

which he would have them use is the power which radiates from a holy life and from an unreserved identification of themselves with their people. From all business, except such handicrafts as they need for their own support, and from all complications with governments, they are to hold themselves resolutely aloof. He even carries his dislike of any activity not strictly religious to such an extreme as to take exception because some of the brethren in the West Indies taught the negroes to write. Perhaps, however, this was because he feared this would cause trouble with the authorities. Dealing, as he does, with the beginning of missions, he does not look forward to the era of schools, which, however, we believe that the Moravians have not been backward in providing for their people; though they have never, like the Scottish and some of the American missionaries, carried them to such a point as invited criticism and necessitated retrenchment.

Zinzendorf's views have their limitations, but they commend themselves by their keeping so near the centre. As Mr. Roy intimates, Spangenberg did not maintain Zinzendorf's level. It was hardly possible. The far-reaching Christian wisdom and the perfect Christian temper bound up in these instructions is gradually filtering into the general consciousness of the churches. As for the *Unitas Fratrum* herself, her shortcomings as viewed by Zinzendorf's standard are more apparent to herself than to others. The rest of us would do very well for awhile if we reached Spangenberg's position.

—"Those who are converted by living personal testimony, the missionary refers to the Bible. That is the second step. He gives them the Bible, no dogma about the Bible. When the hearer of the Gospel asks whence this message comes, the missionary must speak of the history of Christianity and say to him that through God's goodness we have a testimony of the normative beginning, and must give him this testi-

mony. The missionary, of course, has his own opinions concerning this testimony, but I would advise him to give not his thoughts about this testimony, but the testimony itself. The Bible, too, is one of those books that are more praised and criticised than read. Nor does it maintain or lose its position in the world by what we hold concerning it, and is not through opinion, but through itself, what it is. It is very unpedagogical to disturb the quiet working of this book, the naïve enjoyment of it, so to speak, by dishing up to young converts every latest edition of critical dogmas respecting it; nor yet is it wise or reasonable to impose on them a doctrine of the Scripture which leaves them incapable of resistance, perplexed in faith, so soon as they hear of what is going on in the world; and there is no danger but that they will hear it. If we would, we could not hinder even the ruder tribes, not to say those of higher standing, from hearing what in our country is proclaimed on the housetops. Strauss and Renan, etc., are known also in India and Japan. The best weapon against the mischief which they are working is, in my judgment, not to teach them much about the Bible, but to teach them the BIBLE, to teach them to read it, to use it, to live in it."—F. M. ZAHN, in *Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift*.

—"The main difficulty of a school which aims to give popular education is how it can so concentrate itself as to give a thorough development, and not to fritter itself away in the multiplicity of objects which it may be desirable to learn. The centre is found, when religious instruction is placed in the midst, and when in this again the Bible is made the classic of elementary popular training. Scholars that have enjoyed an education which has always steeped them afresh in the Bible will have received a thorough mental development, and at the same time be prepared in the best way for a church which knows how to use the Bible."—*Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift*.