

which was crowded back or crowded out." The same word specially means *requires for judgment*. Comp. Hebrew in 2 Sam. iv : 11. Ezek. iii: 18, etc. The context in the last clause of verse 14; also verses 16, 17, seems to require this meaning here. Where there are two contrary ways of interpreting, the drift of contextual teaching must decide. I think the thought is that though time revolves and men and things pass into oblivion, nothing escapes God's eye or remembrance. What in the coming on of future events is drawn backward or crowded into the darkness of the past, God *seeks* and again brings to light. So understood, the whole passage gets a certain harmony and unity that I cannot make out otherwise.

A Question.

"If a neighboring minister, preaching for a pastor, uses the printed sermon of some popular preacher, has that pastor any duty requiring him to speak or keep silence about it, or should he act toward that person as if nothing had occurred, exchanging, etc.?"

REPLY—Obviously, if the fact be as stated, it is your duty to go to the offending brother and charge him with the plagiarism; and if he admits it, or you have positive proof of it, you would be justified in declining future exchanges. Such a thing must be looked upon as a grave moral and ministerial offense and treated accordingly.

EDITORS.

Was Philip the First Called?

In this suggestive outline of Jno. xiv : 9, in the April REVIEW, Philip is said to be the "first called" apostle. Is this according to the record? In John i : 38-42, we are told how Peter and Andrew, and probably John and James had acknowledged Jesus as Messiah before our Lord said to Philip, "follow me." But was this the formal call to the apostleship? Rather was it not a call to ordinary discipleship? Other passages would

show the former call to have occurred later.

C. E. W. DOBBS.

COLUMBUS, MISS.

Two Astonishing Statements.

IN the HOMILETIC REVIEW for May, in an article by Rev. G. S. Plumley, on "Two Celebrated Sermonizers," these statements occur in speaking of one of them: he "at his death left in his study 5,000 written sermons. . . . He prepared only one discourse each week," and to this he "devoted Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday." At this rate of preparation it would take *ninety-six years and eight weeks* to write 5,000 sermons! This is the longest ministry of which I have read since that of Noah. Are the statements true?

L. E. PETERS.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA.

[I have no doubt the statement is true. I happened to know the person referred to, for more than sixty years a distinguished pastor, and equally an author, whose manifold published works bear testimony to his literary activity. It is not said that he *preached* to his people the "5,000 sermons." Doubtless a very large number of them were "occasional" sermons, as he was continually called upon for public occasions.—J. M. SHERWOOD.]

The Lord's Supper.

ON page 468, Mr. Sholland contends that the Lord's Supper is a "*sacrament*." This is not a matter of opinion to be settled by the Shorter Catechism; but a matter of faith to be settled by explicit Bible statement. Will he kindly refer us to the place in the Word of God where it is so called? Is it not better to adhere to Bible names for Bible things? It will avoid confusion. As well to call prayer, church attendance, reading the Scriptures, Sunday-school or any other religious act a *sacrament*, as the Lord's Supper, for in these the