

their resolutions was that no one of them should engage in private trade, but that all be done for the benefit of the mission. The name of the first Hindoo convert was Krishnu Pal, a carpenter by trade. He was baptized on December 28th, 1800.

On the 7th of February, 1801, Carey's translation of the New Testament was published, and Carey was then working on the translation of the Old Testament.

Carey was then appointed a professorship in the Government College at Fort William, at a salary of £1500 per year, all of which he gave to the mission except a small sum of about £40 which he needed for his family. Carey held his position as professor until 1830, within four years of his death.

Every hour of every day of the week seems to have been occupied either with translating or proof-reading, compilation of grammars or dictionaries in the many different languages he had studied, lecturing or preaching. The first reform which he helped to effect was the prohibition of the sacrifice of children. Another dreadful practice which he used his most determined efforts to abolish was the immolation of widows on the burning pyre of their dead husbands.

For forty-one years Carey was spared to labor for the good of India. He never returned to England. In 1823, he was taken sick with a fever which brought him to the brink of the grave, and from which he never appears to have fully recovered. His chief desire, after his health failed him, was to complete the last revision of the Bengalee version, which work he had strength sufficient to accomplish.

On the 9th of June, 1834, in the 73rd year of his age, his spirit passed away to the Saviour whom he so entirely trusted and had so long and devotedly served. His remains were laid to rest in the graveyard belonging to the Mission.

### WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?

ALBERTA M'PHEE.

"I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God." What mean these words so solemnly repeated? Why this confusion in the presence of our fellows. What think ye of Christ? What is this Nazarene more than his brethren? More than other men? What meaneth the term—The Only Begotten Son of God?

What is the test of sonship? By the law of conformity to type I recognize Jesus as the Son of God. He is like God in his character. "God is love." "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." "God so loved the world that he gave his Son." "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Herein is love. Not to get, or have, or keep, but a mastering longing to give. That man who sees himself as others see him, who has found in his own nature the deep-rooted weeds of selfishness, will recognize the Christ. This utter self-forgetfulness, this man whose love is "strong as death," is not of our type. He is of God.

But why do we call him Saviour? What means this word? The word has in it three ideas. Some one to be saved, something to be saved from, some one to save. "The Saviour of men." Christ saves men. From what? From death. When? Now. How? By giving eternal life. He does not save from physical death, but he takes away the

fear of physical death. To the Christian physical death's but transition. But Christ saves men from spiritual death. Men are dead in sin, lost in ignorance. Christ gives life. "This is eternal life to know God and Jesus Christ." This salvation is not alone in the dim future after death, an escaping from hell, but knowledge of God here, now. God is love and love is self-forgetfulness. "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake the same shall save it." Self-forgetfulness. "Christ made himself of no reputation." What think ye of Christ. I think that Christ can save men by teaching them how to love as God loves, even to self-forgetfulness. "This is eternal life to know God."—"God is love."

### CHRISTIAN BIGOTRY.

O. B. STOCKFORD.

#### II.

In the last issue of THE CHRISTIAN I dealt with "bigotry" as understood by some of those who charge us with it. We have only to refer to the definitions of the word given by any standard dictionary to find that bigotry does not consist, as these people would have us believe, in denouncing as wrong that which is opposed to a person's honest conviction. Bigotry has been defined as meaning "a blind or perverse attachment to a particular creed or to certain tenets; obstinate or unreasonable attachment to a particular creed, opinion, practice, ritual or party organization; intolerance of the views of others."

Having argued that an expression of a person's honest conviction is not only not bigotry but a commendable act, I wish now to examine the real accusation. I will consider it under the following heads: (1) Have we investigated the proper source of Christian belief? (2) Have we examined that source free from prejudice? (3) Are we willing to investigate the views of others and honestly compare them with the source of truth? (4) How do our teaching and practice generally correspond with the interpretation of God's Word by candid Bible students? The ground covered by these questions will be sufficient to answer a charge of bigotry preferred against us in connection with our religious belief. These questions, for want of space, can only be discussed briefly.

(1) *Have we investigated the proper source of Christian belief?* It is a rule of the law of our country that, in the judicial inquiry into any question, secondary evidence of any matter to be adjudicated upon cannot be given when primary evidence of it can be produced. The reason for this rule may be readily seen by those who search for it. The more mediums evidence passes through, the more likely it is to deviate from true facts of the case. For instance, there can be no mistake as to the contents of a document if the court has the instrument before it; but a perfectly trustworthy man's testimony as to what the same document contains may be unreliable because of defect in memory or because he had not examined certain expressions very closely. Even in a case where the courts are open to error they are more likely to come nearer the truth when the original

evidence is before them, than by judging the case through evidence obtained from sources just as liable, if not more so, to be erroneous as their own judgments. Our judicial tribunals, therefore, will require the production of primary evidence where it is possible, and secondary evidence will be admitted only when reasonable grounds are given for not adducing the former. Indeed this rule is carried to such an extent, in particular cases, that secondary,—for example, certain kinds of hearsay evidence—is held inadmissible even where primary evidence can not be obtained. The law declares the original evidence or the nearest approach to it that can be obtained, the best evidence.

This practical, common sense rule might with profit be adopted by Christians when searching for a firm foundation for their religious beliefs. All Christians will admit that the Bible is the source from which we must obtain all knowledge of God's will concerning man. Where access to the Bible can be had, it must eventually be consulted for evidence of God's will. Even conscience can not excuse our actions when by consulting God's Word we may know the truth. It follows then that the person who studies the Word without the use of uninspired writing or teaching, will come nearer the truth than if he exerted the same amount of diligence in considering some secondary evidence of it.

How do the Disciples of Christ stand this test? No people that I know of rely more exclusively on the Bible for what they teach and practice than we do. While the great majority of the Christian bodies rely partly on "secondary" evidence for a knowledge of the truth, the Disciples of Christ allow neither creed, traditions of men, nor any fallible guide to come between them and the Bible. If asked for our authority for any practice that prevails among us we refer to the great fountain head of Christian knowledge—the Bible; and are willing to stand a comparison between our usages and its teaching. On the other hand many of those who accuse us of being blind and unreasonable respecting the truth, examine it themselves through colored lens.

(2) *Have we examined the original source of our evidence free from prejudice?* This question, from its nature, is not so easily answered as the first; for, being a bent of the mind in some direction, it may not always be apparent to outsiders. It will generally show itself to others in some form or forms, however, and some of these I will examine slightly. The reliance placed in God's Word, referred to above, is one of the best proofs obtainable that we have not prejudged the Word. This fact shows at least honesty on our behalf in searching for the truth. The readiness with which our people appeal to the Word of God as containing the defense of what we teach and as the end of all controversy, is evidence that we are not afraid of our teaching and practice being brought to the light, as most prejudiced people are respecting theirs. A biased person is generally not very ready to place the views of others on an equal footing with his own nor to make any comparison whatever.

(3) *Are we willing to investigate the views of others and honestly compare them with the source of Truth?* I think this question must be answered in the affirmative. The Disciples of Christ have always shown a disposition to know and practice the truth; and do not seek to have the Bible conform to any particular belief. Being thus unfettered by any belief and desiring to know the truth we are not only willing but desirous of comparing the views of others with the truth, as by this means we may be aided in our search for it.