

the duty of the man aloft is to report what he actually sees, neither concealing anything nor taking anything for granted. And so it is with the thinker who searches for truth. He must render a transcript of his own mind. What quality in thought is desirable above all others? Is it clearness, as highly prized as this must be? Is it accuracy? Is it striking effect? Is it not rather independence? Independence is the unknown X in the equation, to which term alone value attaches. All the other terms may cancel one another; but individuality in thinking has, aside from all other qualities, a reckonable worth *per se*. Small though it may be, it is a distinct contribution to the sum of human knowledge, just in proportion to its close adherence to the veritable experiences of your own soul—a disclosure of Deity more explicit by far than "the flower in the crannied wall." Little is gained by simply echoing the thought of others, but progress comes of every man voicing his own inner judgments. It is the voice, and not the echo, that awakens a quickening response in the heart of man.

Independence must not be confounded with originality, which is of necessity confined to the few rarely gifted minds. While it is the province of genius to be original, it is the privilege of every thinker to be individual. If you do not see a different facet of the diamond of truth, you see, at least, from a different angle the same facet. That constitutes the sole plus quantity in your thinking. Hence it is that sincerity, individuality, independence, is the cardinal virtue in thought. Just as a man's thinking may be conventional and yet impotent, so one's thinking may be clever and yet insincere. Sincerity has to do with the ethics or the intellect; for the sincere thinker cannot be at once "intellectually acute and morally obtuse"—contradictory characteristics, which are found, nevertheless, in some men. Thus individuality is the chief source of power as well as progress in thinking. "Notions may be imported by books from abroad; ideas must be grown at home by thought."

The formative thinker must have

FAITH IN THE FORCE OF IDEAS,

and their final triumph. He must love not only truth, but also the spirit of truth. He must believe not only in the life of Christ, but also in the Christ of life. He will distinguish sharply between power and office. No man can be influential—mark you, I do not say popular—that does not make this distinction, and base his course upon it. Office is like a barge, which may carry a great burthen; but the propelling power must be furnished from another source—often by a tiny tug. Grounding his reliance upon ideas as opposed to personalities or politics, the lover of truth will eschew all short cuts to reform, whether they appear as legislative crochets or weapons of war. "It is a lesson which genius, too, and wisdom of every kind, must learn, that its kingdom is this world. It must learn to know this, and to be content that this should be so; to be content with the thought of a kingdom in a higher, less transitory region. Then peradventure may the saying be fulfilled with regard to it, that he who is ready to lose his life shall save it. How much longer and more widely has Aristotle reigned than Alexander!"

The formative thinker must have

FACT IN PROPAGATING THE TRUTH.

To his truth he must add wisdom, which is knowledge perfected by experience. He will understand that conservatism is a partner—no silent partner either—in all true progress. Conservatism serves the cause of truth by demanding of all ideas and innovations their credentials, by challenging them, by making them submit to tests as to fitness and power. It is the refiner—no small part in the process of progress.

What a fine illustration of tact has Paul given us in his address on Mars' Hill! How skillfully he avails himself of the ground common to him and to the Greek philosophers! Yet there was no sacrifice or compromise of the truth as he held it. And this suggests that we can err by inadequacy of statement no less than by unfair statement. The thinker who tries to be honest with himself as well as with others will avoid partial or hasty views. He will have regard to the perspective of truth, knowing that a thing must be described as it actually is, not only in itself, but also in its relations, often most subtle, to other things. And, finally, the thinker will be guided to the use of delicate tact by love—by a tyrannous love, in the first place, for fellow-man, and, in the second, for the interests of truth.—Religious Herald.

Paul, the Tent-Maker.

BY J. B. GAMBERELL.

What a marvelous man was Paul and what a varied experience was his. He came near sweeping the whole gamut of human life. It is evident he was well-born. His parents were Hebrews of the Hebrews, and himself a Pharisee of the Pharisees. His education was on the broadest lines. While he enjoyed all the prerogatives of the Jews, he was born a free Roman citizen, and that was not a mean distinction for his time. He was born in a city where the three great civilizations commingled, the Hebrew, the Roman and the Greek. His education was carefully looked to by his parents. He finished at

Jerusalem at the feet of one of the great teachers of the Jewish religion. In his life he had commingled from childhood with Romans and Greeks. He understood the languages, the spirit and the life of all these great civilizations. Besides that he had an industrial education which played no mean part in his life. He was a tent-maker, and this came in very handy later in life, but its significance is not to be estimated by the use Paul made of it in a time of need. An industrial education is of profound significance in any human life. It dignifies labor and gives to one a sense of independence necessary to any great strength of character. Any professional man is stronger if he knows that in a time of emergency he can fall back on a craft of which he is master, and earn his living.

It is an ever refreshing study to follow Paul in his missionary work, to read the scraps of his fiery eloquence, which have come down to us in the Sacred Writings; but if we would see Paul as he really was, we must contemplate him also as a tent maker. In a single passage of the Scriptures he is presented to us as making tents for a living in the midst of his great work as the missionary apostle to the Gentiles. He tells us that his own hands supplied his necessities, and this was done that certain men of his day might not be able to take advantage of the fact that he was supported in his ministry to charge on him selfishness to the detriment of the cause. Paul, the tent-maker, is an instructive man. Let us take some lessons from him. The first is that honest labor has great dignity. In making tents he was following after his Master and ours, who was himself a carpenter. It is with profound meaning that Christ and his chief apostle gave us the example of working with our hands. It forever takes honest labor out of the position given it by a good many people. It dignifies life, and if done with a proper motive, glorifies life. The part in the story of Mary and Martha is not that Martha was less to be considered in work than Mary, but she was putting her work in the way of her soul at a time of great opportunities. There are times when busy workers ought to lay down all their everyday employments and turn all their energies to a protracted meeting or to any other great religious occasion. But idleness is a curse, and more than that, it is a disgrace if people could see it right.

And there is another lesson. Paul, as much as any man, could say of his ministry: "This one thing I do," but notwithstanding that Paul made tents. Here is a very fine point for a preacher. There is a world of difference between making tents and farming or blacksmithing in order to preach, and doing the same things for the sake of doing them or for the profit there is in it. Did Paul make tents to preach? Preaching was no side-line to his business. There be some who have secular employment, making the gospel a side-line to their worldly business. These are by no means in the line of apostolic succession. There are times when a preacher may use secular employments to further his ministry. Whoever does that is in the line of apostolic succession, but that he must do only when the necessity is on him to do it for the sake of supporting himself.

Last week we commented on a letter from a Mississippi brother whose circumstances were very hindering. There is every thing to say for a man who, in order that he may live and preach, is willing to take a double burden on him, but there is nothing to say for those who are willing needlessly to but the double burden on him.

In the way of applying the lesson from Paul, I wish to remark on some tendencies to be guarded against. I happen to be in a place where I have very good opportunities to note some tendencies which I do not consider in the line of apostolic precedent. Nobody who knows anything about this writer will be likely to question his earnest devotion to education and especially to ministerial education. With all my heart I believe in it, and especially for preachers. But we are really in danger of misunderstanding the true function of education. Is it the function of education to lift people above manual service? Do we spoil a plowman or a ditcher or a seaman or a housekeeper or a cook when we send a person to a college? If someone leaves college with a diploma, and there is no pulpit open and no professor's chair vacant, would it be unbecoming for such person to make a crop? I am pretty certain that a good many graduates would think so, and I am dead certain that some would show that their education was shallow. And to go a little further. If a preacher with one or two diplomas should find himself where there was no support for him, must he pull up and roam around over the country until he can find a church that will give him a living? If he does, he will not walk in the foot-prints of Paul. I hardly think I can be mistaken when I say we are unconsciously in our educational efforts, drifting away from the practicalities. There are very many places where people of education could go and double their usefulness by work and finally train a people to do their duty in ministerial support.

I was just the other day at Grandview. Bro. T. B. Newton lives there, and he is an example of a Pauline preacher. Circumstances are just such as to make it hard for him to have support in his ministry. He works

at his trade in a blacksmith shop, but for all that is doing a noble work. The church organized under his preaching a little while back is taking on strength, and other places are calling for his work. We believe it will not be long before they will say to him, "Put down your hammer and give us all your time ministering to our souls." In his case he is working with his hands that he may preach, and such an example is worth much to any community. It is really very deplorable that so many preachers feel they must do nothing else but preach even where there is no place to preach. The spirit manifested by Bro. Newton is the spirit which has taken the land for the Baptists.

Now I have a remark on the other side somewhat. While in Georgia, coming up from the South one day on a train I found myself in a company of Methodist preachers who had been to conference and were returning to their homes. They did not know me, and I sat among them deeply interested in their conversation. I heard three of them talking together about the appointments they had just received. One of them was felicitating himself upon the fact that his new appointment would give him nearly \$300 increase in salary. After a while I begged permission to sit with the three, introducing myself to them and asked them about their salaries and how they lived. The stories they told greatly moved my heart. One of them said he had lived a good part of the year, he and his wife and child, on bread and water. He told how on one occasion as he was leaving home, he had but four ears of corn for his horse and only enough meal for bread, and how courageous his wife was in the midst of it. She said to her husband, "We will live up to our vows if we starve to death. If we are found dead the report can go out that we had slow fever," and she laughed in the midst of her tears. I could not restrain my tears as I heard these men talk of their sacrifices. I said to this brother whose wife had made the remark, if he would allow me to say it, "I think you did not do your duty. I should have been out in the country looking for a job, or ditching, or something else. It was your duty evidently to support your family." But he explained his vows and the matter dropped. Nevertheless I think it would be a great deal better to follow Paul's example, and, in some cases, take up secular work as auxiliary to the ministry.

Now, what I want to say in conclusion is, and to say it very earnestly, that men who are called to preach the gospel are called to preach the gospel in season and out of season. They are called to preach it in hard circumstances and in easy circumstances. They must preach the gospel if they make tents, hammer iron, dig ditches, sweep the streets, or do as a beloved brother and highly respected friend of the writer, work in a livery stable. The work men do with their hands in order that they may preach takes an eternal glory, and the preacher who knows that if it comes to it, he can support himself by manual labor, occupies a position of great advantage. I have seen churches that I would not preach to any longer than it was necessary to set their duty before them. Before I would preach to them and see them perpetually trampling the truth under their feet and despising the precepts of the gospel, I would refrain, leave the preacher's home, live in a garret, black shoes for a living, and preach the gospel in the streets without the restrictions of a Godless church. Blessed is the preacher who is ready to go to all lengths for the glorious privilege of preaching the truth as Christ's ambassador and with no fear of men before his face.—Baptist Standard.

Going to Church.

For what do Christians go to church? Is it chiefly in order that they may give and receive, through the services and their own part in them? These questions would be answered very differently by different persons. Some go out of a glad and grateful heart, to show and to express their gratitude to God, and to bear a part in his public worship. Others go, in order to gain some personal advantage through what they see, hear and feel while there. The one sort are pretty sure to accomplish what they go for. They swell the service of prayer and praise, and by their countenance and evident appreciativeness they cheer the heart of the preacher, and give added force to his preaching. The other sort often find their church-going a failure. The singing is not what they hoped for; the prayers fail to meet their wants; the Bible selections are poorly timed to their requirements; and as to the sermon, "it does not feed" their souls. It is a great pity that there are comparatively so few of the first class of Christian worshippers, and that there are so many of the second class. And it is a noteworthy fact that those who go to church to do what they can to make the service a success grow steadily in character and intellectual power; while those who go there with a chief desire to be personal gainers by their going, shrink and dwindle in their personality. The poorest specimens of church-goers are those who are constantly complaining that the preaching "does not feed" them. Hearers of that sort are like Pharaoh's lean kine—the more they swallow, the leaner they look. In this sphere, as in every other, the words of our Lord Jesus are true, that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."—Sel.