

The Pastor and People.

"I Shall Be Satisfied."

BY HORATIUS BONAR.

When I shall wake in that fair morn of morn, After whose dawning never night returns, And with whose glory day eternal burns, I shall be satisfied.

When I shall see thy glory, face to face, When in thine arms thou wilt thy child embrace When thou shalt open all thy stores of grace, I shall be satisfied.

When I shall meet with those whom I have loved, Clasp in my arms the long removed, And find how faithful thou to me hast proved, I shall be satisfied.

When this vile body shall arise again, Purg'd by thy power from every taint and stain, Deliver'd from all weakness and all pain, I shall be satisfied.

When I shall gaze upon the face of Him Who for me died, with eye no longer dim, And praise him with the everlasting hymn, I shall be satisfied.

When I shall call to mind the long, long past, With clouds and storms and shadows overcast, And know that I am saved and blest at last, I shall be satisfied.

When every enemy shall disappear, The unbelief, the darkness, and the fear, When thou shalt smooth the brow and wipe the tear, I shall be satisfied.

When every vanity shall pass away, And all be real, all without decay; In that sweet dawning of the cloudless day, I shall be satisfied.

The Message of the Church to Men of Wealth.

A SERMON, BY THE LATE REV. FRED. W. ROBERTSON, BRIGHTON.

"And Nabal answered David's servants, and said, Who is David? And who is the Son of Jesse? There be many servants nowadays that break away every man from his master. Shall I then take my bread, and my water, and my flesh that I have killed for my shepherds and give it unto whom I know not whence they be?" I Sam. xxv. 10, 11.

I have selected this passage for our subject this evening because it is one of the earliest cases recorded in the Bible in which the interests of the employer and the employed, the man of wealth and the man of work stood, or seemed to stand, in antagonism to each other.

It was a period in which an old system of things was breaking up and the new one was not yet established. The patriarchal relationship of tutelage and dependence was gone, and monarchy was not yet in firm existence. Saul was on the throne, but his rule was irregular and disputed. Many things were slowly growing up into custom which had not yet the force of law; and the first steps by which custom presses into law from precedent to precedent are often steps at every one of which struggle and resistance must take place.

The history of the chapter is briefly this: Nabal, the wealthy sheep-master, fed his flocks in the pastures of Carmel. David was leader of a band of men who got their living by the sword on the same hills: outlaws, whose excess he in some degree restrained, and over whom he retained a leader's influence. A rude irregular honor was not unknown among these hero men. They honorably abstained from injuring Nabal's flocks. They did more, they protected them from all harm against the marauders of the neighborhood. By the confession of Nabal's herdsmen, "they were a wall unto them both by night and day, all the time they were with him keeping their flocks." And thus a kind of right grew up, irregular enough, but sufficient to establish a claim on Nabal for remuneration of these services; a new claim, not admitted by him, reckoned by him an exaction, which could be enforced by no law, only by that law which is above all statute law, deciding according to emergencies—a indefinable instinctive sense of fairness and justice. But as there was no law, and each man was to himself a law, and the sole arbiter of his own rights, what help was there but that disputes should rise between the wealthy proprietors and their self-constituted champions, with exaction and tyranny on the one side, churlishness and parsimony on the other. Hence a fruitful and ever-fresh source of struggle: the one class struggling to take as much, and the other as little as possible. In modern language, the Rights of Labor were in conflict with the Rights of Property.

The story proceeds thus: David presented a demand moderate and courteous enough (vs. 6, 7, 8.) It was refused by Nabal, and added to the refusal were those insulting taunts of low birth and outcast, which are worse than injury, and stinging, making men's blood run fire. "Gird ye on," said David, "every man his sword." Now observe the fearful, hopeless character of this struggle. The question had come to this: whether David with his ferocious and needy six hundred mountaineers united by the sense of wrong, or Nabal with his well-fed and trained herdsmen, bound by interest and not by love to his cause, were stronger. Which was the more powerful—want whetted by insult, or selfishness jammed by abundance; they who wished to take, or they who wished to keep? An awful and uncertain spectacle which is exhibited in every country where rights are keenly felt, and duties lightly regarded—where insolent demand is met by insulting defiance. Wherever classes are held apart by rivalry and selfishness, instead of drawn together by the law of love—wherever there has not been established a kingdom of heaven, but only a kingdom of the world—there exist the forces of inevitable collision.

I. The causes of this false social state.

II. The message of the Church to the man of wealth.

I. False basis on which social superiority was held. Throughout Nabal's con-

duct was built upon the assumption of his own wealth. David was dependent on his own daily efforts. Was not that enough to settle the question of superiority and inferiority? It was enough on both sides for a long time, till the falsehood of the assumption became palpable and intolerable. But palpable and intolerable it did become at last.

A social falsehood will be borne long, even with considerable inconvenience, until it forces itself obtrusively on men's attention, and can be endured no longer. The exact point at which this social falsehood, that wealth constitutes superiority, and has a right to the subordination of inferiors becomes intolerable, varies according to several circumstances. The evils of poverty are comparative—they depend on climate. In warm climates, where little food, no fuel, and scanty shelter are required, the sting is scarcely felt till poverty becomes starvation. They depend on contrast. Far above the point where poverty becomes unbearable it contrasted strongly with the unnecessary luxury and abundance enjoyed by the classes above. Where all suffer equally, as men and officers suffer in an Arctic voyage, men bear hardship with cheerfulness; but where the suffering weighs heavily on some, and the luxury of enjoyment is out of all proportion monopolized by a few, the point of reaction is reached long before penury has become an actual want: or again, when wealth or rank assumes an insulting, domineering character—when contemptuous names for the poor are invented, and become current among the more unfeeling of a wealthy class—then the falsehood of superiority can be tolerated no longer, for we do not envy honors which are meekly borne, nor wealth which is unostentatious. Now it was this which brought matters to a crisis. David had borne poverty long—nay, he and his men had long endured the contrast between their own cavern-homes and boys upon the rocks and Nabal's comforts. But when added to this those pungent biting sneers which sink into poor men's hearts, and rankle—which are not forgotten, but come out fresh in the day of retribution. "Who is David? and who is the son of Jesse? There be many servants nowadays that break away every man from his master." Then David began to measure himself with Nabal; not a wise man—nor a better—nor even a stronger. Who is this Nabal? Intellectually, a fool; morally, a profligate, drowning reason in excess of wine at the annual sheep-shearing; a tyrant to his slaves—overbearing to men who only ask of him their rights. Then rose the question which Nabal had better not have forced men to answer for themselves. By what right does this possessor of wealth lord it over men who are inferior in no one particular?

Now observe two things.

1st. An apparent inconsistency in David's conduct. David had received injury after injury from Saul, and had only forgiven. One injury from Nabal, and David is striding over the hills to revenge his wrong with naked steel. How came this reverence and irreverence to mix together? We reply. Saul had a claim of authority on David's allegiance: Nabal only one of rank. Between these the Bible makes a vast difference. It says: The powers which be are ordained of God. But upper and lower as belonging to difference in property are fictitious terms: true, if character corresponds with titular superiority; false, if it does not. And such was the difference manifested in the life of the Son of God. To lawful authority, whether Roman, Jewish, or even priestly, he paid deference, but to the titled mark of conventional distinction, none. Rabbi, Rabbi, was no Divine authority. It was not power, a delegated attribute of God—it was only a name. In Saul, therefore, David revered one, his superior in authority; but in Nabal he only had before him one surpassing him in wealth. And David refused, somewhat too rudely, to acknowledge the bad great man as his superior, would pay him no reverence, respect, or allegiance whatever. Let us mark that distinction well so often confused—kings, masters, parents: here is a power ordained of God. Honour it. But wealth, name, title, distinctions, always fictitious, often false and vicious, if you can claim homage for these separate from worth, you confound two things essentially different. Try that by the test of His life. Name the text where Christ claimed reverence for wealth or rank. On the Mount did the Son of Man bow the knee to the majesty of wealth and wrong, or was his Sonship shown in this that he would not bow down to that as if of God?

2. This great falsehood respecting superior and inferior rested on a truth. There had been a superiority in the wealthy class once. In the patriarchal system wealth and rule had gone together. The father of the family and tribe was the one in whom the proprietorship was centred; but the patriarchal system had passed away.

Men like Nabal succeeded to the patriarchal wealth, and expected the subordination which had been yielded to patriarchal character and position, and thus when every particular of relationship was altered. Once the patriarch was the protector of his dependents. Now, David's class was independent, and the protectors rather than the protected; at all events, able to defend themselves. Once the rich man was ruler in virtue of paternal relationship. Now wealth was severed from rule and relationship: a man might be rich, yet neither a ruler, nor a protector, nor a kinsman. And the fallacy of Nabal's expectation consisted in this, that he demanded for wealth that reverence which had once been due to men who happened to be wealthy.

It is a fallacy in which we are perpetually entangled. We expect reverence, for that which was once a symbol of what was revered, but is revered no longer. Here in England it is common to complain that there is no longer any respect of inferiors towards superiors—that servants were once devoted and grateful, tenants submissive, subjects enthusiastically loyal. But we forget that servants were once protected by their masters, and tenants safe from wrong only through the guardianship of their powerful lords; that since a personal gratitude grew up; that now they are protected by the law from wrong by a different social system altogether; and that the

undivided bond of gratitude subsists no longer. We expect that to masters and employers the same reverence and devotedness shall be tendered which were due to them under other circumstances and for different reasons, as if wealth and rank had ever been the claim to reverence, and not merely the accidents and accompaniments of the claim—as if anything less sacred than holy ties could purchase sacred feelings—as if the homage of free manhood could be due to gold and name—as if to the mere Nabal who is labelled as worth so much, and whose signature carries with it so much coin, the holiest and most ennobling sensations of the soul, reverence and loyalty were due by God's appointment.

No. That patriarchal system has passed for ever. No sentimental walling for the past, no fond regrets for the virtues of a by-gone age, no melancholy, political, retrospective antiquarianism can restore it. In Church and State, the past is past; and you can no more bring back the blind reverence, than the rude virtues of those days. The day has come in which, if feudal loyalty or patriarchal reverence are to be commanded, they must be won by patriarchal virtues or feudal real superiorities.

II. Cause of this unhealthy social state.

A false conception respecting rights. It would be unjust to Nabal to represent this as an act of willful oppression and conscious injustice. He did what appeared to him fair between man and man. He paid his labourers. Why should he pay anything beyond stipulated wages?

David's demand appeared an extravagant and insolent one provoking unfeigned astonishment and indignation. It was an invasion of his rights. It was a dictation with respect to the employment of that which was his own. "Shall I then take my break, and my water, and my flesh that I have killed for my shepherds, and give it unto men whom I know not whence they be?"

Recollect, too, there was something to be said for Nabal. This view of the irresponsible right of property was not his intention. It was the view probably entertained by all his class. It had descended to him from his parents. They were prescriptive and admitted rights on which he stood, and however false or unjust a prescriptive right may be, however baseless when examined, there is much excuse for those who have inherited and not invented it; for it is hard to see through the falsehood of any system by which we profit, and which is upheld by general consent, especially when good men too uphold it. Rare indeed is that pure heartedness which sees with eagle-glance through conventionalisms. "This is a wrong, and I and my own class are the doers of it!"

On the other hand, David and his needy followers were not slow to perceive that they had their rights over that property of Nabal's.

Men on whom wrongs press, are the first to feel them, and their cries of pain and indignation are the appointed means of God to direct to their wrong the attention of society. Very often, the fierce and mad-denied shriek of suffering, is the just intimation that a wrong exists at all.

There was no law in Israel to establish David's claims. This guardianship of Nabal's flocks was partly a self-constituted thing. No bargain had been made, no sum of reward expressly stipulated. But there is a law besides and above all written law, which gives to written laws their authority, and from which so often as they devolve, it is due to the framers of the law; for their law must perish, and the eternal law unseem will get itself acknowledged as a truth from heaven or a truth from hell—a truth begirt with fire and sword if they will not read it except so. In point of fact, David had a right to a share of Nabal's profits. The harvest was in part David's harvest, for without David it never could have been reaped. The sheep was in part David's sheep, for without David not a sheep would have been spared by the marauders of the hills. Not a sheaf of corn was carried to Nabal's barn, nor a night passed in repose by Nabal's shepherds, but what told of the share of David in the saving of that sheaf, and the procurement of that repose (not the less real because it was past and unseen). The right which the soldier has by law to his pay, was the right which David had by unwritten law—a right resting on the fact that his services were indispensably for the harvest.

Here, then, is one of the earliest instances of the rights of labor coming into collision with the rights of Property; rights, shadowy, undefined, perpetually shifting their boundaries, varying every case, altering with every age, incapable of being adjusted except rudely by law, and leaving always something which the most subtle and elaborate law can not define, and which in any moment may grow up into a way. Now when it comes to this, Rights against Rights, there is no determination of the question, but by overwhelming numbers or blood. David's remedy was a short, sharp decisive one. "Gird ye on every man, his sword." And it is difficult, for the sake of humanity, to say to which side, in such a quarrel we should wish well. If the rich man succeed in civil war, he will bind the chain of degradation more severely and surely for years or ages on the crushed soul. If the champions of popular rights succeed by the sword, you may then await in awe, the reign of tyranny, licentiousness, and lawlessness. For the victory of the lawless with the minority of past wrongs to avenge, is almost more sanguinary, than the victory of those who have had power long, and whose power had been defiled.

We find another cause in circumstances. Want and unjust exclusion precipitated David and his men into this rebellion. It is common enough to try to much weight on circumstances. Nothing can be more false than the popular theory that embittered outward condition is the panacea for the evils of society. The Gospel principle begins from within, and works outward. The world's principle begins with the outward condition, and expects to influence inwardly. To expect that by changing the world without, in order to suit the world within, by taking away all difficulties, and removing all temptations, instead of hardening the man within against the force of out-

ward temptation—to adapt the lot to the man, instead of moulding the spirit to the lot, is to reverse the Gospel method of procedure. Nevertheless, even that favourite speculation of theorists, that perfect circumstances will produce perfect character, contains a truth. Circumstances, of outward condition are not the sole efficient in the production of character, but they are efficient which must not be ignored. Favourable condition will not produce excellence, but the want of it often hinders excellence. It is true the true leads to poverty: all the moralizers tell us that, but it is also true that poverty leads to vice.

There are some in this world to whom, speaking humanly, social injustice and social inequalities have made goodness impossible. Take, for instance, the case of these bandits on Mount Carmel. Some of them were outlawed by their own crimes, but others doubtless by debts not willfully contracted—one at least, David, by a most unjust and iniquitous persecution. And these men, excluded, needy, exasperated by a sense of wrong, untaught outcasts, could you gravely expect from them obedience, patience, weakness, religious resignation? Yes, my brethren, that is exactly the marvellous impossibility people do most inconsistently expect, and there are no bounds to their astonishment if they do not get what they expect. Superhuman honesty from starving men, to whom life by hopelessness has become a gambler's desperate chance! chivalrous loyalty and high forbearance from creatures to whom the order of society has presented itself only as an unjust system of partiality! We forget that forbearance and obedience are the very last and highest lessons learned by the spirit in its most careful training. By these unallowed conventionalisms we, like heathens and not like Christians, crush the small offender and court the great one—that damnable cowardice by which we banish the seduced and half-admire the seducer—by which, in defiance of all manliness and all generosity, we punish the weak and tempted, and let the tempter go free—by all these we make men and women outcasts, and then expect from them the sublimest graces of reverence and resignation!

(To be continued.)

Beecher's Yale Lectures on Preaching.

THE BIBLE AND THEOLOGY.

Mr. Beecher began his third course of lectures before the students of the Yale Divinity, on Wednesday, the 11th of February. The chapel of the Seminary was filled—as was the case when he delivered his previous lectures—with students of theology, the clergy of the city and adjacent country, and college professors.

"I meet you again, dear friends," said Mr. Beecher, "with feelings of mingled pleasure and pain—pleasure, because I see once more many familiar faces; pain, because I regard the course I have chosen for myself as one of the most difficult I have ever undertaken. It will take me over ground swept by theological storms.

"At the outset, I wish to call your attention to that form of theology which presents itself most attractively to me—viz.: to functional and personal theology in distinction from that which is merely structural; a theology which has as its end the building of a system, but the production of real character. But before we enter upon the study and examination of this theology, we must understand what it means, and ascertain how far, at the present time, it prevails in the community. I do not know how far, in the towns, educated men have let go of religion in their pursuit of science, but in the cities there is a theological uncasting of the mind in these scientific researches. Men are beginning to look upon the pulpit as subordinated to science, and to declare it is one of the instruments which science uses. The Darwinian theory of evolution is exciting wide-spread fear in the church, which, accordingly, it is the orthodox thing to disparage and denounce. But there is no fear from Darwin or science. I believe science is as much one of God's revelations as the Bible we have. The stars are the manifestations of His glory, and the heavens are the work of His hands. It leads man away from a dominating spiritual supremacy. It has no power to excite those profounder depths of being whence high enthusiasm is born, and a formal theology is no better than natural science or speculation if it produces not that.

"A pernicious though not unnatural idea which has sprung up in the church is that its normal state is that of rest, of quiet, of a self-satisfied peace. I remember having a conversation with a devotee in the Romish Church who had great stress upon the fact that she never found rest till she entered upon a life of isolated holiness. That was a strong argument against her religion. Excitement, not rest, is the normal state of the church, and essential to her progress. God does not educate or save the race by rest. Out of the clash and surging of the nations human progress is evoked. There is a rest, but it is the rest of stagnation. The brook is purest and brightest where it murmurs over pebbles and breaks in waterfalls over rocks—at once giving and receiving life. Follow it down to the meadow where it collects in pools, and there, beneath its glassy surface you find dead insects and loathsome black mud, breaching the dreared miasma. So I recognize in the restful form of the church that which breeds selfishness, heresy or hierarchical domination. And I hold that the social agitations and historic crises are God's winners, separating, like His judgments, the chaff from the wheat.

"I use the term theology as but a form of expression for the Word of God—the Word of God is interpreted by a human creature. The Bible to every man is what he interprets it to be. It is not written in Egyptian hieroglyphics, leaving a Champollion to give it an authorized meaning. What it is shown by the man that use it. It is the world's spiritual market-place, and men deal with it on the principle of elective affinity. No two men are alike in their needs or tastes, yet all find this Bible in the same book. Men are clannish in this world; we salute them who salute us; kings

consort with kings, philosophers with philosophers, class with class! The Bible is universal. It sheds its radiance on all alike. It looks down on a common humanity as a mother looks on her child sleeping in the cradle. It contemplates man as sinful, and because sinful, loves him. It addresses itself to chords that are common to all men. Man needs no argument to prove its divinity, no more than he needs argument to prove the maternity of the being that watches at his bedside in suffering. In the Bible we find the germs of all excellence, and its aim is to develop man by its moral power. Its genius is to change him into a spiritual creature. Its teachings are not as the thunderings of Sinai to the Israelites, who a moment after we find turning to a golden calf, but the inspiration of love which it would pour upon all men. We learn love, not from the metaphysicians, not from President Noah Porter, or Sir William Hamilton, but from Solomon and Moses, from Peter and John. We are told by the schoolmen that man came by five stocks, but whether he came from five or twenty he is cast into one mold, and the Bible is the same to him in its appeals everywhere. The breath of the Old Testament is the same as that which to-day rises from Galvary.

The Bible alone is nothing without the man who interprets it. It is like the alphabet in literature—what men make of it. There can be no literature without the alphabet, but the alphabet unused is nothing. Each man has so much a Bible as suits his tastes and meets his individual wants. Thus, a melancholy person overwhelmed with griefs and disappointments will hunt as in natural forests for the consolation it contains. The exuberant, sanguine man has a Bible overflowing with joyousness. Others look at the book from an entirely different point of view, just as in natural scenery one sees geology, another botany, and the third poetry. A company goes out to visit East Rock. The mathematician admires the extent of the landscape, and with his eye will measure the height of the rock; the geologist, examining the strata, will be speculating on its formation; the botanist, on his return, will tell you of the native and cultivated flora that beautify its summit; another looks on all with a poet's eye, and sees in everything a suggestion—the very trees quiver with an invisible emotion; the artist sees every where multiplied forms of beauty, and studies combinations of tints. Yet all see nature. So man's view of the Bible, and his prescribing for himself, is the same as that which he seeks.

As ministers, the Bible furnishes you the raw material which is to be fabricated for others use, as the workman changes wool, drawing it out into threads, plying it through the loom, making it resplendent with dye stuffs and rich in coloring. In this work of fabrication you must preach not to the few, but to the many. Don't bend down as if to touch only the highest in your congregation. You cannot put a jack-screw under a house and raise the top before you do the bottom. Preach the Word as it appears to you in the Book of books—truth for all. In that Book you find the stalk on which the grain grows. The farmer forgets the stalk when it in winter appears as straw, but remembers it when it appears in spring-time and summer bearing his hopes of richest harvest. Let the Bible always appear to you in its summer time of growth. Truth is to be evolved by those experiments which experience will suggest. The wrestlings of virtue with vice will develop it. Never fall into that state of self-conceit where man exclaims, "I do not want truth, therefore nobody does." Make yourselves so familiar with the Bible that truth will come to you, as the breeze comes with the soft air of spring. I recall my early pastorate in a missionary field in Indiana where I was shut up with my New Testament. The constant study of it at that early period of my ministry drew in truths which under other circumstances than those of isolation could not have been attained, and which have been to me as a lasting benediction. Slit off from all other books, from the Bible you may learn the highest duties of their chosen vocation.

Christian Courtesy.

"Be courteous," was an injunction of that one of the Apostles who was the most impetuous of any, and who therefore felt the need of a constraint of himself in this particular. And like a truly wise man; knowing his own weakness, he made it the ground of warning to other men. A Christian who is not courteous is a perpetual contradiction and stumbling-block to those who are without. Temperament, undoubtedly, has much to do with the matter; but if it be unfriendly to the existence of courtesy it must be held in check. If a man is naturally excitable, grace should cause him to curb his temper, if he is prone to gloom and sadness, Christianity should dispense him to light and sweetness; if, knowing his own wickedness, he is given to judge others harshly, he should remember the Lord's injunction, "Judge not;" and if rash in coming to his conclusions or ready to accept the unfavourable judgments of other men, he should put a guard over himself and verify what he hears before he gives it currency.

A gloomy, sour, discourteous Christian is Satan's unconscious ally in preventing the disobedient from turning to "wisdom of the just," and makes that seem disagreeable and unlovely to them which is the perfection of beauty. A Christian should at all times be patient, gentle, affable, and tender of the feelings of others. He cannot be hasty in speech, or forbidding in manner, or intemperate in judgment, without wounding the cause of the Saviour. Like Him, while hating sin, he should love sinners, and should seek to win them to holiness of life by the exercise of those gentle but irresistible graces and virtues which adorned the walk and conversation of Him "who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth: who when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He was galled, threatened not; but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously."—Christian Intelligence.