacity, or the fixed boundary beyond which God has decreed we shall not pass? If theology includes a knowledge of the finite as well as the infinite—

of the universe as well as its Maker—it will be progressive as long as we can acquire any new knowledge of nature or creation. And does not every new fact about nature reveal a new truth about God? When Copernicus solved the problem of the planetary motions, and Newton demonstrated the law of gravitation, mankind knew something about God's way of working in the heavens and on earth, and therefore something about God himself, which until then had been unknown. The researches of geologists have revealed new facts about the history of our planet and the beginnings of life upon it, imparting new meanings to many natural objects about us, and throwing new light upon the Bible itself. And if we admit that there is any measure of truth in the modern hypothesis of evolution, we get from it new insight into the mystery of God's method or law of creation and providence. And dare we say that these and other mysteries of nature will not hereafter be better understood, thereby revealing still other thoughts of God? Have we, in any realm of research, attained the limit of knowledge? If not, all science from man's point of view is progressive, and theology, which has for its subject the Creator and his universe, most so of all. So conservative a theologian as Prof. Shedd says on this subject: "The longer a science is pursued the more is known of the subject. The aim and endeavor is to reach a final and complete comprehension. In theology, which embraces the infinite as well as the finite, the goal can never be reached, either in this world or the next, but more and more will be known, and the progress of the science will be onward forever and for evermore."

As long as physical science is progressive—that is, as long as our knowledge of nature is increasing—what is called natural theology must be also progressive. But it may be argued that knowledge of God and his works reached through scientific research is not properly theological knowledge. Theology may be limited to the spiritual and religious realm, to the truth revealed concerning God and his dealings with men in relation to their duty and destiny as spiritual and immortal beings. Many object to the claim that we are making progress in revealed theology. And there is a sense in which this objection is valid. The kind of progress claimed by spiritualists, or by the Mormons is doubtless spurious. The volume of inspiration is closed. No new truths are to be added to it, no old ones taken away from it, either by new prophetic or rationalistic or scientific light. New meanings may be revealed, wrong interpretations corrected, as Copernicus corrected the mistakes of ancient astronomers, but Bible truth, like the fixed stars of the firmament, remains forever the same.

And yet biblical or revealed theology is progressive—that is, our knowledge of revealed truth like our knowledge of the facts and laws of nature may be and ought to be continually increasing.

First. The wisest critics and commentators are readiest to admit that they have not mastered all the mysteries of revelation. In the Apocalypse, in Daniel and Isaiah and Ezekiel, in Peter and John and Matthew, how many things are beyond our explanations! Will we say that these things are never to be explained? If theology is to have no further progress they must remain mysteries in all the ages. Then why were these things written? How can "all Scripture" be "profitable" if part of it is to remain forever buried in unfathomable mystery?

Second. We know that theology is progressive because it has progressed. Through study and criticism and controversy the Scriptures are better understood than they were in the days of the Church fathers or in the Middle Ages or even in the times of Luther and Calvin and Knox and the Westminster divines. Is not the doctrine of justification by faith more clearly and definitely understood and believed now than before the Reformation? Has not the doctrine and duty of foreign missions shone forth on the world in clearer light since the days of Carey and Moffat and Judson? Precious meanings but dimly seen or entirely missed by ancient readers of the word are now understood by children in the Sunday-school. Mistaken and distorted interpretations have been corrected; the due relation between things essential and non-essential is more distinctly marked. So controversies which were once thought to involve vital issues have been dropped as puerile. The date of Easter is no longer a cause of strife and schism. And we are getting beyond other controversies hardly less empty and foolish. Not many now insist on their favorite form of Church government—Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism or what not—as divinely revealed, and condemn all other forms as unauthorized and evil. Debates on the mode of baptism are growing more and more rare. We are dropping one by one our ritual and dogmatic and metaphysical conceits, and grasping with a firmer hold the central and essential truths of the Bible. There could be no stronger proof of the progressiveness of theology than the revolt we now see in the Presbyterian Church against doctrinal statements which have commanded universal assent in that Church for nearly three centuries. The Scripture is better understood, the light is clearer; theology is progressing.

Third. There has been and there is still likely to be progress through the light that comes in historic and scientific progress. The procession of time itself brings to light what was unknown before. How many theories about the time of the millennium have been dispelled by the march of the years and centuries. Thus new things about the thoughts and purposes of God are revealed, prophecy is better understood in the light of the movements of men and nations. And, as we have seen, science has given us the key to unlock some of

the mysteries of revelation. Who reads Genesis now as men read it before Geology laid bare and analyzed the earth's crusts?

Theology is progressive through our ever-widening knowledge of the nations and peoples of the earth; through our enlarging views and sympathies. We are beginning to see more clearly that God in all the ages and among all peoples has been working out his purposes; that in Assyria and Egypt, in Greece and Italy, as well as in Palestine, preparation for the coming of the Lord was going forward in all the centuries before Jesus was born; and we are grasping the thought that God may be even now working in the thoughts and events in China and Africa and the regions where no Christian missionary ever penetrated.

Peter's theology was progressive. On the house top at Joppa, in the home of Cornelius, he got a wider view; and so God is revealing to the Church to-day wider meanings and a more gracious import in his truth. Larger things than we have yet comprehended are embraced in the Scriptures and in Christianity. Events reveal the truth. New light bursts forth from the word, kindled by the fact or event that made new light necessary. It was in the word before but the new emergency or discovery calls attention to it or throws light upon it. Therefore the Bible and theology are old but ever new. The truth is steadfast but our knowledge of it and joy and blessing in it ever progressing.

It is evident also, from what has been said, that theology is progressive in the other sense—that is, it is from age to age better systematized. As truth is better understood, as new meanings are brought out and old mistakes corrected, truths are seen in more nearly their true relation. Definitions, therefore, become clearer, statements more accurate, arrangement more logical. We can learn more about God; we can arrange what we have learned in better order. Knowledge may ever be increased, creeds ever improved. That is, theology will, until time is no more, be a progressive science.

J. M. H.

MINISTRY OF SUFFERING.

Did it ever occur to your mind to ask whether the ancient disciples of our Lord suffered from the common bodily and mental ills of life, as well as from the persecutions of their enemies? Did they have chills and fevers, pains, and ill health, and all the ordinary evils to which flesh is heir? If they had these in addition to the privations and sufferings which they had to endure for Christ's sake, they had a very hard time of it. We become very impatient and much dissatisfied in these days of liberty and opportunity when we are called to

endure affliction and diseases. What must be the order of that discipline by which the heart becomes chastened into purity and submission, and by which it exhibits a moral grandeur far superior to the spirit of the world or the common experience of Church members? Our human nature is easily affected by conditions, and when highly favored and living at ease, it scarcely seems to appreciate as it should a little privation come to its lot. The strange thing is that experience teaches us so little while it really presents many serious lessons. We estimate other men's wisdom at small value, and push our own experience of life much to our own injury, from the reason that we are naturally unwilling to suffer affliction and loss. It is hard for man to place himself in exact accord with his environments. He needs and must have the aid of divine grace in no small measure, if he lives in peace with God and in spiritual comfort in himself. The truth is that individual and collective man is a failure without it.

It is a severe and often bitter experience, a veritable *via dolorosa*, which gracious souls pass through to attain the elevation of subdued and refined Christian character. A Christian woman of good repute once said, in affliction, that her losses did her no good, that prosperity and not adversity was better for her, because prosperity made her thankful, and adversity made her rebellious. The last time the present writer saw that worthy woman his heart was sad to witness her loneliness and desolation. She had been very wealthy and hospitable, and her view of life was that broad, enjoyable state of things which comes of lavish expenditure and generous dealings all round. Her later days were pinched and harsh, and her heart was having a struggle to adapt itself to the changed condition. What a mistake in a Christian to place such an estimate on the surface of life, while the depth is unstirred by the true things of God. Better far to strive toward the purer and more abiding state of submission and devotion in which we must forever dwell if we live in harmony with God. There are many pangs in the heart before it reaches that state; there are strivings of conscience and judgment with the inclinations of the heart, and there are resistances of the flesh to the rule of the Christian law of self-denial.

Some lives are a perpetual struggle with disease, others with evil tempers and passions, and some natures are naturally less spiritual or devotional than others. These facts in their nature make a difficult and crooked course for Christian people who realize them. Unbidden questionings come into the mind, if not to the lips, and there is no solution of such problems as are darkly suggested. The true recourse is to the secret place of prayer, and the heart-felt cry of the inner soul to God for a better and truer life. The end is worth the effort to secure a nobler and higher relation or spiritual estate, and no Christian should ever despair in the struggle. The present is narrow and the future is wide; earth is small and heaven is large; time is very short but eternity is long—so very long that we may well endure the narrow, small, and short season of things that are evil, if they may be preparatory to the greatness and glory of the exalted and everlasting life of heaven.

QUERIES, NOTES, AND SUGGESTIONS.

Less is gained than many people seem to think by arguing about the abstract, unpractical, or non-essential things in religious and theological belief, or even about the practical and essential. Christ commissioned us not to argue with one another, but to preach the gospel to a lost world. Of course we must have an understanding about what the gospel is. It is, of course, well to lay deep the foundations of doctrine so that we can give to every man a reason for the faith that is in us, but there are some mysteries along the boundary between the revealed and unrevealed, or even within that boundary, that are past our fathoming, some practical questions that good people will still differ about; and we sometimes think life is too short and its work too pressing to spend many of its days or hours in trying to solve the unsolvable. We can not find out the philosophy of every thing; indeed, we can not dig down to the foundation mystery of any thing. We, therefore, have a good deal of sympathy with the views expressed in the following contribution from a California pastor:

WASTED STRENGTH.

It is truly lamentable that the Lord's forces are so discordant. What a vast amount of energy is being wasted, to say no worse of it. The divisions of the army have just been passing before my mind. The great Presbyterian division is engaged in discussing the revision question. The energy of the Congregational branch is being devoted to finding out whether the impenitent will have another chance in the other world. The Episcopalians are working over their prayer-book, and a good deal of friction is developed in the process. The Baptists have not all gotten tired of the attempt to prove that nothing but immersion is baptism. Not a few Cumberland Presbyterians find time for indulgence in theological polemics; and so the record goes. Now, would not the armies of the devil fly if all these guns now being used by Christians against one another should be turned upon them? Would not a shout of gladness arise from the benighted in heathen lands? Let us subdue all lands for Christ, and by that time all these other questions will have solved themselves.

T. A. COWAN.

But even men full of the activities of life can not help thinking of

questions which are beyond answer, as the following query, from a Pennsylvania pastor—one of the busiest and most practical men of the Church—will show:

WERE THEY SAVED?

Were Adam and Eve saved? This question is propounded with no desire to excite mere speculation, but to elicit facts. Did the "old deceiver" gain an eternal victory over the parents of the human race? If the once sinless pair finally accepted the "promise," what are the proofs?

J. R. MORRIS.

Who does not sometimes ponder this mystery of the nations of the dead, Adam and his children? They are immortal in the unseen world, immortal in the deeds and influences they set in motion on earth. While Adam lives in eternity, what he did lives in time. Here is a suggestive elaboration of this thought:

THE TWO IMMORTALITIES.

Mr. E. H. Hood, in an interesting article written from a Comtean point of view, and in which he rejects the Christian doctrine of a personal immortality, says: "Is it not ample compensation to know that old age, decrepitude, and uselessness are to give place to youth, strength, and beauty, and that man's intelligence and virtues become an immortal inheritance by his children?"* To such a question, of course, the unbiased human heart will always answer, No. And still, this same aspect of immortality, which occupies so large a place in the humanitarian religion, is an important half of an intensely important Christian and philosophic truth. For, according to the Bible and observation as well, a man though dead yet loudly speaketh. The dead live on forever in an immortal influence. Consequently, every man is in possession of two immortalities—the one personal and the other influential. By this wise and divine arrangement we become the heirs of all the ages, and—how awful is the thought!—all the succeeding ages become our heirs. To a reflective mind it is thus a terrible thing to live. Each man is found to be standing at the headwaters, so to speak, of an endless river, upon which he is compelled to launch the bark of an unending influence. The Christian theory of immortality, then, includes the Comtean, while, at the same time, it brings most clearly to light the more joyous truth of a personal eternity. And yet, while we sing rapturously of a "heaven above," it is continually reminding us that there is an earth beneath, and that we should ponder well the influential self we are about to imbed in the race we leave behind us. A fact that is certainly fitted to make the thoughtful think is this Christo-Comtean scientific doctrine that "no man liveth to himself."

J. D. GOLD.

* *North American Review* for May, 1888, page 586.

Another correspondent is in favor of giving to non-ministerial students a chance to drink at the fountains of theological education. We see no reason why any thirsty soul should be fenced out from these fountains:

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS FOR ALL STUDENTS.

The majority of theological schools are open only to students committed to the ministry. Even women preparing to be missionaries are not encouraged to apply for instruction—would be rejected if they did. Property titles in some cases require this; where, however, this is not the case, why not open the theological lecture rooms to all students, whether committed to the ministry or not, whether male or female? Would theological study hurt this outside element? Should young men thus taught become elders, would they be any the worse by this special study? Would women thus taught be in any measure disqualified to go as missionaries or teach in the Sunday-schools? Are not the other professional schools open to the ministry? Would scandal-mongers find much scandal in institutions where the faculty were Christian men and the students such as longed for better knowledge of God? If the masses of students were led to aspire to a knowledge of theology, would not our theology better adapt itself to the masses? And would it not fire up some of our theologians to look out over a large crowd of students daily? Moreover, would it not have a good effect on the preacher in the pulpit to have some of these lay graduates to preach to weekly?

R. J. BEARD.

Not only should all study the Bible and theology, but all should have place to help in gospel work. The following points to the true philosophy and method of organized Christian effort:

ORGANIZATION AND INDIVIDUAL WORK.

That which the Church needs to carry forward, successfully, the Master's work is thorough and complete organization for aggressive work, and individual effort within the organization. Illustrations of the power of organization are to be found in all departments of life—commercial, political, social. But individual effort within the organization is the force that brings success. The Church that depends upon organization alone, will fail of the largest success; but the thoroughly organized Church, with its members at work in their individual capacity, can hardly fail to succeed. One illustration of the manner in which the kingdom of Christ is to extend itself, is found in our Lord's parable of the leaven in the meal barrel. By this we learn that the leaven assimilates the whole mass to itself, by the contact of each particle with the particle next to it. Each particle, as soon as it is leavened, communicates its own virtue to all the particles about it. So every disciple is bound, to proclaim Christ to those nearest him,

and every one that "heareth" is bound to extend to others the invitation to "come." Each new disciple must put forth effort to disciple others. Happy that pastor who has his Church well organized, and his members actively at work within the organization.

W. T. FERGUSON.

To secure such co-operation of every Church member each should be educated into an intelligent interest in Church affairs. Therefore the more widely denominational books and periodicals are circulated and read, the larger will be the number who will enlist in helping forward the work. Cumberland Presbyterians ought annually to issue a year book with statistics of denominational progress, facts of history, and expositions of doctrine. In the absence of this we ought at least to place the Minutes of our General Assembly in every family. In view of the fuller statistics that the Minutes of 1890 are to contain it would be well to adopt some plan by which they may be more widely circulated. Hence the following suggestion is timely:

DISTRIBUTING THE MINUTES.

Can we not improve the manner of publishing and distributing the Minutes of the General Assembly?

1. Could not arrangements be made and a few pages of advertisements be inserted, the proceeds of which would go far toward paying the expense of publishing?

2. Ought we not to publish a much larger number of copies of the Minutes; so that every elder in the Church and any one else who wishes to have one can get it. At present, the ministers and clerks of sessions, in those presbyteries only whose contingent tax is paid up, are supplied. The theory is that this restriction will stimulate the presbyteries to pay up promptly, but is it not extremely doubtful whether it does so in fact?

3. Ought we not, at least, to publish a few hundreds, or thousands, of extra copies and offer them for sale to any body that will buy at about cost of publication?

W. B. WITHERSPOON.

Finally we have a paper called forth by a contribution to this department which appeared in the January number.

MAN'S FALL AND DEPRAVITY.

"To what extent did the fall disable the spiritual or moral capacity in man—partially or totally?"

This question is propounded in the October number of the REVIEW (page 498) by "a veteran pastor," and the editor asks, "Who will answer his question?" Another pastor, perhaps a little more veteran than the querist, says, in the January number of the REVIEW (pages 114, 115): "It is a question which has puzzled many ministers and other persons who have not studied the Bible with sufficient care to learn its teachings on this subject, or whose studies have been under the influence of a theological postulate having no proof from the Bible." "Some suppose that Adam, by the sinful act of eating the forbidden fruit, changed his moral nature, and then transmitted a sinful nature to his posterity, so that all his descendants come into the world with a sinful nature, which is the source of all sinful acts. This is a theological assumption without Bible proof. There is not a text or passage in the Bible that says or teaches that man has a sinful nature."

How is this? I read from Paul to the Ephesians thus: "Among whom we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of the flesh and of the mind, and were by *nature* the children of wrath, even as others." And David says, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." And, "The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." And Job, too, asks, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one."

I do not claim to have read and studied the Bible as thoroughly as some of my elder brethren, but I did read it through once, a few years ago, not "under the influence of any theological postulate having no proof from the Bible" that I am aware of, and have re-read portions of it since, with some degree of care, and still read a little nearly every day; and I find myself more "puzzled" to reconcile the declarations made above with the teachings of my Oxford Bible, as I understand them, than I do with the original question.

If Adam's moral nature was not "changed in his sinful act of eating the forbidden fruit," in what sense can he be said to have fallen? And if his posterity have not inherited a sinful nature, why do all need pardon and regeneration in order that they may enter the kingdom of heaven?

If the following scriptures do not teach the doctrine of an inherited human depravity, will the editor or some one else give in the July number of the REVIEW a plain, natural, common sense exposition of them? "They are altogether become filthy, there are none that doeth good." "If by one man's offense death reigned by one." "For as in Adam all die." "There is none righteous, no, not one." "They are all gone out of the way." "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "For if through the offense of one many be dead." "For the judgment is by one to condemnation." "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." This list might be extended.

When Isaiah testified that "the whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint; from the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores," I

take it that he considered the human heart very corrupt; and when Paul testified that "death entered by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," that he regarded this corrupt nature as passing down to posterity. Else, where were the need of the Spirit's aid? But in the work of the atonement the Spirit's help is secured, to convince or enlighten, to guide the submissive penitent, to seal his pardon, clothing him with the best robe—the garment of salvation—to regenerate his nature, to record his name in the Lamb's Book of Life, and to comfort and sanctify and make him meet for the kingdom of God, providing for his moral as well as his legal destitution.

P. AXTELL.

Lack of space compels us to reserve some excellent matter for this department for our next number.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE RIVERSIDE LIBRARY FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: Number 1, The War of Independence, by John Fiske; Number 2, George Washington, by Horace E. Scudder; Number 3, Birds Through an Opera Glass, by Florence A. Merriam; Number 4, Up and Down the Brooks, by Mary E. Bamford. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

In this day, when there is such a surfeit of novels, religious and irreligious, it is refreshing to find now and then a readable and entertaining book for the young outside the domain of fiction. The first two volumes of this series, it will be seen, relate to our country's history, the one being a sketch of the revolution, and the other a short biography of the hero of that struggle. John Fiske's sketch of the War of Independence will prove helpful not only to boys and girls in school, but also to mature men and women seeking clearer views of the period of revolution and national transformation embraced in the thirteen years from 1776 to 1789. It begins with a lucid picturing of the state of things in the early colonial period; then follows an account and explanation of the French Wars, the Stamp Act, and the Revenue Laws, thus making plain the causes which led to the Revolutionary crisis. The author tells us in his preface that when he lectures to boys and girls he observes "that a reference to causes and effects always seems to heighten the interest of the story." One chief merit of this book is the insight it gives into the causes that underlie the events of our national history. It and its companion volume, "George Washington," are worthy to be placed in the hands of every American boy or girl. The last-named volume, though but a sketch compared with the recent work of Henry Cabot Lodge, gives a graphic picture of America's greatest hero, and the stirring scenes and events in which he moved.

The third and fourth volumes of this series, "Birds Through an Opera Glass" and "Up and Down the Brooks," are made up of pictures from nature, the one describing certain birds and their habits, and the other telling about water-beetles and kindred denizens of the brook. Neither is a dry or systematic treatise on the branch of natural history to which it is devoted, but each gives such life-like pictures of the creatures described and of the adventures of the writer in search of knowledge, that the pages glow with all the interest of a continued story. A large part of "Birds Through an Opera Glass" was published in *Audubon Magazine* in 1886.

Perhaps the most sprightly and entertaining of these four volumes is the one on the least promising theme, the beetles that swim "Up and Down the Brooks."

ASPECTS OF THE EARTH: A Popular Account of Some Familiar Geological Phenomena. By N. S. Shaler, Professor of Geology in Harvard University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889.

In this splendid volume we have evidence of two things; first, that scientific subjects, in the hands of a man who is master of them, can be so popularized and stripped of their technicalities as to be, not only profitable, but also interesting and attractive to the unscientific masses; and secondly, that there is a growing demand for such literature. This demand has been much augmented within recent years, by the publication of such books as are found in Appleton's International Scientific Series, and the attention which great magazines like *Scribner's* and the *Century* have given to scientific subjects. The volume before us is a model of mechanical excellence. The engravings are numerous and superb, and aside from its contents, the book has a most attractive appearance.

The author discusses such subjects as come up naturally in the mind of the ordinary observer of nature, including many of the most notable of terrestrial phenomena. He treats successively earthquakes, volcanoes, caverns, and cavern life, rivers and valleys, atmospheric movements, the forests of North America, and the origin and nature of soils.

All the papers except the last, were published, in substance, some time since in *Scribner's Magazine*, and the attention which they then received was a sufficient reason for reprinting them in this form.

The book contains no less than eighty-six engravings, illustrating every phase of the subjects treated, together with a splendid frontispiece showing the Cañon of the Colorado River.

As a contribution to exact science this work is not worth much, but as a means of opening up to the common mind the great treasure house of terrestrial phenomena it is invaluable.

A History of Art: For Classes, Art Students, and Tourists in Europe. By William Henry Goodyear, B.A. Second edition. Revised with new illustrations. New York and Chicago: A. S. Barnes & Company.

No course of instruction should be considered complete that does not include some training of the artistic taste. Many of our colleges have professorships of the History of Art and this subject is taught in all our young ladies' seminaries. This volume—beautifully printed and profusely illustrated—is a comprehensive sketch of the entire subject and so arranged as to fit it for use as a school or college text-book. The object of the author "to present such an amount and choice of illustration as have never been previously attempted in similar works, and as a class-book to present the subject in such a way that the use of still further illustration will be easy and desirable" is well carried out. In more than two hundred illustrations the most important works of art are presented in their natural arrangement. The three subjects, Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting are taken up separately. Technical terms are clearly explained, and the reader or student is assisted at every step by illustrations, many of them from photographs of famous pictures or statues, rare gems of the engraver's and printer's art. The work is not incumbered with tedious details calculated to unfit it for use in elementary classes and yet it gives specific and explicit information on points which learners need to know about. As a study of the development of art from the rude beginnings in Assyria and Egypt through Greece and Italy and down to the present time these pictures as well as the chapters they illustrate will be interesting and instructive to many who do not make art studies a specialty. Price per volume, $3.50. The publishers advertise special rates to art classes for introduction.

The English Men of Action Series. Macmillan & Co., London and New York.

We have received eight volumes of this series, viz.: "David Livingstone," by Thomas Hughes; "Charles George Gordon," by Sir William F. Butler; "The Duke of Wellington," by George Hooper; "Lord Lawrence," by Sir Richard Temple; "Lord Strafford," by H. D. Traill; "Monk," by Julian Corbett; "William Dampier," by W. Clark Russell; "Warren Hastings," by Sir Alfred Lyall.

Perhaps no other species of writing is so interesting and profitable as biography. Almost every one has a natural fondness for narrative and incident. We see this in the relish of children for stores. Biography appeals to this native instinct. It also brings us face to face with human motives and character. We are made acquainted with the people and events with which the life of the person whose story we are reading was connected, with the countries he visited, and the scenes he passed through, the dramas, political, military or social, in which he was an actor. So biography teaches us history, geography, psychology, government, politics, war. The variety of the characters and pursuits of the men included in this series renders it all the more valuable. In the story of the life and death of Strafford we learn much about the events and influences that led to the downfall of Charles I. The life of Monk brings out the story of Cromwell, the Protectorate, and the Restoration. The biography of Wellington includes the events of English history during the lifetime of the Iron Duke, and necessarily brings the reader face to face with other great leaders in the affairs of Europe and the world in that stormy period. The life of Lawrence and of Warren Hastings takes us to India, while the story of the struggles and adventures of Gordon and of Livingstone transports us in imagination to China and Africa. Not the least interesting of this collection of biographies is that of William Dampier, the buccaneer, the explorer, the writer. These volumes are handsomely printed and bound in limp cloth at a uniform price of sixty cents each. They will make a handsome addition to any private or public library.

Systematic Theology: A Compendium and Commonplace Book, Designed for the use of Theological Students. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., President and Professor of Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Published by A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, New York.

This is a large octavo volume of about eight hundred pages, gotten up in superior style. The work, too, as a whole, has received strong commendations from some of the most eminent theologians of all evangelical denominations, and from religious journals and reviews. That it should receive such indorsements is not a matter of astonishment, for even a superficial examination of its table of contents will convince any one that it is a book of great merit, combining as it does clearness, compactness, comprehensiveness, and cogency in as high degree as any similar treatise of orthodox theology extant. The author is evidently a fine scholar and an extensive reader; is familiar with the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and is thoroughly conversant with the writings and theories of the most prominent theologians of the past and the present. Indeed, one is astonished at the lengthy catalogue of authorities presented under each topic discussed, thereby showing not only an intimate acquaintance with books, but also with reviews. And so frank and candid is he in his discussions, in the main, that he not only gives the authorities who coincide with him in opinion, but also those who differ with him.

Being a Baptist of the "straitest sect," and a professor in one of the leading theological seminaries of that large and influential denom-

ination, he never loses sight of his allegiance to that Church. But while this is true, he treats his theological opponents with marked respect. On the sacraments — baptism and the Lord's-supper — he tenaciously adheres to the "old landmarks" of his Church—immersion and close communion.

The greatest weakness of the author is, we think, displayed when he reaches the themes, Election and Reprobation, for he reaffirms and attempts to defend "the time-honored standards" of his Church. This is to be regretted. One would think in view of the fact that the most efficient element in one of the largest, wealthiest, and most influential Churches in Christendom is now trying to eliminate from its creed the "hard points" of Calvinism, that such a step would receive the indorsement of so scholarly a theologian as Dr. Strong. But not so; for the present edition of his book was brought out last year, and there is in it no sign of material relaxation on these points. The day has come when relief must be had from doctrines which the intelligence and theology of the age have outgrown. The voice of Christendom clamors for a theology which has its beginning corner not in human speculations but in the Bible itself. It does not ask for, nor does it want, nor will it tolerate effete dogmas—dogmas which few are bold enough to preach, and which fewer still are willing to believe. Hence, let all such theological mummies lie in the sepulchers of the ages which embalmed them. They are revolting to public view, and all the good they can subserve is to show the curious how long a lifeless corpse may be preserved by skillful hands even after the divine and human decree has pronounced the sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."

But, notwithstanding these faults, the book, in the main, is a most valuable one; and we most heartily thank the learned author for this scholarly contribution to the Christian literature of the age.

LIGHT ON THE PATH; OR, THE WAY HEAVENWARD. By Rev. John Kirk, Evangelical Union Church, Fountainbridge, Edinburgh. John B. Fairgrieve, 7 Cockburn Street, Edinburgh.

This little volume in the space of 216 pages treats of more than sixty practical themes, which touch every phase of spiritual experience and religious life and struggle. The author has long been one of the brightest and most thoroughly interesting contributors to the papers and magazines issued by our brethren of the Evangelical Union Church, and in this collection we see the same deep spiritual insight and apt interpretation of Scripture that have so delighted the readers of his more transient productions. No one can read these gems of religious thought without receiving spiritual profit. We heartily recommend this book to pastors as a suitable volume to place in the hands of Christians, as a means of spiritual culture and development. It is a good book to have on your table for daily reading.

ASOLANDO: FANCIES AND FACTS. By Robert Browning. Author's edition. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York.

Critics are by no means a unit in their estimate of the merits and demerits of Robert Browning as a poet. For instance, of two recent newspaper reviewers, one says: "Browning is eminently a quotable poet;" the other says: "Browning's work is rarely quotable in small bits. . . . He compels us to take him as a whole or not at all." While we easily adopt the latter opinion about Browning's quotableness, there are other point-blank contradictions concerning this poet, which we find it less easy to decide between. We can not agree with those who declare that Browning's verse is not poetry at all, nor do we accept the other extreme view that makes him the greatest of modern poets. That he deserves to be enrolled among the great singers of the world few will deny, but his labored and limping versification and his strained and far-fetched rhyming, as well as his obscurity, which is often almost, if not quite, impenetrable, will forever prevent his poems from being widely popular. A great poem must be both profound and lucid. The profundity must be clothed with a charm of clearness and melody which delights him who reads for pleasure while it instructs those who seek profit. The easily read and delightful surface must reveal and suggest deep things and mysteries unutterable. Browning lacks not the mystery and obscurity, the wise philosophy, the profound suggestiveness; but only occasionally does his verse flow with poetic melody and clearness.

In the volume under review published just before his death we have about thirty short pieces presenting good examples of both his excellencies and his defects. "Muckle-mouth Meg" is a ballad almost singable and quite delightful after you grasp its meaning by a second reading. "Reverie" deals with the deepest thoughts and will require several perusals to make it clear to the average reader. Of four "Bad Dreams" the one numbered IV. has in it a pathos and a suggestiveness that reminds us of "My Last Duchess." One of the best poems of this collection is "Beatrice Signorini." In one of the short pieces entitled "Inapprehensiveness" is this fine line reminding us of Whittier's "Might have been:"

"O fancies that might be, O facts that are!"

Perhaps the finest and most quotable stanza in the book is the following from the "Epilogue" which it is suggested might be appropriately written on the poet's tombstone:

"One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better, sleep to wake."

THE WINNING OF THE WEST. By Theodore Roosevelt. Two Volumes. From the Alleghanies to the Mississippi, 1769–1783. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

These handsome volumes are the graphic record of fourteen years of warfare between the pioneers of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana and their savage foes. Much that is here narrated has been often told before; so the events are already familiar to students of our national history. The special merit of this work is not the bringing to light of new facts but the intelligent grouping and rational explanation of facts long familiar. The exact relation of these border wars to the revolutionary struggle, and their influence in determining the boundaries which the infant republic assumed at the close of that struggle, have perhaps never before been so well and clearly set forth as in these volumes. Many people have been in the habit of regarding these Indian wars as the mere encounter of aggressive pioneers with the savages whom they displaced, and not involving any direct results affecting national or international movements. Mr. Roosevelt shows that the revolutionary contest had a twofold character; that in the East it was, on the part of the Americans, a struggle for independence; in the West a war of conquest, "or rather a war to establish, on behalf of all our people, the right of entry into the fertile and vacant regions beyond the Alleghanies;" that "beyond the Alleghanies the Revolution was fundamentally a struggle between England bent on restricting the growth of the English race, and the Americans triumphantly determined to acquire the right to conquer the Continent." Therefore the backwoodsmen, defending their homes and avenging, sometimes with inexcusable and revolting cruelty, the outrages committed by their savage foes, were really winning the West, making it possible for the republic to expand into its larger dimensions. They were also determining the movements of other nationalities in America. The result was to make the Mississippi Valley Anglo-Saxon rather than French or Spanish.

This systematic grouping of events and the setting forth of causes and results make this work a valuable addition to our historical literature. The easy vigor of the style, the keen analysis of character and motives, the vivid and life-like portrayal of men and events give interest to every page.

The author's sympathy is perhaps too fully with the pioneers and too little with the savages they dispossessed to allow him always to judge impartially between the parties in the conflict, or to do justice to the wrongs the Indians suffered. While he condemns in the most emphatic terms such outrages as the massacre of the Moravians he does not exonerate the victims or their missionary advisers from blame, and seems to consider this and similar crimes as but the deplorable but unavoidable and necessary and therefore the almost

excusable contingencies in the securing a larger result of good—to wit, the winning of the land by the Americans. While he does not excuse cruelties by the whites, he paints the Indian character in very dark colors, and seems to assume that the welfare or rights of these aborigines were and are worth little thought if they stand in the way of the progress of the conquering race and the development of the nation.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE: THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Dublin, etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway.

This is one of a series of volumes on all the books of the Bible, and it consists of expository lectures by the Rev. A. Plummer, D.D. The volumes of this series, it appears, number already eleven published, and others are in course of preparation by leading men of various Churches. It is a series of able and very desirable books. The one we now notice deals with both critical and expository matter. It is clear, learned, and convincing in its method, with objectors to the authenticity of the epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus. It is strong and comforting in its statement of faith upon great questions raised by the apostle. To all ministers and other careful readers of extensive discussions of vital topics we commend the work as one of much value. It is elegantly bound and printed, and at $1.50 it is sold at a very reasonable price.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. A course of Lectures delivered before the University of Pennsylvania: By George Dana Boardman, D.D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1420 Chestnut Street.

This volume contains twelve lectures. The first is introductory; one is devoted to each of the ten commandments; and the last is entitled, "The Lord's summary of the Ten Commandments." It is not a volume laying claim to any special scholarly merit, and has in it little that would prove valuable to those interested in the profound ethical questions involved in the study of the Decalogue. It is popular and practical, rather, as the title would indicate. These lectures were given by the author in compliance with a request which he had received from the Provost and Deans of the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania to deliver before the students "A series of Sunday Afternoon Addresses upon Religious Topics." Dr. Boardman embellishes his thoughts with a graceful rhetoric, and weaves into the thread of his discourse appropriate flashing gems of poetry, and his book will prove attractive and helpful to that class of readers for whom it is designed. The frontispiece is a picture of Mount Sinai, and the printers and the binder have done their work well.

MAGAZINE NOTES.

In the *Universalist Quarterly* for January, Thomas S. Lothrop argues that there is a basis of Christian Union in Christian hymns. He says "a true hymn is unsectarian," instancing, as proof of the extreme sources from which good hymns flow, "Lead Kindly Light," by a Roman Catholic Cardinal, and "Nearer, my God, to thee," by a Unitarian woman.

The *Unitarian Review* (monthly) in the March number has a brief but exceeding apt and interesting historical criticism on "Calvin and Servetus" by Arthur Mark Cummings. This writer holds that one of Calvin's chief impelling motives in consigning Servetus to the flames was cherished anger caused by insults offered by the latter to Calvin's *Institutes*.

The Methodist Review (bi-monthly) is publishing a series of critical articles on the Old Testament books. In the January-February number Prof. Henry M. Harman discusses "The Character of the Book of Joshua and its Relation and Testimony to the Pentateuch." In the March-April number Prof. James Strong writes on "The Prophecy of Isaiah."

The "Easy Chair" and the "Editor's Study" departments in *Harper's Monthly Magazine* conducted respectively by George William Curtis and W. D. Howells form a most attractive feature of this splendid monthly. "The Army of the United States," by General Wesley Merritt, and an Essay on John Ruskin, by Anne Thackeray Ritchie, are valuable papers in the March number.

The Quarterly Review of the M. E. Church, South for January has a very full and attractive table of contents. The Rev. George G. Smith sketches "The Georgia Life of the Oxford Methodists." Other valuable articles are "History of Sunday-Schools," by Rev. J. Thomas Pots, "The Child and the Church," by J. R. G., and "The Rationale of Missions," by M. B. Chapman, D.D.

The monthly numbers of the *Andover Review* always contain much thoughtful and suggestive reading. In the March number, "Creeds as Tests of Church Membership," by Wolcott Calkins, D.D., is an argument against the practice among the Congregational Churches of requiring subscription to a creed as a condition of membership. In the same number Dr. Amory H. Bradford discusses "The Problem of Pauperism," and Prof. Smyth reviews Prof. Allen's "Jonathan Edwards."

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review is the new quarterly magazine which is to take the place of the *Presbyterian Review* whose publication ceased with October, 1889. The first number of the new quarterly was issued in January. On its editorial staff, headed by Benj. B. Warfield, D.D., are ten leading Presbyterian ministers, including W. G. T. Shedd, D.D., Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., and E. D. Morris, D.D. The opening article is on "The Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of Decrees," by Dr. Shedd. It is understood that the theology of the new magazine is to be more rigidly of the strict Westminster sort than that of its predecessor.

Prof. George P. Fisher's series of articles on "The Nature and Method of Revelation," which was begun in the December number of the *Century Magazine*, closed with the March number. The last installment of "The Life of Lincoln," by Nicolay and Hay, appeared in February. A most interesting paper full of suggestions to the rulers of our American cities is "Glasgow: A Municipal Study," by Albert Shaw, in the March number. This magazine brings such a wealth of literary matter and has so many valuable articles on such a variety of themes, that no one who desires to keep up with literary progress and current discussions can afford to do without it.

A glance at the first three numbers of the *Popular Science Monthly* for 1890 will convince the reader of the substantial value of this magazine as a popular educator. Among the themes discussed in these three issues are "The Future Situs of the Cotton Manufacturer of the United States," "Public Schools as Affecting Crime and Vice," "The Mission of Educated Women," "Origin of Land Ownership," "Letters on the Land Question," "Agriculture and the Single Tax." The January number has an interesting sketch of "The Taoiust Religion" of China. Though we can not accept all the views of its editor or correspondents, we find its pages always stimulating and instructive. $5.00 a year. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

For the very cream of our current American literature, it has long been understood that one must turn to the leaves of the *Atlantic Monthly*. Its first three numbers for the new year fully sustain its old-time reputation. The octogenarian, Oliver Wendell Holmes, appears in all three of these numbers with scarcely a perceptible diminution in the glow and sparkle of humor and wit that charmed our fathers in the "Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table." Among the contributors during this year are Henry James, Margaret Deland, Louise Chandler Moulton, Edith M. Thomas, and Thomas Bailey Aldrich. A timely and valuable historical paper in the March number is "The Trial, Opinions, and Death of Giordano Bruno," by William R. Thayer. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Some of the volumes in this list have been discussed by us in reviews more or less extended. Others will receive such notices hereafter. The receipt of all books or pamphlets sent the CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW will be promptly acknowledged, and important works will receive more extended notice.

John B. Alden, New York.—*Genesis of Power*, and the Media through which it acts. By Thomas F. Campbell, A.M.

Tropical Africa. By Henry Drummond, LL.D., F.R.S., author of Natural Law in the Spiritual World.

The Samaritan Chronicle, or the Book of Joshua the Son of Nun. Translated from the Arabic, with notes by Oliver Turnbull Crane, M.A., member of the American Oriental Society.

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.—*Imago Christi.* The example of Jesus Christ. By James Stalker, M.A. Introduction by William M. Taylor, D.D.

Macmillan & Co., London and New York.—*Warren Hastings.* By Sir Alfred Lyall. (English Men of Action Series.)

The Open Court Publishing Company.—*The Psychology of Attention.* By Th. Ribot. 121 pages. Cloth, 75 cents.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.—*The Reconstruction of Europe.* A sketch of the Diplomatic and Military History of Continental Europe from the Rise to the Fall of the Second French Empire. By Harold Murdock, with an Introduction by John Fiske.

Asolando: Fancies and Facts. By Robert Browning. Author's edition.

The Struggle for Immortality. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps.

Little, Brown & Co., Boston.—*The Way out of Agnosticism*, or the Philosophy of Free Religion. By Francis Ellingwood Abbott, Ph.D.

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York and Chicago.—*A History of Art:* For Classes, Art Students, and Tourists in Europe. By William Henry Goodyear, B.A.

John B. Fairgreive, 7 Cockburn Street, Edinburgh.—*Light on the Path;* or the Way Heavenward. By Rev. John Kirk. Evangelical Union Church, Fountainbridge, Edinburgh.

A. D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.—*The Biblical Illustrator*, or Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, Expository, Scientific, Geographical, Historical, and Homiletic, gathered from a wide range of home and foreign literature on the verses of the Bible. By Rev. Joseph S. Excell, M.A. (St. Luke, Vol. I.) Cloth, 740 pages.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

Vol. II. JULY, 1890. No. 3.

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

WHATEVER may have been true in the past, the people of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of to-day demand a ministry as thoroughly equipped as that of any other Christian denomination in this country. In the discussions out of which grew our Church the question of education was one of incidental, not vital consideration. The standard of education still found in our book of discipline, made low enough to meet the case of very humble, but earnest candidates for the ministry in pioneer times, exposes us to misrepresentations and to the more serious misfortune of foolish attempts among ourselves to fasten a temporary expedient upon the Church as a permanent policy. Practically we have outgrown the necessity of such a rule, and while the standard of our book should undoubtedly be much elevated, what is now the law might properly be retained to provide for pious exceptions. Nowhere more than in the training of men for the ministry does haste make waste. William Tennent said, "If a man have but three years to give to preaching the gospel, he should spend two of them in his preparation."

Several considerations conspire to urge our young men to pass with undue haste through the period of preparation. A pious zeal to be practically engaged in preaching is one motive. If it could be distinctly understood that a call to preach includes a call to preparation, not so many would rush irreverently into the sacred desk unqualified for its functions. Secondly, under the hot-house heat of early compliment self-appreciation is unduly developed in a few, causing them to precipitate themselves upon a long-suffering public. Let them know that flattery is Satan's sop to fool them with, and that what is really meritorious in them now will

but a few years hence be inadequate to meet the demands of their admiring friends. Another small few have made the discovery, without much experiment, that hard study is not recreation, and to escape the drudgery of text-books have speedily taken refuge in the sacred desk. Pecuniary motives hurry others on, who are at least willing to assume the cares of wedded life, and permit the hopes of domestic felicity to weigh more with them than the responsibilities of their holy calling. Alas, how often has this sweet-voiced siren wooed to the rocks alike domestic happiness and professional success! Others are induced to cut short their preparatory studies by the entreaties of more experienced brethren. A minister of unusual natural abilities not long since said that he had been thus deceived in early life, and that in his opinion his usefulness had on that account been greatly diminished. Recently a young minister, vigorously pursuing his course in college, was stoutly urged by a friend to drop his studies and begin preaching, and was told that he was as ripe for the work as a shock of wheat, and that more study would fry the grease out of him and leave him as dry as a gristle. This young man is yet at his books. It is no pleasure to note the incongruity in the feelings of those who hold the freshness of our young ministers up to ridicule, while they discourage the efforts after higher attainments in education which would render our rising ministry less jejune and every way more efficient. Many others are hindered in their work of thorough preparation by the lateness of their response to the call to the ministry. The fault lies chiefly with a defect in the family government of our people. Our fathers and mothers are not asking God that their sons may become his ministers, and, so far from bringing their children to God's temple that they may dedicate them to his service, they not unfrequently boldly discourage their sons from entering the ministry. This is the age of gold, and men dedicate their children to mammon; and when, late in life, the sons, in spite of worldly influences, hear the call to enter the vineyard of the Lord, they make an heroic effort to secure that preparation in a few years which should be the work of all the years of childhood and youth. For such earnest and pious men our discipline makes convenient provision: our misfortune is that hundreds less earnest and capable rush through the breach into the ministry who should be compelled to make more of their more favorable

opportunities. For the man with a hard row to hoe who does his best there is unbounded admiration; but the man who desires the benefits of the office, and is too lazy to do the work of preparation, is the object of our unconcealed contempt.

The demand for accuracy in the education of ministers should have more attention than it receives. The extent of personal culture is less important. The possession of advanced learning may be taken for granted, even in its absence, if the minister be quite correct in the language and learning he does employ; whereas if he blunders in these simple matters his claims to high erudition are likely to be set down as pompous pretentions. In this age of schools a preacher must know something well in order to be well regarded, for without respect, he is without influence; and the only way to make the people think you know more than they do is to know more. Men like Mr. Moody (though there are few like him) who succeed without an accurate English education furnish exceptions to the rule that is general. Such men are remarkable for good sense, mental endowments, spiritual earnestness, hard work, and real piety. It takes a great deal of education to make up for the lack of such things. Nothing can keep such men down. And, moreover, it must be remembered that their work is unique, and it must be conceded that with their equipment they could not as pastors achieve a success commensurate with that which has crowned them as evangelists. They know well what they know, as it pertains to the Scriptures and human life. Correctness in all departments of an elementary education can not be too strongly urged, and if any knock at the door of the ministry who have little beside pious intent to recommend them, it is well to reflect that it is more charitable to inflict some present mortification upon the candidate by refusing his application, than to bring down upon him the pains of life-long slavery and shame by permitting him to take steps to an office to which he is evidently not called. It is known that it is easier to keep out than to put out skulls that can not learn; and if the day ever was it has gone by forever when a man in our Church may say, "I 'll be a lawyer or a doctor or I 'll teach, and if I can do nothing else I 'll preach." The Church of Christ has no cause, in this regard, to hang her head, for an eminent man has rightly said, "The ministry is the most learned of the learned professions."

By the exercise of proper discrimination respecting the admission of candidates for the ministry, and suitable encouragement for those who have already entered upon their preparation, we shall suffer no humiliation growing out of an unlearned ministry in our own denomination. The sacredness of the office, the high position of its incumbent in society, and the momentous character of the work to be done, call less for ministers than for men. The minister demanded by this age must be a man of sense, sympathy, and grace, but especially an honest manly man. It was excellent counsel which an eminent divine of Edinburgh gave to a young man who inquired concerning the qualifications of a minister of the gospel. He replied that "he should have three things, the Spirit of God, a classical education, and common sense. The first he must get from God, the second he can secure in our excellent university here in Edinburgh, but if he have not common sense already, neither God nor the university can help him."

As to the scope of ministerial education, it ought to be comprehensive enough to embrace physical, social, literary, and spiritual training. A great mistake they make who suppose that only the weakly boys should go to school, and that the weakliest of the weakly are the most likely subjects for a call to the ministry. The work a minister is to do, the comfort he is to administer, the tribulations he is to bear, require health and strength as well as courage and grace. Mr. Spurgeon says that a bad cold freezes the flow of his thoughts, and his matter becomes hoarse as well as his voice. Since proper notions touching exercise, diet, labor, and temperance in all things, are acquired, if at all, in the formative years, too much attention can hardly be given in our schools to these matters.

Though space allows but a word, a word must be said in behalf of good manners as a necessary part of a minister's education. The gospel minister ought to be a man of manners. No one will think of a fop when the true ministerial gentleman is described. We plead for polish; but polish is not gilt, covering poor material, and easily rubbed off; it is the finish which gold takes on, and which renders even gold more useful and beautiful. There is no affectation in good manners, for true worth is not compelled to assume false appearances. The golden rule is the controlling principle. What conduces most to the good and pleasure of

others is the first thought of the true gentleman. Such a minister, though he can speak when his turn comes, and has some ideas when he speaks, yet knows when to keep silence, remembering that under all good words there is a silence that is better; and therefore, unlike Elihu, he is not "full of words." He speaks in a temperate tone of voice when he does speak, but he is for the most part an attentive listener. Though a hearty laugher, he laughs not too loud, nor at his own wit or at a brother's expense, but fully appreciates what is wise and witty in others, and thereby differs from many in his generation. He would consider himself disgraced to be thought the best joker in any crowd, for while not morose he is serious. What he says is always chaste, and he will neither tell nor hear a story that conveys a hint of impurity. His clothes may not be rich, but they fit well and are clean. His breath is pure, so that a sick lady of the greatest refinement fears not to admit him into her presence. The house needs no airing at his departure. The carpet is as clean as when he entered, and his shoes no cleaner. He violates no rule of propriety which any gentleman is supposed to know and observe. With him self-control is a cardinal virtue. He is his own master because he is the humble servant of his divine Master. In parlor or in pulpit he can sit still, or stand still; and not to be able to do either at will he regards a weakness. That peerless preacher, F. W. Robertson, entered the pulpit, even when late, with calmness and composure. To be able to behave with decorum on all occasions is half the education of life, which, if not imbibed in youth from the daily life of a refined home, can not be gained in club boarding-houses at college. These last-named institutions, like war, may sometimes be a necessity; but, like war, they are always a dire calamity.

At a risk of being charged with discussing trifling matters in no serious need of treatment, the necessity of a more careful training in the ordinary branches of an English education will here, on account of its transcendent importance, be enforced. Such things as spelling and punctuation and grammatical and rhetorical expression, now receiving much attention by boys and girls in our graded schools, can not be ignored as small matters by our coming ministers. A gentleman of Chicago lately told one of our elders that he had in his pocket a letter from a young minister in which he found thirteen misspelled words! A man who has had experi-

ence as stated clerk in presbyteries declares that many of our ministers are unable to express themselves in their reports in simple unentangled sentences. On this subject all our editors could tell a tale of woe were they willing to open their mouths and speak out what they have seen and endured.

The facilities for improvement in the use of language are at every man's hand; and though it has been said that it takes much learning to make things plain, and while a good knowledge of Latin and Greek would assist the effort to master our mother tongue, it still is true that with the best English models before him, with a disposition to toil, any one may secure for himself the power to express his thoughts with a good degree of ease and elegance. It has been said that a clear thought will find its proper word, but ideas are clear when framed in appropriate language. Knowledge, and power to express it, are not co-incident. Beauty, clearness, and force of style come by pains; and the reply of Turner, the painter, to the royal lady who asked him for the secret of his power, is as valuable to literary as to art students. Said he, "I know no secret, madam, but hard labor." It behooves every man preparing for the ministry early to learn the use of pen and ink. Long before the days of Martin Luther the ink bottle had power to drive away the devil; and now that the prince of evil, wise in his wickedness, is bending his efforts to force the printing-press to pay tribute to his dominions, it becomes the friends of truth to exert themselves to wrest this weapon of war from his hand, and wield it mightily in behalf of righteousness. The pen is an arranger, if not a creator of ideas. "Good thoughts abound," said Pascal; "but the art of organizing them is not so common," said Vinet. Effective speakers have nearly all been laborious writers, many of them sparing no pains, like Norman McLeod, who wrote many of his sermons the seventh time before he delivered them. A young man, affecting to despise the practice of writing sermons, was told by the venerable Dr. Peabody that his people would compliment him the first year, tolerate him the second, and get rid of him the third.

The habit of reading the great books is a part of the education of every well-trained minister. There are many great readers, but not many readers of great books. The daily paper is king even in too many preachers' houses. Dean Stanley said that every one

should spend at least an hour a day with a great book; and the number of such books is not great. A student is known by the books he reads as easily as by the company he keeps. Books are company, and the dearest friendships of this world are made with the authors we love. This story of Southey, the poet, is touching enough to move a heart of stone! When he was old and blind, and no longer able to read his favorite authors, he was accustomed to move along the rows of books on his shelves, lean his head tenderly against them, and talk with them as lovingly as with old-time friends. It was he who wrote:

My days among the dead are past;
Around me I behold,
Where'er these casual eyes are cast,
The mighty minds of old:
My never-failing friends are they,
With whom I converse day by day.

My thoughts are with the dead; with them
I live in long-past years,
Their virtues love, their faults condemn,
Partake their hopes and fears,
And from their lessons seek and find
Instruction with a humble mind.

It has been said, "Beware of the man of one book," and a truth lies there; but to know one book, it is required to know more than one.

The training of ministers in the art of public speaking is a subject that requires delicate handling, but is withal so important that it may not be passed without at least a formal notice. The teacher of elocution has fallen into disrepute in the minds of many who can appreciate the wit of Phillips Brooks, who says he believes in the true elocution teacher as he believes in the existence of Halley's comet, which comes into sight of this earth once in about seventy-six years. A teacher in our theological seminary, who could combine the art and practice of good speaking, and be able practically to illustrate his precepts, would prove an unspeakable advantage to our young men; for despite the fact that the vices of an admired preceptor are more readily imitated than his virtues, nevertheless there is nothing so helpful as a good example. So long as it is unnatural to speak naturally, we can not make antural speakers of our young men by simply saying to them,

"Speak naturally"—advice easy to give and hard to take. The speaker who puts power into his sermons must always exercise an intelligent delight in what he is doing. When Matthew Simpson was a young man, feeble in body and lungs, giving no hope of becoming the ablest preacher Methodism has given to America, he set for himself the simple rule of always having something interesting to say, and then to say it in so simple a manner that all the people might understand it. That rule would now put life into many a pulpit, and cure many a sore throat. When a man has nothing to say he is certain to say it in that far-away "heavenly tone," apparently designed for none but the angels to hear. If he could only know that the angels are not listening he might be persuaded to hold his peace, or to speak in the language of men. An elder of excellent sense recently, alluding to this style of preaching, said that it appeared to him not to be directed to the people present, but to somebody else somewhere else. Is the natural, conversational style of public speaking, evidently the one employed by the Great Teacher, not becoming in some places a lost art? Were ministers compelled sometimes to listen to their own sermons, they would cry out with Cain, "My punishment is greater than I can bear." For the sake of the illustration, as well as to honor one to whom I owe the best part of my own education, I may be allowed to refer to the pleasure and profit I realized during my college course while listening to the discourses of a man who, above all others I have ever heard, exemplified the natural mode of public address. It seemed at first scarcely preaching, differing so much from what I had been accustomed to; but could any thing be more delightful than that easy, graceful, conversational, manly, and eloquent presentation of the truth?

A classical education is a necessity for all ministers who are not providentially shut out from such an advantage. No man can carefully study several foreign languages without thereby becoming more familiar with the best use of his own. Whoever gives three or four years to the study of Latin and Greek, besides learning that prepositions and transitive verbs govern the objective case, will come into possession of much knowledge of the philosophy of language and history not in any other way so certainly secured. Passing by, however, with naked reference, the mental discipline gained by an extensive course in the ancient classics,

and the acquaintance made by such study with history, geography, and the races of men, it remains to say that such acquisitions come not by grace alone, but by pains; and though the student should expect the divine aid in his studies, he will discover that even that comes through the ordinary channels of application, since all are aware that a knowledge of foreign tongues in these post-apostolic days comes not by miracle, howbeit, it would appear well-nigh miraculous that any one should make rapid advancement in the mastery of a foreign language by the methods employed in some of our institutions of learning.

Believing profoundly in the value of a classical education for all to whom it is possible, and for hundreds of our ministers who do not attain it, it is another thing to hold that such a qualification should be made a universal condition of ordination. Good reasons might be adduced showing that such a test should not be required. A paucity of ministers would be one result of its enforcement, since many good men lack the time, money, and taste necessary to justify a long course in the languages. It is said, also, that such a standard of education would produce a ministry of such refinement that only high salaries would be sufficient to provide the elegancies of life and the literary and artistic equipments needed to make life bearable. It may be answered that a man makes his own market, and that in our ministry the most thoroughly qualified men most readily find places, are more generally than their less educated brethren consecrated wholly to their sacred calling; and are, other things being equal, better satisfied and contented. An evident incongruity, indeed, appears in some quarters between the quality of the pastor demanded, and the support he receives. Not long since a wealthy but miserly deacon labored with his pastor to induce him to agree to take a smaller salary than he was receiving, the preacher mildly protesting that his income was barely sufficient to keep himself in decent circumstances. The deacon pointed to his hired man, a specimen of severe toil and enforced poverty, clad in the cheapest cotton clothes and without boots, in whose two-roomed tenement house are no carpets, books, or papers, and whose meat grows in a pen hard by the kitchen door, and said, "This man would be glad to get half of your salary." In the delicacy of the situation the minister made no reply, but deep in his soul he agreed with the deacon that his

tenant would be happier with some additional means of support, but did not see how he could afford to divide with him his scanty salary. That pastor will soon be glad to find another field, and it is to be hoped, in the interest of charity, he may not fall into the hands of another such deacon. It is not always the fault of the people that they are not able to retain the man of their choice. Beware of the stingy deacon! A great deal of grace, love to God and souls, has enabled many a refined pastor to solve this difficult problem by adopting such a simple mode of living as comports with a very meager salary. The annals of the Church are set with many such diamond-blazing examples. The Churches of the poor have prospered under such leaders while they gave their pastors the best support in their power. At the same time the candle-stick is being removed from its place in some rich Churches which seem to be striving to reduce their ministers to the condition of pauperism. Is it any wonder that a number of our ministers have jumped out of the frying-pan into other callings, or into other denominations?

It is urged, again, against the classical test that it places a social and intellectual gulf between pastor and people. He thinks and speaks, it is said, in a vocabulary with which they are not acquaint-ed; their ways of life are not his ways; the first principles of re-ligion adapted to their wants are too simple for him; in short, he lives in one world and they in another. The difficulty with this difficulty is that facts are against it, since in numberless instances the most polished ministers have come close to the common peo-ple, in many cases the most refined have been the most simple in life and language, and their learning has proved an aid in making dark things clear, and plain things plainer.

It will not be denied by those acquainted with the facts that the demand is growing general among our congregations for ministers of a high grade of education. As a specimen of what is becoming common, there came recently from a neighboring Church a request to our university for a preacher who should combine in himself all the ministerial virtues, a catalogue of which was furnished, de-scribing a paragon of pastoral and pulpit ability.

Considering the growth of education among all classes and the general increase of wealth, it is wisdom to open our eyes to the demands of our age, and to open our pockets to provide such

facilities for education in our literary and theological institutions as shall meet the wants of our most aspiring students. Till we relieve our enterprising young men of the plea of going abroad to find advantages which they can not enjoy at home, and which our people could provide, we ought to be generous enough not to excoriate them for their wandering. Let our Church be a good mother to her sons and she shall not need to tie them to her apron strings, nor flog them for straying away. The restless, wide-awake, stirring times in which we live require men thoroughly trained for service.

It is a reasonable hope that the day is about to dawn on us when our men of money will amply endow our institutions of learning and aid our worthy young men in their preparation for the minis-try. Some men are born to help other men, and no man knows but that by helping one he is becoming the benefactor of thou-sands. Who can tell when he is doing the greatest good? One can prepare another for doing what he never could do himself. When Samuel Clarke was educating young Philip Doddridge he did not know that Doddridge would become the author of the "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul." So Charles Simeon aided in the education of Henry Kirke White, who afterward enriched the Church with his poetry and hymns. Jonathan Edwards commends the example of David Brainard, who, when he decided to devote his life to the work of preaching to the Indians, had some estate which was left him by his father. Supposing he would have no use for it among the savages in the wilderness, he cast about to decide in what way he could employ his fortune most for the glory of God; and nothing better presenting itself, he decided to educate some young man, well disposed and of good abilities, for the ministry. He proceeded immediately to carry out this good resolution. It may not be amiss to add that at least one young man of great promise of our own denomination is kept at his books in prepara-tion for the ministry by the munificence of a wealthy and pious lady—an example earnestly commended for imitation by others of like means and mind.

If any entertain scruples touching the effect of such aid upon the character of students thus assisted, and are prejudiced by the adage that self-made men are the best men, and that it is wise to compel candidates for the ministry to maintain themselves that

thereby they may maintain their manly independence, I beg leave to reply that all well-made men are self-made whether facilities for their education were good or poor; and that to tug against distressing circumstances is unfavorable to rapid advancement in scholarship; that it is no more humiliating to be assisted during preparation for the ministry than it is to be supported while actually preaching the gospel, since the young men have renounced their secular business to devote themselves to the work of the Church. What the government does for the young men in her military schools may certainly be done by the Church for her candidates for the ministry who have given up all for her service. And as a sense of safety would deter any one from going to West Point and charging the cadets with being charity students and paupers, so a sense of piety and justice should save our beneficiary students from ridicule. At present, as things are, the finger of ridicule is properly turned upon the Church.

After ample time and trial substantially all the Churches of Christendom have adopted the plan of beneficiary education, and all unite in its indorsement. Dr. Charles Hodge says: "The students aided by the funds of this institution (Princeton College) are not inferior in intelligence, in good conduct, or in any thing else, to those who bear all their own expenses. The professors do not know, and can not tell, who are and who are not aided by the funds of the Church. There is no sense of inferiority in the one class, and no sense of superiority in the other." He says again: "We would ask any one who holds that our system is a failure to go to a meeting of our General Assembly and see if he can distinguish those who were self-supported from those who had been aided in their preparatory studies by the Church. The thing could not be done."

With but one out of five of our candidates for the ministry in our schools, the question is not whether our preachers shall be educated classically, but whether they shall be educated at all. It is not disputed that the coming minister in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church must be well educated, and all indorse the saying of the witty Dr. South, that if God has no need of our learning he has much less need of our ignorance.

On the question of moral and religious training I trust all are profoundly impressed with the truth that the ministers to

whom the future of our Church can safely be committed must be men of unsullied morals and unmistakable piety. An irreligious minister is a moral monstrosity. Unsanctified learning is as dangerous as unholy ignorance is useless. The preaching that has not on it the mark of the blood of Christ is not the preaching of the cross of Christ. In the highest sense the minister is born, not made. No learning can compensate for the absence of holiness and spiritual illumination. The gift of God can be purchased neither with money nor labor. The preacher may devour all the books ever printed, and without Heaven's blessing be as lean as Pharaoh's kine when they had eaten up the fat ones. Roundabout acquaintance with the gospel is not sufficient for God's ambassador who must know the power of the gospel as well as the form thereof. The fire of God's love must burn on the altar of his soul who is to proclaim the message of love to sinful men. Love finds time to work, makes heavy burdens easy, and crowns the toiler with success. Scholarship is necessary, though in importance secondary, the truth ever remaining that all real education includes discipline, knowledge, character, and the greatest of these is character.

W. S. DANLEY.

INEQUALITIES OF HUMAN LIFE.

"Fret not thyself because of evil-doers."—Psalm xxxvii. 1.
"In the thought of him that is at ease there is contempt for misfortune."—Job xii. 5.
"Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man."—Eccl. xii. 13.

HARDLY any subject has elicited more inquiry of late years, both on the part of theorists and practical Christians, than the painful inequalities of one sort and another that exist among human beings, even in the same country. Books on communism, socialism, capital *versus* labor, the prosperity of the wicked, the misfortunes of the innocent, etc., have issued from the press by the hundred. But instead of echoing the word or thought of any modern book on this line of inquiry, it has occurred to me that it might be both interesting and profitable to speak exclusively from the mouth of three old inspired Hebrew books—the Psalms, the Book of Job, and Ecclesiastes.

The theme, you must know, is as old as the human race. The Bible touches upon every subject that is allied to human interests or to the human heart, and, among others, it has much to say about this one. The Hebrew mind at no time during the Old Testament period, or afterward, arose to the conception of universal law, or of a system of second causes. He was always accustomed to regard every thing that occurred as the immediate result of a free sovereign will. Direct interposition, even arbitrary interference, was no difficulty to the Jew, to whom Jehovah was the absolute Sovereign of the world, not acting, so far as the Jew could see, according to any established laws. But he had also been taught from the very infancy of his nation that Jehovah was not only Sovereign, but that he was also a righteous God, administering the affairs of his moral government according to the principles of immutable justice and righteousness; and this had become his abiding and one of his cardinal beliefs. But how could he reconcile it with the observed facts of human experience? The wicked prospered, the innocent suffered. This it was that puzzled him.

1. This is the problem raised in Psalm xxxvii.—the prosperity of the wicked, those whom we should expect to receive judgment receive blessing. "Fret not thyself because of him who prospereth in his way, because of the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass;" fret not thyself, for nothing but evil can come of fretting (v. 7, 8). And the advice given, in view of the prosperity of these wicked ones, is "to wait;" be not too hasty in forming an estimate of their prosperity; it is only for a brief season; trust in the Lord; look to the end; for soon God will vindicate his righteousness by rewarding the godly and punishing the wicked. But the Psalmist himself seems to have fretted, for the problem was not solved; there was only an appeal to his faith; every seeming mystery will be clearly understood in the end. But the test was severe. "As for me, my feet were almost gone, my steps had well-nigh slipped. For I was envious at the arrogant, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked." They are in no seeming peril of death. They are prosperous and strong, etc. But as for me, in vain have I cleansed my heart, and washed my hands in innocency. My righteousness has yielded me no profit. I have been plagued all the day long, and these wicked ones are not plagued at all. As the Psalmist thought of these things, in order that he might solve the mystery, he could not fathom it. His brain only grew wearier, and his heart heavier with pondering. His refuge was in the sanctuary—the place where God teaches—and there in some hour of fervent, secret prayer, or perhaps in listening to the chanting of some inspired Psalm, a conviction of the truth broke upon him. He sees the end. The prosperity of the ungodly is clearly shown to be only an appearance. It abides but a little while, vanishing like the fabric of a vision before the terrible reality when God arises to judgment. "It is made manifest also that it is absurd and unreasonable in the highest degree, for us to allow ourselves to be irritated and deceived by such a show of prosperity. We thus learn, too, that every thing depends upon our thus recognizing God as our true and everlasting good, upon our seeking, holding fast to, and proclaiming him as such. For he whose life is bound up in the Person of the Eternal can not perish, but must only rise from one height to another until he becomes a partaker of the glory of God."

But the question, Why should the wicked be so prosperous and

happy? is not answered. But the fact is shown to be, in the long run, in harmony with the righteousness of God, and thereby its perplexing feature is minimized. The Psalmist is no longer envious, seeing that it is better to be holden by his right hand, and guided by his counsel, and afterward received into glory, than it is to be prosperous for a little season.

But a remarkable, if not an unexpected, feature of the solution, so far at least as the wicked are concerned, is that their little season of prosperity terminates even before their life in this world. Instead of following them into the next world, as does the parable of our Savior in the case of Lazarus and the rich man, where *we* know that all apparent unfairness is adjusted, the recompense is seen only on this side of the grave. The Psalmist still occupies the point of view of the Mosaic doctrine of a retribution to be administered, so far as it is indicated, only in this life. And this was, as yet, according to the design of God, of whose righteousness enough had been revealed in history or otherwise to enable his people for the present to take the unknown on faith. After a while more would be revealed, and yet after a while more *will* be revealed. But here for the present God concealed himself, and in the later parables of the kingdom, in order that he might be found of those who sought him. The sincere seeker could know enough of the mystery of the inequalities of the human lot to rest easy in the faith of his righteousness. The wisdom of the Psalmist in fixing his inspired vision on the recompense of the wicked as administered on this side of the grave must be apparent. "That this is so seldom done, even by the well-disposed, that even they are so much inclined to look upon the righteousness of God as inoperative in this life, is a melancholy proof of the degeneracy of the Church, and of the lamentable prevalence of infidelity." God is not unjust in this world that he may be just in the next. He is just now, and hence is just ever. It is this fact that the Psalmist's solution of the "painful mystery" teaches.

2. But the mystery abides. It is not the wicked and the righteous both who prosper. The righteous suffer, those who have sinned not, neither their fathers. So at least the sufferer, whose mind was conscious to itself of rectitude, knew; but not such was the current opinion; not such was the customary interpretation of the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, to the unsatisfactory but wise

incompleteness of which the faith of some was scarcely equal. And Job was among the number about whose experience the discussion of the mystery of suffering on the part of the innocent is made to hinge in an elaborate epic drama, which must be regarded as a classic equal to that of any literature. Let us look at it a moment.

(1) The scene is laid, in the first place, in the invisible world. Job is represented as being the subject of a conversation between Satan and Jehovah. Satan, in harmony with his name, as the accuser, prefers the charge of selfishness against Job. "Does Job fear God for naught?" Any one would serve God as well and faithfully as Job does, if God in turn would do as well by him. Job is a very rich and happy man. It is easy to be righteous and good when all the temptations are in that direction. Jehovah is represented as denying this charge against his servant Job. And in order that the greater shame of defeat may accrue to the accuser, and the greater glory to himself and Job, he says to Satan, "Try him and see; do any thing to him, however severe, only spare his life." This, then, on the divine side, is the basal thought of the book: the possibility of disinterested love and service, so far as any pay at least in this world is concerned. Not often in the revelation of either the Old or New Testament are the gates so far ajar that we may see what is going on, or hear what is being said, in the spirit world. But this is one instance; and perhaps oftener than we are aware we ourselves are the subject of observation or of conversation there.

(2) But the scene of the drama is changed from the invisible to the visible world. Satan and Jehovah disappear from observation. The *dramatis personæ* are Job and his friends. The scene is in Arabia, at the desolated home of Job—his property all gone, his children all dead, even his wife, with lost integrity, speaking as one of the foolish women, his friends turned into accusers, himself afflicted from head to foot with a loathsome disease, and his bed an ash heap. Job, the one who was regarded as a perfect man and upright, one that feared God and eschewed evil! The basal thought now is, on the human side, "Why do the innocent suffer?" These two basal thoughts—the one on the divine side, the other on the human side—may be united in the one inquiry as to the mystery of suffering. The answers are briefly as follows:

1. *Jehovah's.*—To prove to their defamers, whether visible or invisible, the possibility of disinterested love and service. Thereby great joy accrues to Jehovah and a great vindication and reward to the sufferers. This solution restricts the suffering to the innocent, and was not known to Job in the first place.

2. *Job's.*—He can not answer, but affirms, and reaffirms his innocence, and wonders at the mystery.

3. *Job's friends'.*—They answer substantially by denying that the innocent ever suffer. It is all right. God is just. This is also Elihu's answer. Job has no right to complain. "Why dost thou strive against Him? For He giveth not account of any of his matters." "Far be it from God that he should do wickedness, and from the Almighty that he should commit iniquity. For the work of a man shall he render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." "But thou hast fulfilled the judgment of the wicked. Judgment and justice take hold on thee." The third answer corresponds with the Mosaic, and generally received doctrine of retribution, in so far as the latter taught that disobedience must be followed by punishment in this life, and in so far as it failed to emphasize that disobedience in this life may be followed by punishment mainly in the future life. As disobedience implied punishment, so punishment implied disobedience; and all suffering was punishment.

The second answer represents a spirit of dissatisfaction with the current doctrine of retribution, not because it does not contain a great truth, but because it did not contain the whole truth. For one class of sufferings, known only to the sufferer, it furnished no explanation. This remark holds true whether the Book of Job be regarded as an ante-Mosaic production, or was written long after the time of Moses, as it most probably was. One of the earliest religious instincts of man, or, rather, one that soonest manifests itself, is to associate as cause and effect sin and suffering in this present life. Even the heathen have always been accustomed to say: "We have sinned; therefore the gods are angry with us; therefore this evil has come upon us." Or looking at the evil first: "It argues that we have sinned against the gods, and this in turn argues that they are angry with us." If you sin you should be punished in this life. This was not only the Mosaic doctrine of retribution; it had always been, and is yet, the instinctive doc-

trine of the human heart. "When He giveth quietness, who then can make trouble? And when He hideth his face, who then can behold him? Whether it be done against a nation, or against a man only." "He preserveth not the life of the wicked," and those whose life, or whose "quietness" he preserveth not are wicked. "Who hath sinned, this man, or his parents, that he should be blind?" The very anticipation of punishment is punishment. This is one important sense in which the doctrine is always strictly true, no matter when the outward punishment is actually inflicted, though it can not be said that the forebodings of an evil conscience are dewelt upon in the Hebrew wisdom books. Moses, as we have seen, emphasizes this doctrine of outer punishment in this life, not only because of the truth in it, which ought always to be emphasized, but because a sound judgment as well as divine guidance enabled him to know that it was the way whereby he could best accomplish the tuition of the Israelites—especially in their natural capacity. But obviously the common experience and religious consciousness of the Semite, whether Israelite or not, would at least cause him to suspect that the common doctrine of retribution did not include all sufferings—that there are some sufferings that are not to be regarded as punishments of individual sins, and hence, that the righteousness of God needed further vindication.

The first answer, revealed not only in the conversation between Satan and Jehovah in the invisible world, but also in the historical conclusion of the book, classifies and explains these sufferings, so far at least as the nature of the case admits. They are not retributive, nor are they disciplinary in the sense of being intended to make the sufferer better. They are what may be called illustrative suffering, or suffering for the purpose of object-lesson—suffering intended not so much for the sufferer as for others. Or, in other words still, for the purpose of making evident a truth, the mere statement of which in abstract terms would not be believed even if it were understood. The abstract truth in this case is, the possibility of disinterested love and service of Jehovah. To simply affirm the possibility of it to the accuser, whether in the visible or the invisible world, and to actually illustrate the truth of it in the person or experience of Job, are two very different things; the latter of which, of course, is

far more convincing, and therefore more humiliating to the party accusing, and conducive ultimately to the greater good of the party accused and to the cause to which he belongs.

3. The discussion of the same general theme is continued in Ecclesiastes, where, however, the inspired writer gives to the discussion a wider range, including within its scope not only the mystery of prosperity and suffering, but all the vanities, vexations, and ceaseless monotonies of human life. And here, as in the Book of Job, the doctrine is reached by means of the picture as a whole, the total impression, and not in any separate texts or precepts. The struggle, the doubt, as presented here and there by the characters personated, are necessary to this total effect. Its very contradictions, when rightly viewed, furnish the strongest argument for the truth ultimately brought out. The author assumes, to begin with, that happiness is man's greatest good, and affirms provisionally that enduring happiness is to be found in studying, meditating, and reasoning deeply on the actions and lives of men and the natural world. He says he tried this, and found himself to be only as one striving after wind. Regarded as man's greatest good, or as an end in itself, it was vanity. Again, he affirms provisionally that it is mirth and pleasure, and he tried high living, splendid grounds, and all the arts of luxury, all that wealth could give. This, too, was disappointing. The pleasure was only for a moment; laughter became madness. And then fame; but why should he rack his brains to plan and execute great works only to leave them to an unworthy and unappreciative successor? This surely was not what life was for. And when he looks upon life around him, all is monotony and mystery. He sees himself dependent on times and seasons, and other circumstances beyond his control—a divine plan which is doubtless good, but which he can neither understand nor change. And there are so many oppressed ones without a visible comforter, all perplexing and baffling; so many evils in social and civil life which make life only a sore travail. Those who can not enjoy riches are rich, and those who could are poor. Irreverence even in the house of God abounds, as do injustice and violence and avarice everywhere. Such is the picture of things which observation furnishes to the writer, in view of which he concludes that the best that can be done is to accept whatever lot is assigned without fretfulness or

impatience, the reason assigned being the changeless and unknown nature of God's plan, which the author affirms, however, to be wise and all his works and doings very good; whereas in the Psalms and Book of Job a time is seen in the future when all apparent maladjustments will be set right.

The author of Ecclesiastes, amid all the perplexing experiences and observations which he has described, the human labors, disappointments, inequalities, yet sees the hand of Providence, and though its workings be unfathomable to him now, the wise man should not cease to act his proper part in life. Life is not merely a stage play in which there are tragedies and comedies and histories and mysteries, and all the players irresponsible. There will be a judgment, and the Judge will judge justly, though the author says not when, nor does he anticipate the nature of the sentence that will be pronounced on this class or that. Watch and wait. In short the author regards the end and aim of life on earth a legitimate participation in the blessings and enjoyments which fall to our lot, consecrated by wisdom and the fear of God, renouncing the hope of reconciling existing difficulties, inequalities, and seeming imperfections, with an eye steadily fixed on the future and universal judgment as the final solution of all the perplexities and mysteries. Meanwhile, the present and *ever current* duty is God-fear and the keeping of his commandments.

4. This book of Ecclesiastes, like the Book of Job, was not written by an Israelite as such, but only by a Hebrew, whether Solomon or another. Nor was it written for either Israelite or Christian as such. It was written by a *man* (though inspired) and for *man*. The Hebrew was a man no less truly than he was an Israelite, and as a man he thought of himself, his environments, and his destiny.

The writers of Ecclesiastes and of the class of Scriptures to which it belongs represented not themselves alone. All men have been perplexed on the same themes. Such inspired meditations as these fill an important place in the recorded revelations of God, and have comforted many. If they were not here they would be sadly missed, for one large element in man's nature would not have been provided for. They are upon subjects about which all men think, not as Israelites, not simply as Christians, not as heathens, but simply as human beings—beings who can not help

asking why? and whither? beings who must ever be thinking more or less on "the maze and mystery" of things. This part of the recorded revelation appeals to this corresponding part of man's nature. God has heard or anticipated his cry. Man has knocked at the door of the invisible and the unknown, and a responding voice has been heard within. And so man says to himself, There is a Voice, and hence there must be a Presence, and he does not feel so lonely as he would had he asked and received no answer, had he listened and heard nothing. The Voice may enter into no details. It may be only an old version of "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter;" but that is much. To "the infant crying in the night," such as man is in relation to these great mysteries, even only a voice from within is better than everlasting silence. "Thou shalt understand hereafter." And he who hears the Voice aright goes away from the door of the night and about his daily duties comforted.

These books of which I have been speaking are commonly supposed to be hard, obscure, and in some respects of vague and doubtful teaching, but it is because they are not understood either in themselves, or in their attitude to God's other revelations or to the nature of *man* as such. The fact that they are in the Bible is no small proof that the Bible is from God; and as the Hebrew's natural genius was used as the medium of the other revelations so was it used as the medium of these. The *recognition* of the inquiry is the most that is really needed, and is the most that is given in the revelation of either the Old or New Testament —the mere fact that there is a reality behind the veil, and not an eternal vacuum, and that after a while all mysteries will be clearly understood. Beyond this no information could be, and none ought to be either furnished or expected. All the revelation that God has made to man is intended to help man through this world aright. No curious information concerning the hereafter, or concerning the divine administration either of this or of the unseen world, is meant to be given; and even if the Bible had contained such the unconscious consciousness of man would have stamped it as fraud, or at any rate, would have found no peace in it. We can not know beyond what we do know, until as disembodied spirits we come into contact with the pure spiritual realities. Here we must ever in the very nature of the case see through a glass more

or less darkly. But after a while when we awaken in his more perfect likeness, we shall be satisfied, for at his right hand there are suitable pleasures for us for evermore. And with these facts both the Old and New Testament revelations are in abundant harmony.

Now, we must walk by faith, not by sight. Not until that which is perfect shall come will that which is in part be done away. We can not, until we are clothed upon with our house which is from heaven, see face to face and know even as also we are known.

R. V. FOSTER.

SOME HINTS TO POOR COLLEGES.

THE great question which colleges have to solve, whether poorly or plentifully endowed, is how to effect the most work with the available income. Poorer colleges are expected to do more in proportion to their means than the more wealthy ones. It is my object in the present paper to set forth some considerations which will enable them to fulfill this expectation. The subject becomes one of special interest to us as Cumberland Presbyterians when we remember that all our Church schools come under this category. Our Church is three quarters of a century old and we have no college adequately endowed. The Church during this time has made much progress, but I fear that the financial phase of our educational interests is not as well developed as are the other departments of our work. From the very beginning until now, our college training has been carried forward by the devotion and sacrifice of a very few men. It would be profitable perhaps to see what other causes than mere poverty have allowed this state of affairs to persist, but this is not in the scope of the present article. It will suffice to remark that intense conservatism—which is largely superinduced by poverty, I admit—but conservatism, even beyond the measure of our poverty, has prevented us from making the requisite headway.

The insufficiency of endowment being a well-known fact, how may our schools be enabled to offer better work, and if advisable more advanced work? In treating this question I shall draw freely from the experience of older schools which were once in the same condition. To begin at the beginning, it will be necessary to repeat some things which almost every thoughtful college man has already discussed in his own mind, and which may appear trite; but it is easily shown that, however much thinking may have been done, very little action has been taken in the matter by the vast majority of our colleges. Colleges must, as soon as possible, divorce themselves from their preparatory departments. I do not

think it necessary to argue as to the desirableness of this separation; I can conceive of no real advantage in having them together. Such a condition is evidently a makeshift—a mere substitute for a more desirable thing. This very important question may well be asked, however, and demands an answer: How is this to be done when the college is dependent upon its tuition fees, and the majority of the students are in the preparatory department? By way of parenthesis, this fact is very suggestive of what a first-class preparatory school may accomplish when *unencumbered* with a poor college. This is indeed the difficult point. With the present ill-equipped training schools, the preparatory department seems indispensable. On the other hand its retention hinders, as nothing else does, the establishment of private training schools. Few men will undertake to establish a feeding school for an institution whose preparatory department is his strongest rival. Evidently the solution of this must come by degrees. The college may begin by removing its preparatory school to a different locality. This will, in a certain degree, put it on a footing with other schools, and will at the same time obviate many of the evils incident to the connection. At the same time the college must impress upon its graduates the need of the development of the training-school system. I am sure that out of every graduating class of twenty or thirty men, one or two could be found, who, if shown the urgency of the work, and if assured of the co-operation of the college, would be willing to enter this field. By selectiug men who appear best fitted for the work, by giving them special training in such teaching, and by a little influence in placing them in suitable localities, a college could soon surround itself by a dozen feeding schools which would fill its academic classes with more and better equipped men than its preparatory department could. As I have said, the process must be gradual, but the colleges must themselves take some hand in the work or secondary education will be many, many years reaching the desired place; and just so long will the standard of admission to college be a "sliding scale."

Now having our college free from its sub-freshmen work, we reach the main question which I wish to discuss: How can the most and most acceptable work be done with little means? There are many colleges which can not employ a sufficient number of

men to present, properly, the requisite academic courses. Such a presentation demands about twelve men. Eight may do the work by doubling or alternating courses and giving extra hours. It is impossible for a smaller number of men to give the course without materially shortening it, or confining themselves to an elementary treatment and routine presentation of it. It is an injustice both to teacher and taught to expect it. It is out of the question to give a man Geology, Palæontology, Zoology, Botany, and all the related (!) subjects and ask him to do more than give the most elementary treatment of them. If he is a very ambitious and energetic man, he may offer more than this in some one of them, but it will possibly be at the expense of the others. A teacher should know vastly more about a subject than he is expected to teach, and the pupil must know that this is true. The day is past when the President can take Metaphysics, Ethics, and Logic, with English and History thrown in, and present them in a way which is consistent with the modern spirit of research.

But, it is objected, Our colleges can not employ more than four, six, or eight good men. Such colleges can double their teaching force in numbers, and—shall I say?—sometimes *more* than double it in effectiveness, at the cost of one good man, by appointing members from the graduating classes, who are proficient in a given department, instructors in that department. There are, every year, men graduating, who desire to continue study longer, but who are unable to do so after the expense of an academic course. Such men would gladly, and acceptably too, act as instructors a portion of their time for two hundred or three hundred dollars, to be enabled to remain and carry on work in their special lines. The advantages would be mutual, and are so important that I can not refrain from mentioning some of them. The student himself would be able to continue his work for higher degrees, under the supervision of experienced teachers; these teachers would have more time to devote to their fields of work, and would be able to accomplish more for graduates as well as undergraduates; the undergraduate would get more careful training, and would have more electives to choose from; the college as a whole could reach more men and raise the standard of its work.

Aside from the incentive to work to secure the appointment, it would be a means of accenting merit, and holding up the best

students, and lending them in the most unequivocal way the influence of the college in procuring a permanent position later. Some such recognition is justly due the best students of an institution, and no stronger vindication of a man's merit could be made than his selection to such a place. It will dignify the profession of teaching in the eyes of students. There is a wealth of object-lesson in the elevation of a good student from the student ranks to an instructorship. It would further give the student experience in his profession under the eyes and assistance of more experienced men. From the best of such the college might hope to draw its future professors. They would constantly infuse new life into the institution. Men who are engaged in special research are the most enthusiastic of teachers. Woe unto them if they teach not. I do not think the instructor should be given elementary classes, exclusively; he may be better fitted to take the higher ones, and few of the permanent professors would be willing to give up their lower classes, and lose touch with the younger men who are to make up the future classes. Such a plan would extend the personal influence of the faculty, and to such influence many colleges owe the greater part of their endowment.

The only objection which can be reasonably urged against such a plan is the inexperience of the instructor, coupled with the fact that a good student may prove to be a very poor teacher. He should not be appointed unless he expects to become a teacher, and these same objections will apply to his entering the profession elsewhere. The college from which he is graduated would be in a better position to judge of his prospects of becoming a first-rate teacher than any other. The risk of admitting a poor instructor for a limited time does not compare in importance with the risk of admitting an indifferent professor for an indefinite time.

Notwithstanding all this if the scheme were an experiment, we might hesitate to accept an inexperienced fledgeling as instructor in such an important and responsible position; but it is no longer an experiment. In German universities the younger men—special students—are among the most enthusiastic and popular lecturers. The same plan has been tried at Harvard with remarkable success. The young instructors are frequently found to get hold of the students much more readily than the older ones. There are not less than fifty such young men who occupy this

position in the Harvard teaching force this year, and the number is constantly increasing. It is safe to say that ninety per cent. of the men who are from year to year becoming full professors at Harvard have been tested during their graduate work by being appointed instructors.

We now come to the consideration of another feature which has thus far been neglected by smaller colleges, chiefly, it is presumable, because of a lack of men. I refer to the offering of elective courses to students during at least a part of their collegiate training. In a liberal education a certain amount of what we may call standard work should be required—just how much is perhaps an open question, but it is manifestly not the proper thing that men of different tastes, talents, and aims, should be confined to the same curriculum throughout their entire course, when in a majority of cases that is the only training they get. During a part of his college course the student should have a choice of some electives, suited to his particular need, upon which he can put special work. This is especially true of those students who expect to enter professions which do not require training in professional schools. Even in other cases the student would find it desirable to direct the last year's work in obtaining the Bachelor's degree toward his contemplated specialty; for example, the physician would be glad to do extra work in chemistry, zoology, and cryptogamic botany; the lawyer in constitutional history, political economy, etc.

Opinions differ as to the proper time in the collegiate course to introduce the electives. Expediency will decide this question in most cases for some years yet. The same result may be reached in several ways; the work may be wholly required to a given point, and wholly elective afterward; or there may be a portion required each year, with a certain number of electives taken. There are advantages in either plan which are apparent. Harvard College, the first to introduce the elective system in this country, offers during the present year two hundred and twelve courses to students in the collegiate department, only four of which are required. To obtain the degree A.B., a student must pass in the four required and in any sixteen other courses he may choose. So, practically, a man may begin to specialize in his Sophomore year. Electives so early in the course can only be justified by the very

severe requirements for admission. Smaller colleges could not afford to interrupt the required work so early.

The tendency among colleges is toward elective work. I have on my table catalogues of one hundred or more colleges over the country, and an examination of their courses of study is very instructive. Bowdoin College has succeeded remarkably well in so arranging its work as to introduce a number of electives without crowding. It has a faculty of sixteen men. During the Freshman year, Latin, Greek, mathematics, and French are all required, four hours per week being given to each. In the Sophomore year Latin, Greek, French, and mathematics are placed on the list of electives; eight hours per week are required in English, Physics, German, and some others (varying slightly in different terms), in addition to which students must select as much as eight hours' work from the electives. The Junior and Senior years are arranged in the same way, with the number of electives increased to twenty hours per week. The college offers in required courses and electives only about one hundred and eight hours per week. The actual number of hours which the professor is expected to consume in the class-room is diminished by alternating courses. No course is presented more than four hours per week, some only two, some three. This alternation, which allows fewer classes in one day and hence longer time and concentration on a subject, is advantageous to the pupil as well as a relief to the teacher. A force of eight or ten men could present the work as given at Bowdoin with about twelve hours' work per week exclusive of laboratory work.

The ability to offer electives in addition to a regular required course is one of the greatest advantages which will follow the increase in the working force by the appointment of instructors. These, in my opinion, are some of the remedies for the ills which attend the poorly endowed colleges—ills which are common to them all, overworked professors, and, therefore, imperfect presentation of the subjects, and the lack of the spirit of research.

Harvard University. T. W. GALLOWAY.

THE EYE AND ITS ETHICS.

THE eye has perhaps a wider sphere in the realm of ethics than any other human organ, or object of nature. In the divine words of Christ it is often referred to illustrating the most soul-quickening lessons; and in one form or another its use as a moral object-lesson may be traced all through the epistles of the New Testament, and, indeed, through all the literatures of the ages.

Ruskin shows that in order to understand the "ethics of the dust" we must first know something about the dust itself.* So in order to get a good grasp of the ethics of the eye it is well first to find out something about the nature and mechanism of the organ of vision.

There is no end of speculation on the origin of the eye. Mr. Charles Darwin admitted with his usual honesty that the eye was more difficult of explanation, along the lines of mere interaction, than any other member of our wonderful make-up. Evolutionists have always found in the marvelous adaptations of the eye a most stubborn barrier in the way of natural selection by mere internal and external adjustments in the general course of natural law. As Mr. Darwin stands awe-struck in the presence of the beak and tongue of the woodpecker, and confesses that natural selection, through mere external modification, has hitherto failed to explain them,† so naturalists who are noted for general caution have been able to do little more than stand bewildered in the presence of the organ of human vision. The "speck sensitive to light" hypothesis of some evolutionists is worthy of little more notice than a passing smile. Such an assumption might easily be submerged beneath a shower of questions. For instance, why is the eye in the front rather than the back of the head? Why is it so wonderfully protected from painful superfluous rays of light by the expansive and contractile power of the iris which is furnished by circular and radiating muscles extending back through the choroid coating behind the retina so as to be influenced in performing their

*See Lecture III., on *Crystal Life*.

†See *Origin of Species*, Introduction.

functions by the excessive or diminutive rays of light falling on that structure? Why is there an eye on each side of the nose so as to command a wide field of vision? Why are the watery humors within so mechanically protected by the sclerotic and cornea without? And why is the latter so beautifully transparent while the former is not? Why do the cornea, aqueous humor, crystalline lens, vitreous humor and retina happen to be exactly where our most advanced opticians would place them as the result of a reasoning process? Why do the two eyes unite two retinal objects into one, ere they reach the brain, by means of a mathematically exact optic commissure? How did the iris muscles, the different humors, the refractive lens, the three million three hundred and sixty thousand retinal cones, the optic nerves and the sensation of sight itself all happen to be couched in this magical "speck sensitive to light?" Where did the "speck" come from? How did this spot acquire its blushing sensitiveness?

The natural components of the eye are well-known to optical science—mostly water, with a minor per cent of albumen and salts—and yet to mix these substances in the same proportion as they are found in the eye is to discover that many other bodies are more sensitive to light than they. Any one can try the experiment, as the proportion is fifty-eight per cent of water, thirty-six of albumen with the remainder salts and the least discernable membranous matter for the crystalline lens, while the vitreous humor contains ninety-eight per cent of water with the merest trace of albumen and salts. The aqueous humor is in about the same proportion while the whole structure of the organ may be easily analyzed and its properties attained. The fact that the eye is not in any other portion of the body than the head, and there immediately associated with the other organs of sense, has attracted the attention of philosophers in all ages. One of the finest summaries of the wisdom displayed in the location of the senses is given by Socrates:* "God has given us eyes that we may see things to be seen, and ears that we may hear things to be heard, and noses that we may derive pleasure from sweet smells. He has also given us objects upon which all may exercise these organs. He has given us the organ of taste that we may distinguish between the sweet and the bitter. He has defended the

* *Memorabilia*, Book I., Chapter IV.

organ of sight, because it is weak, by the eyebrows, eyelids, and eyelashes. The organ of hearing is capable of receiving all sounds; still it is never filled to excess. He has given us front teeth for cutting and back teeth for grinding our food. He has located the mouth near the organs of seeing and smelling, that they may assist in distinguishing between what is salutary and what is poisonous. He has placed the offensive parts of the system most remote from these, that they may be the less annoying." Whatever may be the true theory of the origin of the eye and our other members, we can certainly affirm that we are fearfully and wonderfully made.

But even if the eye originated and developed according to laws which we see in operation now around us, why should this eliminate the idea of creation and design? Whose laws are they? Do scientists make laws or do they only discover them? These laws have all been bent in and focalized upon an evident purpose. Whose purpose is it? The eye loses none of its glory whether created by miracle or by natural law. Indeed it seems to me that its wonder increases when we relegate it, with its practically infinite intricacies, to the operation of forces which we see. This is the position, I am glad to notice, of Herbert Spencer in his late controversy with the positivist Frederic Harrison. He claims that reverence increases for the Infinite First Cause the more science advances and the wider the sweep of natural laws appears to be; that instead of the universe becoming simpler it is in its simplicity becoming the more inexplicable: "Those who think that science is dissipating religious beliefs and sentiments seem unaware that whatever of mystery is taken from the old interpretation is added to the new. . . . Under one of its aspects scientific progress is a gradual transfiguration of nature. Where ordinary perception saw perfect simplicity it reveals great complexity; where there seemed absolute inertness it discloses intense activity; and in what appears mere vacancy it finds a marvelous play of forces. . . . When the explorer of nature sees that, quiescent as they appear, surrounding solid bodies are thus sensitive to forces which are infinitesimal in their amounts—when the spectroscope proves to him that molecules on the earth pulsate in harmony with molecules in the stars—when there is forced on him the inference that every point in space thrills with an infinity of vibrations passing through it in all

directions; the conception to which he tends is much less that of a universe of dead matter than that of a universe everywhere alive." * True, Solomon says "the hearing ear and the seeing eye, the Lord hath made both," but he does not say *how* they were made. Sir J. W. Dawson also admits that, whatever may be the true theory of the origin of man and things it is certain that it was "an intelligent origin." † Mr. Gladstone also claims in his reply to Ingersoll that, although we and our organs were slowly formed by means of natural laws, this "awakens reason to admiring wonder," and asks triumphantly "why and whereby does this doctrine eliminate the idea of creation?" ‡

The outer coating of the eye is the sclerotic (from *skleros*, which means hard), and is that part which we familiarly speak of as "the white of the eye." It covers four fifths of the globe and serves to the eye as a protector of the retina and the various humors within. It leaves one fifth of the eye unprotected but this part is occupied by the cornea (a horny substance), which, through the opening in the iris, is the transparent gateway to the crystalline lens and thence to the retina. The cornea seems black in the middle—that part not covered by the circular colored membrane called the iris. In itself, however, it is about as transparent as glass and looks black because on looking at it one is really looking into the depth of the eye. In looking from the street at a window which has no window directly opposite in the same room the glass has the appearance of being black. Directly behind the cornea is the aqueous humor and, near its posterior margin, suspended as a curtain with a round hole in it, the iris. This hole in the iris allows the passage of the light from the cornea through the aqueous humor which occupies the space between the former and crystalline lens. The opening in the iris is familiarly known as the pupil. The pupil is enlarged in the dark by the contraction of the radiating muscles which run along the choroid coating and behind the retina. In the light it is made smaller by the contraction of the small muscles that run

* *Religion: A Retrospect and Prospect*, by Herbert Spencer. Republished from the *Nineteenth Century* in full in Gail Hamilton's *Religion*. See pp. 17 and 18. These six long papers from Spencer and Harrison on this subject make a masterly volume.

† *Story of the Earth and Man*, p. 163.

‡ *North American Review*, May 1888, p. 493.

around the iris thus saving the retina and optic nerve from strong and painful impressions. The iris is that colored membrane which we call in some "black," "blue," "gray," etc. A blue eye or a black one is determined by the color of this contractile membrane. It shines through the aqueous humor between it and the cornea and leaves the impression that its color is really on the latter structure; just as we are apt to think that the interior colors of a glass ball are painted on its surface.

Directly behind the iris and aqueous humor is the crystalline lens. In the middle of this lens the rays of light cross each other so that when they fall upon the retina the object is inverted. The reason why our neighbors are not walking about like flies on the ceiling is that the mind intuitively traces the light back again to the external object along the line by which it came, thus giving the object its real position in the external world. The crystalline lens is really a capsule filled with a mixed substance of water, albumen, and salt. The water is fifty-eight per cent of the whole. Within the lens are small elongated structures supposed by some to be other capsules filled with clear matter of an albuminous character. This lens surpasses all other parts of the eye in its marvelous beauty on close examination.

The retina is represented by some as a cup-like continuation of the optic nerve, by others as a net-work of nerves. It is covered by over three million nerve cones, and contains over one million at the "yellow spot," where sight is most intense. Just how sensation is acquired through the means here provided is a confessed mystery to the inquisitive optician. Many of these cones, in birds and reptiles at least, have little drops of colored oil at their ends, and, by excluding all other colors but their own, transmit the impression of black, red, etc. But how the idea of color is found is a profound mystery. Helmholtz, in his *Popular Scientific Lectures*, represents the eye as being more sensitive to some colors than to others, so that, by the relative intensity of the impression one color is distinguished from another.* The late Professor Clifford explains this difference of intensity by the various lengths of light waves in different colors, the primary colors being red, green, and violet, and all other colors mere mixtures and modifications of these.† The longest wave is in

* See his fine lecture on *Optics and Painting*, sec. 3.
† *Seeing and Thinking*, Chap. II.

red and diminishes gradually with the less intensely colored objects. "The velocity of light," says Professor Tyndall, "in round numbers is one hundred and ninety thousand miles per second. Reducing this to inches, and multiplying the number thus found by thirty-six thousand nine hundred and eighteen, we obtain the number of waves of the extreme red in one hundred and ninety thousand miles. All these waves enter the eye and hit the retina at the back of the eye in one second. The number of shocks per second necessary to the production of the impression of red is, therefore, four hundred and fifty-one millions of millions. In a similar manner, it may be found that the number of shocks corresponding to the impression of violet is seven hundred and eighty-nine millions of millions." * "All our sensations of coloring that we get are made up of three sensations corresponding, it is now believed, to red and green and violet, and in the proportion in which these sensations are mixed together, all the difference of the different colors is constituted."† Color, then, does not depend on the number of shocks per second for its intensity, but on the intensity of each shock, or, as Clifford says, the length of each wave as well. Hence, "the difference," says Clifford, "between that disturbance of the ether which makes red light and that which makes blue light is that the waves of red light are longer than the waves of blue light." ‡ When we come to the psychology of these sensations all our efforts are in vain. Tyndall confesses that the entrance of a sensation into a corresponding state of consciousness is "unthinkable." What feels? Who is seated in what Clifford calls "the central office" at the brain battery, taking off the nerve messages and sending out motory messages to the various muscles? How is this operator connected with his wires? How did he come there? How does he leave?

Behind the retina are the optic nerves leading back to the two lobes of the brain. Now, strange to say, the optic nerves cross each other in the optic commissure without getting their message confused. Here we have two messages entering consciousness as one and from different sets of nerves. The nerves reach the different sides of the two retinas exactly as the lines from the hands of

* *Six Lectures on Light*, Lecture I.
† *Seeing and Thinking*, Lecture on "The Eye and Seeing."
‡ *Ibid*, "The Eye and Seeing."

the driver reach the different sides of the heads of two horses. The nerve at the left side, say of the left eye, and that at the left side of the right eye, unite at the optic commissure and enter the right lobe. So those at the right side of both eyes unite and enter the left lobe. Thus both eyes are made to see as one, just as two horses similarly reined are made to act as one in all their movements.

The study of the eye has always been intimately associated with theories of perception and speculative philosophy. Some, reasoning from the fact that we only see the image on the retina, claim that we perceive through our senses only phenomena, ideas, impressions, sensations, images, as they have been variously called by different idealists and agnostics, that we do not behold, touch, taste, smell, or hear the thing in itself or objective reality. The truth is, however, that there is no eye behind the retina looking at the image produced there, else our neighbors would all be standing on their heads. But the mind, through the optic impression, traces the refracted rays back the way they have come to their true position outside. Thus it is the thing in itself which the mind perceives, and not an image at all. Indeed, our recent advances in physiological psychology have given agnosticism its death blow. It is now established that there is a perfect unbroken connection between the brain and external objects, between the brain, indeed, and the most distant star.

There are, however, acquired perceptions, and it is in these that illusion is apt to arise. Hence, a picture with its shades, shadows, and perspective, all on a flat piece of canvas, is apt to deceive us into the illusion of supposing we perceive distances there and objects as in actual relief from each other; whereas, we only perceive a flat-colored surface daubed by the painter's brush. A perception of distance is acquired from intervening objects or forms of shadow and perspective by experience. Hence, when we see them imitated on canvas or otherwise, we are apt to conclude that we actually see a long avenue, formed of trees and houses, with real men and women on the sidewalks. Professor Drummond gives a remarkable case of the illusion of the acquired perception in sight in the case of the little insect which perfectly imitates a white bird dropping, spattered out on a rock among real droppings. It is really provoking to one's gravity to read how hard it

was for him to distinguish the fraud from the reality. It was only by accidentally noticing one of them move across the rock that he discovered its animal identity. When it stopped, if he took his eye from it for a moment, he found it impossible to distinguish it from the other spatterings, so perfect was the artistic illusion of his acquired sight perception. He says: "Lying upon all the stones round about are the genuine droppings of birds; and when one sees the two together it is difficult to say whether one is most struck with the originality of the idea or the extraordinary audacity with which the *rôle* is carried out." * Distance is an acquired perception, and, therefore, may deceive us, as it often does, but the external picture reaches the mind exactly as it is. The mistake of the Professor was not in his sense-perception, but in his hasty synthetic judgment. Our sense of sight does not propose to reveal the nature of objects but the actual object itself as it exists in the outside world. Analysis is the function, not of sense, but of reason.

A man receiving his sight for the first time does not perceive objects as separate from each other. Neither does an infant. This is acquired perception which is the result of reason and experience in discovering objects to be separate in space. To a child, and a man first receiving his sight, a mountain twenty miles away appears as near the eye as the point of the nose. I shall not soon forget how pleased I was when I first got my little boy to distinguish me from my chair or book-case. We read of a man receiving his sight who had been born blind, and who, we are told, could not distinguish men from trees. That New Testament case is optically exact. If the record had said that he saw as though he had always seen, the optician could not have believed the statement. This is only one case in many wherein science is confirming the Bible records.

It is interesting to notice how often the eye or its functions are referred to in popular teaching. A "short-sighted man" is one who is not provident in his ways. It is usually characteristic of the folly of youth. Now, it is strange that actual short-sightedness is characteristic of young eyes. There is a tendency of the rays of light to be focalized ere they reach the retina. Hence, the book has to be held close to the eyes so as to let the rays fall back-

* *Tropical Africa*, Chap. VII., "Mimicry."

ward, or a lens must be procured that will tend to keep the rays apart until they reach the proper focus. Long-sightedness, on the other hand, is usually characteristic of age. Wisdom comes with age and renders its possessor "far-seeing." In this case the rays tend to fall back of the retina, and the book has to be pushed out, or glasses procured with sufficient convexity to enable the rays to be focalized clearly in front of the retina.

We often speak of getting a "wide view" or a "wide horizon" on different subjects so as to be saved from bigotry. Now, this is exactly what the Creator has intended we should have. Without moving the head a single eye can sweep up and down and across one hundred and ten degrees. Had we not this "breadth of view" our horizon would be most disagreeably limited.

In certain diseases of the eye the sight becomes opaque, so that every thing seen partakes of the same nature. Hence, we say that "when we look through blue spectacles every thing seems blue." The eyes of the soul may become diseased also, so that every thing and every character will appear to us as "a root out of dry ground," while to the clear-sighted those same objects may be "altogether lovely." It is our duty, then, to preserve the luster of the soul's eye, so that we may not impinge our bilious coloring upon the objects of beauty all about us.

Christ says we may "have eyes and see not." "There is no person so blind as he who does not desire to see." We may close our eyes and stop our ears, and by doing so repeatedly the power of sight and hearing will gradually fail for lack of use. The blind fish in Mammoth Cave have long since quit looking, and now they have lost the power to look. So some men "love darkness rather than light," and by living in their Mammoth Cave have ceased to see. Parker says "the man who shuts all the doors and pulls down all the blinds and lives in the darkness he has created is not an agnostic; he is a fool." *

Impressions remain on the retina for a short time. A firebrand at the end of a string swung in a circle gives the appearance of a solid ring. This is because the impression remains on the retina until the object comes round again. I looked steadily the other day at a focalized point of light, formed by a convex lens, and for about five minutes afterward every thing I saw had that

* Sermon: *Job's Redeemer.*

impression upon it. So we ought to take heed what we look at, as these scenes remain indelibly impressed on the retina of the mental eye to annoy us in the future, if not forever.

Sailors and plainsmen have acquired a wonderful power of distant vision. In like manner there are men like John, Paul, Plato, Victor Hugo, and others, who have looked so steadily across life's ocean for the haven of eternal rest that the fair port has gradually grown plainer as their powers of vision have increased; while materialists have casually looked in the same direction, and have seen nothing but mist and shadow.

The number of these striking lessons and applications multiply as one traces them out, and the more you pursue the subject the more you are convinced that the eye is a delightful study both in its wonderful mechanism and its varied analogies.

J. D. Gold.

AMERICAN MISTAKES.

THERE are a great many things in this world that might be changed for the better, and not all of these are on the other side of the sea. Some of them are in the "land of the free and the home of the brave," as little as we may think of it. In fact a great many of them are lying all around us, "openly exposed to view." Some are grossly glaring defects, while others are only seen by those who look for them. Of the first-class the American newspaper, with its periodical utter disregard for any thing that even savors of truth and fairness, and with its abnormal sensationalism and indecency, is perhaps one of the most prominent in existence; and, to civilized people, the probable duration of its unreformed career is even now becoming a matter of thoughtful speculation. But it is not the object of this article to discuss this huge joke on our national civilization, but only to refer to it incidentally in its connection with our educational progress, and passing by it to see if we can not find beyond it one or two other things bearing on the aggregate intellectual status of the nation that might easily be changed for the better.

Looking with our eyes but half open, we can readily see that we are teaching a false idea in our schools, and that we are neglecting great opportunities outside of school, in our "cormorantish" struggle for more money. Instead of teaching that every man should be a bread winner, we are striving to impress the idea on the child that he is an exception to the rule, and that while others may be expected to work, he is to be promoted to places of honor and profit without the loss of a drop of sweat or the exercise of an ounce of energy. In other words, we are teaching our boys that they may every one be presidents, and our girls, that the highest and only aim of woman is to wear tight clothes, and pound a piano. These teachings are cruelly false, and the sooner we abandon them, the better for the general public welfare. This does not mean that we are to discourage our boys, but it does mean that we should be frank enough to teach them from the start

that "life is real, life is earnest," and that the great victories of life come only to those who fight the hard battles of life. Neither does it mean to depreciate the importance of the higher culture of woman nor to disparage her efforts in the direction of bodily neatness, but it does mean that our women should be taught that as between bread and music as a sustainer of human life, bread will always be in the lead; and that a large degree of common sense mixed along with the experiences of youth would certainly pay handsome dividends to old age, and frequently to future generations.

The "heathen Chinee" woman has the same right to squeeze her feet until she can not walk, that the American woman has to cut herself in two with a piece of cotton string; and the Indian woman shows the same lack of good sense when she dangles her gorgeous jewelry from her prominent nose, that her Christian sister does when she parades herself before the public with her profuse display of vulgarly luxuriant jewelry.

By all means teach the boy the ablatives, datives, genitives, vocatives, etc., and the girls too as for that matter, and let them puzzle over the forty-seventh problem of Euclid till they are both tired, if they like, and then let them together wake the music that sleeps beneath the ivory keys; or let them together put life on the canvas till it breathes, if they can; but, while they are doing this let them remember that men make the shoes of the world, and that women bake the bread. Teach the boy to turn a grindstone, and let him know that an auger bores holes—when man furnishes the motive power, and that the saw cuts planks under the same conditions.

Teach the girls that graceful movements of the body may be developed in a rolling-pin drill, quite as well as in the Spanish fandango; and do not allow her to lose sight of the fact that to be able to boil an Irish potato well is of more importance to the human race than to know the science of blondining and banging her hair.

To rear a good boy is certainly a step in the right direction, but it is much better to know what he is good for as you go along, and to let him know that the world needs men who are good laborers as well as men who make good presidents, and that it needs a great many more laborers than it does presidents; and at

the same time let his sister know that the world needs more women who can broil a beefsteak, and fewer women who are practiced poodle-dog nurses.

Our false teaching is driving young men to the cities by the thousands, and thus each year is increasing the strain at our storm centers at the expense of intelligent effort in our real wealth-producing centers. We forget that every dollar in the world represents a hundred cents' worth of hard work done by somebody, and we also forget that the forest, and the mine, and the farm furnish the world with all the capital it ever had, all it has now, and all that it ever will have; and we forget further that God made the country and that man made the town.

By all means let us abandon the idea that every thing in this world is to be learned in school, and let us impress the beginner with the fact that when he has graduated in all the colleges in the land, he has only then read life's introductory page, and that the great book of human knowledge and human wisdon lies unopened before him, and unexplored so far as he is concerned.

It is estimated that more than ninety per cent of all the men who begin business in the United States fail at some time in their business experience. This enormous percentage of failure is the result of a wrong estimate of the forces against which we must contend, and this estimate comes from wrong teaching. Why not begin by teaching some of the sterner facts that every man must learn at some time in life, rather than start young men with notions that experience will sooner or later compel them to give up? If we could only see the wrecks of manhood that every year come from the lists of young men who start life with "fair prospects;" and if we could only realize that most of these were wrecked on breakers against which they had not been warned, we would certainly see that it is not only much better, but that it is also much easier to start a man right than it is to get him right after he has gone wrong.

Our cities are full of bright intelligent young men who are going to the bad in droves because they have never been taught that they each should be good for some particular kind of work. The best intellect of the nation is leaving the farm and drifting to the cities, where a large per cent of it is lost in the whirling, seething vortex of vice that opens its wide jaws to welcome its victims.

Why? Because our teaching degrades labor and offers a premium to the man who can live without it. Our teaching couples ignorance and labor, and makes them walk hand in hand; and it incidentally makes rascality respectable.

As a nation of people, let us get the idea that every able-bodied man and woman owes it to himself and to the community to be a worker, and that it is the positive duty of every one to be a student for life.

In proportion as individuals shut themselves up in their individuality, they shut out the light, and thereby dwarf the aggregate intelligence of the nation. The man who thinks that because he has graduated in some college he knows all that he needs to know is wofully at fault in his judgment, and the man who makes money getting the sole aim of his life is not only doing himself a wrong, but he is actually sinning against the public.

It is true that the body must have food and raiment, and it is true, also, that these can only be had for a price, and that it is every man's duty to pay the price, but this is not all the truth there is connected with man's life, experience, and destiny. The needs of the body are but temporary, while the needs of the soul have no end. Can a man afford to dwarf his soul to fatten his body? The paradigms of the school only suggest the student life to the man who takes high rank among men. It is the every-day home culture that gives large development to the soul and makes a man strong, just as it is the every-day exercise of one's religion that makes him a good Christian.

T. M. HURST.

THE PREACHED WORD.

AMONG the forces and influences which have obtained among men, none have been more attractive or potent than that of the orator. Whether we trace it in Homeric song, or in Druidical myths and legends; in the studied speech of the polished Greek, or the more matter-of-fact Roman, its influence and power has been without a rival in molding thought and controlling action. And to-day there is no other influence so potent for good or evil. The orator at the hustings or in the halls of legislation, the lecturer on the platform, or the religious teacher in the pulpit, wields a power which can not be measured.

In the dissemination of divine truth oratory has always had a prominent place. The ancient prophets were held in high esteem by the Israelites, and, at the time of the Savior's advent, among the great men who had passed away, the prophet was revered above the king. From Malachi till the appearance of John the Baptist the prophetic voice had been silent. Four eventful centuries had passed without the sound of a voice inspired of God. The chosen people had the law and the prophets to read and teachers sitting in Moses' seat to instruct them. But, instead of imparting instruction, these teachers covered up the real message of God by their traditions. When the forerunner appeared and broke the silence of centuries it was the "voice of one crying in the wilderness," a call to repent of their sins which were held up to them with startling boldness. And when Jesus entered upon his public ministry it is recorded that "he came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God." "He spoke in their synagogues being glorified of all." His words were heard with wonder and amazement. His enemies bore witness that "never man spoke like this man." His discourses, though but briefly reported to us, are sufficient to cause us, at this distance of nearly twenty centuries, to echo the same sentiment, and to enable us to understand the impressions which they produced.

Jesus Christ wrote no book or pamphlet; but his oral addresses constrained those who heard him to wonder at the gracious words

which proceeded out of his mouth. He preached his own gospel, setting an example to his chosen ministers of labor and zeal in teaching the people. By day and night, on Sabbath day and week day, in the temple, in the synagogue, in the market-place, in the wilderness, on the mountain top, along the highway, by land and by the sea, to saint, to sinner, to many or few, he was ever preaching, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. He wrote nothing with his own hand, and all his words which have been preserved to us can be read in the space of a few hours; yet it is not extravagant to say that they form the most precious literary heritage of the human race.

When Jesus sent the twelve forth for the first time on a mission of preaching, the first words of instruction he gave them were, "As ye go preach." After his resurrection he extended the command: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And when the apostles were imprisoned for preaching, "the angel of the Lord opened by night the prison doors and brought them forth and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple, to the people, all the words of this life." (Acts v. 19, 20.) Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17); and again, "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. i. 21); and again he admonished Timothy to "preach the word." (2 Tim. iv. 2.)

Those who came after the apostles, the great army of preachers who went forth through all the world, and their successors in all the churches, made the public preaching of the word their great work. There is no fact in ecclesiastical history better attested than the great use made of preaching in the early centuries of the Church. Who wielded a greater influence than John Chrysostom, who from his power as an orator received the name he bears in history, the golden-mouthed?

After the long sleep and spiritual death of the Dark Ages it was the voice of a John Huss, and afterward of Luther, preaching the simple doctrines of the gospel that waked the Church to life. Luther, with his stalwart faith and iron will, trumpet-tongued, sounded forth the glorious gospel, and shook the throne of papacy to its very foundations. The reformers on the continent and in

England followed his example. Attempts to silence them were in vain, for they felt, "Woe be unto us if we preach not the gospel." It may be confidently affirmed that the prosperity of religion in any Church has ever been in proportion to the fidelity and zeal with which this ordinance of God has been used. An unholy people can not live under the continual sound of faithful preaching.

We are living in an age of intellectual activity, of advancing culture. More people can read and do read now than at any time in the past. The printing-press is turning out papers, tracts, pamphlets, magazines, and books by the million. But with all this there was never a time when the public preaching of the gospel was more needed or more effective than now. The dying apostle's injunction to "preach the word" was never more imperatively necessary. If men were everywhere convinced of their alienation from God and exposure to his wrath; if they were filled with intense anxiety, with unutterable dread of approaching ruin, if they were waiting with breathless suspense and alternate hope and despair for Jehovah's message, and were pale with desire and longing to receive pardon and a Father's smile, then an angel flying in the midst of heaven and announcing the terms of reconciliation would be sufficient to bring the whole race back to the fold of God. But it is not thus. With rare exceptions men are well-nigh unconscious of their estrangement from God and sadly indifferent to his wrath. Unbelief pervades and benumbs the spirit. Pride refuses to hear the voice of rebuke and pity. Selfishness denies the possibility of supreme devotion. Appetite clamors for present indulgence. God is excluded from the guilty soul. In him it has no delight; to him it gives no honor; from him it desires no message. His being is sometimes doubted. His providence is denied. There are many now as in the days of Job who sneeringly ask, "What is the Almighty that we should serve him, and what profit shall we have if we pray unto him?"

His government is boldly pronounced unequal and severe. Of all messages from Jehovah, one that proclaims salvation as a free gift, on the basis of an atonement, is the most unwelcome. To the "Jews it is a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness." Multitudes, by reason of prejudice or superstition, are unprepared to hear it with candor, and yet other multitudes, by reason of

spiritual ignorance or stupor, are unable to receive it as "joyful news."

Preaching must appeal to intellect, reason, and conscience; it must instruct, convince, and alarm. "For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little." (Isaiah xxviii. 10.) The practical design of the ministry is to reach all people with the gospel. How otherwise could this be done so effectively as by the living voice of the accredited herald?

No theory or plan of disseminating a knowledge of the gospel is worth any thing which does not bring the gospel to the people. No theory of ministerial culture is either scriptural or philosophical or sensible which can not bridge the gulf between the clergy and the masses. The methods of lay labor for evangelizing the masses, which are so popular at present and in the main so hopeful a sign of our times, are defective and will fail, just so far as they assume to confine to laymen the duty of personal contact with what are called the lower orders, and to exalt the clergy into an upper layer of influence in which they shall simply be preachers to select hearers—teachers of teachers—reaching the masses of people only by proxy. Such an adjustment of forces in the Church is hierarchy. The philosophy of it is priestly. It is a return to the genius of Judaism and paganism. A preacher would better work on in the dark, with nothing but mother-wit, a quickened conscience, and a Saxon Bible to teach him what to do and how to do it, than to vault into an aerial ministry in which only the upper classes shall know or care any thing about him.

The ministry must reach the people; the poor must "have the gospel preached unto them." This can not be done by writing and distributing papers, tracts, and books. The printed page can be made a powerful auxiliary to the preaching of the word, to the dissemination of truth, but it can never take its place. The Church of to-day needs to be aroused. As was the command to the prophet so it is to the minister, "Cry aloud and spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet and show my people their transgressions and the house of Jacob their sins." (Isaiah lviii. 1.)

The Old Testament recognizes a divine call to the prophetic office: "But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak. . . . even that

prophet shall die." (Deut. xviii. 20.) God said to Jonah, "Arise, go unto Nineveh that great city and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee." (Jonah iii. 2.) "Then I said I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." (Jeremiah xx. 9.)

Jesus Christ instituted but little, he inspired much. It is the cross, and not his institutions, that separates the old dispensation from the new. What remained he left to the Holy Spirit who was to come after him. He abolished virtually, rather formally. He preferred the insensible but infallible action of the Spirit to the less sure and less delicate action of the letter. His reign is a spiritual reign. His disciples after his resurrection understood this and were in no haste to abolish or overthrow. And it was not always given to them to see at once what in the old economy was consistent with the new. God did not impart to them at once all they were to know, but gave them light which was gradually to chase away the darkness. Jesus Christ called around him a few men from among his followers and instrusted them with a message and with functions similar to his own. "As my Father hath sent me even so send I you." (John xx. 4.)

Paul says, "Jesus Christ gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." (Eph. iv. 11.) Here Jesus Christ appears as the guide of his Church, of its messengers; the organization and government of the Church are ascribed to him.

Jesus said, "Go. . . . preach the gospel to every creature," and this instituted the Christian ministry. So then a Christian minister is a person called of God to serve him in his visible Church on earth, in the ministry of the word and ordinances, and in the exercise of discipline.

The necessity of such a special call to the work of the Christian ministry is shown by the relations and work involved in the character and duties of the Christian minister. He sustains special relations to God, the Savior, hence he is called the "servant of God in the gospel of his Son," "a minister of the new covenant," "an embassador for Christ," "a steward of the mysteries of God." In these relations a "necessity is laid upon him," and he is bound to perform special duties under an awful responsibility. Now, these special duties and relations require a special call. "How can they preach except they be sent." (Rom. x. 15.)

The call of God to the gospel ministry is that command of the great Head of the Church, accompanied with corresponding operations of the Spirit which requires a person to undertake the office of a minister of the word and ordinances in the visible Church. The apostles had an *immediate* personal call from the Savior which their successors have not had. The call to the gospel ministry is now altogether *mediate*, not because there is in it no powerful operation of God's Spirit in the heart of the person called, but because the ordinary means of grace are, in the first instance, used in the call, and because the Church is employed as the medium through which the call is made efficient. The internal call comprehends the experience of true conversion to God, so that there shall be a renewed heart, and in that heart sincere love to the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord asked Peter with great solemnity and emphasis: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" Peter having answered in the affirmative, he said, "feed my lambs, feed my sheep." Whoever wishes to ascertain whether God has called him to the work of the ministry, must first inquire whether he so loves the Savior as "to count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus." This does not constitute the call, but is an indispensable pre-requisite to it. In the internal call there is superadded to the experience of renewing grace those special influences of the Holy Spirit, which exert in the heart of the converted man a prevailing holy desire to be employed in the work of a Christian minister.

The great Head of the Church has a right, which he exercises, to choose men to this work, because:

1. He alone knows all hearts, and thus chooses such as are full of love to him.

2. He alone knows the field to which he wishes to send men. There are the learned and the ignorant; there is the village, the city, the country place, the wilderness, the heathen lands; to all of these the messenger must be sent who can best present the message from the King.

3. He alone knows the capabilities of the man. He can make no mistake.

That the power of calling to the active work of the Christian ministry is vested in the rulers of the Church may be proved by the following scriptures: "Lay hands suddenly on no man." (1 Tim. v. 22.) Here Paul enjoins Timothy to exercise the power of judging of the qualifications of men for the gospel service, and rejecting those who shall appear unqualified. "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii. 2.) But this power which the Church possesses of calling men to the ministry is not a sovereign, but a ministerial and limited power. It must be exercised agreeably to the mind of the Lord Jesus Christ, as expressed in his written word. The Church has no right to take the initiative, and call men to the work of the ministry, but must wait the choice of the King in Zion, and induct into the sacred office only such as are believed to be moved by the Holy Spirit to this great work. The Church can only "pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest," and when those whom he moves to this work present themselves for this service in the Church, then they are to be received as such, and helped on in the work, or in the preparation for the work, whereunto they have been called in answer to the prayer of the Church, the man called, and the Church inducting him into the office ever remembering that the great work of the minister is to "preach the gospel," "to speak to the people all the words of this life," "to preach the word."

As I write these lines (Feb. 4, 1890), I call to mind that eighty years ago three men, comparatively obscure, bowed before God, in a humble cabin, and offered up that prayer which gave formal existence to the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. I remember, too, that the life work of these men was to preach the gospel. They and their immediate successors wrote but little, so we have very meager remains of their discourses, but we have the results of their labors. They were ablaze with zeal, with love for perishing souls, and made a glorious record of devotion and success in winning men to Christ. They were men noted for their power in the great assembly of the people. The message of life intrusted to them was like a burning fire shut up in their bones, so that with burdened hearts and trumpet voice they told the story of the cross, and aroused the careless to flee from danger. They felt

"woe is me if I preach not the gospel." God then, and always has, honored his preached word. It is the great instrumentality of making known the way of life.

"He that hath my word let him speak my word faithfully."

"How beauteous are their feet,
Who stand on Zion's hill;
Who bring salvation on their tongues,
And words of peace reveal!
How charming is their voice!
How sweet their tidings are!
Zion, behold thy Savior King,
He reigns and triumphs here."

J. S. HOWARD.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

A Criticism.

It has long been held by a large section of the Christian community that the doctrine of justification by faith is what Luther said it was—"*articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*"—the text of a standing or falling Church. According as it has been held and preached, so has there been success in Christian work and progress made in the divine life. It is clearly the doctrine of the Scriptures, and for its exposition and defense the Apostle Paul set himself most resolutely more than once. The Epistles to the Romans and Galatians were written mainly with this intent. To the apostle it was no secondary matter, but one which entered into the very core of the faith, and constituted the essence of the gospel that it was his life's work to make known. To err here is to err on many other essential doctrines of the Christian system. Correspondingly to be right here is necessarily to be right on other matters of doctrinal and practical moment. This being so, every attempt to discuss and explain the doctrine, in a calm and reverent spirit, should be received with gratitude. At the same time care should be taken that error be avoided, and above all that no views of justification be entertained which are not supported by the teachings of the Holy Ghost and in harmony with human reason.

With such conceptions in my mind I read in the Cumberland Presbyterian Review for April the article "How and Why Justification is by Faith," from the pen of the Rev. B. G. Mitchell. It displays no little thought and philosophical acumen, and I found it stimulating in the highest degree. Some of the positions laid down were, to me, startling, others were novel. Altogether I was forced to the conclusion that if the teachings of this article are right, some of us have been wrong all the days of our lives, and have been misrepresenting the teachings of the Bible and the facts of human experience.

No one will, or ought to dispute the assumption that there is a philosophy of the doctrine. This there is, as there is of the whole

circle of the Christian verities. But that this philosophy is rightly expounded in the article in question I am far from thinking, and would like to submit some of the main statements and positions to a brief examination. This shall be done in a fraternal spirit. "Truth like a torch, the more it is shaken it shines," is a motto worthy of all acceptation. In its spirit I shall proceed to my task.

First let us examine the doctrine of Faith as set forth in this article. This is fundamental to the whole superstructure. It is declared that "Faith is a universal principle. Spiritual existences of whatever character or order are so constituted . . . as to be shut up to an exercise of faith." Is this so? Could it be reasonably said God has faith? He is a "spiritual existence," the greatest and only perfect spiritual existence, and he has and can have no faith. The impossibility of Deity's having faith arises from his very perfection. This, I imagine, every sound philosophy teaches and must teach. Again we are told, "Unbelief is not the want of belief." If it be not, what is it? If I have unbelief concerning the existence, say for example of Alexander the Great, have I belief concerning that renowned warrior? Certainly not. The very language employed contradicts such a conception. It is true indeed that unbelief in God does not necessarily imply want of faith in all things and beings else, but this is a different thing from what is laid down as a philosophical axiom in the declaration, "Unbelief is not the want of belief." It is want of belief, and neither common sense nor sound thinking will warrant any other conclusion.

But these things are trifles which serve only as straws to indicate how the course of thought runs. A far more important point is reached when we consider the writer's definition of faith or belief. "Faith and unbelief," it is said, "are both positive acts of will." This is something new and is an utter misreading of both Scripture and the facts of human consciousness. No proof is given to substantiate this assertion, and I am bold enough to aver none could have been produced. When man, as a spiritual being is analyzed, he is found to possess the power of thought, the power of will, and the susceptibility of emotion. All that he experiences or does is realized in, or done by, one or the other of these three capacities of his soul. Faith must consequently be predicated of either the power of thought, the power of will, or of the emo-

tional nature. Is it "a positive act of will?" If so it would be a volition, and not an intellection, and that man could *directly*, by an act of his free will, believe and not believe as he chooses. But this he can not do, and the reason is found in the nature of faith. It is not an act of the will, but of the intelligence. It may be, and is, conditioned by acts of will, but is to be carefully distinguished from volitions either antecedent or consequent. Faith is belief, and both words express an act of the intelligence and consists of the conviction that the thing testified is real, that the testimony is true, and the person believed in is trusted. Our conviction that a statement is true, is not an act of will, but by reason or intelligence. Our conviction that the gospel testimony, for instance, is true is not a volition. It is an act of the intelligence and moral side of reason, leading to trust, obedience, and love. He that believeth is saved, not he that acts; otherwise salvation would be by works, for all acts of will are works of an inner character and the cause of outer deeds. Faith works by love and constitutes the hand that seizes hold of God in Christ and things unseen and eternal.

Passing by what is advanced regarding the end of creation we come to the contention regarding the law of the end of moral beings. It is asked: "How could the Creator do more or less—I would speak reverently—than impose upon his creatures spiritual as well as physical, the law of their end?" Again, "It is certainly true that at the self-same moment when spiritual entities (or substance) were created the principles or laws of their being were impressed upon them so that the laws of spirit are necessarily inherent in its very essence, are concreations of it." I hope this deliverance is intelligible to my readers. I can not say it is fully so to me. What is meant by the word "laws" in these sentences? They are said to be the same as principles; but surely this is not a correct definition. It would be far from philosophical, indeed it would be absurd to say the Creator, "imposed on his creatures spiritual, as well as physical, the principle of their end." If laws are not principles, are they substances? This can not be, for they are impressed on "spiritual entities (or substance"). What, then, are they? Are they forces, causes, moving powers? If Mr. Mitchell says they are, we have to refer him to the article by Mr. Margeson in the same number of the REVIEW, in which he ex-

plodes the fallacy of such a theory. What are called physical laws are not impressed on nature. They are not creations, far less inherent in the essence of material entities and concreations of them. They have not and never had an existence in the wide domain of the natural and seen universe. As Mr. Margeson well puts it, they are the "methods by which the Creator proceeds in controlling all that exists." Ultimately they are found in the divine reason, and constitute those principles in accordance with which the divine activities are put forth. To affirm that they are creations or concreations is to confuse the mind, not to elucidate the truth, and to contend that they are inherent in the essence of either matter or mind is to present a view of the Creator's relation to his creation which has long been abandoned by Christian thinkers. When God created man he did not impress upon him his spiritual nature, make a part of his essence certain laws which were to be self-active and operative. As a moral being he possessed capabilities and such capabilities as were necessary to make him a moral and responsible agent. To him was made known the moral law, not by being made inherent in his essence, or impressed upon his substance, but revealed *in* and *to* his conscience. This law is made known *to* man, but is not of man. It is the voice of authority of the "man within the heart" as Mackenzie has it, of the "Lord of the conscience" as others term it. By means of it, God, as ruler, deals with his moral subjects. Its sanctions are life and death, and we are urged to do the right that we may live. To do what God's law commands is "the law of the end" so far as we are concerned. And obedience to the divine will works out the chief end of man's existence which is also the chief end of all that God does—viz., his own glory. For of him and through him and to him are all things to whom be glory now and for ever, amen. Disastrous will be the result to man, as sinner or saint, if he thinks he has to do with concreated laws impressed upon his spiritual nature and inherent in its very essence, and not with the living God and heavenly Father.

We get nearer the main subject of the paper when we examine what is said on the subject of condemnation. Speaking of the first man the writer says: "Two possible courses of action lay open to him as to all free spirits, either of consecrating himself to God . . . or of directing the activities of his being selfward or down-

ward. He chose the latter, and in perfect accord with the laws of spirit, a bad moral quality was imbued, or more especially following his act of unbelief, which as we have seen was a misdirection of his soul activities, a wrong faith was a condition, state, habit, or ethical effect which theologically we denominate depravity. This moral effect, depravity, necessarily resulted in a deprivation of the good which the law of the soul's creation was intended to conserve. This state of deprivation or loss of good is termed 'condemnation.'" If this deliverance is not clear it is not for want of elaboration. Stripped of all its philosophical phraseology it comes to this, In man's believing the devil's lie rather than God's truth, there followed an ethical effect—viz., depravity. This depravity resulted in the loss of the good for the enjoyment of which man was made. The loss of the good, or happiness, is condemnation. With this statement I join issue, and that to the fullest extent. The writer is not warranted in designating the loss of happiness, which is the result of depravity, as condemnation. Neither when viewed philosophically or theologically is it condemnation. The word condemnation is a forensic term, and in all cases has relation to a law. It is the adverse judgment of a ruler when a subject is tested by that law and is found to have transgressed its requirements. In the case of man and God, man is condemned because he has sinned; having done moral wrong and become guilty he comes under the penalty of the law violated. The imposition of this penalty is the condemnation of the soul. Under the gospel condemnation arises from the sin of unbelief or from not accepting deliverance provided in Christ Jesus. Here again condemnation is adverse judgment of God as moral governor. Nor will it do to reply that the deprivation arising from depravity is the divine practical judgment of man's sin, and that condemnation and the loss of good are therefore the same thing. Such an answer inverts the order and relation of condemnation and its penal, moral natural consequences. Deprivation is not an antecedent of condemnation, but a consequent, just as the punishment of a criminal among men is not the cause but the effect of his condemnation. Nor do we admit that depravity is either condemnation, or the penal consequences thereof. God the ruler condemns, but will it be contended that in doing so he depraves? Such a conception is a horrible one, and predicates of the divine

Governor actions utterly foreign to all that is known of his character and nature. He is love and light and in him is no darkness at all. His penalty of sin is to be distinguished from the natural results of sin, as the loss of the social status of a criminal is to be distinguished from the punishment inflicted by the vindicator of law. For the character of the former the government is responsible, for the latter the man himself, for by his own action he has brought upon himself the suspicions of his neighbor through his breaking of those bonds which bind society together.

Thus our contention is against the misuse of the forensic term condemnation. It refers to legal action and nothing else, whereas depravity and deprivation arising therefrom are natural results springing from moral evil done. The order is not (1) bad faith, (2) depravity, (3) deprivation—condemnation. It is (1) bad faith, (2) resulting in the violation of the moral law—sin, (3) condemnation for the evil done, (4) deprivation as the natural result of sin, (5) depravity as the natural result of deprivation. Take a concrete case. Adam on hearing the lie of the devil cherished it by an act of will and made it his own. He violated the Edenic law and was condemned for doing so as the first transgressor. By sinning he shut out from his soul the light, life, and Spirit of God and without these his nature became depraved. To invert this order as is done in the article under review, I humbly submit is to contradict the Bible and every-day experience. After what has been advanced it will not be necessary for me to state that I can not fully accept the assertion "that condemnation is not the effect of an arbitrary judicial act of the Almighty, but is the necessary result of a purely natural and philosophical process." If the former statement, so far as the word "arbitrary" is concerned, is not to be received, the latter statement is to be altogether rejected. Condemnation the result of "a purely natural and philosophical process!" What does this mean? A "philosophical process" in nature is surely a new thing under the sun. Yet this is, we are assured, what produces condemnation which consists in deprivation through depravity. This has been so far answered by what has gone before, and may be thinkable by some minds, but I confess it is beyond my apprehension. Condemnation is not the result of a natural process, it is a judicial act of the Almighty, not indeed arbitrary, but in harmony with his law which is holy, just, and good.

"Another principle elucidated by the foregoing," says Mr. Mitchell, is that "the legal grows out of, and is determined by the moral." Astonishing! Can there be a moral act of a moral creature prior to moral law? Impossible. Moral acts by moral creatures presuppose moral law, as the rule of life, and without the latter there could be none of the former. No more profound philosophical axiom could be enunciated than that of the apostle when he says "where there is no law there is no transgression." He could as truly have said where there is no law there can be no obedience, no holiness, no good moral action, and no character springing therefrom. The legal is first and conditions the moral. When the spirit under law obeys, it is justified, made holy and blessed. When the law is disobeyed, the sinner is that moment condemned, deprived of blessing, and becomes depraved. This order the writer of the article under review would invert to get the semblance of a foundation for maintaining that deprivation is condemnation, and by doing so, succeeds, to use his own words, in "turning philosophy upside down."

"Good moral quality" springs from good moral action. Good moral action is only possible where there is moral law authoritatively commanding the right and forbidding the wrong. Moral law is legal, and thus the legal is in the order of nature prior to moral act and moral quality. "This is natural, normal, just."

The way having been cleared, the main subject of the article is reached, "Justification by Faith," and the writer's theory of justification is the reverse of his theory of condemnation. There is first wrong faith, then unbelief, depravity, and deprivation of good, which is condemnation, all by "a purely natural and philosophical process," so there is right faith, then spiritual purification, a state of restoration to the soul of the good, which is justification, and all by "a purely natural and philosophical process." From this it will be seen there is no room in the theory for the Holy Spirit's work or for sanctification. The place of sanctification is taken by regeneration, and is antecedent to justification, which has not to do with the pardon of sin, a freedom from the penalty of the broken law, but the restoration of the soul to blessedness. This so-called legal state springs from the moral or ethical. Man is consequently justified because he is made pure, and as he is made pure. Out of his spiritual purification justification necessarily grows, and faith

is the root of all. This is the whole doctrine set forth in this article, and its philosophy is to be tested by its being able to explain the facts of Christian consciousness and the declarations of scripture. That it fails to do either is what has been already more than suggested. Indeed, it is a mere theory, and should have been proved to be true before seeking its philosophy, for the philosophy of an imaginative theory is not calculated to advance the cause of either religion or philosophy. As expounded by Mr. Mitchell his theory consists of several assumptions which are denied by a large number of able theologians and philosophers. Let me name a few of these assumptions. It is asserted (1) that "faith is a positive act of will." This is denied. It is asserted (2) that the moral law is inherent in, and a concreation of, man's moral nature. This is denied. It is asserted (3) that the legal grows out of the moral. This is denied. It is asserted (4) that the spiritually pure are alone justified, and that according to the degree of their purity. This is denied. It is asserted (5) that justification is a consequence of regeneration, justification, and the restoration of spiritual good to the believing sinner. This is denied. It is asserted (6) that the ground of justification is in the sinner himself, and not in Christ. This is denied. It is asserted (7) that justification is not a judicial act of God, but the result of "a natural and philosophical process." This is denied. It is asserted (8) that the whole of man's salvation is accomplished by a "natural and philosophical process," and consequently not by the agency of the Holy Spirit. This is denied. In the scheme set forth in the article before us, these eight postulates are assumed as true, without being proved, and consequently a philosophy of them can give no help to those who are anxious to understand the problem: How a man can be just with God.

In conclusion I will venture to submit to the consideration of the reader the lines along which a true theology and a true philosophy of the scriptural doctrine of justification by faith may be found. Hints are all that can be given:

1. Man has been created a moral and responsible being. This implies that he is under moral law, and this law is made known to him by God, his Creator and Father. It is not a creation, or concreation. Neither is it, so to speak, a strand of his moral nature. It is a revelation made known through conscience, and is the

authoritative declaration of the right with appropriate sanctions. It is not self-active, can not inflict its own penalties, or give its own rewards. The moral law is the instrument of the divine moral government, and is wielded by the divine moral Governor.

2. The "law of man's end," or, in other words, the end of man's existence, is found in God. The chief end of the whole creation, man and angels included, is found not in creation itself, or in the manifestation of God in creation, but in the Creator. If it had been otherwise, God would have subordinated himself to the work of his own hands. The shorter catechism is right when it says "man's chief end is to glorify God." This is not the declarative glory, but the subjective glory. This may be defined to be the satisfaction God has in his moral creatures when they answer the end of their being, and act in harmony with his Holy Will.

3. Man sinned and came short of the glory of God. Man violated the law of love—the moral law. On the ground of this, God by a judicial fiat condemned him. This act was objective to the sinner, being in God, but it was made subjective as well. It was in the "court of heaven;" it was also made known in the "court of conscience." Because of this, condemnation, deprivation, were experienced, and depravity ensued. Mr. Mitchell says: "The soul is not depraved because it is condemned, but condemned because it is depraved. Just as in the natural body, an unhealthy physical condition normally results in the deprivation of the blessings of good health." This is not so. "The unhealthy physical condition" is only possible because the blessing of good health is not enjoyed. The absence of health produces the unhealthy condition, and not *vice versa*. So, in like manner, condemnation is conditioned on guilt, and depravity springs therefrom. Condemnation and depravity may be in the order of time synchronal, but in the order of nature the former comes before the latter.

4. Man being condemned—deprived of blessing and polluted—was helpless to save himself, or remove his condemnation, and restore his soul to its proper ethical and spiritual condition. What man could not do, God sent his Son to accomplish by assuming man's nature, taking his place, and dealing, by way of atonement, with his sins. Christ died for the unjust—was made sin for us; became a ransom for man, bore his sins in his body; became a

propitiation for the sins of the world. He was set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare the righteousness of God, that he might be just and the justifier of those who believed. Those are the commonplaces of the gospel, and are explicitly made known in the Bible and believed by all evangelical Christians.

5. Those who have faith in Christ are justified. Faith appropriates all that Christ is and has done for man. A man comes to have faith in Christ through the influence and working of the Holy Ghost. This appropriating faith is the condition of justification which is an act of God' s free grace, and includes among other blessings the pardon of sin, and acceptance by the heavenly Father. The ground of justification is not in the sinner, for God "justifies the ungodly," but in Christ it is for his sake the believer is justified, nor is this divine act an empty act in the divine mind. It, like condemnation on the ground of guilt, takes place there, but it is also experienced in the believer's soul. It becomes a conscious possession. As one of the most profound of modern theologians has put it, the particular man having faith in Christ "is placed in *possession* and *enjoyment* of divine forgiveness, or in a *state of justification* not merely by a divine sentence, but also by a divine act."

6. Out of this new restored relation to God by faith in Christ, springs the new life, the holiness without which no one shall see the Lord. "This believing appropriation of the *crucified* Savior," says Martensen, "brings with it actual fellowship of life with the *risen* Savior in his Church, a fellowship in which the believer possesses the righteousness of Christ, not only outwardly, but inwardly, as the creative principle for the development of life. Christ dwells in the heart of man by faith, for faith is itself the living bond, the secret point of union between Christ and the individual soul." In this way we become living branches of the living Vine. Christ dwells in us, the *unio mystica* is experienced. Thenceforth, we work out our own salvation with fear and trembling God working within us to will and to do his own good pleasure.

Such seems to me a brief outline of the theology and philosophy of the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith, as revealed in Holy Scripture and believed in, in all ages, by the Holy Catholic Evangelical Church.

Edinburgh, Scotland. WILLIAM ADAMSON.

THE MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE.*

DURING the past four months I have been a man of many moods. At times my soul has been aglow with enthusiasm over the splendid opportunity which has been thrust before me by action of the Board of Trustees. At other times I have been dazed and bewildered as I have tried in vain to solve problems of the divine Providence which have arisen in connection with this call. Again, I have sat uneasily in my chair—scarcely able to hold in check the reins of action—as I have cast my eye ahead and seen the sphere in which my spirit is henceforth to move. Anon, my heart has leaned back toward the chapel in St. Louis and toward as loyal a congregation as ever gathered about a pastor; and I have wondered how I dared forsake such a people and such possibilities. At times I have looked at myself and I have said, "How comes it that thou, who belongest to the least of the tribes of Israel and who art the least in thy father's house—how is it that *thou* art chosen to head the educational work of thy Israel in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado?" At other times, I have looked up into the heavens and have beheld the glory of the great God; I have seen his Almightiness, I have been impressed with his Wisdom, I have realized that the Church and her institutions are the apple of his eye, the very body of his Son, and I have been filled with unutterable peace as I have reflected, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." There have been many times when I have been sentimental. I have lifted my pen from my correspondence and have heard the tramp, tramp of the young people as they have filed in and out of the recitation rooms; I have listened to the muffled murmur of the voices of teachers and students as the work of education went on, and, standing erect in soul, I have said, "Here a man may do his manliest, his most fruitful, his most permanent work. God be praised that I may share in it!"

* Inaugural at Missouri Valley College, June 12, 1890.

The President* of the Board of Trustees has given me a serious and comprehensive charge. In so doing he has spoken as the mouth-piece of the Church, which is proprietor, and of the Board of Trustees, which is custodian, of our noble institution. I am mindful that he has laid upon me a tremendous responsibility. As a response to his authoritative commission, I shall speak of THE MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE. By outlining briefly this mission, I hope to be able to exhibit my conception of the objects of the institution over which I am called to preside, and thereby to assure you of the ends which it shall be my endeavor to attain.

Not of education, nor of schools in general; not of the high school, nor of the university; but of the *College* would I speak. Not of the college founded by individual enterprise, or by State authority; but of the college that is founded by the Christian Church and for the purpose of serving the cause of Christianity—of this would I speak.

I.—The Mission of the Christian College as learned from its *origin.*

The college, as to its origin, is not a secular institution. It is the child of the Church, so that, in the very highest sense we may say, the "Church is the mother of learning."

As far back as the days of Abraham systematic instruction had its place among the people of God. The Jewish Church in the times of Moses had crude schools for the training of the young in the knowledge of the God—Theology being the only "ology" that they knew—and very little of that. We read of the same thing in the days of Ezra. One of the brightest visions that can come before the imagination of a boy is that of the Nazarene lad of twelve years, sitting in the midst of the doctors in the Rabbinical school at Jerusalem, "hearing them and asking them questions." Paul was educated under the great religious professor, Gamaliel; and afterward himself was professor of theology for two years "in the school of Tyrannus," at Ephesus. Apollos got the bulk of his literary training under Philo in the schools at Alexandria, but received the finishing touches under Priscilla and Aquila, who "expounded unto him the way of God more carefully" at Ephesus.

* The Rev. E. D. Pearson, D.D.

For the most the Church trained her own preachers in apostolic times; but in the succeeding centuries, when the kingdom of God spread so rapidly, the Church in her ministry felt the power of the secular schools of Greece and Rome. In the main this was not to her advantage, as it gave a pagan philosophical coloring to the doctrines of Scripture, which is not entirely effaced to this day. Fortunately, however, for the Church, by the barbaric invasion in the sixth century, the schools of the Roman Empire, which had kept alive the traditions of pagan education, were almost entirely swept away. The Church, having lost none of her zeal for the education of her clergy, enlarged the scope of her cathedral schools. By the twefth century these cathedral schools had grown into universities at Paris, at Bologna, and at Oxford, and Cambridge. The number and sphere of these universities have grown from that time till now, and during all these centuries the Church has never allowed them to slip from her grasp. They have been founded in her interests, manned by her scholars, and have wrought their results chiefly upon her membership.

The lesson which is taught us as we reflect upon the origin of the Christian College then is this: *Its mission is to train preachers for the important service which they are to render in the world as ambassadors of Jesus Christ.* The critical measure of the work that any college does is then to be made primarily with reference to its devotion to the preparation of young men for the holy ministry. If this is not kept continually in the foreground; if special provision, in the selection of the faculty and in the outlining of the course of study, is not made with reference to this class of students, then the Christian College is failing of the grand end of its foundation; it is no more a *Christian* College; it has vacated its calling, become secularized.

II.—The Mission of the Christian College as learned from its *History*.

When the university took definite shape in the twelfth century, it had but two faculties—medicine and arts, the latter course being that of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the "*trivium*;" and arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy, the "*quadrivium*." Afterward there were four faculties—medicine, arts, law, and theology. Until the fourteenth century the Dominican monks claimed the sole right to teach theology; hence the young preachers got their arts at the university and their theology at the monastery. Thus we see the scope of the Church school widening. It expands its educational work so as, not only to prepare its clergy to preach, but to prepare its members to practice medicine and law, and to take places in the ranks of refined society.

In the thirteenth century there was another movement forward in these schools, and here we first find our word "*College*." Its original usage was somewhat different from its present meaning. In connection with the university of Bologna, in the interests of poor young men, houses were established, called "colleges," in which they might live almost or quite gratuitously during their course at the university. The word "*College*," therefore, is intimately associated with the idea of benevolence in education. The first college was founded in February, 1256, by Zoen, bishop of Avignon, and was designed to support eight students from the province of Avignon, under the supervision of three canons of the Church who were supported by the university. In 1326 the Spanish College was founded for twenty-four students and two chaplains. Other colleges speedily followed. Finally, these became recognized as essential parts of the university and were co-extensive, so that every member of the university had to attach himself to a college, and *vice versa*. Thus, at present, the university is really nothing more nor less than a coporation of colleges.

We learn, then, from this rapid historical sketch, two things concerning the college which it would be unwise ever to overlook.

(1) The purpose of the college is essentially *eleemosynary*. It is intended to be a blessing to the poor. Its mission is to help poor young men to obtain an education. This idea is in part fulfilled by the endowment of an institution so as to support the faculty without dependence upon tuition. However this end can not be fully attained without *dormitories* in which students of small means may be warmed and fed at small cost while in attendance at college. I sincerely hope the day is not far distant when such conveniences may be supplied by that same generous people who founded our magnificent college.

(2) The *college* is identified with a *single faculty*, either arts, medicine, law, or theology. Hence, we may have a college of arts, a college of medicine, a college of law, or a college of theology. Two or more of these colleges constitute a university.

Ours is a college of *Arts*, a school of history and literature, a school of philosophy and mathematics, a school of science and of languages. It is the college of colleges, that without which the others can not be realized in the highest sense, the fundamental establishment in the series which makes man complete for any good work. The school of medicine never does its best work except upon the foundation of a classical education. The terminology of medicine is chiefly Latin and Greek in derivation; the substances used as remedies are drawn from the field of Natural Science; the judgment of the practitioner needs the discipline of a mathematical training for analysis and the breadth of philosophical study for generalization. He must know mind as well as body, for there is interaction between them and every diagnosis will be faulty which does not take knowledge of this fact. A similar process of reasoning may be applied to the Science of Law and to the Science of Theology. No man can attain his best in any profession except upon the basis of a classical education.

It is a very common saying that the preachers of the present day must be thoroughly educated in order to meet the demands of the hour. The same is true of physicians and lawyers. The time has come when men may not dare to assume the functions of any of the learned professions unless their assumptions are founded upon a scholastic training. The world is already expressing its contempt of unfitness in its most emphatic way—that is, by *slang*. When it would utter its disapproval of an incompetent lawyer, it calls him a "shyster," and similarly with reference to a physician, it calls him a "quack." Our young men, who are seeking a short cut to the learned professions, are doing it at their own peril. The law of sacrifice and of patient endeavor holds here, as everywhere else in the domain of the natural world. No man may get to the heaven of his professional ambition on "flowery beds of ease." He must fight if he would win. Broad is the road and wide the gate which leadeth to professional failure, and many go in thereat. Narrow the road and strait the gate which leadeth to professional success, and few there be that find it. The rigid discipline, the full regimen of study, the comprehensive training of the college student, is the need of needs for the student of medicine, law, or theology.

Our college of arts, therefore, stands at the gateway of life—it

is the gateway. Through it, or through some equivalent for it, every man must pass who would do well his part in life. Blessed is the man who does his preparatory work at the beginning of life, and needs not to be embarrassed with it as he journeys by the way.

III. The mission of the Christian college as learned from its *course of study*.

The mediæval college of arts has given place to the modern college of arts. We still have the "*trivium*" (grammar, logic, and rhetoric), and the "*quadrivium*" (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy), but these belong almost entirely to the preparatory school. The science of language has vastly expanded. The same is true of the science of mathematics. That which was formerly in the body of the college course of study is now in its preparatory course of study. The world moves—so does the college. The demands of a liberal education are continually increasing—the college is raising the tone and broadening the sphere of its work in order to meet this wise demand of advancing civilization. The refinements of industry and professional life make a more marked specialization a necessity for success. The college makes a sweep of the whole horizon of being, ideas, and instrumentalities, in order that a young man may first have a comprehensive view before he makes choice of his specialty.

1. The college gives a liberal course in *philosophy*. The student is taught to look at mind, its constitution, laws, and possibilities; he is taught to look at the conduct of moral beings—to interpret its principles, and enforce its inspiratives in harmony with reason and righteousness; he is taught to look squarely at the subtle conditions of things themselves, to consider being, space, and time, not as they appear, but as they really are; he is taught to interpret all things in harmony with the three great ultimate ideas of reason—the *true*, the *beautiful*, and the *good*. Thus, what once was complex, mysterious, heterogeneous, falls into a grand symmetry, and the mind is prepared to believe that back of all this wondrous and manifold creation there is one living and true God, its Author and Sovereign.

Psychology, logic, ethics, æsthetics, metaphysics, and the philosophy of religion: these are the technical names which we now use to designate the six branches of philosophical science. These are all taught. The result is a wholesome corrective of that su-

perficial skepticism of which we find so much among the young men of our day. It would effectually undermine the same sort of foolish doubt which is found in some of the *older* men of the day, if they could have a course under some able professor of philosophy.

It is unfortunate that most of our Western colleges are so limited in the means of support that they are compelled to overlook altogether or to intrust to incompetent hands this important branch of college instruction. I am rejoiced in this, that I have been called to preside over an institution whose resources are so abundant that we dare project large things and undertake thoroughness in every department of our work.

2. The college gives a liberal course in "*mathematics.*" These are the "*Exact* sciences." Their forms are determined with the utmost precision in accord with the demands of an unyielding logic. The mind must be clear and positive in its judgments, simple and comprehensive in its definitions, lucid in its grasp of principles, and methodical in their applications, or it can never make headway in the mathematical sciences. On the other hand, if the mind is either vague or conceited, there is no medicine so good as a few years in trigonometry, algebra, analytical geometry, differential and integral calculus, and mathematical astronomy.

3. The college gives a liberal course in the *physical sciences.* It looks at the facts of nature, studies their modes and conditions, determines the laws of their relations and activities, classifies them according to species and genera.

I say, "Physical science *looks at* the facts of nature." Once the college student simply *imagined* these facts, but the present method is for the teacher to bring the objects themselves under his eye in an illustrative way and from them to induce their laws and relations. The museum and laboratory are, therefore, indispensable features of college furnishings, they are a part of the faculty. Such things are very expensive, but no less necessary on that account. The college which does not provide them is unavoidably second-rate. The professor who does not avail himself of them, who is not inventive and ambitious to secure them, is under present conditions an inefficient teacher. Chemistry, physics, mineralogy, botany, zoology, geology, and astronomy must all be taught through the senses. The appeal is primarily to the reason, but the eye and the ear must become auxiliary.

4. The college gives a liberal course in *languages:* Latin, Greek, German, French, Anglo-Saxon, English.

A man must not only understand the nature of things, the principles of their classifications, and the stern laws of reasoning, but he must have the vehicles of expression. Of what use is a clear thought if the mind have not the means of its expression? True, we are not to express ourselves in Latin or Greek, nor even in German or French; yet in the study of these languages we learn our own language most effectually. All the time we are studying Latin and Greek we are studying the very roots of our own language; and we are mastering our own tongue in the effort to clothe the thoughts of Cæsar and Virgil, of Xenophon and Homer, in words of our own. It is by making use of our language in order to interpret another's thought that we become its master and that we can interpret our own thought without confusion or hesitation.

The preacher is an expositor of words. His mission is to take the thought of Scripture and after having it inwrought into the texture of his own mind, thence to throw it out red-hot upon the minds of others. In order to be successful, he must be a master of language. To him especially is the study of the languages, ancient and modern, exceedingly essential. As we learned from the origin and history of the college, so we learn again from its curriculum, that its mission, especially to the Church, is through its ministry.

I have shown the mission of the Christian college to be to the Church in the training of its preachers, in the aiding of its poor to an education, and in the discipline of its rising membership in the classical arts. Its mission is expansive. *Teaching* is the business, not of preachers only, but of men of all professions. The public school is an institution of the day. It was conceived in the Christian college. "There is no law of evolution by which the common school grows up into the college, for, as an historical fact, the college is first and gives birth to the common school. It is not by the lower education of the many that we come to have the higher education of the few, but the exact converse of this is the universal rule. The education of the many is always dependent upon the education of the few."*

* Hickok: *Moral Science*, p. 167.

In these public schools there are thousands of teachers. The mission of the college is to them as to its own heirs. They have entered the profession which the college has made. They should partake of the good things which are spread upon the parental board. At present, through a spirit of false economy, boards of control of district schools employ teachers of low grade; but the day is coming speedily when such things will belong to the past. The standard is rising all the time, and soon the college will be the only source of supply to the common schools. God speed the day! There is also a new occupation among Church members—*Sunday-school teaching*. The Church is calling loudly for better trained and better furnished teachers. The Church suffers from much incompetency at present, but it does it of necessity. Efforts are already being made to improve the quality of Sunday-school teaching, but the agency which is certain to surpass all others in effecting this much-desired result is the Christian college, especially when it gives due regard to the subject of biblical instruction. The students of our college, a few years hence, will make a marked impression upon our congregations in this particular.

In addition to the regular course of literary study, which involves Jewish and Christian history, one hour is devoted each week by all the classes to direct biblical study, involving Old and New Testament history, the Life of Christ, the Life of Paul, the Evidences of Christianity, sacred poetry and prophecy. So that, by the time of graduation, every student will be entirely competent to teach in the Sunday-school in a manner that will do his Church credit.

The Christian college does not ignore the State. The Church's Rule of Faith and Practice teaches that "the powers that be are ordained of God," that the ruler is "a minister of God to thee for good," and that every soul should be "in subjection to the higher powers." Hence, by studies in civil government, political economy, history, and ethics every student is prepared to perform well his part as a citizen of the State. In the homes of the country patriotism is kindled as a sentiment; in the colleges it is inflamed with rational intelligence. No grander patriots have ever risen than those who sprang from our seats of learning in the critical days of the nation.

I have unfolded my conception of the mission of the Christian college, and by so doing I have told you what I expect to accomplish in this place. You will judge my undertaking by these facts, and you will judge my work in the future by what I have this day declared. What I do shall be done for the Church of Jesus Christ, and it shall be done only in the sufficiency which he will graciously allow. Every day we shall read his word, every day we shall court his favor, and every day we shall strive to make some advancement toward the realization of his kingdom in the earth.

W. H. BLACK.

NEW TESTAMENT COMMUNISM.

THE aim of this paper is not to discuss Communism in general, or to consider the merits or demerits of this or that ancient or modern communistic scheme. Dissatisfied mankind in all ages of the world has been devising schemes of many sorts for the betterment of society; and the idea of a community of goods has been a favorite one from very early times, and has found advocates in almost every generation. Certain monastic orders among the Buddhists very anciently held to a rude sort of communism, in which they renounced marriage and property in order to reach a certain ideal of sanctity. In the early history of Greece some of the followers of Pythagoras professed to practice a community of goods. Plato, in his "Republic," advocates communism as the true theory of the state. He divides society into three classes, and allows but one class, the lowest, to hold property of any kind. The higher classes, the *archontes* and the warriors, hold every thing in common for the benefit of the state.

Among the Jews there were two sects, the Essenes and the Theraputæ, neither of which, however, is mentioned in the New Testament, who partially practiced communism. And after the advent of Christianity, all along the earlier centuries of the Church's history, there were various developments of a communistic tendency in the establishment of communities of anchorets and monks; and in later years, in France, in Germany, in England, and in America, there has arisen a succession of agitators and reformers who have promulgated communistic doctrines and formed communistic sects. The limits of this paper forbid any specific mention of these. None of them have ever shown any practicability or attained any success except in a few instances of small communities controlled by strong religious principle. Many of them have been nothing but the wild and baseless dreams of ambitious and selfish schemers. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss these, but to find out, if possible, what that communism was which was practiced in the early Church in Jerusalem;

to discover its purpose and its governing principles, and then to inquire, briefly, what application of those principles may be made to the life of to-day. That there was a sort of communism practiced for a time in the early Church, is quite clear. In Acts ii. 44, 45, we are told that "all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, as every man had need."

In Acts iv. 32, 34, 35, we are told that "the multitude that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common. Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostle's feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need."

The death of Ananias and Sapphira recorded in Acts v. 1–11, also grew out of events connected with this communistic form of Church life. With these passages of Scripture before us, let us seek for:

I. The leading facts concerning New Testament Communism. Three facts stand out clearly:

1. The arrangement was purely *voluntary*. So far as we know, there was no law, written or unwritten, requiring of them this mode of life. It is true Christ had said to the rich young man, "Go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor" (Matt. xix. 21); and, on another occasion, "Sell that ye have and give alms" (Luke xii. 33); but these words can not by any fair interpretation be made to show that the Savior had in view for his disciples a communistic mode of life. That the practice among the early disciples was purely voluntary, and that every man had the privilege of putting his property into the common fund or of withholding it, of putting a part in, or all, is shown by Peter's words to Ananias (Acts v. 4), "While it remained was it not thine own? and after it was sold was it not in thine own power?" The sin of Ananias was not in putting in a part instead of the whole, but in putting in a part while *pretending* to put in the whole. It was not the sin of withholding, but the sin of hypocrisy and deception. In this arrangement there was no compulsion brought to bear upon any man. True, there must have been a mutual agreement among

the disciples in reference to the plan, but all the offerings to the common fund were the honest, voluntary offerings of devout, believing hearts.

2. The arrangement was purely *local*. It was confined, so far as we know, to the Church in Jerusalem. We never hear of it outside of Jerusalem. Poverty seems always to have been a marked characteristic of the Church in Jerusalem. Later, we read of the disciples in Antioch sending "relief to the brethren in Judea" (Acts xi. 29, 30); and that it was sent to Jerusalem by the hands of Paul and Barnabas. (Acts xii. 25.) And years after this when Paul was writing to the Church in Rome, he said: "But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." (Romans xv. 25, 26.) But even if the saints in Jerusalem were, as a rule, poorer than those in other cities, if there had been any thing in the law of the Church which demanded a community of goods among Christians that law would have been recognized in other places as well as at Jerusalem. But as we hear not a syllable of it in connection with any other place, we must conclude that the arrangement was merely incidental and local, growing out of unique conditions in Jerusalem. And there are those, among them Hinds in his "Early Christianity," who go further and say that even in Jerusalem it was confined to those who were engaged in the ministry, including the female catechists, or deaconesses, who were called "widows." This view, however, is hardly tenable. But if it were true, it is clear that the scheme was not one, as some have charged, by which the apostles were enriched. At least, we see Peter and John forced to say to a lame beggar, "Silver and gold have we none." (Ch. iii. 6.)

3. The arrangement was purely *temporary*. After the mention which is made of it in connection with the first days and months of the Church's history we hear no more of it. It evidently ceased to exist. The last mention of any thing like it is in Acts vi. 1, where reference is made to a "daily ministration" to the "widows" of the Church. It may have gone into disuse gradually as the peculiar conditions which gave rise to it gradually passed away. Of these peculiar conditions I shall have more to say presently. The Church continued to care for its poor, but communism

as a method of Church life was discontinued, not as a result of apostasy from original principles, but because the original conditions in a measure passed away. If such a thing were an essential part of Church life, as has been claimed by some, would it not have been continued by the apostles? If it had been continued by the apostles, would there not have been some mention of it in their writings? But in fact, we see not a word about it in all their subsequent writings, hence we conclude that it was not considered an essential and permanent mode of life, but only a matter of temporary expediency. On the other hand, we see in all their subsequent writings a constant recognition of the distinction of rich and poor, and a constant appeal to those who had this world's goods to minister to those who had not. Paul evidently did not recognize the existence of any such institution as communism. "Charge them that are rich in this world," said he to Timothy, "that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18.) Writing to the Ephesians, he said: "Let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." (Eph. iv. 28.) Writing to the Corinthians he gives very explicit directions and very earnest exhortations concerning "the collection for the saints." (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; 2 Cor. chapters viii. and ix.) All this, and much more which might be adduced, is utterly inconsistent with the idea of an existing community of goods, hence we infer that the communistic mode of life had ceased to exist in the Church.

These three facts then seem to be established, that such communism as did exist in the early Church was voluntary, local, and temporary. Let us now consider:

II. The purpose and character of this arrangement.

Why were those early Christians led to adopt such a plan? The answer to this is to be found mainly in the peculiar condition of the Church in Jerusalem at that time. Let us take a look at the circumstances. The Christian disciples had suddenly grown from a feeble few to a vast multitude. Three thousand had been added on the day of Pentecost, and soon after the number of the

men had been increased to five thousand. (Acts iv. 4). Many of these new converts were foreign Jews and proselytes who had come to the city to attend the feast of Pentecost. They were there from every part of the empire, and from every point of the compass. (See Acts ii. 9–11). Coming to Jerusalem simply to attend the feast, many of them had doubtless come prepared for only a short stay, but after they were converted to the new faith it became necessary for them to remain longer under the instruction of the apostles. We can easily see that, not being prepared for such an emergency, many of them would come to need assistance. Again, some of the new converts were doubtless native Jews, who through the enmity of the rulers and higher classes would be thrown out of their former means of livelihood, and would have no one to look to for help except their Christian brethren. And while there were some persons of property among the converts, the masses of them were most probably poor people. Under these circumstances the disciples who had property felt drawn to help those who were in need. This view of the circumstances which led to the arrangement, helps us to get at the purpose of the arrangement. This purpose was simply to provide some form of relief for their needy brethren. That this was the purpose is shown further by the fact that this was the very thing accomplished. "Neither was there any among them that lacked" (iv. 34). "Distribution was made unto every man according as he had need" (iv. 35).

This knowledge of the purpose of the arrangement helps us to a conclusion as to the character of it. As we have seen, the disciples were numerous. Many were poor, and the demands were great. Large gifts were needed. To meet these large demands the wealthier sold their property and placed the proceeds at the disposal of the apostles for the benefit of the needy, only reserving for themselves equal rights with the others in the use of it. There was no such thing as equal distribution of ownership of property. There was simply the establishment of a common fund, to be drawn upon as the necessities of each brother demanded. They were all "of one heart and of one soul," and they were willing for the time to have but one purse. This, then, was the simple character and purpose of New Testament communism: a fund, created by the benevolence of the wealthier

members of the Church, which was to be used in common by every member, so that none might lack for the supply of his necessary wants. It furnishes neither example nor argument for the wild extravagancies of many modern Communists; for it differs from their schemes both in form and in spirit. We come now to consider:

III. The principles governing this arrangement.

We have seen that their communistic mode of life was a method voluntarily adopted to accomplish a specific purpose—viz., the relief of the brethren in an emergency. And it does not require a prolonged examination to see that the principles by which they were governed were the simple principles of self-sacrifice and beneficence. They were warm in their first love for Christ and his people, and the very sight of brethren around them in need touched their hearts to such a degree that they were willing to share their own possessions with the needy even to the point of self-sacrifice. They were compelled by no specific commandment, but they were impelled by that highest of all laws, the law of love. The particular form of charity which they adopted in their obedience to this law of love was not essential. The essential thing was that "distribution" might be "made to every man according as he had need." And in every age this is one of the ends at which the Church is to aim—viz., the relief of destitution around us. Jesus said: "The poor you have with you always." And in solving the problem of their relief the same law by which those early disciples were controlled is the law by which we must be controlled. This law, the law of love, holds good in every age and in every clime. The methods of its expression may differ, the manner in which obedience to it is manifested may vary, but the law is the same all the time and everywhere. God does not require this or that particular form of charity, but he does require that in some form there be exhibited the spirit of self-sacrifice and of liberality to the needy.

What, then, is the lesson of this New Testament Communism? It is simply the lesson of consecrated money. It was "the prices of the things that were sold" (iv. 34), it was their "money" (iv. 37), which they brought and laid at the apostles' feet, and thus consecrated to the Lord. Among all the needs of the Church to-day, not one, it seems to me, is more pressing than the need of

consecrated money. We magnify the ministry of preaching, the ministry of prayer, and the ministry of praise; let us not neglect the ministry of giving. The highest type of consecration is "purse-and-all" (personal) consecration. Think of the power of money in every sphere of human activity. In the commercial, industrial, intellectual, and political world not a wheel turns without it. Back of steam, electricity, and even of learning and of law, is money. And even in the kingdom of God it has a value and a power. Sanctified money is one of the mightiest of forces in the promotion of happiness, of righteousness, and of truth. Think of its power not only in relieving the physical necessities of God's poor, but also in relieving their spiritual necessities through the propagation of the truth we love. Suppose the wealth of the church in America were consecrated to God, free to be drawn upon as the necessities of his poor and his cause demanded. What a reconstruction of society would be wrought, what a mighty advance would be made in all that concerns the welfare of men! The wealth of the United States is said to be sixty billions of dollars. Of this, it is estimated that twelve billions are in the hands of evangelical Church members. And yet the Church lives on with all this hoarded wealth, while the poor hunger and souls perish. Here and there a few devoted hearts, like Barnabas of old, hold their all subservient to the will of God and the claims of his cause, but the multitudes in the Church are like Ananias and Sapphira, who, while professing to lay all on the altar, are yet "keeping back a part," and that a very large part, for themselves. And in these closing lines, I would plead, not for the restoration of communism as a method of Church life, as a system of social organization, but for resubmission to the principles which governed those early disciples, the principles of self-denial and of whole-hearted liberality. And I plead for this, not merely because of the good to others which may thus be wrought, but because of the good to ourselves which will come as the reflex influence of this spirit. In the early Church a perfect flood of spiritual blessing accompanied their obedience to this law of love. "And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the Church daily such as

were being saved" (ii. 46, 47). "And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all" (iv. 33). And whenever we, like those early disciples, submit ourselves to the law of love, and consecrate our all to God, we, too, shall enjoy the same spiritual prosperity and power. "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." (Mal. iii. 10.)

W. B. PRESTON.

SOME PHASES OF AGNOSTICISM.

In times gone by in countries of the highest ancient civilization, there were gods in plenty, the trouble being to find *a* God. It is a notable fact that the probabilities indicate that all these peoples were originally monotheistic, the idea of plurality of gods being the product of a later period, and of conditions indicating a depravation, rather than elevation of the higher instincts of our nature. Unquestionably this was the case in Egypt, as is shown by the remains of her literature now being utilized by the labors of the successors of Champollion to the extent that we have the means of accurately tracing the original ideas of this people, as well as the stages by which the lower theory was gradually introduced into their religious system.

To this age belongs the doubtful credit of having a large representation of the best thinkers and most accomplished masters of the sciences, which they have made their specialties, who are the advocates of the theory, that there is no God, or its equivalent; that if there is a God we can not know it, or have any rational assurance of the fact. That which we can not know or have any rational assurance of is to us nil; for us it has no existence at all, be the fact behind what we know as it may.

To all this philosophy we desire to enter a most emphatic dissent, and give some reasons for that dissent. To the man who has kept himself familiar with the writings of the masters of thought of the present day, such as Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, and their school on the part of the agnostic view, and Janet, Mivart, Martineau and their compeers, who represent perhaps with most ability the theistic view, there will be found nothing new in what is here presented. The field has been too thoroughly gone over by these men for any adventurer in philosophy to hope to find any thing fresh, or that has not been said already. But to the younger student, I may be able to give some thoughts that may help him to a knowledge of the elementary arguments in reply to the assaults, now so popular, on all religion, coming on the platform

through the press, and even in the school-room, from what is designated as the "scientific school."

The problem is, whether the universe as we see it is the result of blind but inherent forces in matter as it gradually, in the process of limitless ages of past time, worked itself into its present state of order and regular action, which it is the delight of the scientists to study. In ascertaining the plan of its movements are we merely finding out the blind laws of nature, merely tracing the order of antecedents and sequences? The scientist assumes what is the fact, that in nature, in all the fields of material activity there is a definite set of arrangements from which certain sequences invariably follow, and the work of science is to acquire a definite knowledge of these relations and so get at the secret of the plan.

But does not this of necessity involve the existence of a planner, the work of mind? We assume it does. We take a clock, examine its adjustments, and thus trace back along the line of adaptations step by step, the thought of the original inventor. This is but the reverse process to that of invention, but lower in degree, because it is easier to follow the thought back along defined lines, than to originate it, and push it forward into fact.

The work of the scientist then is but this reverse process in the study of the laws of the universe. He sees how the machinery of the universe works, and step by step gets back to the original conception, at least in the sections which he is able to master. As he finds order, plan, definite relations all serving fixed ends, he assumes that a like law pervades all the rest, though he may not as yet understand it.

If this reverse process is the action of mind, a thing that intellect is alone competent to do, it follows inevitably that the original conception is the work of a still higher order of mind, capable of not only the conception, but also able to put it into fact, and make it do the work of the conceiver.

It is said, however, that here we reason on the basis of our own experience of things made, and this can have no application to things in the realm of nature of which we have no such experience. The answer is, that wherever we find definite conception worked out on a definite plan to a preconceived result, we know it was the work of mind, whether we ever had any previous experience of

that particular work or not. In fact we are compelled by the laws of thought so to conclude, and therefore, when we find the facts the inevitable truth to us is that mind conceived them. This, by the law of our knowledge, is truth to *us*, whether the absolute truth or not; and whatever is true to us is the point at which we must rest if we deal rationally with the question. Possibilities of error are not to be taken into the account, for mere speculative possibilities can never furnish the basis for a rational conclusion.

It is impossible to enumerate the evidences of the plan, order, arrangement, purpose, in the universe around us, or more than glance at a few in an article of this character. They will be found in the works referred to on the theistic side of the argument. I give a few that will serve to bring out the thought by apt illustration. Take the system of the heavens. The stars move along their appointed pathways with more regularity than our railroad trains follow their iron paths. The train, however skillfully handled, will sometimes run off the track. Then great bodies have their line of march so accurately marked that their place in the infinite spaces can be calculated with certainty at any minute a thousand years hence, and at the appointed moment the star will walk into its place to verify the calculation of the astronomer. Its schedule time is never missed. It comes always to time, and never misses the connection. A failure would disarrange all the movements of the bodies of the system. The comet that flies with such astonishing speed, and in the most eccentric orbit, will pass before the glass of the astronomer a thousand years from now in its wild race along its appointed trackway, on schedule time.

The railroad train that does this for a series of years is unquestionably directed by skillful hands, guided by minds with capacity to master all the complexities of arrangement that tends to produce the desired result. Can we assume that mind is not behind and managing the greater complexity involved to produce the result in the case of the stars? If so, does it not require that we shall blindfold our reasons, and refuse to think on this problem, as we do in all other cases, in order to reach such a result? In the light of this simple illustration, of which the universe is full, has not the theist clearly made out, what our lawyers would call a *prima facie* case for a God; which means, a case proven till the contrary be shown by a preponderance of proof. Thus the burden

of the proof is on the agnostic. He must meet the case made out and the question is, Can he do it? Has he done it?

He assumes that with matter and force all the work of nature can be accounted for. It may be conceded, that with matter and force, as at present arranged, with the relations of parts all accurately adjusted the work would follow. But from all we know of these two elements, after the keenest analysis of science, what power has yet been found that gives them capacity to plan, order, arrange, and have a preconception definite of a future result, either simple or complex? Matter is defined axiomatically as inert. If at rest it would remain forever in place, if put in motion it would go on forever, until stopped by a superior power of some kind. It can neither originate movement nor stop it when it is once originated. It would be a strain on reason too strong to assert that such a substance could by possibility either bring itself into existence, or furnish any element toward a constructive plan of things such as we see in nature. It is but the mere material to be used by a constructive intelligent agency in effectuating its designs.

But force, that which gives movement, is the element relied on to do the work. But in order to work to accomplish an end, you must have more than force under any fair conception of what force is. Force has no directive power. Powder has force latent in it, that is developed into immense explosive power by heat, but we might explode all the powder now in the world, and all that we could make throughout eternity, and we would forever fail to start a planet, even ready prepared for the start, on a definite track at a rate that would never slack; and all conceivable eternities would fail us to produce the regulated system of the universe by any such process. But put a mind to work, let the gun-barrel be prepared under intelligence, and sighted by a trained mind and hand, and the powder then exploded behind a ball, and it hits the "bull's-eye," at a hundred paces. If it misses, the failure is precisely in proportion to the want of skill in the mind and hand that uses it. Inevitably it is totally dependent on the mind using it for all directive power, by which a certain result can be had. No mathematician exists who can calculate the precise line of direction that would result from the explosion of a dozen kegs of powder, in contact with a mass of bricks, however accurately they had been adjusted. What of calculation could be made would be the result

of the perfection of adjustment by the mind and hand arranging the bricks, in order to have the force so applied as to give motion in a certain direction.

With matter and force alone it is certain we have no sufficient basis on which to build a theory of constructive power, no capacity to work out complex and regulated movements to a desired result. The scientist who works out his theory of the universal plan, with only matter and force as the elements for the grand results we see, has assumed that for force which no observation or reason has ever been able to find in it, a power to do the work of a true cause, that is, a power to compel things to be *this* and not *something* else, to work in this way and not the opposite, that is the power to chose between two alternatives. This power belongs alone, as far as we know, or ever can know, to mind, a personal being. And whatever possibilities there may be in fancy to the contrary, they are but empty possibilities, furnishing no basis for reasoning, no ground on which a rational conclusion can be established.

But to meet all difficulties, the theory of evolution has been conceived and worked out with a painstaking skill in forms so perfect that it seemed for a while destined to take its place as accredited science. But we are compelled to say, with Virchow, that it is as yet unproven and so it is likely to remain. According to this theory, original matter had in it the germ or germs from which all living things as we see them were ultimately evolved. Matter under this view is assumed to be endowed with inherent germs of life. It was capable of developing all living forms and would in time inevitably give the organic and inorganic universe as we now see it, and will, as we suppose, continue to add by the same gradual process new forms of life, as yet undreamed of in our philosophy.

The radical error that underlies this theory, is that it fails to give us any account of origins. Whence came matter with its vast endowment of potentialities? Is it eternal, self-existent, or did it have a beginning? In other words this theory only gives us an account of processes and growth. It ignores many stubborn facts that the theory will not solve. For instance, in all the living species of animals, their continuance by propagation depends on the conjoint action of male and female of the species.

Take for example the chicken or any fowl, the product of the egg from a hen, impregnated by a male germ. How, under the theory of evolution, you get the necessary pair of chickens for the starting of the species I am unable to see. But the difficulty grows when we see that as soon as the necessary pair is evolved, the process ceases, and propagation goes on henceforward and forever by the action of the two sexes alone upon the principle on which science does its work, that observed *facts* must be the basis on which all the conclusions must rest. I can not see any fact on which it can be assumed that any living creature was ever produced, except by an original creation of an original pair, and then the regular process of propagation for the continuance of the species.

It is a further part of the general theory of this branch of the evolutionary system, that organ and function were the results of conditions demanding them. How the sexual organs could have ever found a demand, in advance of sexuality already completed I am totally unable to see. The sexual feeling is inherent in the organism, without it, it would never exist; and so with every organ of the living being.

The theory of evolution as expounded by Spencer and his class assumes that every thing is linked in an iron chain of necessity. Man, and each individual but the resultant of all the past of his ancestors, to which will be added the accretions of his own individual experiences, these to be transmitted in like manner to descendants *ad infinitum*. On this basis is built the anticipation of a philosophic millennium in the process of the ages, when every man will enjoy all he wants, but will never infringe on the rights of others. The idea is of continual advance on toward perfection. Alas! the past of the world's history dispels the golden dream, and gives us but the record of the life of people who have risen to a climacteric period, stood for a time, and then step by step, have trod the downward road to wreck and ruin.

A word as to the notion, that each individual man is but a resultant of the past as modified by his own environment. On this theory it is impossible to account for the great reformers and the men of genius who have turned the stream of human progress and thought into new channels—Moses, Jesus, and the men whose lives have made epochs in the world's history. How was it that

they were not like others born under similar conditions, in the same year and age? What was there in the condition of Moses' birth, the son of a Jewish bondwoman, that tended to make him the leader and lawgiver he was? What (speaking from the point of view of the philosopher) in the conditions surrounding Jesus, the son of a Jewish peasant, a carpenter's son—and himself a carpenter—that made him alone of all the ages without a peer, the man who poured into the life of humanity a tide of spiritual force that continues to run with unabated power after over eighteen hundred years through the life of the world? How is it that among the Jewish bondsmen no man like Moses was born—and of all the peasants and carpenters' sons born in the year one, only one Jesus was produced for the world's redemption to a higher life? Whence comes Homer, Shakespeare, Milton, and Dante, who have sung for the world songs immortal? Are all such cases breaks in the everlasting evolutionary chain? The whole theory breaks down when such things are considered. In truth it fails to account for the facts in so many instances, only a few of which I have given, that we can never fear seriously its adoption into an accredited system of the science of the world.

After all, the Christian thinker may rest easy in the conviction that no hypothesis of the origin of things will ever be found that better solves the problem, than the simple statement of the old Jewish record, that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and all things therein. While science may show, and I think, has shown, that creation was progressive and worked out to completion by stages each the father of the next succeeding, yet God, the God of the Jewish record, is the author of it all. Such a Being as we conceive that God to be, gives a satisfactory account of all we see. Nothing science has wrought as yet into theory has done so, and we feel sure nothing it ever will do can more satisfactorily meet the demand of the highest reason, and profoundest philosophic acumen. Whatever may be the fate of systems of theology under the general upheaval and freedom of criticism now going on in the world, the Christian thinker may rest easy in the assurance that the foundations of his faith remain sure. They have not as yet been shaken; they never will be.

THOMAS J. FREEMAN.

A STUDY OF THE VISION OF OBADIAH.

THERE will ever be much discussion respecting the date of this prophecy, and the location of certain places mentioned in it. It is not my purpose to weigh the arguments urged to support different theories, nor to consider bold speculative opinions, such as Ewald's, who sees in this book certain large extracts from earlier prophecies. Let us assume that the book is a unit with distinct prophetic aim. The beauty of the composition, however, as it moves on, each fresh step bringing the aim into clearer and fuller definition, will hold our thought rather than theorizings and vain speculations upon points about which conclusions may be confidently reached only after new historical evidence has been brought to light.

Space will not be taken to point out the differences between this translation and others, but it is hoped that every departure may be either the truth or else lead to the truth.

THE VISION OF OBADIAH. This is the title to the prophecy. It may have been placed here only to show authorship. The prophet has but this one brief prophecy in Scripture. He himself is known only by this one brief utterance; yet so noble is his faith in Jehovah, so vehement his feeling against Edom which is grounded in the justest of reasons—her treachery toward Jacob—that we long to know more of this man, who had such excellence of faith and such vigor of feeling. Our desire for a further acquaintance is increased when we are under the sway of the rhetorical beauty of his writing and the organic symmetry of his prophecy. To these reasons for valuing this prophet must be added others which arise from the teachings we obtain concerning Jehovah, who, in the view of the prophet, fails not to mark the deeds of men.

"Thus saith the Lord Jehovah." Here is the authority of the prophet. Indeed, the speaking of Jehovah is the only basis of faith which a Hebrew prophet lays down for belief in his utterances. Herein Obadiah links himself with all prophets before and

after him. Herein rests his right to a place in sacred Scripture. This "Thus saith the Lord" always brings us into a reverent listening. It is so earnest, it is so sure, it portends so much. All the words of Jehovah may not be comprehended, yet they are not enigmas to baffle our minds with doubt. If all may not be understood, yet enough may be to make him nearer to us, more reverently feared, more fervently loved. Such faith alone encourages us to study his words.

Concerning Edom we have heard the report from Jehovah and a messenger has been sent out among the nations: "Rise up." And we will rise up against her in war! (first verse).

The report is concerning Edom; the messenger goes to the nations on account of Edom. Hence, this phrase should not be connected with what precedes. The prophet identifies himself with the nations. This uprising among them is regarded as the obedience of the nations to the command of Jehovah. The word of Jehovah to them is: "Rise up." And their response is: "We will rise up in war against her." There is here no strange freak in Hebrew prophecy. With the Hebrew Jehovah commanded the nations. He would give them to his anointed as an inheritance. Therefore this oncoming of the nations against Edom was inspired by no vain wish on their part for conquest which might fail to be achieved, but it was the appointment of Jehovah, and hence must be accomplished. There was hope here for afflicted Jacob, and there was terror here for Edom.

> Behold I appoint thee small amongst the nations,
> Despised art thou greatly.
> Thy presumptuous heart hath deceived thee,
> O thou who dwellest in the cliffs of the rock.
> Lofty is his dwelling,
> Who saith in his heart:
> "Who shall cause me to descend to the earth?"
> If thou wert as high as the eagle,
> And if among the stars thy nest were placed,
> From there I will cause thee to descend,
> Saith Jehovah. (v. 2–4.)

The rhetorical beauty of this passage is most attractive. Jehovah's estimate of Edom is given in the first four lines. She is despised, because of her presumption, in part due to the height and security of her abode. The next three lines present us with

a reflection of Jehovah, arising when he beholds the overweening trust of Edom in the strength of her high strongholds. Anywhere and at all times, says Jehovah, his dwelling must be high who boasts that no one can overthrow it. The passage closes with an expression of the purpose of Jehovah. The height of the eagle's flight makes diminutive the elevation of the abode of Edom, and the giddy height of the stars dwarfs to nothing the ascent of the eagle. Still Jehovah's hand shall reach even to the stars, if need be, and cause Edom to descend. Surely one is charmed by the vigor and poetic beauty of the passage, and the devout mind can not doubt the truth conveyed by the words. There is no place for haughty man secure from the reach of Jehovah.

> If thieves come to thee,
> If robbers by night,
> How canst thou be confounded?
> Shall not they steal only their fill?
> If pruners come to thee,
> Shall not they leave behind gleanings?
> How can the treacheries of Esau be searched?
> How can they be examined? (5, 6.)

The prophet has learned the purpose of Jehovah. To man it seems impossible of accomplishment. That Esau should be punished for his treacheries, can not be doubted. But how can it be effected? Not the robbery of marauders can confound him. These may come, yet they will take only their fill. Something will still remain. The fulfillment of Jehovah's purpose must not be looked for in any such slight, partial way. It could not suffice for Esau's treacheries. The prophetic mind sees the fulfillment, but these questions awaken inquiry concerning fulfillment in the mind of the hearers and readers. Haughty, treacherous Edom is to be brought down. How? that is the question.

> All men in alliance with thee shall send thee to the border.
> Men at peace with thee, at thy table,
> Shall lead thee astray, shall prevail against thee.
> They shall make a wound instead of thee.
> There is no understanding of it. (7.)

Here we find the forerunners of the time of fulfillment. Esau shall lose the friendship of those who are in alliance with him. They shall send him to their border, shall cast him out. Not this

alone, but the familiar friend, the one that eats at his table, shall be deceitful, and prevail against him. No more shall it be in the power of Esau to wound. He shall be powerless. Such are the forerunners of the time in which Jehovah chooses to confound him.

Shall it not be in that day, saith Jehovah,
That I will destroy the wise men of Edom,
Even understanding from the mountain of Esau?
And thy heroes, O Teman, shall be dismayed,
That every one may be cut off from the mountain of Esau. (8–10.)

Jehovah tells us here the time of the accomplishment of his purpose, its method, and its completeness. Surprise takes us at the time selected by Jehovah. When Esau is driven from the borders of his allies, when he is betrayed by his friends, then Jehovah comes to confound him. "Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God, on them which fell severity." The method is equally severe. Wisdom and understanding shall be destroyed from the mountain of Esau. Eliphaz, the Temanite, was leader in the discussion when the faith of Job was to be assailed by wisdom. Jeremiah asks in astonishment: "Is wisdom no more in Teman, is counsel perished from the prudent?" Edom was the home of wisdom, yet Jehovah, when he confounds, will first make that home desolate. Then he will destroy the heroes of Teman. A city with its wise men destroyed and its heroes dismayed is indeed defenseless. The completeness is awfully severe, for every one shall be cut off from the mountain of Esau. This phase of the character of Jehovah as manifested by this pitiless judgment makes us shudder while contemplating. But it is as true as that phase revealed by his love. The same authority establishes both. His severity, however, is not arbitrary; it is always caused. The prophet will now tell us the cause:

Shame shall cover thee
For the slaughtering of, for the violence to thy brother,
And thou shalt be cut off forever.
In the day when thou stoodest hostile,
In the day when aliens captured his wealth
And foreigners entered his gates and cast lots over Jerusalem,
Thou also wast as one of them.
Yet thou shouldst not have looked
Upon the day of thy brother, upon the day of his exilement.

Yet thou shouldst not rejoice over the sons of Judah
In the day of their destruction.
Yet thou shouldst not have enlarged thy mouth
In the day of distress.
Thou shouldst not have entered into the gate of my people
In the day of his calamity.
Thou, surely thou, shouldst not have looked upon his evil
In the day of his calamity.
Nor shouldst thou have reached unto his wealth
In the day of his calamity.
And thou shouldst not have stood upon the cross-road to cut off
his fugitive
And thou shouldst not have imprisoned the survivors of him
In the day of distress. (11–14.)

This passage faces us with the cause of Jehovah's severity toward Esau. It is a most graphic portrayal of a hate remorseless, without pity, without end; a hate that had usurped the place of love. The hate of a brother toward a brother; a hate deeper than that hate which calleth a brother a fool, of which the Christ with all his tenderness could only say, that it made its possessor in "danger of hell-fire." The elements of this hatred of Esau for Jacob are blackest-dyed. It so transformed Esau that as a foreigner with foreigners he plundered the holy city; it so changed his brother-heart that he looked upon the pillage of his brother, rejoiced in it, and encouraged with words its continuance, yes, he even partook of the plunder; it so completely dehumanized him that he killed the fugitives of Jacob, and in the distress which afflicted the small remnant he returned to imprison them. Herein Esau's hate had its complete triumph.

Moreover near is the day of Jehovah upon all nations.
According as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee.
Thine award shall return upon thine own head.
Therefore as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain,
All nations round about shall ever drink;
Until they shall have drunk, and gulped down, and become as though
they were not. (15, 16.)

Stern, indeed, is the expression "Day of Jehovah," at least as that day appeared now to the prophetic eye. It was not His day, while his chosen people were slain, or plundered, or carried into captivity. The day of Jehovah is the day of His triumph, the day of His allotment of judgment. The basis of His decision is,

"According as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee." Nations are here considered, not individuals. The downfall of nations is, according to the prophetic view, the product of their deeds. That spirit of destruction which a nation cherishes shall be the spirit which it shall find in its own destroyer. And this spirit shall work, until all nations which possess it shall be destroyed, "until they become as though they were not." Syria is to-day a sad reminder of the inexorableness of this law. The day of Jehovah to any nation is come, when it has demonstrated by its history that its sins have caused its overthrow; for "the wages of sin is death." Not new is this law which the prophet repeats. New, however, is the occasion for its recall. With awful directness is it stated that Esau is doomed. But the hatred of Esau was remorseless, and there was no power in him to remove it out of his heart. The doom of Jehovah upon him is justified by the universality of the law under which he is condemned.

But in the mountain of Zion shall be the escaped ones,
And they shall be holy,
And these shall possess the house of Jacob with his possessions.
Then the house of Jacob shall be a fire and the house of Joseph a flame,
But the house of Esau shall be for fuel.
And Jacob shall kindle against Esau and consume him,
And there shall not be a survivor of the house of Esau.
For Jehovah hath spoken it. (17, 18.)

Yet that destruction of Esau which resembles the destruction that had come to other nations, nourishing his spirit (*vid.* 15, 16), does not give the just award to Esau. There will yet be a remnant of him. But every one is to be cut off. Then only has Jehovah accomplished his purpose. In the fulfillment the prophet beholds Jacob as taking a part. His few which escaped the general destruction of his house are in the mountain of Zion. They have become again the house of Jacob. Now the prophet portrays a scene which sets forth strongest contrasts and whose climax is "the confounding of Esau." Jacob is become fire. Esau is become stubble. There is a burning, and nothing survives of Esau. Here is a fearful antitheses wrought out by the power of Jehovah. The nation, apparently destroyed by the power of man, is raised up into a mighty avenger through the power of Jehovah. We

may fail to trace through history that course of events which were the fulfillment of this prophecy, since there are too few historical data in our possession to induce one to hazard his reputation for safe conclusions by asserting that such and such events mark the accomplishment. But the law illustrated here has often been established in the vicissitudes of nations. There can be no Macbeth among the nations without having the children of Banquo rise up to avenge.

And they shall possess the South
With the mountain of Esau and the plain with Philistia:
And they shall possess the field of Ephraim and the field of Samaria,
And Benjamin with Gilead.
And the boundaries of the wealth belonging to the children of Israel are
Where the Canaanites are unto Sarepta,
And the boundaries of Jerusalem are
Those which are in Saphar.
And they shall possess the cities of the South.
And deliverers shall come up to the mountain of Zion
To judge the mountain of Esau;
And the kingdom shall be Jehovah's. (19–21.)

This passage is confessedly full of difficulties. The present translation is an attempt to remove some of them. The Hebrew is not inconsistent with the rendering. The Hebrew word translated "captivity" may be pointed so as to be rendered boundaries. A heap of stones was used for the sign of a boundary in the time when Israel first became a nation. This passage refers us to that early allotment of land to the children of Israel and tells us that it is to be re-enacted by Jehovah in these Messianic times, when the kingdom has become Jehovah's. This suggestion as to the reasons which have determined this translation is sufficient for my purpose. Now let us consider this closing to a prophetic utterance most uncompromising in its tone toward Esau and most encouraging toward Jacob. Esau has been destroyed. Not a survivor remains. Jacob then enters into his inheritance. But Jacob is represented as the house of Jacob and the house of Joseph. The mention of Joseph is the sign of reconciliation of all the children of Israel. In verses 17 and 18 the land is viewed as restored to all the chosen people, but in 19, 20, 21 the land is por-

tioned out. The grand consummation is that the kingdom is Jehovah's.

This brief prophecy by one who is known simply through this utterance reinforces the truth that only that people can survive whose God is the Lord. To-day Esau in the pride of his power may seem to defy Jehovah, and through his ever-burning hate be constantly alert to destroy the faintest reminders of Jacob: yet the faith of Jacob will multiply his few to a multitude, that shall destroy and leave no survivor of Esau. The truth is individual as well as general. True, eternally true, is it that the spirit of destruction will occupy the house, unless the saving spirit of Jehovah have already possession. Jacob survives, only because the living God inhabits his dwelling.

W. W. MARTIN.

Vanderbilt University.

CHANGE OF THE SABBATH FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

THE Jews keep the seventh and Christians the first day of the week as the Sabbath. The Christians have changed the time of this weekly day of rest. Have they any authority for making this change? If they have, it certainly can be found; if not, it ought to be known. Seventh-day Adventists and others are making much ado, just now, over this question; using it in such a way as to make it a step toward abolishing the Sabbath entirely, thus making an inroad upon Christianity itself.

Christians believe that the change was made by divine authority—that is to say, it was made with the knowledge and consent and approbation of our Lord Jesus Christ. From the resurrection of Christ until now, Christians have kept the first day of the week as their Sabbath. Christ was crucified the day before the Jewish Sabbath, and on the afternoon of the same day Joseph of Arimathea "craved the body" "because it was the preparation—that is, the day before the Sabbath." (Mark xv. 42.) The Lord lay in the tomb a part of the preparation day, all of the Sabbath day, and a part of the first day of the week. "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene. And she went and told them that had been with him that he was alive." (Mark xvi. 8, 9.) The first meeting of the disciples for worship was the same day that Christ rose from the dead. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." (John xx. 19.) Albert Barnes, in his notes on this verse, says: "It is worthy of remark that this is the first assembly that was convened for worship on the Lord's day, and in that assembly Jesus is present. . . . Since that time, the day has been observed in the Church as the Christian Sabbath, particularly to commemorate the resurrection of Christ." If the

disciples had been committing an error in keeping this day as their Sabbath, Christ would have corrected them. The fact that he did not, is of itself a divine sanction. "And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." (John xx. 26.) This was again the first day of the week. They have passed over the Jewish Sabbath, and nothing is said about meeting together for any purpose. Christ is present at this second meeting, giving his sanction and blessing them. When the first day of the week came round the third time, how natural it was for the disciples to come together for worship again. They had had the presence of the Lord Jesus for two consecutive Sabbaths. It is by no means probable that the disciples would have kept the first day of the week as their Sabbath without the sanction of the Lord Jesus. Thus when we go to the starting point, we are forced to the conclusion that the change was made by divine authority. It is not improbable that the apostles had oral instructions from the Lord Jesus in regard to their proceedings.

We have further proof that this change was made by divine authority from Paul's teachings. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." (Acts xx. 7.) This is in exact keeping with the action of the disciples when Christ was present, and giving his sanction. They came together to break bread, that is in the eucharist. They were celebrating the Lord's-supper on the Lord's day. There is no doubt but that action of the disciples, in this case, voices the action of the whole Church. In 1 Cor. xvi. 2, Paul says: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." There must be some reason for designating the first day of the week as the time for making their contributions. He says he had given the same directions to the Churches of Galatia. The preceding days they had been engaged in secular business—that is, making money; and now he tells them to make their contributions upon this particular day set apart for religious worship. They were to give as God had prospered them in their business. If they had not been keeping

the first day of the week as their Sabbath, then these contributions would have been on the seventh day of the week.

While John was upon the Isle of Patmos, he says: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet." (Rev. i. 10.) Chrysostom, who lived in the fourth century, says: "It was called the Lord's day because the Lord rose from the dead on that day." To John there was something in this day that made it peculiar. It was not as other days. He was blessed on that day above what he was on other days. He had some reason for calling it the Lord's day. He had been in the habit of meeting Christians on the Lord's day for worship. He, no doubt, remembered these seasons of grace, and while in exile made these Sabbath hours a time of special worship, and was so blessed that he was constrained to write: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." It was the Lord's day because the Lord Jesus Christ had sanctified it by rising from the dead. The Scriptures which have been quoted seem to be conclusive in their bearing upon the question under discussion.

It is a matter of some interest to know how the early Christian fathers understood the question, as to the change of the Sabbath. Ignatius, who was born A.D. 30, and died A.D. 107, gives the usage of the Church in his day. He was an apostolic man. He says: "Those who were brought up in the ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope. . . . no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's day, on which also our life sprang up again by him and by his death."* Ignatius refers to the Jews, as those who were brought up in the ancient order of things, and now instead of keeping the Jewish Sabbath, they were keeping the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath. This he gives as an historical fact, and not as an opinion. We have the testimony of Barnabas also, as to the practice of the Church in his day. He lived about A.D. 100. He speaks for the Christians, and says: "Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead."† He means, by the eighth day, the first day of the week, for on that day Christ rose from the dead. He speaks for the Christians at large. Justin Martyr was born A.D. 110, and died A.D. 165. In

Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I., p. 62. †*Ibid.*, p. 147.

his first Apology for the Christians, under the head of Weekly Worship, he says: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits." Then, after giving other items in regard to their worship, he continues: "But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior on the same day rose from the dead." * This is so pointed that we can not fail to understand that Justin speaks for the whole Church. The Apology commences: "To the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Augustus Cæsar, and to his son Verissimus. . . . and to the sacred Senate, with the whole people of the Romans, I, Justin, the son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, present this address and petition in behalf of those of all nations who are unjustly hated and wantonly abused, myself being one of them." We see from this that he speaks in behalf of all Christians everywhere. Then from the year A.D. 110, to the year A.D. 165, it is a plain historical fact that Christians kept the first day of the week as their Sabbath. Then again, he says: "Christ was crucified the day before Saturn's day (Saturday), and on the day after Saturn's day, which is the day of the Sun, He appeared to his apostles and taught them these things." Not only did they keep the first day of the week as their Sabbath, but Christ "taught them these things." In the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which is a document of very ancient date, we have this language, to wit: "But every Lord's day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure." We commence with Scripture, and end with history, and from this double proof it is as clear as sunlight, that the Christians, from the resurrection of Christ, kept the first day of the week as their Sabbath. That which Scripture teaches, and history confirms, ought to be received as true.

Conclusion.

1. In the time of the apostles, and doubtless after that date, there were Judaizing teachers in the Church who were sticklers

* *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 186.

for Jewish customs. Some of them said: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved." Paul said there were some such who "desired to be teachers of the law." These teachers taught the people that they must observe the Jewish Sabbath.

2. There are men now traveling over the country, and teaching, that there is no authority for keeping the first day of the week as the Sabbath day. They are called Seventh Day Adventists. One of these men some time ago made the statement that Constantine changed the Sabbath. Another one made the bold assertion that the Roman Catholics changed it. The truth is the charge was made about three centuries before Constantine's day, and about six centuries before there were any Roman Catholics in the proper acceptation of the term.

3. It is clear that this teaching is tainted with infidelity. The purpose of the effort to unsettle the Church upon this subject is not, it is feared, to secure a better Sabbath, but rather that we may have none. Infidelity wants no Sabbath, and it wants the Church to have none.

4. As long as the Sabbath stands, it is a constant rebuke to infidelity. If the Church does her duty and maintains her rights and her privileges the Christian Sabbath will always stand as it now is. It is one of the strong pillars of Christianity itself.

M. M. Smith.

EDITORIAL.

CHURCH *VERSUS* SOULS.

One reason why there is among Protestants such a general distrust of the Roman Catholic Church is the well-nigh universal impression that the chief aim of that Church is to win power and numbers rather than souls. People believe that the Roman leaders are seeking Church aggrandizement, influence, and sway in society and government, more than to bring spiritual blessings and salvation to men. To build up the hierarchy, to make a larger field for priest and bishop and cardinal to flourish in, to extend the rule of the pope —this is believed to be the chief motive of Roman Catholic activity. Now, whether this impression is wholly correct or in part groundless prejudice, the feeling of opposition to Romanists which it inspires is proof that we instinctively condemn ministers and Churches who labor chiefly to build up an ecclesiastical organization and ecclesiastical power and influence. And there is danger while we condemn this motive as unworthy and hateful in others that we may be unconsciously swayed by it ourselves. If the pastor's chief solicitude is to have his Church succeed, to add to its strength and numbers and popularity; if the members are mainly anxious and active to make the congregation more respectable and influential, then it is not Christian solicitude or a Christian motive that influences them. It is the very Roman motive which we condemn in the followers of the pope.

The Rev. Sam Jones compares a Church whose highest aim is to keep itself going and growing to a locomotive with power only to run itself. It can move along the track with more or less speed but has no power to move any thing except its own weight. It may move gracefully, but it is nevertheless a failure and a sham. The true Church of Christ has a higher purpose than to keep itself up and get itself along. There is danger of making too much of numbers and added influence and resources—danger of forgetting the true end of our work in looking at these outward things, in hurrying to grow strong and rich and influential. The Christ-motive is, not that the Church may be built up, but that the world may be saved. The central purpose is to rescue the lost. The building up of an outward organization, a visible kingdom, is but secondary, a means to the great end. The test question is, Are we carrying out the great commission, making and training disciples?

Even where the original aims are purest and most Christ-like, where at first the one purpose is to lift up and bless and save, there comes in time a temptation to seek Church growth and aggrandizement more than to save men and women from their sins. As numbers increase, as the converts become an element of power in community and State, the organizing and increasing and directing and using of this power, the reaping and dividing the honors and the profits, seem to many of greater moment than the rescuing of sinners and the building up of saints in grace and good works. The primary object is lost sight of in the secondary: the means is made the end. At last converts are sought not so much that they may be rescued from the bondage and curse of sin, as because we want to add the weight of their wealth and influence to the "beloved Church" we are helping to build up. Thus the Church is made first and souls second. When members go wrong there is danger of being more exercised about the scandal and disgrace—the injury the Church will sustain—than about the danger and hurt to souls! It was this proneness to make an idol of an earthly organization—this turning aside after temporal profit and dominion—that caused the long sleep of apostasy from which the Reformation has but partially aroused the Christian world, and into which every prosperous ecclesiastical organization is in constant danger of falling back.

The earthly Church, however proud a man may be of the particular branch of it to which he belongs, is but an instrument which the Lord will cast aside whenever it ceases to be of use in saving men and women. It is but the scaffolding which God is using to build souls into his spiritual kingdom. We are not to make more of the instrument than of the work, more of the scaffold than of the building. If we spend most of our strength in protecting and buttressing this earthly scaffolding, while the true building is made secondary or forgotten, God will reject and in the end cast down our rickety ecclesiastical idol, and if we ourselves are saved it will be only "so as by fire." It is said that in Europe and America working men—what are called the masses—are not friendly to the Christian Church. Wherever this is true one chief cause of it is the fact that the Church approaches the masses with the purpose of strengthening itself more than of saving souls. Men and women—especially the lowly and the poor—read our true motive and will not long reject those whose highest aim is to do them good. When we become less anxious to add to the organized forces and temporal glory of the earthly kingdom than to deliver men from sin and death, when our anxiety to save the Church is lost in our earnestness to save souls, then will the common people hear us gladly.

J. M. H.

CHRISTIAN CULTURE AND EDUCATION.

That the Church has a tremendous work before it in the salvation of the world no one denies. That it has a wonderful influence in the general affairs of mankind is acknowledged. That it is really the light of the world, as our Lord said, and the salt of the earth in its moral relation to men is held firmly by the best of men. The Church is the patron and friend of learning and learned institutions. Its money, its labor, its men and women are freely given to the work and the cause of education. Its efforts are not confined to the narrow bounds of catechetical instruction and pulpit ministration and Sunday-school teachings. Much of its best culture and toil is given to the interests of the day schools from the primary department of instruction to the highest university courses. It is folly on the part of the so-called liberal thinkers, the free thinkers, skeptics, agnostics of the day to talk about the intellect of the times going away from Christianity. The facts and the figures disprove this unwarranted assertion and they go so far as to show that the greatest factor in the world's enlightenment to-day is the Church of Christ. The power that is back of and under the civilization of the age is the moral earnestness of the Christian religion. The ground of this is the divine energy that is in the hearts of Christ's followers. They believe heartily in the divine original of the Bible and of the Church as the gifts of God to men, and they believe that these are divine instruments better adapted than any other to teach and bless the races of men. The Church is not confined to a set mode of operations any more than to a certain race of peoples. The wisdom of the just is practical and flexible and its appliances are the result of contact with actual needs of men in life. The rule is the truth as revealed in Scripture, and the principles contained therein are paramount in power and direction. The Bible guides the true follower of Christ in all his methods and measures of action. There is large liberty of manner and uses in the world, but firm demand on the conscience and heart for righteousness and faithfulness. Christians see the beauty of truth wherever found. They feel its claims to obedience and they desire to show it to other men. The great principle is clear to any thorough Christian that Christian culture, unforced, free, and enlightened, is a necessity to the eventual and general civilization and safety of the race. There can be no justification of the idea that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." This is the cry of ecclesiasticism and despotism, not the voice of Christian liberty and truth.

Such is the state of the case, and yet the candid mind can but look with deep concern at the existence of facts which appear in the course of the struggle of truth against error and of culture against barbarism

and ignorance. There is this to be said. The conflict of ecclesiastical and political partisanship is developing some serious restrictions upon the power of education in free America, as well as elsewhere. Education is supposed to be a great curative force applied to the ills of human society. Indeed, enthusiastic reformers have argued that with the use of the general level of intelligence would come the equally general level of morality and virtue. Is it not strange that such figures as are accessible on this subject are discouraging? In the *Popular Science Monthly* for January, Benjamin Reece has an article on "Public Schools and Crime," in which are some very startling facts. In setting these forth, he says: "In his 'Political Science,' Woolsey tells us that 'the fall of the Roman Empire was an effect of a moral ruin.' Yet all will admit that Rome and the other civilizations of antiquity were richer and more learned in the time of their decay than during the period of their infancy and growth; but the moral correlative being wanting, they tottered to their fall. Just look at the records of our mentally and morally deranged as exhibited in our statistics of insanity and crime and vice, and they alone are enough to cast doubt upon the claim that a public school education for our illiterates is sufficient to insure a decrease of mental and moral delinquency. For it remains to be explained why, in the decade ending with 1880, population has increased thirty per cent and illiteracy only ten per cent, a relative decrease, that the number of criminals during the same period present the alarming increase of eighty-two per cent, while of insane persons there appears the enormous addition of one hundred and forty-five per cent. Can it be possible that with greater educational facilities there is to be increased crime, and that every enlargement in the seating capacity of our schools is to be followed by a larger corresponding demand for insane accommodations and additional felons' cells? Perish the thought! Yet if the instruction of our common schools subdues the tendency to crime, why is it that the ratio of prisoners, being one in 3,442 inhabitants in 1850, rose to one in every 1,647 in 1860, one in 1,021 in 1870, and one in 837 in 1880; while, upon the authority of the Rev. S. W. Dicke, the amount of liquor consumed per capita was three times as great in 1883 as in 1840."

Continuing his facts, the writer shows that the native born population is to be credited with the large increase of crime and insanity, and then gives some curious and serious figures as to illiteracy and education in comparison. He says: "An examination of the 'Compendium of the Tenth Census' of the United States discloses some novel and threatening facts. The illiterates of the United States comprise seventeen per cent of the total population. The morally and mentally deranged, as shown by the number of criminal and

insane persons, bear the ratio of one to every 332 inhabitants. The general average of illiteracy is exceeded by every one of the original slave States with the exception of Missouri, but the average ratio of the mentally and morally unsound is only reached in the State of Maryland. South Carolina, which shows the highest percentage of illiterates, viz., 55.4 per cent, presents the lowest average of any State in the Union as regards insanity and crime, having but one delinquent in every 568 inhabitants as compared with one in every 167 in California, one in 205 in Massachusetts, and one in every 222 in the State of New York. With the single exception of the State of Maine, every Northern State east of Indiana has a larger ratio of insane and criminals than the average for the Union, while the States west of Ohio, those on the Pacific slope excepted, fall below the general average. The table which follows presents some disquieting facts, which should serve as a salutary warning to those who expect to find in mental stimulation an equivalent for moral growth and culture:

COMPILED FROM COMPENDIUM OF TENTH CENSUS, AND OTHER OFFICIAL SOURCES.

	Illiterates ten years of age and over.	Assessed valuation per capita.	Ratio of insane and criminal.	Ratio of saloons to population.
	1880.	1880.	1880.	1887.
	Per-centage.	*Amount per capita.*		
Fifteen illiterate States.....	40.4	$145	1 in 402	
Northern States west of Ohio.....	7	297	1 in 379	1 in 700
Northern States east of Indiana ...	5.3	551	1 in 265	1 in 308
Average	17	$340	1 in 332	1 in 227
				1 in 329

The table unmistakably shows a greater per capita of wealth where the fewest illiterates are enumerated, but it no less clearly shows that this augmentation of riches has been accompanied by increased insanity and crime and more wide-spread vice. But we need not confine ourselves to the general statistics of the United States, for the records of New York present similar conditions, which can be analyzed more in detail. The 'Annual Report of the Superintendent of the New York State Prisons, 1886,' records that the prisons of Auburn and Sing Sing contained 2,616 convicts; of these, 1,801 are credited with a common-school education, 373 are classed as being able to read and write, nineteen are returned as collegiates, ten as having received classical, and seventy-eight academic, educations, ninety-seven as being able to read only, and 238 as having no education. Is it not contrary to our most confident predictions and undoubted expectations that the common schools should furnish eighty-

three per cent and the colleges and academies over four per cent of the inmates of Auburn and Sing Sing?"

After showing that poor and ignorant persons are usually convicted and punished while educated and rich criminals often escape public exposure, making the facts still stronger as above stated, the writer quoted also says that about twenty per cent of criminals are total abstainers from intoxicants—that is, eight out of ten of our criminals are liquor drinkers, in spite of education. These last figures taken from the Auburn and Sing Sing, New York, prisons may be regarded as fairly representative of the whole country.

Now a long and earnest inquiry may arise from these facts in many minds, and it is easy to multiply words here as to the cause or causes of such a sad and surprising state of things. The patriot and the Christian are unwilling to give up the system of public education in our common schools, and yet the mind eagerly asks, What shall we do? Let us answer frankly and boldly. Compulsory education in Germany has made a mighty nation, a nation of power, progress, and wealth, but a nation largely infidel, under State control without religion. Priestly domination and education in Italy, Spain, Portugal, all South America and Mexico have made whole races and nationalities of ignorance, superstition, bigotry, and intolerance. The human family suffers from the extremes of godlessness in State government and the despotic rule of established hierarchy. In neither case has the word of God, pure and simple, been brought to bear in school upon the young and tender mind of youth in its elastic and formative stages.

In the public schools of our country, the Bible has been largely excluded from the daily readings and study. Are the facts above noted not all a like result of lack of the direct influence of biblical truth upon the minds of the young? Clearly so in every case. What then? Place the Bible in the public schools of the country and keep it there as the great and only true fountain of true morals and moral culture. Will it bear hard on some persons? Better this than bear hard on the moral life of the whole country. Better this, if it has to be done by a vote of the people of a given district, whether the grand old book which Chillingworth designated when he cried, "The Bible, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants;" or the Douay Bible; or some other version, only so it is the word of God without men's notes or comments.

Christian culture begins and ends in Bible principles, and while it grasps all science and compasses all literature in its survey, it sees all these in that pure, beautiful, and powerful light which holds man true to moral and religious truth, and therefore holds him true to God, to his neighbor, and to himself.

M. B. D.

SHALL IT CONTINUE?

The Publishers of the CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW have made an honest and faithful effort to put this magazine upon a self-sustaining basis. It is certainly a very important part of our Church literature. Every denomination of Christians ought to have such a vehicle for setting forth the views of its leading thinkers upon great theological and moral questions, as well as upon the practical issues of the day. That our Church needed this REVIEW was not for a moment doubted when its publication was projected two years ago. That the Church has not patronized the Magazine as it ought is clearly evident. We are now in the middle of the second year, and thus far progress has been backward. Repeatedly the Church has been notified that the circulation of the REVIEW must be largely increased if its publication is to be continued after the present year. The time is approaching when a decision of the question must be reached. It is not a question whether those now taking the REVIEW desire its publication continued, but whether they and the publishers jointly can succeed within the next few weeks in materially increasing the circulation so that there may be some encouragement to hope for better things. Let us hear within the next thirty days from every one who can add another name to the subscription list. We do not solicit from our readers any expression of sentiment as to their opinion of the REVIEW. Such expressions we have had from many, and are satisfied those heard from express the sentiment of all. The encouragement now needed is of a more material sort. We are doing the best we can. Let other friends of the publication do the same. The crisis is at hand, and we hope the developements of the next few weeks will enable us to say the publication of the REVIEW shall be continued.

W. J. D.

QUERIES, NOTES, AND SUGGESTIONS.

Is the unrest among the down-trodden, laboring classes of the Old World to be looked at as only melancholy proof of depravity and insubordination? Its outward manifestation is often misguided, excessive, violent; but is there not in it proof of unsubdued manliness, unquenchable aspirations after better things? Is not this a thousand times more hopeful than unresisting and abject bowing of the neck to the yoke? Even the nihilistic hatred of the Christian name is not hatred of the real Christ whose one mission is to uplift and save, but hatred of a false image in whose name injustice and extortion and chains are justified. Christianity has been misrepresented, caricatured, made hateful. All true Christians ought to recognize in this many-voiced

and discordant clamor for wages and recognition and rights the unconscious human cry for the true gospel and the true help that yields in the end better than earthly blessings. Our aim should be not to stifle the cry or to crush back the rising multitudes but to show them the true good, to reveal to them the true Christ, to lead them in a new pathway of hope and joy. These thoughts are suggested by the following contribution from a correspondent in Germany:

CHRISTIAN SYMPATHY.

If we make the Church include all bodies of Christians, and the masses all who need Christianity, the attitude of the Church to the masses becomes a very important question. Cardinal Manning, who figured in the settlement of the late London strike, believes, as he says, that his Church in the future will not have to deal with princes and parliaments, but with the masses. Soon after the highest Roman Catholic authority in Canada had condemned the Knights of Labor, Cardinal Gibbons said: "No, we must recognize the rights of the working classes, and if the Church has the title of 'the friend of the people,' *that* will win." It is the opinion of Dean Plumptre, of the English Church, that while we can not identify ourselves with socialism, especially with the more violent forms of socialism, we must recognize the rights of the laboring men, because we must recognize the rights of *all* classes, and our attitude toward all should be that of intelligent and watchful sympathy. So, the great object of Catholics and Protestants is to win the people for the Church, and the effort is a good one so long as that means winning them for Christ and not a mere political stroke for increasing the power of a particular Church. By the people we ought to understand the people generally—the capitalist as well as the day laborer, the educated as well as the ignorant, the colored man as well as the white man—and we are to include all the so-called grades of society. Why should we be so one-sided as to admit the claims, or condemn the sins, of one class, and not those of another. All we need to do is to look at the masses not so much from the new point of view of some social reformer as from the New Testament point of view: "All things to all men."

As to the methods to be employed, it goes without saying that those are the best which produce the best results, either in social reforms or in evangelistic work. Canon Farrar, speaking a few months ago of the hundred thousand men who took part in the London strike, told us: "Neither the Church of England nor any other religious bodies went for much in the minds of those working men." In order therefore that the Church might be better able to reach these classes he pleaded for the organization of a brotherhood within the Church. A Roman Catholic writer insists, naturally enough, that the

movement is a good one, and says, truly enough, that if the hearts and homes of the poor are not touched the Church fails to do its duty. The virtues claimed for this plan are purity, humility, obedience, and personal consecration. But it is possible for the ministers and laymen of the Church of England to have these virtues, and to practice them successfully, without resorting to a brotherhood. Besides it seems rather fanciful, in such a day as this, for Protestants to think of reaching the masses by a kind of monastic order. There are plenty of men, ministers and laymen, who would be willing to go and work among the poor if they were called on to do so. They would go not so much for the novelty of the thing as to preach to sinners, and preaching to sinners is no novelty. I once heard Dr. Charles F. Deems say: "I have frequently had in my congregation all classes, from the poorest to the richest, and I have always tried to forget that fact, and think of them only as a congregation of sinners." In this day of political disturbances and class hatred, of socialism and of infidelity, our sympathy should be intelligently placed, and our choice of methods ought to be made with good judgment, but the main thing, as President Patton insisted in a recent address, is to preach the Word.

W. P. BONE.

Berlin.

Preaching the word is doubtless the one chief gospel force. "How shall they believe in of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" But in heathen lands as well as in our home Churches, in city and country, busy pastors find that the most effective preaching is not always from the pulpit or by the minister in charge. The Master himself more than once tested the power of wayside preaching, and it was he that sent forth the Samaritan woman and afterward the healed demoniac to tell the good news of the kingdom to their neighbors. One great defect in our Christian work is the failure to enlist private members to do their part in preaching the word. Every soul is called to a ministry by virtue of its regeneration. The Lord lights no candle except that it may shine. The fact that you have a tongue and that God has saved you proves that he intends you to speak for him. Till all can be enlisted to do their part some such plan as the following, suggested by a California correspondent, might be profitably adopted by pastors and sessions:

DIVISION OF LABOR IN THE CHURCH.

Should not lay workers be more extensively employed in our Churches? I do not mean to do such work as every Christian should do at home or in his place of business or in his circle of society. This we all understand should be done to the greatest possible extent. But should not good men and women be employed to devote all their time to house-to-house visitation, the circulation of religious literature, and

other Christian work? Hundreds who can not preach are well fitted for such work. Would it not be economy for a Church session or boards of missions to employ a pastor who shall have the superintendence of the whole work, do the preaching, and such other work as can be done only by a clergyman or some one as well qualified, and in addition two or more lay workers who shall canvass the city (if the work be in a city) and look after non-church-goers, see to the wants of the poor, see that every child is in Sunday-school, and otherwise extend the work? A pastor who preaches two or three times a week, conducts special or revival meetings several weeks in each year as every city pastor must, attends marriages, funerals, etc., simply can not do as much of the general personal work as should be done; nor do his people in their ordinary relations do enough of it. So some extra helpers are needed. The adoption of this plan would be but the carrying out of the principle of the division of labor which is so universally applied in the business world. It is a great waste to have a skilled laborer to do work that can as well be done by one of less ability. So in the Church it seems a waste for a man who can do one thing exceptionally well to turn aside from it to do work which could be done as well or better by hundreds of men and women who possess no peculiar abilities, but whose hearts are full of a desire to do good. This is not proposed from any thought that one part of the work is less important than another. All parts are probably equally important. There is no little work in the Lord's harvest field. All that pertains to the kingdom of God is great; but there is variety of work which calls for men and women of varied capacities.

T. A. COWAN.

But there can never be such a division of labor as to relieve the pastor of the duty and necessity of visiting his people and knowing them in their homes and every-day pursuits. His success in the pulpit depends on this. When by such intimate association he has entered into the thoughts and sympathies of those who attend his ministry, when he has learned to love them and won their love, he can give each public message the force and directness of a personal appeal. This is the ideal preaching. Every thought and doctrine should have a practical aim, a direct application to the hearers present. There ought to be no random firing from the pulpit, no discharge of the gospel artillery merely to win attention and admiration by the loud report. Something should be aimed at—something of interest and profit to the people who hear. The following contribution refers mainly to pulpit rebukes:

PERSONAL PREACHING.

Preaching should be personal in the sense that it is adapted to the persons hearing. Then it is practical preaching and not personal in

the offensive sense. A good sermon always does willing hearers good, either by drawing attention to their own defects, or to One who can help them. In almost all assemblies are some who are not ready to have their besetting sins pointed out, especially when they have made up their minds not to give up their sins. There are professed Christians who magnify their sins into virtues, or at least justify their infirmities on account of the imperfections of their neighbors. A good sermon will find out these sins. It may give pain to the possessor, just as it hurts to tread on a man's corns, or as a man with inflammatory rheumatism screams when you but point to the place. There are conscious, sensitive sinners, who regard every successful effort to designate the seat of spiritual disease as a personal allusion to be promptly resented. Strange that they can not see their resentment is confession! Would that the confession were always attended with repentance and reformation. Now it is evidently the duty of ministers to be faithful in warnings, and even in rebukes, provided always that the chastisement is administered in love and sorrow, and is entirely free from the lambasting spirit which characterizes the venting of personal spite. ("Lambasting" is defined in the Century Dictionary, but is designated "slang," and therefore I apologize for using it, but with this bow will let it stand.) A pastor can certainly be allowed to warn his people against sins which he has renounced himself, for he will be sure, in such a case to reprove in love and meekness.

I am, however, far from admitting that it is necessary or even an advantage that a preacher shall have committed all the sins in the catalogue, in order that, having been forgiven himself, it shall be easier for him to rebuke with tenderness all transgressors. Confessedly every one knows enough about the nature and power of sin and temptation to qualify him for treating gently the erring, if only he have himself known the luxury of the forgiving love of the heavenly Father. It is to be regretted that, as some parents never correct their children except in passion, so some pastors are supposed to be guided by a like rage when they administer reproof to their people, and are occasionally suspected of even taking pleasure in the exercise. Since Paul was by no means a sentimental person, his course in this matter is a safe one to follow. Says he (Acts xx. 31): "By the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." Nor need we be surprised to learn (Acts xix. 9) that under this tender and faithful ministry "divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil" of his preaching "before the multitude." We may safely follow the rule he laid down for another (2 Tim. iv. 2), and by which he himself was doubtless governed: "Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine."

W. S. DANLEY.

Of course every minister must often preach to people he does not know. There are, perhaps, strangers at every service and he must sometimes stand before an entire congregation of men and women whom he never saw before. But he need never speak without a direct aim, or despair of immediate practical results. Whether he is acquainted with his hearers or not he knows their "human hearts are human," that they find sin bitter and disappointing, that they need salvation, and that some of them long for it. If he points out the way of life through Christ, if he teaches earnestly and lovingly the great truths of the Bible his preaching will be personal and practical and helpful to many. God's word has healing in it for every soul. But we must be careful not to misinterpret or misapply these wonderful words of life. The following communication shows how this is sometimes done by well meaning and orthodox preachers:

USE GOD'S WORD FAITHFULLY.

Lately, in reading a sermon by a distinguished clergymen, my mind was impressed afresh with the importance of handling the word of God for the purpose for which it was given. In speaking of the incomparable glories of heaven he used 1 Cor. ii. 9 in proof. This was virtually putting words into the mouth of God he has never spoken.

The wording of the text does not warrant such an application, neither does the context. The subject under discussion and the connection clearly show that the contrast instituted is between the wisdom of the world and God's wisdom in man's salvation—between what the unaided, natural man can know of gospel grace and that known by the man filled with the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. It discloses how entirely impotent natural religion is in the presence of revealed religion, and has to do with what is realized here on earth without any reference whatever to the world to come. The minister was greatly astray even if he had needed such words to support his proposition. Such a use is making the word of God to do duty in behalf of a theory instead of forming our theories upon the word of God.

A similar abuse is sometimes heard from the pulpit of 1 Cor. xii. 7, when that text is brought forward to prove that all men are convinced of sin by the Holy Spirit. Just as in the foregoing case the truth announced is fully warranted by the word of God, but not in the text used, as it treats exclusively of the gifts and responsibilities of those in Christ. The whole chapter speaks of the believer, not at all of the unbeliever.

One other such misuse will be sufficient for the present. Not infrequently Heb. v. 4 is employed to prove that the Lord calls men to preach the gospel. If the text is examined in its connection it will be clearly seen that the Holy Spirit here shows that while Christ as

the High-Priest of God was infinitely above the Aaronic family or line of priests, yet as positively as they, he was called of God to his priestly office. Certainly no reference is here made to gospel ministers. The Scriptures clearly show that the Lord calls men to preach his word, but this text can not be legitimately used in proof of that truth. Misapplications of the Scriptures should be carefully and conscientiously avoided. Aside from the damaging influence such carelessness must have upon the person himself, it must have one of two evil effects upon every hearer who examines such proofs and sees their irrelevancy; either to prejudice him against the truth advanced, or to weaken his confidence in the preacher. To "preach the word," not its misapplication, is our mission. The texts referred to are not inserted for two reasons: (1) To economize space, (2) because the reader is held to be able to recall the exact wording.

J. B. MITCHELL.

The questions asked by our next contributor touch some of the central doctrines of the gospel:

REGENERATION.

That which is done for man in the work of regeneration is presented in the Scriptures by many, and different statements.

Jesus refers to it as a "birth from above." It is referred to in Romans viii. 2, as "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" in Romans ii. 28, 29, as circumcision; in Romans vi. 4, as a baptism; in 2 Corinthians v. 17, as a new creation, and in Ephesians ii. 1, as a quickening or resurrection. The Confession of Faith says: "Those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ are regenerated or born from above, renewed in Spirit and made new creatures in Christ Jesus." Again, referring to how it is done, the Confession declares that it is the work of the Holy Spirit who, by taking of the things which are Christ's and showing them unto the sinner enables him to lay hold on Christ. In the light of these scriptures and quotations from the Confession of Faith the following questions are presented:

1. Does the work of regeneration refer to the moral nature as corrupted by the fall of Adam, or to the removal of guilt as the result of actual sins?

2. If it refers to the Adamic nature, how can we reconcile this view with the oft-repeated statement, "that some of the remains of a corrupt nature out of which arises the tendency of the believer to sin still exist after regeneration?"

3. If there remains moral corruption after this work, and regeneration refers to the Adamic nature only, how can we say regeneration is a perfect work?

4. If, as the Confession teaches, those who believe are born from

above, and infants have moral corruption by heredity, how shall we account for the regeneration of the infant except "by the normal method," which is faith in Jesus Christ?

5. Is there any more of the Adamic nature for the work of regeneration to overcome or renew when a man is fifty years old than there was when he was but one day old?

6. Will adults, any more than infants, be condemned in judgment for the Adamic nature, or the natural tendency to sin?

J. H. THARP.

One of the points touched in the foregoing communication is more fully discussed in the following:

INFANT SALVATION.

In the January number of the REVIEW, page 113, a writer concludes a paragraph discussion of this "theological question which has puzzled Christian thinkers since the days of the fathers" with this sentence: "The truth seems to be that no children are regenerated until they come TO DIE, and that all children DYING in infancy are regenerated IN DEATH, or AT THE TIME OF DEATH, by the Holy Spirit, and saved through efficacy of the blood of Christ."

The editor commends the answer thus: "Perhaps no better solution of this question than the one presented can be given." What of this "solution?"

1. It makes death the great desideratum for all infants. Why should not the parent as devoutly pray for the *death* of his infant child as for the salvation of his other child who has lived to years of accountability? If this be the true solution it is certainly a great misfortune not to have died in infancy. For according to it salvation is absolutely certain to the infant, but we have great reason to fear that even in Christian lands the "road to destruction" is indeed the "broad way" in which the "many" of adult age continue to walk.

2. This solution is in accordance with Article 54 of our own Confession of Faith: "All infants dying in infancy, and all persons who have never had the faculty of reason are regenerated and saved." Which is *not* supported by the proof-texts cited.

3. But is Article 54 in accordance with the fundamental principle of Christianity as formulated elsewhere in the Confession? Notice the Catechism. Question 16: "What effect did Adam's sin have upon his posterity?

"*Answer.* Adam's sin corrupted his moral nature and alienated him from God; and ALL MANKIND DESCENDING FROM HIM BY ORDINARY GENERATION inherit his corruption of nature, and become subject to sin and death.

"Question 17. Into what estate did the fall bring mankind?

"*Answer*. The fall brought mankind into a state of alienation from God, which is spiritual death.

"Question 18. What does God require, that we ("all mankind") may escape the punishment due for sin?

"*Answer*. To escape the punishment due for sin, God requires of us ("all mankind") repentance toward him and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Question 19. What is repentance toward God?

"*Answer*. Repentance toward God is that exercise whereby the sinner, *out of a true sense of his guilt, with grief and hatred of sin*, turns from it.

"Question 20. What is faith in Jesus Christ?

"*Answer*. Faith in Jesus Christ, the ability of which is of grace, is receiving and resting upon him alone for salvation as he is offered to us ("all mankind") in the gospel."

Notice the Confession of Faith. Under "Divine Influence," Article 39: "The Holy Spirit . . . . so moves upon the hearts of men as to enlighten, etc., and, by so doing, inclines them to come to Christ." Article 40 continues and concludes . . . . "So that while it is possible for all to be saved with it, none can be saved without it." Article 41 goes on to say, "This call . . . . is effectual in those only who, in penitence and faith freely surrender THEMSELVES wholly to Christ. . . ." Under the head of "Repentance Unto Life," Article 43, we have . . . . "Yet God is pleased to require ALL MEN to repent." Under the head of "Saving Faith," Article 46, we find, "While there is no merit in faith, yet it is THE CONDITION of salvation. . . ." Article 51 declares, "Those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ are regenerated. . . ." The necessity and nature of regeneration is pointed out in the two succeeding Articles.

All of these statements condition salvation upon a personal exercise of faith in Christ. Article 54 seems to rest upon some other condition for salvation, for by far the larger number of those who, as we have always been taught, will finally attain the bliss of heaven. And so the "solution" must of logical necessity teach. Is it true then that faith is THE CONDITION OF SALVATION to a minority of the heirs of salvation while something else is the condition to the large majority?

The simple truth is the "solution" proposed by the writer and commended by the editor does not solve any thing. This theory, that "infants may be saved without personal faith," to use the language of another," subverts the fundamental principle of Protestantism." Another has said: "The current unformulated theory that they (infants) can be saved without acceptance of the righteousness of Christ undermines the fundamental principle of Christianity." It

appears then that "there must be some way in which infants and incapables . . . . may be brought into contact with God and have an opportunity to believe in him, or they can not be saved in accordance with the Scriptures and the Creeds of Christendom," "For there can be no justification without faith for them any more than for others."

A suggestion then comes to us from another, that may be offered here, though to many it may be a "specter of frightful mien." "The Intermediate State is for them (infants and incapables) a state of blessed possibilities of redemption." This may provide an element in the yet to be reconstructed doctrine of infant salvation.

J. A. McKAMY.

However we may be puzzled about the philosophy and method of infant salvation it is certain that He who said "suffer the little children to come unto me" will receive every infant soul into heaven. If we can not make our well-built theological systems fit this divine certainty so much the worse for our systems. It is well, if we can, to map out the exact method by which God saves our children that die; it is still more important to surround our living children with such influences as will lead them ever upward. Among such influences one of the most potent is a godly home. The pastor of a Hebrew congregation contributes a paper containing some orthodox Christian teaching on this subject:

ABOUT HOME.

Look at home. Is it what home should be—what we could make it if we would? Is the husband and father, the bread-winner, free from care and anxious thought when he crosses the threshold of that temple wherein are enshrined his household gods, when he meets the dear ones who look toward him for that light which is to gladden their lives and direct their footsteps? Ah! pity the one who must forever bear his burden of work, nor be enabled to cast it off in that which should be his haven of rest, peace, and happiness.

When the sun sinks below the horizon does the wife and mother, freed from household duties, appear fresh, cheerful, and ready to greet her consort with a happy smile? Is she able to amuse and instruct her little ones? If not, try to remedy the evil quickly while it can be cured.

If man or woman suffer the cares and labors of life to absorb all their time, whether it be the business pursuits of the one, or the home duties of the other; if we suffer these to occupy what should be our leisure moments, leaving us no time that may be called our own to devote to reading, to amusement, to the sweet amenities of family life, to the proper training of our children, we may discover how grievous is our error when it is too late to remedy it.

Let the home be such a one as will leave loving, tender, grateful memories in the hearts of our children that will never leave them while life exists—memories of home joys and of a holy faith. But to form a happy household there must be a united interests, a bond of affection and duty drawing all the members of the family together after the hours of labor are past; making the welfare of each the happiness of all, and the sorrows of each the distress of all. Without this there can be no union in the home, but merely an assembly of units that, like grains of sand, have no cohesive power, but may readily be scattered. Only reflect how short at best and how fleeting is the time that we can have our children with us; and then decide whether, as they advance in years, they shall be alienated from us by reason of our own indifference or neglect. We should always bear in mind that the impressions made in the tender years of childhood, are more potent in the formation of character than the instructions of maturer years. These impressions made within the blessed circle of the home are the work of the parental mind and example. Therefore it is the more incumbent upon us to do our share in the sacred work that God has allotted to us, and to see that that work is well performed. When our children go forth to battle with the cares of life, see that they carry with them sweet and bright memories of the home of their youth, and of the fond parents who were their loved companions, their dearest friends, and most honored instructors; and those unfading memories will be to them at once a shield and buckler in the worldly strife.

In dealing with older children and in imparting to them instruction and advice, we should minister to their self-respect by showing that we respect them. If we glance lightly over mere faults and give more praise and encouragement to real excellence, if we take pains to recognize the faculties they possess and to draw forth latent powers, thus creating a sense of strength and hope instead of despair and recklessness, faults that were once apparent may imperceptibly disappear under the beneficial and wholesome influence of a growing force of character. Thus will the evil be overcome with good. I scarcely know a sadder sight than a family of growing boys and girls, or grown up young men and women, accepting, even expecting coolly and thoughtlessly, continued sacrifices and gifts from tender and doting parents, appropriating every thing and contributing nothing, while the parents are actually wearing our their lives to secure comfort, pleasure, or advantage to their children, who give in return only ingratitude, indifference, and disrespect, evincing not a particle of filial sympathy. Children who are honored by their parents' confidence, and taught to add their quota of assistance and to bring their offering of self-sacrifice whenever the good of the family requires it, wi

rarely be guilty of ingratitude or disrespect. They are in full sympathy with their parents, not because their natures are peculiarly sympathetic, but because they have been made participants in the responsibilities and labors of their home. Let us never become such slaves to work or outside pleasures that no time shall be left for the social and intellectual culture of our youth, or the sweet intercourse of the family circle.

RABBI ISIDORE LEWINTHAL.

The following, with which this somewhat extended list of communications is closed, brings us face to face with the profoundest questions often asked, but never yet answered by philosopher or scientist:

WHAT? HOW? WHY? WHITHER?

Among the many questions that arise in the human mind when it contemplates any object of knowledge, there are four which are of prime importance. To answer these questions is one of the chief burdens of all systematic thought. They are comprehensively embraced in the four short words, What? How? Why? Whither?

WHAT?—As an answer to the first of these questions we have the established facts of human knowledge. It includes all that is known of the present and past condition of the universe, physical, mental, moral, and æsthetical. It may be called statical science. It is nature at rest. It is knowledge obtained by experience, observation, and experiment. To this branch of investigation belong the established facts of astronomy, geology, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, sociology, history, pure mathematics, etc. The three great facts are Matter, Spirit, God. The connecting link between matter and spirit is Vitality; that beween spirit and God is Will. Of the real nature of these facts, however, we know nothing. The questions, "What is matter?" "What is spirit?" "What is God?" can not now be answered.

HOW?—In answer to this question we find the proximate cause of phenomena. This is dynamical science, or nature in action. It is method, process, evolution, development. It treats of antecedent and sequent. It is causation in the narrow sense—that is, it concerns the investigation of secondary causes. It is law and order. It appeals to the reason and is the basis of all true science and systematic knowledge. It gives us the great generalizations and inductions of science. It furnishes, however, no explanations of ultimate cause. The misapprehension has largely prevailed that in general laws we have the final and full explanation of phenomena. This is a mistake. When we have found in the law of gravitation an explanation of the movements of planets, we have but removed the difficulty one step farther away, and the mind arises from its temporary satisfaction to inquire the cause of gravitation. To this branch of study belong theoretical

astronomy, the nebular hypothesis, dynamics, dynamical geology, the laws of physical and chemical action, ontogeny, phylogeny, evolution, philosophy of history, logic, politics, etc. The movements of the universe are carried on through the operation of forces, which are either material, vital, spiritual, or divine. Of the real nature of these forces and the exact method of their operation we have no adequate knowledge.

WHY?—The answer to this question belongs to philosophy rather than to science. It involves ultimate causation, the *causa causarum*. All the causation of science is secondary. Law only shows method or process. We know nothing of the real nature and cause of gravitation, evolution, or ratiocination. In the physical world there is no real spontaneity. For ultimate cause we must look elsewhere. The only place, where it seems likely now to be found is in the free will. The will, however, unless it be purely capricious, must have a motive behind it. We can do no better, then, than to follow Aristotle and divide ultimate cause as follows:

1. Efficient cause. Whence?

(*a*) Primary. First cause. Will.

(*b*) Secondary. Interaction. Popular causes forming a chain which reaches back to primary cause. How?

2. Final cause. Motive, end in view, design. Wherefore?

Here belong the final problems of philosophy. This is the study of the soul of man as a free source of power and design, and of God as the ultimate source of all power in the universe and the great designer of all things that are and become.

In this study we seek for the origin of matter, vitality, and spirit, and try to discover the end or purpose for which each exists. Nature furnishes no clew to its origin. Science fails to find the essence of things, philosophy seeks in vain for the ultimate principle, yet the uncultured human soul solves the problem by an intuitive sense of its own nature. That a supreme spirit exists is a natural inference from our own spiritual existence, and atheism is abhorrent to the very nature of man. The idea of God has been common to all ages and all nations; not acquired by a course of philosophical reasoning, but coming as a sort of inspiration.

It is a remarkable fact that the God of the Hebrews, a people versed neither in science nor philosophy, proves to-day to be the same God who answers to the most rigid requirements of science and philosophy, and who alone gives explanation and meaning to the universe. This is a fact which the atheist and agnostic must explain before they can rationally maintain their ground. Man is a microcosm, nature the macrocosm. As man has a soul which is the true essence of his being, so nature has a soul which is God. Separate

man's soul from his body and the latter passes back to inanimate nature whence it came; separate nature from God and it could no longer exist.

WHITHER?—This is the question of chief interest to man. It involves the fate of the physical universe and the immortality and future state of the human soul. If there is no future for man, his existence is a failure, and it were wise for him to "shuffle off this mortal coil" as soon as he has gathered the sweetness out of life. Unlikely infants should be killed and the old and feeble should be strangled. If the soul dies with the body, there is no duty, no right and wrong, no good and evil, no virtue, no basis for ethics, no accountability; there is no significance in mind, no virtue in morality; self-denial is want of sense and charity is foolishness.

For the solution of these questions we require the combined help of science, philosophy, and revelation. Science alone gives us materialism; philosophy alone, idealism. If we confine ourselves to science and philosophy, we have agnosticism. With the three combined we obtain that realism which satisfies the human soul and gives meaning and significance to all that exists. Existence would be futile without activity, activity becomes rational only in mind, mind is significant only as the organ of a spiritual being, and spirit finds no explanation except in God. I predict that, as science advances to the limits of its power and philosophy continues to seek ultimate principles, theism will the more strongly retain its hold as the only rational and ultimate explanation of the universe. Science leads to philosophy; philosophy to God.

J. I. D. HINDS.

Though several of the contributions in this department considerably exceed the limit of "twenty lines or less," it is believed that the longest will not be found least interesting or instructive. We hope to present other good things, long and short, in the October number.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE: JUDGES AND RUTH. By Rev. R. A. Watson, M.A. The Prophecies of Jeremiah, with a sketch of his Life and Times. By Rev. C. J. Ball, M.A. The Epistles of St. John. By Rt. Rev. W. Alexander, D.D. The Book of Revelation. By Rev. Prof. W. Milligan, D.D.

The series of which these books are a part contains expository lectures on all the books of the Bible by the foremost preachers and theologians of the day. So say the publishers, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, New York city. The volumes are designed for all intelligent students of the Scriptures and are as well adapted to

the people as to the clergy, but they are certainly full of valuable thought for the preacher. The design is a good one and we are glad to commend these books as having a freshness and suggestiveness in them which the earnest student will appreciate. To commend these volumes separately would be to say that as a person may need to study a particular portion of Scripture, he will find the volume he desires to be well adapted to his advancement. That peculiar book, the Revelation of St. John, is treated here in a comprehensive way, not touching the details of verses or even of small sections of chapters, but is presented in broader views as the writer conceives the purpose of the Holy Spirit to be in regard to the future of the Church in the world. When the writer of this notice was a youth in the university, he was in a class led by the professor of languages who led us through the mazes of Revelation as guided by Barnes' Notes. It is very interesting to see how differently the old and new treat the subjects presented by the apocalyptic apostle. The new certainly has the advantage of arriving at conclusions in a shorter space and with more comprehensiveness of treatment.

The work on Jeremiah and his times is interesting and instructive, and we may say especially is the sketch such. It really has the effect of a modern study of life and character. The writer enters vigorously into Jeremiah's views and mission, and shows how his labors and sacrifices were calculated to do good in the days after the fearful scenes which he so faithfully depicted beforehand and of which he gave such bold warnings to sinning Israel.

It is enough to say that these volumes are worth their price and for books so well bound, so beautifully printed, containing such matter, and of such size, six dollars for six volumes is surely reasonable. Let our young men especially take note.

THE SERMON BIBLE: ISAIAH TO MALACHI. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, 1890.

The firm which sends us this volume seems to be putting forth many standard works for the Christian public, and with such variety, too, that all classes may be suited. The volume here noticed is compendious, having homiletic excerpts from a great number of able writers, not in exhaustive treatment, like the Expositor's Bible, but of sufficient length and force to give a many-sidedness to the text of Scripture. There has been much research to collect the best thoughts of so many authorities and compile them in a wise connection of exposition in this volume. The result is good for the spare hour, for the few minutes of relaxation, as well as for the close study of the pastor preparing for his pulpit. It is a good work.

GOD AND LITTLE CHILDREN: The blessed state of all who die in childhood proved and taught as a part of the gospel of Christ. By Henry Van Dyke, D.D. Anson D. H. Randolph & Co. New York. $1.00.

The purpose of the two discourses which make up this little volume as stated in the preface is "to show that No Children Lost, All Children Saved, is as true as gospel." "The dark old dream of the perdition of infants," continues the author, "has indeed begun to fade, long since, from the soul of Christendom, and the hope of their salvation has grown brighter and more clear from year to year, but there is still room and need for a book to prove that the black vision is utterly baseless, and that the bright hope is altogether reasonable, since it rests on the same foundation as Christianity itself." In the first discourse the author before setting himself to prove that the baselessness of "the black vision" shows that such a vision was for many centuries cherished as a reality by doctors and theologians as well as in popular belief in almost every part of the Church. From the fourth to the eighteenth century it was an accepted doctrine that some dying infants are damned. While this doctrine did not originate with Presbyterians the claim that Calvinistic theologians never believed or preached it is shown to be utterly false. Augustine, *pater durus infantum*, "the hard father of infants," was father of this hard dogma. He said that babes who die without baptism are lost. From the days of Augustine down to the end of the seventeenth century, theologians at large including Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians accepted and taught the doctrine that some infants are damned. The Canons of the Council of Trent pronounced an anathema upon any one who denies that a new-born infant must be baptized in order to be regenerated and thus fitted for entrance into everlasting life. Melanchthon's Augsburg Confession also anathematizes those who claim that children can be saved without baptism. The declarations of Calvin and other theologians of his school are given showing that they taught that God by eternal decree foreordained some infants to damnation. The Puritan view is indicated in a quotation from Michael Wigglesworth of Massachusetts. The words are from a description of the Last Judgment and are supposed to be the Judge's sentence to reprobate infants:

> You sinners are: and such a share as sinners may expect,
> Such you shall have, for I do save none but mine own Elect.
> Yet to compare your sins with theirs who lived a longer time,
> I do confess yours is much less, though every sin 's a crime.
> A Crime it is; therefore in bliss you may not hope to dwell:
> But unto you I shall allow the easiest place in Hell.

The falsity of this doctrine is shown by four arguments: There is

nothing in God's word to support it; it is condemned by natural justice; it is contrary to the principle of judgment as revealed by Christ that only the guilty and rebellious are punished; it is contrary to the love of God in Christ Jesus. Therefore Dr. Van Dyke declares: "We do not believe that there are children in hell. . . . If it is written or implied in any creed we refuse allegiance to it. If it is the essential part of any theological system we cut loose from it."

The second discourse is devoted to the affirmative proposition that all infants are saved. The first argument used is the fundamental Cumberland Presbyterian doctrine "that Jesus Christ died for all mankind." The second position is not less broad: God desires and purposes to save every soul that can be saved; and then "Jesus Christ has taught us that children belong to heaven."

The following extracts will perhaps throw some light on the author's views of the method or philosophy of infant salvation: "There is not a line or a word to shut out one of the little dying children. . . . Christ died for them, and Christ saves them when they die. But perhaps some one will say, 'How then do you get rid of the consequences of the Fall? How do you explain away the guilt of sin which rests on every descendant of guilty Adam?' We do not explain it away. . . . For not one word does the Scripture say of the relation of Adam to the race, which it does not say of the relation of Christ to the race. . . . If Adam's transgression brought a curse on all mankind, then Christ's atonement brought a blessing upon all mankind. The closer you bind a child to his fallen father, Adam, the closer you bind him to his risen Father, Christ. . . . The obedience of Christ countervails the disobedience of Adam, and blots it out completely. . . . Original sin is all atoned for. . . . No living soul shall ever perish for Adam's transgression. . . . The little child that comes into the world is born into a sinful humanity but it is not guilty in God's sight any more than it is guilty in your sight. It is made innocent by the precious blood of Christ. . . . If it passes out of this world before it has willfully turned away from the mercy of God, before it has chosen sin and loved it and lived in it, it passes pure and guiltless, a ransomed spirit, a lost child found, a beloved child saved, into the boundless love of our Father in heaven. . . . Is there any spiritual grace which they require to fit them for the vision of God? The Spirit can bestow that grace upon them even though they are unconscious of it. Do they need to be born again? He who gave them life will give them new life."

This volume is not only of interest to theologians as showing the hopeful and liberal trend of thought in the Presbyterian Church, but its convincing and assuring words will bring fresh consolation to many bereaved hearts.

DYING AT THE TOP: OR THE MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CONDITION OF THE YOUNG MEN OF AMERICA. By Rev. Joseph Waddell Clokey, D.D. W. W. Van Arsdale, Chicago, Ill.

This book, without being pessimistic or sensational, sets forth the discouraging and alarming facts concerning young men and the resulting danger to our country. He holds that "American society from ocean to ocean is suspended over an abyss," and that it "will require the engineering skill of the best elements in Church and State to keep us from depths of distress alongside of which the taxation of England in the old Colonial days and the slavery of the South were but baubles." The power and influence of young men as the aggressive element in society are set forth by many historical illustrations; and facts and statistics are given to show that this aggressive element is drifting away from Christianity and virtue. But five per cent of our young men are Church members and but fifteen out of one hundred attend Church at all; while the ranks of criminals and vagrants are constantly recruited from this class. Among the influences that lead souls astray, heredity, corrupt homes, a secularized Sabbath, the saloon, and the bagnio are enumerated. Under the latter head the author does not shrink from giving plain but necessary and solemn warnings against the insidious and corrupting power of the social evil.

He finds hope of deliverance from these varied evil influences only in the Church of Christ and the gospel. He looks with hope on two new forces which the Church has put forth into the field, the Christian woman, and the Christian young man. The dangers mentioned in this volume are real and threatening and ought to spur every Christian to new activity, while the practical hope pointed out at the close should inspire the Christian army in its forward march.

NATURAL RELIGION: The Gifford Lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1888, by F. Max Mueller, K.M., London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1889.

Lord Gifford, a Scotch lawyer, a few years ago, provided in his will for the endowment of a lectureship on Natural Theology in each of the Universities of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and St. Andrews. The conditions of the endowment indicate in a marked way the spirit of the times. It was the intention of Lord Gifford that the subject of religion should be investigated and discussed in a purely historical and scientific way. The fifth proviso of the will in regard to the lectureships is as follows: "I wish the lecturers to treat their subject as a strictly natural science, the greatest of all possible sciences, indeed, in one sense, the only science, that of infinite being, without reference to or reliance upon any supposed exceptional or so-called miraculous revelation. I wish it considered just as astronomy

or chemistry is. I have intentionally indicated, in describing the subject of the lectures, the general aspect which personally I would expect the lecturers to bear, but the lecturers shall be under no restraint whatever in their treatment of their theme—for example, they may freely discuss (and it may be well to do so) all questions about man's conceptions of God or the Infinite, their origin, nature, and truth; whether he can have any such conceptions; whether God is under any or what limitations, and so on, as I am persuaded that nothing but good can result from free discussion."

It is further provided that "the lecturers appointed shall be subjected to no test of any kind, and shall not be required to take any oath, or to emit or subscribe any declaration of belief, or to make any promise of any kind; they may be of any denomination whatever, or of no denomination at all (and many earnest and high-minded men prefer to belong to no ecclesiastical denomination); they may be of any religion or way of thinking, or, as is sometimes said, they may be of no religion, or they may be so-called skeptics or agnostics or free-thinkers, provided only that the 'patrons' will use diligence to secure that they be able, reverent men, true thinkers, sincere lovers of, and earnest inquirers after, truth."

Each lecturer is appointed for two years and may be reappointed twice. The number of lectures is not limited.

Of Lord Gifford, Mueller says: "During the last seven years of his life when confined to the sick room by creeping paralysis his mind, always active, bright, and serene, became more and more absorbed in the study of the various systems of philosophy and religion, both Christian and non-Christian, and he made no secret to his own relatives of his having been led by these studies to surrender some of the opinions which they and he himself had been brought up to consider as essential to Christianity. There can be no doubt that he deliberately rejected all miracles, whether as a judge, on account of want of evidence, or as a Christian, because they seemed to him in open conflict with the exalted spirit of Christ's own teachings. Yet he remained always a truly devout Christian, trusting more in the great miracle of Christ's life and teaching on earth than in the small miracles ascribed to him by many of his follows."

The book before us contains the first course of Gifford lectures delivered at the University of Glasgow. No man in the world, perhaps, could have been selected who would better have represented Lord Gifford's ideal. While Max Mueller is a firm believer in God and religion, he is not one whom the orthodox theologian delights to honor. He believes in revelation, but does not believe that all of revelation is in the Bible, nor that all that is in the Bible is revelation. He holds that religion is natural and progressive. He says: "There

is nothing in the idea of revelation that excludes progress, for whatever definition of revelation we adopt, it always represents a communication between the divine on the one side and the human on the other. Let us grant that the divine element in revelation—that is, whatever of truth there is in revelation—is immutable, yet the human element, the recipient, must always be liable to the accidents and infirmities of human nature."

This course of twenty lectures is really but preparatory to a larger treatment of the subject hereafter. The first lecture is devoted to a discussion of Lord Gifford's will. The next six are given to the consideration of the various definitions of religion and the development of the author's own definition. This latter is significant and far-reaching. It is this: "Religion consists in the perception of the infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man" (p. 188).

To apprehend fully what this means, one must read the book. It supposes that the perception of the infinite is the basis of the religious idea and feeling, that the infinite is directly perceived as the complement of the finite and that the infinite, whether perceived in nature, in man, or in self, gives rise to the religious feeling. It is large enough to include Buddhism in which neither God, creation, nor future life is recognized.

In the next three lectures a plea is made for the historical method as opposed to the theoretical in the study of religion.

The remaining ten lectures are devoted to the discussion of the materials for the study of Natural Religion. These are Language, Myths, Customs, Laws, and Sacred Books. The argument is that language is necessary to thought, that myth grew out of language, that sacred books are written myths and that customs and laws are based upon religious ideas.

No man who proposes to keep pace with the trend of the religious thought of the present day can afford to remain ignorant of the contents of this book.

In subsequent lectures Professor Mueller will treat of the three branches of Natural Religion, which he defines as Physical, Anthropological, and Psychological. By Physical Religion he means that arising from the apprehension of the infinite in nature, as the worship of the sky, the earth, the air, rivers, mountains, etc.; by Anthropological Religion he means that which arises from the perception of the infinite in man, as the worship of ancestors, kings, etc.; and by Psychological Religion we are to understand that which springs from the perception of the infinite in the self-conscious subject, represented by the *Atma*, self, of the Upanishads, the *Daimonion*, indwelling God, of Socrates, and the *Holy Ghost* of the early Christian philosophers.

MAGAZINE NOTES.

One can not read over the tables of contents in the successive issues to *The Popular Science Monthly*, without seeing how wide is the range of topics discussed in that always solid and interesting if not always theologically sound magazine. Among the subjects treated in its pages since April the following may be mentioned: "Science in the High School;" "Is Education Opposed to Motherhood?" "The Indwelling Spirits of Men;" "Sumptuary Laws;" "Cats and their Friendships;" "Glass-making;" Education and Crime;" "The Affirmative Side of Agnosticism." In the June number Dr. Andrew White resumes his "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science," discussing "The Antiquity of Man and Egyptology." The April number contains Prof. Huxley's article on "The Natural Inequalities of Men," and the May and June numbers Herbert Spencer's article "On Justice."

The *Chautauquan*, which with the beginning of its present volume last autumn assumed the regular magazine form, this summer makes another new departure by introducing the element of fiction into the pages hitherto sacred to fact and science and moral, educational, and literary essays and sketches. Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen's novelette, "The Golden Calf," a well written romance, appears in the July number. We understand that each number hereafter is to contain at least one short story.

The numbers of the *Atlantic Monthly* bring so much solid reading along with the choicest fiction and the most stimulating literary, political, social, and scientific discussion, that one feels that he could not spare them from his monthly stock of literary supplies though he may not have time to digest their contents. In the June number Charles Dudley Warner discusses "The Novel and the Common School," and Hannis Taylor presents facts and arguments to show the growing inefficiency of the National House of Representatives as a legislative body. In the July number Miss Fannie N. D. Murfree, sister of "Charles Egbert Craddock," begins a story entitled "Felicia."

No other publication that comes to our table brings such interesting and varied reports from mission fields or so much useful and instructive missionary reading as *The Missionary Review*.

We have seldom read a more realistic and revolting picture of the horrors of the slave-trade and the curse it brings to the native African tribes than that painted in the April *Century* in the illustrated article

of E. J. Glave. In the last three months this popular magazine has published a large number of papers of solid and permanent interest. In the May number an interesting series on "The Women of the French Salons," was begun by Amelia Gere Mason. In the June number Dr. W. C. Wilkinson writes on "Homer and the Bible," and Edward Atkinson on "Comparative Taxation." This magazine is also a worthy rival of *Harpers* in the excellence of its illustrated, descriptive, and historical articles.

In the *Unitarian Review* for June the editor writes on "Our New Attitude Toward the World-Religions." The world-religions are Brahminism, Buddhism, and such like, and the new attitude toward these he claims is growing tolerance—a tendency to put all faith, Christian and otherwise—on the same level. In the same magazine is an interesting sketch of Voltaire and a discussion of "Schopenhauer's Estimate of Christianity."

Critical students of the Old Testament books will be interested in Prof. W. W. Davies' paper in the *Methodist Review* for May–June on "The Integrity of the Book of Job." The "Editorial Notes and Discussions" in this *Review* are able and extended and it has a well-digested resume of foreign affairs and events.

In the April number of *The Quarterly Review* of the M. E. Church, South, Dr. W. F. Tillett answers the question, "What Books Shall I Buy?" Among the other articles in this number are "Walks in London," by Rev. William Harrison, M.A.; "Theism, A Survey of the Argument," by Rev. J. J. Tigert, D.D.; "The Land of the Montezumas," by Rev. P. C. Bryce, and "Historical Memoranda M. E. Church, South," by H. S. Thrall, D.D.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review is proving itself a worthy successor of the defunct *Presbyterian Review*. We have not been able to discover any very marked evidences of the predicted increase in the blueness of its theology. In the April number Prof. Thos. H. Skinner seems to teach that God is not the Father of all men. He says: "In respect to our original and native family connection we are as far as possible removed from the family of God. Neither physically, nor intellectually, nor morally, nor spiritually, have we the most remote kinship to God as our Father." This may satisfy some of his readers, but we believe that many will still prefer to think of God as one to whom an awakened sinner, as well as a trusting saint, can look up and say, "Our Father."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Some of the volumes in this list have been discussed by us in reviews more or less extended. Others will receive such notices hereafter. The receipt of all books or pamphlets sent the CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW will be promptly acknowledged, and important works will receive more extended notice.

From Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.—*The Religious Aspect of Evolution.* By James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Enlarged and improved edition. 119 pages. Cloth.

From Macmillan & Co., London and New York.—*Captain Cook.* By Walter Bezant. 191 pages. Cloth, 60 cents. *Havelock*, by Archibald Forbes.

From John B. Alden, New York.—*Kadeschda: A poem in nine Cantos.* By Johan Ludvig Runeberg. Translated from the Swedish by Mrs. John B. Shipley (Marie A. Brown). 103 pages. 50 cents.

The Prophet of Palmyra; Mormonism reviewed and examined in the Life, Character, and Career of its Founder, together with a complete History of the Mormon Era. By Thomas Gregg. 552 pages. $1.00.

Tropical Africa. By Henry Drummond, LL.D., author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World."

History of the Conquest of Peru with a Preliminary View of the Civilization of the Incas. By William H. Prescott. In two volumes.

From Ginn & Co., Boston.—*A Short History of the Roman People.* By William F. Allen, late Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin.

From A. C. Armstrong & Son: New York.—Four volumes of the Expositor's Bible as follows: *Judges and Ruth.* By the Rev. Robert A. Watson, M.A. *The Prophecies of Jeremiah*, with a sketch of his Life and Times. By the Rev. C. J. Ball, M.A. *The Epistles of St. John* (twenty-one discourses). By William Alexander, D.D., D.C.L. *The Book of Revelation.* By William Milligan, D.D. $1.50 per volume.

The Sermon Bible: Isaiah to Malachi.

The Unknown God: or Inspiration Among Pre-Christian Races. By Loring Bruce.

The Salt-Cellars: A collection of Proverbs, together with Homely Notes thereon. By C. H. Spurgeon.

From The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago.—*Epitomes of Three Sciences;* Comparative Philology, Psychology, and Old Testament History. H. Oldenberg, J. Jastrow, C. H. Cornill. 75 cents.

W. W. Van Arsdale, Chicago.—*Dying at the Top;* or the Moral and Spiritual Condition of the Young Men of America. By Rev. Joseph Waddell Clokey, D.D.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

Vol. II. OCTOBER, 1890. No. 4.

I DO BELIEVE.

NONE but mathematical truth is capable of demonstration, which Mr. Webster defines to be a course of reasoning showing that a certain result is a necessary consequent of assumed premises; these premises being definitions, axioms, and previously established propositions.

Ordinary matters of fact are proved by moral evidence alone, by which is meant, says Mr. Greenleaf, not only that kind of evidence which is employed upon subjects connected with moral conduct, but all the evidence which is not obtained either from our own senses, or from intuition, or from demonstration.

In most of the affairs of life a thing is considered proved when it can be said there remains no reasonable doubt of the fact in question. The grounds of belief are various. Much that we accept as truth consists simply in what others have told us. It is sometimes said that the reason why we believe in the religion of Jesus Christ is because the facts relating to it were stated to us in our tender childhood, and have been repeated over and over in later years. It is true, as alleged, that this affords a ground for belief, and, I think, a legitimate ground, *prima facie.*

What every body says is true, and what every body else believes is likely to be true. It is absurd, however, to suggest that the mere consensus of faith on the part of the Christian world should of itself be conclusive and satisfactory evidence of the truths of our religion. Children and very ignorant people generally go no further in their inquiries, but intelligent and educated minds stop not here. Hundreds and thousands of the mightiest intellects

have investigated for themselves. They have brought to bear in this investigation their knowledge of history, of archæology, of geology, of language, of astronomy, and almost every other branch of science, and have announced as the result their firm belief in the truth of the Bible. Now, I submit that this fact of itself is sufficient to beget faith in me until, at least, I am able to look into the matter myself.

I have never calculated the distance from the earth to the sun, yet I believe the distance to be somewhere between ninety-three and ninety-five million miles. The reason why I believe it is that many learned men for centuries past have made the calculations, and repeatedly announced the fact. To this extent I pin my faith to the statements of others without investigation.

Mr. Hume said that in matters of religion he relied on his own "firm and unalterable experience." So the king of Siam, when informed by the Dutch embassador that in his country water became hard, by being frozen, refused to believe it, because he said it did not accord with his own experience. This puts the learned and accomplished infidel upon a footing with the weak and benighted barbarian.

Skeptics firmly believe thousands of scientific and historic truths, not pretending to challenge their correctness, basing their convictions wholly on the statements of others. In fact, the immense mass of accumulated truth constituting our education is of this character. That is, we receive it neither from demonstration nor by intuition, nor, indeed, from our own senses, but accept without doubting the oft-repeated statements of others.

More intellectual power has been expended in the investigation of the Christian religion and the Book on which it rests than upon any other subject that affects human life and human destiny, with the result that, in overwhelming numbers, men have given it their adhesion. On the fifteenth of March, forty-four years before Christ, Julius Cæsar set out for the Roman Senate, and upon entering the chamber was attacked by a number of senators, receiving wounds notably from Casca and Brutus. He fell at the foot of Pompey's statue and expired. Is there an intelligent man to be found who does not implicitly believe these facts? Would not any one who doubted be set down as a simpleton? Yet the tragic end of this great warrior occurred more than two thousand years ago.

No man who witnessed his death has left any record of the fact. One or two contemporaries have narrated the facts. They obtained their information possibly from eye-witnesses. The circumstances in regard to the death of Jesus Christ, his resurrection, and all his acts and sayings, are reported in one way or another, by as many as eight separate writers, who witnessed his death and heard his words, to wit: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Jude, and Peter. These books were written shortly after the occurrences, and at different times. Each book was as separate and distinct as were Tacitus and Pliny and Livy. That they were written by different men is easy to tell, judging by the style of the writers, just as it is easy enough to see that Macbeth and Paradise Lost were not written by the same man. Scholars become experts in distinguishing such matters where the ordinary reader would fail. They detect the difference in writers as readily as a farmer would distinguish between the different kinds of cattle he owns.

Now, if I am expected to believe what only two or three contemporary writers say about Cæsar, why should I not give equal credit to what eight writers say about Jesus Christ? The answer of the unbeliever is that the facts stated by the historians in regard to Cæsar are in accordance with the usual observation and experience of men, whereas some of the facts stated in the histories of Christ are unusual, and indeed, contrary to human observation and experience. That is all true. Still, the gospel narratives do state a great many facts which are in no way miraculous. They tell of the geography of the country where the miracles are said to have occurred, of the governors and rulers in their succession, and of many other persons and things; and these ordinary facts are corroborated either by profane history or by subsequent travel and observation. In other words, they state a great many facts which we know to be true from independent sources of knowledge.

Now, I submit that having stated so many facts of history, politics, geography, topography, customs, and manners, with such minute accuracy—all of which we know to be true—is it not a fair presumption that the other facts which they state as having witnessed, are also true, though they were out of the usual course of things? *Noscitur a sociis* is a law maxim, as well as an every-day, common sense saying. We are to judge of men and things by the company they are in. If a man should tell me twenty things

which I know to be true, and then he tell me two or three facts which I do not know to be true, the latter facts also are presumably correct. Of course, this presumption is not conclusive. Still, if the witness has maintained all his life a reputation for honesty and truthfulness, and what he states is not denied by those who had the same means of knowledge with himself, the presumption of the truth of his statements is greatly strengthened.

The writers of the gospel spoke of these things in Jerusalem, Corinth, Rome, and, in fact, in the whole civilized world while the facts they stated were fresh in the minds of thousands of witnesses in the country where they occurred. They wrote down their epistles and their histories, and these were read by thousands of men and women at the time; and yet there is not a book or letter contemporary with them denying the facts which they state. Caiaphas, Ananias, Herod, Pilate, Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and hundreds of others, able and learned Jews and Romans, lived in that day. They were the most intelligent men of the age.

Is it not remarkable that none of them left on record any thing disputing or denying the wonderful facts which these disciples were publishing? If the raising of the widow's son, of the ruler's daughter, and of Lazarus, from the dead, and the feeding of the five thousand with two or three loaves and fishes, and many other wonderful things which the writers of the Gospels assert to have been performed by Christ, were lies being circulated everywhere, is it not strange that some book, letter, or record denying the facts and exposing the frauds was not written and handed down to us?

The truth is, the contemporary enemies of Jesus could not deny the truth of his miracles. There were too many thousands of witnesses. So they attacked him upon altogether different grounds, charging that he was in league with the devil, and guilty of blasphemy, because he claimed divine power. The writers of the gospel set out with the assertion that Christ was God, that he was the same great being who made all things now come down to this world and disguised as a man. Admitting their premise, it is easy enough to believe that he who made man could raise him from the dead, or that he who made the sea could still it with a word. There would be nothing more extraordinary in a God of omnipotence calling a dead man out of his grave than for a man like Brutus to stab Cæsar to death, considering the relative power

of the two. Convince me then that Christ is God and I am prepared to believe implicitly all that is said of him. On the other hand, convince me that he did the wonderful things that are recorded of him by the New Testament writers, and I am irresistibly driven to the conclusion that he is God. The main question, therefore is, Are the records truthful? In fact, this is the only material inquiry, because the rest follows as a necessary consequence.

Many as the writers are, good as their reputation is, plain as their statements are, it has been often objected that they do not agree among themselves, that their accounts of certain transactions are contradictory. Any fair, intelligent, and careful reader should be able to meet this criticism. The reason of the apparent discrepancy, in a few cases where the different writers relate the same occurrence, arises mainly from the different points of view of the witnesses. If there is a post in the street, and one side is painted red and the other white, the man who walked on one side will swear in court that the post is red, while the other will swear that the post is white. Both are honest and truthful men, and there is no real discrepancy, though they appear to be contradicting each other. The same is true of two witnesses who see a street fight. When called into court there will be found quite a difference in their statements in detail. Both will identify the belligerents; both will swear that they fought on a certain day and at a certain place; but one witness says he saw a knife with blade open, in the hands of one of the parties, while the other did not see the knife, but saw the other party put his hand in his bosom as if to draw a pistol. Every observant man who has been about the courts will agree that all this is true. In fact, it would almost raise a presumption that there is something wrong in the testimony if the witnesses should agree exactly in all the details.

In the narrative of Christ riding into Jerusalem, one writer says he rode upon an ass, while another says they put their garments upon an ass and a colt, and he rode thereon. The fact that the colt is not mentioned by one of the writers is no reason for saying that there is a discrepancy. No doubt there was a colt with its mother, but one of the writers simply does not think it necessary to mention it. There is no conflict. This is one out of many instances that might be given, in none of which, by fair and

liberal construction, would there be found any real disagreement. Somebody wrote the books which compose the New Testament. Somebody used the language there recorded. Who did it? No man of common sense can fail to see something extraordinary in the statements, in the language, in the sentiments. Who uttered those wonderful words? Is it possible that a set of unlearned fishermen could have conceived of such a character as Jesus Christ, or that they could have put in his mouth the language that has been the admiration of the best men of the world for twenty centuries? Such a thought is so utterly absurd that the French infidel, Renan, declares it impossible. He, in his Life of Jesus, makes our Lord a hero whom he almost worships, and while he insists that he was only a man, asserts that the disciples, not only did not and could not have manufactured those remarkable sayings, but that they rather spoiled them by their awkward and bludering reports.

Daniel Webster used to say that the Sermon on the Mount was enough of itself to convince him of the existence and divine character of its author. Certainly no such truths as those contained in the sayings of Jesus had ever been announced to the world before. No man has written or said any thing to compare with them since. He distinctly and repeatedly claimed divine power. He allowed himself to be worshiped as divine. Why? Was he deluded himself? Was he beside himself, and laboring under some hallucination, as some are in this day? Do his words indicate that he was mentally unbalanced? Or are they the tremendous, sober truths that address themselves to the hearts and consciences of men? Was he a good man? Would a good man have claimed what he claimed—equality with God, omnipotent power—unless it were true? Were the disciples bad men or good men? If they were good men they would not have written a pack of lies. If they were bad men they would not, they could not have prepared and published and practiced the splendid system of morals embraced in the books in question.

Were the writers a set of numbskulls and simpletons?

When they declare that they saw Christ raise the dead repeatedly, still the winds and the waves, heal the sick, open the eyes of the blind, and the ears of the deaf, all with a simple word, is it possible that they were deceived? Could my reader be deceived

by a juggler pretending to raise a putrid dead body out of the grave, and putting life into it?

Another argument in favor of the Bible truths may be drawn from their exact adaptation to our nature. The vine trailing on the ground, with its head raised, and swaying back and forth in the air, suggests the want of a stake or a tree on which to climb. And when it reaches the desired support how it naturally winds itself about it tightly, constantly ascending toward the sun. So the souls of men in all ages have been reaching out after something stronger, something greater, on which to lean. There is a feeling of helplessness in us all. When we find the Christ of the Bible how readily we cling to him, and like the vine, climb upward, and still upward, for more light.

Suppose one should receive a mysterious box, tightly locked, but no key is sent with it. All the keys of the household and of the neighborhood are called into requisition, but none of them will succeed. The wise locksmiths are sent for, but they are unable to pick the lock or open the mysterious box. After a time, a stranger comes, and brings with him a key which he says will fit the lock, that he made the box and the key, and is able to open it. So, in the presence of many persons he applies the key, and the lid flies open, and the beauties, and treasures, and mysteries of the interior are exhibited to all present.

So the Bible is the only key that can unlock the mysteries all around us and within us. The wise locksmiths have for ages tried to open these closed lids, but have failed. Our origin, our duty, our destiny, without revelation, were sealed. The Son of God, who made all things, has come to us, like the stranger, and has brought with him the Great Key that unlocks to the beholding and wondering sons of men the glorious things which were mysteries, but are now made plain.

Many years ago there was a beautiful child who strayed from his father's house, and was lost. The child was very young, not being able to tell where he lived or the names of his parents. By some means he was taken hundreds of miles from home, and fell into the hands of strangers. As he grew up he observed other children enjoying the comforts and affection of home and of fond parents. He often wondered if he did not have a dear father somewhere, and a fond mother to love him. He said to himself, "I

must be somebody's son." And the boy's heart yearned for an imaginary home and an imaginary father.

One day there chanced to come from the far East a traveler who was journeying through the wild country, and he left an old, yellow newspaper which had been printed years before. The boy, now a well grown youth, got hold of the paper, and saw in it an advertisement headed: "A Lost Child," and it read thus:

"Strayed or kidnapped, a little boy three years old. The child may be known by a mother's mark, shaped like a serpent, just over the heart on his left side. There is also a scar on his right arm, between the elbow and shoulder, about two inches in diameter, the result of a burn. Further, when an infant his nurse let him fall, fracturing his right leg, and this healed so that he has a slight limp in his gait. If this should be read by any one knowing of such a child, or be heard of by the child himself, as he may grow older, there would be joy unspeakable in his old home, and a loving father's heart would welcome him back a thousand times when he shall return."

Upon reading this he cried aloud, "I am the identical person described." Tearing open his clothes he looked at his naked breast to re-assure himself. "Yes," said he, "here is that serpent over my heart, and here is the burn upon my right arm, and I still limp. Surely, surely, I am the very person described. It can refer to no other; and it must be a genuine advertisement, for no one else could have known so well of these marks except my own precious father and mother. I will arise and go to my father."

And thus it is with us all. We feel that we have strayed. We know we are in a strange land. We are painfully conscious that we need the sweets and comforts of home. The Bible describes us. It describes us so minutely that, comparing the statements with ourselves, we feel sure that the author of the Book "knew what is in man," and the Maker of man is the author of the Book. No honest, unprejudiced man can carefully read the Scriptures without having his heart respond, "I believe it; it is true."

N. GREEN.

PRESBYTERIAN CREEDS AND PULPITS.

"For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administered is best;
For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

—*Pope.*

As to government, Presbyterian Churches are one. Indeed, the distinctive title, Presbyterian, designates a certain form of government, being derived from the Greek word, πρεσβύτερος. This word is used in both the Septuagint and the New Testament to designate the officers to whom was committed the government of the Church.

But it is with the creeds and pulpits of Presbyterian Churches, and not with their forms of government, that this paper has to do. The creeds of the Presbyterian Churches of the world are practically embodied in two systems, the one embracing what is known as the Westminster Standards, the other the symbols of faith of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. The Reformed Confession of the sixteenth century, the Heidelburg Catechism of 1563, the Helvetic Confession of 1566, and the Thirty-nine Articles of 1571 differ but little from the Westminster Shorter Catechism, or from the older Scotch Confession. Reprobation and Preterition are either expressed or implied in all these, as also in the Westminster Confession, and it will be sufficient for the purposes of the present paper to compare the latter, as a fair exponent of them all, with the Confession of Faith of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

In most points in what is understood to be orthodox theology, these two systems agree, viz.: As to the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; man's moral depravity; Jesus Christ the Savior; Justification by faith; Regeneration by the Holy Spirit; eternal happiness for those who believe in Christ; and eternal misery for those who are finally impenitent and unbelieving. Thus far these two systems of Presbyterian doctrine go hand in hand, and in many of these points are also in agreement with the teachings of other branches of the Church. But when we come to the doctrine

of Election and Reprobation there is a divergence such as makes the two systems entirely distinct.

Minor points of difference are to be found between the different branches of the Presbyterian Church, but these are the only considerable differences as expressed by formulated symbols. These are so radically different as in some points to be contradictory, and can not possibly both be true at the same time. If two and two make four, then two and one do not make four. If "God, from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably foreordain whatsoever comes to pass," then it is true that nothing has ever come to pass except that which God foreordained, for the ordination was *from all eternity*, and it was *unchangeable*.

If it be true that "the number of the elect is so definite and certain that it can neither be increased nor diminished," and also that the "rest of mankind are passed by and foreordained to everlasting death," then, as certainly as fate itself, no possible human effort can either increase the number of the elect, or diminish the number of those foreordained to everlasting death. Now, take in connection with these statements the further idea that the elect are certainly brought in, in God's good time, and that it is impossible for any others to be brought in, and we have, at once, a system which is as fixed as the deposits of the Silurian age, and results which can no more be changed by any human effort than can the stratifying of the geologic rocks.

Now, compare with this the doctrine of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and we have an irreconcilably different system: "God, for the manifestation of his glory and goodness, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordained what he himself would do, what he would require his intelligent creatures to do, and what should be the awards, respectively, of the obedient and the disobedient." Then add this: "Jesus Christ, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he, through the Eternal Spirit, once offered unto God, became the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, so God can be just in justifying all who believe in Jesus." It is not needful to quote further from these Confessions of Faith. Their respective teachings are known throughout the Christian world. Especially is this true of the Westminster Confession, since so much has been said by Presbyterians themselves concerning its teachings upon these very points in which it differs from the teachings of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. These hard points of doctrine, which are sought to be either modified or expunged by revision, have been set before the public in all their naked deformity by some of the best writers and clearest thinkers of the Presbyterian Church.

But when we come to compare the pulpits of the two Churches, we find them consonant in their teaching. Even among such ministers or branches of the Presbyterian Church as do not favor a revision of their Confession of Faith we find the teaching of the pulpit to conform to the teachings of the creed of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and not to their own. This may seem like a grave charge, but let us see upon what authority it is made. Dr. Philip Schaff, a prominent minister of the Presbyterian Church, and a man of world-wide renown, wrote in a recent widely circulated article: "There is a great difference between a system of theology for scholars and a Confession of Faith for the whole Church. Unfortunately, several of the older Protestant Confessions, notably the Westminster Confession and the Lutheran Formula of Concord, ignore that difference, and contain too much polemical and metaphysical theology, which should be left to the chair of professors and has no place in the pulpit. No judicious Presbyterian minister preaches reprobation and preterition in the Church, or in the catechetical class, or in the Sunday-school; and if he did he would limit or destroy his usefulness. Why, then, retain them in the public standards, and require a solemn subscription to what the subscribers do not believe at all, or at least never dare to preach?"

And Dr. Schaff might have gone further, and said, the ministers of his Church not only do not dare to preach their hard doctrines, but they do preach, with great acceptance to their people, such doctrines as are absolutely incompatible with them. They preach, everywhere, as fully and as earnestly as do Cumberland Presbyterians, that all men may be saved, if they will; and that the only reason why they are lost is because they reject the overtures of mercy.

No wonder Dr. Schaff goes on to say, in the article referred to: "The cause of truth and honesty imperatively demands an elimi-

nation of those features which are now far more objectionable and obnoxious than they ever were before the recent discussion." It would, indeed, be unfortunate now to fail to eliminate those harsh features from that Confession of Faith after all that has been said of it by those who have heretofore accepted it as their creed.

It was claimed, some years ago, that Cumberland Presbyterians were saying and writing things about the Westminster Confession that were unkind, and were not warranted by the teachings of that book. But this will be urged no longer, since so many leading men of the church subscribing to that system have written things about its teachings beside which all other statements made before seem absolutely tame and insipid, and which, if accepted as true, must leave the impression upon every sincere mind that former statements of Cumberland Presbyterians were not overdrawn. Not only so, but the conviction is fastened upon every such mind knowing the facts these men can no longer afford to remain in a position where they will tacitly indorse that which they have so fully condemned.

The result, then, must certainly be that the Westminster Confession, when modified, will be nearer the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession than before, and the two denominations, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, will be much closer together. The creeds of both Churches will then be conformed to the common utterances of the pulpits of both. It is not, however, to be expected that by the first attempt all the objectionable features of the old book will be eliminated. Such thorough and radical work is rarely, if ever, accomplished at once. Indeed, it usually requires years of patient waiting to secure what afterward seems to be the only thing which could reasonably have been done. It is, indeed, no wonder that the Presbyterian Church should hold on with some tenacity to symbols of faith that were far in advance of the thought of the age which produced them, and which have been handed down, from generation to generation, with so little change, even becoming "time honored" by their weight of years. But, after all, it is not a little strange that such clear-headed, noble men as have honored the Presbyterian pulpit during the last several decades should be willing to hold those symbols, notwithstanding their age, and at the same time preach a set of

truths which, if true, utterly and completely refute and overthrow the standards.

How can such a great scholar and thinker as Dr. Schaff bring himself to believe that some doctrines would be suitable for a professor's chair which would not do to preach to the people? Is it not perfectly safe, nay, is it not also right to preach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

This is precisely what the honored Doctor and his brethren do preach—a full, clear, glorious gospel, bearing the offer of salvation to every one who will hear it. There is no body of men on earth who preach the fullness of the gospel in all its preciousness with more clearness and unction than do the ministers of the Presbyterian Church, whether North or South, or Cumberland Presbyterians—all preach the same gospel. Surely nothing, then, is needed to make all these Churches one, except that their written symbols of faith be made to correspond as nearly as do the utterances of their pulpits. God speed the day! W. B. FARR.

WOMAN IN CHURCH WORK.

THE nineteenth century has witnessed many radical changes in almost every form of human activity. Old ideas, old customs, and even old forms of religious faith, have perished. And the end is not yet. Other ideas, customs, and faiths, hoary with the frosts of ages, bear upon their brows the marks of speedy dissolution. Among these changes none are more marked than that relating to the position of Christian womanhood considered as a factor in Church work. The time was when woman's duties were supposed to be confined to the narrow limits of domestic life. For ages she was an almost unused force in the ecclesiastical agencies for evangelizing the race. Literally she kept "silence in the Churches." It is not so to-day. Now her voice is heard "in the Churches," telling the sweet story of Jesus' love to the millions of children who assemble at the call of the Sabbath bell. In the prayer service her tender pleading rises, like fragrant incense burning on the altar of a loving heart, to Him whom she knows to be her friend. On the platform she wields her magic wand with a master's hand. From the editor's sanctum she speaks to the multitudes, clothing her thoughts with the "vesture of numbers" which are at once their strength and their charm. Inspired by zeal for her Master and love for the souls of the dying, she denies herself the enjoyments of Christian civilization that she may carry the message of salvation to the benighted in other lands. From the pulpit she appeals to lost men and women in behalf of a better life, and God owns her ministry by sealing it with souls. And in a few instances upon her head has been placed the ordaining hands of ecclesiastical authority, investing her with official power as preacher and governor in the Church. Never before has woman occupied so many fields of service, and never has her value as a factor in world evangelization been felt as it is to-day. And everywhere she has not only done her work, but she has done it well.

It is a question with many whether woman may not have transcended her prerogative in thus widening the field of her

activities. To define her exact boundaries may not be an easy task. However much men may differ as to the sphere of her operations, it is certain that she occupies a wider place in religious work than was allowed her in former times. This changed condition is doubtless due, to a considerable extent at least, to a more liberal interpretation of the Scriptures bearing upon this subject. The Church is realizing as never before that "where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." We are learning more and more the meaning of the Master's words, "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." Extreme literalism was the bane of the old Hebrew theology. Its necessary fruitage were the numerous exactions, prohibitions, and doctrinal hair-splittings which so grievously wronged and burdened the people. Nor have Christian theologians been free from the same charge. The Greek philosopher and the Hebrew rabbi were agreed in their estimate of woman. The former said that "woman had received her highest glory when her name was heard amongst men least either for virtue or reproach;" and the latter declared, "The law is better burned than committed to the keeping of a woman." He who would contend for the exact and literal interpretation of those passages in Paul's writings which seem to put the seal of eternal silence upon woman's lips, and dogmatically make them a law of unconditional and universal application, can adopt the language of both Athenian statesman and Hebrew rabbi as an article in his Confession of Faith. Was Paul's "keep silence in the Churches" an indorsement of these sentiments? If so, Paul was against Paul as well as against the manifest spirit of New Testament teaching. The spirit of the epistles must certainly apply everywhere and at all times. The great fundamentals of doctrine and duty must be ever the same. Here there can be no contradiction. But while principles remain unchanged, their application may vary according to circumstances and conditions. It is not only reasonable, but probable, that there were local conditions in the Church at Corinth and among the people to whom Timothy ministered which made Paul's advice opportune. Under like conditions such advice would be equally applicable now. Paul, with all his enthusiasm, was never so rash as to run counter to the prejudices and customs of the people unless there were moral principles involved. In the interpretation and application of the epistles

allowance should always be made for local colorings, environments, and changed social customs. The injunction, "Greet one another with a holy kiss," is fulfilled to-day with a cordial, warm-hearted shake of the hand.

Against the literal interpretation of these Scriptures and their universal application to all conditions and environments of Church life, the Scriptures themselves utter solemn and unmistakable protest. Omitting the examples given in the Old Testament, and also the references therein contained bearing upon this subject, attention is asked to a few quotations mainly from the New Testament.

"And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." "And also upon the servants and upon the handmaidens in those days will I pour out my Spirit." (Joel ii. 28, 29.)

"And being assembled together with them, (Christ) commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me: for John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i. 4, 5.)

"But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts i. 8.)

"Then returned they (the apostles) unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet." (Acts i. 12.)

"And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas, the brother of James. These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with the brethren." (Acts i. 13, 14.)

"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 4.)

"This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days (the gospel dispensation) saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." "And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out, in those days, of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy." (Acts ii. 16, 17, 18.)

"And the same (Philip) had four daughters which did prophesy." (Acts xxii. 9.)

"Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head." "Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" (1 Cor. ix. 5–13.)

"And I entreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, help those women which labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow laborers whose names are in the book of life." (Phil. iv. 3.)

From the foregoing scriptures the following facts are apparent:

1. That women as well as men were present on the day of Pentecost waiting for the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

2. That this baptism came alike upon both men and women.

3. That the purpose of this baptism was their enduement of power that they might prophesy and be Christ's witnesses.

4. That women as well as men did actually prophesy and witness in apostolic times.

5. That Paul's language, "labored with me in the gospel," implies the public character of the work in which the women mentioned were engaged.

6. That it is not unscriptural for women to pray in public. While Paul's suggestion as to keeping the head covered was doubtless prudential, it incidentally proves the publicity of this service.

Though the privilege of prophesying belonged to women before the advent of Christ, it was exceptional rather than general. Joel's prophesy and its fulfillment as recorded in the second chapter of the Acts, and the examples of Philip's daughters, as well as numerous other references in the New Testament, seem to imply that under the Christian dispensation the privilege should be general rather than exceptional. The Hebrew word most frequently rendered "to prophesy" is defined by Gesenius thus: "To boil up, to boil forth, as a fountain; hence to pour forth words, like those who speak with fervor of mind or under divine inspiration." Its Greek equivalent, as is seen by an examination of the Septuagint, is προφητευω. And this is the word rendered "prophesy" in all the examples of female prophesying recorded in the New Testament. In Old Testament times a prophet was not merely a seer or a predicter of future events, but the declarer of a divine message. As among the Greeks the μάντις was the ecstatic utterer of an oracle, and the προφήτης was the sober-minded interpreter of the oracle, so, however much of manticism may have been included in the work of the Hebrew prophet, it is the mission of the

Christian prophet to interpret the divine oracles—the word of God. "On the whole," says Oehler in his Old Testament Theology, "prophecy was designed to educate the nation to a perception of what kind of knowledge of the future could alone be a blessing to man, by opening its eyes to the holy government of God in history and to the aims of divine providence, that thus it might learn to prepare for coming judgment, and, walking in their light of the own calling to salvation, and of the great future which this involved, might regard it beneath its dignity to yield to the yearning for soothsaying. If, then, we regard the collective contents of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, we must say that prophecy is employed entirely in promoting the interests of the kingdom of God." But the Scriptures are our best guide in defining its own terms. This is certainly true of the word in question. In 1 Cor. xiv. 3, Paul says: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort;" and in the verse following he adds: "He that prophesieth edifieth the church." In verse 31 of the same chapter he says: "We may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." The scope of Christian prophecy is here sufficiently indicated. It is the public expounding of the oracles of God for the learning, edification, exhortation, and comfort of men. Now is it possible that this master of logic contradicted himself when he said to these same Corinthians, and in the very same chapter, "Let your women keep silence in the churches;" "for it is a shame for women to speak in the church?" Surely not. In the 28th verse he who speaks in an unknown tongue is commanded to "keep silence in the church," "if there be no interpreter" present. The reason for this prohibition is given. As no one could understand the speaker without the aid of an interpreter, his speech would be profitless; therefore "let him keep silence." The reason for his enjoining the women to silence may not be so apparent; but there are good grounds for believing it was not on account of sex. He had just before said, "Ye may all prophesy," a thing impossible if this prohibition was all inclusive. How could the prophetess "edify the Church" by keeping silence? Or did the prophet enjoy privileges from which the prophetess was excluded? If so, where is the proof? Nowhere is there any evidence that such was the case.

There is a better solution of the difficulty—one which does not array scripture against scripture. Any interpretation which makes truth inharmonious is false. An examination of this epistle, and more particularly this chapter, shows that the Church at Corinth was in a state of confusion. Divisions and disorder existed; and it may be reasonably inferred that these were caused to a greater or less extent by the imprudent conduct of some of the female members. They were disturbing elements in the Church, not speaking to edification. It is said that in Oriental countries where women are uneducated, they go into the houses of their deities and sit in groups, gossiping, talking nonsense, and asking silly questions. It is reasonable to suppose that something of this kind existed in the Church at Corinth, and that this is what Paul forbids. According to Liddell and Scott the primary meaning of λαλεῖν here rendered "speak" is "to chatter and talk." Robinson, in his Lexicon of the New Testament, defines it, "to speak or talk: to use the voice without any necessary reference to the words spoken." While it is not contended that it is always so used in the New Testament, it does seem probable that this is its meaning here; and, if so, we have the reason for the apostle's interference, and also for the words with which he closes the chapter, "Let all things be done decently and in order." With all due regard for scholarship and conscientious convictions of those who would seal the lips of the intelligent and consecrated Christian woman, it is confidently believed that there is nothing, either in the Old Testament or in the New, that goes to show that she must be excluded from any sphere of Christian work which awaits her doing and for which she is qualified.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." It is but just to woman that in the discussion of this subject her work should be considered. She has been tried; and she points to the record for her vindication. Though popular prejudice forced her to enter the opened doors with faltering steps, she has compelled the Christian world to acknowledge her power as a factor in Christian work. In the Sunday-school, in the mission field, on the platform, in the editor's chair—everywhere, she has acquitted herself with honor. Her voice is heard in the inquiry room and in the prayer service; and, if we may judge by results, the great Father, hers as well as ours, hearkens and hears. She expounds the "glorious gospel of the

blessed God" to the waiting multitudes, and as they breathlessly listen to her tender pleading, hearts are touched and won for Christ. Who shall undertake to say that the world is not better because of this enlarged activity of Christian womanhood? In one of the presbyteries of our own Church is a woman who prophesies. Speaking of her, one of the ministers of that presbytery said to me: "She has done more good in bringing sinners to Christ and in building up the Church than all of us together." Is it not true that God is owning and blessing the labors of such women? Is it not true that he is vindicating the right of Christian womanhood to occupy a wide place in his service? Shall not the Church see the leading of the divine Hand in the triumphs she has wrought? Shall not the Church learn the ways of God in his providence as well as in his word? To those who would tie the hands and close the lips of God's prophetesses we would suggest a prayerful consideration of Gamaliel's advice to the Council concerning Peter and John: "Refrain from these men (women), and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught. But if it be of God ye can not overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

The Christian religion exalts womanhood. The fact that Jesus was "born of a woman" makes her life luminous with glory. Is it a wonder, then, that she is ready, as opportunity is afforded her, to render the largest possible service to her emancipator. As she was last at his cross and first at his grave, so she has always been ready to testify her love for him, and to sacrifice in his service. Why hinder her? Her sex no more disqualifies her for a place on the platform than for a place in the Sunday-school. If she be allowed to sit within the circle of a little group of children, teaching them the truths of the Christian religion, why should she not be allowed to stand before an audience of men and women, teaching them the same truths? She can think as logically, feel as intensely, and speak as eloquently in the one case as in the other. If within her heart the Holy Ghost has kindled the sacred fires of heavenly love, so that she feels impelled to call the lost to repentance and life, who shall say to her, Nay? There is no danger that her hand will defile the moving ark. As in the deep yearnings of her heart she longs for the salvation of sinners, and sympathizes with the heavy-laden, let her follow the promptings of her

enlightened conscience in her ministry of doing good, remembering that God has set upon her the seal of his approbation in the success which has already crowned her efforts.

"Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest." Though more than eighteen hundred years have passed away since these words fell from the Master's lips, the need still is for more harvesters. And yet there are unused forces in the Church waiting for the sanction of ecclesiastical authority to permit their development. While the tongue is uttering the prayer, "Lord, send forth laborers," the ecclesiastical hand is holding in check many who would gladly enter the harvest field. It seems that God has used the zenanas and harems of the East, inaccessible to men, to teach the Church that he would have Christian womanhood unshackled. The Church is beginning to learn the lesson. She is coming to realize that woman's part in the work of Christ is not to be determined by the possible meaning of a word or interpretation of a text, but by the manifest trend of the whole word of God, the indications of Providence, the character and magnitude of the work, and the fitness of the agencies which may be employed.

But here we are confronted by the question: Shall woman be ordained, officially and formally set apart to the work of the gospel ministry? Shall she be invested with ecclesiastical authority, not only to preach, but also to rule in the Church of God? However much men may differ as to governmental forms, all agree that ordination to preach carries with it authority to rule. Whatever may be our views in reference to the ordination of women, it is certain that all arguments on the affirmative side of the question must be, if not anti-scriptural, at least extra-scriptural. Even Miss Frances E. Willard, perhaps the acutest and most zealous advocate for the ordination of women that this age has produced, admits that Christ "called no woman to be an apostle," and that "he did not designate women as his followers." Because Jesus said to Mary, "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father," are we to infer that woman should be invested with official authority as preacher and ruler in the Church? The fact that the woman of Samaria testified to the people of her city, saying to them of the stranger at the well, "He told me all that ever I did," has nothing to do with the ques-

tions of Church order. That Aquila and Priscilla "expounded the way of God more perfectly" is no proof that Priscilla ought to have been ordained to the work of the gospel ministry. Nor does the fact that "from their sex he (Christ) had his human origin;" that he sternly reproved "men who did them wrong;" or that "certain women ministered unto him of their substance," even remotely indicate that woman should enter the ministerial vocation. And yet these are some of the arguments relied on by those who are clamoring for what they call the "ecclesiastical rights of women"—that is, their official investiture with all the duties and responsibilities of the gospel ministry. If, as the advocates of female ordination so strenuously claim, women have special fitness for the sacred office, why did not Christ, who knows all about human qualifications and special adaptabilities, give women a place in the apostolic college? and why did he not send forth seventy women instead of seventy men on their evangelistic mission? and why was not the government of the Churches in apostolic times committed to a female eldership? Miss Willard laments that "we behold the white male dynasty reigning undisputed," and adds: "Only one thing can end the dire enchantment we are under, and that is to know the truth, for the truth alone makes free." Certainly, then, Christ and the apostles lived under this same "dire enchantment;" for then as now the "male dynasty reigned," and that without protest.

Such reasoning as I have referred to, in the preceding paragraph, does not commend itself with sufficient force to justify the Church in revolutionizing a principle in Church polity which we know to have existed from the time of its institution till the closing of the sacred canon; and which has continued almost without exception till the present time. In all that long history there is not an example, not a precept, not even an intimation upon which an argument for female ordination can be based. Should not this fact be taken as presumptive evidence against such an innovation?

But the New Testament is not wholly silent here. From frequent allusions and instructions in reference to those in authority we may reasonably infer that the ordination of women was never contemplated by the apostles. When Paul said to Timothy, "A bishop must be the husband of one wife," he doubtless did not suspect that the time would ever come in the history of the Church

when this might be impossible; else, in view of such a contingency, he might have added, "A bishopess must be the wife of one husband," parenthetically giving as a reason therefor the apostle's question as it would apply under these changed conditions, "If a woman know not how to rule her own house, how shall she take care of the Church of God?" If ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ought to be a husband, we may suppose by parity of reasoning that ἡ ἐπίσκοπος ought to be a wife. In fact, Paul advises "that the younger women marry, bear children, and guide the house." Can woman fulfill her divinely appointed mission in the home, and at the same time do the work of preacher, pastor, and overseer in the Church? Man's relation to the home is such that he can meet his obligations here without affecting his ministerial effectiveness. It is not so with woman. Maternity, the training of her children, and the varied duties of domestic life which are hers by virtue of her womanhood, must forever bar her from the arduous and exacting work of the Christian preacher and pastor. For frequent and extended periods the conditions of wifehood and motherhood are such as to necessitate her absolute withdrawal from the public gaze. Not only do her womanly instincts protest against publicity, but her physical condition imperatively demands abstention from the activities of public life. To be untrue to the former exposes her to ridicule; to disregard the latter imperils her own life and also the life of her offspring. Woman's heaven-ordained destiny is motherhood, with all its burdens, blessings, and responsibilities. Primarily her home is her kingdom. As true wife and mother she reigns, or should do so, with a power as quiet and gentle, yet as absolute as that of any monarch; and the seed she sows in the virgin soil of infancy will germinate to eternity. But though her first duty is to a greater or less degree in the home, we are not to infer that this is to be the limit of her activities. God calls every Christian to do something in the general harvest field. Into this field woman may enter, as I believe, by divine right, and find full scope for the exercise of her ministry, public as well as private, as far as the conditions of her life will admit; and that, too, without the necessity of ordination.

It does not follow from the fact that women were prophetesses in the apostolic times that they should be invested with all the authority which ordination implies. There is no hint that Philip's

daughters ever received the imposition of hands. Neither does the fact that a woman may feel moved to preach the gospel prove that she should be ordained. Moody, Whittle, Williams, and many others, though believing thoroughly in their mission to preach, are unordained men. They have never even desired ordination. And yet God has wonderfully blessed their ministry; thus showing that grace is not necessarily confined to the official channels of the Church. If the ordination of women was unnecessary during the first hundred years of the Church's history, why should it be thought necessary now? During that century there were women as loyal to Christ and as consecrated to his service as are any to-day. Though they "prophesied," and were "witnesses;" though they labored with Paul in the gospel, they were never invested with ecclesiastical authority. In the absence of any authority for female rulers, and in the absence of any such necessity, the Church can well afford to "make haste slowly" in a matter so radical.

But the foregoing are not the only reasons that may be urged against the ordination of women. While it is readily admitted that woman has qualifications of both mind and heart which might make her a valued adviser in the courts of the Church, it must also be admitted that these courts have oftentimes in the exercise of discipline, to investigate matters which would put her modesty to the severest test. Many of us can recall instances of trials before the Church session, in which testimony was heard that would have crimsoned the faces of either sex if it had been given in the presence of the other. In such cases, a woman as presiding officer or elder would feel sadly out of place. To get at the facts so as to render an impartial judgment a series of disgusting details are sometimes necessary. In the civil and criminal courts of the country a lady lawyer can evade this humiliation by refusing to become an advocate in such cases; but in an ecclesiastical court the female official must meet these responsibilities, however repugnant to her feelings, or else shirk her official duty. If the plea that she is a woman will not exempt her from assuming the duty of an ecclesiastic, it will not serve as an excuse for her absence from the court of the Church in such an emergency.

In closing this discussion we may summarize the brief arguments against the ordination of women thus:

1. The Scriptures, which we as Protestants believe to be a sufficient guide in all matters of faith and practice, furnish no example of a woman's having ever been set apart to the office of the Christian ministry.

2. There is in the Scriptures no warrant for such a procedure.

3. The trend of Scripture teaching indicates that such a thing as the ordination of a woman was never contemplated, and, therefore, never intended by the apostles.

4. The privileges which are hers by the authority of the Scriptures and by virtue of her humanity, are ample for the exercise of her highest endeavor in Christian work; hence, there is no necessity for her ordination.

5. The demands of domestic life, and the conditions and duties of motherhood protest against it.

6. The necessities of discipline are frequently of such a character as to indicate that she should be exempt from official position in the Church courts.

In general, let woman fulfill her heaven-born purpose; let her put her brain, her heart, and her tongue into her Master's work, let her prayers, her speech, and her pen be consecrated to the advancement of his kingdom; let her rightly estimate her power and opportunities to "rescue the perishing" and save the lost; and let her have the liberty to give to this sin-cursed earth as much as possible of her ministry of love. But let her be spared the embarrassments that must be hers should she assume to take a place in the Church not assigned her by the word of God, and for which her nature and the purposes of her life unfit her.

E. T. Bowers.

THE PREACHER IN POLITICS.

THIS is surely a subject that in this decade demands more than ordinary attention. Not a few there are that would restrict the preacher's sphere so narrowly as to make him very much like one in a strait jacket. Evidently he ought not to be so circumscribed as to be practically deprived of citizenship. The most ignorant and humble African is allowed to cast his ballot, and if he so desire, run for office. Can we ask less than this for the preacher, who, as all will grant, has at least average intelligence? We can not but regard this subject as one of great moment to us as a Church, since at this writing (July, 1890) there are three of our ablest ministers candidates for office before the people. One of these is a candidate for Governor of one of our States on the prohibition ticket. One is a candidate for representative in a convention to change the Constitution of his State. Another asks the people to make him county judge. These are among our best men and ablest divines.

Have these brethren stepped aside, and are they engaged in that which is incompatible with their high vocation? None who know these men and who take into consideration their former lives, great moral worth, and high ministerial character, will say this without much thought and hesitation. We should not use the word Politics in its low meaning. Webster defines the word: "The science of government; that part of ethics that has to do with the regulation of government," etc. In a bad sense, "Artful or dishonest management to secure the success of political measures or party schemes," etc.

There is a great cry in some directions against "Preachers of the gospel dabbling in the foul pool of politics." And yet if you were to tell these men thus speaking that *they* are corrupt or foul, it would be resented as an insult. Will not dabbling in that which is foul befoul the dabbler? If politics is necessarily so corrupting that it defiles and morally ruins all who engage in it, then indeed preachers and all other good men ought to steer clear of its baleful influence. On the other hand it can be said that if the affairs of

State are to be handed over to tricksters and venal wire-workers, it necessarily follows that our country is doomed, for we can not expect that the laws will be better than the law-makers. It is true in these matters, as in hydrostatics, that the stream will not rise higher than the fountain.

It is assumed (for effect) by those that raise the hue and cry against the "Holy man of God dabbling in politics," that the minister is purer than other men, and that this purity can not be maintained with such corrupting surroundings as political associations necessarily bring with them. I know that it is often said, that members of our legislatures and congresses are in large proportions corrupt and venal, yet I can not for a moment believe that a majority of our representatives are either venal or corrupt; but many, *very* many of them are pure and good men. These charges should determine us to send a larger number of men to these places of trust who can neither be bought nor debauched.

I do not claim that all preachers are proof in these things, but if they be half so pure as the average politician claims for them when he speaks so eloquently of "dragging the white robes of the minister at God's altar in the filth of politics," they are better men by far than the average politician. It can not be denied that the pulpit has had much to do with the best phases of politics in the past. John Knox denounced in inspiring terms the political and social customs of the people of his age, and the government under which he lived, and no one did more to bring about the wholesome, social, and political reformation that followed.

Chalmers fought with heroic courage the policy that subjected the Church to the State, and won for religious freedom a victory the fruits of which will be gathered for ages to come. On the eve of the Revolution of 1776, resistance to British oppression rang out from numberless pulpits all over the land. And while this was true of other denominations, it was specially true of Presbyterians. During the late war between the States, the pulpits, both North and South, spoke out in burning words for the cause that each section believed to be the cause of right. The preachers more than others educated the minds of the Northern people to seek the destruction of African slavery. And the pulpit of the South quieted many a disquieted conscience by arguing the divine right of slavery. These questions, we admit, have moral as well as

political phases, but how few are the questions discussed on the hustings that have not both of these phases.

Surely laws against murder, theft, arson, and all laws referring to marriage, divorce, and even debt have their moral sides. The pulpit has been one of the greatest educating factors in all great principles affecting the welfare of the race in the past, and will be not less so in the future. If, then, ministers are to discuss these living issues, how few are exempted from the list. And yet when the pulpit discusses such momentous issues as the Sabbath, the common school, or prohibition as seen from the point of view of the State, hands are thrown up in holy horror, and the preacher is "interfering with politics," and is a great sinner. What enlightened and honest man will dare say these themes do not belong to the pulpit, at least in their moral bearing? And, in the humble opinion of the writer, he that refuses to agitate them when he sees it to be right, is nothing less than a moral coward. Whether or not it is best for the minister of the gospel to offer himself as a candidate for political preferment, we must pause to consider. Thoughtfulness and prayer ought surely to precede such a step. When one consents to become a minister of Jesus he tacitly, at least, consents to give up those things that will hinder his ministry. We are enjoined by our Master to be "as wise as serpents" as well as "harmless as doves." The ministry must not be made a secondary matter. It must be the one great absorbing work of life. It is enough to fill an angel's heart, and did fill the Savior's hands. Can a man best serve the Master by becoming a candidate for political office? This must be determined very largely by each individual. It may be admitted that it might become necessary for the preacher to turn aside for a little season from his great work. The Apostle Paul went back for a time to his tent making. Finis Ewing was for some years clerk of the court of his county. Caleb Weedin filled the same office in his State. These things may to some become a question of bread. Why not be allowed, under these circumstances, to hold a secular office of profit? But to seek or accept office from motives of mere personal ambition, is not compatible with the high calling of the ministry. For reasons such as the following, the minister ought not, as a rule, to go into partisan politics.

1. By so doing he stirs up unnecessary opposition to himself

personally. One of the greatest powers for good, with the preacher, is his personal popularity. If we admire the speaker, we are much more apt to receive the message. If we dislike the speaker, his words come to us through the distorted lens of prejudice. Was not this thought in the mind of the apostle when he wrote, "seek whatsoever things are of good report." So great it is said, was the personal popularity of the sainted Polycarp, that his judges wept when they passed judgment against him, and they besought him to recant. But while personal popularity must not be bought at the expense of truth, virtue, or religion, yet it is a potent factor in a successful ministry. It has been said that some of our preachers in Texas were compelled to change fields because of their advocacy of the cause of prohibition in the late contest in that State. If in this they did their duty only, and did not abuse their privileges, they will certainly be entitled to the promise uttered by Jesus when he said, "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

2. Seeking office divides the attention of the preacher, and thereby weakens his power for good. It takes all the combined energy and power of an ordinary man to succeed in the ministry. His resources must be concentrated, and no outside draughts must come in to weaken him. A divided heart can not be warm, and roving thoughts can not be pungent. Looking at the gospel ministry, what preacher has not in his heart said, "Who is sufficient for these things?" We need to conserve all our powers, mental and moral. The thought will come up, Does not that preacher best serve his country that best serves his Master?

3. A preacher in politics gives wicked men an opportunity to sneer at the ministry. True, this they will do any way, but at the same time we must not give our enemies and the enemies of the Cross a seeming advantage of us. "Watch thou in all things."

4. He runs the risk of having to endure the melancholy of disappointed hope. I put it "hope," since it is probably better to write it disappointed hope than disappointed ambition.

It is assumed that most preachers will scarcely allow themselves to believe that the allurements of Fame have much to do with their political aspirations. The ears of few men are deaf to the voice of praise. Touch the right cord and no man is insensible

to delicate flattery. This is a sweeping declaration, but I am persuaded that it is nevertheless true. The politician is exposed in a remarkable degree to the disappointment of defeat. When a boy I wrote after a copy which read, "Disappointment chills the human heart." How true! Many politicians have grown morose and gloomy by reason of defeat. I know of more than one whose life has been poisoned by being relegated to private life after having a measure of success in politics. Can a minister of the gospel consistently pray, "Lead me not into temptation," and at the same time rashly place himself in such danger?

5. Success itself is dangerous. There is an intoxication about success in political life that is exceedingly dangerous to the heart of the ordinary man. Success so stimulates that he wishes to climb to greater heights. We learn readily to love the shouts of the multitude, and the praise of men is apt to become to us more than the praise of God.

Few of us can, like Jesus of Nazareth, weep over the woes of our fellows while the multitude casts palm branches in our way and cry, "Hosanna!"

Goldsmith's picture of the village pastor always deeply touches us—

"A man he was to all the country dear,
And passing rich with forty pounds a year.
Remote from towns he ran his godly race,
Nor e'er had changed, nor wished to change, his place.

"Unpracticed he to fawn or seek for power,
By doctrines fashioned to the varying hour;
For other aims his heart had learned to prize,
More skilled to raise the wretched than to rise."

J. S. GRIDER.

REV. JOHN MILLER AND SOME OF HIS BOOKS.

Rev. John Miller, of Princeton, New Jersey, has recently presented the Theological Library of Cumberland University with the following works, the products of his own facile pen: 1. A "Commentary on Paul's Epistle to Romans, with an Excursus on the famous passage in James, chap. ii. 14–26." 2. "Feitch in Theology." 3. "Theology." 4. "Is God a Trinity?" Mr. Miller is the author of a number of other works on subjects intimately connected with Christian theology. He is now seventy-one years old. He is a son of Dr. Miller, one of the founders of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, who is well known to the theological world through his writings on Theology and Church Polity. And who was one of the teachers of Rev. F. C. Usher and Rev. W. A. Scott, who were the first Cumberland Presbyterian preachers that ever attended a regular theological school. Usher remained true to his first love to the day of his death, though he, as did Scott, married a Presbyterian. Scott, however, abandoned the Church in which he was reared and educated. How far his deflection from the Church of his father was due to Dr. Miller's influence over him is not known. Dr. Miller, like many other learned and pious men of his day, believed that Cumberland Presbyterians were involved in grievous error, and thought that he was doing God's service when he labored to crush the young and feeble Church. Scott, during his connection with the seminary, kept up a correspondence with Rev. James Smith (the Scotchman), the editor of the *Evangelist*, then the only weekly paper published in the interest of our Church. This correspondence led to a very animated discussion between the editor of the *Evangelist* and Dr. Miller concerning the doctrinal differences between the two Churches. The unexpected often happens. The point of interest in this case is that, while Scott abjures the faith of his father, and embraces that of Dr. Miller, which, of course, was strictly Calvinistic, his own son, who was carefully trained in his father's faith, comes to renounce many of the leading characteristics of

that faith, and assert a doctrine which is more nearly in harmony with Cumberland Presbyterianism which his learned father labored to suppress.

Mr. Miller is a patient and painstaking student of the Bible, the plenary inspiration of which he firmly holds, rejecting all authority which, in his judgment, contravenes the inspired text. He is an independent thinker, and boldly, yet with becoming modesty, expresses his convictions. He does not wholly reject Calvinism, but is evidently less in harmony with Calvin than with Augustine, but not strictly so with either. Some of their doctrines he characterizes as "brutish." The great object of his life-long labor has been and is to expose the errors, theoretical and practical, of the Church of his fathers. I will here venture to suggest that he, like Arminians, has departed, in some instances, too far from Augustine, and in other instances has not gone far enough; or, that he holds some of the errors of Augustine, and rejects some of his truths. He was cut off from his Church chiefly for his bold denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, as taught by the Westminster standards, and as held by Athanasians generally. He holds as firmly to the deity of Christ as needs to be done, or can be done, by any one. His little book, "Is God a Trinity," is both a masterly vindication of the deity of Christ, and a merciless onslaught upon the Athanasian Trinity. The doctrine of the Trinity, however, is not his chief objection to Westminster theology. Against this theology he urges other and graver objections —graver because they are more destructive to vital godliness. Cut off from the Presbyterian Church, he has been laboring independently for several years, and has succeeded in establishing three congregations in Princeton and vicinity, and is pushing his reformation with all proper means at his command. He is very much concerned to know more about Cumberland Presbyterians—is reading our literature—Confession of Faith, the Minutes of our Assembly, Church History, and other works. He favors a new statement of doctrine, comprising nothing except what is absolutely essential to the Christian system. To these essential doctrines he would require a "close subscription," allowing to all full latitude as to non-essentials. He seems to have small faith in the outcome of the present Revision movement in the Presbyterian Church. The changes contemplated by the revisionists are not

those that, in his opinion, most vitally affect the true spiritual interests of Christianity. Many things in Mr. Miller's books the writer heartily approves; others, again, he is not able to accept. The main object of this paper, however, is neither to approve nor condemn, but to furnish the reader some insight into this author's doctrines and aims. Two of his books only will be noticed in this paper, his "Fetich" and his "Commentary on . . . Romans." From these extensive quotations will be made, thus enabling Mr. Miller to speak for himself, and the reader to judge for himself.

I. Fetichin Theology* was first given to the public in 1874, and the Third Edition was issued in 1887. Mr. Miller says in the Preface: "For thirty years the author has been busy upon a theory of ethics. He has subjected it to every test. If it is false, he is another instance of a life wasted by error. If it is true, it justifies his absences from the pulpit; for it is of the very essence of its analysis that it sets at rest many of the questions that are dangerous to our best theology.

"The author confesses that the *indicia* of his special ethics led him to entertain the scruples which this book unveils, and made disagreeable to him doctrines that have planted themselves in our common Calvinism. . . . . Meanwhile, the rectifications which this book attempts is the main grand purpose of his life, in giving away so much of its history to ethical investigation."

Mr. Miller thoroughly believes that many erroneous and dangerous doctrines "have planted themselves in our common Calvinism." The rectification of these errors, it seems, has been the controlling purpose of a large part of his student life. This he has attempted to do by subjecting theological questions to every possible test. These errors he discusses under the general name of "Fetich," hence the title of the book, "Fetich in Theology." The work might perhaps be as appropriately named "The Errors of Calvinism, as Formulated and Defended by Dr. Charles Hodge," for this is the predominating character of the book.

Our author, in defining Fetich, says: "A common dictionary would call it a material idol. But we prefer it (Fetich) for two particulars: (1) First, it is the *system* as well as the idol; for it is

*Fetich in Theology, or Doctrinalism Twin to Ritualism. By Rev. John Miller. Third Edition; pp. 264. Princeton, N. J.: Evangelical Reform Publication Co. 1887.

used for the charm-power, as well as for a gree-gree on a shark's tooth, or any one fetich. . . . Moreover, (2) it has vast resemblances with us, for it is the fetich of a people who believe, as we do, in a Nzambi, or Great Divinity. They (the pagans) catch up their fetiches in random ways from almost any thing; though, doubtless, this origin, as of the bronzes in India, does not forbid, with the low people, a more direct adoration, yet this mixed state fairly illustrates the mixed state and all the more senseless conditions of cult-thought among ourselves."

By this extension of the word fetich, our author makes it include all errors in worship and in doctrine.

"FETICH IN PRACTICE."

1. "God may become a fetich, but only by ceasing to be a real God, and by becoming a false divinity;" as when we attribute to him what is not true, or deny to him what is true.

2. "The Bible may become a fetich, and remain a real Bible; of course we have no other. . . . Now it is the religion of Protestants. But how easy to let reason and holiness go out of it, and to use it afterward for a wretched fetichism."

3. "Prayer (is) a fetich," when it is a mere heartless form, or a mere habit.

4. "Seriousness (is) is a fetich," when it is prompted by a mere sense of decorum in connection with religious worship; yet seriousness is altogether proper in worship and Christian deportment.

5. "Profession (is) a fetich," when it is relied upon as a proof of sainthood.

6. "Almsgiving (is) a fetich," when the motive is selfishness instead of benevolence.

7. "Preaching (is) a fetich," when it comes to be regarded as the indispensable means of saving men. "Paul never preached a sermon" "in our style of discourse." Mr. Miller says many pertinent things on this subject well worthy of study.

8. "Faith (is) a fetich" when it as a mere act of intellect is relied upon as a guaranty of a saved state.

9. "Repentance (is) a fetich" when it springs from fear or "spiritual terror." Repentance is "sorrow for sin," a "change of mind."

Mr. Miller describes the results of "*Fetich in Practice*" in the following words: "Religion becomes an orgy like the phantoms of the Greeks—like some bottom land producing ranker jungles. Would you see the symptoms? Look around, believers in the Church, rascals in the market-place; men's minds made selfish, even by the gospel as a scaffolding for heaven, like Babel, to lift them above the deluge; Christ a covenant rock; faith a mere carnal scheme; repentance a mere trading debt; and a thorough radical reform no part intrinsically of the doctrine of salvation."

Mr. Miller, in discoursing upon these fetiches in practice says many pertinent and forcible things, the design of which is to show that ritualism in every form is worthless without holiness, or as I should say, without love to God and men.

"*Fetich in Doctrine.*" Mr. Miller takes his instances of fetichism in doctrine chiefly from the theology of Dr. Charles Hodge. He enumerates from this source ten distinct fetiches, as follows:

1. "*A God all for himself.* Hodge's Theol., Vol. I., p. 436."

2. "*The will of God the ground of moral obligation.* Ib., Vol. I., p. 405."

3. "*The idea of God innate.* Ib., Vol. I., p. 191."

4. "*Vindicatory justice a primordial attribute of God.*"

5. "*God's highest end to display his glory.* Ib., Vol. I., p. 536."

6. "*This universe not the best possible.* Ib., Vol. I., p. 420."

7. "*God's providence not a continuous creation, else God the author of sin.*"

8. "*Man's helplessness not disinclination.* Ib., Vol. II., p. 261."

9. "*Saving faith not in its essence moral.*"

10. "*Rationalism an over-use of reason.* Ib., Vol. I., p. 34."

Mr. Miller by copious quotations shows plainly enough that Dr. Hodge holds to all these enumerated doctrines, and seeks to support them by revelation and by reason; by authority, and sometimes by human consciousness. Mr. Miller, however, denies the whole of them and sets himself vigorously to work to refute them, and also to prove their contraries to be true. He maintains—

1. That "God's highest end (is) not himself but his holiness." "God's holiness," he says, "is (1) a love to the quality of right, and (2) a love for the welfare of all his creatures. God's holiness

is his highest motive. Being his highest motive, God's holiness is his imperative law. Being his imperative law, it is fair to distinguish and to say, 'God's love for the welfare of all his creatures is less, *quoad* the obligation of motive, than his love to holiness.'"

2. Mr. Miller maintains that "*God's highest end* (is) *not himself but his holiness.*"

3. He asserts that "the ground of moral obligation (is) the excellence of holiness."

4. He holds that "God does every thing for his glory," "in the sense of *might*—that is, Holiness as God's highest excellence."

5. He says, "The idea of God (is) not innate."

6. He says that "Vindicatory justice is not a primordial attribute of God."

7. He says the present "is the best possible universe."

8. He says, "God (is) not implicated with sin though preserving providence be the same as a continuous creation."

9. He says, "The sinner's helplessness is disinclination."

10. He affirms that "Saving faith is in its essence moral."

11. He says, "Rationalism is not too much reason." "Reason is a revelation of God. It is an earlier revelation than the Bible. The Bible has been built on reason. It could be no revelation without reason. . . . . It is fearfully dangerous to deny reason before unregenerate men." These citations give us (1) Dr. Hodge's views concerning the doctrines enumerated, and (2) Mr. Miller's views concerning the same doctrines. It is quite apparent that the two views are in irreconcilable conflict, though both authors claim to be Calvinists, and to prove their doctrines both by reason and revelation. Mr. Miller, I think, quite conclusively shows Dr. Hodge to be in error in every point discussed. He also shows that Dr. Hodge contradicts himself in his statements concerning every one of these questions. Whether Mr. Miller sufficiently rectifies Dr. Hodge's errors on all the doctrines named is highly questionable.

To some of his positions I gravely object. But the object of this paper is to give a brief statement of Mr. Miller's views rather than to state my own, having elsewhere sufficiently indicated my opinions concerning the questions in hand. I, however, deem it not improper to say that Mr. Miller's doctrines are upon the whole

far more biblical and self-consistent, more rational, and more favorable to purity of life than those of Dr. Hodge.

"The Commentary on Romans"* is a neat volume of 390 pages. This is one of Mr. Miller's latest, and perhaps one of his most valuable works. I do not know that I can better serve the interests of the readers of our REVIEW than by giving them some insight into the character of the work. He believes the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration, and sets the Bible above all other authority. He is an independent writer, thinks for himself, and boldly avows his convictions. He does not hesitate to dissent from our English Version and other high authorities. The reader may find both profit and pleasure in his translations, as well as in his peculiar doctrinal views.

In his preface he gives us a few radically different and conflicting translations of the same Greek texts. He says:

"1. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy' (English Version, Rom. ix. 15), and the sentence, 'I will have mercy on whomsoever I can have mercy.'"

"2. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'obedience to the faith' (E. V., i. 5), and the sentence, 'obedience of faith.' One favors the view of doctrinalism, or our believing our way into the kingdom. The other makes faith obedience and itself a moral act, or the beginning of a better life."

"3. There is a vast difference between the sentence 'justified by faith' (E. V., iii. 28), and the sentence, 'made righteous in the shape of faith' (material dative). One builds a doctrine not lisped till the Reformation, and the other rests upon the atonement and considers righteousness that imparted righteousness which Paul means by what we have already noticed in the 'obedience of faith.'"

"4. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'for that all have sinned' (E. V., v. 12), and the sentence, 'on him at whose charges all did the sinning.'"

Mr. Miller translates Rom. v. 12 thus: "Wherefore as by one man sin came into the world, so death by sin, and thus to all

*Commentary on Paul's Epistle to Romans with an Excursus on the Famous Passage in James (ii. 14–26), by Rev. John Miller. Princeton, N. J. Evangelical Reform Publication Company. 1887.

men death passed through on to Him at whose charges all did the sinning."

"5. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'Until the law sin was in the world' (E. V., v. 13), and the expression, 'As far as there was law.' One is thrown away upon a case that never happens, while the other is the soundest ethic. In proportion as there is law men sin. And as all men have law, at least in an original conscience, all sin."

"6. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'I was alive without the law once' (E. V., vii. 9), ... and the wholesome moral fact that sin is the punishment of sin." (This not satisfactory.)

"7. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'All things work together for good' (E. V., viii. 28), and the sentence, God 'works as to all things for good with them that love' him."

"8. There is a vast difference between the sentence, 'Declared to be the Son of God' (E. V., i. 4), and the sentence, 'Determined on as the Son of God.' One postulates an eternal sonship, and that it is only 'declared' in time. The other ranges itself with such expressions as 'Mine elect;' it agrees with the account 'by that man whom he hath ordained.'"

Mr. Miller says of his proposed renderings of the texts cited, "If they are new they should be watched. If they are true they should be treasured. But if the arey both new and true, that is not what has roused us to work. These and a multitude of others are not simply new texts, adding, if they are supported by the Greek, new paragraphs to the word of God, but they bring to bay a concerted system of mistakes. Protestantism has ascribed too little morality to God, and demanded too little morality of men." He closes his preface by saying, "The course of the Reformed now is, that they build Rome with a faith that has no works, and place at the top of their creed sovereignty instead of holiness."

In his comments on these texts, Mr. Miller supports his renderings by appeals to Greek usage and astute reasonings which the supporters of the old renderings will not always find it easy to refute. They, however, will be measurably disregarded by orthodox Calvinists and some others, though they may be unable to prove them false, or to show them to be of evil practical tendency.

Orthodoxy is vigorously, though often blindly, opposed to all changes of doctrine and to all new translations that favor such changes, however well sustained by critical exegesis and Bible usage these translations may be. Protestantism in opposition to the papacy formally disclaims infallibility, and yet practically affirms it, and appeals to human authority, to tradition, to Church councils, in its own defense and in condemnation of all innovators. By this means reformations in doctrine are made exceedingly difficult. If possible at all, they come by a very slow process. The average mind does not readily abandon old religious theories for new ones. Most men have only a traditional or inherited creed. They, however, feel as rigidly bound to adhere to and defend such a creed as if they themselves had elaborated it from the Holy Scriptures. It often happens that those that are the most violent in persecuting innovators, heretics so deemed, are the least capable of formulating and defending any creed. The noisiest dog in the pack may be the least reliable in an emergency. Such men seem not to know that no advancement in theological science is possible except by innovation or changes, and that all changes must have their inception in some individual mind. True, all changes are not reforms. But it is equally true that there can be no reform without change; hence, to oppose all change is to oppose all reforms, all advancement in theological science and practical Christianity. To propose vital changes is to incur the risk of martyrdom; and he that opposes and persecutes the innovator is falsely deemed a hero and a "defender of the faith."

Mr. Miller is to-day a martyr to his convictions—exscinded from the Church of his fathers because of his honest dissent from some of its tenets—tenets which are indefensible before the bar of reason and thoroughly condemned by the sacred Scriptures. He may not live to see his proposed theological and practical reforms generally adopted by the Church of his fathers, but he has sowed much good seed, from which the Church sooner or later will reap a generous and profitable harvest.

It would be both interesting and profitable to readers having an aptitude for such studies to give Mr. Miller's entire arguments in support of his rendering of all the texts cited in the foregoing extracts. But to do this would require more space than should be allowed to a REVIEW article. I therefore give his comments upon

only one passage. This will give a pretty fair insight into the general character of his book. The following is his commentary on Rom. ix. 14, 15:

Translation.—"What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? By no means; 15. For he says to Moses, I will have mercy on whomsoever I can have mercy, and I will have compassion on whomsoever I can have compassion."

Comment.—"The true philosophy of God includes the doctrine of his entire sovereignty. The sovereignty of God, which even infidels are inclining to under the modern naturalisms, has been frightfully marred by two additions, which men otherwise good, have rashly made to it. One is, that God is sovereign over the actions of my mind, which he undoubtedly must be to be any God whatever, and *shapes the choices of his sovereignty for the display of his perfections;* a gospel that is simply horrible. Hell must measure its depth of mischief. Atheists have attacked it with zeal, and then pretended that they were attacking Christianity. It has not a lineament of what is Christian. We are indeed taught that God does every thing for display (Ps. viii. 1; xxix. 9), but always as a gracious instrument. We are taught that this display is vital for our good (Ps. lxiii. 2). We are taught, therefore, that it is an intermediate end (Eph. iii. 10; Rom. ix. 17). But that God damns a creature for display, and that such is his final, and therefore only, and in itself all-sufficient and absolutely positive and necessary end, must sink any conceivable system. And sadly enough, the same men who teach this wickedness, teach another, namely, that this self-adulating conduct of the universe is sovereign in the sense of naked, stark, and absolute pleasure of the governing will. When we take the word, 'good pleasure' and put the word 'mere' to it (West. Sh. Cat., Qu. 20), forgetting εὐδοκία, which it is meant to translate, and forgetting 'good,' which might be a reminder of the truth, we form habits of theology which God's character will not bear. 'The righteousness of God' is the very thing revealed in the gospel (Rom. i. 17). In the very heart of our religion, viz., Christ; and in the very object of Christ, viz., the salvation of the sinner; and in the very secret of salvation, viz., the will of the Almighty, to plant a motive like display, and then to forget even that, in a stark supremacy and such do-as-you-please vital sovereignty of work, is really to throw away

the beauty that converts, and to put in its place a horror which repels the perishing.

"Now the resting place of this mistake has been this ninth chapter of our English. Here are three verses. They stand apart, and undoubtedly they teach, if left to King James, this naked sovereignty of heaven. Once more scholars have looked in upon them and left them the same (R.V.). They must be very clear Greek, so any one would think. Moreover they are very different Greek; so that if one were differently read, the others would still stand separate. Let me mention them together:—'I will have mercy on whom I (will) have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I (will) have compassion' (v. 15). *So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy* (v. 16). *'Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth'* (v. 18).

"Famous texts! We open a Calvinistic creed, and there they are as a matter of course. Under the head of Predestination no sentences have been used so much. In long ages of agitation we have looked to them for the harsh and the bitter. What a sadness if it has been all a mistake! And yet close criticism will find that such has been the fact. The first sentence is from the Old Testament (Ex. xxxiii. 19). Moses, after infinite condescensions, cries out, 'I beseech thee show me thy glory.' God answers him. He translates what he will do into these two promises, 'I will make all my goodness to pass before thee,' and, as though it were the same thing, I will proclaim (my) name, etc."—and then with the *vav* of material fulfillment, he utters our text. I appeal to any fair mind whether it is morally possible that God meant that all his 'goodness' was exhibited to Moses, and all his great name proclaimed, by telling him he would do as he pleased! What is conspicuous is the solitariness of the averment. There is nothing more. Man has grandly prayed, and God has gloriously answered. And now, that all the consummation is in this willful speech, I will do as I please! is of hermaneutical dreams the most flatly scandalous? '*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*' And though we do not pretend to shape scripture, yet reason can cry a determined halt, and say, the text, 'This is my body,' or the text, 'Wash away thy sins,' or the text, 'I give unto thee the keys,' or if there be any other conundrum in the book, it shall be looked hard

into for its sense, before we rest for a moment upon an absurd or wicked interpretation.

"Doing this for Exodus we find that the established significance has been an almost willful presumption.

"Let it be understood that there is no subjunctive in Hebrew. The sense of contingency is supplied by the future. 'Can the rush grow up without the mire?' (Job viii. 11;) that is simply the future. Our translators say '*can*,' there; why not, therefore, in the infinitely weightier passage? Elisha says to the woman, 'Sojourn wheresoever thou canst sojourn' (E. V., 2 Kings viii. 1). This is precisely parallel. Why do the translators understand the subjunctive, and yet fatally forget it where it would have expounded and glorified the Almighty?

"In a context where he was about to say, 'Only my back parts can be seen,' meaning the results of my administrations, why did not the translators seize so important an assurance to our faith (especially as they seized the far less important instances), and when God had said, 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee,' see how splendidly he was fulfilling that speech when he said 'I will be gracious to whomsoever I can be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I can show mercy?'

"Taking refuge in the Greek, and saying: It is the Greek that is inspired (quoted as it is and adopted by the apostle), insisting that the Greek (ὸς ἂν with the subjunctive) must mean the future, will not answer at all. Ἂν really belongs to ὸς, not to the subjunctive (Meyer, Alford, see Jelf, Gram., § 829, 1). The subjunctive always expresses contingency. We confess that in most instances the contingency is not *potential*. But that is as it happens. The contingency is explained by the subject matter. When the Septuagint says, 'Will a flag grow without mire?' (Job viii. 11), or when the New Testament says, πως φυγητε (Matt. xxiii. 33), our translators do not hesitate a moment,—'Can a flag grow without mire?' (E. V.) or 'How can ye escape the damnation of hell?'

"The reader must always judge the sense, 'Bake that ye will bake, and seethe that ye will seethe' (βσα εαν LXX., Ex. xvi. 23). Here we would never say 'can' for they *could* stuff all into the fire at a stroke. But the contingency in an instant emerges as one of convenience. Then when David says, 'Seeing I go whither I

may' (E. V., 2 Sam. xv. 20); and when Elisha says, 'Sojourn wherever thou canst sojourn' (E. V., Kings viii. 1); the turn of the sense, though the future is the same, infallibly marks out the subjunctive difference. For how else can we arrive at any meaning on the part of the apostle? Dr. Hodge, upon the harshest ground of arbitrariness, says that Paul is simply stating what God claims; because we can not go back of that. He does as he pleases, and simply is saying so. But in that we forget that Paul has volunteered an explanation. To say that he has shifted the responsibility to the Old Testament Scriptures is absurd, for it is an Old Testament Scripture that is in question (v. 13). It would be defending one speech of God by obtruding a worse. That is what tempts the infidel. Therefore, Alford holds that what Paul is meaning is, that what influences God is actual mercy. 'When I show mercy I show mercy;' but that is hardly sufficient; for the difficulty does not lie in the region of mercy, but in the region of wrath. Give Paul the sense of those indifferent passages about 'the flag' and 'the rush,' and the text becomes of the first class. The chapter sweetens in a moment. Sovereignty remains just as total; and I believe it to be absolute. But it is not a do-as-you-please sovereignty. Paul brings Moses into a line with Christ. Just as the prophet said, 'What could have been done more for my vineyard that I have not done in it?' or, as Jeremiah, 'He doth not afflict willingly;' or Christ, 'How often would I have gathered;' or Paul, 'Who will have all men to be saved;' or Ezekiel, 'Have I any pleasure at all in the death of him that dieth?' So there can be no ripple of doubt that Paul's great answer was meant to be that God had said to Moses that he would have compassion on all he could, and save all that he was able.

"To the objection that this denies God's omnipotence, we oppose, first, his own texts above given; but then, further, we interpose a proper account of God's omnipotence. He could make all the sea-corals archangels; or, taken by themselves, he could make the chalk cliffs of England redolent of their ancient life, and then make each insect that made them, a planet covered with inhabitants. But query, Is it irreverent to say that he *could not do this* in the broadest, widest, and most intelligible sense? God has a mighty whole for his work; and it is perfectly consistent to imag-

ine that he can not remove even a grasshopper from our planet, athwart or aside of his whole design.

"16. But let us move on to the next difficulty. '*So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy*' (E. V. and R. V.). This is the translation of every body. And yet it is a wonder. The first syllable should have bred a pause. What a departure from all the thinking of the Bible to say that mercy 'is not of him that willeth!' What, in all strictness, is it of, according to the rules of the gospel, except specifically this very thing? If a man *wills*, he is saved. As a man *wills* be it to him. To bring the impenitent to *will* is the whole burden of gospel preaching. A man will not *will* without the Spirit; but that is not the idea. That is taught in another sentence, where John says, 'Which were born not of the will of the flesh' (John i. 13). We may search in vain for a sentence which makes light of the human *will* as not the *sine qua non* of the soul's redemption.

"But what then does the sentence mean? Lay it down smoothly in the Greek and look at it: remember Hebraistic habits of speech that love to place substantives last (Prov. xvi. 2; xxi. 2; xxii. 11; xxvii. 9, see Com.). And, lest some men object the repeating of the article, remember Jelf's rule that in certain strong cases the article must be repeated (Jelf, Gram. § 459 9). Therefore, it will be seen to be remarkable that a certain sense which we now subjoin has not been earlier the reading of the passage.

"16. Then, therefore, it is not of the willing, nor of the running, but of the mercy-showing God.

"That meaning is entirely complete. With Paul's quotation that Heaven does all it can; and with the implication that, in announcing this, God fulfilled all that he had declared, and made all his goodness pass before his servant, comes the simple corollary that then 'it is not of the willing nor of the *eagerly hastening God* that damnation comes,' but of one whose great aim is 'mercy.' It is not justice that is crushed by a theology like this, but justice that is ennobled. Just as the sun produces tempests, as well as summer radiance, so God does but shine when he curses, and shines too in mercy and compassion, though, as the fruit of his mercy, in the shape of a needful rectitude, some men are the victims of his wrath, and suffer endlessly where he can not save."

Remarks.—1. Mr. Miller's translation of Rom. ix. 14–16, and his accompanying comments require to be not merely read, but closely studied to be properly appreciated.

2. If his translations are correct, and his conclusions are valid, they set the doctrine of divine sovereignty in a light utterly antagonistic to the generally accepted Calvinistic view of sovereignty.

3. No one, whether Calvinist or not, should feel at liberty to say that our common translation of these texts gives the true doctrine of sovereignty until he proves that Mr. Miller's translation is false, which I suspect will be quite difficult to do; so much so, that few, if any, will attempt it. The old translation and exposition will, by Calvinists generally, be adhered to as an integral part of the word of God. Divine sovereignty will continue to be dogmatically asserted in a manner quite incompatible with human accountability. God will continue to be misrepresented, and his word perverted by human authority.

Mr. Miller translates Romans v. 12 thus: "Wherefore, as by one man the sin passed into the world, so also the death by the sin, and thus death passed through unto all men on to Him at whose expense all sinned."

This text (Rom. v. 12) has for ages been a puzzle to exegetes, commentators, and theologians. Various and conflicting renderings and explanations have been offered, none of which have given entire satisfaction. Mr. Miller's presentation of the subject is to me new, and is, perhaps, the best that has been given. As far as I can see, there is no sufficient reason why it should be more acceptable to one denominational scheme of doctrine than another.

Whether Mr. Miller's views are defensible or not, a patient and careful study of them can not fail to be profitable to those having a taste and aptness for such subjects.

S. G. BURNEY.

ORDINATION OF UNQUALIFIED MEN.

Are our various Church interests endangered by the ordination, or the receiving, of ministers, who are not qualified?

The example of some of our sister Churches has had an influence to lower our ministerial standards in practice, if not in theory. Our Methodist and Baptist brethren, in many portions of their Churches, require less preparation for the ministry than our own most lenient presbyteries would think admissible. Yet a wonderful degree of success has attended their labors, insomuch, that they are to-day the strongest Churches numerically in the land. And there are those to be found, both in our pews and pulpits, who accept this apparent success as evidence in favor of lower ministerial standards.

Another argument of similar character presents itself plausibly to very many, namely, "The Cumberland Presbyterian Church, by lowering her ministerial standards during the revival of 1800, made a forward movement, which has never been reached by the mother Church." It is therefore argued that moderate qualifications are more favorable to ministerial success among the masses than more extended culture. If this be true we should know it, and be governed in our work by it.

I will consider, first, the argument as drawn from the practices of the Methodist Church. Those who make this argument do not take into account the course of study required of candidates for higher orders in the Methodist ministry. It is true a man may begin almost without previous preparation in the lower orders of the Methodist ministry; but he is advanced to the functions of the ministry proper only after a thorough course of study, extending through a term of years. It is true that this course does not embrace a high order of classical, literary, and scientific study, but it does include the fundamental principles of theology, which of itself must give a good degree of mental training. In addition to the theological course required, candidates for ministerial orders are encouraged to avail themselves of the advantages of their

schools and colleges, where they may obtain a degree of culture bearing favorable comparison with other denominations. The reserve check against abuse is found in the form of government. The power of the bishop, through the conference, is sufficient to regulate ministerial supply so as to give the best results.

The power of the presbytery is more circumscribed, less absolute; and the will of the minister, and of the congregation, must each be respected.

If a conference finds more ministers than work on its hands, it can locate its supernumeraries without consulting the Church or the ministers.

The Presbyterian safeguard against an oversupply is in the care with which they induct men into the ministry. An absolute call of the Church for the service of a candidate is the final consideration that can properly induce the presbytery to lay hands on those seeking ministerial authority. I am persuaded that a rigid adherence to this plan would obviate the great difficulties that now embarrass our Church. Let young men who feel they are called of God to the work of the ministry be encouraged to go forward in preparation for this work, in the exercise of their gifts as opportunity may offer; but in no case to be advanced beyond licensure until some congregation, or congregations, are ready to offer them a support in the ministry. It seems but reasonable that the Macedonian cry should be raised, and that the prayers and alms of Cornelius should go up as a memorial before God. The idea of ordaining a man simply on his belief that he is called to preach, without corroborative evidence, is simply absurd. The idea of receiving a man into the presbytery because he is a good man, but can not find work in a sister Church, should not be tolerated for a moment.

The presbytery ought to exercise the care with regard to her servants that is exercised by the government. Her officers are not held in commission without duty. Suppose all the ex-Presidents were continued in authority, or the ex-Generals should, by virtue of their former office, have a joint right with the commander to plan the campaign; such suppositions appear ridiculous enough. Yet we find men received into the presbytery having on the legal armor of gospel ministers with no congregation willing to accept their ministrations, or support them in the work of the ministry.

There is a wrong here, and it ought to be corrected. If we have men unworthy of support, we ought to get rid of them. If the Churches will not do their duty, they ought to be delivered into the hands of Satan, as the Lord delivered Job and Peter, until they learn their true estate, and are willing to accept God's plan. If we have more men than the Churches can sustain in their work, it is evidence that we have been hasty, and have answered when no man called. How great are the responsibilities of presbyters! Who is able for these things?

The Presbyterian plan on this subject is, "Lay hands suddenly on no man." We can not afford to lose sight of it for a moment.

In the Methodist Church the difficulty may be partially obviated through the bishop and the conference. In the Congregational Churches the congregation is a distinct individual, and not a part of a homogeneous organization. Injury to one congregation is not so easily communicated to the whole body. Whatever may be said of the ignorance of the Baptist ministry in some localities, it is certainly true that, as a Church, they are moving rapidly forward, and taking a high stand in literary attainments.

Is it true that lowering the standards of literature has been an advantage to the Cumberland Presbyterian Church? The founders of the Church were not in favor of lower standards, and submitted to a necessity as a necessity, and held out the highest standard as the rule. The necessity was such as we can not appreciate in our day. They were in a new country, without schools, without money, without organization, without prestige. In the face of all these difficulties, they set on foot agencies that have given us schools able to compete successfully with the best of their class, and our Church has grown to be astonishingly large, but who will doubt that with the wealth, the learning, the prestige, and the organization of the Presbyterian Church, we could have gathered fourfold more for Christ than both have done. The culture required by the fathers was relatively more than the same attainments would be in the present day. Under the head of the sciences, they required an equivalent to the learning of their day. But science has made vast progress within the past half century. So that to be abreast of the times this additional field must be occupied. Biblical and historical criticism has kept pace with science. The preacher is liable to make himself a public laughing-stock, if he fails to realize these facts. A congregation can scarcely be gathered together, even in the rural settlements, without including some one able to discover a blunder on these familiar subjects. The school-teacher, the newspaper, have left their tracks in every portion of our land, and whatever else they fail to do they do not fail to make apparent the blunders of the preacher.

The teacher must be ahead of, not behind, those to be taught. It was not the lowering of educational standards or the introduction of unlearned men into the ministry, that achieved such grand results for the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; but the announcement of the grand doctrine, "God is sovereign, man is free." Justification by faith, preached by Martin Luther, gave the world Protestant Christianity. The sovereignty of God and the freedom of man, preached by our fathers, gave the key-note which will unite the Church universal in one fold, with one Shepherd, even Christ the Lord. The present discussion of the Westminster symbols is a finger-board along the way of time, pointing to this grand result. I, therefore, reach the conclusion that our standards should not be lowered, but that we should look steadily forward to the best educational privileges within our reach.

There are two things much needed by the Church at large. One is a university, manned and equipped on an equal footing with the best institution of our land, or of the Old World. The other, that of which we feel the greatest pressing need, is the academic school, where students can pass from the common school studies to the college classes. Every presbytery should have such a school. Every county in the State should provide against this deficiency in the facilities for education. The Synod can not afford to lose sight of the Synodical school. This work will require much time and labor; but it is a work that must be accomplished if we would prosper as a Church. It is needed to lead the public mind to appreciate the importance, the end, and the aims of higher culture. It is needed to give that culture to those who are to be the leaders in the thought and work of the Church, in the midst of those environments which bind together the hearts and interests of preacher and people.

But after these general preparations have been made, there will still be a class of men seeking admission to the ranks of the ministry who can not, from one cause or another, avail themselves of

these advantages. Yet some of these men are of equal promise with their more favored brethren, and can be aided by a proper course of study, which should be scrupulously demanded by the Educational Committee of the presbytery. To protect the Church at large from the delinquencies of individual presbyteries, each presbytery should require of candidates for admission, from whatever quarter, that they pass an examination on literature and theology, equal to the course required by the presbytery of her own probationers. This power belongs to the presbytery, and could be profitably enforced. There is, therefore, no deficiency in the Cumberland Presbyterian system—the only difficulty lies in the malpractice of the presbyters.

THE ATONEMENT.*

I. THE ORIGIN OF THE ATONEMENT.

IT did not originate in necessity, as the only way to vindicate the justice of God, to magnify and honor his law, or maintain his sovereignty over his universe; but in his unselfish love for his fallen and lost children. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotton Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." We do not believe that we are authorized to say, it was a love of pity that moved the great heart of our heavenly Father to provide a remedy to save the lost, neither are we justified in saying it was a partial love, for he is "no respecter of persons."

II. THE OBJECT OF THE ATONEMENT.

"For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." "Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and raised for our justification."

The object of the atonement is to save the sinner by such a manifestation of God's love as is in harmony with himself and his moral government. The sinner is to be saved from sin; not merely rescued from the penalty of violated law; but redeemed from the guilt and defilement of sin and restored in as complete and perfect harmony to the moral government, as if he had never been guilty of or defiled by sin, and every constituent part of his salvation is

* The reader will observe a marked disagreement between the teachings of this article and the one that follows it on the nature of the atonement. The writers and not the editors are responsible for the views set forth.—ED.

in perfect accord with God's moral perfections, and the honor of his law. While God loves the sinner, he hates and condemns sin, and "will by no means clear the guilty." Salvation embraces justification, regeneration, and sanctification of the moral nature, and final glorification of the person. The atonement not only provides for the complete salvation of the sinner, but secures all the help necessary to enable him to accept of it, and if he is not saved, God's grace as well as his justice is vindicated, and the true reason of his being lost is given by Christ, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

III. The Nature of the Atonement.

"Our first parents, being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit; whereupon God was pleased, for his own glory and the good of mankind, to reveal the Covenant of Grace in Christ, by which a gracious probation was established for all men." "The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works wherein life was promised to Adam upon condition of perfect and personal obedience. Man, by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make the second, commonly called the Covenant of Grace, wherein he freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved." Confession of Faith, sections 17, 22, 23.

Adam, as the representative of the first covenant, by disobedience, failed, and hence forfeited the right to all the blessings therein promised, such as life, holiness, and communion with God. Christ, the second Adam, as the representative of the Covenant of Grace, engages to remove all legal obstructions to the possession of these blessings, and place them in reach of Adam and all his race.

This engagement was accepted, the Covenant of Grace ratified, and divine justice as fully satisfied as when Christ sealed the covenant by his blood on the cross; and Adam, in the light of the promise given him, could secure the blessings of the new covenant. "Knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ: who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake." "The Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world."

Christ is said to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 John ii. 2, 4, 10.) That is, he appeases, and renders favorable, conciliates. Paul says, "God set him forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness." Christ on his cross has become the place of reconciliation, then, by his blood, and that was shed in order to show the righteousness of God, not to conciliate the sinner. The question now occurs, who was to be appeased, or conciliated? It must have been God, or the shedding of Christ's blood could not "show his righteousness." For *what* was he to be conciliated? For the trangression, committed by actual transgressors. Is there any law, human or divine, that holds claims against nonentities for prospective violations? "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law." "For the law worketh wrath; but where there is no law, neither is there transgression." Being is as essential to transgression as law.

In the Covenant of Grace Christ became the appeaser of divine justice, for all claims held against the first pair of the race, and thus removed all condemnation for sin committed under the covenant of works, satisfying the conditions of it, and setting it aside; by which he became the head of the new covenant in which Adam and all his race are granted "a gracious probation, wherein God freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved." In Romans, 5th chapter, Adam is said to be a type of Christ, and several points of analogy are given, a few of which we notice: "So then, as through one trespass, the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life."

Justification here means "a setting right." The condemnation would have cut off the race as suddenly as Satan was cast out of heaven but for the free gift, which came through the one act of righteousness, which set all men right in regard to life and a new trial.

"Where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly." This evidently refers to Adam's fall and restoration.

"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." "Taketh away"—taketh up and taketh away. The word signifies both, as does the corresponding Hebrew word. Applied to sin, it means to be chargeable with the guilt of it (Levit. v. 1; Ezek. xviii. 20; Eccl. xxviii. 38), and to bear it away." According to the language here used, the Lamb of God took upon him and bare away "the sin"—not sins—of the world. What sin can be called "the sin of the world," but that by which the world was lost?

"But now once, at the end of the ages, hath he been manifested to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself."

Christ is here represented being manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, and we believe that he did that for which he came into our world, our old theories to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is a significant fact that in all the charges of sin against Adam's children, found in the Bible, there is not an instance in which any of them are said to be guilty of, or condemned, on account of his transgression. But the Bible and our Confession of Faith teach that "Adam's sin corrupted his moral nature and alienated him from God; and all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation inherit his corruption of nature, and from this original corruption also proceeds actual transgression."

"Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned."

"As in Adam all die."

When God passed the sentence upon Adam, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," he did not personate any of his posterity, for as yet he had none, but all take their personal existence subject to that curse. So do we understand those passages that speak of Christ's work for man, such as "he died for all," "he died for every man," "the iniquity of us all was laid upon him," "he bore our sins in his own body on the tree," etc.

As each person takes existence under the Covenant of Grace, he comes under its provisions, and has the offer of all the blessings purchased by Christ in that covenant.

Again, all men enjoy life and a day of probation by virtue of what Christ has done for them. "Ye were bought with a price."

"Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom."

A great many passages in the Scriptures, familiar to all who have made the subject a study, when given their plainest and most natural meaning, it does seem to me, teach the expiatory nature of Christ's sufferings, and that he in some way appeased divine justice for the benefit of the sinner. Only a few of these passages are here given:

"All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid (made to light) on him the iniquity of us all. For the transgression of my people was he stricken; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin" (a guilt offering). Why should our iniquity be made to light on him, he stricken for the transgression of the people, and his soul made a guilt offering, if not to expiate sin?

"Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him. But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ." Here Christ becomes sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in him; and we are made nigh to God in the blood of Christ.

"And according to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." "It was necessary, therefore, that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us; nor yet that he should offer himself often; as the high-priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own; else must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." On the foregoing we notice—

1. The tabernacle was an emblem of heaven.

2. It, the people, and all the vessels of the ministry, were cleansed with the blood of goats and calves.

3. The law of Moses required that these, which were copies of the things in the heavens, be thus cleansed.

4. But the heavenly things were to be cleansed with better sacrifices than these—Christ's blood; "so Christ also having been once offered to bear the sins of many."

5. What can the cleansing the heavenly things mean, but appeasing the justice of God? Surely expiation for sin is here taught.

6. "As the high-priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood, so Christ by his sacrifice entered into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us."

Again, the nature of the atonement may be seen from the fact it is presented in the Scriptures as the ground of the sinner's justification.

"All those who truly repent of their sins, and in faith commit themselves to Christ, God freely justifies, not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins and by counting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, or any evangelical obedience, to them as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith."—Confession of Faith, Sec. 48.

"Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardons all our sins, and accepts us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone."—Catechism, Question 35. Justification is purely a judicial sentence, a declaration of right. The just claims of the law have been fully met, and justice requires the sentence of innocence. In the case of the sinner, he stands condemned by the law, and no obedience that he can render will remove that condemnation. In the language of the great and good Dr. Morrow, "were the sinner to appear before God with one single tear in his hand, as a part of the merit of his justification, it would be enough to damn his soul."

Christ has fully met the claims of the law, and the sinner receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith, God freely justifies, by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto him.

The grace of God as manifested in justification is not in the judicial sentence, in declaring the sinner right or innocent, but in giving his Son to be made sin on our behalf that we might be

made the righteousness of God in him. "Much more then, being now justified by (or in) his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him." We are here said to be justified by or in the blood of Christ. That blood therefore must satisfy the demands of the law in behalf of the sinner, and thereby remove his guilt.

The argument presented is, that, if the blood of Christ can justify us, much more being justified we shall be saved from the wrath of God through him. Christ's blood therefore appeases the wrath of God, and is the meritorious cause of justification.

"And not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation." Reconciliation comes through Jesus Christ; justification is an essential element of it; therefore justification comes to the sinner through Jesus Christ.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the ordinance (requirement) of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

We notice in this—

1. The law could not justify man for the reason that, owing to his sinful nature, he could not obey it; hence, it became to him the law of sin and death, because it condemns sin.

2. This being true, God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh as an offering for sin, that it might be condemned in the flesh.

3. This was done that the ordinance (the requirement) of the law might be fulfilled in those who walk after the Spirit.

4. The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus makes us free from the law of sin and death.

5. There is, therefore, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus; the requirement of the law being fulfilled in us must, therefore, be by receiving Christ by faith, who is the end or requirement of the law, to all them that believe in him.

"For as through the one man's disobedience the many were

made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous." This is one of the proof texts referred to in our Confession, as authority for the statement that in justification God imputes the "obedience and satisfaction of Christ" to the believer.

The symbol of our faith, the highest authority in the Church, as well as the Scriptures, sustains our position, that the atonement made by Christ is the meritorious cause of the sinner's justification.

This text also sets aside the commercial idea of the atonement. The one man's disobedience affects no person until he has a personal existence, even so the obedience of the one makes none righteous until they receive and rest on Christ and his righteousness by faith.

IV. The Extent of the Atonement.

If the view that we have given on the nature of the atonement be correct, there is no favoritism or partiality in its provisions. Adam's fall and the extent of its injury in his family is certainly the only limit to be given to the provisions of the second Adam. There can be no reason given in the relation of men to the fall, for limiting the provision short of the race, and none can be found in the love of God, because that embraced the world; none can be found in what Christ did, for he gave himself a ransom for all.

There is no limit given to the influence of the Holy Spirit, for he is to reprove the world. The commission given is to preach the gospel, good news, to every creature, and the Church is commanded to pray for all men. The invitations are as broad as suffering humanity, and grace runs through the whole scheme of redemption crying to all the lost, without respect to persons, "whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."

V. The Scripture Representations of the Atonement.

Its nature and extent may also be seen in the representations of it in the Scriptures.

1. It is represented as opening the prison. "I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light

of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of prison" (Isa. xlii. 6, 7).

"As for thee also, because of the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water. Turn you to the stronghold, ye prisoners of hope; even to-day do I declare that I will render double unto thee" (Zach. ix. 11, 12).

In the passage in Isaiah God sets forth the work of the Messiah as twofold—

1. To manifest this righteousness in the salvation of sinners. This was done by satisfying the demands of the law that bolted the door of the prison, in which he filled the engagements of the Covenant of Grace for the people.

2. To give light and liberty to the prisoners. In Zachariah God says it was by the blood of the covenant that he sent forth the prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water. All of God's covenants with the people were sealed with blood, to typify the blood of Christ that sealed the Covenant of Grace.

The light and liberty, purchased by the blood of the covenant, are free for all who will turn to the stronghold, but they were not purchased in separate parcels for each prisoner. So of the atonement; it is as abundant as the light of heaven, and as free as the air for all who will leave the prison of sin, and flee to the stronghold in Christ; but no prisoner can claim any part of it until he complies with the terms of the gospel.

3. It is represented as opening a fountain. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness" (Zach. xiii. 1). The Lord is said to be "the fountain of living waters" (Jer. xvii. 13). Christ said to the multitude, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come; he that will, let him take the water of life freely."

1. The fountain represents the abundance of the atonement. It can not be exhausted: the grace of God in Christ is inexhaustible as God himself.

2. This fountain cleanses from the guilt as well as defilement of sin, but it removes neither until its healing waters are applied.

The sinner is as guilty before applying to Christ for pardon and justification, as if Christ had never died for him; and the atonement is as incapable of being divided into parcels as a flowing fountain. There is enough for each, and enough for all, but none can claim any part, until applying to Christ to be cleansed.

3. It is represented by the healing power of the physician.

"Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?" "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick."

The sick man represents the sinner; the physician the Lord Jesus Christ; the remedy the atonement. The physician does not keep in store a certain portion for each sick person, but he has ample remedies for the sick when called for: so has Christ provided a sure and perfect remedy for sin, but he has not labeled a portion for each sinner, and laid it away in his great store-house of grace, to await the sinner's call.

4. The atonement is represented by a feast or supper.

"A certain man made a great supper; and he bade many: and he sent forth his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready." The man here represents Christ; the supper the atonement; the invitation the gospel. The provision of this great feast gave no person a right to a portion of it; after it had been rejected by some, the man said, "none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper." The atonement is sufficient for all men, but in its provision no person is represented, and the rejecters of it are not cut off from any of their *rights*.

Dr. Wilson, of London, gives a compendium of Christ's work for the sinner thus: "Christ, the sinner's substitute, the believers righteousness, the Christian's life." We would offer an amendment which, we think, is more scriptural in phraseology at least: Christ the sinner's Savior, the believer's righteousness, the Christian's life.

In conclusion, I must be permitted to say, that I have written this paper, and now submit it to the readers of the REVIEW, in compliance with solicitations from dear brethren, and in doing so am conscious of but one motive, to know and honor the truth; and if I have in the smallest degree attained to that end, it will aid

in brightening the evening shades of a life of three-score and ten years. In the investigation I have felt more impressed than ever before, with that sublime sentiment of the apostle, who has written more extensively on the subject than any inspired writer: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen."

P. G. REA.

FROM DEATH UNTO LIFE.

"He that heareth my word, and believeth Him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life."

DOCTRINE waits upon interpretation. It must be biblical. But what is the true interpretation? A chorus answers in unison as to the first statements, but breaks into discord at the explanatory parts. Let him who knows "the whole truth and nothing but the truth," be patient with us who "know in part."

It may be admitted that doctors of divinity must fortify against these dangers: (1) Selfishness; (2) the metaphysico-biblico interpretation; (3) the interpretation that rejects the aid offered by the study of God's world of matter and man.

As to the interpretation it may be admitted, (1) that it is often unsafe to press the letter; (2) that truth is in *all* the scripture that bears on a given point, and not in a fragment, and (3) that an exegesis which controverts the face of a text is not always to be received with suspicion.

As to the interpreter it may be admitted, (1) that he may love God and truth with his whole heart, although we may account him an enemy to both; (2) that he may be "orthodox" when he assaults beliefs that are ours by inheritance or careful research, and (3) that he can not always be loyal to scholarship and conviction if confined within a creed.

Reverently desiring to know all that can be learned concerning our salvation, we gladly acknowledge that our constant inquiry must be, "What saith the Scripture?"

I. *The Scripture saith that we are dead*—that is, we are depraved, and alienated from God, not having a nature and character like his. "You . . . . were dead in trespasses and sins." This is the starting point. A discussion of eternal life must begin here. We must know the soul's condition. It is dead—not figuratively, but literally. There is life which it has not. Into this life it must be born. In relation to this life it is now absolutely dead: "The mind of the flesh is death. . . . . Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed

unto all men, for that all sinned. . . . . In time past ye walked according to the course of the world, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience; among whom we also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest. . . . . This I testify, that ye no longer walk as the Gentiles also walk, in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardening of their hearts. You, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, etc. . . . . In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This is the soul's ruin. It is death—depravity, and "alienation from the life of God," and not liability to punishment and pain. All the connection that future punishment and pain have with the question is incidental. The other fact comes first, and declares the situation as we must face it. The matter that calls for divine remedy is a present awful state, and not exposure to a future awful state. It is in no sense both, only as the latter is the necessary continuance of the first. It is because of what our life is that we need a Savior, and not because of what may befall us. We are not going to die; we *are* dead. "You . . . . were dead." "He that . . . . believeth . . . . hath passed out of death into life." "Death passed unto all men."

In the quotations that I have given from Paul he says we were wrong in *walk*, in *spirit*, in *nature*, and in mind; were darkened in understanding, ignorant, hard of heart, alienated from God, and enemies to him. He and other inspired teachers do not bring into the question "doom" and future pain, only as they speak of the cumulative effects of evil, and of our continuing in sin until we shall become eternally separated from God. Truly, truly, God declares that our trouble is death, and not liability to future punishment. The present, not the future, needs the remedy.

II. "*The Scripture saith*" *that death is the natural and necessary consequence of sin, and is not a penalty.* ". . . . Were by *nature* children of wrath." "The mind of the *flesh* is death." "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." In these words from Genesis God does not declare a penalty that he will inflict, but merely foretells the consequence of sinning. God did not execute Adam. Adam was a suicide. If God had said, "I will not inflict the death penalty; I will let him live," would

he have been alive, and in no need of a Redeemer? He would have been alive if one can have this life that is in the Son while he is disobedient and unrighteous, and without trust and love. All that God might have withheld would not have saved the poor man. There is no more reference to penalty in the words of God quoted from Moses than there is in these other words: "In the day that thou drinkest prussic acid thou shalt surely die." God did not seize the poor man and kill him, and doom him to eternal distress. There is nothing in the Bible that teaches death to be desert or penalty. Some passages seem to teach this, but not so clearly as the ninth chapter of Romans seems to teach that God hates and damns men just because he wants to do it. The man was dead before he heard the voice of God in the garden. It had happened just as God had said it would; and he was dead not because God came to him and drove him out, but he was driven out because he was dead. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment." They had always been "away." They were not lost because they were sent away, but were sent away because they were lost. "Gather ye the tares to burn them." They were not tares because they were burned, but were burned because they were tares. We are not sinners because we are judged, but are judged because we are sinners. "Thinkest thou this, O man, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God: who will render to every man according to his works; to them that seek for incorruption eternal life; but unto them that obey not the truth shall be anguish and wrath." "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body." From these selections it follows that no one can escape the consequences of sin; but it does not follow that "anguish and wrath" are inflicted as the awards of Christ's judgment. "Eternal life, and glory and honor," are mentioned as being "rendered" in the same sense in which wrath and anguish are rendered. Who understands Paul to teach that eternal life is a future award? We have it now. "He that hath the Son hath life." The condition of the impenitent, according to these passages, is no more affected by "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God," than is the eternal life of the redeemed. The judgment of Christ does not make character and condition, it declares them as they have been wrought out by the

life in the body. We do not need deliverance from penalty, but from the evil within us which impels us to "the things done in the body." In a sense, permissible within express limitations, our pains and wretchedness through sin may be called penalties, as the bodily suffering of a libertine are the penalty of his sin. Physical impairment is, in a sense, the penalty of wrong living, but it is first and above all the natural and necessary consequence of wrong living. The condition of the sinning soul results from sin as naturally and necessarily as does physical impairment from the abuse of bodily parts. It is the reaping of our own sowing. This being true, is a remedy needed for penalty, or for a condition?

III. "*The Scripture saith*" *that Christ came to make us alive to God.*—"In him was life. . . . I am come that they might have life. . . . God hath given us eternal life, and this life in his Son. . . . Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. . . . Reckon yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ. . . . Yield yourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead. . . . The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ." These utterances of the spirit are clear and radical. We are not saved unless we have been made alive through Christ. Any thing less fails; nothing more is possible. A gospel which represents Christ as having the petty mission of saving men from punishment, present or future, is far from glorious. He has the higher mission of making men alive to God, and of filling them with his fullness. Paul declares this to be the purpose of the atonement when he says, "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." He repeats the same truth strongly and clearly when he writes, "He hath made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." If these things be not accomplished in us through Christ, we are not saved. To preach any other gospel deludes souls and belittles the work of Christ. The eternal life that is in the Son is the life of trust, love, and service. Christ came to relieve us of our distresses, to give us his own righteousness, to make us partakers of the divine nature, to beget us again that we should be born the children of God. This, and this only, saves. Trust no other thought between the lost soul and its Savior. Do not rob

Christ of his preciousness and glory by charging him with a mission of lower and narrower scope. This is the Redeemer that our hearts cry out for. We know that we need redemption from sin, and not deliverance from penalty. God has given us the doctrine of such redemption through Jesus, and let us strive not to obscure it.

The word does not teach that Christ bore the penalty of sin, or a substitute for that penalty. It goes infinitely beyond this, and says, "He bore our *sins*." What does my soul care for penalty? What does it care for future suffering? It is *sin* that I want deliverance from. He bore our sins by becoming the way through which we might be delivered from them. He bears our sins by taking them away from us, and giving us righteousness. Fortunately, Matthew so explains a part of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. "When even was come, they brought unto him many possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying Himself took our infimities, and bear our diseases." He did not bear their diseases by becoming sick in their stead, or by suffering something substituted for their sicknesses. He bore them by curing the sick. He does not bear our sins by suffering in our stead, but by curing us of sin. This is biblical. I confidently assert that the doctrine of "substitution" is heterodox. I insist that substitutionists preach a more real, radical, and glorious salvation through Jesus. They must more closely follow Isaiah and Peter. To say that he made satisfaction to law, or endured suffering that was the desert of our sins, or offered obedience and love in our stead, does not begin to go far enough. It is mere prattle. He came to take away *sin*, and make us "the righteousness of God." If this be not his mission, let us turn from him, and seek another who can do this. Between his taking away or bearing our sins, and his making expiation by suffering, or his removing of difficulties in the mind of God, there is no necessary relation. This may be seen by examining a few texts.

"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body upon the tree." Matthew viii. 16, 17, explains that he bears our sins by curing us of them. Peter, with the next stroke of his pen, explains that he bears them, not to expiate them, nor to deliver us from suffering, but "that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness.—"The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." By bearing away our sins (not barriers on the divine side nor suffering as penalty) he releases us from them. To release is to ransom.—"This is my blood which is shed for many unto remission of sins." By his life, his death (the shedding of his blood), and his resurrection, Christ becomes the perfect Savior who makes us "dead to sins and alive to righteousness." This is the remission, or the letting go, of sins.—"Without shedding of blood is no remission." It is plain that the death of Christ has a necessary connection with our salvation. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin." He "made peace through the blood of his cross." "But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ." This doctrine is our hope. We hold to it with all our strength, and protest against its being lowered to the level of endured penalty, or substituted satisfaction, or substituted obedience, or substituted righteousness, or substituted love, or substituted suffering, or substituted any thing else. God deals in realities, not fictions. Christ, by his life for us, his death (blood) for us, his resurrection for us, delivers us from sin (not something else); and makes us believing, loving, obedient, and righteous, and does not account us to be such when we are not. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Remember, that Paul is writing to the Galatians about the Mosaic law; and then turn to Deuteronomy from which he quotes, and learn what "the curse of the law" is. Christ was "accursed of God," just as was any one else hanged on a tree. Paul quotes from Deut. xxi. 23. What is the curse of the law from which Christ redeemed us? Read Gal. iii. 10, and Deut. xxvii. That is the curse from which he hath redeemed us. It has no relation to the soul's suffering for sins. "Christ died for our sins." He "gave himself for us." Had we not been sinful he had not lived and died among men. Had he not died for us we had not found a way out of sin. He gave himself for us even unto death, not to placate God, or to take upon himself the deserts of our sins; but he "gave himself for our sins that he might deliver us out of this present evil world" (Gal. i. 4); he "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify

unto himself a people for his own possession" (Titus ii. 14). God *forgives* sins that are past. He does not require their expiation. When we are made penitent and righteous through Christ God "passes over" our sins. Forgiveness upon any other basis would be iniquitous.

David said that the only sacrifice for his sin was "a broken and contrite heart." When Isaiah spake for God in reproving and instructing the sinful people, he told them to wash and be clean, to cease doing evil, and to learn to do well, and that then God would wash away the scarlet and crimson of their sins. And unto the individual he said: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."

"Wherewith shall I come before the Lord? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams? Shall I give my first born for my transgression? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Sin does not need expiation. God does not require it. He requires that we be turned from sin, and established in righteousness by Jesus Christ, and then he "passes over" our sins, "blots them out," removes them from us "as far as the east is from the west," casts them "into the depths of the sea." Any other basis of forgiveness is immoral. No other basis is given, except in some instances where the punishments are only disciplinary, and are purely of God's temporal administration. This is not controverted by Rom. iii. 25: "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God." This passage has no reference to forgiveness, as one may see by referring to the Greek; but refers to the toleration, or passing by, of sins without punishing the offenders for the uses of the temporal administration. God's forbearance in this instance brought none of the blessings of eternal life, but has effect upon only the "temporal" life.

There was no obstruction upon the side of God, to be removed by Christ. On the contrary, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." It is wholly gratuitous to interpret this as

meaning also that God was reconciling himself unto the world. Such a result is a marvel of exegetical evolution. A mighty multitude of scriptural voices declare that God has always been ready to save as soon as the lost would come unto him.

IV. *"The Scripture saith" that Christ makes us alive, or saves us, by giving us himself in the sense that we take him into ourselves, and "have" him.*—"He that hath the Son hath life—Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." The expression of one who is saved must be: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me." He saves us by giving us his mind, his spirit, his righteousness, *himself.* He gives us "the right to become children of God." We are not saved until we "are sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus." The "Scripture saith" that Christ saves, not by removing an impediment in the mind of God, and then giving us the right to be born of the Spirit into the family of God; but by giving us *life*—life that is as distinctively a creation of God as is physical life, and which is given by only him.

In these pages philosophical and theological terminology has not been employed. Sanctification seems confused with regeneration, and justification excluded. I have used only the term "salvation," and have discussed that doctrine without considering logical or chronological steps in the process. This simplifies discussion. Something saves. Let us learn what it is. It is not then necessary to ask, "What justifies, regenerates, and sanctifies?" Salvation is having the life that God gives through his Son. Nothing else than this saves. If this be determined, it is not necessary to discuss the province of regeneration and sanctification. I have written only to suggest to those who, like myself, may be unable to accept the common interpretation of the scripture bearing on the redemptive work of Christ, a possible different interpretation, and one that seems to me to be more reasonable and scriptural. The doctrine of substitution in its various phases, and with its logical connections, I reject with all my heart. If I believed this doctrine to be taught in the Bible I would not have

the vestige of belief in the infallibility of the book. Some find comfort in a doctrine that is horrible to others. One finds rest where another finds unrest. One is able to believe what another disbelieves with his whole mind and strength. Those who "would see Jesus" *will* ask questions. "Why?" and "How?" come to their lips anxiously and often, and many wait long, or for ever, for a better reason for becoming his disciples. "Why?" and "How?" fester in the minds of Christians until service becomes half-hearted, until faith divides the realm with doubt, and peace is wounded by trouble. Without the interpretation herein put upon God's word, he would be to me "a root out of a dry ground," and my soul would see no beauty in him that it should desire him.

H. C. BIRD.

SHAMS IN RELIGION.

I KNOW of no better way to show the necessity, importance, and benefits of "reality" in religion, than by pointing out a few of the shams in religion.

1. Religion without Christ.

Saul of Tarsus was a striking iillustration of this sham, for in Acts xxvi. 5, he says: "After the most straightest sect of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." Here was "religion" after the "straightest sect;" but there was no Christ in the religion of Saul at that time; for in Acts xxvi. 9, he says, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus." And in Acts xxvi. 14, Christ himself said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" What a sham! very religious, but no Christ in that religion, and consequently no reality. Afterward, Saul's religion became a reality, by the acceptance of Christ through faith, and then he could truly say, as is recorded in Gal. ii. 20: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I *now* live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." There was then reality in the religion of this once straightest Pharisee.

2. Christ without the Cross.

There are religionists of our day who accept Christ as a good man, as superior to all other men, but not divine; and therefore they reject his vicarious death and the atonement he made. Their religion is a *living* Christ, but not a *crucified* Christ; such religion is a sham, for God says in 1 Peter ii. 24: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." It is not enough to glory in the goodness and superiority of Christ as a man; but we are to glory in the cross of Christ; because it was the shedding of his blood on the cross that secured, as the basis of salvation, the remission of our sins. Hence, we are told in Heb. ix. 22: "Without shedding of blood is no remission."

Therefore, if the blood of Christ was not shed for my sins, then my sins have not been forgiven; and if my sins have not been forgiven, then there is no reality in my religion.

3. The Cross without Christ.

There are those religionists who are great sticklers for the literal cross, they must have it on their church steeples and in their church buildings where they bow to it and cross themselves with "holy water" before it; while others have it stamped on their prayer books and wear it suspended from the neck as an ornament: and yet many—not all—of these very same people do not evince one solitary evidence of love for, obedience to, or union with him who died on that cross; and their religion is to all appearances [and "by their fruits ye shall know them"] a worship of the cross and not of the Crucified One. They are making the same mistake and perpetrating a similar sham to the one Israel perpetrated when they "did burn incense to it" [the brazen serpent]. It is both a sham and a shame to worship the Cross and dishonor the Christ; and the words of God recorded in 2 Tim. iii. 5, exactly describe this sham in religion, "having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away."

4. Ritualism without Righteousness.

The Pharisees were very ritualistic, for they had their "sects," their "straight sects," and as Paul says, "the most straightest sect." And the Pharisees are not all dead yet, for there are those who observe "times," and "seasons," and "ceremonies," and all the ritualistic commands of their "sect;" but who, at the same time, live in violation of the commands of God's revealed word. Certain sins are not committed on certain days because the ritual forbids, while those same sins are committed on other days with impunity, just as though God's commands did not require us to abstain from sins on all days alike. What a sham to fast and to refuse to eat meat on Friday, and then get drunk and gormandize on Saturday. What a sham to try to crowd enough religion into forty days to do for the balance of the three hundred and sixty-five. What a sham to refuse to dance during Lent, and then wind up with an "Easter Ball." Lent and the ritual are, of themselves, all right; but to attach obedience to them rather than to God's word which demands obedience at all times and seasons is to practice a sham in religion, and to merit the rebuke of the Master

who said to the Pharisees, in Matt. xxiii. 23: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." Well might Christ also say to them, "even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." And well did Christ say to all his professed disciples, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Ritualists, are you righteous? If so, I bid you God speed; but if not, then your religion is a sham.

5. Knowledge without Experience.

The Pharisees made such great pretensions to a knowledge of Moses and the law as even to reprove the Son of God; but in their hearts and lives they never had an experience of vital godliness; and consequently they, as Christ told them, made "clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within . . . . full of extortion and excess." And so it is with some religionists of our day; for they pride themselves on their orthodoxy, their knowledge of the Bible, and their general thoroughness of theological questions, while in their lives there is no evidence of an experience of the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost. I know of nothing more hazardous to the soul, than a knowledge of, and a participation in, holy things without a heart-felt experience of those things which touch the conscience and ennoble the life. In Matt. xxvi. 48, is a case in point: "Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast." Judas Iscariot had a knowledge of Christ, he had lived for perhaps three full years in the closest contact with Christ; had heard his sermons, had listened to his parables, had observed his life and had witnessed his miracles; but never did Judas have an *experience* of the love and grace and saving power of Christ; and what was the result? It was the startling fact, that the hardest heart, the most sordid soul, the vilest hypocrite and the supremest traitor came from the college of the apostles.

6. Baptism without Regeneration.

Since Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, it is right, proper, and important to be baptized; but for a

man to be baptized without having his heart made right with God, it is to practice a sham and have a religion without a reality. Acts viii. 13, 21, settles this question: "Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done." Yet, in verse 21 of this chapter, Peter said to Simon, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God." This verse settles the question that Simon's "belief" was not genuine, and that baptism had not made his heart right in God's sight. Reader, though you may have been baptized with water, yet if you have not been baptized with the Holy Ghost, your religion is a sham, for in Titus iii. 5, we are told how God saves us—"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

7. Bible without Inspiration.

There is no religious sham more pernicious to the world, the Church, and the gospel ministry, than laxity of views as to the verbal inspiration of all the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation. Words are signs of ideas, and if the words penned by the sacred Penman on the original manuscripts are not God's words, then we have not the ideas of God; and if we have not God's ideas, then whose have we? If the words of the Bible are not God's words, then the Bible as a revelation from God is wiped out as a testimony to themselves and to every thing else. Moses said in Ex. xx. 1, "God spake these words." Samuel, in 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, says, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me." In Acts i. 16, we are told that the "Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake." In Jer. i. 9, God says to Jeremiah, "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth." In Mark xiii. 11, Christ said to the apostles, "For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Christ in his intercessory prayer, John xvii. 7, says to the Father, "I have given them the *words* which thou gavest me." Then if Christ clung to the "words" is it not wise and best for us to cling to the words also, and to all of the words? For we are told in 2 Tim. iii. 16, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." Let the Revised Version say what it may, if all is not inspired, then who knows what is and what is not inspired? When you begin to reject, *where* is the line to be drawn? Verbal inspiration is the palladium

of sound, and consistent, and persistent orthodoxy. More than one great light of the pulpit in the nineteenth century, by surrendering this stronghold for weaker ones, such as "Inspiration of thoughts," "Inspiration of superintendence," "Inspiration of degrees," and *Inspiration in spots*, has swung clear round the entire theological compass, and denied the most vital doctrines of the Bible, such as the fall of man, the atonement of Christ, and everlasting punishment. What a religious farce, sham, and shame for men to say they are called of God to herald his eternal word, and then spend their time as self-constituted censors to doubt, dissect, and deny what is God's word.

Preacher, if you do not want your ministry to be a failure and your religious work a sham, then accept the Bible as a reality from God, and preach it with a holy zeal, and with the fire of heaven shut up in your bones.

Asheville, N. C., June, 1890.

R. G. PEARSON.

A STUDY ON JAMES AND HIS LETTER.

AMONG those who thought Jesus to be overwrought in his religious zeal was his brother James. James was probably the eldest of our Lord's brothers. He seems to have been converted at Pentecost, for if he had been in the believing band soon enough he no doubt would have received at least the nomination to fill the vacancy in the apostolic circle. In connection with Peter, James comes before us as a man in whom the Rock apostle had confidence. The year 44 A.D. is marked as the time when this leader rose to the chief place in the Church in the Capitol.

1. Paul in order to get some practical hints and knowledge from head-quarters came up to Jerusalem. He there met with James. Paul may not at first have fully appreciated the apostolic idea. But when he speaks of himself as being like one "born out of due season" it can hardly be asserted that he held loose views of the strict apostleship. Still it is likely that the apostle to the Gentiles knew himself to be an apostle as much as Peter was, only that he was outside of the special twelve. When he called James an apostle he may have thought of him in the same category of apostle as he himself was.

2. When Peter was forced out of Jerusalem by the persecution which originated among the Pharisaical Jews he left such word that James naturally took his place of leadership in the Judeo-Christian Church. His position was a very important and trying one. He had many new converts to train in Christian Church work. In time Pharisees came and offered themselves for Church membership. They were received. But they were such a high Church party that all the skill of the new society must have been necessary to keep them away from the old Mosaical ceremonies. Even with the greatest care of James and those who labored with him, Pharisaic tendencies crept into the Church and held fast to the rather influential right wing of Jewish Christians. Some of the legalistic Christians found their way to Antioch and would have grafted the new religious order of things into the old. It

would have taken but a few decades to have starved out the graft. Then the old trunk of Judaism would have remained as it was. But James is not to be made responsible for this early Pharisaical trend among some of the members of the Jerusalem Church. He was a wise pastor. His flock, large and somewhat scattered, needed unifying and a great deal of spiritual strengthening. He would spoil his Church if he weeded it out too soon.

3. To keep the Church in Jerusalem from breaking to pieces on the rock of legalism required a firm hand. James was firm and patient. To send the busy workers away out into the dark field required enthusiasm. James was at least in harmony with missions. He was a careful teacher if not a noted inspirer of missionary enterprises. His own Church required so much cultivating that he could not get away from the Capitol. Perhaps he did not desire a change of work.

4. When the difficulties which gave rise to the council of 50 A.D. came to be adjusted James was on hand to welcome his brethren. In the assembly James represented the wing of strict orthodoxy. His speech was conservative and yet it was liberal enough to extend the full privileges of the "true word" or the gospel of Jesus to all men. The words he spoke were considered to be of such weight that they were incorporated in a short letter which was placed in Paul's hands to be read in the new Gentile Christian Churches. Of the four most distinguished men who took part in the first Christian Synod (James, Peter, Paul, and John) James was pre-eminently the pastor and counselor. Many years before the synod the then stranger, Paul, had formed the opinion that James was a "pillar apostle" along with Peter and John. His fine organizing and executive powers made in a measure at least the same impression upon Jews, Jewish Christians, and Gentile Christians. What such a pastor should have to say to the Churches in their trials would be interesting and helpful to those Churches. The Jews scattered through Asia Minor, Rome, and Egypt numbered myriads. Many of them were converted by the efforts of Peter and the other apostles. Among these Jewish Christian Churches James would soon be known as the pastor in Jerusalem. Words from him would be eagerly sought for by the struggling Churches.

5. In time James wrote a letter. Just when this brief epistle

was written can not be accurately determined. James set no date at the beginning or close of his letter. What a world of theories it would have saved us if he had dated his writing! But it does not seem to have been the custom in those days to give the year of composition. Giving time for the Church to spread among the Jews of the dispersion and not attributing to the Jerusalem pastor the design of offsetting Paul's doctrine of faith, nine or ten years after the synod, or 60 A.D., may be assumed as a very probable date.

6. Jerusalem, A.D. 60, then, are the place and time. The writer does not tell us just why he writes. He has no apology to make, but immediately draws up his thoughts and gives them forth in plain words to his own scattered kinsmen. From the pastor's surroundings we may get hints as to what is occupying his mind in his study. About thirty years had elapsed since the Church was organized in Jerusalem. That would be time enough for the first warm zeal to cool. The members of the Jewish Christian Church were indeed "rooted and grounded" in good doctrine. They would not likely slip so far as right belief in God was concerned. Centuries of othodoxy were behind them. False faiths would scarcely get a hearing among the people of the dispersion. If not so strict on some things as the Jews in Jerusalem they were purely monotheistic in their belief. This worship, held for the most part in synagogues, centered as firmly in one living and true God as did that in the temple. James did not write to combat Paul. He had a different work to do. Right belief in God the Father was already in the mind of the Jewish Christians. But that faith had to be cultivated by good works.

7. If we could unroll each one of these Bible letters clear into the core we would find much experience there of a personal nature which would help us to understand the meaning of the author. What an experience James had in his home Church during those thirty years! Sixteen years he had been pastor. Will he not write a short history of his Church for his brethren of other places? There would be danger of copying if he should. Some practical things those Jewish Christians—and indeed those other Christians the converts from heathendom—need. These will be supplied.

8. James in a very friendly manner and with a true Christian

humility introduces himself to his readers. He is not an ethical Pharisee but a converted Jew who feels his childhood training when he takes up his pen to write on religion. As a servant of God, a full believer in Jesus he writes. Among the subjects of which his letter treats is this one: *Faith Applied*. But this theme is not taken up in a scientific manner. The letter comes from a very warm heart and zealous mind. A close theological treatise is not to be expected. But the composition of faith, its conduct, and its results are all set forth. James has in mind a complete faith which is necessary to a true Christian. The faith of a man is so much of the man himself that it is in the man's life and the man's life is in his faith. When a man is tried his faith is tried. But such a trial ought to give joy instead of sorrow. For by such adverse influence upon the man's faith his faith will not be destroyed. On the contrary steadiness and endurance will result. Patience may have to wait under a long trial but in the end righteousness will come to make the man blessed. It is a Christian's duty to guard himself. He can do that by keeping busy at good works. What is faith but the mainspring of works? The peculiar faith possessed by Christians is "of the Lord Jesus Christ." That faith is to be kept pure by earnest efforts. It can be kept pure by fulfilling the "royal law" of loving our neighbor as we love ourselves. The writer names many hindrances and helps to the application of complete faith. The rich man receives his share of warning. The humble, self-sacrificing man who lives by a pure faith in Jesus receives the great reward. Thus the pastor's letter to his dear fellow-Christians reaches its culminating teaching, viz.: that true faith applied is salvation.

J. G. PATTON.

THE TRUE PREACHER.

THE true gospel preacher has a deep and abiding consciousness of a divine call. He feels that he is a divinely appointed messenger, sent from God, to deliver a divine message. Christ was a real preacher, called and anointed of the Holy Ghost. This it is that makes the difference, more than learning, more than logic, and more than scholarship, between the true gospel heralds and the false. With this glowing impression in his soul Heaven's chosen ambassador utters the deep things of God with authority and with an unction that makes even the hearing of the truth a solemn responsibility.

God's chosen messenger has an abiding consciousness of the divine presence. The Holy Spirit is in him, upon him, and about him as an ever-encompassing deity. Somewhere I have read that Chrysostom once dreamed that he was preaching, and he saw about him the angels and before him the Lord Jesus Christ. He was so deeply impressed that on the next Sabbath his dream appeared a glorious reality as he stood in God's presence and spoke with unusual power. So the true gospel preacher feels that he stands in God's presence, with God's word as his message, deathless spirits as his audience, angels above him, the Lord Jesus Christ before him, and the Holy Spirit's manifestations upon him. Under these influences he is quickened in soul, awakened in heart, and with thrilling thoughts, bold and impassioned words, and earnest, enthusiastic manner, he sends the truth deep down into the souls of men.

The true preacher has a deep and quickening sense of the responsibility of his work. Luther said: "Although I am old and experienced in speaking, I tremble when I ascend the pulpit." Some one has spoken of the "tempest of spirit" which the minister experiences when he enters the sacred desk. The paleness of countenance, the trembling lips, the drops of cold perspiration on the brow, tell of the intense mental struggle, of the overwhelming responsibility of this untiring, life-long watch for souls. He has

a pure solid Christian character, a strong influential manhood. He is a living exempler of the truth so that those under his influence are constrained to lead better lives. He is a model man, full, noble, broad. He has patience, sweetness of disposition, Christ-like tenderness and love, beauty and completeness of character, all the graces necessary to clothe him with the highest influence and power.

He is the embodiment of the truth in human form. The word is in his heart as a living experience, a glowing enthusiasm, an intense reality. The embodiment of God's truth, he is a voice, a revelation, a "burning bush" so that when he speaks men feel that God is speaking through him. Filled with the power of the Holy Spirit he takes so much of the living word as has become a part of his spiritual life and with it strikes at the hearts and consciences of men—strikes until the truth burns down into the depths of their souls.

He has a deep religious experience. This was one secret of the power of Wesley, Whitefield, and others who have shaken cities and nations by the power of their inspiring eloquence. John Bunyan's religious experience enabled him to write one of the most wonderful books of the ages.

The true preacher has power over men. He may not be a profound scholar; if he is, so much the better, but he has great religious vitality, he has a living spiritual power within him, and under its influence his audiences swell and his Church grows. He may not be distinguished in learning, but he is eminent in zeal, in spiritual life, so that communities are transformed under his influence. His personal experience is deep and strong, his emotions profoundly spiritual. He is a living preacher.

He has deep sympathy for men. He studies them that he may adapt himself to them. He knows the reasoner, and presents to him the truth in clear, calm logic. Some he moves by the impassioned and emotional; some he reaches through the beautiful, and others through the imagination. He knows men that he may know how to speak to them. He is weak to the weak and "all things to all men" that he may win them to Christ.

He has the power of imagination to grasp high and glowing conceptions of the truth and to present invisible things as though they were visible. He preaches the invisible Christ as an ever-

living, ever-present Savior. He has the Christ-power in his soul. Christ appears to him as the "chief among ten thousand," and his presentation of him has the inimitable charm of reality. The Bible is pre-eminently a book of the imagination. Where can we find more graceful utterances than those of Christ? Revelation is full of awful and glorious figures addressed to the imagination. The sublime scenes of the Bible are so pictured in the imagination of the true preacher that he is able to describe them with the vivacity of an eye-witness. The distinguished Bascom, when asked how he succeeded so well in preaching, replied: "By painting every thing vividly in my mind and then speaking of it as I see it before me." It is supposed that Milton's mind while composing the "Paradise Lost" was in the state of a sublime waking dream, in which heaven and hell, chaos and creation, appeared in one glorious vision. Something of this kind takes place in the mental experience of the true minister of Christ.

He has the power of invention which requires soul-absorption; and soul-absorption is the greatest power that a man can exercise over thought. Edison invents. He is absorbed in the one thing —invention. He has no time for Greek, or Hebrew, or any thing else except that which leads to the one object of his life— invention. So the true gospel minister, with one grand all-absorbing idea and aim influencing his whole life, invents— invents plans, invents methods, invents ideas, until the sermon is woven together with strong, massive thought. He muses upon the great doctrines until the fire burns, until the truth takes full possession of his soul, until his great thoughts are encompassed with holy emotions that give freshness and power to his pulpit ministrations.

He uses direct address. Christ, the only perfect model, who spoke as never man spake, delivered the spontaneous utterances of his great mind and heart. The apostles and early preachers used direct address. Chrysostom and Augustine spoke without notes. Spurgeon and Parker speak without manuscript. Moody, Aitkin, Pearson, and other distinguished evangelists use direct address. So do the majority of the great pulpit orators of our country. Direct address is adapted to the masses. The people in great multitudes rallied around the standard of Luther. "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about" Jordan went out to

hear John the Baptist. Even men of high culture enjoy direct address. Franklin went twenty miles to hear the eloquent, enthusiastic outbursts from the lips of Whitefield. Dr. Chalmers is mentioned as an example of great power combined with reading, but his greatest power was displayed when he left his manuscript and uttered thoughts in the most impassioned style. On great occasions it is said that he was terrible, his frame convulsed, his face flushed, the veins in his forehead stood out like cordage, his voice reached a shriek; he hung over his audience menacing them with his shaking fist, or stood erect maniacal and stamping.

Finally the true preacher is endued with power, spiritual and invisible. This is not learning, or logic, or rhetoric, but it can use these and make them grand in preaching the gospel to all nations. The power of God's Spirit in all its majesty is ready to work through the preacher's words, thoughts, tongue, eyes, soul, mind, and heart, for the salvation of souls. With what power the apostles preached! Society was revolutionized and men in high places trembled under the influence of their words. Athens, Ephesus, and the great cities of heathendom were shaken to their centers, so that it was said of the apostles that they "turned the world upside down." Peter, clothed with spiritual power, preached until the thousands cried out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Livingstone, endued with power from on high, preached a sermon that brought five hundred men to God.

How shall pulpit power be attained? By long, severe mental toil the mind may be trained to think profoundly, and then all may be baptized afresh in the pure element of love. By earnest, fervent prayer that stirs the heart to its profoundest depths, the preacher may be clothed with thrilling power so that men are drawn to him as the steel is to the magnet and they are led to inquire, "Whence comes this wisdom?" and their own hearts under the melting influence of gospel preaching answer, "It is heaven-born." By an unfaltering faith he may yield himself to God who will take possession of all the faculties of his mind, heart, and soul and vitalize them until the preacher is so endued with power from on high that the word delivered shall be quick and powerful, God's mighty weapon for breaking down the strong-holds of Satan, the hammer which breaks the rocks in pieces.

There is great need of power in the pulpit. The powers of

darkness must be overthrown and the nations brought to God, and the pulpit with its power of head, heart, and life, must be as it ever has been the mightiest of all agencies in accomplishing the grand work. That the triumph of the truth may be hastened the pulpit, with its powerful adjuncts of home and Sunday-school, must lay its strong hands upon the fountains of power, upon the press, philosophy, science, the greatest thoughts of the greatest men, and energize them, making them the burning force in transforming lives and saving souls.

D. S. BODENHAMER.

ORGANIC UNION OF ALL CHURCHES.

THAT the religious world is very much divided no one denies; that it ought to be united in one organic whole, some assert, while others deny. No matter which position one assumes, he is compelled to admit that it is a matter of serious importance. Not only is the Christian world divided into different denominations; but these are, in many instances, arrayed against each other. Congregation fights congregation, Church paper makes war on Church paper, jealousy, contention, hatred, and strife exist to an alarming extent. Every earnest Christian is bound to recognize these things as evils and to grieve over them. This spirit of rivalry and opposition not only exists at home; but in some instances has been carried abroad by missionaries, and has given trouble and hindered the work in foreign fields. The desire to get members, to build up one's own Church is often much greater than the desire to save souls. Much of the zeal and activity of Churches is put forth to build up self rather than to glorify Christ. I have known of instances where congregations seemed to hate each other worse than they hated the devil, if we might judge from their talk; for they talked against each other worse than they did against the devil.

In the face of all these things it will not do to try to dodge or conceal the issue by talking about the higher spiritual union. There is a spiritual union that binds all of God's people in one, and is often strong enough to overcome denominational differences and break down denominational barriers; and for this we should rejoice and be thankful. But when all that is said, there still remains the fact that much of the evil that exists is spiritual. There is spiritual division as well as spiritual union, spiritual strife as well as spiritual harmony. Envy, jealousy, and hatred are of the spirit. Several evils result from this state of affairs—

1. The person is unfitted for genuine Christian work. Envy and hatred drive out the love of God. The Bible says, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar. . . . . And this

commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God loveth his brother also." The Christian possessed of this evil spirit is to that extent shorn of his strength.

2. Misused power. In this unholy strife of Church against Church, and Christian against Christian, how much time, talent, and strength have been wasted. If they had been directed against the common enemy, they might have done good instead of harm.

3. Loss of power. In union is strength. Disintegration means weakness. If there was the greatest harmony and good feeling among Churches, still the present divisions would cause great loss of power. If all Churches were united in one there could be greater economy in the use of both men and money. As it is, we often find two, three, or more Churches with as many pastors in a town of not more than a thousand inhabitants. One Church and one pastor would be amply sufficient for such a place; and, if Church union existed, these surplus preachers and the money used in building and sustaining extra Churches might be employed in places where now there is a dearth of Churches and preachers. Again, there would be need of fewer Church papers, boards, and schools; and those that were needed could be much better sustained. Vast sums of money are used in running machinery which would be rendered unnecessary if there was only one Church. What resistless power the people of God would have if, in the name of Jehovah, they would move forward as one united host to conquer the world for Christ.

"If once all the lamps that are lighted
Should steadily blaze in a line,
Wide over the land and the ocean,
What a girdle of glory would shine!
How all the dark places would brighten!
How the mists would roll up and away!
How earth would laugh out in her gladness
To hail the millennial day."

4. These things have a bad effect upon the unconverted world. Sinners, in many instances, can not understand why these things should exist. They have no preference for one Church over another. Each Church asserts that it is right and others wrong, so they do not know what to do; and many of them do nothing. While, perhaps, comparatively few sinners are as just described, still, doubtless, multitudes of them are more or less unfavorably

affected by denominational differences. Some may have been kept away from Christ, and may have gone down to hell on this account. Also, adversaries use these things as weapons, not only against denominations, but against Christianity itself.

But let it not be supposed that denominations exist without cause; and that there is nothing in the way of their uniting in one organic whole. There are grave difficulties in the way. These are of such a nature that many think that organic union would not be advisable if it were possible. Two of these will be considered.

1. Doctrinal differences. It is well known that denominations differ widely, and, apparently, irreconcilably on points of doctrine. Uniting in one body would not destroy these differences. Men's opinions can not be changed by any such process. The strife and contention would probably be carried on in the one Church; and that might prove to be a greater evil than the existence of denominations. Until something is done to lessen these differences and allay the bitterness of debate, perhaps things are best as they are.

2. If there was only one Church it would be such a powerful institution that bad, designing men would be liable to crowd into it in order to have its influence to help them gain their ends. We know what the Roman Catholic Church became under such circumstances. True, things are very different now from what they were in the days of Constantine and during the centuries immediately succeeding his reign, and altogether similar results are not likely to follow; but largely similar results will follow in any age when the ungodly crowd into the Church for unholy purposes. The Roman Catholic Church and all State Churches have felt the effects of this, and suffered grievously from it in loss of spirituality and vital Christianity. It is to my mind a most serious obstacle. It would not cease to threaten after a few years of successful union, but would always continue to threaten. "Eternal vigilance" would be necessary to guard against it.

Besides the difficulties already named, there are still others of less importance—

1. Our attachment to our various denominations—their names, histories, and traditions. We love them and hate to give them up. They have become sacred to us—almost a part of ourselves. Sometimes, perhaps, our reverence and veneration for these have become too great—greater than for Christ himself. However dear

they may be, if it is best for the general cause, we ought to have enough of the spirit of self-sacrifice to surrender them cheerfully.

2. Church Polity. Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, all have their claims presented by zealous advocates, who claim that their respective systems of Church government exist by divine appointment. Others do not claim for them divine appointment, but insist that they are not out of harmony with New Testament teaching, and are best adapted to the needs of the Church in evangelizing the world. Here, again, it can readily be seen that somebody must give up before there can be union; and that is just the thing that no one seems to have a disposition to do.

3. The arrogant assumptions of some Churches. "Apostolic Succession" is a great hobby with some. Now and then we find a denomination that claims to be the only Church of God in the world. It is right, all others are wrong. In fact, it claims that other denominations are not Churches at all—only sects, or societies. In the light of the present age, it seems almost needless to say that such claims are utterly groundless. It does not require a prophet to see that there can be no union effected while this spirit prevails.

Before all Churches can unite, there must be a recognition of the existing difficulties by all, and mutual concessions. This subject has already become a kind of hobby with several Churches; but the trouble with them is, that while they want union they are not willing to make concessions. They want the union to take place upon the basis of their own doctrines and polity. Through press and pulpit they harangue the people on the subject until they make the impression upon many that they alone are in favor of union and all other Churches are opposed to it; whereas, I suppose, there is not a Church in Christendom that would not be in favor of union on that basis. The difference seems to be that the others have sense enough to see that it would be folly to expect any such thing. It would be like the lion and lamb lying down together—the lamb inside of the lion. It would just be one Church swallowing up the other. Evidently, the one that did the swallowing would be the only one that would assent to such an arrangement. Hence the necessity of mutual concession.

If organic union is ever accomplished a beginning must be made

somehow. The question is, How? The best plan would seem to be for those Churches most alike to unite first. For instance, let all of the different Presbyterian Churches unite in one. So with the Methodist Churches, the Baptist Churches, and so on to the end. After a time those larger bodies might be able to unite until all Protestantism is joined in one; and, by and by, the Protestant Church, and the Roman Catholic Church, and the Oriental Churches might all be able to unite. Then the Church of God in the world would be one organic whole; and in outward form, as well as in the higher spiritual sense, there would be "one fold and one shepherd."

Is this only a dream? Is it too much to hope for? too much even to wish for? Whether it be or not, certainly it is not too much to desire that all minor bodies holding essentially the same doctrines and polity may be united. For one, I earnestly desire to see the day when all the Presbyterian Churches in the United States shall unite and form only one Church.

But we have n't organic union; and, except upon a small scale, we are not likely to have it for many years. What shall be done in the meantime? At least, there should be co-operation and Christian courtesy among all Protestant Churches. Let them respect each other, labor for rather than against each other. If once all denominations could and would realize the solemn fact that no Church has a right to exist in this world for the purpose of perpetuating and enlarging itself as an institution, but is here to serve a divine purpose and accomplish a divinely appointed mission, then the way would be open for co-operation.

The first article in *The Homiletic Review* for September is by Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D., on "The Possible Federation of the Evangelical Protestant Churches." I have not yet had time to read more than the first page of the article. The plan suggested strikes me as a good one. It goes beyond simple co-operation, and is a considerable advance toward organic union, and might be useful in paving the way for that. The following quotation from Dr. Beecher's article will give an idea of his plan: "We need not define it [federation] more closely than by saying that it indicates something less than consolidation of existing Churches into a single body, having governmental functions, and something more than the mere recognition that all the Churches are in reality one.

It implies, perhaps a council of some sort, common to the bodies composing the federation. It implies some kind of accepted organization, some kind of official community. The common organization may have only advisory power, but it must be the power of advice that comes from a regularly accepted source." Thus are presented three plans of operation. Which is best? I know not. It will perhaps be found best to begin at the lowest, advance to the next higher, then to the highest; it being borne in mind all the time that no plan is adopted for its own sake, but for the sake of best utilizing the forces of Christendom. The supreme desideratum is the most economical use of all the resources of Christianity—men, women, and money—in the evangelization of the world. Let us have that whether it come by co-operation, federation, or organic union.

F. T. CHARLTON.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

A COUNTER CRITICISM.

IN the July REVIEW appears a criticism of a contribution by myself to the preceding number. The reviewer, Dr. William Adamson, of Scotland, rather surprised me, and in a measure gratified me, by his somewhat careful and extended criticism. I had not thought my little contribution worthy of so much notice. But I can understand it all when my reviewer tells me that if the teachings of my article are right, "Some of us (the reviewer and those who agree with him) have been wrong all the days of our lives, and have been misrepresenting the teachings of the Bible and the facts of human experience." I feel the force of this argument, and realize how vigilant the Church should be to suppress all heresy and to guard well the doctrines once delivered. Fortunate is that Church that has strong sons to rise up and defend her.

First, my critic takes issue because I declare that all "spiritual existences of whatever character are so constituted as to be shut up to the exercise of faith," asking, "Could it reasonably be said God has faith?" I am sorry my critic did not see my article preceding, "How and why Faith Purifies the Heart," of which the one criticised is the complement. Not only so, but I thought I made reasonably clear from the very first page of my last article the sense in which I used the words "faith" and "unbelief," and also their subjects. I used the word "faith" or "belief" in the expressed sense of "trust," and "unbelief" in the exactly contrary sense. I said, "unbelief is not a want of belief, but is as truly an exercise of the soul, a *trusting*, as is the faith of the most devout worshiper. For faith, philosophically considered, is the expression of the soul's activities, or life, a positive self-submission to one particular course of effort, and a consequent self-withholding from all others. The self-withholding is as much an act of will as the self-submission." In the light of this quotation it is seen that faith is a trusting in God, and also in what sense it

is a "positive act of the will." Belief in the sense of merely intellectual assent, conviction, is not a "self-submission" to God, a trusting in God. Again, I say on same page, in immediate connection: "Faith is not a condition arbitrarily imposed by the Creator, but is a natural and philosophical requirement growing out of the nature and dependence of all *finite*, spiritual being," etc. If faith is a "requirement growing out of the nature and dependence of all *finite* being," then surely I ought not to be misunderstood when I say "spiritual existences of whatever character" are shut up to its exercise, and be charged with applying it to God.

But my reviewer says it is "something new" to teach that faith and unbelief are in any sense "volitional." He tells us that faith and of course he must mean saving faith, is purely an act of the intelligence. He says: "It may be, and is, conditioned by acts of will, but it is to be carefully distinguished from volitions, either antecedent or consequent." Again: "Faith is belief, and both words express an act of the intelligence and consists of the conviction that the thing testified is real . . . ." With this view of saving faith I do not wonder at my critic's protest. With him the faith that saves the soul seems to be merely intellectual assent, rational conviction. To me this is bad philosophy and worse theology. Faith as an assent to a proposition is involuntary. When evidence is full and clearly apprehended by the intelligence it is impossible not to believe. Conviction is forced on the mind. Can we say in the light of the "teachings of the Bible and the facts of human experience," that the soul is forced to believe in, to trust in, God? The faith of mere assent is not the faith that saves the soul, for if it is, then all who are convinced of the claims of the gospel of Christ would be saved. The devils "believe and tremble," but they are not saved. Saving faith, trust, presupposes and includes assent to, conviction of, the truth. Without an intelligent conviction of the truth, an assent to it, a voluntary submission to God would be impossible. But the former is one thing and the latter another. The former may be without the latter, but the latter can not be without the former. This Dr. Adamson seems to admit unintentionally, and thus unwittingly contradicts his theory. He says: "It (faith, conviction) is an act of the intelligence and moral side of reason, *leading to trust*, obedience, and

love." (Italics mine.) If mere assent is saving faith, and he that is thus convinced is saved, why any necessity for a "leading to trust?" Christ says: "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." Cumberland Presbyterians teach that, "Saving faith, including assent to God's holy word, is the act of receiving and resting upon Christ alone for salvation, and is accompanied by contrition for sin and a full purpose of heart to turn from it and to live unto God." * Here it is taught that faith is an "act of receiving and *resting upon* Christ," a voluntary submission to him. And Cumberland Presbyterians are not alone in thus teaching. Delitzch † describes faith as the 'most central act of our being, the return to God, the going out of our inner life to him.' Also Dr. Charles Hodge: "What, therefore, the Scriptures mean by faith which is required for salvation, is an act of the whole soul, of the understanding, of the heart, and of the *will*." ‡ In the light of these quotations what becomes of the sweeping statement that it is "something new" to teach that faith is in any sense volitional, that it is to be "carefully distinguished from volitions, either antecedent or consequent?"

I am criticised for teaching "that at the self-same moment when spiritual entities (substance) were created the principles or laws of their being were impressed upon them, so that the laws of spirit are inherent in its very essence, are concreations of it." My critic pronounces it "absurd to say the Creator 'impressed on his creatures, spiritual as well as physical, the principle of their end.'" Let us see. The main point of controversy is the meaning to be attached to the ever-elusive abstract terms, "law" and "principle." It should be remembered that law, as an abstract, is the conception of the established antecedence and sequence, or the divinely established order, among the phenomena of nature, spiritual as well as physical. It simply expresses the constant relation of condition and result, antecedent and sequent. I agree with my reviewer that law, defined in reference to God, is the "method by which the Creator proceeds in controlling all that exists." This is objective law. Thus viewed it has no power, no force, no substantial existence. It is the merely abstract expression of God's will. But if defined in reference to its subjects, law becomes expressive of those material and spiritual conditions and

* Con. Faith, Sec. 45. † Bible Psyc., p. 174. ‡ Sys. Theo., Vol. 3, p. 91.

results, antecedents and sequents, causes and effects, as they are made known in material and spiritual nature; or more specifically, it expresses the ascertained and invariable relation of those conditions, antecedents, and causes, to their respective results, consequents, and effects. As these conditions, antecedents, and causes, together with the uniform relationship to their respective results, consequents, and effects, are divinely ordained, it follows of course that the law, which is expressive of these, is the "method by which the Creator proceeds," is the "will of God," but not that will, method, or rule, as merely made known objectively, but that will or method as subjectively expressed in the material and spiritual natures. The will, or method, of God, as thus expressed in the spiritual nature, is what we understand by concreated or subjective moral law. Or, to recapitulate: Law is simply an established and uniform order of antecedence and sequence. To violate this order is to violate law. As an illustration, our physical and spiritual well-beings are contingent upon certain physical and spiritual conditions, because certain conditions are followed by certain invariable results. Law expresses the relation of these conditions to their results. To comply with this order, or relation, is to obey law, and not to comply is to violate law. Now while this order of antecedence and sequence is of the divine willing, yet it takes concrete or subjective form in the physical and spiritual natures. So that when we violate this divinely established order, we sin not only against ourselves, but also against the "living and heavenly Father." We violate the law as the objectively expressed will of God, and also the law as the will of God subjectively expressed in the constitution of our being. This must be true if the doctrine of the divine immanence be true.

With the foregoing explanation it is not necessary to reply at length to my reviewer's criticisms on this part of my article. He says: "To contend that they (laws) are inherent in the essence of either matter or mind is to present a view of the Creator's relation to his creation which has long been abandoned by Christian thinkers." This is certainly news. Does he mean *all* Christian thinkers, or only those of his own philosophical and theological school? If he means the former, then I challenge his statement; if the latter, then I must admit that his statement is only too true.

Cumberland Presbyterians teach: "This law (Law of God) is of universal and perpetual obligation, and is written primarily upon the hearts of all accountable beings. . . . After Adam's fall, and that of his posterity through him, a written form of the law became necessary."* Our people understand Paul to teach the same thing when he says that the Gentiles, who have not the written law, "are a law unto themselves, in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts." In commenting on this, Meyer says that "the Gentiles, who do the requirements of the law, practically show thereby that that requirement is inscribed on their hearts."† Of course, if they have the "requirement of the law" inscribed on their hearts, the law itself in some real sense must have been written on their hearts. We can not separate a law and its requirements. But to show that Cumberland Presbyterians are in good company in their teachings on this subject, I can not refrain from quoting from Dr. Thomas Guthrie, the eminent Scotch divine and orator. He says, referring to Dr. Livingstone's description of the moral sensitiveness of the rude tribes of Africa, "Nor is it possible to read his clear statements on that subject, without arriving at this very interesting and important conclusion, that the Ten Commandments received from God's own hand by Moses on Mount Sinai, are but the copy of a much older law—that law which the finger of his Maker wrote on Adam's heart, and which, though sadly defaced by the fall, may still, like the inscription on a time-eaten and moss-grown stone, be traced on ours."‡

My reviewer joins issue with my statements in reference to depravity and condemnation. In my article I maintained that depravity, spiritual pollution, logically precedes condemnation which is but the legal, penal complement of depravity; that condemnation is the deprivation of the good that obedience to the law conserves. Or, that depravity is a moral, spiritual condition of which condemnation is the penal, legal result. He says the "loss of the good," deprivation, is not condemnation. Then what is it? His answer: "Condemnation is adverse judgment of God as moral governor." True. But I would ask, Is it adverse judgment, as he expresses it by "judicial fiat," an act objective to the sinner? Or is it adverse judgment of God as expressed subjectively in the sinning spiritual nature? God is immanent in nature, is as much

* Confession of Faith, Secs. 67, 68. † Romans ii. 14, 15. ‡ See *in loco.*

present in the moral nature as in the court of heaven." Indeed, he has his court in the soul as well as in heaven. All creation is his throne, and every soul his court. When the soul sins the "judgment of God" falls at once in the form of its vitiated nature, disturbed harmonies, loss of joy, good, etc. The judgment of God is not first passed in the "court of heaven," objective to the sinner, and then by mere judicial fiat, wholly from without, impressed upon the sinner, and thus made subjective in the "court of conscience." God's judgments do not take such a long, mechanical, roundabout course. That I may not misrepresent my reviewer, I quote: "Man violated the law of love—the moral law. On the ground of this, God by his judicial fiat condemned him. This act was objective to the sinner, being in God, but it was made subjective as well. It was in the court of heaven; it was made known in the court of conscience." But I would ask why "made subjective" in the sinner, and made known in the "court of conscience?" If condemnation be mere "judicial fiat" in the mind of God merely, and "objective to the sinner," is the sinner not as much condemned already as when this judgment is made known in conscience? But how does this judgment become "subjective," "known in conscience?" By a mechanical visitation from without? This is the theory of my critic. Does the Creator and governor make known his judgments in the soul other than through its normal order and activities? It is just here that the mechanical theory of condemnation breaks down. Condemnation is first in the "court of heaven," "in God," "objective to the sinner." But so long as it remains thus, the sinner is not directly affected by it. Somehow it must be made known to him, become subjective, else to him it would be no real condemnation, would only be "an empty act in the divine mind." Such a condemnation would be no condemnation. This my critic virtually admits. In contrasting the act of justification with that of condemnation, its reverse, he says: "The ground of justification is not in the sinner, for God justifies the ungodly, but in Christ; it is for his sake the believer is justified, nor is this divine act an empty act in the divine mind. It, like condemnation on the ground of guilt, takes place there, but it is also expressed in the believer's soul. It becomes a conscious possession." Passing over the first part of this quotation, the teaching of the latter is, that condemnation

and justification as acts objective to the soul are "mere empty acts in the divine mind," but by becoming subjective in the soul they become real, full acts, conscious possessions? What does my critic mean by an *empty* act? So long as condemnation and justification remain mere acts in the divine mind, they may be said to be "empty," but when they become subjective in the soul, then they are real and full! So I would say, too.

The order given by my reviewer is: (1) Bad faith; (2) Sin; (3) Condemnation; (4) Deprivation, loss of the soul's good; (5) Depravity. Remembering that depravity is a vitiated, perverted condition or state of the spiritual nature, or substance, we see, according to our critic, that in the case of the first sinner (and why may it not be true of all sinners?) he was first a transgressor, then was condemned, then deprived of all good, and then as a "result" of all this became depraved in his spiritual nature! "Astonishing!" How is it logically possible for a man to be a sinner, condemned, deprived of all good, without his spiritual nature first becoming vitiated, perverted? The truth is, in the very act of sin, bad faith, the harmonies of the soul were destroyed, its nature became changed, which could but deprive it of God, its highest good. Spiritually diseased eyes can not see God. The soul becoming impure, by that very impurity was shut out from loving companionship with God. It seems to me that to invert the order, as my critic does, "is to contradict the Bible and every-day experience."

The mechanicalness of his theory becomes equally apparent when applied to justification. My reviewer's order is: (1) Faith; (2) Justification, judicial acquittal; (3) Blessed, forfeited good restored; and (4) Spiritual purification, or depravity removed. This is the exact logical counterpart of his order of sin, condemnation, loss of good, and depravity. This order seems to me logically impossible. Is it possible even in thought to restore to the soul the blessings of justification, its forfeited good, without first changing its moral and spiritual temper or condition? As well talk about restoring to a diseased eye the blessings of light without first removing the disease, as to talk about restoring to a soul the blessings of justification, righteousness, its forfeited good, without first freeing it from its spiritual pollution, its moral disease. My critic denies that it is "only the spiritually pure that can be justified."

This is astonishing; yet he is logically forced to maintain this. God truly justifies guilty sinners, but he does not justify them while in their sin and guilt. Does Dr. Adamson teach that it is possible for the impure, in any real sense, to be justified before God, to see God? The justified are saved, are the children of God, and hence may see him. But Christ says: "Blessed are the *pure* in heart, for they shall see God." The converse of course is that the impure shall not see him, can not see him, because of their impurity. There can be no justification, no judicial acquittal, no good restored, no seeing God, without prior spiritual purity. The law that justifies is a law of love, it requires purity of affection. Paul says, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." To this Dr. Adamson agrees, for he says: "Man violated the law of love—the moral law." And now what follows? That an impure soul can not love God. But if an impure soul can not have right affection, can not love God, how is it possible for it to be justified by the law of love which is admitted to be the moral law? According to my critic, a soul is justified before it is made pure in its affection, and yet the very law that justifies is a law of love, one that requires purity of affection! But how are we justified by God, by this law of love, law of holy affection through Christ Jesus the Lord? By faith in Christ we are made one with him, are made to partake of his nature, are made pure in him; we partake of his nature, and consequently of his righteousness, just as the branch partakes of the nature of the vine. Thus becoming spiritually and morally (in a relative degree) like Christ, we are made pure in affection, made to love God, and thus fulfill the law of love, and receive the blessings of justification.

My reviewer makes me teach doctrines I do not teach, charging me of teaching justification independently of Christ, of dispensing with the Holy Spirit, and of holding that salvation is entirely by a "natural and philosophical process." It is difficult for me to understand how he could so misconceive what I wrote. Let me quote from the article criticised: "If, therefore, this moral state, or habit (depravity), of the soul is to be removed there must be a change of faith. But as long as the soul believes the course it is pursuing to be for its greatest good, it will necessarily continue therein. . . . The gospel realizes this, and provides a remedy in the word, and the quickening influences of the Holy Spirit.

Without these the soul could do nothing else than continue on its state of abnormality. The Spirit by revealing the truth unto the intelligence occasions proper desires, and lays the ground for a possible acquiescence of the will. . . . It is seen that this renovation is the result of a natural and philosophical process, and at the same time it is a work of grace, inasmuch as it is by the quickening and enlightening influences of the graciously-given word and Spirit that this renovation is made possible and effective."

Fault is also found with some of my terminology. It is asked what I mean when I speak of a "natural and philosophical process," what I mean by justification being the "result of a natural and philosophical process," and it is declared that a "philosophical process in nature is a new thing under the sun." By the word "natural" I mean normal, and by the word "philosophical" I mean rational. A "natural and philosophical process" would mean a process in harmony with nature, "normal," and which at the same time addresses itself to the mind, the percipient subject, as "rational." In my article I treated regeneration and justification—soul renovation—not so much as to their source as to their subject and the laws of soul by which they are brought about. Considering them thus, perhaps I erred in not discriminating more closely between the natural and supernatural. Regeneration and justification, considered in reference to their source are supernatural works, but considered in reference to their subject and the laws of soul in obedience to which they are brought about they are natural works—are in obedience to a "natural and philosophical (rational) process." While salvation is supernatural as to its source, it is certainly "normal and rational" as to its process. All this I thought was made reasonably plain in my article. But let us look at it more closely. Peter says (Acts xv. 9) that the heart is purified (*katharizo*) by faith. Is faith natural or supernatural? James teaches (chapter i. 18) that we are begotten by the "word of truth." Peter (1 Peter i. 23) says we are "born again . . . by the word of God." Do we not receive the word according to the natural law of faith? But Paul (Eph. vi. 17) says the "word of God is the sword of the Spirit." And Christ tells us (John iii. 5) that we must be born of the Spirit. But how are we to be born of the word and of the Spirit

both? A question presents itself just here: In the salvation, renovation, of the human soul, does bare spirit, in some miraculous way, move upon bare spirit; does the Spirit of God, by direct impact, move upon the human spirit, and thus effect a change? Or does the Spirit indirectly, through the normal activities of the soul, using the word as the "sword" and means of bringing about the change, or birth? True, this "word of God" is Christ, but do we not receive the word according to the natural, normal law of faith? The Spirit does not move independently of the law of the activities of the soul, but in perfect accord with it. The Spirit enlightens, quickens, excites, strengthens, uses the word, presents Christ—all this is supernatural; the soul sees, comprehends, assents, accepts the "word," yields to Christ, goes out to God—all this is natural. In this the natural and supernatural elements are happily blended in perfect accord with the laws both of the subjective and of the objective. Just how this "word," which is the "sword of the Spirit," when received by the soul, works its wondrous transformation I suppose none but God can tell. Christ is the "truth" of God (John xiv. 6). Thought is life. Truth is the food of thought. We receive Christ, "the truth," and God takes care of the rest.

My reviewer concludes his critique by giving us what he regards the "hints" along the line of a true theology and philosophy of the scriptural doctrine of justification. Space forbids a notice of these. Some of them have been noticed incidentally.

There are other points to which I would like to reply. But my editor has informed me that space is precious. I have already used more than my share.

B. G. MITCHELL.

Oxford, Mississippi.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM AND THE EDUCATION OF THE MINISTRY.

WHEN we mention *The Theological Medium* there is one name always certain to occur to mind, that of Dr. Milton Bird. Dr. Bird, the editor of that journal, accomplished a great work in the education of the ministry of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of his generation. He was favored by Providence with a good long life. My first recollection of Dr. Bird and the *Medium* dates from boyhood in 1846–47. My father was a standing subscriber to it and it made regular visits to our house. The part which it served in the education of the ministry in the theology of our Church, it is the unpretentious design of this article to show. But should the article fail to set forth the subject in full, as probably it will, it may nevertheless call the attention of some readers to some things both truthful and pleasant.

The *Medium* was a means of communication prized by the contributors for the good which it did, and by the young men preparing for the ministry as a source of instruction. The former we may look upon as teachers, the latter as pupils being taught and prepared for their responsible work. It will be called to mind that comparatively few of the latter ever attended a theological school in the days referred to. To this latter class the *Medium*—at first a monthly, afterward a quarterly—was the source of much instruction in written form. They looked to it for expressions of views on theology from the older and better qualified men. Here what had been termed "the medium theology," the theology between the stern features of Calvinism on the one hand, and what were considered to be the dubious uncertainties of Arminianism on the other, found frequent expression. This in the hands of Dr. Bird meant a great deal; for he was a theologian of no ordinary ability. An examination of the pages of *The Theological Medium* will make an interesting showing in this respect, all along during its continuance. In accordance with this view we find him saying under the head of "Our Aim," in the September number of the monthly for 1845:

"It is intended that *The Theological Medium* shall be what its name imports, the *just temperature* between extremes. The safe standpoint to which right reason conducts the mind as certainly as gravity brings the pendulum to rest at the center of its vibrations, and the influence of the magnet the point of the needle to the pole. It will never knowingly quit the middle highway of truth leading to heaven—to walk in the gutter on either side. Aiming to advance the glory of God and the welfare of men; it will not advocate the cause of faction, but the cause of truth and the universal interests of Christianity. As conducive to this, it will maintain the doctrines and measures of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church as supported by the Holy Scriptures." Again in the August number, 1854: "The *intermediate standpoint* consistently harmonizes the agency of God and the agency of man. It is a position as distinct as the base of the hill between the valleys, as the planet's path between the action of the centripetal and centrifugal forces. The ultraists at each extreme may not discover a doctrinal basis between them, but those who derive their theology directly and simply from the Bible and the enlightened sense of the world will (discover it). Has man no agency in making his final destiny? Can he take his destiny in his own hands and control it at pleasure? These questions bring up the radical difference between the Calvinistic and Arminian theology. One system ascribes more to sovereign agency and less to creature agency; the other more to the latter and less to the former. The intermedial system does not push God's agency so far as the Calvinistic, nor man's agency so far as the Arminian. Here arises the constructive and modifying principle of the Cumberland Presbyterian system."

Again in the April number, 1855, we find the editor discussing the freedom of the will, combating the necessarian argument of President Edwards. He says: "The whole question respecting the doctrine of the self-acting power of the mind resolves itself into a question concerning the divine power. If it be admitted that God can will by the free exercise of his own powers, then the only question will be, Can he communicate this eminent power to a creature? Seeing that necessarian theologians glorify and exalt the sovereignty of God above every other divine attribute when speaking of their dogma of predestination and election, it is strange that they contend that God can not create a free, a self-acting agent." Now suppose we leave this to his revealed word, as we must. On consulting it we find it answering (Deut. xxx. 19), "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing, therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Again in the New Testament (John v. 40), "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Coming down to 1859 in the June number of the Quarterly, Dr. Bird says: "All sin is only and wholly from the creature. It arose from a perversion of the human will. It can not be accounted for upon any principle of law, for it is a violation of all law. God has no agency in it; his agency produces nothing but good, unmixed good. He overrules sin, but did not create it."

Keeping on a line with our subject I notice some other writers, and keeping in mind the educational feature also, we find in the number first referred to in this article, September, 1845, a contributor, Rev. A. G. Gibson, drawing the distinction between foreknowledge and decrees in the following: "Let it be remembered that there is an important distinction between the foreknowledge of God and election, or what is commonly called the divine decrees; a distinction highly necessary to be known in order to a correct understanding of many parts of the Bible." With a view of preserving the harmony of God's "blessed word" the writer proceeds to propound the following interrogatory: "Can the Deity certainly foreknow that a thing *will be*, and can it at the same time be possible for the same thing *not to be;* and that possibility of its not being in any way affect the certainty of his foreknowledge? Now those who answer this question in the negative are reduced to the necessity, however unpleasant, of admitting the doctrine of fatality with all its revolting consequences. If this be true, it will then follow that the affirmative is the only correct answer to the above question propounded. We maintain therefore that God can certainly foreknow that a thing will be whilst it is yet possible for that thing not to be; the possibility of its not being is not, however, to be considered with reference to the mind or foreknowledge of God, concerning that there is no contingency or doubt whatever, but to the thing itself; or to speak more correctly to the agent by whose means or influence the thing is brought about. For instance, God foreknew that Adam would eat the forbidden fruit, yet

it was possible for Adam not to eat it, or else God would not have commanded him not to eat it."

Here we take occasion to remark the coincidence that Dr. H. S. Porter took up this distinction and extended it in his admirable treatise on this subject. His "Foreknowledge and Decrees" is marked by candor of argument and by the wideness of the distinction he has drawn. See his argument in the paper referred to. He may have gotten his idea from the *Medium*, for he was a reader of it.

REMARKS.—The worth of this journal—*The Theological Medium*—to the Cumberland Presbyterian Church can hardly be overestimated. First, great was its beneficent and direct influence on the ministers; and second, through them upon the membership, who received the doctrines from their preaching. As the revival spirit of 1800 was spread abroad, the doctrines of its promoters are also spread abroad. The fire was kindled in many hearts and it caught from heart to heart. The history of this periodical would be interesting should it be written, for it would show suspension and revival, mainly if not wholly on account of financial loss and support. The contrast would show up strikingly between what it was in 1845 and what it is now. It was then a monthly of twenty-four pages, and contained three articles aside from the editorial matter. Now it is a magnificent quarterly of one hundred and twenty-eight pages, and containing twelve or more articles. It is a singular fact that financial embarrassment continues still to jeopardize its continuance, notwithstanding our increased membership. If it should be said that we do not need this instrument of educational force in the theological line because we have, as a Church, a theological school for the instruction of our young men, a reply might readily be made by saying that wider average education in preachers and elders demands more reading matter for such intelligent minds. The able quarterly review is more of a necessity than ever, since the age requires higher culture and information in our leaders.

A. G. BURROW.

EDITORIAL.

IS PREACHING WORK?

IT is Thomas Carlyle who tells us that there are but three ways of making a living: work, begging, and stealing. Under which of these heads shall we place the preacher's calling?

All those useless and hurtful occupations which are equivalent to idleness or worse than idleness—which tax rather than help others, and diminish rather than increase the world's sum total of good—we may class as begging and stealing. Work rightly defined means, not activity merely, not toil merely, but activity and toil which result in good; not merely "effort directed to an end" but effort directed to a beneficial end.

Many useless and many infamous callings tax and wear out body and mind. The tramp wastes more strength and endures greater hardship than many an honest worker. The harbor thieves of New York city, it is said, lead such a life of toil and exposure that "six or eight years will wear out all but the most hardy." Who will say that Jesse James or Rube Burrows found their "effort directed to the end" of robbery a path of ease and flowers? There is scarcely a criminal employment that does not require "days of toil and nights of waking," but however toilsome an occupation may be, if it yields no benefits to mankind, it is begging or stealing open or disguised. Every calling is to be weighed in the balance of usefulness. Whoever fails to give as much as he receives is a beggar or a thief. This includes the rich idler that lives on the bounty of the dead or the unrequited toil of the living. If you thrive on false pretenses, giving something useless for something valuable, you may call it business, but it is theft wearing a mask. If you take the earnings of others and give back that which will hurt them, it is stealing, with the added element of murder in it. This is the damning thing in the drink manufacturer's and the dram seller's trade.

Work, then, in the high sense here used, means first, labor; second, usefulness: effort directed to a good end, and yielding good.

Let us subject the preacher's calling to this double test. Does the labor it requires and the benefits it yields entitle it to be respected and rewarded as part of the world's work?

I. Does it require effort enough? Is there a sufficient outlay of

energy in a faithful minister's life to make it proper to class him as a worker?

Let us compare the average pastor's labor with that of others whose work is recognized as useful and necessary. Such a pastor has, let us suppose, fifty families under his charge. He must be faithful not only in the pulpit but in his visits and daily ministering in sickness and sorrow, ready to answer every call, industrious in finding relief in every case of outward or spiritual need. If he does all that is expected of him in this purely pastoral department, the labor will be very little less than that of the doctor who practices in the same neighborhood. The attorney who faithfully looks after the interests of his clients, giving needed information on legal questions, helping in the intricate matters which relate to law and rights and wrongs, is rightly recognized as a useful and honorable worker. But the pastor has every member of his Church as a spiritual client. He must investigate intricate and perplexing questions relating to subjects more important and solemn than any involved in mere human statutes. If faithful, he must study the character and spiritual needs of every member of his Church. A pastor can hardly spend all the time and take all the pains implied in these varied duties with less labor than the ordinary lawyer gives to his clients. If a man prepares a half dozen lectures in a year, and goes from place to place delivering them, we recognize his work and pay for it; but the pastor must prepare and deliver more than a hundred discourses yearly. If an author should prepare two volumes a year he would be thought sufficiently industrious, but the minister who writes fifty-two sermons writes more than enough to fill two good sized volumes. Even if we leave out of the question the time which must be spent in reading books new and old, in the study of theological and scientific themes and current topics, in Bible study and prayer—things which no man who succeeds in the pulpit can neglect—it is plain that the preacher's labor is arduous and exacting enough to entitle him to recognition as a worker. All may not labor thus faithfully. There are lazy people in all avocations; but farming is work in spite of the fact that some farmers neglect their fields, and the same rule applies to preaching.

II. But will the preacher's calling bear the second test? Does the outlay of strength yield adequate benefits? Is the good produced worth the costs?

The institutions of the Christian religion have never been sustained without a class of men devoted exclusively to their upbuilding. In the beginning special heralds were commissioned who left their boats and nets and made preaching their sole employment. The Lord said of them, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." All subsequent history proves that men will not hear—can not—without a preacher.

Therefore we may properly set down all the good produced by Christianity as the fruit of preaching. Not that preachers have done it all or the largest part even; but because experience, as well as the testimony of Christ and his apostles, goes to show that preaching is an essential factor in religious progress. Every revival epoch has been an epoch of great preachers. Every important movement has grown up under the leadership and eloquence of a consecrated ministry. Even the Day of Pentecost needed the eloquence of Peter. The Reformation would have been impossible without the living voice and influence of Luther and Zwingle and Knox. Methodism grew up under the ministry and leadership of the Wesleys and their helpers and successors; and the voices of Ewing and Donnell and Morgan "crying in the wilderness" were an essential factor in the great revival in which the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was born.

Leave the Churches in any town or city ten or twenty years without pastors and what would be the result? We can judge by what we see in Churches left pastorless for a few months. Religion can not be maintained in any community without men who devote their whole lives to this work; therefore the benefits that result from Churches—from Christianity—are the fruits of preaching.

What are some of these benefits? We may say the fundamental wants of the race are food, shelter, clothing. Religion does not directly produce these, but who will say that these physical necessities are not more abundant because of the influence of religion? Where Christianity flourishes there are fewer idlers, less intemperance, more producers, fewer paupers. Under the influence of religion the income is greater, the waste less, hence religion, and therefore preaching, is worth sustaining as a helper in producing material necessities. It is a promoter of good government, liberty, justice, peace. Every man is freer and safer in a community where men are under the influence of the teachings of Christ. The more Christianity pervades a community, the less suspicious people are, the less violent and selfish, the less disposed to rob and injure others. It was not the fever nor the forests but the evil and darkness in the hearts of the people that most hindered Stanley's march in "Darkest Africa." If all these savage and benighted tribes could to-morrow be brought under the transforming influence of the gospel so as to make the Golden Rule the rule of every life, a woman or a little child might penetrate to the darkest Africa. America is a safer country to travel in than Africa, mainly because America is in part Christian and Africa almost wholly heathen. The same truth is illustrated on a smaller scale in every city and town and neighborhood in Europe and America. In London or New York or Chicago, the saloon or gambling house districts,

where Christ's name is never heard except in blasphemy, are the dangerous districts; we feel safer when we reach the neighborhoods where Churches and Sunday-schools and Christian homes abound. Safety, purity, peace, good surroundings, and wholesome influences to mold our children into noble lives, are valuable things worth paying for; but we can not have them without Christianity and Churches and preaching.

But a thing may have been useful in the past and still be useful in a limited degree, and yet it may be our interest and duty to abandon it and adopt a better thing in its place. A flail was a useful instrument in other days and may still be useful in some places, but this is no reason why it should not be generally superseded by the threshing machine. So it may be argued that preaching which was a useful instrument for good in the past, has in this day of general enlightenment and progress been superseded by the printed page and the newspaper; that the pulpit and the pastor are now less important if not altogether out of date. It would be a sufficient answer to say that the printing-press and the other inventions of this age have not rendered public speaking and direct personal agency needless or unimportant in other departments of human activity. Merchants advertise in the newspapers and negotiate bargains by telegraph, but this does not do away with the necessity for commercial agents with glib tongues and persistent energy. Never before were so many agents of this kind employed to travel and solicit purchasers. No great enterprise goes forward without personal effort—the direct influence of the human voice and presence. Politicians use the press, but to make a campaign successful speakers and direct agents were never thought more necessary than now. Personal contact and magnetism and the voice of eloquence are the most potent human influences. No great movement can long go forward without them. Therefore preaching—the pastor's influence in leading men in the upward way and guiding the affairs of the congregation—is not only work, but work that can not be dispensed with.

The character of this age, the boasted progress and enlightenment, make the preacher's office not less but more important. Our material and intellectual progress is in danger of outrunning religion and morals. People are too absorbed in money-making, too mad in their chase after fortune or fame—to heed the voice of religion. Therefore no work is so important as the preacher's. We need talent and devotion in the pulpit that will demand attention. What threatens our country is not poverty or famine, not oppression from without or the restriction of our liberties—but corruption and moral bankruptcy. The most momentous work of the age therefore devolves on the Church and the ministry. Nothing else is so imperatively needed as

the right kind of preaching; in no other field is there such an opportunity to use the highest talent for the noblest end.

Thus far we have purposely avoided all allusion to the interests of a future life; but we must not leave out of sight this higher view. We are never to forget that this is but the prelude of an endless life. Taking this larger view, the importance of the preacher's office is seen in a new light. To inspire souls and lead them into the path of life and build them up in the highest manhood, developing the moral and spiritual powers, setting them, even here, to the doing of such useful and loving tasks as might well be continued in heaven, and thus fitting them for the heavenly life—all this is, or ought to be, the peculiar care of the preacher. No other work compares with this in importance—nothing deserves the name of work that does not contribute to this end.

THE CHURCH AND PROGRESS.

The true relation of the Church to the progress of the ages is variously stated. It was a big mistake made by the Church of Rome in taking the position of a dogmatist on simple, scientific facts, and proposing to execute corporal penalties on transgressors of its ultimatums. When, for illustration, the wise men around the pope declared, and repeated the declaration with emphasis, that the sun, moon, and stars revolved around the earth in daily actual motion, and thereby authoritatively demanded that men continue to believe the earth to be the center of the system of universal nature, the world was a deeply interested listener as Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and other scientific minds asserted the entire falsehood of the doctrine. What would be the outcome of the conflict was no matter of doubt to the advanced observers in science, and the result has been a sweeping reversal of the dogmatic utterance of men whose line of studies was not science, but ecclesiastical and theological creeds. The same may be said of many geological determinations in the same period and in later times. The human mind is devoted to the past, and to its own long-cherished opinions, and it is with really revolutionary force that all radical changes are made in the course of thought which has held on for generations.

We of the present century, and especially of the second half of the century, have been living at a time when it may be truly said, "There are so many wonders, wonders have ceased." There are men now living who were born before the first steamboat ever plowed the waters, and who have lived to see the vast system of steam navigation come to its perfection, so that the navigable waters of the globe are alive with vessels of all nations of Christendom. These aged men have seen the telegraph, telephone, phonograph, and all the

marvels of modern invention literally transform the whole system of business and of thought, and lead mankind out into a vast world of progress. All this has been done by studious thinkers in the different ways of nature's manifold facts, powers, and principles. No unnecessary bar must be placed across the path of investigation into any thing that this world or other worlds offer for human thought. The Bible is replete with the spirit of inquiry, so that he who made the ravens said, "Consider the ravens," and he that made the lilies said, "Consider the lilies." The Psalmist cried out, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all." The spirit of the word of God is not that of blind following in a beaten track of things. It is full of the inspiration that stirs man's heart, and arouses all his faculties to action. The spiritual and the intellectual sides of our nature are both freely considered in the Bible, and the desire of man to know is wisely encouraged under due and necessary limitations. The wise man says (Eccl. vii. 13), "Consider the work of God; for who can make that straight which he hath made crooked?" Here we have a fundamental moral principle in the affairs of life. The exhortation is the same as directing us to ascertain clearly what we may find established by the moral government of God. This principle is applicable so generally that we may never reverse the order of moral cause and effect, as here indicated. So in our investigations of natural works for facts and systems of scientific truth, man must fully understand that there are some things which God has fixed, and they are irreversible. The Psalmist again says, "For ever thy word is settled in heaven." When a plain edict of Almighty God is declared, the world is to bow before it with utter reverence and obedience. But we must know that the Bible is the wisest book in the world, because it everywhere shows that God has settled beyond disputation only those vast questions which man's finite powers and carnal nature never could determine.

The great rule to guide the Church in its relation to progress is therefore freedom under the limitation of human incompetency to judge of certain great things. There is a world of faith based on *criteria* which are addressed to the intellect, but which are simply suggestive, not conclusive, in many respects. For example, we see the great worlds about us by day and by night, and we conclude that they are the works of the mighty power of One able to create them. Again, we behold the bodies of men, and see them animated by a mysterious force, whose actions reveal intelligence, purpose, will, and power. The former all deliberately call God, and the latter the soul. We firmly believe in the existence of both, although we can not say that we know they exist. Our faith is as strong and assuring as knowledge of ordinary facts can be. We turn to the Bible, and by all acceptable testimony among men it commends itself to us as God's

revelation of great facts, principles, precepts, and examples. It lays down certain truths as inviolable and obligatory. It makes known facts which it commends us to receive and declare upon the general trustworthiness of its character. Such, for example, is the fact of the original purity and innocence of man, and his subsequent fall from holiness into a state of sin by transgression, in which he involved all his posterity. Another fact is the atonement for sin by Jesus Christ, "the last Adam," "the second man (which is) the Lord from heaven." These two great facts, the fall of man and the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ, are fundamental in the history of human redemption. The whole scope of biblical testimonies is unintelligible without them. They account for the vast body of facts and principles found in both Testaments. The world displays a condition which may be explained in the light of these two luminous events.

There are other fundamental thoughts and facts in human history which are revealed in the Bible, but in the relation of the Church to progressive thought, as guided by the Bible, ample liberty is given for all reasonable speculative investigations. When men deny absolute principles or essential doctrines, they take issue with Christian thought by the very necessity of the case. It is not best to state our theories of unsolved problems, either of fact or doctrine, in such way as to make them set forth the last word on the subject. Where God has not spoken, it is hard for man to say the last word, and so the opportunity for a new and better word on thought and theory is wide open. This is easily illustrated by all modern progress, and the Church can happily adjust itself to the varying phases of development, content to allow the world's needs and experience to sift out the evil and to establish the good which appears. Real truth has no need of fear in the end, and so the process of any new development of thought may be carefully watched and, if practicable, guided in working itself out. This, of course, is meant in connection with whatsoever does not contravene essential principles. These are settled for us in the Bible, "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." When, therefore, we say that the Bible is not a book of natural science, whether of geology, astronomy, geography, or other, we are prepared to listen to wise men who teach as well on each or all of these subjects. This may include the time, forms, causes, effects, and relations of things.

Now it is manifest that what has been said is general in its bearing on progress, and it is safe to say the Church has been a foster mother to all true science, although there are very notable exceptions to this statement, as previously indicated in this article, and as viewed by men who glory in the thought of resistance to the dogmatism of ecclesiastics. During the last fifty years, men of the Church have been most assiduous students, and promoters of scientific progress, and

the culture and needs of the Christian population have done more to develop the truth of science than all other combined agencies. It is a happy fact that the Church has at the same time laid a wise curb against the ardor of men who have been disposed to run away with revelations of science. This must still be done, even though some of these ardent students of nature should be highly learned men in the faculties of instruction in Christian bodies. No difficulty is thus placed in the way of safe and sufficiently rapid advance on all lines. Let the reason of men of faith calmly meet that of men of non-belief, or of those who hold that "nothing is sacred but doubt." Let the "light of day in on all the unsolved or untouched problems of nature."

This brings us to a point of illustration in the conflict that is raging between men of faith and men of science philosophically considered. Let us remember that it is manifestly at the line of philosophy where the conflict really rages. It is philosophy as applied to science drawing deductions which seem to sweep away the foundations of the old faith. We are to say no bitter words, but we are to utter earnest and bold ones, if necessary. We are "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." The September number of the *Popular Science Monthly* contains an article on "The Fall of Man and Anthropology," which was written by one of the very learned men of the times, an ex-president of a noted university. This article is only a part of a series constituting a study of the subject mentioned in the light of modern science. The author says: "In previous chapters we have seen how science, especially within the past few years, has thoroughly changed the intelligent thought of the world in regard to the antiquity of man upon our planet; and how the fabric built upon chronological indications in our sacred books, first, by the early fathers of the Church, afterward by mediæval doctors, and finally by the reformers and modern orthodox chronologists, has disappeared before an entirely different view forced upon us, especially by Egyptian studies, Geology, and Archæology." This he connects with archæology and says: "We are at the beginning of a vast change in the basis and modes of thought upon man—a change far more striking than that accomplished by Copernicus and Galileo when they substituted for a universe in which sun and planets revolved about the earth, a universe in which the earth is but the merest grain or atom revolving with other worlds, larger and smaller, about the sun; and all these forming but one among innumerable systems."

Now this sounds like a challenge, a note of warning, a fire-alarm in the night, or some other dreadful omen. In the first place, we propose to be calm and keep watch for the change prophesied. Particularly so, since the learned writer continues as follows: "Ever since the beginning of man's effective thinking upon the great problems around him, two views have existed regarding the life of the human race upon earth, each utterly opposed to the other. The first of these is the belief that man was created 'in the beginning,' a perfect being, endowed with the highest moral and intellectual powers, but there came a 'fall,' as the result of which came into the world evil, toil, sorrow, and death." He rightly says that this opinion was held in common among intelligent nations of remote antiquity, and speaks of Chaldean, Greek, Roman, and Jewish views on the subject. Then he speaks of the opposite view as having appeared at an early period, taking the poem of Lucretius, a celebrated Roman philosophical writer, *De Rerum Natura*, as the best expression of that view. He calls the poem a "great poem" and utters strong words as follows: "Despite its errors it remains among the most remarkable examples of prophetic insight in the history of our race. The inspiration of Lucretius gave him almost miraculous glimpses of truth." Other similarly emphatic terms are used to express approval of the theory that man has come up from lowest possible conditions to a higher degree of intelligence. He also tells us that Horace, in one place, "dwells upon man's first condition on earth as low and bestial, and pictures him lurking in caves, progressing from the use of fists and nails, first to clubs, then to arms which he learned to forge, and finally to the invention of the names of things, to literature, and to laws." Continuing he says: "The investigations of the last forty years have shown that Lucretius and Horace were inspired prophets: what they saw by the exercise of reason illumined by poetic genius has been now thoroughly based upon facts carefully ascertained and arranged . . . . showing beyond a doubt that, instead of a *fall*, there has been a *rise* of man from the earliest indications in the Quaternary or even, possibly, in the Tertiary period."

All this clearly expresses the learned author's view of the orthodox doctrine of the fall of man. He seems thoroughly happy over the "new growth of truth," as he calls the newly awakened interest in the Lucretian idea, which interest arose about the middle of the present century. The hypothesis which gives the writer so much pleasure is that there has been "an upward tendency" in the human race "during vast periods of time," the "long, slow processes" having been upward from "the first appearance of man," possibly millions of years ago. Notice one very broad generalization of the writer in opposition to the doctrine of the Church concerning Adam as he came from the Maker's hand. When speaking of the orthodox teaching, he says: "The statement in our sacred books that 'death entered the world by sin' was taken as an historic fact, necessitating the conclusion that, before the serpent persuaded Eve to eat of the forbidden fruit, death on our planet was unknown." The "historic fact" of death coming upon the race of man by sin may well be considered in view of the

Apostle Paul's teaching (Roman v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, etc.), as well as in view of what our author calls "one of the documents which form the expressive poem beginning the books attributed to Moses." The entire drift of the learned work of Dr. A. D. White, from which we have been quoting, is reduced by his own conclusion to this: "The vast antiquity of man and the evolution of civilization from its lowest to its highest forms" is placed "beyond a reasonable doubt." We need only to sum all this up by saying that the doctrine means that man never fell from an estate of holiness, is therefore not a sinner, did not need a divine Savior, and, of course, redemption by the death of Christ for our sins is a mere myth. Such is the course and effect of philosophic science.

In concluding, it is well to say that the Bible and the Church of Christ have heard frequently before his day such thunder as this able man has created. The lions have roared by the way and the wild boar out of the wood has wasted the heritage of the Lord, and been left slain by the path. The tongue, the pen, the sword, the arena, political power, ridicule, every possible weapon has been employed to destroy the old faith. The carnal world, the wise critics, the scientific philosophers, the pseudo-philanthropists, bitter enemies and false friends have endeavored to pick the body of Christ to pieces and to put out the light of its divine chart of life, and yet the Church was never in all history so strong as now and the Bible was never before so widely, understandingly, believingly read and obeyed. So will it yet be.

M. B. D.

QUERIES, NOTES, AND SUGGESTIONS.

The breath of the popular breeze is always pleasant, and sometimes, and to some people wholesome and stimulating. But the Lord doubtless sees that many of his servants work better in a colder and more bracing atmosphere—that the chilling rain or even the pelting hail of criticism does many of us good—so the wind and the weather are frequently contrary. Nevertheless people are in the habit of speaking of popularity in a minister as a good omen if not as an actual virtue. This tendency has evidently been observed by the writer of the following communication:

PREACHERS AND POPULARITY.

A recent writer in one of our Church papers says of a minister of the gospel in the city from which he writes, "He is the most popular preacher in the city." In a recent number of the *Cumberland Presbyterian* a writer refers to another minister, as "the most popular preacher in the State." These and similar statements suggest a few inquiries:

1. While a minister ought to be "well reported of by the brethren," while he "must have a good report of them which are without," must he, in order to reach his highest success and usefulness, of necessity be popular?

2. When Paul says, "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some," does he say that he becomes "pleasing to the people in general?"

3. How many of the men whom we now delight to honor as reformers were in their day "popular?"

4. Have the Master's words of warning, Luke vi. 26, "Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets," lost all their meaning for the ministers of Christ in our day?

J. L. CRAWFORD.

No, popularity is not a duty, nor is it a condition, or always a result of true success. He that walks faithfully in the path of true service will probably at times be cheered by the hosannas of the multitude but he must also be prepared for the cry, "Crucify him." Hardly any thing could be a greater departure from the true spirit of a minister of the Cross than to make human praise a chief motive. May it not be that an unconscious desire to please, rather than to arouse souls to repentance, is a reason why the old fashioned themes of law, and penalty, and death, and judgment are so seldom treated in some modern pulpits? This inquiry is suggested by the following communication:

DOGMATIC PREACHING AND THE LAW SIDE.

The question, "Is the church losing its power over its membership in matters of questionable propriety?" has lately been answered affirmatively by some good observers. If this is so, why? May not one reason be because we have less dogmatic preaching than formerly? And is there not now a need of a revival of dogmatism? Are we content to hang our faith on all the quibbles of modern infidelity? Is it not God's plan to establish a very few facts and upon these to build his system of revelation afterward treating all infidelity with scorn? A few things being true all else must follow, and why submit to debate, and lose the power of positivism. God seems to vindicate by results the childlike and simple faith of positive believers. A messenger, such as Jonah, who simply declares God's message honors God more and is honored of God more than all the all-analyzing anatomists who submit Deity and his mysteries to their logical dissection. Paul, the wonderful logician of the ages, was a "steward of mysteries," and need we not again to enter upon such a stewardship?

Again, in this day of "gospel preaching," as it is termed, is there not a disposition to forget the law side of the divine government?

"Come along, come along," we say so much that both the message and its author are laughed at. And if they "come along" those rush in who trample under foot both the holy blood of our Savior and the majesty of our God as it is revealed in his laws. They neither appreciate Christ nor fear God. Does gospel or grace take away law? Does not gospel magnify it? Are we any less under obligation to obey after regeneration than before? Is not regeneration rather the giving of the power or disposition to keep the law? Is it not the writing of law upon the heart rather than the removal of law from us? Make the tree good so that its fruit may be good, is good sense and sound theology. Genuine repentance never comes unless there be condemnation, and there is no condemnation without the law. Is there not a demand now for more Finneys, whose eyes' flash shall bring condemnation? It seems to me that this is the old way and the sure way of making Christians who in their very thoughts will have the spirit of obedience.

A. B. BUCHANAN.

But however large a class of ministers there may be who shrink from presenting the solemn and awful doctrines of the Bible, the writer of the next article is evidently not one of the number.

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN.

A preacher once in his sermon said that a man might sin away his day of grace, and in his life afterward the promises of God could give him no encouragement. The brother who "followed" said, that if the man was deprived of all ground of hope for salvation he did not see why the Lord would continue his life for a moment longer. The first preacher had in mind the words of the Savior, "But whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." (Matt. xii. 32.) The second, doubtless, had in mind the old couplet:

"While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

Are these two quotations in harmony? Is it not a fact that preachers remember the couplet better than they do the Scripture? The Savior did not teach that a man would die—the death of the body—immediately after sinning against the Holy Ghost. He however taught plainly that such sin should not be forgiven. Often in the history of the race men have lost their lives when the Almighty would execute upon them the penalty of violated law, and the swift destruction brought upon them proved that God rules over the earth as well as in the heavens. The penalty attached to the sin in question is not sudden destruction but an absolute refusal to forgive. It is of no use to ask why the man should be allowed to live when he had lost even the comfort of God's promises. Many desperate sinners live to ripe

old age and never repent. Did not the Almighty know beforehand what these men would do? It might as well be asked in reference to these, Why were they permitted to live when the Lord knew they would not repent? And then that other useless but oft-repeated question, "Why did God make man when he knew beforehand that the man would sin?" could come in for its share of consideration. Men ought to learn that they have nothing to do in the way of directing the work and making out the ways of the all-wise God. It is enough for them to know what the Lord has revealed regarding their work and their ways. It is a plain fact of revelation that a certain sin shall not be forgiven. The penalty is not death to the physical man but the exclusion of such a one from the wondrous love and almost unbounded grace of God. The man in this condition may yet live—live for years—but he is no longer a probationer. To his feet God's word is no more a lamp, nor is it a light unto his pathway. No more does the Spirit draw him to the Father. He is dead while he lives. His blighted, withered soul retires into the narrow confines of self and broods in rayless gloom over mercies despised, capacities abused, and opportunities lost. The curse is on his brow, not as the flaming vengeance of offended Deity, but as the palsying grip of spiritual death claiming its own before the judgment.

"There is a line by us unseen,
That crosses every path,
The hidden boundary between
God's patience and his wrath.

"To pass that limit is to die,
To die as if by stealth;
It does not quench the beaming eye
Or pale the glow of health.

"The conscience may be still at ease,
The spirits light and gay;
That which is pleasing still may please,
And care be thrust away.

"But on that forehead God has set
Indelibly a mark
Unseen by man, for man as yet
Is blind and in the dark."

F. R. EARLE.

There is such a mystery and awfulness in the thought of being shut out beyond the boundary of God's mercy—such danger that sensitive and naturally despondent souls will be driven into needless fatal despair by it—that it should be presented with the greatest care and prudence. It is a doctrine to warn the presumptuous and profane, not to torture and discourage the penitent overwhelmed with the

sense of condemnation. No one who longs for forgiveness has forfeited hope of forgiveness. Two articles follow referring to the work of Christ in procuring forgiveness:

FROM WHAT DOES CHRIST SAVE?

Jesus is Savior from what—sin, or its consequences? Did he come into the world to save from punishment or from corruption and depravity? Of course he does save from punishment, suffering, death, and hell; but is this the work which the Scriptures emphasize? Most certainly, no. "And thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Much of our hatred of sin is from fear of its consequences, which feeling is probably allowable in the fleeing sinner; but is unworthy the Christian. Of course sin is bad because it brings suffering, death, etc., but its deepest curse is a depraved and rebellious soul, opposition to our loving Savior. It is selfish to be afraid of suffering, death, and hell, and yet ready to tolerate sin. A Church member said to me, "If I believed as you do about the doctrine of the preservation of believers, I would commit all the sin I wanted to." I have always doubted the genuineness of that man's conversion. He wanted to get away from the punishment of sin but seemed to care very little about Christ. The Christian should be like Christ, hate sin and try to remove sin, knowing that if the cause is removed the effect will cease. T. A. COWAN.

IT IS THE BLOOD APPLIED THAT SAVES.

The Universalist says, If Christ died for all men, necessarily all men will be saved. The Calvinist says, Christ died for a certain number only, and all that number will certainly be saved. Cumberland Presbyterians accept neither of these statements. Each of them teaches universalism, one limited, the other unlimited. The first teaches a double universalism—universal atonement and universal effectual application of it. The second teaches a limited atonement, but a universal effectual application to the class for which atonement was made. Cumberland Presbyterians teach a universal atonement, but an application only partially effectual on account of man's unwillingness to receive. Do not Universalists and Calvinists blunder in making Christ's death *per se*, too nearly every thing? It is not Christ's *death* that makes atonement, but his *blood*. Look at the ritual service of the day of atonement, as taught in Leviticus. The sins of the people were ceremonially transferred to the victim; it was killed, its blood was caught in a vessel, the body, sin-cursed and unclean in God's sight, was carried from his presence outside the gates of the camp, and entirely consumed by fire. The blood the high-priest took into the holy of holies and sprinkled it on the mercy-seat—God's throne. It was not the death of the victim that made atonement, it was the blood. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul" (Lev. xvii. 11). About the only purpose the *death* of the victim served in this ceremonial was that it was the only means of securing the blood. "The life of the flesh is in the blood." The blood taken, death ensued.

The work of Christ, in making atonement for the world, consisted in two principal acts—taking the life of the victim and entering the holy of holies with the blood. Our sins were transferred to his body, and he bare them forth beyond the gates of the city and offered himself on the cross (1 Peter ii. 14). That broken, sin-cursed body was buried (not burned) out of God's sight. And that natural body, made unclean by the transfer of our sins to it, was not the body which arose from the grave, but Christ was given a glorious, spiritual body (Phil. iii. 21). He then took the blood and entered into the holy of holies above, "to appear in the presence of God for us." The benefits of Christ's incarnation, life, death, and resurrection are, to some extent, universal and unconditional. But much the larger benefits flow from the blood of Christ, and these are offered on conditions to be met in man. "It is the blood that maketh atonement." "In whom we have redemption through his blood." "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." "Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." It was not the death of the paschal lamb that saved the Israelites, but it was the blood on the door-posts. Likewise, it is the blood of Christ that saves. But these blessings accruing from the blood are offered men alone on the condition of faith in Christ. "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through *faith*, by his blood, to show his righteousness." Christ died for *all* men and for all alike, but he applies the blood, which atones, redeems, cleanses, to those who *believe*, and to those only.

A. W. HAWKINS.

The term Agnosticism, as is shown in the first chapter of Prof. Schurman's recent work, "Belief in God," is not easily defined, and is by those who profess to be agnostics made to mean pretty much any thing. We suppose it means something nearer faith than the fool's creed, "There is no God;" so our next correspondent discovers in agnosticism a sign of progress:

AGNOSTICISM AND FAITH.

I think that agnosticism should be regarded as one of the hopeful signs of the times. Atheism used to be the popular thing, but science and philosophy have now shown that its position is untenable. To

prove that God does not exist, one must have complete knowledge of all time, all space, and all being. The atheist is thus compelled to yield his ground, and so he compromises by becoming an agnostic. This is equivalent to the admission that there may be truth in the theistic hypothesis after all. Now, the agnostic having yielded this much, is under obligation either to accept theism or furnish a better explanation of the universe. He can not long remain an agnostic. His very nature will drive him to faith in some hypothesis. Agnosticism is, then, a mean between atheism and theism, and, from the atheist's point of view, is a step in the direction of faith. There are many questions of vital importance which neither science nor philosophy can ever hope to solve. Agnosticism closes all access to such and leaves the soul in darkness; faith, looking beyond knowledge, lifts the veil and pours a flood of cheerful light upon them. The world is moving. The agnostic will have his reign and then go his way just as the atheist has done.

J. I. D. HINDS.

The theme touched upon on the next article is one that vitally concerns not only the Church, but the nation:

MORALITY AND RELIGION.

The contention that morality may be taught in our public schools and colleges without teaching religion is old and ever new. The whole controversy has been fostered by wrong ideas of both religion and morality. They have been looked upon as separable in thought and practice, whereas, Christ, long ago, taught that in order to true morality—love to man—one must be truly religious—have love to God. Hence, he says that on love to God and love to man hangs all the law and the prophets. According to Christ, then, religion is morality and morality is religion—a moral man is religious and a religious man is moral. That was a milk-and-water definition of religion which a prominent Christian educator gave lately. "Religion," said he, "has to do with God," and "morality has to do with our duty toward mankind." Religion, then, is only an impracticable, sky-scraping, mystical affair, which has no practical bearing upon our relations to each other! But, strange to say, the Apostle James defines our relation to our fellow men *as a religious one*. Thus he captures for religion what some lop-sided educators have claimed for what they have dubbed as "only morality." James' "pure religion and undefiled" is none other than the "cauld morality" of some theologians. Jesus agrees with James—or, rather, James agrees with Jesus—in claiming that a perfect system of religion embraces duties toward our fellow man, and that a wholesome morality reaches up to and lays hold of the almighty Father of Spirits. In other words, he destroys the artificial division of some between morality and religion,

and teaches most explicitly that to be moral is to be religious, and to be religious is to be moral. A terrible day indeed it would be for God and his Church if "religion should be relegated to the Churches and morality to the schools and universities," as some Christian educators even are insanely asking. Will people support a thing of no practical value? Are they to be expected to uphold an institution which scorns the affairs of men and indulges entirely in speculative harangues about the mysteries of the unseen world? Nay, verily! We must hastily come to the common-sense position of Jesus and James, refusing to yield a single inch of the Church's legitimate territory, and reiterating the old statement of the Great Teacher, that love to God and love to man is the sum total of a true morality and a practical religion.

I am pleased to notice that the trend of modern thought is in the direction of the ethical teaching of Jesus. Herbert Spencer defines morality as "true religion."* He also scorns the idea of the State discharging its duty to the citizen by providing only literary or scientific culture, and argues that this "religion" must be taught. And so he wisely concludes that "we are satisfied, that though imperfections of nature may be diminished by wise management, they can not be removed by it. The notion that an ideal humanity might be forthwith produced by a perfect system of education is near akin to that shadowed forth in the poems of Shelley."† Mr. T. H. Huxley, also, claims that "an exclusively scientific training will bring about a mental twist," and that an Englishman may "get a literary culture out of his Bible, his Shakespeare, and his Milton."‡ But how is he to get it if the Bible with its *practical* religion is to be shut both out of the Church and school? As a good brother has wisely hinted lately, let us have less of the old hair-splitting religion and more of that of a practical rail-splitting sort.

J. D. GOLD.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE ELEMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY. By Gabriel Compayré. Translated by William H. Payne, Ph.D., LL.D., Chancellor of the University of Nashville, and President of the Peabody Normal College. Boston: Lee and Shepard.

The spirit of American institutions is so different from that of those in Europe and our own books are so excellent that the transla-

* See his reply to Harrison where he claims that reverence for an Infinite Being and love for our fellows is the sum of true religion. Published in Gail Hamilton's *Irrepressible Book*.

† See Spencer's excellent work, *Education*, chap. iii., on "Moral Education."

‡ Address at opening of Birmingham College of Science. Published in *Animal Automatism and Other Essays*.

tion of a foreign text-book for use in American schools would seem to be an unnecessary work. It behooves us, however, to take and use the good, whatever may be its source. We have before us a work of rare excellence. It is an Empirical Psychology, intended for teachers and students in Normal schools. The following extract from the translator's Preface will indicate the scope and character of the work:

"A book to serve the needs of the general teaching class should have the following qualities:

"1. It should contain only the essentials of psychology; it should not be a cyclopedia of psychological science.

"2. It should not be a work of erudition or learned research, designed for the specialist and the proficient; but a book for the dissemination of scientific truth among persons who need it first of all for the application they can make of it.

"3. It should be written in terms readily intelligible by ordinary readers; it should not require any extraordinary scientific acumen or power of interpretation.

"4. As most teachers of youth are believers in the spirituality of the soul, and in the absolute dissimilarity of mind and matter, they prefer a book whose tone and treatment are in accord with the Christian spirit.

"It is because Compayré's *Notions Elementaires de Psychologie* seem to embody these qualities to a greater degree than any other book with which I am acquainted, that I have undertaken its translation.

"One charm of the book lies in the fact that Psychology, under this mode of treatment, has all the concreate interest of physical science. The subject is no longer enveloped in transcendental obscurity, but is brought within the compass of the ordinary intelligence by being presented as an experimental science, or science of observation."

The work of the translator has been well done. We recommend the book especially to teachers and also to all who are interested in the subject of psychology.

A SELECT LIBRARY OF THE NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Second Series. Translated into English, with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes Under the Editorial Supervision of Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., and Henry Wace, D.D., in Connection with a Number of Patristic Scholars of Europe and America. Volume I. Eusebius Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine. New York: The Christian Literature Company. Oxford and London: Parker & Company. 1890.

Eusebius is so great and famous a Church historian that his name is familiar to all readers of Church history. His life of Constantine

and his oration in praise of that renowned emperor ought to commend the volume to many readers besides ministers of all Churches, who refer to Eusebius for early Church history. The history was translated by Professor McGiffert, of Lane Seminary, and the life and notes on the text are valuable because very helpful to an understanding of the author's life, purposes, and teachings. There are three indexes to this large volume, containing all material aids for reference. The work is one of positive value to all students of ancient times.

The ample learning, literary skill, zeal, and power of Eusebius may well be considered in connection with a study of his times. His times were most stirring days. They were the days of Constantine the Great, the friend and deliverer of the Christian Church. They were the days of Diocletian, the arch persecutor of Christians, who preceded Constantine and who shed the blood of the helpless followers of Jesus as if water was being poured upon the ground. They were the days of Athanasius and of Arius, those two great leaders of the contending Christian forces of theology when the trinitarian doctrine was set forth and defended by the former, and the Arian, or Unitarian view was promulgated by the latter. It was a time of vast power, a mighty transition period in the history of the Church, and when the rebound from the extreme of bitter adversity to the other extreme of unlimited prosperity brought the Church to a state of dangerous temptations. Eusebius lived in the midst of marvelous intellectual conflicts and he himself was subject to the criticisms of learned and prominent men in the Church, some strongly for, others positively against, him.

The details of his history contain an immense amount of matter, much of it in small space and of great importance. Part of his work was historical, part theological, part apologetical, part biographical, part critical, part oratorical, part panegyrical. The volume before us is a grand one and we may not, even with many words, fully set forth all that is contained in this large work. The labors of the translators, editors, publishers, and printers combine excellency and beauty.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE. By the Rev. Henry Burton, M.A. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway.

This work is called "The Expositor's Bible." The plan is not the ordinary textual commentary, but a series of views set forth in twenty-six chapters, with homiletical, expository, and critical discussions of topics. The chapters have such titles as "The Genesis of the Gospel," "The Mute Priest," "The Gospel Psalms," "The Virgin Mother," "The Temptation." The style is clear and strong. The spirit is fresh and earnest. Under the head of "The Gospel of the Jubilee," the following striking words illustrate the author's manner:

"It would be easy to show that Jesus, personally, was a lover of freedom. He could not brook restraints. Antiquity, conventionalism had no charms for him. Keenly in touch with the present, he did not care to take the cold, clammy hand of a dead Past, or allow it to prescribe his actions. Between the right and the wrong, the good and the evil, he put a wall of adamant, God's eternal 'No;' but within the sphere of the right, the good, he left room for largest liberties. He observed forms, occasionally, at least, but formalism he could not endure. And so Jesus was constantly coming into collision with the Pharisaic school of thought, the school of routinists, casuists, whose religion was a glossary of terms, a volume of formulas and negations." Again, he says, "To the Pharisee religion was a cold, dead thing, a mummy, all enswathed in the cerecloths of tradition; to Jesus it was a living soul within a living form, an angel of grace and beauty, whose wings bear her aloft to higher, heavenlier spheres, and whose feet and hands fitted her just as well for the common walks of life, in a beautiful, every-day ministry of blessing."

The order of the Gospel of Luke is the order of the discussions and they are very profitable. We would have been pleased to have this volume to notice earlier in the year that its very suggestive contents might be enjoyed and used by Sunday-school teachers in connection with their studies; but the book is valuable for all years and seasons. It may properly be termed a moral, social, and doctrinal life of our Lord Jesus Christ, and it is well done.

BELIEF IN GOD: Its Origin, Nature, and Basis; being the Winkley Lectures of the Andover Theological Seminary for the year 1890. By Jacob Gould Schurman, Sage Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890. Price, $1.25.

The world is passing through a philosophical and theological revolution. Recent advances in science have compelled the abandonment of certain anthropomorphic conceptions of God and his mechanical relationship to the world. Many have imagined that, in this crisis, God, immortality, and religion would be lost. Such is not the case. Human thought is simply passing through a metamorphosis, and the new state will be to the old as the parti-colored butterfly is to the crawling caterpillar. Any thing which facilitates this transformation will be welcomed by a large class of thoughtful readers.

The object of the book before us is to furnish a rational ground for belief in the existence of God and for theistic conceptions, which shall be in harmony with recent scientific and philosophical thought. The first of the six lectures discusses agnosticism, and is an admirable piece of philosophical criticism. The author shows that the postulate of agnosticism itself goes beyond sense-perception, and adds, "Timid

souls may find comfort in the observation that current agnosticism is well seasoned with gnosticism, and is, perhaps, as near to omniscience as it is to nescience."

The second lecture treats of the "Logical Character of the Belief in God." Here is developed the author's peculiar conception which he calls "anthropocosmic theism;" *cosmic*, because the "hypothesis of the being of God is the only one that can render intelligible existence and change;" and *anthropic*, because nature reveals God "as a metaphysical unity demanding characteristics which would remain unintelligible to us but for our own experience of self-conscious existence."

The third lecture, on the "Origin and Development of Belief in God," is one of the most interesting and curious in the book, and the one, too, perhaps, to which the orthodox theologian will make the greatest objection. The author handles the Hebrew Scriptures with the same reckless and critical freedom which he applies to the Vedas and the Koran.

The subject of the fourth lecture is "Belief in God as Cause or Ground of the World." Here we find a unique, yet logical, discussion of causation, shaped to fit the author's doctrine of anthropocosmic theism.

The subject of the fifth lecture is "Belief in God as Realizing Purpose in the World." This is the Teleological argument recast so as to avoid the difficulties in which it has become involved through scientific theories, and particularly that of Development. The following quotations will give an idea of the author's position: "Development does not negate design; it rather affirms it." "In a last analysis cosmic force and intentionality converge in God." "The fact remains that thought can not surrender the teleological view of the world." "Man is indispensable for the attainment of God's glory."

In the last lecture we have "Belief in God as Father of Spirits." God is made immanent in nature and inseparably connected with it. Spirit is an emanation from God and a part of the divine essence. The following quotations represent in a meager way some of the rich thoughts contained in this lecture: "The material world we regard as the expression of the divine will." "It is the continuous efflux of the divine energy, and apart from God has absolutely no existence. Material things exist simply as modes of the divine activity; they have no existence for themselves. Spiritual things, on the other hand, exist at once in God and for themselves. They are in God; for as God is the underlying ground of all things, so philosophy must confess with Scripture that in him we too live and move and have our being." "The fact of our own personality is an inexpugnable deliverance of consciousness." "While the infinite spirit is the first cause, finite spirits are the only second causes—*causes* because they

have the power of initiating action; second cause, because they derive it from the first cause, in relation to whom they are effects." "That man is made a new creature who has come to see that God and not self is the center of reality." "The endless problem of religious thought will be the re-setting of the religion of Christ in the framework of contemporary knowledge." "In the restless march of mind, the aids of one generation become the obstacles of the next." "From symbol to essence, from picture to reality, from myth to fact, from the Christian religion to the religion of Christ: such is the movement which under the influence of scientific criticism is re-shaping the theology of our day. The good is no longer dogmas about the Messiah, but the actual content of the revelation made in and through the historic Christ."

The author concludes his book, and we will close this review, with the following: "For my own part, I think it has been shown that the phenomena both of the universe and of human life require the thinking mind to postulate a supreme ground of things which we are entitled to describe as a self-conscious Spirit and loving Father."

LITERARY NOTES.

The Quarterly Reviews and Monthly magazines are full of both various and interesting matter. Here lies *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* with names to articles which at once give us the impression of learning, research, and critical accuracy. The subjects in the current number are important. Notice Dr. Kelley's article on "The Egypticity of the Pentateuch," in which the testimony to Moses is very strong, even saying that not "a single error can be cited in the Old Testament story of Egypt as thus far tested by the Egyptian annals." He means that the hieroglyphics on columns, walls, and other Egyptian works have been read without contradicting the Old Testament. Dr. Macloskie presents a very suggestive article on "The Testimony of Nature." We always lift our hat to Dr. Morris, of Lane Seminary, and of course his study of "The Religious Consciousness" is worth any one's close reading. Other fine articles appear.

The *Methodist Review* (bi-monthly) for September–October, contains seven articles by contributors, besides editorial notes and discussions through fifty pages. Discussions by leading men are given on such topics as "Is the Book of Daniel a Prophecy?" "Persistence of Old School Dogma," "Was the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ Literal, Absolute, and Complete?" "The Race Problem," etc. Such is our pleasure in Bishop Mallalieu's discussion of the resurrection that, were we to make an eclectic number of our quarterly review, this article should certainly find a place in it.

The look of the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, Chester, S. C., is substantial and pleasing, although the cover is *blue*. This need not alarm any one as the *Andover Review*, its antipode in some aspects of theology, is quite blue externally. These are able reviews and they ought to be very useful in the spheres of their influence. About the most interesting thing to us in this number of the *Presbyterian Quarterly* is the "Note" of our friend Dr. Shearer on the Assembly's overture and the answers of presbyteries concerning the tithe. Fifty-one out of seventy-one presbyteries voted that the tithe law of the Old Testament is not binding under the New Testament dispensation, ten declared it to be binding, six declined to express an opinion.

The Canadian Methodist Quarterly is a worthy representative of the thought of its very useful denomination, the Methodist Church in Canada, and the current number is noteworthy as containing an extensive discussion of that great subject, "Messianic Prophecy." Some of the views in this article are valuable as especially clearing up the surroundings of the doctrine of Christ in the Old Testament. We understand that this is the only review of its kind in Canada. It deserves general recognition by Canadian Christians.

The Unitarian Review (monthly), and *The Universalist Quarterly* present heavier or lighter shades of views of things seen from their peculiar points of observation. The latter is a creditable publication as a representative of its household of faith. The former is naturally not so solid as it addresses a more general audience from its monthly outlook. These journals are adapted to a purpose and may subserve it very well even for people who hold very opposite opinions to those of their editors and supporters.

A beautiful monthly is the *New England Magazine*, the "Cotton Centennial, highly illustrated" number of which lies before us. The illustrations are beautiful and numerous, especially of two articles, "Pawtucket and the Slater Centennial," and "The Cotton Industry of New England." The articles are entertaining and instructive. There are other happily illustrated pieces. Three or more of the articles will be of special interest to literary and philanthropic persons, to wit: The one on John Henry Newman, the one on Stopford A. Brooke, and that on the Indian Question.

The *Popular Science Monthly* is always interesting and instructive, and it is always ably edited. It addresses itself to thoughtful people and also to the general reader, but it commends itself to the writer of this notice as decidedly liable to go wrong on questions which touch the orthodox faith of the Church. This may be offset by the fact that it is intended to be a very liberal magazine. Readers of its scientific and philosophic dissertations will do well to read with eyes open to see.

The Forum is now regarded as one of the ablest of American periodical publications. Its range is wide, but it is also high. United States senators, presidents and professors of colleges, renowned literary characters, noted scientists are the order of men who fill its large space monthly. There is thought and food for thought in its numbers, and one wants to be calm, collected, and curious as he reads into the depths of the substantial volume which each number makes. It will amply repay any one who desires exhaustive investigations to read this leading magazine.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Some of the volumes in this list have been discussed by us in reviews more or less extended. Others will receive such notices hereafter. The receipt of all books or pamphlets sent the CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW will be promptly acknowledged, and important works will receive more extended notice.

From Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.—*Jesus the Messiah.* By Alfred Edersheim, M.A., Oxon, D.D., Ph.D.

From A. F. Randolph & Company, New York.—*The Minor Prophets.* By Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. *The Church: Her Ministry and Sacraments.* Lectures Delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation, Princeton Theological Seminary. 1890. By Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D.

From A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.—*Jesus of Nazareth: His Personal Character, His Ethical Teaching, and His Supernatural Works.* By John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D. The following volumes of the Expositors' Bible: *The Book of Exodus.* By the very Reverend G. A. Chadwick, D.D. *The Gospel of St. Matthew.* By John Munro Gibson, M.A., D.D.

From D. Appleton & Co., New York.—*Why Not and Why: Short and Plain Studies for the Busy.* By William Dudley Powers.

From Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago.—*Three Lectures on the Science of Language and its Place in General Education.* By F. Max Müller.

Calvinism Contrary to God's Word and Man's Moral Nature. By D. Fisk Harns. Published by the Author, Harmor, Ohio.

From John Burns Book Company, St. Louis.—*Patmos: The History of the Kingdom of Heaven and the Church of Christ.* By Rev. E. R. McGregor, A.M.

From John B. Alden, New York.—*Iceland Discoveries.* By Mrs. John B. Shipley (Marie A. Brown).