

week, special services for them, personal invitations to them to attend these services, Bible class on Sunday for these; here are some of the things that men can do, and ought to do."

No doubt if Christian men would give an evening a week to help their brother men, to get above the world, with its drudgery or its frivolities, they would be doing a good work, acceptable to God.—*Southern Churchman.*

THE BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD.

(From the American Church S. S. Magazine, Phila., for January)

One of the marked traits of modern study is the expansion of words to cover larger areas of thought. An example of this is the larger meaning given in the word "days," in the first chapter of Genesis. The study of Geology suggested that the idea of a period of time might lie back of the days of creation, and biblical students, reminding themselves that one day with the Lord may be a thousand years, were enriched with a broader grasp of their well-worn theme by accepting the suggestion of science. The old, familiar word "day" was not dropped, but was illumined by a new reflection coming behind it. There was no reason to quarrel with the word which had done such good service in the text of the first chapter of Genesis, but it became rather dearer, more servicable by its capacity for transmitting new light. The capacity of a word for transmitting new thought is like the power of a good lens, behind which one may place an oil-light, or a lime-light, or an electric light, without discarding the lens. Multiply the candle power of the light if you will, but do not change the lens every time you increase the power of the light behind it.

There is no need, then, of discarding old terms and phrases any more than of discarding the lens of clear glass because some increase of light has come to shine through it.

There has been a disposition manifested in modern teaching to discard the term "the Word of God" as applied to the Bible. Some writers prefer the expression, "The Word of God is contained in the Bible," to the more widely accepted and time-honored assertion, "The Bible is the Word of God." It is a mistaken supposition that any such change is demanded. The only demand is for a term or phrase which will transmit whatever new intensity the light of truth may acquire. If the assertion that "the Bible is the Word of God" is sufficiently transparent, that is all that can be asked, and all that could be provided by the substitution of a more modern equivalent.

It is required in a good lens that it shall be achromatic which simply means capable of transmitting the pure whiteness of light without any tint of color. This is also required of any word used for the transmission of the pure whiteness of truth revealed by God to man. Now look at the phrase, "The Bible contains the Word of God," and compare its achromatic quality with the phrase, "The Bible is the Word of God." This latter phrase transmits to us the thought of a revelation without the admixture of human frailty. The former phrase, "The Bible contains the Word of God," gives us an idea of a revelation discolored by the medium through which it has passed—discolored also by rash thinking and irreverent methods. It has the fault of a bad lens, which not only fails to give a white ray of light, but does not even give a well-balanced view of the colors of the spectrum, but emphasizes one very glaringly and glaringly tint to the destruction of both the beauty and serviceableness of the light. This phrase about containing the Word of God emphasizes the human element to the neglect of the Divine element, and fastens the at-

tention on the defects of the letter of the Bible rather than on the substance of its spirit.

It is as if, in pointing out some well-known character in a crowd, one should be obliged to say, There is the body that contains the soul of such and such a person; instead of saying, briefly, There is the person himself. The Bible is not merely like a chest containing a medley of accidentals, but it is the embodiment of a living force, and as in common parlance we point to the living human figure saying, That is the person, so when we point to God's revelation of Himself in the Bible, it is both common sense and good English to say, That is "the Word of God." It is not necessary when Queen Victoria passes along the street in her carriage to say, "The carriage containing the Queen is going by;" but briefly, "The Queen is going by." If she were riding in a very shabby vehicle utterly incompatible with her royalty and the rabble might forget her presence, it might be appropriate to say, "That carriage contains the Queen; don't forget it." Unless we think the Bible a very shabby conveyance for Divine truth, there is no use of making a distinction. The method we advocate is to retain the phrase, "The Bible is the Word of God," and to show its capacity for transmitting Divine light. Accept all that modern research has accomplished. Let us rejoice in the broad view that God's revelation of Himself has had an actual movement in human history before it was recorded by the scribe on parchment. Let us recognize that not only by voices crying in the wilderness and by the pens of ready writers, but also by types, by national institutions, by slow historic developments as well as by great crisis and epochs of transition, by every service of human life as well as by speech, God has been manifesting Himself to man. This manifestation, in its announcement and accomplishment, has been committed to writing, and the written record is so animated by the force that is revealed that the letter is to the spirit as a well-shaped body is to the manifestation of the living soul. So permeated is the letter by the spirit of revelation that the form of the record has grown with the spirit as body and soul grow together, until they have become as inseparable as the vital organs and the functions belonging to them. Of such a blended form and substance we cannot say less than that it is "the Word of God."

This use is also sanctioned by the long-established habit of Hebrew and Greek thought, in which the Word of God has always stood for more than the mere utterance of the lips and the written record. Hebrew literature contains examples of this usage, which Edersheim has treated at length in his "Life of Jesus;" and every reader of the New Testament is familiar with St. John's usage in his application of the *Logos* to the divine nature of our Lord. No theologian denies that there is a pervading reference to Christ in the Old and New Testaments as "The Word of God behind the mere words of Scripture, binding the written pages into a living unity, ever more and more clearly revealed and progressive by realizing His manifestation of the Father in all the children of God, and, finally, to glorify creation itself by illuminating and lifting all creation into the glories of redemption. Both the book of nature and the book of grace have in them a progressive hope, which moves on toward a transparent condition, in which God's presence shall shine out in an unhindered revelation.

The devout student of the Scripture sees in its pages fresh gleams of eternal light, radiating from the temple of God, making its walls translucent so that its stones become a mere veil, a curtain ever growing thinner and more transparent until it is refined in the flesh of Jesus Christ to a medium absolutely transparent to faith. The granite rock becomes as crystal, and the dusty stones of stumbling are turned into jewels that shine with Urim and Thummim revelations. The new heavens and

the new earth will contain no page, no stone, no heart opaque to God's light; and when all nature's record will realize its end in becoming "the Word of God."

REQUESTS.

Subscribers, in arrear, would very much oblige us, and materially assist our work by remitting **WITHOUT DELAY**, the amount due us together with *renewal* subscription. The amount so due is in the aggregate very considerable; and its non-payment seriously affects us. Will not subscribers **EXAMINE THE LABEL** on their papers, ascertain the date and remit amount due *by first mail*; registered letter or P.O. Order?

We would also ask each subscriber to assist our work for The Church by sending in the name of at least **ONE NEW SUBSCRIBER**. We cannot believe that this would be a very heavy task in any case; and it would quickly increase our circulation, and if we are to believe the many flattering—though wholly *unsolicited*—assurances of the benefit accruing to The Church through the publication of the **GUARDIAN**, each subscriber would thus become a co-worker with us in extending its beneficial influence.

We would also ask subscribers, Clerical and Lay, (but specially the former) to furnish to us the names and addresses of parishioners to whom *specimen* copies of the **GUARDIAN** might be sent, with a view of increasing our subscription list, and thus enabling us ultimately to reduce the subscription price. Some of our Subscribers complain of the return to the former rate of \$1.50 per annum; but we were compelled to take this step through the failure of Churchmen to respond to our effort to furnish them with a sound weekly paper at one dollar. Even at \$1.50 the **GUARDIAN** is lower in price—we hope not *in tone*—than either of the other weekly Church papers.

The appeal that the Episcopal Church makes to the New Testament and to the Primitive Church is free and honest. It challenges an examination by them. What does the New Testament teach? How did Clement, and Ignatius, and Polycarp, and Irenaeus, and Cyrian, and Athanasius, and Jerome, and Augustine and Cyril receive and transmit, the one to the other, the doctrines and the government, and the worship of the Church? Upon their usages, upon their faith, historically the English, and the her daughter, the American Church, rest their claim to a part, a living, continuous part, in the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. What they showed that the Church held then we hold now; what they taught as the Church's doctrine we teach now, and we do not fear the closest scrutiny into our claims by this test. More; we desire it, we urge it. Those who have thrown away Apostolic government cannot endure it. Those who have added to the faith shrink from it. Of all bodies of the Christian world now, the Anglican Church and her daughter communions alone can abide by the test of the Primitive Church. She therefore makes great use of it in her controversies, and she must, upon every legal maxim, demand that her organization, and her history, and her standards of faith, be judged by this touchstone.—*The Church Cyclopaedia.*

The Creed says, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," not I believe in the "Protestant Episcopal Church."