THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIX.—APRIL, 1895.—No. 4.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—ARTHUR HUGH CLOUGH AND HIS POETRY.

BY PROF. J. O. MURRAY, D.D., PRINCETON, N. J.

WHAT is commonly known as the Oxford Tractarian Movement left its traces as well upon the literary as on the ecclesiastical history of England. The more deeply it is studied, the more that comes to light as the biographies of its leaders and adherents are published, the more apparent become its deep-reaching and farspreading effects and influences. Names like those of Cardinal Newman and Dr. Pusey overshadow, perhaps, the names of Matthew Arnold and Arthur Hugh Clough. Yet the latter have wielded influences in the world of literature as potent as those wielded by the former in the spheres of theology or Church polity, and it is safe to say that neither Arnold nor Clough would have affected English literature in the manner they did but for their residence at Oxford during the stirring years of Tract 90 and its fellows. The writings of both these men, the poetry of Clough, the poetry and essays of Arnold, are sure to live. They have elements of classical and enduring power; they have been and still are affecting deeply many thoughtful minds; and these writings bear the traces of the mental struggles of the severance from old beliefs which marked their Oxford days. Clough and Arnold were close friends. Both were scholars of the best English type. Both were men who had the courage of their opinions. Whatever we may think of their views, we must always do homage to their intellectual honesty. To maintain it, they both sacrificed worldly position. Clough died early, and his friend Arnold has embalmed the memory of their friendship in his *Thyrsis*, which has taken its place among the four or five great elegies of English poetry.

The life of Clough was an uneventful one; but it knew some experiences which shaped all his literary work, and which must therefore be reviewed in order to understand and appreciate it. He was born at Liverpool, January 1, 1819. When not quite four years old, his father removed to Charleston, S. C. There Clough's early childhood was spent. His mother seems to have had a large share in his mental

training. Together they read "histories ancient and modern, stories of the Greek heroes, parts of Pope's Odyssey and Iliad, and much out of Walter Scott's novels." After five years' residence in Charleston, Clough, at the age of nine, was taken to school at Chester, England, and one year later, in the summer of 1829, he was transferred to Rugby. Dr. Arnold had begun his work there in the year previous, and was already signalizing his advent to the position of head master by his influence over the pupils. Here Clough remained till 1836, when, having won the Balliol scholarship, he went up to Oxford. During this seven years' residence Clough was being molded by Dr. Arnold. His letters written while at the school all show the influence on him of Dr. Arnold's moral and intellectual personality. "I don't know," he wrote to a friend, "which to think the greatest, the blessing of being under Arnold, or the curse of being without a home." It is evident that he gained from Dr. Arnold that high conception of intellectual honesty as a writer, that "constant shaping of daily thoughts and actions to a high unselfish end." "I verily believe," he wrote another friend, in the last year of his residence, "my whole being is soaked through with the wishing and hoping and striving to do the school good, or rather to keep it up and hinder it from failing at this, I do think, very critical time, so that all my cares and affections and conversation, thought, words, and deeds look to that involuntarily." Thus molded by Dr. Arnold, with a high reputation for scholarship, with his faith in the generally accepted beliefs of the Church of England unshaken, he was in the autumn of 1836 duly entered as a member of Balliol College, Oxford, having won, as we have said, the Balliol scholarship. The "storm and stress" period of his life was now about to begin.

He was brought early in his Oxford career under the influence of John Henry Newman and Wilfrid Ward, both of whom followed the stream of tendency till they landed in the Roman Catholic Church. Clough felt all the magical power of Newman's personality, the charm of his scholarship, the persuasiveness of his preaching at St. Mary's. With Ward, his relations were those of intimate friendship. Together they discussed the questions which were then filling all Oxford minds and racking not a few of Oxford's choicest spirits. It is doubtless true that at no time he was in serious danger of joining the Romanizing party. The effect of all this discussion upon him was simply to force upon him "a thorough examination of his religious belief; and whether in the spirit of reaction or not, he subjected the whole structure of his creed, by way of test, to a treatment so violent as to shake it to its lowest foundations." It is enough to say that for Clough the struggle ended in rejection of what is commonly called "historical Christianity." He accepted instead what he called "the real Religious Tradition." He had no sympathy with the exulting, supercilious tone which a crude and bold Rationalism so often protrudes. "It is

no new gospel," he said, "to tell us that the old one is of doubtful authenticity." How far he reacted from the Romanism which captivated J. H. Newman and Ward may be seen by a glance at his views of F. H. Newman's "The Soul." It is difficult to say just what he meant by the "real religious tradition." He was not an out-and-out agnostic, though he could say, "You have found out God, have you? Ah! my friends, let us be—*silent*"; and at another time, "Whether Christ died for us upon the cross, I cannot tell; yet I am prepared to find some spiritual truth in the doctrine of the Atonement. Purgatory is not in the Bible; I do not, therefore, think it incredible." There were at least two articles in Clough's creed which he believed profoundly: First, that God was in some close and vital relations with the human soul; and secondly, that the meaning of life here was duty strenuously performed in view of the ineffaceable distinction between right and wrong. These articles of faith gave him that earnest moral tone, which dated from his Rugby life, to the hour of his death. It was needful to dwell at some length on this Oxford experience and its results, since it furnishes the clew to much, if not the most, of his poetry. The remainder of his career need not occupy us long. In 1848 he resigned his tutorship at Oriel, thus terminating the Oxford residence, which as undergraduate and graduate had lasted for twelve years. Then followed a brief service, from 1849 to 1852, in the headship of University Hall, London. That ended, he turned to America, and was for a time at Cambridge, Mass., occupied in tutorial and literary work, greatly beloved by the Cambridge circle of such men as Longfellow, Dana, Lowell, and Hawthorne. He returned to England in 1853, having accepted the offer of an examinership in the Education Office. In its labors, and also in some literary work, chiefly his translation of Plutarch, he continued till his death, in 1861.

Clough's poetry is too little known. Doubtless it appeals to the selecter class of readers. But even among these it has not gained the notice it deserves. For purity and grace of workmanship, as well as for subtlety of insight and truthfulness of delineation, it must be ranked high in the Victorian school. In general, his poetry may be said to revolve around the two poles of love and duty. The four poems, his longest and most elaborate, *The Bothie of Tober-na-Vuolich: a long vacation pastoral; The Amours de Voyage*, *Dipsychus*, and *Mari Magno*, will always be named as those which show his genius at its best. In this paper, however, we are not concerned so much with a general estimate of his poetic work as with the religious element in many of his minor poems. This, indeed, appears in the *Dipsychus*. But for its chief embodiment, we must turn to such poems as are found in the class entitled *Poems on Religious and Biblical Subjects*, and the *Poems on Life and Duty*. In these it has a full-throated ex-

pression. They are as deeply suggestive as the poems of Matthew Arnold, which touch on similar themes. The first thing which strikes any reader of Clough's poems touching on religious questions is their reflection of his moral and religious personality. In one sense they are strongly subjective. The emotions they embody, the struggles they depict, the doubts they utter, the aspirations they convey, the conclusions they reach have all swept over his soul, have lived his life. Thus when we read the lines entitled "With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,"

> "It fortifies my soul to know
> That though I perish, Truth is so;
> That howso'er I stray and range,
> What'er I do, Thou dost not change.
> I steadier step when I recall
> That, if I slip, Thou dost not fall,"

we know that Clough's inner life had experience of this spiritual mood—that it was a transcript rather than an imagined spiritual result. Thus, too, when we have gone through with the *Dipsychus* and have followed the dialogue between Dipsychus and the Spirit through all the mazes of the questioning in which they discuss "questions of theology and social ethics, setting forth in broad and well-defined contrast the double point of view which may be taken by a scrupulous and easy conscience, the discord between the Spirit of the Gospel and the spirit of the world, and the divergence between a craving after spiritual things and an acquiescence in the order of carnal and conventional routine," we are sure that Clough himself has been over every step of this road; that these are chapters from his own experience of life. It is needless to say that herein is found a source of the power in these poems. However we may shrink from some of his utterances, however others may seem to us failures as meeting the demands of life upon faith, this note of genuineness holds us. He is not amusing himself with his doubts, nor seeking to amuse us by his portrayal of religious struggle. There is another and more distinctive note of moral pain sounded in the religious poetry of Clough. No one reading this poetry can help the feeling that Clough, in giving up his old faith in Christianity, has not found a satisfying repose in the diminished belief to which he clung. If ever there was an earnest skeptic, it was he. All that Matthew Arnold, in his stanzas on the Grand Chartreuse, has expressed of sad craving for the "joy unspeakable," the "peace that passeth understanding," is felt in the lines of Clough whenever he approaches the subject of religious hopes. It seems to us that the calm he seeks to embody at times is a forced quietude of soul, more the effort of will than the spontaneous outpouring of his heart. It is striking that Browning and Clough have each made Easter Day the point of departure for some of their most distinctive religious utterances. Clough's poem on Easter Day will

vividly illustrate what is meant by the note of moral pain in much of his religious poetry. Its general aim has been well described as a "semi-dramatic expression of the contrast he felt between the complete practical irreligion and wickedness of the life he saw going on and the outward forms and ceremonies of religion displaying themselves at every turn."

Quoting a stanza here and there will give but a meager idea of the whole. It is all our space will admit. "How can we believe," it seems to say, "that 'Christ is risen' in such a world as this?"

"Through the great sinful streets of Naples as I past,
With fiercer heat than flamed above my head,
My heart was hot within me, till at last
My brain was lightened when my tongue had said:
Christ is not risen!
Christ is not risen! no,
He lies and molders low.
Christ is not risen!

. . . . . .

"Eat, drink, and die, for we are souls bereaved.
Of all the creatures under heaven's wide cope
We are most hopeless who had once most hope,
And most beliefless that had most believed.
Ashes to ashes, dust to dust,
As of the unjust also of the just.
Yea, and of that Just One too!
It is the one sad gospel that is true—
Christ is not risen!"

But in Part Second of the poem, the poet comes into a different and saner mood. There is a resurrection in which lies the hope of mankind.

"So in the sinful streets, abstracted and alone,
I with my secret self held communing of mine own.
So in the Southern city spake the tongue
Of one that somewhat overwildly sung;
But in a later hour I sat and heard
Another voice that spake, another graver word.
Weep not, it bade, whatever hath been said,
Though He be dead, He is not dead.
In the true creed,
He is yet risen indeed;
Christ is yet risen."

There is, too, a note of protest in some of his poems against the blankness and barrenness of some forms of the modern unbelief. What religious convictions Clough did hold he held not only fixedly, but with warmth approaching intensity. No better illustration of this could be found than in the poem called *The New Sinai.* A stanza or two will make this clear.

"'Lo, here is God, and there is God!'
Believe it not, O man;
In such vain sort to this and that
The ancient heathen ran.

Though Old Religion shake her head
And say in bitter grief
'The day behold that first foretold
Of Atheist unbelief,'
Take better part with manly heart,
Thine adult spirit can;
Receive it not, believe it not,
Believe it not, O man.

. . . . . .

"Take better part with manlier heart
Thine adult spirit can.
'No God, no Truth!' Receive it ne'er,
Believe it ne'er, O man!
But turn not then to seek again
What first the ill began.
'No God,' it saith; ah! wait in faith
God's self-completing plan;
Receive it not, but leave it not,
And wait it out, O man."

How far Clough was from that type of modern unbelief which finds delight in negations and slurs everything that has an accent of faith about it may be seen in his lines entitled *In a London Square.*

"Put forth thy leaf, thou lofty plane—
East wind and frost are safely gone;
With zephyr mild and balmy rain,
The summer comes serenely on;
Earth, air, and sun and skies combine
To promise all that's kind and fair:
But thou, O human heart of mine,
Be still, contain thyself and bear.

"December days were brief and chill,
The winds of March were wild and drear;
And nearer and receding still,
Spring never would, we thought, be here.
The leaves that burst, the suns that shine
Had, not the less, their certain date.
And thou, O human heart of mine,
Be still, refrain thyself, and wait."

In the stanzas *Qui laborat orat*, the poet questions whether it be not profane to give even the most abstract form to God, and concludes that work is the truest expression of earnest prayer. Nowhere is the dictum of much modern thought that "work is worship" put more reverentially or with more feeling.

"O only Saviour of all our light and life,
Whom as our truth, our strength, we see and feel,
But whom the hours of mortal moral strife
Alone aright reveal!

"Mine inmost soul, before Thee inly brought
Thy presence owns ineffable, divine;
Chastised each rebel self-encentered thought.
My will adoreth Thine.

. . . . . .

"If, well assured, 'tis but profanely told
In thought's abstractest forms, to seem to see.
It does not dare the dread communion hold
In ways unworthy Thee.

"Oh, not unowned, Thou shalt unnamed forgive;
In worldly walks the prayerless heart prepare:
And, if in work its life it seem to live,
Shalt make that work be prayer."

The same general conception, the same aversion to anything like the revelation of God as a divine being in the Scriptures, the same vague but firm belief in a God to be revealed fully perhaps hereafter, but now only dimly recognized in the soul itself, are found in the poem beginning, "O Thou whose image in the Shrine." One of its stanzas will disclose Clough's favorite view of the Deity.

"O Thou, in that mysterious shrine
Enthroned, as I must say, divine!
I will not frame one thought of what
Thou mayest either be or not.
I will not prate of 'thus' and 'so,'
And be profane with 'yes' or 'no.'
Enough that in our soul and heart
Thou, whatso'er Thou mayst be, art."

There are two veins in Clough's poetry on religion. One is bitter, almost cynical. It springs from his revolt from all skepticism which leads to unworthy living, or from all orthodoxy which to him seemed wanting in moral or intellectual honesty, or both. It may have been a survival of Clough's earlier creed, but he was profoundly averse to all falseness in life. The expression of this mood is found in such poems as *Life is Struggle*, *In the Great Metropolis*, *Dipsychus*, and especially in *The Latest Decalogue*.

"Thou shalt have one God only; who
Would be at the expense of two?
No graven images may be
Worshiped, except the currency.
Swear not at all; for, for thy curse,
Thine enemy is none the worse.
At church on Sunday to attend
Will serve to keep the world thy friend.
Honor thy parents; that is, all
From whom advancement may befall.
Thou shalt not kill; but needst not strive
Officiously to keep alive.
Do not adultery commit;
Advantage rarely comes of it.
Thou shalt not steal; an empty feat
When it's so lucrative to cheat.
Bear not false witness, let the lie
Have time on its own wings to fly.
Thou shalt not covet, but tradition
Opposes all forms of competition."

The other vein is that of a struggling, patient waiting; a longing for more light, but a willingness to act on what we have: a faith in the unseen which is invincible and under the influence of which his heart grew soft and tender. It is seen in such poems as *O Thou of Little Faith, Through a Glass Darkly, Hope Evermore and Believe*, and in the exquisite lines, *Qua Cursum Ventus.*

The preacher will find his account in the study of Clough's religious poetry. It will disclose to him a type of skepticism, reverent not mocking, earnest not flippant, sad but not without strains of hopefulness, and while rejecting what is essential to Christianity, not without a struggling and serious faith. It is not all negation. And herein is its power over many minds of the better class. No candid soul can ever have any other feeling for such doubters as John Stirling and Arthur Clough, but the deepest interest and the warmest kindliness.

II.—THE SPIRIT OF MAN.

BY REV. JAMES DOUGLAS, M.A., BRIXTON HILL, LONDON, S. W.

"MAN, know thyself," is an advice easy to give, but not easy to follow. Fichte's students did not find it hard to think the wall, but when bidden to think who thought it, they were instantly thrust beyond their depth. How vague and uncertain man's knowledge is of himself is seen in the generality attaching to the use of terms that relate to the mysterious entity we name *man.* Soul and spirit are employed interchangeably; and often where it is not so, where stress is laid on the fact that there *is* spirit in man, no clear thought illumines the distinction, no power is present to make evident either what spirit is in itself or what are the functions which it exercises, or any of the grounds on which its priority is based. To most people (and we speak now of the reflective and the instructed) the spirit of man is a *terra incognita*, a land known to exist, but quite beyond mortal ken. They may hold, and that rightly, that it is not to be confounded with the soul; that spirit is the greater quantity; and that though for convenience soul may be used as a synonym of person, and may be taken to sum up all that man is in himself, yet spirit has in all things the preeminence, being the leading and ruling factor in the constitution of man. But having said so much, the subject is laid to rest. No attempt is made to mirror forth what the spirit of man is. The *fact* of the possession is insisted on, but the *nature* of the possession is unresolved. In other words, we are held to be chiefly that which we know not; and the term used to designate the deepest secret of our being is regarded as if it were as unintelligible and impassive as is the face of the sphinx.

Without intruding into knowledge too high or too wonderful for us, we hope to make clear in this paper how the spirit of man is to be distinguished, and how just are its claims to the leading place in the human constitution. Novalis has said: "Man is the higher sense of our planet; the star which connects it with the upper world; the eye which it turns toward heaven." If man be all this and more, it is because of the spirit in him which gives him his distinctive setting in the divine economy and marks him out as responsibly related to God. That spirit is the leading constituent in the nature of man is clear from Gen. i. 27: "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." Some eight years ago Prof. Franz Delitzsch took occasion, the King of Saxony being present at the time, to point out the anti-Darwinistic character of man's constitution, how that "God created him, in contradistinction from lower animals, according to His own image—that is, *gave him spirit from His spirit.*" This sentiment is immovably set in Holy Writ. Since "God is Spirit" (John iv. 24) and man is created in His image after His likeness, it must needs be that the fundamental and ruling constituent in the nature of man must be spirit likewise. Man's distinctive faculty, therefore, is spirit. He is no mere natural product; no mere piece of animated clay; no mere animal, however highly organized. If he were that and no more, the Scripture, which assures us that he was created in the likeness of his Maker, would be meaningless; and if it were true that by the fall he had lost spirit, then it would follow that man, by the fall, had ceased to be man, and that redemption was undertaken in the interest of an animal only—*an unthinkable hypothesis.* The conclusion, then, stands that man has spirit-faculty, spirit-capacity, a power to take on God; even as Augustine has said: "Thou, Lord, hast created us for Thyself, and hast redeemed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee."

But how, it may be asked, is the presence of spirit in man to be traced, and with certainty distinguished and attested? It will aid us in this inquiry if we remember that it is of the essence of a distinctive endowment to give distinctiveness to the subject in which it inheres; and that since it is by the possession of spirit man's unique place in creation is determined, we may hope to find, both in his intellectual powers and in his moral sense, the clearest evidence of that uniqueness. Turning, then, to the intellect of man, we ask what trace have we there of the fact that God has given him spirit from His spirit? Is the human mind distinctive in this sense, that it is a mind of another kind and of a superior order to that of the animal? Unless this can be shown, and shown clearly, the possession of spirit by man has no plain mental indication. What, then, are the facts? Do they warrant us in the affirmation that the intellect of man is a spirit-intellect and no mere enlargement of the animal mind? We

believe they do; we believe that if the psychological tests, which are equally open to all, be but applied, it will be found that God, through the impartation of spirit, has brought man into intellectual touch with Himself; so that, although he is made aware of his limitations, it is not time or sense experience which limits him, but the Uncreated and Unconditioned One only.

How clearly this is seen in the faculty of "Pure Reason," upon which metaphysicians have descanted without explaining its genesis! "Pure Reason" simply outlines the intuitional character of the spirit of man in the region of intelligence. Because of spirit, the better part of knowledge—the distinctive part—is due to the informing power of the mind itself. We need not hold the doctrine of innate ideas, which Locke combated, in order to vindicate the truth that there is more in the intellect than ever was in the senses, for supersensible intuition is a plain mark of the spirit's intellectual life, with which the animal mind has nothing in common. Whence, for instance, has come to man the conception of eternity? Time contains it not; nor is experience capable of evolving it. The conception of eternity transcends, by a whole diameter of being, the sum of time's contents; yet it springs up from within the mind of a mere creature of a day. What explanation is possible save this, that God has put upon the mind of man the stamp of His own eternity by giving him spirit from His spirit? The like applies to the conception of immensity. Of immensity we experimentally know nothing. Even a drop of water bears some proportion to the sum of the earth's contents, but what proportion does our experience bear to the infinitude in question? Yet the idea of immensity is clearly ours. There is a something in us which necessitates our belief in the illimitableness of space on every side. Can we come to any other conclusion than this, that that mysterious something which enables us to do this is due to the distinctiveness of man's origin, as one created in the divine image and "constituted," as has been beautifully observed, "for the breath of the eternal Father"?

Summed up in a word, the presence of spirit in man is distinctly outlined in the region of his intellect, in the ability which he has to bring to the birth notions which, while transcending experience and all positive comprehension, are yet immediately discerned as of universal force and as bearing the stamp of irreversible necessity. Why, for example, should we know that the ends of a straight line produced can never meet? The notion is abstract, incapable of sense-verification, and yet it is instantly perceived as necessary and universal. And so with respect to the whole region of abstract and axiomatic truth. Into this region the animal mind, however trained, educated, or ingenious, never enters: all this is reserved for the mind that is informed and transfigured by spirit. How wonderful, then, is man, and how clearly is the presence of spirit to be detected in the region of

his intelligence! As spirit-endowed, he is a coin of a godlike stamp. Mere practical reason does not explain the distinctive in his case, for many of the brutes share this in common with him. The wit of the horse and the sagacity of the elephant have passed into a proverb. Even the domestic birds, and creatures tinier far, such as the ant, have an intellectual lobe of singular refinement, fitting them for processes of thought and action that bespeak wondrous contrivance and skill. But while all other creatures are sense-bound, man is free. His intellectual environment, indefinitely enlarged by the informing power of a spirit-capacity that is God-derived, impinges the transcendental and divine. Only the spirit of man is the interpreter of his intelligence. The senses are worthless as a solution of his mental furnishing, for he deals not only with what is, but with what must be; rises above the particular to truths necessary and universal; transcends experience and time, and only finds his limit when h touches the infinitude that God is. Such is man intellectually construed, "the higher sense of our planet, the star that connects it with the upper world, the eye that looks toward heaven."

Further light is cast upon the nature of the spirit of man by the clearly defined sense there is in him of *personality*. Ferrier, late professor of moral philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's, has been at infinite pains to show that man is not only conscious, but self-conscious; that his consciousness is not only occupied with varying successive states of thought, will, and emotion, but, over and above that, running through it all, is the consciousness of a self, a responsible self, in which all these states inhere. It is attention to this subject which imparts such wonderful interest to the unfolding life of the child. For a time the child is just like the parrot. It hears itself addressed in the third person, and for a time knows no better than to do the same. During this period the spirit is not properly awake: the higher nature of the child slumbers. But after a time the child and the parrot part company. "Pretty Poll" still describes herself as "Pretty Poll," but the child has awakened to the fact that it is a self, and begins the use of the personal pronoun "I." In this, we apprehend, is seen another clear evidence of the presence and quality of spirit in man. The animal is conscious, but man is self-conscious. In virtue of the enduement of spirit, he awakes to the sense of personality with all that that heritage imports.

Looking now more directly at the moral side of man, we are confronted by a mysterious "ought" in the human breast, to which we cannot give too much heed. Whence comes it—this sense of obligation, this feeling of responsibility? To what origin or spring is it to be referred? Can we explain it on any other hypothesis than that man, being created in the image of God, being gifted with spirit, is thereby placed by the tie of moral sense in responsible relation to his Maker? To us the conclusion seems just. Conscience—that impera-

tive voice which says, "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt not"—cannot possibly be resolved into that which is beneath. Mere animal organization cannot explain it. The moral sense is too big a thing for the mere utilitarian in morals to deal with. He is baffled by it. Conscience proclaims that man is meant for God; that his misery, as well as crime, is to be on wrong relations with Him; that man is not animated matter merely, but that enshrined in him is spirit.

How suggestive to note, let man fall as he may, he can never quite bury the spirit in the flesh! Though he may drug his conscience and falsely indoctrinate it, still he cannot exorcise the mysterious "ought" from his breast; he cannot altogether paralyze the delicate cord that quivers in the presence of the unseen and obligatory. Is not the reason this, that he cannot quite *dehumanize* himself? That there is that operative in him which tells that he is possessed of something more than a merely animal soul, and that he is designed for something more than a merely animal destiny? Surely it is so! Surely an embryonic hell or heaven is distinctly to be traced in the very constitution of man!

It remains to point out how the very desires and appetites of man's soul betray the informing presence and activity of spirit. As with man's cognitions, so with his desires: the possession of spirit means their expansion far beyond all mere creature limits. Hence it is that, if God be not the fruition of man's desires, he is forever doomed. Inordinate desire, a mark of the spirit in man, is not strictly an animal property. Howbeit in this thing lies man's most besetting temptation. "Enough" is a word incapable of definition.

"Man never is, but always to be, blessed." The appetites grow as they feed, and become the more insatiable with every fresh gratification. "He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase." When can human lust say, "Now I am satisfied"? Never. Fallen-spirit like, the sinner wearies himself in hewing out broken cisterns and spends his life in a sigh. Ah! that those who know the secret of blessing would keep to their text and devote themselves to its exposition; for man's desires, informed by spirit, have only one true correlative—the Son of God. "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldst have asked of Him and He would have given thee living water" (John iv. 10).

Thus the intellect and the desires, personality and moral sense, alike bespeak, in their distinctive characteristics, the potency and regal sway of the spirit of man.

THE value of human laws is only this—to conserve the Great Eternal Law of God; to enable us to keep that; to hinder us from disobeying that.—THEODORE PARKER.

III.—DRUMMOND'S ASCENT OF MAN.

By George P. Mains, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

This book is so free in the movement of a vivid style, so rich in illustrative fact, as to forbid attempt to show its qualities in these respects in a condensed review. Our author is an evolutionist, but as such he is a man of lofty thought and of reverent spirit. He is neither materialist nor agnostic; he is not one of those who beat about in the little wilderness of their thought on the hunt for a hypothesis that shall rid the universe of God. Mr. Drummond boldly assumes that man, in the entirety of his being, is a part—though he may be the crown—of nature's order; that he is, body, soul, and spirit, a product of those evolutionary processes a history of which may be traced in Nature's own book.

Aside from preface and introduction, the book consists of ten chapters.

Chapter first treats of the "Ascent of the Body." Starting with the simile of the single-roomed hut of the primitive savage, our author from the single-celled human embryo traces the process of body-building until from the most elemental beginning he brings us to that marvel of organic complexity and adjustment, the myriad-roomed palace—the completed human body. In an eloquent paragraph he defends this process against any imputation of its detraction from either the dignity of man's origin or from the sublimity of the creative plan, and concludes that evolution interprets for creation its sublimest meaning, and discovers for the human race a most splendid genesis.

The second chapter deals with "The Scaffolding Left in the Body." By this are meant certain vestiges to be found in the human frame of structures which are fully formed in other animals. It is claimed that these incomplete or rudimentary elements in the human body, themselves of no use to man, some of them indeed a source of peril to him, must be construed as so much evidence of man's physical derivation from an animal ancestry.

"The Arrest of the Body" is the title of Chapter III. With the making of man organic evolution has reached its goal; it can go no farther. The general position here taken is that this being so perfect in his own organism will, by the very fruits of his genius, not only limit his capacity for a higher physical development than that already attained, but will do away with the necessity for such development. The civilized man invents motors which render his legs less enduring for the long tramp than are the legs of a savage. The Indian of the forest has a more far-sighted vision than has the learned university professor; but the latter, with his instruments, forces suns deep buried in space to surrender to his knowledge their constituent ele-

ments, while in a grain of dust or in a drop of water he is able to behold a microcosm of the universe.

The completion of man's physical organism was but the preface in the history of evolution. Up to this moment man himself had been in charge of evolution, its chief work and end. Henceforth he must be largely a director in shaping the evolution of history. Just the process through which man thus comes newly crowned and sceptered for lordship in creation is not made quite clear. There seems a moment in the wondrous drama when the curtain drops. When it rises again, a great change has come over the universe; before it was physical, now it is a psychical universe, and, as we look, "Man stands alone in the foreground, and a new thing, spirit, strives within him." Henceforth that which is to evolve is not the animal man, but the spiritual, the psychic man; but with his coming evolution takes a new direction.

Chapter IV. discusses "The Dawn of Mind." The author promptly disclaims any scientific knowledge as to the origin of mind. He admits the infinite distance between the mind of man and everything else in nature. Mind in him differs not only quantitatively but qualitatively from mind as found in all lower animals. The view nevertheless taken is that what we know as mind in man is a development by evolutionary processes through the medium of long-ascending gradations of an animal lineage. For proof of this general position reliance is placed upon five sources of information—namely, first, the mind of a little child; second, the mind of lower animals; third, such material witnesses—as flints, weapons, pottery—to primitive states of mind as are preserved in anthropological museums; fourth, the mind of a savage; fifth, language.

Chapter V. treats suggestively and with much telling illustration of "The Evolution of Language." The acquisition by man of the power to speak, to express his mind, is the one factor which has given to him great advantage over all other beings in the race of intelligence. Language is the one medium which enables the thought of every individual to be banked in the general mind of humanity. Language permits the thought of a generation to outlive the generation which originated that thought. And so, with the uses of language at command, man, both the individual and the race, ran up a rapid fortune in brain-matter.

Chapter VI. gives a vivid restatement of a law now long familiar in the history of evolution, namely, that of "The Struggle for Life." The author, while fully conceding the necessity of this law as a condition of progress, nevertheless argues that, on the whole, its operation in nature is not cruel but beneficent.

In the three following chapters, entitled respectively "The Struggle for the Life of Others," "The Evolution of a Mother," "The Evolution of a Father," we have unfolded to us the distinguishing and

most interesting features of the author's philosophy of evolution. In the struggle for the life of others we meet man on a higher plane than any on which he has yet appeared: not simply as we have found him in the realm of body, nor yet on the higher altitudes of intellect, but where he stands at his full height, where "love has become to him the breath of life, the energy of will, the summit of desire." The story of evolution as usually told has hitherto given no place to love as a law of life. This omission is a strange oversight of science, for "love is not a late arrival, not an afterthought, with creation." The struggle for the life of others reveals the supreme factor in the evolution of the world. The law of the struggle for life is wholly insufficient for the interpretation of the entire course of nature.

In a discussion too elaborate for quotation, but most fascinating in statement, the author develops his view of the evolution of love. He draws for the material of his argument upon factors which he names: "Self-sacrifice in Nature," "Cooperation in Nature," "The Ethical Significance of Sex," and finally, "The Ethical Significance of Maternity."

Two great factors underlie the process of evolution: the one, nutrition; the other, reproduction. From the one is born the struggle for life; from the other the struggle for the life of others. Between these two factors all the principles named find their play. When evolution has produced a human pair, its laws determine that upon the man shall fall the function of nutrition; upon the woman that of reproduction. Man fights for bread; woman pays the debt of motherhood. Man, struggling for nutriment, represents selfishness, individuality; woman, sacrificing for her children, represents altruism. These two master-principles, blending in children, acting and reacting in all history, secure for man that mean in which alone his true life is found.

The chapter on the "Evolution of a Mother," however interesting, and that on the "Evolution of a Father," however fanciful, must be here passed by without attempted analysis.

In the final chapter, entitled "Involution," special and discriminating emphasis is laid upon the function of environment. Environment is not only the prime factor in development, but environment itself rises and imparts new ministries with every evolution of any form of life. The overlooking of this latter fact, next to ignoring the altruistic factor, is the cardinal error of evolutional philosophy.

The author is thoroughly theistic. With him evolution is but the method of creation. He believes that God is immanent in nature, that the maintenance and development of the present order needs the active energy of a living will as much as did the creation of atoms at the first. God's method in nature, so far as we know it, is a method of growth. There may be other methods, but if so, we do not know of them.

From dateless time evolution has wrought toward one goal. Sky and sea, the beautiful cosmos, the body of man so wonderfully wrought, mind, will: these are its products; but the one supreme product of evolution is—LOVE. "Whatever controversy rages as to the factors of evolution, whatever mystery enshrouds its steps, no doubt exists of its goal. The great landmarks we have passed, and we are not yet half way up the ascent, each separately and all together have declared the course of nature to be a rational course, and its end a moral end."

So much for the way-marks that lie along the course of this fascinating book. In closing this paper, we venture the following suggestions:

1. Whatever temptations otherwise the study of the book may suggest, it will only be fair that the reader shall always bear in mind the limits of purpose which the author set for himself in his writing. Believing that evolution was given to the world "out of focus," and that its general basis needs not only reexamination but restatement, Professor Drummond simply undertakes, in this volume, not the construction of the new scale to which the true evolution theory should be drawn, but to furnish only the "accents" for such a scheme.

So far as the factors in the theory are concerned, he seeks to give a proper place to at least two, both of exceeding importance in the field of evolution, yet both, as he conceives, strangely overlooked or neglected in most contemporary scientific thinking. These two factors are: First, the "Otherism," or the altruistic element everywhere working in nature; second, the constant rise of environment itself with every step in the evolution of life. Beyond this attempted readjustment of "accents" he distinctly declares that his book has nothing for the specialist—except, it may be, the reflection of his own work. "Nor, apart from teleology, is there anything for the theologian."

The reader, in his own thought, will inevitably be carried on to the great fields of psychology, ethics, and theology, and he would be glad to follow the footsteps of his charming guide into these higher and more modern fields of research to see where he would lead. But he must remember that the author in his "Ascent of Man" has only professed to conduct us into the earlier stages of human development. The author, so far as his self-assigned task is concerned, parts company with us when as yet his subject, at best, is but a semi-savage, at the very "point where all the higher interest begins." We must not, therefore, hold Professor Drummond to too close account for opinions which he has not yet uttered, nor still are we quite at liberty to prejudge the products of work he may yet give us when he shall have explored the higher and more accessible fields of man's modern development.

2. Professor Drummond's style is an element to be considered in any of his works. He has a wizard's power in the use of words. He has the temperament and the imagination of the poet and the artist.

These qualities carry in themselves for the reader both a charm and a danger. Human nature delights in pictures. The ordinary artist, drawing his free-hand cartoons in the window of the big store, is sure to have his crowd on the pavement. But Professor Drummond is no ordinary artist. His canvas is ample as Nature, and on it, with a perspective that opens from the earliest dawn, he pictures in bewitchment of color and combination the vital drama of the ages. This artist commands a great audience. This audience is made up of no street-rabble; it is an audience composed of reading, of thoughtful, of aspiring minds. It is an audience held together by a charm which no criticism can break. The specialist in science may say that Professor Drummond is but a dreamer; the theologian may declare that in theology he is no authority; but he cannot be displaced in this way. He knows so much, and thinks so clearly, in the departments of both science and theology, and he carries such enchantment into the method of his statement, that he is quite sure to command an admiring following, even though his exacting critic may go begging for a hearing.

But under these very royal robes of style, robes woven in the fine loom of the artist's soul, there may easily linger both a snare for the author and a deception for his reader. The poetical, the pictorial mood is not the one which applies mercilessly the logic of fact to theory, nor yet subjects facts themselves to the test of crucible-fires. We have been unable to read this book without being here and there arrested by the suggestion that Professor Drummond's artistic sense must, and at various points, have flooded and submerged his sense of scientific accuracy; that he has unconsciously painted as he would have his picture, and not as the abysmic and compelling facts of nature would often demand. He has a way of applying ethical terms to soulless things. In the vividness of his view he sometimes seems as though assigning moral quality to flowers, the spirit of self-sacrifice to cells, and makes seeds the bread which love has yielded from its own life as food for the world's hunger. If one were dealing simply with poetry, he ought, doubtless, to feel the prick of his own ungraciousness for making such a stricture; but cold and accurate truth requires it to be said that some things to which our author poetically—doubtless poetically, but seemingly with no consciousness of the fact—ascribes consciousness and moral quality are, and must always be so considered, absolutely destitute of both. With no desire certainly to detract from the merits of his book—qualities in which the book is rich—we think its readers cannot be too careful to remember that analogy is not identity, that the prefiguring type is not the coming reality.

3. The prevailing motive for the writing of this book was doubtless to enforce the idea of the unity of creation, to make it more clear that the entire cosmos, as we observe it, from its rudimental elements

to the highest developments of mind and spirit in man, is but the unfolding of one unbroken plan. The conception is sublime. Unity of plan in nature is a conception which, it must be said, commands the assent of thought in the present as never before. But is it so clear that Professor Drummond's view of this unity is the one most demanded by our knowledge? He believes that all higher forms of life are evolved from forms still lower, that animal intelligence is the fountain to which can be traced the regnant genius which now holds its seat only in the human brain. Now, this all may be true; but we cannot see that our author has as yet succeeded in making it so appear.

We have reviewed the dramatic scene which indicates the transition of the universe from a physical to a psychical character. Before the curtain fell man was a mere animal, an instinct savage, a being essentially devoid of rational soul. When the curtain rises, this same being stands alone in the foreground, and "a new thing, spirit, strives within him." This, as a specimen of free-hand drawing, is fascinating. But of how much value is it as proof that man, the self-conscious thinker, the rational and moral spirit, is evolved from any order of life beneath his own? All that Professor Drummond thus assumes may be true. But if evolutional science has no more complete or convincing evidence than is here adduced for the evolvement of man as a psychic and moral being from lower orders of life, then, it must be said, the thinking world is as yet under no bonds to accept this view.

Our author seems impatient of any theory which assumes that the Creator may have wrought or interposed more prominently at one point of time than at another in the process of the unfolding cosmos. His view of the unity of creation seems to be such as to forbid the introduction of any specially creative epochs or acts anywhere along the march of the plan. This view may be correct. But why, in our present ignorance of facts, is it so binding that we assume it as the only truth? That which many generations of wise men have accepted as revelation represents God as having moved in upon our world by different dispensations, as having manifested Himself at sundry times and in divers places. Indefinite ages have intervened since God began His creative work. Science may know much to-day, but it knows far too little to inform us with authority as to just how God may have employed Himself with our cosmos through all the infinite ages in which He has had it in hand. If it has pleased Him here and there to signalize the onward movement of the world's history by establishing periods of distinct creation, it does not, therefore, follow that in the interim of these periods He has been less really or actively present in His own universe. In any event, until evolutional science can more rationally demonstrate its own theories as to the origin of the mental and moral man than thus far it has seemed able to do, it will not be in particularly good taste for it to undertake to laugh out

of court those who are old-fashioned enough to believe that God had some special and distinctive hand in the creation of man.

4. No one can feel the touch of Professor Drummond's spirit without knowing that he is devoutly and beautifully Christian. He closes his book with a eulogy upon Christianity, and designates it as the very efflorescence of that evolutionary process which God has been conducting from the eternal ages. Curiously, we should like to know how the author, himself a pronounced Christian, would adjust his philosophy to some old and seemingly well-established facts of Christian teaching. But as this question is not properly in the field of our present review, we take most respectful leave of an inspiring writer in the pleasant anticipation that, in his own well-chosen time, we shall hear from him again.

IV.—THE ORDER OF THE EVENTS OF THE RESURRECTION MORNING.

By Rev. Jesse H. Jones, North Abington, Mass.

What was the order of the events of the resurrection morning?

Each of the four gospels gives some account of the resurrection; but the four taken together make a tangled maze of story, which, so far as I am aware, no one has ever been able to thread. Dean Alford says: "Of all harmonies those of the incidents of these chapters are to me the most unsatisfactory," and "I have abandoned all idea of harmonizing them throughout." This tangled maze I have attempted to thread, and as the first step toward showing the result the chief of the tangles may well be noted.

1. The first tangle is as to the time when the women reached the tomb. Matthew says, "As it began to dawn"; Mark, "very early on the first day"; Luke, "at the deep dawn"; and John, "early, while it was yet dark." But Mark apparently sets a square contradiction to himself and all the rest in his verse, as follows: "And very early on the first day after the Sabbath they came to the tomb when the sun was risen." Now here the contradiction is plain: for we know that the same persons could not have arrived at the tomb that morning both "very early," "while it was yet dark"; and "when the sun was risen."

2. The second tangle in the maze is as to the time when the angel descended. Matthew makes the impression so strongly that the event took place before the eyes of the women as they were going to the tomb, and after they had said, "Who shall roll us away the stone?" that Dean Alford says, "It must mean that the women were witnesses of the earthquake and that which happened." Moreover, the account in Matthew also carries the impression that the angel who rolled away the stone and sat upon it was sitting there when the women came up,

and from that seat said to them, "Fear not ye"; and it was sunrise then. But John says that Mary Magdalene came to the tomb "while it was yet dark," and he explicitly declares that the stone was rolled away then; yet his narrative plainly implies that the angel was not sitting there on the stone, and that she found no trace of the guard, or had the least hint that any guard had been there. Hence it follows, of course, that the descent of the angel and the fleeing away of the guards had all taken place and been finished before Mary Magdalene came.

3. The third tangle in the maze is concerning the going of the women to the tomb. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all seem to teach that Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and Salome, and Joanna, and others with them, made one group, which went together to the tomb, the first two making it strongly. But no one can read John's narrative carefully without being convinced that, according to him, the Magdalene went to the tomb alone, and long before the others, and that all which happened to her was before the group had reached the tomb at all.

4. The fourth tangle in the maze is concerning the appearance of Jesus to the women. Matthew and Mark not only make a strong impression that Mary Magdalene was one of the group who said among themselves, "Who shall roll us away the stone?" but that impression is carried right along inevitably into that further account found in Matthew alone, of the appearance of Jesus to the women on their return, and makes it seem as though she was one of those who took hold of His feet and worshiped Him. But in the first verse of the addition to Mark (xvi. 9), it is explicitly said that Jesus "appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom He had cast out seven demons"; and this brief account agrees closely with that of John, which describes the appearance in detail, and makes the impression that it all must have happened before the group of the women came to the tomb. Moreover, how could she be one of that group when only a short time before, as John tells us, Jesus said to her, "Touch Me not"?

These are the chief tangles in the maze, to the clearing up of which I hope that what follows may be found a real contribution.

The first event of the series is recorded in Mark xvi. 1, as follows: "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices that they might come and anoint Him." To see what this tells we must realize that the Jews began and ended their day with sundown, just as our fathers did two generations ago. So then the saying, "And when the Sabbath was past," etc., means, now after the Sabbath had ended at sundown, and (secular time) the first day of the week had begun, while the evening twilight yet continued, the women went out and bought spices, and made ready to start early the next morning to embalm the body of Jesus. The mere statement seems to show it true.

The next event was the earthquake with the descent of the angel, the overwhelming effulgence of the glory of the Shekinah, the rolling back of the stone, and the sitting of the angel upon it, and the falling to the earth of the terror-stricken guards. The record of John is conclusive that all of this must have been over, the guards clean gone away, every trace of them disappeared, and of the angel as well, except the rolled-away stone, before Mary reached the tomb "while it was yet dark." At what time in the morning was this "yet dark"? The phrase would naturally imply a time before dawn, and so would agree substantially with the "very early" of Mark, the "deep dawn" of Luke, and the "began to dawn" of Matthew, though perhaps signifying a short time earlier. A study of the sky and almanac for that time of year, making due allowance for the difference of latitude, will enable any one to fix the hour quite closely.

At the time of the Passover, as it fell that year, the sun rose about 5.30, and dawn came about an hour earlier, I should say more rather than less. This would take us back at least to 4.30, more likely to 4 o'clock, as the time when Mary Magdalene reached the tomb; but the descent of the angel and all that came with it were completely past, with no trace left but the rolled-away stone. But that whole movement must have taken some time, which brings us so near to 3 o'clock in the morning that we cannot but recall what that hour is. That is the hour of "the morning watch"; and the Bible student almost instinctively remembers that it was "in the morning watch that the angel of Jehovah looked into the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud." And then it occurs to one that it was the same Jehovah angel who wrought that great work in the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts who wrought this work also, rolling back the stone, so that the mighty One of Israel might come forth from the tomb. This point being reached, it is the natural inference that the hour when the Jehovah angel rolled away the stone and sat upon it was the same as that when he discomfited Egypt of old; and this hour so closely agrees with the requirements of the records, as we have searched them out, that we may fairly conclude it to be the time when the events did occur.

After the descent of the angel and the fleeing away of the guards, the next event was the coming of Mary Magdalene to the tomb. The synoptists, especially the first two, imply that she came with the other women. They are correct in saying that she came to the tomb, and that the other women came to it; but John's narrative shows conclusively that she and they did not come together, but that she came alone and before them. On this point the synoptists have the two events confused together into one, except that the addition to Mark differs from what is before it, declaring that Jesus "appeared first to Mary Magdalene," thus agreeing with and confirming the record of John. These two witnesses, and the conformation of the order of the

events, seem to me together to be conclusive for the position now advanced.

Mary Magdalene then came to the tomb alone first of all the disciples, and reached the place "while it was yet dark," which would be more than an hour before sunrise—the time when the group of women came. She must have started earlier; and to see the conditions under which she came we study the sky again. The time was only three days after the full of the moon, and when it was shining strong and nearly full, clear on to the rising of the sun. Thus it was that there was sufficient light at so early an hour that Mary could thread her way through the narrow streets of the comparatively strange place she was in, to the tomb where the form of her best beloved lay, before a glint of dawn appeared.

When she came to the spot she "seeth the stone taken away from the tomb." Then she runs forthwith, not to the other women, but to Peter and John and tells them; and they go at once, running to the place. And here Luke confirms John, so that we feel sure of our ground. Peter and John came quickly to the tomb, Mary evidently being right with them; and they examined the tomb, as John tells us, and then returned to their home, as Luke says of Peter, wondering in themselves "what had happened." So Mary is left there alone, evidently from the narrative it being yet the gray of the morning, for the fact that she did not recognize Jesus at first, but thought He was the gardener, gives the impression that there was more than her blinding tears to hinder her, and that it was still the dusk of the morning when He appeared to her. Then, at the latest, the hour of this appearance was about 5 o'clock, half an hour before sunrise, the time when the group of women reached the place. Right from this interview "she went and told those who had been with Him, as they mourned and wept," as the addition to Mark says; and who of them could it be that she went to so probably as to those two, Peter and John, to whom she had so few moments before run and told, "They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb"? To them, doubtless, she went, and told them, and whoever were with them, saying, "I have seen the Lord"; and that He had said these things to her. And it is fair to infer that she had reached that place, and was already engaged in recounting her story, even before, perhaps, the group of women, going from another place and by a different route, reached the tomb, "the sun being risen," and they all unknowing of what had taken place with Mary.

The last set of events in the series is what happened to the group of women. "They came to the tomb when the sun was risen." Evidently they knew nothing about the guards, nor about what had happened at the tomb that morning; and so they said, "Who shall roll us away the stone?" When they reached the tomb they found the stone rolled away, as Mary Magdalene had; but as to how it came

to be rolled away they had no knowledge. Then they "entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." And this brings us to the visions of the angels.

A careful examination of the record makes it plain that the synoptists record one event, and John a different event: but from John, Mark, and Luke it is evident that both events happened within the tomb. But a comparison of the accounts of the three synoptists makes it clear that they are describing the same event, whatever their variations may be. Hence it is evident that the angel who speaks in the account in Matthew is not sitting outside the tomb on the stone in his glory, as he appeared to the guard in his descent; but his glory is withdrawn, and he is within the tomb, on guard as it were, and visible only to those who come into such a soul state that the open vision can be vouchsafed to them. As to there being one angel or two, Matthew and Mark speak of one angel, Luke and John of two. Doubtless there were two, but only one spoke; and so a part of the records speak only of that one, while the rest mention both.

If the sun had but just risen when the group of women came to the tomb, surely he would be well above the horizon, and day would be shining broad and clear when they set out on their return from the tomb, as they "went and fled," "and ran to tell His disciples." And as they ran in the broad, shining day, "behold! Jesus met them, saying, All hail!" These women Jesus permitted to take hold of His feet and salute Him; while only an hour before he said to Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not." This clear, strong, complete contrast is conclusive that the Magdalene was not with the rest of the women, but that the two incidents were altogether separate. As soon as Jesus had finished speaking they hastened on their way until they had returned, when they "told all these things to the eleven, and to the rest"; telling them, of course, to Peter and John, to whom Mary Magdalene had so short time before told her equally strange experience. But both stories alike "appeared to them as idle tales, and they disbelieved them."

And now as to the guard and what occurred to them. They alone saw the descent of the angel and the glory, and they alone told it. None of Christ's friends knew anything about that matter till afterward. Moreover, Matthew does not tell the story to show the time when it happened, but to show the event as the reason why the women found the stone rolled away. Hence he mentions the event immediately after he has stated the inquiry of the women among themselves, to show how their question was answered. Therefore, nothing as to the time of the event is to be inferred from its position in the account of Matthew.

There is only one point more to be considered. Matthew says that "while they (the women) were going" to tell the disciples, "behold! some of the guard came into the city, and told the chief priests all

the things which were come to pass." But some one will ask, If the guards were driven away from the tomb about 3 o'clock in the morning, how could it be that it was not till about 6 o'clock, or some three hours after, that they were in the city telling their tale to the chief priests? The answer will easily occur to a military man. The guards were on post under military law. They had been driven from their post by a force that was irresistible, and yet which was so mysterious that it could not be classed with human forces, and it had now disappeared. They could not show it to their superiors in authority, and, as the case stood, they were liable to death for having deserted their post without visible cause. Their fright at the power which drove them from their place of duty, and their terror at what might be done with them for their apparent dereliction from duty, might well make them pause when they were out of sight of the angel, and wait a while till they should recover themselves and consider what they would do. And then this is what they did do: They sent a delegation, "some of the guard came into the city," and those sent told the story for all, to see if they could be released from their penalty. The chief priests saw at once that if the guard should be put on trial, or under any official circumstances should tell the story, it would be established as true forthwith, and all their efforts to stamp out the hated man and His doctrine would be void. So they did as Matthew tells us, giving the soldiers complete assurance of safety, and at the same time making them eager to tell the tale that had been invented for them. But the real facts got out, very likely through Joseph of Arimathea, or Nicodemus, who were both of the Sanhedrin; and so the disciples finally came to know it. Thus it was that "some of the guard" were going into the city some three hours after they had been driven from their post, and at the same time when the women were going into it by another way, those to tell the chief priests, and these to tell the disciples. What different tellings the two were!

Thus have been set forth in natural order all the events of the resurrection morning, and shown to be in full harmony throughout without any conflict. Perhaps I cannot finish this work better than by giving the four accounts in the gospels arranged into a mosaic with every piece in place. Such I believe the following to be:

THE RESURRECTION.*

PART I.

(1) Matt. xxviii. 2-4, (2) Mark xvi. 1, 9-11, (3) Luke xxiv. 12, (4) John xx. 1-18.

1. [2] AND when the Sabbath was passed Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices that they might come and anoint him.

2. [1] And behold there was a great earthquake: for an angel of Jehovah descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it.

*[1], [2], [3], [4], stand for Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John respectively.

3. [1] His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him the guards did quake, and became as dead men.

4. [2] Now, when Jesus was risen the first day after the Sabbath, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons.

5. [4] Now on the first day after the Sabbath Mary Magdalene cometh early while it was yet dark, unto the tomb, and seeth the stone taken waay from the tomb.

6. [4] She runneth, therefore, and cometh unto Simon Peter, and unto the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith to them.

7. [4] They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they put him.

8. [3] Then Peter arose [4] and went forth, and the other disciple, [3] and ran unto the tomb.

9. [4] Now they two ran together; and the other disciple outran Peter, and came first to the tomb.

10. [4] And stooping down he seeth the linen cloths lying, but he did not go in.

11. [4] Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and stooping down he entered into the tomb.

12. [4] And he beholdeth the linen cloths lying alone; and the napkin that was upon his head not lying with the linen cloths, but folded up in a place apart.

13. [4] Then, therefore, entered also the other disciple, who came first unto the tomb; and he saw and believed.

14. [4] For as yet they knew not the scripture that he must arise from the dead.

15. [4] Then the disciples went away again unto their own homes.

16. [3] And he (Peter) departed to his home, wondering unto himself what had happened.

17. [4] But Mary was standing without by the tomb weeping.

18. [4] So as she wept she stooped down into the tomb, and beholdeth two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.

19. [4] And they say to her, Woman, why weepest thou?

20. [4] She saith to them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they put him.

21. [4] Having said this, she turned back, and beholdeth Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.

22. [4] Jesus saith to her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?

23. [4] She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith to him, Sir, if thou hast borne him away, tell me where thou didst put him, and I will take him away.

24. [4] Jesus saith to her, Mary.

25. [4] She, turning herself, saith to him in Hebrew, Rabboni; which is to say, O my Master!

26. [4] Jesus saith to her, Touch me not: for I have not yet ascended unto the Father.

27. [4] But go unto my brethren and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.

28. [4] Mary Magdalene [2] went and told those who had been with him, as they mourned and wept, [4] declaring to the disciples, I have seen the Lord and that he said these things to her.

29. [2] And they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen by her, disbelieved.

PART II.

Matt. xxviii. 1, 5-15, Mark xvi. 2-8, Luke xxiv. 1-11.

1. [1] Now after the Sabbath, [2] very early on the first day after the Sabbath, [3] at early dawn, [1] as it began to dawn into the first day after the Sabbath, [3] they (the women who had come with him out of Galilee) [2] came to the tomb when the sun was risen, [3] bringing the spices which they had prepared.

2. [2] And they said among themselves, Who will roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb?

3. [2] And looking up they see that the stone had been rolled back [3] from the tomb, [2] for it was exceeding great.

4. [3] And they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.

5. [3] And it came to pass while they were much perplexed about this, behold two men stood by them in dazzling apparel.

6. [2] They saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe; and they were amazed.

7. [3] And as they were affrighted, and bowed down their faces to the earth, [1] the angel answered and [2] saith to them:

8. [2] Be not amazed; [1] Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek [2] Jesus, the Nazarene, the crucified.

9. [3] Why seek ye the living among the dead? [1] He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come see the place where he lay: [2] where they laid him.

10. [3] Remember how he spake to you, when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.

11. [3] And they remembered his sayings.

12. [2] But [1] go quickly and tell his disciples [2] and Peter [1] that he is risen from the dead.

13. [1] And behold he goeth before you into Galilee. There shall ye see him, even as he said to you, Behold, I have told you.

14. [1] And they departed quickly, [2] went out and fled, [1] from the tomb with fear and great joy: [2] for trembling and astonishment had come upon them.

15. [2] And they said nothing to any one; for they were affrighted; [1] and they ran to tell his disciples.

16. [1] And behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail!

17. [1] And they came up and took hold of his feet and worshiped him.

18. [1] Then saith Jesus to them, Fear not. Go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me.

19. [3] And they returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to the rest.

20. [3] Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women with them, who told these things unto the apostles.

21. [3] And these sayings appeared to them as idle talk; and they disbelieved them.

22. [1] Now while they were going, behold some of the guard came into the city, and told to the chief priests all the things which were come to pass.

23. [1] And when they had assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money to the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we were asleep.

24. [1] And if this come to a hearing before the governor, we will persuade him, and make you safe.

25. [1] So they took the money, and did as they were taught; and this word has been commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

V.—THE POSITION OF THE VIRGIN MARY DURING THE CRUCIFIXION.

By Henry M. Kieffer, D.D., Easton, Pa.

What position did the mother of our blessed Lord occupy during the crucifixion? Was she, as represented in pictures and in the "Stabat Mater," near the cross, "*Juxta crucem lachrymosa*"; or was she at some distance from the cross, or partly the one and partly the other? The synoptists represent her as standing "afar off" with "the many women" and "Mary Magdalene." If the first three Evangelists are correct in their account, how could Christ speak to His mother and to St. John, and how can St. John's account be reconciled with this? for *he* says, "Now, there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene."

If we had only the account of the synoptists, we could not be certain that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was there at all, or if there, she must have been afar off, at least during a portion of the time. And if we had only St. John's Gospel, we should picture Mary, the mother of Jesus, as standing close to the cross and not afar off. How is this difficulty to be reconciled? Or are both statements somehow true? We may perhaps be better prepared for our study of the subject if we here draw out the four different accounts of the matter given by the four Evangelists:

St. Matthew.	St. Mark.	St. Luke.	St. John.
"And many women were there, beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto Him: among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children."	"There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome (who also, when He was in Galilee followed Him and ministered unto Him); and many other women which came up with Him unto Jerusalem."	"And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed Him from Galilee, stood afar off beholding these things."	"Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. "When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by, whom He loved, He saith unto His mother, Woman, behold thy Son! Then saith He to the disciple, Behold thy mother! and from that hour that disciple took her unto his own *home*."

These statements are apparently contradictory, St. John saying that the women stood "by the cross," the other three Evangelists (though not mentioning the mother of Jesus) saying that they stood "afar off." St. John makes no mention of women save as standing near the cross; the synoptists make no mention of women except of such as stood "afar off."

It may be that the contradiction is only seeming and not real. Perhaps the two accounts view the case from different standpoints, and make their report of how things were *at different stages of the crucifixion.* This is the more probable, as it is observed from an examination of the context that St. John reports the women as standing by the cross *in the early stages of the crucifixion*, while the other three mention the group of women as standing afar off *at the close of it.* May not this afford us a clue to the solution of the difficulty?

Suppose we imagine this group of four women as accompanying our Lord to Golgotha, and as standing near the cross during the preparations for the sad work. Jesus is divested of His garments, laid out on His cross, nailed thereon, and the cross is erected. At this point we believe the mother of our Lord to have left the dreadful scene. Indeed, one can hardly understand why she and the other women with her should not have withdrawn ere this, from womanly feelings of modesty, if for no other reason. We believe that when Jesus was divested of His garments and about to be nailed to His cross, He committed His mother to St. John, and *he took her away at once.* Alford, in commenting on the passage, says: "'*From that time*' is probably to be taken literally, so that she was spared the pangs of witnessing what was to follow. If so, St. John returned again to the cross. That he took her to his own home—εἰς τὰ ἴδια—need not imply that John had a home in Jerusalem: it would apply to his lodging during the feast. The meaning is that henceforth wherever he was she was an inmate with him."

It may well be that our Saviour wished her to be removed, in mercy to her. We know not. But note the fact, first, that she is said by St. John to be with the other three women at the cross up to this time, and secondly, that the other women at the conclusion of the crucifixion are represented by the other Evangelists as being "afar off." Why afar off? Why did they not remain where, by St. John's account, they had so far been, "by the cross of Jesus"? What could have occurred to take them away? What would naturally take them away? What more natural than the removal of Mary by St. John? If he, then, in the earlier stages of the crucifixion, took her away, the other women would naturally go along; and this will, then, account for their being found later "beholding afar off." On the other hand, if the mother of Jesus remained to the end of the dread scene, would not they likely have done the same?

But the question remains: Was the mother of Jesus in that group "afar off"? Or has St. John taken her elsewhere? But where else *would* he take her, except in that little group of blessed women yonder, beholding afar off? These were indeed for St. John the beginning of those τὰ ἴδια to which from that very moment he took her, for he had no home in Jerusalem, so far as we know. Having spent all the time with the Saviour at Bethany during the feast, he would not be

likely to have a hired lodging in the city. He may be supposed to have taken her to some friend's house; but it is worthy of being considered whether St. John would likely have absented himself from the cross for so long a time as would have been necessary to convey her there. The place of the cross was, indeed, "nigh to the city," though it may well have been at some considerable distance from such a supposed friend's house. And, besides, the roads and streets being now full of people, it would have required much time to make their way through the crowded thoroughfares.

We know from what St. John says about his seeing the spear thrust into Jesus's side, that he was again at the cross at the conclusion of the crucifixion. There may, nevertheless, have been ample time to have taken Mary to some friend's house; but is such a supposition necessary? "From that hour he took her to his own"—not "home," as the English Version has it—but rather "to his own things," εἰς τὰ ἴδια—an expression which will comprehend not only a house or home, but friends and fortune as well.

And in whose care could he or would he more naturally leave the mother of our Lord than in that of these women who are mentioned as standing afar off at the conclusion of Calvary's dread scene? They had so far been her attendants: why not preeminently so now? What was it that took them afar off but the desire to be with her and to comfort her? True, the synoptists do not name her in this group, though they do mention "many other women," among whom the Virgin Mother may possibly have been.

On this point Alford says (Note on Matt. xxvii. 56) "Matthew and Mark both omit Mary the mother of Jesus. But we are to remember that, if we are to take the group as here described at this moment, she was not present, having been, as I believe (see note on John, verse 27), led away by the beloved disciple on the speaking of the words, 'Behold thy mother.' *And if this view be objected to*" (even Alford is not sure: the matter admits of doubt), "yet she could not be named here nor in Mark, except separately from these three, for she could not have been among those 'who ministered unto Him.'" Perhaps, then, this may be the reason why they do not mention her.

Alford also says at this same place: "There must have been another group of His disciples within sight, including Thomas, who said, 'Except I see the print of the nails,' etc., and the rest, to whom He showed His hands and feet."

Meyer says: "The Evangelist (Matthew) chooses to name just these (Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and Salome), *without excluding the mother of Jesus* and the other ministering women."

Schaff, in a note in Lange, says: "To account for the omission of Mary by Matthew and Mark, we must suppose either that she had at that time left the cross with John, who took her to his home, . . . or

that there were different groups. There must have been another group of disciples, including John and others, to whom He showed the nail-prints. Compare Luke's 'all His acquaintance' (masculine, *ὅι γνωστοὶ*). The previous flight of the disciples does not exclude their return to witness the scene 'afar off.'"

Stier says: "Jesus feels that more awful sufferings, the last fearful conflict, draw nigh, and therefore provides for her (Mary's) earlier departure from the place."

We see thus how much supposition there is here. Scarcely any two of our best commentators agree.

One thing seems to the writer certain: that the prevailing conception of the Virgin Mother of our Lord remaining at the foot of the cross, and throughout all the stages of the crucifixion to its conclusion, is a misconception, for which we are more indebted to an uninspired art than to the Word of God. The paintings do indeed so represent her: so too does the beautiful "Stabat Mater." Yet neither the one nor the other is an inspired authority. Both are guesses—none the less that they have become permanent guesses. Indeed, it is a question worthy of being considered how far these representations of painting and poetry were the outgrowth or the accompaniment of the worship of the Virgin in medieval times. It were evidently in the interest of the Roman Church to represent the Virgin as close and as constant to the cross as possible.

SERMONIC SECTION.

AN UNRISEN CHRIST.

By Richard S. Storrs, D.D. [Congregational], Brooklyn, N. Y.

And if Christ be not risen.—1 Cor. xv. 14.

It is an appalling supposition: we almost stand aghast before it as presented to us by an inspired apostle. There are some suppositions which we are angry to have made when they concern even the things of present worth. If any one say to us, Suppose it turns out that all of your coins and bars of gold are nothing but brass and gilded lead; that all of your title-deeds to property are worthless; that your nearest friend, most intimate in your life, is merely a crafty impostor; that with all the appearances of health which you have there is in you a disease before which death is imminent—we do not wish such suppositions made to us, and we are offended and angry when they are; and yet they concern only the earth and our earthly experience. But this supposition of Paul goes farther and reaches higher. If Christ be not risen, what he affirms as the consequence is palpably true; then is our preaching unmeaning; then is your faith empty of power and purifying knowledge. But there are other consequences than these which he did not mention, and perhaps could not bear to particularlize, on which it is meet for us to dwell.

If Christ be not risen, then death has absolute power in the world. If the cross of mankind kills, so that there can be no future making alive, then

Christ Himself becomes the greatest witness to this fact; the wisest and most powerful and purest of men having no defense against death and no power afterward of returning into life. That is true if Christ be not risen; and every grave is sealed forever, and death is the signal of eternal sleep. Then all the prophecies which went before concerning the Messiah are superfluous, extravagant, and false. When Simon spoke to Him as the Son of God on earth, the Lord of Glory, before whom the beautiful gates were opened; when Hosea and Daniel and all the others pointed to this mighty King of Israel and King of the world—it was not an utterance inspired from on high, and full of truth and authority, it was simply the fancy of their own mistaken minds. It cannot be that all this line of prophecy was intended to terminate upon the life of a young man dying at thirty-three, hardly known at all outside of a small section of country, and whose remembrance and influence naturally closed with His death. We might as well suppose one of the ancient aqueducts, built with its mighty arches spanning Campagna, league after league, and reaching back into the five hills, was constructed by imperial enterprise and ambition in order to bring to the city a few trickling drops of water that should close their flow after the first hour had passed. And then there goes back a dismal doubt to us, to say the least, over all the miracles which are recorded as having been wrought by the Master—back to the divine. It is not credible that the swell of harps in the heavens, of angelic instruments, should have celebrated the coming to earth of a human being; yes, and after a little to have His life crushed out in bloody destruction by the rage of the Jews and by the Roman nails and spears. We doubt everything in the miracle if this last miracle is not maintained, "if Christ be not risen," as says the apostle. And then He is not the unique and holy Son of God. There is no other authority, no other significance, in His declaration of truth and duty, than belongs to a wise and instructed man. He is not declaring to us the thought of the Almighty, He is not giving us the revelation as He sees it, and the discovery in the way of life as it lies before His divine mind; but He is giving us theories such as other men give, out of the Christian world as well as within it; there is no authority in what He says. If He be merely the man Jesus, crushed on the cross and not rising after it, then there was not a voluntary element in His death. He was killed because He could not help it. He was killed because the spearhead of the Roman pierced the flesh and divided the heart. He was killed because those around Him determined that He should be, and He had no power of resistance, no power of rising again. And so there is in His death no voluntary element and there is no remission of sin, for that comes with the voluntary sacrifice of the Master on behalf of those who are sinners—as He said Himself, "My blood shed for many, for the remission of sins"; "My life, which I give for the life of the world." Then there is no present Lord in whom we may trust, to whom we may consecrate ourselves, on whom we may depend, praying to Him for life and succor and all that we need; and there is no living Lord in His kingdom on the earth, and there is nothing to come except confusion and disaster, such as was before His disciples; nothing at the end of it but destruction, as there was nothing for His life on the earth, lofty and lovely as it was, except final death, from which there was no return.

There is no Gospel—it is literally true—there is no Gospel "if Christ be not risen"; no glad tidings of great joy to be proclaimed to the world; no mighty announcement of life beyond the grave; His words concerning that are merely human words and uncertain. He had no power to open to us the horizons of life out beyond the grave,

closing on earth. We cannot know that anything which He said of the future is certainly true, if He did not illustrate and exemplify what He said in His own actual resurrection; otherwise His words are mere day-dreams in the air. Then the Bible is rent in every part; the prophecies, songs, gospels, acts, epistles, and revelations too, torn into strips. There is no authority for the Scripture and no truth in it; no Son of God dying by His own consent, and rising again for the glory of God and the welfare of man.

Now, these are not suppositions which are drawn out extravagantly in order to show the value of that superstition, "if Christ be not risen." These are the things which men affirm who deny the resurrection. They say frankly, "Christ was a human person, like any one else, only better in character and perhaps with a subtler intuition of truth, but He died and was buried, and that was the end; and the ancient prophecies have no authority for it; and the testimony of gospels and of the apostles in their epistles has no authority; and we deny the divine nature and supremacy of the Master on earth."

These are the results: "if Christ be not risen," then is our preaching unmeaning; then your faith is empty and vain. But also these consequences follow in this epistle before us: that death is the triumphant conqueror of the world, and there is no escape or hope of anything afterward; and that the prophecies are vain and fictitious, and miracles are legendary and fanciful and poetic. There is no unique Son of God in the world, and His death was not voluntary, and therefore not for the remission of sin any more than the death of any martyr; and what He told us of the life beyond the grave was altogether a human suggestion. He did not illustrate it in His own experience, and He is not the living Lord whom we can trust; not a living Lord to carry His kingdom in the world, and the Bible is wrong and there is no Gospel. Death is more terrible, and the world is gloomier, and the grave is more appalling, and the future more awful than if there had not shot over the earth a gleam of apparent illumination from the coming of the Christ and the rising of the Lord.

You have seen the landscape on a dull and murky day, how, with a sudden shock of light shot upon it, it seemed all illumined, and the clouds closed again, and the landscape was darker and gloomier than before by reason of the contact with that solitary and fleeting gleam of splendor. So it is with the world. "If Christ be not risen," as the apostle presents the supposition, then is the world lonelier and darker than ever before He came.

It seems as if Paul's hand must have trembled as he wrote the word; that his voice must have trembled as he dictated it to another; and so he seems to hurry on to the sublime affirmation which stands only a few verses after, in the 20th verse, "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." That dismal and dreary supposition which I made a moment ago, "if Christ be not risen," was only a rumor against it that it might illuminate this majestic fact, "but now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that sleep."

Think of the consequences reversing the others which followed from the admission of that transcendent act; to him so marvelous; to him so full of glory and promise, and to us, I trust, as well. Christ is risen from the dead; then all this prophecy in the earlier time is true and has been fulfilled, and all the miracles related of Him take versimilitude, become probable beforehand, as we look back from the resurrection, sublimest of them all, in which they all come to their climax and consummation, which irradiates all that went before, walking on the sea, and breaking bread for the multitude, and turning water into wine, and opening

the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, and lifting the dead into life again. He could do it all; in Him was power to lift Himself into life after death and break the gates of the sepulcher. All this: and then we have this Son of God in the world, and we can listen to His words, tender as those of human friends and authoritative as those of God Himself, speaking within, and hear every gracious invitation and promise, and know that underneath it and behind it is divine wisdom and life and eternal being.

Then His death was voluntary. He arose from the dead after death; then all the world combined could not have taken His life, even to dim it in its luster, unless He consented. It was a voluntary death. He walked toward it, knowing what was coming. He took it upon Himself. It was for a sufficient purpose, that He might make redemption for man, atonement for the sin of the world, blotting out our transgression from the book of God's remembrance. Then He is with us, and we may trust Him, and He is with His kingdom, carrying it forward, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. Then what He said of the other life is true. He showed it in His example and life; and we ought to obey His word, to be His disciples when the time comes, and should glory in the expectation. Then we have the old Bible back; that which has been the foundation of civilization in every land which has possessed it; that which God makes the Book for the world. We do not strike out one part or another part of the prophecy on record; we have the whole compacted together by this mighty keystone in the arch, the resurrection of the Son of God and the glorious manifestation given by Him as the divine representative and Son in the world. Then the world is beautiful; it is not a place of graves; it is a place of graves that are to be opened. It is not the city of the dead. They who are dead to human view are living unto God. It is a portal of paradise instead of a place of graves, and there is light upon it every Easter morning such as never was before on sea or shore until the Master had risen from the grave.

These are the consequences of that great affirmation of the apostle. "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that sleep." It is almost as if he said, Pardon me for the supposition, dismal and dreary, involving the world in gloom and overshadowing your hearts with fear, anxiety, and dread, "if Christ be not risen." Oh, let the thought go, for "now is Christ risen from the dead," and through Him the horizons of life are widened and the heavens are open and the glory comes into view.

There are two thoughts which I will suggest briefly, which we may well consider in view of this; and the first, of course, is, what reason we have for gratitude to God, profound and constant, that He has given us proof of the resurrection of Christ, so ample, so full of meaning, so absolute in its power to produce conviction on any reasonable man. He might have left a mere verbal statement of it, and then the aspiring and believing spirit might have accepted it. But He has given us such testimony to it as cannot be brought to the establishment of any other historical fact in the world. It is certain that the death of the Master was complete. It was not His friends merely who saw that death, though they saw it and were overwhelmed with sadness and grief in view of it. They heard his last words; they could almost see the spirit passing out from the closing lips. They knew He was dead. The soldiers knew it—they who had, with determined and stolid rage, carried Him to His death—and they were proficient in the signs of death. Many things they did not know. They knew the phenomena of death as well as any surgeon in the world to-day knows it, and they pronounced Him dead. And the Jews,

raging against Him, knew that He was dead. They had seen it and they heard the testimony of the soldiers and the testimony of those who loved Him. They were triumphant in their knowledge that at last they had killed Him and He was out of their way forevermore, this falsely-pretending Messiah, as they held Him to be. And modern surgical science has even demonstrated the physical occasion of His death in the legend of the heart. It was death, public, not private; then there might have been a simulation. It was a death the result of a judicial process, a death inflicted by anger and by brutal power. It was not a death the result of disease; it was a death the result of determined violence, which was to be satisfied with nothing but the accomplished purpose. Certainly He was dead; if testimony can prove anything, that was proved. And it is as certain that He was seen again in life, and seen by many. Testimony to that is as absolute. It is the testimony of His friends, who knew Him personally and could not be deceived as to His identity—friends who were not expecting the event, by which their minds, as it were, were almost overwhelmed, as if they had seen a spirit. It was the testimony of those who could not understand what they saw, but it was before their eyes. And they were incredulous to the last, like Thomas, "Except I see the hand and the side, I will not believe." They could not believe and would not; and yet they testified that they saw Him again, and they could not be deceived in regard to it. It was not the testimony of those who saw Him for a moment in a passing glimpse, but of those who saw Him repeatedly at intervals, here, there, and elsewhere, during a period of forty days. It was the testimony given by those who were ready to seal their witness by their blood, and who did it against the rod of the Jew, against the proud malice and hate of the Roman. They testified to this fact that they had seen Him—500 of them at once; many of whom, Paul says, were living at the time when he was writing to the Corinthians, twenty-two or twenty-five years afterward. If any testimony can prove any fact, this fact of the reappearance of Christ after His completed death is established. Unless all judicial processes of inquiry into alleged facts are mere confusion and bewilderment, this fact is established certainly, upon constant evidence, by a sufficient number of unimpeachable witnesses.

You have heard the vision of heaven which came unto Stephen in the agony of his death, and that given to Paul on the way to Damascus; and the evidence of that testimony of St. Paul cannot be overstated. In blinding glory he saw the Lord and heard His voice. The persecutor became the apostle, and he who hunted Christians to the death preached the Lord to all whom he could reach.

It is an event, this of the resurrection, which is demonstrated by the effect of it on the spirit of the apostles. Take Peter, for example. Here he is before the Master has come to the cross in the early hours of that Friday morning. Frightened by circumstances, he denies three times that he knows the man at all. His whole spirit has gone into a collapse of utter fear. The Master is taken and carried to the cross; it seems to make this appear more complete, if possible, and a permanent impression in Peter's life. On the other hand, he met the Jews and declares to them this risen Christ, preaches to them with power and earnestness which they cannot withstand. "This Jesus, whom you, with wicked hands, have crucified and slain, has God raised from the dead, whereof ye are witnesses; therefore repent, every one of you." This was the man who was frightened almost to death by the question of the servant in the house. There is some element there which you must concede, in order to account for the collapse on the one hand and the consummation on the other—the utter

timidity and the absolute courage; and the only way to explain it is this fact of the resurrection of Christ: that explains everything.

Think of that early Church, with mechanics and slaves, tinkers and weavers, as a philosopher of the time said, thinking to withstand the Roman power. You might as well set an eggshell to withstand the stroke of a ball from a mighty gun. Something held them together; gave them continual inspiration; something told them that the Church was to live and be triumphant; and in the entire development of Christians afterward the same spirit went on in them. Christendom never came from an unbroken grave. It would have been buried in that grave, as Judas thought it was going to be, and as the Jews thought it was going to be, except there had been a resurrection from the dead. Then you can explain Christendom, Churches, and literatures, if Christ rose again; but otherwise they cannot be explained at all. Our whole civilization rests on the broken Cross of the Master, and it is incredible that a civilization like this, in a world advancing steadily for eighteen centuries, has been founded on a lie. You impeach the sanity of the race in that statement. No, it is founded upon a rock, the faith of the Christian. It is founded upon his own present experiences. We see Christ clear to us in our hour of extreme need, when we come to Him in prayer and rise to Him in praise; and we see Him in His kingdom, turning difficulties into instruments of advance, overcoming obstacles by means unperceived beforehand, and converting disaster itself into victory.

Yes, these are the consequences of the fact affirmed by the apostle, and blessed be God that He has not left it to a written statement; that He has built the truth of the resurrection of Christ into the history of mankind. He has made it as certain as if it were written on the arch of heaven. That is the reason for gratitude. With what joy should we welcome the coming of the day which reminds us of this stupendous fact in the history of the world—the Cross of Christ and the resurrection that followed; redemption and heaven side by side! Every Lord's day should bring its note of triumph into our life. It is not for meditation only on philosophical or theological themes; it is not for grief only, though that is appropriate as we meditate on our sin; but every Lord's day should give noble impulse to our spiritual life, lift us to higher elevations of thought and aspiration and expectation, and send us forth equipped better than before for life's struggle, conquerors of the world. That is the usefulness, privilege, and glory of the Lord's day, and every service ought to have that note of triumph in it. The grave is broken; that is the meaning and suggestion of every service of the Lord's house. Most of all, when the very anniversary comes and we are carried back to the cross and to the sepulcher from which the Master came, should this note of triumph be in our hearts or on our lips: songs of triumphant praise should sound from organ and voice. When we go home, it should be with a feeling that the world is consecrated, the sepulcher has been broken, and that life is lovelier than ever, and duty more beautiful, and death not terrible. So we should walk with an elastic step, with a light shining over our faces and in our eyes, and with music on our lips as we go to our homes; and if any one ask, Whence came this new expression? Whence came this sweeter and more victorious tone? we should be able to say to them, It is natural, for to-day I have walked with the risen Christ; to-day I have walked as conqueror of the Cross with Him who conquered it; to-day I have walked near the gates which He entered who broke the bars of the sepulcher and ascended in glory to heaven.

CHRISTIANITY supplied what stoicism never possessed—love and humanity. —*Lorimer.*

RESURRECTION DAY.

BY T. DEWITT TALMAGE, D.D. [PRESBYTERIAN], NEW YORK CITY.

And the field of Ephron, which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre, the field and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, that were in all the borders round-about, were made sure unto Abraham. —Gen. xxiii. 17, 18.

HERE is the first cemetery ever laid out. Machpelah was its name. It was an arborescent beauty, where the wound of death was bandaged with foliage. Abraham, a rich man, not being able to bribe the king of terrors, proposes here, as far as possible, to cover up the ravages. He had no doubt previously noticed this region; and now that Sarah, his wife, had died —that remarkable person, who, at ninety years of age, had born to him the son Isaac, and who now, after she had reached one hundred and twenty-seven years, had expired—Abraham is negotiating for a family plot for her last slumber. Ephron owned this real estate, and after, in mock sympathy for Abraham, refusing to take anything for it, now sticks on a big price—four hundred shekels of silver. The cemetery lot is paid for and the transfer made in the presence of witnesses in a public place, for there were no deeds and no halls of record in those early times. Then in a cavern of limestone rock Abraham put Sarah, and a few years after himself followed, and then Isaac and Rebekah, and then Jacob and Leah. Embowered, picturesque, and memorable Machpelah! That "God's acre" dedicated by Abraham has been the mother of innumerable mortuary observances. The necropolis of every civilized land has vied with its metropolis.

The most beautiful hills of Europe outside the great cities are covered with obelisk, and funeral-vase, and arched gateways, and columns, and parterres in honor of the inhumated. The Appian Way of Rome was bordered by sepulchral commemorations. For this purpose Pisa has its arcades of marble sculptured into excellent bas-reliefs and the features of dear faces that have vanished. Genoa has its terraces cut into tombs, and Constantinople covers with cypress the silent habitations; and Paris has its Père la Chaise, on whose heights rest Balzac, and David, and Marshal Ney, and Cuvier, and La Place, and Molière, and a mighty group of warriors and painters and musicians. In all foreign nations utmost genius on all sides is expended in the work of interment, mummification, and incineration.

Our own country consents to be second to none in respect to the lifeless body. Every city and town and neighborhood of any intelligence or virtue has, not many miles away, its sacred enclosure, where affection has engaged sculptor's chisel and florist's spade and artificer in metals. Our own city has shown its religion, as well as its art, in the manner in which it holds the memory of those who have passed forever away, by its Cypress Hills, and its Evergreens, and its Calvary and Holy Cross cemeteries. All the world knows of our Greenwood, with now about two hundred and seventy-five thousand inhabitants sleeping among the hills that overlook the sea, and by lakes, embosomed in an Eden of flowers, our American Westminster Abbey, an Acropolis of mortuary architecture, a Pantheon of mighty ones ascended, elegies in stone, Iliads in marble, whole generations in peace waiting for other generations to join them. No dormitory of breathless sleepers in all the world has so many mighty dead.

Among the preachers of the Gospel, Bethune, and Thomas DeWitt, and Bishop Janes, and Tyng, and Abeel the missionary, and Beecher, and Buddington, and McClintock, and Inskip, and Bangs, and Chapin, and Noah Schenck, and Samuel Hudson Cox. Among musicians the renowned Gottschalk and the holy Hastings. Among philanthro-

pists, Peter Cooper, and Isaac T. Hopper, and Lucretia Mott, and Isabella Graham, and Henry Bergh, the apostle of mercy to the brute creation. Among the literati, the Carys, Alice and Phœbe; James K. Paulding and John G. Saxe. Among journalists, Bennett, and Raymond, and Greeley. Among scientists, Ormsby Mitchell, warrior as well as astronomer, and lovingly called by his soldiers "Old Stars;" Prof. Proctor and the Drapers, splendid men, as I well know, one of them my teacher, the other my classmate.

Among inventors, Elias Howe, who through the sewing machine did more to alleviate the toils of womanhood than any man that ever lived, and Prof. Morse, who gave us magnetic telegraphy; the former doing his work with the needle, the latter with the thunderbolt. Among physicians and surgeons, Joseph C. Hutchinson, and Marion Sims, and Dr. Valentine Mott, with the following epitaph, which he ordered cut in honor of Christian religion: "My implicit faith and hope is in a merciful Redeemer, who is the resurrection and the life. Amen and amen." This is our American Machpelah, as sacred to us as the Machpelah in Canaan, of which Jacob uttered that pastoral poem in one verse: "There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife, and there I buried Leah."

At this Easter service I ask and answer what may seem a novel question; but it will be found, before I get through, a practical and useful and tremendous question: What will resurrection day do for the cemeteries? First, I remark, it will be their supernal beautification. At certain seasons it is customary in all lands to strew flowers over the mounds of the departed. It may have been suggested by the fact that Christ's tomb was in a garden; and when I say garden I do not mean a garden of these latitudes. The late frosts of spring and the early frosts of autumn are so near each other that there are only a few months of flowers in the field. All the flowers we see today had to be petted and coaxed and put under shelter, or they would not have bloomed at all. They are the children of the conservatories. But at this season and through the most of the year the Holy Land is all ablush with floral opulence.

You find all the royal family of flowers there, some that you supposed indigenous to the far North, and others indigenous to the far South—the daisy and hyacinth, crocus and anemone, tulip and water lily, geranium and ranunculus, mignonette and sweet marjoram. In the college at Beirut you may see Dr. Post's collection of about one thousand eight hundred kinds of Holy-Land flowers; while among trees are the oaks of frozen climes, and the tamarisk of the tropics, walnut and willow, ivy and hawthorne, ash and elder, pine and sycamore. If such floral and botanical beauties are the wild growths of the field, think of what a garden must be in Palestine! And in such a garden Jesus Christ slept after, on the soldier's spear, His last drop of blood had coagulated. And then see how appropriate that all our cemeteries should be floralized and tree-shaded! In June, Greenwood is Brooklyn's garden.

"Well, then," you say, "how can you make out that resurrection day will beautify the cemeteries? Will it not leave them a plowed-up ground? On that day there will be an earthquake, and will not this split the polished Aberdeen granite, as well as the plain slab that can afford but two words—'Our Mary,' or 'Our Charley'?" Well, I will tell you how resurrection day will beautify the cemeteries. It will be by bringing up the faces that were to us once, and in our memoires are to us now, more beautiful than any calla lily, and the forms that are to us more graceful than any willow by the waters. Can you think of anything more beautiful than the reappearance of those from whom we have been

parted? I do not care which way the tree falls in the blast of the judgment hurricane, or if the plowshare that day shall turn under the last roseleaf and the last china aster, if out of the broken sod shall come the bodies of our loved ones, not damaged, but irradiated.

The idea of the resurrection gets easier to understand as I hear the phonograph unroll some voice that talked into it a year ago, just before our friend's decease. You touch the lever and then come forth the very tones, the very song of the person, that breathed into it once, but is now departed. If a man can do that, cannot Almighty God, without half-trying, return the voice of your departed? And if he can return the voice, why not the lips and the tongue and the throat that fashioned the voice? And if the lips and tongue and the throat, why not the brain that suggested the words? And if the brain, why not the nerves, of which the brain is the headquarters? And if He can return the nerves, why not the muscles, which are less ingenious? And if the muscles, why not the bones, that are less wonderful? And if the voice and the brain and the muscles and the bones, why not the entire body? If man can do the phonograph, God can do the resurrection.

Will it be the same body that in the last day shall be reanimated? Yes, but infinitely improved. Our bodies change every seven years, and yet, in one sense, each is the same body. On my wrist and the second finger of my right hand there is a scar. I made that at twelve years of age, when, disgusted at the presence of two warts, I took a red hot iron and burned them off and burned them out. Since then my body has changed at least half a dozen times, but those scars prove it is the same body. We never lose our identity. If God can and does sometimes rebuild a man five, six, ten times, in this world, is it mysterious that He can rebuild him once more, and that in the resurrection? If He can do it ten times, I think He can do it eleven times. Then look at the seventeen-year locusts. For seventeen years gone, at the end of seventeen years they appear, and by rubbing the hind leg against the wing make that rattle at which all the husbandmen and vine-dressers tremble as the insectile host takes up the march of devastation. Resurrection every seventeen years, a wonderful fact!

Another consideration makes the idea of resurrection easier. God made Adam. He was not fashioned after any model. There had never been a human organism, and so there was nothing to copy. At the first attempt God made a perfect man. He made him out of the dust of the earth. If out of ordinary dust of the earth and without a model God could make a perfect man, surely out of the extraordinary dust of mortal body, and with millions of models, God can make each one of us a perfect being in the resurrection. Surely the last undertaking would not be greater than the first. See the Gospel algebra: ordinary dust minus a model equals a perfect man; extraordinary dust and plus a model equals a resurrection body. Mysteries about it? Oh, yes; that is one reason why I believe it. It would not be much of a God who could do things only as far as I can understand. Mysteries? Oh, yes; but no more about the resurrection of your body than about its present existence.

I will explain to you the last mystery of the resurrection, and make it as plain to you as that two and two make four, if you will tell me how your mind, which is entirely independent of your body, can act upon your body, so that at your will your eyes open, or your foot walks, or your hand is extended. So I find nothing in the Bible statement concerning the resurrection that staggers me for a moment. All doubts clear from my mind. I say that the cemeteries, however beautiful now, will be more beautiful when the bodies of our loved ones come up in the morning of the resurrection.

They will come in improved condition. They will come up rested. The most of them lay down at the last very tired. How often you have heard them say, "I am so tired!" The fact is, it is a tired world. If I should go through this audience, and go around the world, I could not find a person in any style of life ignorant of the sensation of fatigue. I do not believe there are fifty persons in this audience who are not tired. Your head is tired, or your back is tired, or your foot is tired, or your brain is tired, or your nerves are tired. Long journeying, or business application, or bereavement, or sickness has put on you heavy weights. So the vast majority of those who went out of this world went out fatigued. About the poorest place to rest is in this world. Its atmosphere, its surroundings, and even its hilarities are exhausting. So God stops our earthly life, and mercifully closes the eyes, and more especially gives quiescence to the lungs and heart that have not had ten minutes' rest from the first respiration and the first beat.

If a drummer-boy were compelled in the army to beat his drum for twenty-four hours without stopping, his officer would be court-martialed for cruelty. If the drummer-boy should be compelled to beat his drum for a week without ceasing, day and night, he would die in attempting it. But under your vestment is a poor heart that began its drum-beat for the march of life thirty, or forty, or sixty, or eighty years ago, and it has had no furlough by day or by night; and whether in conscious or comatose state it went right on, for if it had stopped seven seconds your life would have closed. And your heart will keep going until some time after your spirit has flown, for the auscultator says that after the last expiration of lung and the last throb of pulse, and after the spirit is released, the heart keeps on beating for a time. What a mercy, then, it is that the grave is the place where that wondrous machinery of ventricle and artery can halt!

Under the healthful chemistry of the soil, all the wear and tear of nerve and muscle and bone will be subtracted and that bath of good, fresh, clean soil will wash off the last ache; and then some of the same style of dust out of which the body of Adam was constructed may be infused into the resurrection body. How can the bodies of the human race, which have had no replenishment from the dust since the time of Adam in Paradise, get any recuperation from the storehouse from which he was constructed without our going back into the dust? That original life-giving material having been added to the body as it once was, and all the defects left behind, what a body will be the resurrection body! And will not hundreds of thousands of such appearing above the Gowanus Heights make Greenwood more beautiful than any June morning after a shower? The dust of the earth being the original material for the fashioning of the first human being, we have to go back to the same place to get a perfect body.

There will be no doorknob on the inside of our family sepulcher, for we cannot come out of ourselves; but there is a door knob on the outside, and that Jesus shall lay hold of, and, opening, will say: "Good morning! You have slept long enough! Arise! Arise!" And then what a flutter of wings, and what flashing of rekindled eyes, and what gladsome rushing across the family lot, with cries of "Father, is that you?" "Mother, is that you?" "My darling, is that you?" How you all have changed! The cough gone, the croup gone, the consumption gone, the paralysis gone, the weariness gone. Come, let us ascend together! The older ones first, the younger ones next! Quick, now, get into line! The skyward procession has already started! Steer now by that embankment of cloud for the nearest gate! And, as we ascend, on one side the earth gets smaller until it is no larger than a mountain, and smaller until it is no larger than a palace, and smaller

until it is no larger than a ship, and smaller until it is no larger than a wheel, and smaller until it is no larger than a speck.

Farewell, dissolving earth! But, on the other side, as we rise, heaven at first appears no larger than your hand. And nearer it looks like a chariot, and nearer it looks like a throne, and nearer it looks like a star, and nearer it looks like a sun, and nearer it looks like a universe. Hail, scepters that shall always wave! Hail, anthems that shall always roll! Hail, companionships never again to part! That is what resurrection day will do for all the cemeteries and graveyards, from the Machpelah that was opened by Father Abraham in Hebron to the Machpelah yesterday consecrated. And that makes Lady Huntington's immortal rhythm most apposite:

When thou, my righteous Judge, shalt come
To take Thy ransomed people home,
Shall I among them stand?
Shall such a worthless worm as I,
Who sometimes am afraid to die,
Be found at Thy right hand?

Among Thy saints let me be found,
Whene'er th' archangel's trump shall sound,
To see Thy smiling face;
Then loudest of the throng I'll sing,
While heaven's resounding arches ring
With shouts of sovereign grace.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

BY REV. T. W. YOUNG, LOUISVILLE, KY.

If a man die, shall he live again?—Job xiv. 14.

There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.—Acts xxiv. 15.

THE only positive and satisfactory answer to the question of Job is given in the New-Testament teachings, in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The immortality of the soul is closely, though not essentially, connected with the resurrection of the body. Outside of Christian circles death has always been the king of terrors. We find among the heathen a strong belief, in an abstract way, in the immortality of the soul, but no definite belief in the resurrection of the body. The nearest approach to the Christian doctrine of the resurrection is the popular philosophical notion of metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls. But their immortality was, even at the best, a sad and gloomy immortality, instead of which they would gladly have preferred the present life in the flesh. "Instead of a Paradise it was only an indefinite purgatory." In regard to the resurrection of the body, we must be content to know only in part. All human theories are mere guesses. We are shut up to the Bible. But in this book we find a stream of light reaching from the dawn of creation, growing brighter and brighter till it ends in the glory of the consummation of all things.

I. In the Old Testament the resurrection from the dead is evidently taught. In Ex. iii. 6, God's address to Moses at the burning bush, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," the resurrection is taught. Moses, possibly, did not understand the full meaning of the words; but this is unmistakably their meaning, for the Saviour, in Matt. xxii. 31 and following, appeals to these words in proof of the resurrection. To the Jews this argument of Jesus had a convincing power that is hard for us to realize. It silenced the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection of the dead. The translation of Enoch and the rapture of Elijah strongly imply a belief among the Jews in the resurrection. The raising of the child by Elijah, and also the raising of one by Elisha, and again the dead man resuscitated by contact with Elisha's bones, are illustrations of the fact that a belief in the resurrection was common.

The Jews evidently believed in the activity of the soul after its separation from the body. This is seen in their tendency to the practise of necromancy. The calling up of the ghost

of Samuel by the Witch of Endor is an example of it. This practise of necromancy is frequently referred to and forbidden (Lev. xix. 31, 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, Isa. xix. 3, Deut. xviii. 11, et al.). The belief is shown in the use of the word Rephaim, translated "giants," "the dead," but properly meaning "manes," or "the dead of long ago." Also it is further seen in the use of sheol, the abode of the departed, and again in the phrase so often used, "gathered to their fathers," said of those who had died. These biblical facts certainly reveal to us that a belief in the immortality of the soul, and that it was in an active and not in an inactive, sleepy state, was common among the Jews.

The idea of a reunion of soul and body is clearly taught or implied in various places. Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones [chap. xxxvii.], though symbolizing the restoration of the Jewish nation, yet implies that the notion of a resurrection of the body was not regarded as absurd, nor beyond the limits of the power of the Almighty. Isaiah declared [xxvi. 19], "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead." The Psalms are rich in passages which teach a resurrection of the body. During the Maccabean period the hope of the resurrection was more definitely defined and developed (2 Macc. vii. 9, 14, 36; Wis. ii. 1, 23; iii. 9). The heroes of faith in Heb. xi. evidently looked forward to a future resurrection and everlasting life. The prophets delighted to make mention of a common hope that the dead shall live.

But it must be confessed that all the Old Testament references are not very definite. There was left yet room for gloom and despondency. It remained for the Gospel to bring "life and immortality to light."

II. The New Testament answers the question positively and definitely. When Christ came, the Jews generally believed in the resurrection of the dead. The teachings of Christ and the apostles confirm and encourage such a belief. The references in the New Testament are numerous. There are five recorded cases of dead persons being brought back to life again, the daughter of Jairus, the widow's son at Nain, Lazarus, Dorcas, and Eutychus. These, like the similar cases in the Old Testament, were simply resuscitations of dead persons—a resurrection to mortal life and subject again to death, which is essentially different from the general resurrection of the dead; but they in a strong way implied the truthfulness and credibility of a resurrection of the body.

The basal fact upon which the Christian doctrine of the resurrection rests is the resurrection of Christ. Some of the characteristics of Christ's resurrection are: (1) His body rose from the grave; the body in which he lived on earth. It had seen no corruption. (2) It rose to immortal life, "to die no more." (3) It rose a spiritual body. This is more reasonable than to believe that His body was raised a natural, corruptible, mortal body, and was gradually changed into an immortal and spiritual body. (4) His body was the first raised to spiritual and immortal life. He was the first fruits from the dead. This great miracle of the Redeemer's resurrection gives the ground of hope and defines the nature and character of the Christian's resurrection to eternal life.

The very words employed by Christ and the apostles to designate the resurrection, viz., ἔγερσις and ἀνάστασις, which differ only in the figurative form of the thought, are practically synonymous and have the following significations: (1) They import immortal life in general in a future world. (2) They signify distinctly the resurrection of the body. (3) They sometimes refer to a spiritual and moral resurrection. But this last is merely metaphorical, and, according to

the ideas of the New Testament, the second signification is always implied in and with the first as a condition or consequence. This is clear in Paul's argument in the fifteenth of 1 Corinthians. The soul is an immaterial thinking substance, and exists in a conscious, active state apart from the material body. But still all we have ever experienced or known of its action and development has been in connection with and by means of a bodily organization. It is incredible to believe that the Creator will preserve the soul in "an imperfect and mutilated state, a mere wreck and relic of itself," to all eternity. God's revelation clearly teaches that the soul is to be continued to immortal life, and it also teaches that it is to be ultimately reunited to the body.

III. Let us now notice something of the history of this doctrine in the Christian Church. From the very first there sprang up differences of opinion as to the resurrection. In the days of the apostles we read of one Hymenæus, who said that the resurrection was past already. When Paul's first letter to Timothy was written, Hymenæus had made one convert in the person of Alexander, and before the other was written he had made another, named Philetus. These, Paul says, have erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already, and thereby overthrow the faith of some. Waterland says of these persons: "They appear to have been persons who believed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but misinterpreted them, allegorizing away the doctrine of the resurrection and resolving it all into a figure and a metaphor." Immediately after the apostles extreme views began to be advocated in two directions, by the Chiliasts and the Gnostics. The former tended to "an unscriptural grossness of detail, the latter to an equally unscriptural refining away of the substantial fact." Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian held with the Chiliasts and taught a double resurrection. These were followed by Clement of Rome, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Minutius Felix, who held to a proper resurrection of the body. Origen, influenced by Alexandrian philosophy, spiritualized the doctrine. He was followed in part by the two Gregories and Basil the Great. Jerome went to an extreme in opposing them and fell into the error of teaching a gross, material, and sensuous resurrection. He was followed by Epiphanius and Theophilus of Alexandria. Jerome's became the prevailing doctrine of the Church of Rome, and has so continued until substantially to the present day. Rufinus held to the resurrection *hujus carnis*, and John of Jerusalem distinguished between resurrection of the flesh and resurrection of the body. But this view met with little favor, and was overshadowed by Jerome's. The Reformers generally held to Jerome's views, but leaned more decidedly to the Augustinian and Pauline representations.

In later years many Protestants, in all communions, have felt compelled, by supposed philosophical difficulties of the case, to give up the doctrine of the proper resurrection of the body, and have been content with no definite belief about it, or have sided with the Socinians and Unitarians, who deny a proper resurrection of the body; or else they hold with the Swedenborgians, who maintain that each soul at death is clothed with its spiritual body. Henry Ward Beecher declared that "the resurrection of the body is a theory deader than death," and Bishop Foster says in his book, "Beyond the Grave": "I cannot for one moment believe in the resurrection of the grave body." There is a deplorable tendency on the part of some modern teachers of ability to deny the resurrection of the body, to spiritualize the material part of it away, to reduce all references in the Bible to it to figure and metaphor. Dr. Nisbet has written a book entitled "The Resurrection of the Body: Does the Bible Teach It?" in which he em-

phatically denies the resurrection of the body laid in the grave, or any part of it. Nitzsch is quoted as saying: "The body of those who are raised is not the corrupted or corruptible one. The ever-becoming and transient material does not participate identically in the resurrection." Joseph Cook advocates similar views, and quotes Ulrici in favor of the theory that "there is an invisible, non-atomic, ethereal enswathment within this mortal body, which is eliminated by death and constitutes the future body."

IV. The various views as to the resurrection may be classified as follows:

(1) The Gnostic, or spiritualizing theory. This view holds that the word resurrection is used in a figurative or spiritual sense as applying to the soul, the raising of the soul from spiritual death. Hymenæus was undoubtedly a Gnostic and was the originator of this view.

(2) The Swedenborgian theory. This view might also be named the "enswathment theory." It teaches that in this life man has two bodies, an external and an internal organism, a physical and a spiritual body. At death the spiritual body is eliminated from the physical body, which is laid in the grave and is mortal, while the former is immortal. The internal or spiritual body does not die, but rises with the spirit to the realms of eternity. Resurrection simply means the rising of the spiritual body out of the physical body.

(3) The environment theory; which is that when the soul is released from the body it takes on a body from its environment in the spiritual world. The soul cannot exist in a disembodied state, cannot be individualized or localized apart from a body of some kind. That the soul may not be found naked, it takes on a body that is agreeable to the moral realm it occupies.

These three theories agree in that the body that is laid in the grave will never rise again, that no part of it will go to form the resurrection body. These theories profess to find support in the Scripture, but it is only the semblance of support, and they ignore too much that is against them.

(4) The identical-body theory. This view holds that there will be a resurrection of the identical body that is laid in the grave, that it will be raised and reunited with the spirit which once inhabited it on the earth. Christlieb, in his "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," p. 449, says: "Whoever denies a bodily resurrection should be honest enough no longer to speak of a resurrection at all. Resurrection does not refer to the spirit, the continued existence of which the Scripture takes as a matter of course, but only to the body and its issuing forth alive from the grave. Only that can rise again which has before been laid down in the grave, and that is only the body and not the spirit. Let us, then, have done with these ambiguities." In favor of this theory, which we believe to be the true one, we may argue: (*a*) The very terms used by the sacred writers, ἔγερσις and ἀνάστασις, translated resurrection, teach it. All other theories must first of all explain away the common and natural meaning of these words. This cannot be done except by a destructive violence to the common laws and usages of language. (*b*) The resurrection of Christ was a literal resurrection of His body from the tomb. His is a sample of what all believers' shall be. He was the first fruits. To this it is objected that Christ's risen body was one of "flesh and bones"; that it is not the body He now has in heaven; that He ate food after His resurrection; that a spiritual body is an immaterial body, and that our risen bodies will not be so. We reply that what is objected is partly a gratuitous assumption, about which nobody knows. We cannot prove that our risen bodies will not be like Christ's, but there is strong Scriptural intimation that they shall be. A spiritual body may be at the same time a material body. But this belongs to the nature

of the resurrection body and not the discussion in hand. (*c*) The redemption which believers have in Christ includes both soul and body. The apostle declares that we are "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies." And the body to be redeemed is evidently the one sold under sin; none other needs or can have any redemption. God calls this body the temple of the Holy Ghost, and surely He will not suffer it wholly to perish. (*d*) It is this body of our humiliation that is to be fashioned anew and conformed to the body of His glory. "Who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body?" The apostle is speaking of this mortal body that is now living and containing the soul. It is not to be exchanged for another, but fashioned anew. "But if the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through the spirit that dwelleth in you." This quickening could only be spoken of our mortal bodies. No other kind could need it. If there were ethereal enswathment, non-atomic bodies, whatever they are, they would not be mortal, we presume. It is this mortal body that must put on immortality. This corruptible body must put on incorruption. And so the whole argument of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. not only favors, but plainly teaches the literal resurrection of this material body. (*e*) We read again that "all that are in their graves shall hear His voice and come forth." This is meaningless if there is not to be a connection between the resurrection body and the grave body. The soul is not in the grave, only this mortal body that the soul left is in the grave. Dan. xii. 2 tells us, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This must refer to the mortal body, for it only sleeps in the dust.

(5) All the resurrections mentioned in the Bible were of the same material bodies which once lived on the earth. It is true they were raised to a mortal life, but these examples teach that not only is the soul immortal and can exist apart from the body, but that it is again reunited to the same body—an indication of what will be true of all at the last day. After the Saviour's resurrection we are told that "many bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of their graves and appeared unto many in Jerusalem."

(6) It is declared that when Christ shall come to judge the world, He will then raise the dead from their graves. "The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear His voice and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Christ declared that "of all the Father had given Him He had lost nothing, but would raise it up at the last day." "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." Bishop Foster says, "If I understand language, these passages do certainly teach a general resurrection at the end of the earth, and in connection with a final and general judgment. The attempt to explain them so as to mean a resurrection and judgment which is now progressing, or so as to refer them to any local or temporal event, or to any fact current in providential history, is not satisfactory. That all the dead do appear at the end of the world in bodies, I find it impossible to doubt; but that they are substantially the bodies in which they once lived I cannot for one moment believe."

To this last statement only we take exception; and from the facts brought out we believe there will be a literal resurrection of this material body at the last day, when the trump of God shall sound. Let us so live in this world that we shall be among the just who will be raised to everlasting life.

THE GLORY OF THE EASTER SUN.

By Pastor W. Ziethe, D.D. [Evangelical Protestant], Berlin.

And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about three-score furlongs, etc.—Luke xxiv. 13–35.

Easter morn had come, and the Prince of Life had arisen from the dead. But the genuine Easter joy only gradually found its way into the hearts of the disciples and of all those who loved the Lord Jesus. The three women—Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome,—had stood at the empty tomb of the Lord and had heard the message of the angel: "Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified. He is risen; He is not here; behold the place where they laid Him." And yet they fled from the grave and they trembled and were amazed; neither said they anything to any man, for they were afraid. The two disciples in our Gospel lesson are on the afternoon of this day going from Jerusalem to Emmaus. They have heard the Easter message, but the Easter blessing has not yet entered their hearts. They are telling each other how certain women had frightened them by their words, and are sorrowfully wending their way, without hope. Yet on the evening of the same Sabbath the disciples were assembled behind locked doors for fear of the Jews. Easter had come, and the glory of the Easter sun had risen over them, but the Easter joy had not yet entered their hearts. Only when Jesus suddenly entered, and greeting them with His salutation of "Peace be unto you," we are told that the disciples were glad, because they now saw the Lord.

The mighty and glorious Easter miracle will be of no benefit to us, beloved, if the Easter sun does not arise in our hearts also; if we do not in faith receive the Easter message; if we do not within ourselves experience the joy and the blessings of the Eastertide. The Lord is near; He is risen indeed! This is the glorious and blessed message which has been preached for centuries, and which is preached this day again. You can hear one Easter sermon after the other, and live through one Easter season after the other, yet this alone will not secure you the joys and the blessings of the sacred memorial day. Notwithstanding all this, you are to-day perhaps sorrowful and downcast, lonesome and lonely, as were those women and the two disciples mentioned in our text, or as were the eleven on that Easter evening. The rays of the glorious Easter sun must first penetrate your heart and soul, must warm and illumine them, before you can joyfully join in the chorus of praises and thanksgiving, saying, The Lord is risen indeed.

And to enable you to do this, the text of to-day is helpful. It is one of the most precious Gospel lessons in the whole cycle of the church year. It exhibits to us the joyfulness and friendliness of the risen Lord, and gives us courage to approach Him and to seek His communion. It also shows to us in the experience of the two disciples how the Easter sun can arise in our hearts. It does not often happen that this takes place suddenly, and that it at once appears in all its glory in the poor sinner's heart, as was the case with Paul on his way to Damascus. As is the case with the sun of the solar system, the Easter sun has its dawn and its first rays—the full glory of its light and warmth. We accordingly ask ourselves the question: *When does the glory of the Easter sun arise in our hearts?* and answer: (1) When Jesus is our companion; (2) when Jesus is our faithful leader; (3) when Jesus is our dearest friend; (4) when Jesus is our welcome guest.

I. The two disciples in our text, Cleopas and his companion, are together journeying from Jerusalem to Emmaus. They both are filled with the warmest sympathy for each other and know

each other. They are speaking to each other of the things that have in the recent days happened in Jerusalem, and yet their hearts are filled with sorrow, so that the Lord, when He comes to them, asks them for the reasons of their sorrow. Something is the matter with them. Possibly they do not themselves know what the real cause is. They possibly do not understand themselves. And yet their hearts are bowed down, and this is quite apparent in all their conversation. The one cannot relieve the other, and the second cannot comfort the first. They stand in need of a companion who understands how to comfort them and to open up for them the fountain of true joy. This Jesus knows; and therefore He comes to them with the wonderful love and affection, and becomes their charming and dear companion.

Our path in life is much like that of the two disciples on their way to Emmaus. It matters not whether it is long or short, if thirty, or forty, or fifty, or sixty furlongs. The matter of importance is the company and association we have on this pilgrimage. That indeed is a pitiable and lamentable soul which must go the way alone and without an associate; but even if it has many treasures of gold and silver, even if it is full of earthly honors and pleasures, it is nevertheless a soul to be pitied. The longer the way happens to be, the more dreary and forsaken it will be. Again, that soul is to be pitied which makes this way in bad company. In this case, we hear nothing of the questions and answers of the conversation and inquiries which interest the disciples here in our text. In such company are heard only impure and unclean words, unjust and unholy conversation. But even that soul, too, is to be pitied which goes through life in better company, but still has not the best friend and companion as his associate. Even if a man has a faithful wife and darling children, has friends and relatives with warm hearts, faithful in good and in evil days, yet is he poor unless he has also that Friend who is the best and most faithful companion on life's journey.

There is a longing and anxiety found in every honest heart and mind, which is satisfied by no joy of this world and by no human companionship. This is the longing for truth amid all errors and falsehoods of this world, the longing for the gleams of the glorious sun of truth dispelling the darkness. It is the longing for happiness, which will remove the burdens and sorrows of life. It is the longing for the truly good, which no power on earth can take away from us. It is the longing for salvation, with a firm and unshaken foundation; a longing for peace which passeth all understanding; a longing for life beyond the grave; a longing for the kingdom which abides to all eternity.

This is the high ideal worthy of the man created in the image of God and created for eternity. Only callous and ignoble men will have nothing to do with such noble longing and prefer to wallow in the mire of the world. Especially are the noblest of men filled with such longings, and seek above all things their satisfaction. These are the people whose course in life is really a journey to Emmaus, *i.e.*, homeward. These are the people who have in truth a longing for home in the highest sense of the term.

Blessed is the man who has such longings and has felt their throbbing. Blessed is the man who has a longing for the real truth and real wisdom, the real good and real salvation. He who feels as did the disciples on the way to Emmaus will find on the way as his companion our Jesus. Even if He seems to be yet a stranger, and if your eyes are holden, yet He is your blessed companion. The day begins to dawn. The first rays of the glorious Easter sun begin to appear in your hearts. But this is not all: Christ is more than a companion to us.

II. Christ is also our faithful teacher. Christ does not walk in silence by the

side of the two disciples. He soon asks them as to the subject concerning which they were so anxiously conversing. Cleopas thereupon tells Him of their sadness and laments over their disappointed hopes, confesses the doubt and dismay in his own heart, his anxiety between faith and uncertainty, between terror and wonder. Then the Lord first rebukes them for their foolishness and slowness of heart, and because they have not believed the words which the prophets spoke. Then He becomes Himself their teacher in the Gospel, and earnestly and clearly interprets to them the truth, that such suffering on the part of the Messiah was in accordance with prediction and the will of God. What grand interpretation of the Scripture this must have been which the two disciples were privileged to listen to! Therefore their hearts burned within them, and they eagerly and in silence, in faith and humility, listened to the words of the wise Teacher of God's Word.

Jesus must also be our teacher if the Easter sun is to cast its glorious warmth into our hearts, if the Easter blessing and the Easter joy is to be ours. There are indeed many who recognize Christ as a "prophet mighty in word and deed," who believe that He was a great man and a wise teacher, and who honor Him as such; but they do not read the real meaning of His words, nor do they heed His teachings. Therefore, they go their way in darkness and sadness. One joy after the other disappoints them; one hope after the other proves a fleeting shadow. Their hearts waver between doubt and faith, between fear and hope, and therefore they never find real peace or real joy. There are many disciples of the Lord who are walking on such paths and passing through such hours. This friend or that friend has been taken from him; this or that hope has disappointed him. Sadly he proceeds on his journey. Then He comes who is the true teacher, Jesus the Lord. We often speak of the blessing of the divine Word. Yet we do not read the Scriptures often enough or study them prayerfully enough.

We should suffer Christ to open up for us His Word, so that we may understand it. We must above all things recognize the great and blessed truth that Jesus Christ ought to have suffered these things in order to enter into His glory. The word concerning the cross, the gospel of His death and resurrection, is the kernel and central truth of the entire sacred Scriptures. To this points the Law, with its emblems and orders; of this the psalmists sing; of this the prophets foretell; this the Gospel announces; this is the contents of the Scriptures from their first page to their last. This is the Gospel which was already proclaimed in Paradise. This is the song of jubilee, which is reechoed in the golden streets of the Jerusalem that is above. This proclamation and this message of grace must be believed in the heart. If you permit your Saviour to instruct you in this great truth, if you believe the words which He speaks, you are on the right way. The morning dawn of Easter day will be reflected also in your eyes, and the first dewdrops of the blessing of Easter will fall into your heart. In this light you will understand the humility and the glory of the Lord, His work and His life. In this light you will understand your own life, your own joys, your own sufferings. In this way you have found the way and the truth; you have learned from that prince of teachers, Jesus, the risen Lord.

III. But He must also be your dearest friend. The hearts of the two disciples begin to burn as they listen to this wonderful stranger. They feel that He is a man who can help them. Their sadness is removed; their hopes are revived; their doubts are gone; their faith is strengthened; their hearts are comforted. They love this remarkable man more and more. The journey is only too soon at an end. The time has passed all too quickly as the period

for parting companionship is at hand. Jesus "made as though He would have gone further." They ask Him to abide with them, as it is toward evening and the day is far spent. They ask this both for His sake and for their own sakes. They cannot persuade themselves to leave the man with whom they have spent such a profitable evening to continue his journey in the night alone. They offer Him the hospitality of their abode. They themselves do not want to spend the night without having seen and heard more of this strange associate. They need Him; they are hungry for His words and for His comfort. Therefore, they ask Him to abide with them.

It is not enough, my brother or my sister, that you seek Jesus and are anxious for Him. It does not suffice that you hear His Word and believe it with all your heart. Jesus Christ must be the dearest friend of your heart. He must become dearer and dearer to you.

Your heart must burn for Him. Your daily prayer and petition should be, "Abide with me"; and especially should this be the case when we come to the parting of the ways. Then you must feel what He is to you. Even if others do despise Him, reject Him, and cast Him aside, to you He should be all the more precious and dear, and you must offer Him an abiding place in your heart, when many refuse Him this. And this offer you must gladly make. You experience it more and more each day that you cannot live without Him; and especially when the evening approaches, when darkness grows deep and thick around your soul —then must you learn to utter the prayer, "Abide with me, the day is far spent."

And Jesus may sometimes seem as though He would pass on, as though He would forsake you. That is at times His method.

Then pray again, "Abide with me," and you will feel the blessing of this prayer. When your sins trouble you, when weighed down by sorrow and the cross, when the evening of your life has approached, then is He the dearest and sweetest friend of your soul. This you will learn, if you are at His side and in His communion. Christ becomes more and more near and dear to you, and at last He is the only real friend you know or would know.

IV. But He is also to be your welcome household guest. He does not suffer His friends to ask long; He gladly stays. He has already decided to stay, and He only feigns as though He would proceed on His journey, because He wants to be asked to remain. He enters the house with them; He seats Himself at the table; He takes the bread, blesses it, breaks it, and gives it to them. Strange man! He acts as though He were the master of the house, for that which He here does was in Israel the sacred privilege of the lord of the house. Strange man! What is He doing, and how does He do it? As *He* takes the bread, blesses and breaks it, this is done only by one person. The disciples, with ever-increasing wonder, watch Him. Now their eyes have been opened, and they know the Lord, their beloved Master, Jesus Christ, Him who has been crucified and has arisen again. It has become Easter, and the Easter sun has arisen in their hearts.

And this, beloved, is the best of all. Jesus must enter our homes and houses. Jesus must sit down to table with us. Jesus must be the lord and master in our households. We ourselves must ask Him to become such.

Blessed is the house in which the Easter Prince is the real master and housefather. Blessed is the house in which father and mother, parents and children, master and servant, sit at His feet and sit at His table. Blessed is the house where Jesus, and Jesus only, breaks the bread; where the daily bread is received at His hands, and where He blesses it; where the bread of life is sought at His door and is asked of Him. In such a house there is the bright light of day; in such a

house the glory of the Easter sun spreads happiness and bliss; here Easter joy and Easter blessing abound. Blessed be our God for the victory of death given us through the Prince of Peace; for the conquest of hell through the Lord Jesus Christ, who broke the bonds of the tomb. And blessed be God, who gives us the Easter joy in His beloved, and the rays from whose glorious Easter sun bring cheer and eternal joy to mankind and to every believing Christian. Amen!

THE RISEN CHRIST.

By Rev. Canon Newbolt, London, England.

The Lord hath risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon.—Luke xxiv. 34.

At length, then, the good news has asserted itself. "The Lord is risen indeed." The morning, which began in gloom and in the dread of cruel insult, brightened into hope; as the day wore on, fitful and fleeting dreams flashed out behind the studded storm-rock, and, indeed, in the evening, as they returned with their glad experience, it was to find the home which they had left in the gloom of doubt flooded with the light of certainty. All the clouds had rolled away, the gloom dispersed, the torture of suppressed hope had melted before the gathering glory. "The Lord is risen indeed"—what a bright welcome home!—and hath appeared to Simon—to Simon, who would strengthen his brother, or to Simon whose faith had given way? It is impossible to doubt which. "Christ is risen." The cry goes up, whose echoes float in joyous cadences down the centuries of Christian life. "Christ is risen," sings Religion, overwhelmed with the fulness of it. "Christ is risen," tosses back Morality in an antiphon of joy, as new virtues elevate the bodies of our humiliation into the likeness of His glorious body. "Christ is risen," sings Art, shaking her plumes for a higher flight. "Christ is risen," answers Poetry, alive with new impressions. "Christ is risen," cries the mourner out of his tears. "Christ is risen," shouts the penitent out of his captivity. The world itself keeps Easter day. As the old carol reminds us, there is a spring feeling in the air; a joy thrills through the services; the heart feels lighter as after the tension of a great effort.

Spring birds are singing, singing,
For the daybreak in the east;
Silver bells are ringing, ringing,
For the Church's glorious feast.
Christ is risen, Christ is risen,
Sin's long triumph now is o'er;
Christ is risen, death's dark prison
Now can hold His saints no more.
Christ is risen, risen, brother,
Brother, Christ is risen indeed.

I. Evidence of the Resurrection.

Ah, here we drop into simple, prosaic, yet necessary evidence. The resurrection may be a beautiful gem as a subject for poetry, and an incentive to the imagination; but how do you know it is true? Even St. Thomas felt this. He was absent from the impressionable band of unquestioning and interested followers on that first Easter day, and he never gave in until the enthusiasm of the others involved him in the same ecstatic receptivity. Simon commences it. It is carried on by some without hardly knowing what they are doing, who are in a condition to imagine anything, to believe anything, in their barred and bolted assembly in that Easter night. Is that so? Did the apostles underrate the importance of evidence in the character of their witnesses when they made the resurrection the foundation of their preaching? St. Peter, when speaking at Cæsarea, so far from thinking this to be unimportant, deliberately says that the witnesses were chosen, that our Lord chose to make use of His own intimate friends and followers in publishing this great truth; and St. Paul, in his creed-like communication of the facts of our redemption, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, mentions several groups of appearances of our Lord after His res-

urrection as the very buttresses and supports of his great doctrine that "He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." What do you expect, dear friends? What do we want, what evidence do we think the best? Do we imagine that this is an experience which should be brought, as it were, before a committee of experts, who could give us a cut-and-dried report of the truth of the resurrection? Experts? It is exactly to these that our blessed Lord did show Himself after His resurrection, to men and women whom He had educated to pursue a phenomenon of the spiritual world in its spiritual bearing, men and women to whom the resurrection would appear not as an isolated phenomenon divorced from all similar causes, belonging to no series, reducible to no scheme, but rather as the working out of a cause which had been pointed out to them long ago, of a scheme whose foundations they had seen solidly laid before their eyes, the filling up of a void in a system which needed the resurrection, an answer to the appeals of the apostles inexplicable without it. Religion as well as science has its experts, men whom God carries on by experience and comparison to understand the real meaning of spiritual phenomena. And in this connection it is not a little significant to notice that those persons who had most of the preparation for Good Friday were the least prepared to welcome the great joy of Easter, whereas in the Magdalene and St. Peter, both of whom had undergone that spiritual experience, there was a preparedness to receive the earliest manifestation of the risen Lord. If we, too, would be witnesses of the resurrection, we must be of the number of those who day by day are adding to the stock of religious experience studied in the dark night of sorrow, spread out in the brilliant rays of joy, learned on the mountain-top, verified on the lake, confirmed on Calvary. If one great naturalist could take twenty-nine years to verify an experiment, surely a witness of the resurrection is not to be looked for in the compass of a magazine article, or in the mere sifting of what is called Scriptural evidence. Of the witnesses of the resurrection St. Paul, in the passage I have alluded to, enumerates four groups. And the first of them is St. Peter and the twelve—the word twelve, you will notice, being used here in its popular significance, although the number, of course, was not itself full. I would venture to protest at the outset against any attempt to fill up what Holy Scripture has left vacant, or to invent imaginary conversations between our blessed Lord and St. Peter, where we are simply told in ten places that a manifestation was vouchsafed to Peter, as we infer on Easter day, first, by himself, and then with the other apostles in the upper room. But having said this, we cannot forget who St. Peter was, and the wonderful significance of this meeting. If we are to suppose that not one word passed between these two, we cannot forget the time when they last met, when the secure faith was buffeted and covered with insult, when friends had forsaken and foes were triumphing, and when St. Peter the Rock, against the warning of the truth of his own protestations, had said, not once or twice, that he did not know the man. When last they had met, one glance had been enough to drive him out into the night, and wear away his cowardly treachery in an agony of repentance. And now to meet Him face to face! There is pleading in those fixed eyes. They will pierce thee to the quick and trouble thee; for though now sinless, thou wilt feel that thou hast sinned as never thou didst before, and wilt desire to slink away and hide thee from His sight, and yet wilt have a longing aye to dwell within the beauty of His countenance. Yet St. Peter has a history; he has moved in the shadow of a great sorrow which hides him from the sun of Easter day, but Christ had already come to comfort sorrow, and now He comes to reassure penitence. Surely

the Easter sun shines down on no heart more full of joy than his who during this solemn season had tasted the bitterness and the joy of penitence. "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." Easter day is the help and the stay of the penitent. There are hundreds and hundreds of people to whom sin has come as a dread and unwelcome visitor; religion has been unpopular for a moment, the chief priests and elders, men of influence, have been against them; it was so easy to deny, so hard to prove, but harder still to rise, harder still to dream of forgiveness, and of restoration to pardon and peace. Have you ever thought, dear friends, what it must have been in the old heathen world when a man wished to lead a new and better life? To whom could he turn? To the gods? They were on a lower level than himself. Drunkenness was deified, lust was crowned, cunning was even in the religious ceremonies of service; the path of progress was strewn with incentives to sin. All his own strength of will, all his sense of propriety and the prudence of his moral sense, his self-discipline, one by one they snap before the onslaught of passion; fierce temptation comes leaping in upon him, tossing resolutions to the wind, and scattering them away like straws before the blast. Who could help, who could lift us? "Now is Christ risen from the dead." Human nature is linked with the divine, and has passed through death; and a man who is God, and God who is man, can help the sons of men tortured by sins, betrayed in their hopes—a life of perfect holiness is molded before us, the storehouse of Christ is open to us, and there is the abiding strength of the sacraments, the cheering guidance of the blessed Word, the sheltering hospice of the Church, with its ministry of care, ever at hand to help wandering sinners. Sin, before Christ came, was a pathless waste, in which many a soul lost its way without a hope of recovery; but since He lived and died and rose again, the penitent feels that a higher and better life is open to him, a strengthening hand is held out to penitence, St. Peter's denial is tenderly, lovingly forgotten, and he is being prepared to receive his threefold charge, and to protest out of a broken heart, "Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee."

II. The Appearance to Peter.

But St. Peter, if he had a past, also had a future; and with such an endowment upon him, our blessed Lord appears to him on Easter day. The eventful years had passed since Christ, looking on that impulsive, mercurial temperament in the fisherman, had said, "Thou art Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone," or "I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Surface after surface had flaked away. A character which could not bear the weight of ridicule—how could it bear the weight of the growing Church? Impulse, presumption, readiness, zeal, had all fallen away, crushed and pulverized; but now on the bare heart was to be laid a deep foundation of personal experience, which nothing hereafter should overthrow. "I have seen the Lord." Oh, impression never to be effaced! oh, memory never to be obliterated in the darkest hour! oh, presence of resurrection beauty and glory, driving away the storm-clouds of remorse and drying up the tears of penitence! Impulse is steadying to strength, hastiness into waiting for the Lord, shrinking into steadfastness; the apostle is being formed whose sermons shall spread the power of Pentecost, whose work shall extend the Church, who in prison and in martyrdom shall learn patiently to wait for Christ. Here was a memory for the dark hours that brilliant Easter morning. Here was a memory when the feelings were tempted to betray reason, that startling meeting with the unchanged Friend! Here was a memory when death appeared; there behind the veil was that same form waiting and watching which had the freedom of the tomb and

the key of death! It is a memory, dear friends, it is a tradition like this that surely we all need for our dark hours. Is there any among those I see before me so unhappy as to have no memory of a day with the Son of Man, no memory of a first communion when Christ Jesus seemed to meet him with the tenderest affection and the strength of great support; no memory of forgiven sin, when Christ seemed to drive back the menacing crowd waiting to condemn, and to say, "Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more"; no memory of Easter when the triumph of the Lord seemed bound up with his happiness, and the joy of the Lord was his strength? It is these personal convictions, believe me, these personal experiences, which we all need for the work and the failures of the dark days of life, for its times of tribulation, as well as its times of wealth. How much there is which needs sanctifying and rectifying in our worldly and natural endowments, how much work is spoiled by pride, maimed by temper, or frustrated by selfishness! To have seen the Lord is the consecration of power; it is to turn natural endowments into sanctified gifts. To have seen the Lord is to have within us something of that enthusiasm, that God within, which we so sorely need in the conditions of our life. It is the fashion now, rather, to appear to care intensely for nothing, to take religion calmly and easily, to look upon it almost as a sign of bad breeding to be intensely concerned in the existence of the soul, and to interfere with a man's religious belief as you would with the existence of his income. The fetish of undenominationalism has its votaries in the religious world, where to be indefinite is to be moderate, to be moderate is to be safe, to be safe is to be committed to nothing, but to be an honorary member of all forms of religion. To have seen the Lord, to have felt the enthusiasm of Easter, is once for all to disperse this wretched paralysis, to have the abiding presence of a sacred memory which eclipses in its splendor all lower and lesser religious aims—it is this which drove the apostles back in spite of blows and threats in their obstinate persistency. "We cannot but speak the things we have heard."

Ah, my friends, in view of the dark clouds which will come driving even across the Easter sun, when the flowers which decked our altars are also brought to deck the tombs of those whom we have loved and lost, then we know the time is not far distant when round us, too, the mists of death will be closing. Ah, we know what we need in view of these dark mysteries, the strength of a personal conviction, the memory of a meeting with Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life. Surely on this Easter day we shall look out for it, look out for it in those places where He so often comes to meet us—those avenues of prayer, those avenues of meditation, of sacramental meeting; we shall look out for Him in the quiet walk, we shall look out for Him as we lay flowers on the grave, we shall expect the thin air to part where the echoes of melody and the progress of prayer and the brilliancy of worship fill His temple with glory. To have seen the Lord was the seal of forgiveness, but also it was the planting of a conviction.

III. The First Easter and the Lasting Church.

And St. Peter has passed on into the temple; he has joined the other apostles, he has told them the secret, and on the first Sunday of the Christian era there is gathered together the nucleus of the future Church, and to them Jesus Christ appeared for the fifth time, St. Peter being with them on this Easter day. Many things are being started into life to-day—Sunday instead of the Sabbath, and now is the inauguration of that life and power of Christ which has made the Church such a blessing in the world. There they are met together in fear and dread, huddled together for fear of the Jews,

talking together over the perplexities of the day, and weighing the wild rumors that had reached them. St. Mark tells us they were sitting at meat, as if in fulfilment of His own promise that where two or three were gathered together in His name there would He be in the midst of them. There, from their simple meeting together, it has become an assembly of the Church, a foreshadowing of the Christian assembly which ever afterward should meet especially on the Sunday. Christ's risen self is there to secure with His blessing and His presence the assembling together of the faithful, and the burden of Christ's message to them is peace and power, not to look into the deeper mysteries of the moment, or to study those words of which we clergy have each of us felt the power at the most solemn moments of our lives. This is the impression; it is the prevailing result of that solemn meeting in the assembly of the first Easter—peace and power; and where the Church has been true to herself these have ever been the prevailing characteristics of her life. Pass through the length and breadth of this land, and look at the parish churches in towns and villages, standing where for centuries they have borne their silent witness to God, where generations have come and gone, and the history of the land is written in the records on their walls; still they stand an influence of peace, a sacrament of power. Look at the great cathedrals. Who can tell how much good they did even in the darkest times of neglect and gloom by the quiet witness of their grand structures, or even by the refining influence of their musical services which they then imperfectly kept up? Who could measure now the influence on the nation of being publicly and solemnly allied with definite profession and belief in what we call an established Church? Or if we look at the individual Christian, we shall see even clearer Christ's presence in His Church is to him a presence of peace and power. Sometimes we can see remaining in some of our old churches, on the tower, a ring which local tradition calls the sanctuary ring, pointing back, if the tradition be true, to the old days of sanctuary, when the pursued might escape to the church in days of imperfect security and there be safe from his enemies. We know, at all events, what it is to be able to escape to the Church from the pursuit of an overwhelming temptation and the talons of pursuing care. Every day we live we have to thank God for the help and the blessing of His presence in His Church; those whose lives have been molded by the Church's service know what a help it has been to them. Time flows on, and the great round of feast and festival. It rejoices when they rejoice, it weeps when they weep; the streams of life flow into it and out of it, but still it goes on. Now it is the seven bishops imprisoned for conscience sake. What cheer on the day of their discharge! Or, again, it is the deliverance of the apostle from prison which is being read as the lesson for the day. The service of the Church, where it is allowed to be part of our life, never grows wearisome, never seems to be out of touch with our joys or our sorrows. Here we learn, as we learn nowhere else, the deeper truths of our religion; here Christ Himself meets us and gives us power as of old. He stood in the midst of His disciples on that Easter day and said, "Peace be unto you," and breathing on them said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," turning their meeting of fear and surprise into the foretaste of the blessing His presence would be to the Church, and the peace which would envelop their lives; so that even when they met again eight days hence there is no more mention of closed doors or fear of the Jews. The peace of God is the garrison which keeps their hearts and minds through Christ Jesus. Christ is risen; peak after peak has flashed on the glorious news; the Magdalene, St. Peter, the women, the two travelers on the road,

the apostles, still the message speeds on. There are depths of sin and degradation here in London waiting for its cheering voice; there are penitent hearts waiting for its comfort. Africa, India, China, Japan, the vast regions of heathendom, still want to hear the glorious Easter news. It is for us to kindle the beacon of holiness, so that others may see our good works and glorify our Father which is in heaven. "Christ is risen!" This is the song we shout, earth and heaven in one, on Easter day; with this we part from our loved ones, with this they answer us from the other land; with this we lay us down to rest; the echo of this we listen for from beyond the grave. There is, it is said, a beautiful custom in parts of Sicily when the fishermen are going on some expedition into the deep sea; their wives and children accompany them to the shore, and as they embark they raise all together their voices in a hymn of praise to God, and as they put out to sea those in the boats answer to those on the shore, in an antiphon of devotion, verse after verse, until their voices die away in the distance, and the yearning sea carries them out of sight and hearing. So we to-day stand on the shore of eternity, and as soul after soul puts forth into the deep, and passes from our sight, we raise the song of confidence, "Christ is risen," and the answer comes back from the bosom of that boundless ocean—

Christ is risen, risen, brother,
Brother, Christ is risen indeed.

PRAYER.

BY REV. W. R. BALDRIDGE, A.M. [UNITED PRESBYTERIAN], ST. CHARLES, IOWA.

The words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah: And it came to pass in the month Chisleu, in the twentieth year, as I was in Shushan the palace, that Hanani, one of my brethren, came, he and certain men of Judah; and I asked them concerning the Jews that had escaped, which were left of the captivity, and concerning Jerusalem, et seq.—Nehemiah i.

I. WHO should pray (verses 1, 2)?

1. Great men should pray. "Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah."

2. Rich men should pray. "I was in Shushan the palace."

3. Good men should pray. "Hanani, the brother of Nehemiah."

II. When should we pray (verses 3, 4)?

1. When there is need. "When I heard these words" (verse 4).

2. When there is Providential occasion. "In affliction" (verse 3).

3. When there is trouble. "Wall of Jerusalem down" (verse 5).

4. When we are engaged in other religious exercises:

(a) Meditation—"Sat down" (verse 4).

(b) Humiliation—"Weeping and mourning" (verse 4).

(c) Fasting (verse 4).

III. Why should we pray (verse 5)?

1. Because there is a God. "O God" (verse 5).

2. Because of His power to answer. "Great and terrible" (verse 5).

3. Because He is faithful. "That keepeth covenant" (verse 5).

4. Because he is merciful. "And mercy" (verse 5).

IV. How should we pray (verse 6, 11)?

1. With specific desire. "Hear THE prayer" (verse 6).

2. With persistence. "Day and night" (verse 6).

3. With confession. "Confess the sins of Irsael" (verse 7).

4. With faith—

(a) In God's promises. "The word Thou commandest" (verse 8).

(b) In God's people. "These . . . Thy people" (verse 10).

(c) In God's Providence. "Prosper Thy servants" (verse 11).

(d) In God Himself. "O Lord, I beseech Thee" (verse 11).

A FUNERAL SERMON.

Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light.—2 Tim. i. 10.

THE dominion of mightiest monarchs and conquerors has always found limit of time or space; ruins mostly tell their story. One monarch there is whose empire is world-wide, whose conquests are ceaseless through ages, has spared neither age nor sex; has been on earth truly king of kings. This monarch—this conqueror is Death.

But there is a mightier One. The strong man armed is despoiled by a stronger than he. "Christ hath abolished death," etc.

1. Christ has *abolished the darkness* that once rested over the future. "In My Father's house are many mansions." "They shall see His face—hunger no more nor thirst any more. God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

2. Christ has abolished the only real curse of death—sin—with its alienation from God and fearful looking-for of judgment. From all this His people are already delivered, and have begun a glorious immortality. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life."

3. By His own resurrection, and His promise of the believer's resurrection, He has made death but an incident in the endless life. Here we are imperfect believers in Jesus—there believers in Jesus perfected. How simple, how safe a thing is death to the believer! We ask no visions or transports, no marvelous change as a test of this safety. The question is one for life and death, "Dost thou believe on the Lord Jesus Christ?" He who can answer this question aright is already saved, and pass hence when, where, or how he may, he shall not fail of the inheritance laid up for him in heaven.

4. Thus Christ abolishes, too, the earthly shadow that would else attend the believer's death. While our hearts are lonely, we are glad for those who have passed to the rest—the glory—to "be with Christ, which is far better." The same path of the ransomed lies open for us to join them soon in the fadeless light, on the tearless shore.

THE EARTHLY RESURRECTION.

I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.—Gal. ii. 20.

DEAD—crucified! Is it not melancholy? No; for Christ is risen. Here is one dead upon earth, yet risen from that death to a diviner life. "Nevertheless I *live*."

The curse of all monastic forms of piety, Catholic or Protestant, ancient or modern, is the trying to *keep the man dead*. Crush out ambition, natural action, taste, every joy, and *stay dead*. That continued death breeds spiritual corruption. This "Nevertheless I *live*" is what is needed. Every good power more alive than ever. Ambition consecrated, exalted, loftier than ever; love sweeter, taste purer, joys more heavenly. All pulsing with the divine life of the Son of God. "Nevertheless I *live* . . . Christ *liveth* in me."

ABLE TO SAVE.

BY REV. DWIGHT M. PRATT, M.A. [CONGREGATIONAL], PORTLAND, ME.

Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost.—Heb. vii. 25.

THIS verse lets us into the heart of the Gospel.

Sin is universal. It is here in this cultured congregation, in every heart—the sin of forgetfulness of God, of pride, of worldliness, of unbelief.

I. Ability to save requires:

1. Knowledge of the sinner's need. A physician must be able to diagnose disease. Christ knows what is in man.

2. Desire to save. Personal interest in the sinner. This is the preeminent characteristic of Christ.

3. Infinite love. Love is the redeeming power. No salvation without love.

4. Infinite power. "To the uttermost." No sin must be beyond the

reach of redeeming grace. Christ had "all power."

II. The human element in salvation. "Them that come unto God by Him."

This implies:

1. Trust. Commitment of self to Christ as to the great Physician.

2. Love. Reciprocal relation to Christ.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. Commercial Gambling. "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition."—1 Tim. vi. 9. Rev. Frank G. Tyrrell, St. Louis, Mo.
2. What Ought I to Believe about Miracles? "And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt."—Ex. iii. 3. John Henry Barrows, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
3. Harp and Sling. "And it came to pass when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp, and played with his hand; so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him. . . . So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and with a stone, and smote the Philistine, and slew him; but there was no sword in the hand of David."—1 Sam. xvi. 23 and xvii. 50. Rev. Clinton W. Wilson, Lyons, Iowa.
4. The Word on Trial. "The word of the Lord is tried."—Psa. xviii. 30. Rev. J. H. Creighton, Lithopolis, Ohio.
5. The Glorious Gospel. "According to the glorious Gospel of the blessed God which was committed to my trust."—1 Tim. i. 11. T. DeWitt Talmage, D.D., New York City.
6. A Royal Manhood. "Now, therefore, behold the king whom ye have chosen, and whom ye have desired! and, behold, the Lord hath set a king over you."—1 Sam. xii. 13. Henry Van Dyke, D.D., New York City.
7. The Death of Frederick Douglass. "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?"—2 Sam. iii. 38. Rev. J. G. Jenifer, Washington, D. C.
8. Christus Imperator. "All things have been created through Him and unto Him, and He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together; and He is the head of the body, the Church, that in all things He might have the preeminence."—Col. i. 16-18. C. W. Stubbs, D.D., Dean of Ely, England.
9. Patience with God. "Now, when John had heard in prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples and said unto Him, Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?"—Matt. xi. 2, 3. "Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him."—Psa. xxxvii. 7. Rev. George Jackson, London, Eng.
10. The Individual and the Race. "I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people; I have found David My servant; with My holy oil I have anointed him."—Psa. lxxxix. 19, 20. Canon H. Scott Holland, London, Eng.
11. The Achievements of the Young. "Let no man despise thy youth."—1 Tim. iv. 12. Prof. A. H. Godbey, St. Charles College, Mo.
12. William M. Taylor: A Memorial Sermon. "That disciple whom Jesus loved."—John xxi. 7. Henry A. Stimson, D.D., New York City.

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. A Pure Judiciary and Public Morality. ("And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counselors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city."—Isa. i. 26.)
2. The Source of Human Authority. ("Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory."—Dan. ii. 37.)
3. The Duty of the Ministry in View of Official Corruption. ("But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which he had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison."—Luke iii. 19, 20.)
4. Christ's Mission to Cities. ("And He said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—Luke iv. 43.)
5. Life's True Pilot. ("Now God Himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you."—1 Thes. iii. 11.)
6. Confidence in the Lord the Basis of Confidence in His Followers. ("And we have confidence in the Lord touching you, that ye both do and will do the things which we command you."—2 Thes. iii. 4.)
7. The Final Cause of the Miraculous. ("Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not."—1 Cor. xiv. 22.)
8. The Modesty of Greatness. ("And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling."—1 Cor. ii. 3.)
9. When Nothing Goes Wrong. ("And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose."—Rom. viii. 28.)
10. The Presence that Expels Grief. ("And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as the bridegroom is with them, they cannot fast."—Mark ii. 19.)
11. The Death that Brings Life. ("I have slain them by the words of my mouth; and thy judgments are [margin, that thy judgments might be] as the light that goeth forth."—Hosea vi. 5.)
12. Daring the Divine Judgments. ("That say, Let Him make speed, and hasten His work, that we may see it: and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, that we may know it."—Isa. v. 19.)
13. Labor: Its Oppressors and Its Champion. ("Ye have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your house. What mean ye that ye beat My people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord of Hosts."—Isa. iii. 14, 15.)

LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TRUTHS FROM RECENT SCIENCE AND HISTORY.

By Rev. Geo. V. Reichel, A.M., Brockport, N. Y., Member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

"Of Making Many Books, there is No End (Eccl. xii. 12).—This Scriptural saying came forcibly to mind while examining several recent devices for indexing both permanent and current literature. Among others, C. Wellman Parks, of the United States Bureau of Education, suggests a plan for indexing current literature, by which he intends "to avoid the necessity for consulting more than two alphabetical lists to find any article that has been published during the year current." For the use of the Government Bureau, the "index entries will be set in type on a machine similar to the Linotype—a substitute for the former laborious work of setting type by hand, producing stereotyped lines of words to any number desired." Dr. Parks' invention possesses the additional advantage of setting boldface, italics, and Roman in the same line. He further tells us that since each such line of type is cast solid, "it can be handled as a card in an ordinary card catalogue. Then, after a week's index has been printed, the type will be placed on suitable galleys and the new matter run in until printing-day, when the matter will be repaged and run through the press. The new issue of index will make the previous week's number unnecessary for further use."

Denominational Unity. — Henry Fairfield Osborn, of New York City, in a recent address on an important subject in zoology, had occasion to say, among many other good things: "In the problem of how to think and work most effectually and with most permanent results, all the sciences meet on a common ground."

The remark "illustrates a great principle, or better regarded a law, which, applied to the work of Christianity, may be restated thus: *In the problem of how to advance the Redeemer's kingdom most effectually and with permanent results, all Christians meet on common ground.*"

Now, it is easy enough to say that we acknowledge this law and to say so sincerely, yet it appears to be quite a different thing to as sincerely obey it. Christians of all denominations want—yes, and hope—some day to overcome all the difficulties which hinder the advancement of Christ's righteousness, but the hope meets too often with contradiction to enable us to to recognize any permanent common ground for thought and work. We appear to find it at times, and believe then with ease, that millennial possibilities need not be so remote, after all; but alas! even Christ Himself — the conceded True Common Ground for all believers to build upon—is disputed and disagreed about, and our dreams of "denominational unity" vanish into nothingness. One thought, however, lingers to console, namely: However much we of the several denominations disagree, He is able to make even the disagreements work together for the ultimate triumph of His cause, and to show us all that love His name, as one by one we are called to pass the Pearly Portals, that denominations are of the earth, earthy, having no place in heaven.

To believe in denominationalism as existent in the land of the blessed is simply pugnaciousness, as ridiculous as it is offensive; and yet such belief is not unknown. We remember one good old Elder, in a former parish, expressing a fervent hope that among the "many mansions" of heaven, the

several denominations would find large enough accommodation for each to enable them to remain apart for all eternity! Such a view of heaven seems incredible, yet he was almost childish about it, and gave more than one of us the suspicion that he believed his own denomination would be the most satisfactorily housed!

We may smile at this strange attitude, yet let us submit an inquiry: If denominationalism would be out of place in heaven, why is it not out of place on earth? Some one may say that this is not a fair way of putting the matter, but since what time was earth better than heaven?

THE GOSPEL AND NEW CONDITIONS.—No true scientist applies his knowledge of established law and fixed principle in precisely one way at all times. With every new condition that may arise, he recognizes, as he should, that, as a famous zoologist puts it, "New discoveries continually produce new conditions; hence there is nothing more obstructive than the reverence for old ideas and systems which have outlived their usefulness." Continuing, he says: "In observation, an old principle was *de minimis non curat lex.* Now, we cannot be too exact. Every cusp and facet of an animal's tooth has its value, not as a sign-post for a new species, but as suggestive of some function or relationship. Bird's-eye methods of comparison which, for example, find no difference between a rhinoceros and a lophiodon molar are of no service now that we are called upon to distinguish between so many lines of ancient mammals crowding in among the ancestors of existing mammals."

The Gospel of Christ is, in its primal teaching, established. Its application, in the face of new discoveries of human character and of human life, is as variant as the versatility of thought itself. The most successful teacher of Gospel principle is he who, while patient with men's inconstancies, recognizes that divine truth is, however unalterable, applicable in as many ways as there are star-beams in space.

FOLLOWING TRUTH, NOT LEADING IT.—This is at once the modest, liberal, and most rapidly cultivating condition the earnest inquirer for divine knowledge can assume.

A famous scientist, Daniel G. Brinton, president of the Brooklyn meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held last August, was so impressed with this conviction that he ventured to utter it in his introductory address. "The first lesson which every sound student learns," said he, "is to follow his facts, and not to lead them. New facts teach him new conclusions. His opinions of to-day must be modified by the learning of the morrow. He is at all times ready and willing to abandon a position when further investigation shows that it is probably incorrectly taken. He is in this the reverse of the opinionated man, the hobby-rider, and the dogmatist. The despair of a scientific assemblage is the member with a pet theory, with a fixed idea, which he is bound to obtrude and defend in the face of facts. Yet even toward him we are called upon to exercise our toleration and our charity, for the history of learning has repeatedly shown that from just such wayward enthusiasts solid knowledge has derived some of the richest contributions. So supreme, after all, is energy, that error itself, pursued with fervid devotion, yields a more bountiful harvest than truth languidly cultivated." Yet, however supported, all this prying into the objective, external aspect of things; this minute, painstaking study of phenomena; this reiterated revision and rejection of results—are with the single aim of discovering those absolute laws of motion, of life and mind, which are ubiquitous and eternal; which bear unimpeachable witness to the unity and the simplicity of the plan of the universe, and which reveal

with sun-clear distinctness that unchangeable order which presides over all natural processes, lifting the mind above the gross contacts of life, presenting aims which are at once practical, humanitarian, and spiritually elevating.

"I GAVE MY HEART TO KNOW WISDOM" (Eccl. i. 17). — However much the pessimist may dispute it, nevertheless it is true that the goal of humanity is wisdom. Dr. Powell, of Washington, declares: "In following the course of humanity from the earliest stages of development to the highest enlightenment, it is found that man has traveled by five roads—all parallel—from the starting point of ignorance toward the goal of wisdom, viz.: industries, pleasures, languages, institutions, and opinions.

"Now he travels on one road, now on another, parceling ont his activities and dividing his time between all. On wings of thought, he passes from way to way. When he travels by one road, he seems to have one end in view—by another road, another end in view; and yet, as often as he changes his road of travel he is pursuing the route to wisdom. He may travel by false charts, or he may lose his way, and yet the end in view may remain the same. He engages in the arts of industry, and the purpose is welfare; he engages in the arts of pleasure, and his purpose is happiness; he engages in the arts of speech, and the purpose is expression; he engages in institutional arts, and the purpose is justice; he engages in the arts of learning, and the purpose is knowledge. In the way by labor, the way by pleasure, the way by speech, the way by institutions, and the way by learning—in all ways—he runs to the goal of wisdom."

"YOUR SIN WILL FIND YOU OUT" (Num. xxxii. 23).—This declaration is proved in one instance, at least, in a most remarkable manner.

The story comes from Bermuda, and is to the effect that late in the fall a very prepossessing mulatto woman disappeared from her home. Suspicion was at once directed toward her husband, he being accused of having murdered her. No trace of the body, however, could be found; and after a while search was suspended, and people generally said that the woman's disappearance would never be accounted for.

One day a group of fishermen were quietly seated upon the shore, overlooking what is known as the Long Bay Channel. A slight, but persistent breeze was ruffling the entire surface of the water, which in itself would attract no especial attention at any time; but one of the group on the shore observed that at some distance out, there was a long streak in the water, which remained perfectly glassy. He at once connected the trivial fact with the disappearance of the mulatto woman. Just why he did so is not readily explained, perhaps; but, at all events, he instantly proposed an investigation, which after a while was made, with the result that a full discovery of the crime and the husband's guilt was brought about.

The murderer, being a fisherman, had calculated that by sinking his wife's body with heavy weights to the bottom of the channel it could not under any ordinary conditions regain the surface, and that after a short time the fish, which were very numerous, would easily destroy all possibility of identification. It never occurred to him, however, that the devouring fish would in eating the flesh liberate, so to speak, the oil-cells contained therein, which, coming in contact with the surface, would spread, calming it in precisely the same manner as a cask of oil emptied into the sea stills its turbulence. Portions of the woman's clothing remaining fully identified the body.

HEATHEN REVERENCE FOR THE SUPREME BEING.—The Marutse tribe of Africa, whose name suggests the

Maruts of Hindu mythology, is a new tribe to us, although we have an excellent description of them from the travels of an eminent English explorer. He tells us that they inhabit the rich country once the home of the warlike Ma-Kololo, of whom Dr. Livingstone so often speaks in his journal, and that, unlike the great and powerful Bantu tribe known to us as the Zulu race, they are entirely independent of the influence of European civilization as found in South Africa. Their appearance, their customs—in fact, their whole existence—is most peculiarly distinctive. It is their religion, however, which interests us here. Other tribes about them have no form of belief which may be said to constitute a religion, but the Marutse tribe are very clear in their ideas of a Supreme Being, and express a strong hope of immortality. Their name for God, N'Yambe, is seldom heard to pass their lips, so great is their reverence. Not long ago a man in one of their villages was gored to death by a large wild animal taken alive in a recent hunt. The villagers, with sad faces, simply said: "It is the will of N'Yambe, and we cannot resist." When any one falls ill in the tribe, prayer is made to God as N'Yambe, with a fervor of appeal which might win remark for an enlightened Christian. At certain seasons some of their rivers overflow the surrounding country, causing much destruction to property and even life. These occasions are regarded as national calamities. The people gather at an appointed place and offer prayers to N'Yambe and to those who may be about him. Once they had a king who claimed to be directly commissioned by N'Yambe to perform great miracles. Quietly the people called upon him to prove his supernatural gifts before them, and when he failed, as they expected he would, he found that he had forfeited his people's respect forever. The dress of this tribe is remarkably well made, and their astonishing skill in working ivory and all kinds of metal should win them more notice than they hitherto have received. Mentally, they would rank high. They have a fine ear for music, and manifest a marked respect for their women.

"WHATSOEVER THY HAND FINDETH TO DO, DO IT WITH THY MIGHT" (Eccl. ix. 10).—This is an injunction which the successful worker, obeying, has found to be the secret of his prosperity. Yet it is not always understood clearly as it might be. Some writer in *The Lancet* says: "This precept being interpreted, means that there should be *mind in work.*" Yes, and heart and soul also. "The difference," continues the writer, "between a work of art and the product of machinery lies in the presence of a mark of mind directing the handiwork in the one case, while the other is simply a predetermined result produced by a duly formulated process, wherein or whereby physical forces are directed and controlled by other physical forces on a set plan, to perform a defined series of actions, which *must*, in the nature of things, end in the production of the effect foreseen. Mind sets the one process or series of processes in operation, and they work out their physical destinies. In the other, mind is the active controlling power throughout. Little or no success, therefore, can be expected in any calling which does not suit the temper and bias of the mind pursuing it. There cannot be 'might' or earnestness in an uncongenial enterprise. It is not necessary that an occupation should be ardently loved, but it is indispensable that there should be some special fitness for a calling, if the powers are to be resolutely and effectually engaged.

"Thus we observe that men who work in hard material are men of iron will, which is equivalent to saying that the men of what is called hard-headed earnestness find a natural vent for

their energy in work that requires and consumes active power. On the other hand, the worker in soft materials is commonly either theoretical or dreamy. There is a special type of mental constitution connected with almost every distinct branch of industry, at least with those branches which have existed long enough to exercise a sufficient amount of influence on successive generations of workers. We are all familiar with what are called racial types of character. It would be well if some attention could be bestowed on the industrial types, both in relation to educational policy and the study of mental and physical habits in health and disease."

Why could not attention also be bestowed on the industrial types, in relation to better approach on spiritual matters, and the study not only of mental and physical habits, but of spiritual habits as well? Why need the practical dispenser of Gospel benefits leave such minute study of men only to the physician in the necessarily narrower sphere of medicine than his own? Magnify your opportunities, brethren! Then, indeed, "whatsoever our hands find to do, would be done with our might."

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

By Arthur T. Pierson, D.D.

Marginal Commentary: Notes on Genesis.

Gen. xxi. Taking the first two verses of this chapter, we have three statements:

(1) The Lord visited Sarah, as He had said.

(2) The Lord did unto Sarah as He had spoken.

(3) At the set time of which God had spoken.

A threefold emphasis upon God's fidelity to promise: *as* He promised, *what* He promised, *when* He promised.

Compare xvii. 15, 16: There the name is Elohim, here it is Jehovah. What the God of creation said, the Lord of covenant fulfilled.

Sarah indulged in a poetic outburst, which had doubtless, prophetic inspiration. Compare Hannah's, Elizabeth's, and Mary's similar utterances (1 Sam. ii. 1-7, Luke i). The original bears marks of designed parallelism.

And Sarah said:

"God hath made laughter for me,
Every one that heareth will laugh with me,
Who would have said unto Abraham,
That Sarah should suckle offspring;
For in his old age have I borne him a son."

When the manifestly typical name and personality of Isaac are considered, this utterance is seen to have a prophetic significance.

9. The word *mocking* means laughing, and is in the Septuagint rendered "*playing* with Isaac." Among the various interpretations the most probable is that the laughter of Abraham and Sarah was derisively imitated by Ishmael (see Gal. iv. 29).

Whatever was the character of the laughter, it moved Sarah to appeal to Abraham to "cast out" Hagar and Ishmael, and the Almighty confirmed the decree (verse 12). This narrative should be carefully compared with Gen. xvii. 15-27.

Also the story of Hagar's flight should be set alongside of the similar narrative in chap. xvi. 1-16. Both the resemblances and the differences are significant.

In both cases Hagar fled before the jealousy of Sarah—in one case, when Ishmael was conceived; in the other, when Isaac was born and weaned. In

both cases there seems to have been extreme thirst, and a fountain of water and an angel figure in the scene. In both cases the angel of the Lord speaks words of encouragement, and utters a prophecy about Ishmael. In one case, Hagar is sent back; in the other, not. It would appear that in both cases the fountain may have been divinely disclosed to her, and hence the emphasis upon *the seeing God*, who had not lost sight of her even in her despair.

It is well to assume in all Bible study that no repetition of similar incidents occurs without a reason, which oftentimes devout study will unveil. Adolph Saphir has sagaciously shown a typical bearing in the two miraculous feedings of the multitude by Christ and in the two drafts of fishes, pointing out that both the likeness and unlikeness have pregnant meanings.

12. *In Isaac shall thy seed be called.*

Here we have another instance of the narrowing down of the prophetic lines within which the Messianic seed was to appear. At every ramification of a plant it becomes by geometrical progression much more impossible by shrewd guesswork to indicate the particular branch on which the single fruit which is to appear is to be found. In Gen. iii.15, we learn that the Messianic seed is to be in Adam's family. Of all his descendants, Seth is chosen; of Seth's, Noah; of Noah's three sons, Shem, etc., until we come to Heber's family, and then it is to be in Abram's line; and now of Abraham's sons, Isaac is preferred to Ishmael. In each new case of limitation and selection, conjecture becomes by the law of compound probability more and more impossible. Nothing can account for the boldness of such particularity of prediction and the certainty of its fulfilment, unless God be the author of the prophecy and the history.

21. Hagar took for Ishmael *a wife out of the land of Egypt.* Another typical fact. How careful was Abraham that Isaac should not marry an Egyptian or a Canaanite. It was fitting that Ishmael, who is the ancestor of the Arabs, should be linked with Egypt, the symbol of this world.

Ishmael needs more study than he has received. He had twelve sons and a daughter. Twelve princes (xxv.16), probably fathers of tribes called after them. They spread over the desert to the Persian Gulf and peopled the Arabian peninsula to the north and west, the main nucleus of the Arab people. To this day the true Ishmaelites are thoroughly wild men, living by plunder and warlike depredations. They remain essentially nomadic, dwelling in tents, having no settled habitation, but following a migratory life, and hence accumulating little property save in flocks and herds, which follow their wanderings. They bow to no scepter but that of their chiefs, and spread terror wherever they go. Mohammed claimed Ishmael as his ancestor, and hence the identification of the false prophet with the name of Ishmael.

To say no more, if Ishmael be taken as the type of Mohammedanism, the biblical narratives concerning him become invested with a new significance.

Note the home of the Mohammedan tribes; the place of their Mecca; their roving, wild, and predatory life; their methods of propagandism; their location near the Jewish "Holy Land"; their untamable character, even before Christianity, as the unsubdued masters of the desert; and, while boasting of the same Abraham, who is to us the father of the faithful, refusing to be assimilated to the Christian and his faith. Note also that to this day Arabia and Egypt remain as one in character and faith. What other two countries after these thousands of years acknowledge this early wedlock!

31. Beersheba, the well of the *oath*, means also the well of the *seven*. There was a link between the number seven and the idea of ratification by oath, as is seen in the sacrifice of seven victims, the gift of seven gifts,

or the testimony of seven witnesses or pledges, as in this case.

33. Abraham planted a grove—rather a tamarisk-tree. Trees and wells, especially in desert places, were naturally associated, as at Elim. The well nourished the tree and the tree protected the well, and both made an oasis. This evergreen shrub, by its hardiness and tenacity of life, would be to Abraham and his seed a lasting memorial of their right to and possession in this well.

Compare the first Psalm, where the man whose delight in the law of the Lord is compared to a tree planted by the river—the roots taking up the moisture and transmuting it into sap, and so into leaf and flower and fruit. The Word of God nourishes the spiritual life of the devout disciple, and he in turn defends the Word, as its witness and obedient example; and when you get the Word of God and the true child of God united, you have the oasis in this desert of life.

CHAPTER xxii. This chapter unveils *Abraham's* "*temptation*," *i.e.*, his testing or proving.

Much needless difficulty has been found or made in these words: "God did tempt Abraham," and they have been construed as in direct conflict with James i. 13. But the verb translated *tempt*, as Gesenius contends, means to test by the sense of smell, hence to put to proof (comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 39, Psa. xxvi. 2).

The father of the faithful was in God's school. As he was not only the first especially chosen representative of a righteousness which is imputed by faith, but was to be the head of a believing people, the divine Teacher took upon Himself in a very peculiar sense Abraham's moral and spiritual training for his destiny. This was one of the stages in that education. His call, his Egyptian experience, circumcision, separation from Lot, and the various theophanies by which he became the friend of God, and knew Him as a friend—all indicate his special schooling. Never has any man—not excepting Moses, who presents a marked parallelism—been more peculiarly educated by the divine Educator than was Abraham.

2. "*Offer him there.*"

It has been said that God here commands Abraham to *slay* Isaac, which is contrary to the noblest instincts of our nature. It is quite noticeable that God gave him *no such command.* The Hebrew word, עָלָה means to go up, and in the Hiphil, to cause to go up or ascend. Literally translated, this might be rendered, "and cause him to go up there." The English word "offer" conveys a similar meaning; literally, it means to bring to, or present before, another. Abraham did all this; and however he may have *understood* the command as including the actual sacrifice of Isaac, the command itself did not necessarily include such a consummation of the act. Compare Malachi i. 8, "*Offer* it (the blind, lame, sick) now to the governor: will he be pleased with thee or *accept* thy person?" etc. Here a distinction is drawn between an offering *presented* and an offering *accepted.* Abraham was commanded to present Isaac for an offering. God did not tell him to do anything more. Abraham undoubtedly understood that he was to slay his son, but God never meant that he should.

This one consideration alone relieves all the real difficulty of the passage; and we need not resort to the expedient of defending God's temptation of Abraham on the ground that the true basis of all morality is the will of God, which is at least doubtful, for there is an eternal distinction between right and wrong aside from the volition of God; nor do we need to vindicate this proving of Abraham on the ground that he ought to do as much for Jehovah as the heathen did for their demon gods. The whole conclusion of the history, with the intervention of God by a voice from heaven, and the furnishing of the sacrificial victim, condemns human sacrifice, and proves that even when

God's will is construed as favoring and commanding it, such an offering is repugnant to the will of God, though it were the very crown of faith, devotion, and self-abnegation.

As to the rest, it is only necessary to call attention to the remarkable readiness, promptness, and calmness with which Abraham prepared to obey. Heroism, more perfect, the history of man does not furnish, nor faith more sublime. Here was the only son, and the son of his old age, essentially a marvelous gift, in whom centered all his hopes; and the apparent will of God required him not only to yield him to God, but to sacrifice him, and, as he thought, slay him with his own hand; yet at once he made ready to obey in every exact particular.

8. *God will provide himself a lamb.* An instance in which he uttered perhaps an unconscious prophecy.

14. In the mount of the Lord it shall be *provided;* or, in the mount will the Lord provide, is a better translation, and shows the connection of the name Jehovah Jireh with the rest of the verse.

The significance of this event reaches beyond this testing of Abraham. All agree that the occurrence is *typical,* though there are two quite divergent interpretations of the type.

One class of interpreters look upon Isaac as the type of the Messiah, and the resemblances are very striking.

(1) Isaac's supernatural birth.

(2) The dearly beloved and only son.

(3) Willingly obedient unto death.

(4) The victim carrying the wood to the place of the altar.

(5) The sacrifice fulfilled in purpose, though not in act.

(6) The father receiving the son as from the dead

(7) After three days, in the father's purpose and belief.

As to the defective feature, the actual death being lacking, this was supplied by the death of the ram, and his substitution for a human life.

Theodoret says Isaac was the type of the Godhead, and the ram of the manhood. Isaac was a human being, and too high in nature and rank to be actually slain on the altar; and hence the Most High prepares a purely animal victim at the critical moment to be exchanged for Isaac, and so, as it were, to give *continuity* to the sacrificial offering thus far represented in Isaac. So the blessed divine Son offered Himself for us all, but was by nature incapable of suffering as a sin offering; so the Father prepares for Him a perfect humanity (Heb. x. 5), that in the human nature which was capable of sin and suffering He might endure temptation and death, being so joined with that impassible, immortal nature as to be inseparable from it. Thus Isaac and the ram together represent the two natures of the Son of God joined in his vicarious substitution.

The other interpretation makes Isaac to represent the attempt of man by sacrifices of his own to avert divine wrath; and the ram provided by God to represent the Messiah of God, who takes the place of all the vain offerings of man, as the acceptable victim.

Both theories are ingenious, but the former seems to be preferable.

After all, it makes little difference what particular mode of interpretation be adopted, so long as we see here the essential truth foreshadowed, that God has provided a Lamb as a sin-offering to take away the sins of the world.

OUR whole scientific conception of things is formed now in equations of force. The transformation of energy proceeds beneath all stable appearances of things. The earth quivers to its center to the influences of the stars. Elemental forces hold each other in firm embrace in the great mountains and in the ancient order of the heavens. It is with the primal and eternal forces that we have to do even in the quietest of things. Human history, no less than the physical processes of nature, is a ceaseless transformation and conservation of energy. Human destiny is a problem of forces.—*Smyth.*

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By Wayland Hoyt, D.D.

April 1–6.—Crossing the Bridge before You come to It.—Mark vi. 34.

Our common proverb, "Don't cross the bridge before you come to it," quite accurately and picturesquely translates this Scripture into the terms of our daily life. In discussing this topic I cannot do better than to say over again what I said about it, a good while since, in the columns of *The Congregationalist*. I think it was Mr. Beecher once told me how, for a long time, he needlessly weighted himself and hindered himself with a pestering anxiousness. He was a young man and preaching in his first mission church in that little pioneer town in Indiana. It fell to his duty to make many horseback journeys, and chiefly in the spring, in preaching tours and in attendance upon associations. There were many rivers in the country, and in the spring the floods were out; and in that new country the bridges were none of the strongest, and just now were especially dangerous because of the spring floods. For days and days before he must undertake such journey, and after he entered on it, he was almost sick with a kind of nervous dread, lest when he struck one of these bridges it should not bear him. And so the journey, hard enough anyway in the mud and in the rain and sometimes in the sleet and snow, was rendered doubly difficult by such foreboding anxiousness. But the bridges always held. And so the pile of possible evil he strapped upon his back was a quite useless and an altogether needlessly added weight upon him. And he learned at last not to bother about the bridges, at least until he came to them.

Is not that a very real picture of the way many of us, and concerning many things, are quite steadily doing? Crossing bridges in anxious foreboding long before we come to them, weighting and hindering ourselves with valueless and needless worry, forgetting the defending injunction of our Lord and Master, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

How frequently we cross these bridges before we come to them concerning the results of the possible mistakes we think we may have made!

Here we stand, where it is the doom of life we must so often stand, where two ways meet. We are sincerely desirous to choose the way which is at once the right and the best. In the time yielded us for decision we make use of all the aids given us by means of which we may reach the right and best decision. We pray; we take account of the teachings of the Scripture; we listen to our consciences; we get all the light an intelligent survey of the situation can afford us; we take reckoning of our capacity, our aptitude in this direction or in that; we gather what light we may, as well, from the advice of judicious friends. Then at last it comes, as it must come always, that we ourselves must make decision. And so we start along our chosen way. Then unlooked-for difficulties appear in this way in which we have chosen to set our feet. Then we say we have made a mistake. It does not follow that we really have, but we think we have.

But we must go on—that is the doom of life, that we must go on. We are nervous and hesitant in our going on. We are regretful and brooding about an impossible getting back into a past which is already fixed and finished. We imagine ourselves plunged into the whelming flood of some disaster. We come up to one of these bridges builded of the results of our choosing. We go on it, for we must. It bears. But there is another bridge ahead, and then another and another, and all the time we are in foreboding fear. And so we

weight and hamper ourselves and forget our Lord's injunction, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Then how often we cross the bridge before we come to it concerning accumulating, and as they seem to us when looked at in the lump, impossible duties. Jane Taylor's story of the discontented pendulum is in point. Gloomy day; pendulum out of heart; fell into a mathematical mood; began to calculate how many times it would have to swing back and forth in an hour, a day, a week, a month, a year, in ten years. Pendulum, utterly appalled, stopped. Nor could it be persuaded to start again until it began to see that it must only sway once in the moment next it, and that simply doing that would in time put the whole ten years' work behind it. A bridge of duty which cannot be made to bear the weight of a ten years' service heaped at once upon it will easily bear that whole weight when it is distributed upon it as the recurring moments and days may demand. Sydney Smith's prescription of "short views" is a good one for anxious people. Such crossing of the bridge before we come to it prevents clear vision and the right estimate of things; it turns and twists the events of life to somber caricature; you see things always with threatening aspect. You see them thus, though they do not really wear such aspect. You are scared needlessly.

The best way of defeating this so common tendency of foreboding trouble, of crossing the bridge before you come to it, is the sedulous cultivating of a special intimacy with Jesus Christ. Of what evils is not that, after all, the master cure? The heart and meaning of our Christianity is personal faith in the person Jesus Christ, and this Christ of ours solicits such special intimacy with every one of us. "Friendship," says Emerson, "bathes the soul in an element of love like a fine ether." And the particular significance of my Christianity is that Jesus Christ and myself stand together in the relation of a personal friendship. He is to be intimate with me and I with Him. He discloses Himself to me in the pages of the gospels—His love, His tender sympathy, His delicate and self-sacrificing attention. He puts Himself close to me by the ministry of the Holy Spirit. He dwells in me, clarifying my vision, girding my purpose, lifting my ideals. "Closer is He than breathing, nearer than hands and feet." And as I open myself for the inflowing of His friendship I learn to love, and the child of love is trust. And so it is possible for me to go with a sweet, deep, unforeboding rest, for life, for death, for future destiny, held in the clasping arms of an increasing trust, for He will make the bridges stand and bear.

APRIL 7-13.—AMID THE OLIVE-TREES.—Mark xiv. 32.

It is Gethsemane. Turning aside, like Moses, to see the great sight—the agony of our Lord amid the shadows of the olive-trees—draw not too nigh, listener; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. There are mysteries here which even the angels, bending intently down, cannot fathom. But there are some momentous lessons we may reverently gather even as Moses was taught by the strangely burning bush.

1. Behold here, coming out with the utmost clearness, the most precious truth of the *absolute humanity* of our Lord Jesus.

I have thought much of John Ruskin's words, "We never think of Christ enough as God, never enough as man, the instinctive habit of our minds being always to miss of the divinity, and the reasoning and enforced habit to miss of the humanity. We are afraid to harbor in our thoughts or to utter in the hearing of others any thought of our Lord as hungering, tired, sorrowful, having a human soul and affected by events of human life as a human creature is; and yet one half of the efficiency of His atonement and the

whole of the efficiency of His example depend on His having been this to the full." But here, amid these olive-shadows, let us grasp this truth of the precious humanity of our Lord. How constantly the truth comes out—the *sinking* beneath a mighty trouble, the craving for sympathy, the even passionate calling for friendly presence, the request for others' prayers, the struggle to bring the will into perfect chime with the Father's will, the victory through submission, like Jacob's there by the Brook Jabbok—clinging instead of wrestling—how profoundly human it all is, how it repeats our own experiences, how it assures us that it is our own nature burdened there and pleading there and triumphing there! Humanity is there—a humanity as real as the patriarch's when he said, "All these things are against me"; as real as David's when he lay all night on the ground pleading for his baby's life; as real as Paul's when he struggled with his thorn in the flesh. What light does all this throw upon those great words in Hebrews: "For in that He Himself hath *suffered* being tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted." How real prayer must be and efficacious unto the heart of such a Christ! What certainty of sympathetic succor!

2. Let us learn, reverently waiting here among the olive-trees, to rightly *estimate our sin.*

What were the elements of this awfully anguishful sorrow? For knowledge? Yes. "Jesus, therefore, *knowing in Himself* all things that should come upon Him." Shrinking from the pain of death? Yes. He who became flesh would share with us that shrinking. But certainly there must have been another element—the *substitutionary.* He was wounded for our transgressions. It does not seem to me at all possible to explain this agony pressing out bloody sweat unless a real element of substitution be allowed. He bore our grief. He carried our sorrows. To me there is a fearfully solemn application here. Some say the punishment for sin is not endless, that in the other life the sinner may *suffer out* his *own* punishment and so eventually and essentially save himself. If that be true, this awful agony of Jesus is to me inexplicable. Nay, in this awful agony of Jesus, I see at once His voluntary substitution of Himself for the sinner, and the terrible guilt and danger of human sin.

3. Let us heed our Lord's tender appeal to His disciples; let us refuse to be sleepily sluggish and laggard; let us be ready to watch with Him, to be alert for His sake.

4. Let us learn the necessity of forearming prayer. How true these words of Robertson: "That hour in the garden was a precious opportunity given for laying in spiritual strength. Christ knew it well. He struggled and fought *then;* therefore, there was no struggling afterward, no trembling in the judgment-hall, no shrinking on the cross, but only dignified and calm victory, for He had fought the temptation on His knees beforehand, and conquered all in the garden. The battle of the judgment-hall, the battle of the cross, were already fought and over in the Watch and in the Agony. The apostles missed the meaning of that hour; and therefore, when it came to the question of trial, the loudest boaster of them all shrank from acknowledging whose he was, and the rest played the part of the craven and the renegade. And if the reason be asked, it is simply this: They went to trial unprepared; they had not prayed; and what is a Christian without prayer but Samson without his talisman of hair!"

APRIL 14–20.—AND CAME TO THE SEPULCHER.—John xx. 3.—As we come with John and Peter to the sepulcher, and the preaching of our Lord's sepulcher while it is

First—A *sealed* sepulcher,

(*a*) That sealed sepulcher preaches to us of *death*, for it holds a dead occupant.

There could be no doubt about His death. They hung Him on that cross. Upon it He was smitten with such spiritual agony that His heart broke. The Roman soldier, marveling that He should be so soon dead, thrust His heart through with his spear. That settled it. After that there could be no question about His death. To His death the executing centurion certified; to the fact of His death the procurator, Pilate, assented; in the fact of His death the Pharisees rejoiced, because of the certainty of His death the disciples bewailed. Yes, the body which was held by that sealed sepulcher was a dead body, as dead as was Abel's body when Cain smote him down, and our first parents hung in wondering misery over their murdered boy.

(*b*) That sealed sepulcher preaches of a *specializing identification*. Think of the meaning of that sealing! Before that sepulcher's door they rolled a mighty stone blocking its entrance. Then they sealed it. How? They drew a string over the stone and fastened each end of it with wax, then into the wax they sank a seal. Who sealed it? The Roman authorities. That particular and special sepulcher in which they had laid the dead body of our Lord, the Roman authorities thus sealed; that sepulcher which disciples lingered before, and Pharisees rejoiced over, and centurion designated, and Roman sentinels were sent to guard. How precisely identified—*that* sepulcher.

(*c*) That sealed sepulcher preaches of the triumph of a bitter enmity. He lived. He wrought. He blessed. He taught—no man ever spake like this man. But they hated him—Pharisee, Scribe, Sanhedrim. And now they have conquered in His death. Yes, death ends the controversy. A great cause has come to nothing. A bitter enmity has won its victory.

(*d*) That sealed sepulcher preaches of the *utter going out of hope*. They trusted—those faithful disciples—that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel. But now to those disciples, that sealed sepulcher is the black temple of a complete despair.

Second—Going with the disciples to the sepulcher. Listen to the preaching of our Lord's sepulcher when it is *unsealed:*

(*a*) It preaches of transcendent *triumph*. Our Lord has utterly vanquished death.

(*b*) It preaches of transcendent *power*. Have you noticed how the folded grave-clothes preach of the *ease* of our Lord's victory? There is no evidence of straining struggle. Our Lord accomplishes so easily, He can have care about the disposition of the cerements which wrapped His body round.

(*c*) It preaches to us of an *unanswerable argument*. Our Lord staked the whole integrity of His being and ministry on the resurrection. He meets the test. "He is risen, *as He said.*"

From these preachings gather some lessons.

1. *The certainty of another life.* Our Lord has proved a life beyond death by living it before human eyes.

2. *Death's vanquishment.* Christ is the first fruits. He is a specimen of death's final vanquishment.

3. *A glorious life.* I do not know anything more stimulative of high cheer than a careful comparison of our Lord's pre- and post-resurrection life. Into a glorious life, like his post-resurrection life, He will surely lift us.

4. *A present duty.* Such a Christ will surely conquer. What duty and what wisdom to be in real alliance with Him, and now, at once!

APRIL 21-27.—OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION, AN INCENTIVE TO DUTY (Phil. iii. 10).—It was for this the Apostle Paul was praying, that he might know Christ, *and the power of His Resurrection.*

Some mean, meager dark room in one of the vast insulæ or lodging-houses, and probably in the ghetto where the Jews were crowded and the

squalidest portion of the city, was the "hired house" in which the worn apostle lived a prisoner, whence he wrote this epistle of which this prayer is part. Analyze a little his condition:

(*a*) Living thus, he could not know a moment's solitude. A Roman soldier was chained to him, day and night.

(*b*) Living thus, he was denied all exercise. I doubt if he ever crossed the threshold of his poor room, which was his prison.

(*c*) Living thus, he was living a very different life from that to which he had been accustomed, ranging, as he had been, to Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, etc., amid new scenes and surroundings. This chained and limited life must have been most depressing.

(*d*) Living thus, he was a chronic invalid; that plaguing "thorn in the flesh" was with him still.

(*e*) Living thus, he was under the shadow of a great uncertainty; he could not know what would be the issue of his trial before Cæsar.

(*f*) Living thus, he was living also amid great anxiety—there was upon him still the care of all the Churches. How would they get on? The mother-like solicitude for the Churches is a characteristic of the epistles of the captivity.

How hard it must have been to maintain cheer, hope, faith; to hold himself to the doing of the duties toward God, others, himself, which even in such imprisonment would still clasp him!

Plainly, what the Apostle needed was power, incentive. This power he sought; this power he found. This epistle to the Philippians, though it had its birth in such a winter of imprisonment, is a beautiful summer-caroling of thankfulness, praise, joy.

We, too, need power.

There is no better power for us than that which so kept and girded the great Apostle—the power of the resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

(*A*) It is the power of a *living* Christ. This is the message of the risen Lord. "I am He that *liveth* and was dead; behold, I am *alive for evermore.*"

(*B*) It is the power of a *powerful* Christ. I have read how, in the city of Hanover, in Germany, is an old, neglected graveyard. Near the entrance is a tomb, in which are the remains of a woman who belonged to the old nobility, and who was buried here about the middle of the last century. The tomb is covered with massive blocks of stone, fastened with heavy iron clamps. On one of these stones, besides the name of the woman and the date of her death, there are carved these words: "This grave, bought for all time, must never be opened." But there are mightier forces than heavy stones and iron clamps. A little seed found lodgment in the crevice between two of the stones. It took root and grew, until now there is an immense birch-tree waving its graceful limbs over the tomb. But as the tree grew its roots went through the grave, and the trunk lifted the great stones and broke the iron clamps. And the little seed has opened the grave, for its power was greater than the stone and iron. It was the power of life.

So Christ had, in Himself, the power of life. He mastered death. And pointing to His resurrection as instance and specimen of His power, He exclaims: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth; and lo! I am with you alway; go ye, *therefore.*"

(*C*) It is the power of a *sympathizing* Christ. Through all the changes of earth and resurrection He remains the Christ vibrating with sympathy. So His help is real. So prayer to Him is real. We have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, etc.

(*D*) The power of His resurrection is the power of a *forgiving* Christ. One dreamed:

I sat alone with my conscience,
In a place where time had ceased;
And we talked of my former living
In the land where the years increased;
And I felt I should have to answer
The question put to me,

And to face the answer and question
Throughout an eternity.

The ghost of forgotten actions
Came floating before my sight,
And things that I thought were dead things
Were alive with a terrible might;
And the vision of all my past life
Was an awful thing to face,
Alone with my conscience sitting
In that solemnly silent place.

But it needs no dream to tell me that my conscience is against me. I need atonement. Christ has wrought it. His resurrection is the pledge that that atonement has been accepted, so I may be delivered through the atonement of the risen Christ from the dragging consciousness of my sins. I may be glad and free to lay hold of duty.

(*E*) The power of His resurrection is the power of a risen Christ, who by His resurrection has opened for me the vista of another and a larger life. What incentive to duty here—the hope and reward of heaven!

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

St. Paul's Pastoral Counsels to the Corinthians.

BY PROF. W. GARDEN BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D., EDINBURGH.

IN drift and structure, the First Epistle to the Corinthians is a remarkable contrast to the Epistle to the Romans. The one is emphatically a letter, the other a treatise or discourse. The Epistle to the Romans is a grand exposition of the greatest of all sciences—Christian theology. The letter to the Corinthians is a friendly discussion of some matters of difficulty that had arisen in the Church of Corinth. In Romans, we have Paul the preacher and the theologian; in 1st Corinthians, we have Paul the pastor and ecclesiastical adviser. And although surpassing ability in both these departments is seldom found in the same individual, the Apostle shines in the one as much as in the other. The wise, acute, yet spiritually minded and affectionate pastor is not less conspicuous in the letter to the Corinthians than the great preacher and profound theologian in the Epistle to the Romans. True, there are passages in 1st Corinthians worthy to rank with anything in the Epistle to the Romans, but these arise out of the pastoral counsels which precede them; and the explanation is, that the soul of the Apostle was always so much on fire with the great truths of the Gospel that he could not touch them without unfolding somewhat of their glory. But the number of brilliant gifts that met in St. Paul almost defies enumeration. Even apart from his inspiration, was he not the greatest theologian, the greatest missionary, the greatest preacher, and the greatest writer of the early Church?

There are many things to be noted for a life-picture of the Corinthian Church when Paul wrote his letter. The city itself, Corinth, was not the old Corinth of the Achean league, that maltreated the Roman ambassadors, and in return brought upon itself utter ruin and destruction nearly a hundred and fifty years B.C. The place lay desolate for a century, notwithstanding its remarkable advantages as an emporium for commerce, through the harbor of Cenchrea on the one side and that of Lechæum on the other. At length it was rebuilt by Julius Cæsar, about a hundred years before Paul visited it. It became the Roman capital of Greece, and regained a large share of its former prosperity. As a meeting place for East and West, in its earliest days it had brought together the vices of both, and in its restored condition it seemed to fall heir to the wickedness of its predecessor. Though the new Corinth did not contain that

infamous Temple of Venus which of old had been served by a thousand harlot priestesses, it was notorious for its profligacy and sensuality, and the Christian Church did not escape the effects of the tainted atmosphere.

As to the Church of Corinth, it was remarkable for this, that a very large proportion of its members were of Gentile origin. This probably furnishes the explanation of the different tactics to the Jews which St. Paul followed in Corinth as compared with other European cities. Instead of betaking himself to flight, as at Thessalonica and Berea, when the synagogue stirred up opposition, he shook off the dust of his mantle against the Jews, but continued in the place, devoting himself chiefly to the Gentiles. This composition of the Corinthian Church likewise explains the great difference between the errors and corruptions of that Church and those, for example, of the Galatian. The one Church consisted mainly of Gentile elements, the other of Hebrew.

There was another respect in which the Corinthian Church was distinguished—the abundance and brilliancy of its supernatural and spiritual gifts. No other Church seems to have been so richly endowed. It was a great hive of ecclesiastical activity. But this very wealth of gifts bred a tendency to disorder. Thus between the moral disorder of the community and the ecclesiastical disorder of the Church, there was great need for a strong controlling power to create a more settled and regulated condition. Hence the great aim of the epistle is to gender *order*, moral, ecclesiastical, and spiritual. It is to control without killing the effervescence and exuberant outflow of activity in the Corinthian Church; to guide the new life into safe channels; to promote unity and harmony without chilling ardor or lessening efficiency. To accomplish this was a task of no ordinary difficulty. Few men have the gift of handling an impetuous enthusiasm so as to leave its force unabated, while its errors are corrected and its extravagance subdued. But the Apostle was eminently successful; and the instrument which he made use of was not his dialectical method, so conspicuous in his Epistle to the Romans, but his sanctified common-sense. The Holy Spirit, that made so much use of his logic then, makes equal use of his mother-wit now.

His success was very remarkable. The proof of this is that in 2d Corinthians he hardly finds it necessary even to touch on the matters on which he had written so fully and so earnestly in his first epistle. His tone is remarkably changed. On all the points on which he wrote, the Corinthian Church appears to have followed his advice, and the threatened storm settled into a delightful calm. The only reason he finds for returning in the second epistle to what he had written in the first is to calm down the distress which the reproofs of his first epistle had occasioned. And not only were the evils apparently corrected at once, but they were corrected once for all. Never again had incest of the worst kind to be condoned at Corinth. Never again did men drink to intoxication at the Lord's table. Never again were the public services of the Church disturbed by such disorder. Never again was there serious doubt on the doctrine of the Resurrection. In a somewhat different sense from that in which he used the words of 2 Cor. ii. 14, he might have said of the effects of his first epistle, "Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in every place."

The topics on which the Apostle gives his pastoral counsels fall under several heads. On some of them his advice had been asked; on other points he had received information of what was going on, and apprehending dangers to which others were blind, he gives his views in clear, strong terms. Dividing the epistle on this principle, we find that—

1. The first point relates to a party

strife in the Church. This brings up the great question of Church union, and of the way in which strife and division are to be dealt with in a Church, along with the question of apostolic authority and the standing of ministers (i–iv.).

2. The next point relates to a sin of incest that had been committed, and the unsatisfactory state of feeling prevalent in the Corinthian Church (bred of their heathen origin) respecting sensual vice (v.–vi.). This suggests a digression on law-pleas, and the principle that should guide members of the Church in exposing their frailties to the heathen. The subject of Church discipline is brought up, and the Christian view of litigation.

3. The third point relates to marriage, and involves the question of *social* contact between the Church and the world (vii.).

4. The fourth point refers to feasts of the pagan sacrifices, and involves the question of contact between the Church and the world on the *ceremonial* side (viii.–x.).

5. The fifth concerns various Church arrangements, embracing (*a*) the clothing of *women* in meetings for worship, (*b*) the administration of the *Lord's supper*, (*c*) the exercise of *gifts* (and here occurs the beautiful excursus on "charity"), (*d*) the paramount claims of *order* and edification (x.–xiv.).

6. The sixth point is a doctrinal one —the *resurrection of the body*. Here the eagle expands his wings and soars aloft, far as the eye can follow (xv.).

7. In the last chapter, returning to earthly things, he gives directions *for collecting money;* then makes some personal explanations in regard to his own movements, and refers to various persons known to the Corinthians. The subjects are Church finance and Church fellowship.

I. *Church Divisions and Church Union* (i.–iv.). With this topic the Church in all ages has been only too familiar. It is not easy to know precisely what the Corinthians were quarreling about. There seems to have been not a little of temper in the matter—men finding themselves somehow in different camps, and getting into fierce conflict for little better reason than because they were in different camps. How did the Apostle deal with this state of things? First of all, he took no side, not even his own; he said not a word on the merits or demerits of the opposing factions, or of the men to whom they related. Seeing that it was mainly an affair of temper, as so many Church quarrels are, he did not profess to decide between the parties, but he quietly set himself to restore a Christian spirit. And for this end, he dwells on the infinite claims of our great divine Lord, the head of the Church, to all honor and glory, in the view of all that He has done for us, tacitly indicating that it is shameful for His ransomed people to quarrel over the merits of His servants, and to show a passionate eagerness to secure great honor for them. He rears the Cross before their eyes, shows them the Son of God crucified upon it, and aims at so overpowering them by the stupendous work of the Saviour agonizing to save men as to make their little aims and party ambitions sink into contempt. In a word, he tries to subdue them into a Christian spirit by exalting CHRIST. "Is Christ divided?" Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? The lesson is a memorable one, lifting up Christ on the cross, and likewise on the throne, as the antidote to the spirit of faction. Dazzling men so with the glory of the sun, that the difference between star and star can hardly be seen. Too often it falls to the authorities or leading men in the Church to have to deal with congregations torn by strife. The origin of the strife is often very paltry. The course followed by St. Paul may give us a useful lesson in such circumstances. Enter as little as possible into the *pros* and *cons* of the

controversy. Mediators should avoid taking a side. Rather aim at lifting the thoughts to a higher region, at so filling the people's hearts with the glory of Christ that the spirit of strife, ashamed of itself, shall die, as it were, a natural death.

Nor is it well to wait for this till strife actually breaks out. Prevention is better than cure. Strife will be held in abeyance if the ordinary drift of the ministry, alike in preaching, in prayer, and in praise, is to impress the people with the claims of Jesus Christ, and to excite the spirit of wonder and gratitude in the contemplation of His work and His love. There can be little tendency to strife where all hearts and voices blend in the song, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain."

But exalting Christ does not mean merely preaching the Incarnation and the Atonement. It is only when the preacher's own heart is stirred by the emotions of humility, gratitude, and wonder that he can expect his audience to get a right impression.

This, however, is not all the pastoral lesson from this section of the epistle. In the course of the partizan quarrel, reflections had been thrown out against the Apostle on the subject of his preaching; both substance and style had been found fault with. Why did he dwell so much on that unphilosophical subject, the Cross? Why did he not cultivate a more literary style? Did he not remember that Corinth was now the capital of Greece, and in some sense the heir to the Athens of former days. The Apostle's answer was virtually, I preach what I was called to preach. But not in a dark, dogged spirit. When I preach the Cross, I preach what God uses to enlighten, to transform, to beautify, to save. I preach it, too, in many lights. Is not the Cross the great mystery, long kept secret, and now at length revealed to the glory of God's grace and mercy? Is it not the outcome of divine wisdom, for want of which the princes of this world killed the Lord of glory? Is the crucified but risen Saviour not the fountain of all that is most needed by man in order to raise him to the true height of his being—is He not the source of "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption?" Is it not from Christ crucified that those blessings come of which it is written that eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the mind of man? And as to the poverty of my style when compared to that of the flowery rhetorician, is that worth minding if God is pleased to bless my words, and make them words of life to souls dead in trespasses and sins?

In one place he vindicates himself by lowering the whole order of which he is a member. You are boasting, are you, of this minister or of that? But what *are* ministers? In the spiritual vineyard, only instruments. They can plant and they can water, but they can do no more. They cannot form one living seed; they cannot produce a single grape. All the power, all the resource, all the glory, are God's. How infinitely better for you to be in vital relation to Him than to be under some favorite minister! Just think what you have when you have God! Why, everything! "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, for ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

II. *Sensuality and Litigation* (v.–vi.). The case of incest—that of a man who had married his stepmother—was very deplorable; but the worst feature of the case was that it gave rise to no remonstrance in the Church. It was taken coolly; no effort was made to deal with it in the way of discipline. How clearly we see the effects of the polluted atmosphere of Corinth—sensual vice readily condoned! But the case was practically humiliating to the Church, for among the Gentiles it was a thing hitherto unknown. Possibly in Corinth, as in other places, there was a tendency to abuse the doctrine of

free grace. When forgiveness was to be had so freely, men may have loosened the rein of self-control, or they may have supposed that they were emancipated from the obligations of the moral law as well as the ceremonial, and that the pleasures of the flesh were not excluded from the liberty with which Christ had made them free.

How, then, does the Apostle deal with this deplorable situation? First, he tells them very plainly what he thinks of the case, and how smartly he would have dealt with it had he been present. It was a shocking affair, an affair for the highest censure of the Church; indeed, he had himself virtually excommunicated the offender, and had delivered him to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

But denouncing the crime was not enough. He throws new light on the sinfulness of sensuality. As before he had shown the sinfulness of faction and strife by placing them over against the Cross of Christ, so now he indicates the vile nature of sensuality by bringing into view the mystical union of the believer and Christ. If the believer and Christ are one, the believer's body is a member of Christ. Now, to take the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot, is an outrage immeasurably gross. It is a bold and startling view of sensual vice. We shudder at the thought of a Christian doing a thing so horrible, so blasphemous. Moreover, the Apostle dwells on the Christian life as a holy festival, a festival peculiarly glorious because the sacrificial victim is Christ our Passover; and if for the Hebrew Passover they had very carefully to put away all leaven, how much more careful should we be to keep the Christian festival with clean hands and a pure heart! It is the glory of Christianity that it offers its blessings to all, and does not shut its door even against the abominable. But once we come within the Church of Christ, we undergo a process of divine purification—"ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;" your bodies are become the temples of the Holy Ghost. It is madness to fancy that you may hug the abominable lusts of the flesh.

Here, then, is another pastoral lesson—how to check sensuality. But here again it should be remembered that prevention is better than cure. It is better for a pastor to impress his view beforehand, so that sensual vice and all vice shall be seen in its own odious colors, than wait till some hideous outburst of it has horrified all. How is he to train his people so that the very face of vice, though painted and decorated with every fascination, shall become odious to them, and the best and strongest feelings of their hearts shall be roused against it? How better than, when setting forth the glorious relation to Christ into which grace brings them and the surpassing purity of Him with whom they become one, by bidding them say what they think, in that light, of the common sins, against which even Christians are not proof—sins of temper, sins of greed, sins of sensuality, sins of pride, sins of deceit? Of course this is not an attractive subject. It repels those whose pampered appetites will have nothing but sweet and luscious food. But it is wiser to follow Paul than pander to the taste of spiritual epicures. One of the highest functions of the Christian ministry is to show the odiousness of sin. Might we not make more speed in this than we do by weaving together animating views of Christian privilege and strong dissuasions against self-indulgence, against sensuality, against all forms of sin? The skill of the Christian pastor is shown in his associating bright and pleasant things with duty; repulsive and horrid things with sin. Men will often be drawn when they will not be driven. Pastoral tact is shown in the use of bright as well as lurid pictures when the object is to promote purity,

to draw men to the footsteps of Christ.

Another useful pastoral lesson here is to be found in the different treatment the Apostle would apply to those that are without and those that are within. The fact of pagans living unclean lives may not prevent our being on friendly terms with them; but if a Christian should be leading an unclean life, no sort of fellowship should be held with him. Why this difference? Because, where men professing to be Christ's were flagrantly dishonoring Christ, it was incumbent on them to show their disapproval; they had a responsibility in the matter; in a sense, they were even judges; but it was not so in the case of those "without." They were not of the family, Christians were not their keepers; it was enough that they were in the hands of God. Mutual fellowship and mutual guardianship go together. If we see our brother going astray we must not sit still; the Church in an orderly way must express concern and pronounce its censure, and strive to bring him back to the ways of God.

It seems to have been this distinction between those "within" and "without" that suggested the otherwise abrupt introduction of the subject of lawsuits, vi. 1–8. We have called this an excursus from the second point—the treatment of sensual sin; and it is manifestly such, for at v. 9 the writer returns to the other topic, sensual sin. As we are called to exercise a kind of judicial oversight over erring brethren when their conduct before God is concerned, so we are called to do the same when the matter in question is a temporal matter between man and man. It is God's intention that Christians should never obtrude their differences before an unbelieving and unsympathizing world. The Apostle was surprised that any Corinthian should be blind to the manifest unseemliness of such a disclosure, and he writes accordingly: "Dare any of you, having a matter against his neighbor, go to law before the unrighteous and not before the saints?" Rather than this, why did they not rather suffer wrong? In our day, when the judicial tribunal has known the influence of Christianity, public litigation among Christians may not be so great an evil, although an amicable arrangement by arbitration is much to be preferred. But there is still room for remonstrance in similar matters. For instance, is it in the spirit of the Apostle that Christian men, when they consider that the Church has done some wrong thing, should rush with their grievances to the secular press? How seldom do we find a man willing rather to suffer wrong than bring discredit on the Christian name by hurling accusations against his Church. Once in Dr. Livingstone's African life, when a calumnious charge was brought against him by a clergyman, and he might have demolished it by a letter to *The Times*, he bore the charge quietly, on the ground that it did Christ's cause so much harm to see ministers quarreling. How precious a grace is forbearance, yet how rare! How can we wonder that nations should show so little forbearance under slight provocations and are so ready to rush to arms, when even the minister of religion, excited by a sense of wrong, rushes into the arms of a secular editor? It is, indeed, a serious matter to set the gibes and flaunts of ungodly men in motion against the cause of religion. Do we not all need to be reminded of two memorable texts — "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God"; "Inasmuch as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men"?

A HUMAN life is a problem of forces. Powers from all worlds are met on this earth and contend for the mastery over us. Influences from all the ages flow in the veins of humanity and beat in the heart of each new-born child. It is a question of forces—physical, moral, spiritual—what shall become of every one of us?—*Smyth.*

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

CONDUCTED BY J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D.

With the Specialists.

THE demand that morality be made dominant in economic affairs is becoming more and more general, and is an evidence that our present agitations and disturbances are but the forerunners of the coming of a better day. Mr. Carroll D. Wright says: "The relation of labor and capital as joint forces in relation to all the forces of society can only be judged properly by a philosophical application of the highest ethical rules."

Has every man a right to existence who is born into this world? Malthus would answer that a man may not even have the right to be born into the world, much less a right to existence. "A man who is born into a world already possessed, if he cannot get subsistence from his parents, on whom he has a just demand, and if society do not want his labor, has no claim of *right* to the smallest portion of food, and, in fact, has no business to be where he is. At nature's mighty feast there is no vacant cover for him. She tells him to begone, and will quickly execute her own orders."

The history of inventions is full of surprises. Hearn says in his "Plutology": "Nothing is more striking in the history of modern inventions than the unexpected quarters from which important novelties are constantly derived. The founder of the cotton manufacture was a barber; the inventor of the power-loom was a clergyman. A farmer devised the first application of the screw-propeller. A fancy-goods shopkeeper is one of the most enterprising experimentalists in agriculture. The most remarkable architectural design of our day has been furnished by a gardener. The first person who supplied London with water was a goldsmith. The first extensive maker of English roads was a blind man bred to no trade. The father of English inland navigation was a duke, and his engineer was a millwright. The first great builder of iron bridges was a stonemason, and the greatest railway engineeer commenced life as a colliery engineman."

In his "History of Socialism," Mr. Kirkup gives the Iron Law of wages as taught by Lassalle: "The Iron Economic Law, which in existing circumstances under the law of supply and demand for labor, determines the wage, is this: that the average wage always remains reduced to the necessary provision which, according to the customary standard of living, is required for the subsistence and for propagation. This is the point about which the real wage continually oscillates, without ever being able long to rise above it or to fall below it. . . . From the produce of labor so much is taken and distributed among the workmen as is required for their subsistence. The entire surplus of production falls to the capitalist. It is, therefore, a result of the Iron Law that the workman is necessarily excluded from the benefits of an increasing production, from the increased productivity of his own labor."

Much has been made of this Iron Law; but it is not an unalterable law, but only a rule that prevails generally or under certain circumstances. Often an increase of wages takes place which enables the laborer to increase the standard of living and at the same time to save a part of his earnings. Even among Social Democrats the admission is now made that the tendency of the wage to the level of subsistence and propagation is not an unalterable law. Labor combinations are among

the most efficient means for establishing an entirely different rule.

So completely does our entire civilization rest on the idea of private property that many find it difficult to understand the attacks to which it has been subjected. They regard property as the condition of prosperity and of life itself, and therefore worthy of the utmost protection. The sacredness of property is a common phrase. Nevertheless the attacks on it are old, and in our day they have become violent and persistent, especially on the part of communists and socialists. They were made with great vigor in the middle of the last century, and since then have never ceased. Some interesting facts are given by Dr. Gumplowicz, a writer on sociology, and the following are taken from one of his works. Morelly published a book in 1755, in which he declared that vanity, pride, ambition, hypocrisy, crime, and other evils are the result of private property, and absent where it does not exist. Hence he wanted it abolished, such objects alone being excepted as are required to meet our actual needs, and necessary for daily labor. In 1768 Abbé Mably said: "Since we have had the misfortune to introduce property in land and differences of rank, covetousness, ambition, vanity, and envy enter our hearts in order to lacerate them, and they take possession of governments so as to tyrannize over people." He advocated a community of goods as the remedy. Dr. Gumplowicz thinks the learned historian Mably correct when he says: "Since I see proprietorship in land introduced, I behold inequality of possessions; and how could it be otherwise than that out of these disproportioned possessions should arise opposite and antagonistic interests, all the vices of wealth, all those of poverty, a degradation of minds, and corruption of morals? . . . Open all the volumes of history and you will see that all peoples have been tortured by this inequality of possessions. The citizens, proud of their wealth, scorned to regard as their equals men condemned to labor. Thus arose unjust and tyrannical governments, partizan and oppressive laws—in short, all those innumerable evils under which the peoples groaned. This picture is presented to us by the history of all nations." Rousseau declared the first man who made a piece of land his property a "defrauder," and denounced private property as a curse. Brissot de Warville in 1780 pronounced private property theft, he being in this respect a forerunner of Proudhon and Lassalle. He affirmed that the possession of $200,000 is evidently injustice and robbery if $40 are enough to support life. To the rich he cries: "Oh, haughty man, before thy door the poor hunger, and thou imaginest thyself a proprietor! Thou art mistaken. The wine in thy cellar, the provisions in thy house, thy furniture, thy gold, all belong to them; they are the lords of these things. That is the law of nature." He taught accordingly that men ought not to be punished for taking what they need.

It is significant that such sentiments prevailed before the French Revolution and prepared the way for it. Of the views of the communists during and since that revolution, Babeuf expresses a fundamental principle: "Nature gave to every man an equal right to all goods." The following is an utterance of our own day, and gives a view which seems to be on the increase: "Men respect property only as it represents the public good, and hate it whenever it becomes typical of wrong and oppression."

Injustice to Capitalists.

IN the excitement and passion of our times, principles are in danger of confusion and ethical judgments liable to perversion. Hardly anything is a more hopeful sign than the deep sympathy which has been excited in behalf of the laboring classes. Whether this

sympathy is always well bestowed is, however, a different matter. The times are severe, and severely their demands must be met. No sentimental view of the situation ought to disguise the fact that toil is better than indolence, that much poverty is self-imposed and can be cured only by changing the character of the sufferer, and that misplaced charity is a curse instead of a blessing. The love that tramples on justice ceases to be love. We must distinguish between the deserving poor and the fraud, between the hopeful and the hopeless paupers, and between the honorable toiler and the miserable shirk.

Not less danger is there of the perversion of judgment respecting capital. It has become popular to attack the insolence, the tyranny, and the brutality of capitalism; and wherever these exist they ought to be scourged to death. The danger, however, consists in the temptation to regard all capital as if it had this character, whereas much of it is most merciful and most beneficial. Where the attack on capitalism becomes an attack on capitalists as a class, as is so often the case, many innocent ones are condemned with the guilty. There is, perhaps, no other sphere in which the most careful discrimination is more urgently in demand. The laborer who deposits a hundred dollars in a savings bank is a capitalist; is he, therefore, insolent and brutal? Is the toiler who thus accumulates capital degraded below the man who spends his last penny in the saloon? Many thousands of the aged, of widows and orphans, depend on the capital which is the result of honest toil, of wise saving and sacrifice; and the wholesale condemnation includes them as well as the "vulturous and vulpine species." The charges made against capitalists are really meant for employers; and these must be distinguished from capitalists. The insolent employer may use the capital of others, while he has but little of his own. But all employers are not tyrants. Some of them are the hardest of workers, are just to those whom they employ, and have more worry and more hours of toil than the day laborer. They are subject to the fiercest competition, and only with the greatest difficulty can they keep their heads above water. This class embraces multitudes of small manufacturers and dealers who have risen from the ranks of labor, or ought to be called laborers in the best sense. But even larger establishments can maintain themselves only with the severest efforts, and they may be charged with greed when they but yield to the necessity of the situation. Professor Walker says: "There is a class of employers who derive from the business they conduct a bare subsistence, at the cost of much anxiety, and perhaps also of discredit, many of them living mainly at the expense of their creditors. These we call the no-profits employers. From this point, where profits, if any, are so small and so hardly earned that they may, for scientific purposes, be disregarded, upward through many grades, we have employers who derive moderate profits, liberal profits, and profits, monumental profits, aggregating in a lifetime colossal fortunes, according to the degrees in which they bring courage, prudence, foresight, frugality, and authority over men to the organization and conduct of business enterprises." While there are grand and monumental profits, which ought to be more fully shared with laborers, there are also no-profits employers, who cannot give their laborers higher wages and meet their own wants.

Even Sodom may have some righteous souls; must they be consumed with the wicked? The discrimination which we demand shields the honorable capitalists as much as it condemns the dishonorable. We insist that even a Carlyle cannot castigate too severely an idle and voluptuous aristocracy; but we claim that many of the capitalists are not of this class.

Of this aristocracy, he says "that such a class is transitory, exceptional, and, unless nature's laws fall dead, cannot continue; . . . that it will have to find its duties and do them, or else that it must and will cease to be seen on the face of this planet, which is a working one, and not an idle one."

Recently a man of means said that "the rich are more concerned for the welfare of laborers than the latter are inclined to be fair to capitalists"—another one of those general statements which are both true and false. Not only are there men of means who are friends of laborers, but we also believe that their number is on the increase. They want to pay a fair wage and to prevent overwork; they have regard to the intellectual and moral welfare of their employees, and introduce such sanitary and protective arrangements into their factories as to secure the laborers against disease and accident; and their personal concern for the employed shows that they esteem their personalities, and do not class them with machines and brutes, which are valued only for the sake of the profit they yield the owner. We have reason to believe that a personal regard for laborers on the part of their employers will be the means of the improvement of the condition of the toilers. This regard is enforced where it is not voluntary. Laws are being enacted for the protection of laborers; the neglect of the rights of workingmen has been frequently exposed, and the sympathies of the public for the suffering toilers have been aroused; the laboring classes themselves have been awakened so as to appreciate their condition and dues, and by means of agitation and organization they have insisted on claims heretofore ignored; and the whole trend of modern discussion and life has told on employers, revealing conditions formerly overlooked, impressing the rich with responsibilities before unfelt, and demanding a humanity toward the masses which has thus far been withheld. Prominent in advocating the cause of sufferers and working nobly in their behalf have been men of large means, who gave generously of their possessions to endow institutions in order to bring the comforts and culture of the age within the reach of the laboring classes.

Are we not inclined to blame employers for conditions which they have not created, but for which society itself is responsible? Even Social Democrats distinguish between the individual capitalist and the system under which he lives. This system is held by them responsible for the economic evils of the day. They affirm that our present order of production and distribution is at fault, and that the individual employer acts consistently if he enters vigorously the fierce competition and governs his business according to the law of demand and supply. They claim that so long as the rule prevails that every man must take care of himself every one will seek to do the best he can for himself. Singer, a Berlin Jew and millionaire, is a leader of the social democracy. He is considerate toward his laborers, but conducts his business on the usual economic principles; and his fellow-socialists admit that, with the present system, success cannot be gained in any other way. A wicked employer may unnecessarily rob his employees; but the robbery of the laborer is held to be an essential element of the present economic system, and that there can be no rent or profit or interest without exploiting the toilers. The capitalist may be innocent, being the slave of the system under which he conducts his business, and the dupe of unavoidable circumstances.

We can admit that many employers are put into the severest straits by individualistic competition, without advocating the revolution sought as the sole remedy by the social democracy. It is gross injustice to accuse the individual of wrongs which are social institutions, and which society ought to make impossible. There are

certain relations between the employer and the employed which cannot safely be left to the dominion of capital and the need of labor; they must be determined by the law. If society does not care to remove the causes of strikes, then it has no right to complain of the inconveniences and losses occasioned by strikes. Experience is rapidly teaching us that it is better to be under a law equitable to all than to be subject to the law of greed, of starvation, or of brutal force. There are some things which society must have; and if individuals will not give society its dues, society must oblige them to do so.

We can understand the injustice of laborers to capitalists, particularly of such whose education and opportunities do not enable them to distinguish between the abstract capitalism and the concrete possessors of capital, who make their sufferings and their subjection their logic, and who experience so many proofs of selfishness from their employers.

If the honor due to noble men of means is to be given them, they must be separated from the cruel and insolent ones who treat laborers as slaves, and whose regard for them is measured by the service to be extracted from them. The growing embitterment against capitalism and capitalists is largely due to those who use their means for base ends and oppress the laborers subject to them. This no one knows better or laments more than the humane and upright capitalists, who suffer for the baseness of wicked employers.

A New Sphere of Church Activity.

THE Church has so many spheres of activity now that it is difficult, if not impossible, to enter all of them with vigor and success. In many cases the organizations are likewise so numerous that it seems unreasonable to ask for any more. On the other hand, new emergencies arise and new demands are made which require attention. Sometimes they are so imperative that they cannot be dismissed. They concern the Church deeply, affect its life seriously, and may pertain to its most vital interests. Often the needs which spring from the immediate present also have peculiar attractions, and the attempts on the part of the Church to meet them may give it new inspiration, new life, and new vigor.

No Christian in touch with the tendencies of the age can doubt that new spheres of usefulness are being opened up to the Church by the labor agitations of the day. Christian literature abounds in discussions of a social character, and this is prophetic that a new era is dawning for practical life, as well as for Christian theology and ethics. Whether the Church is willing or not to take it up, a social mission is being forced on the Church as never before in its history. The meaning of this mission evidently is that the social principles of Christ and His apostles must be clearly and fully expounded and applied to the burning questions of the day. The New Testament has a social system rich in facts, in laws, and in principles; this system and all it involves must be embodied, intellectually and ethically, in the institutions of Christianity. We need the Christian solution for such problems as these: What is society? How is the individual related to it? What social distinctions are sanctioned by the Gospel? What place does the personality occupy in contrast with things? What views prevail respecting labor and service? What is the duty of the strong to the weak? How would Christ's law of love and sympathy affect modern society? These and numerous other questions are of first importance, and their answers would bring the Gospel into the most immediate and most vital contact with the deepest concerns of the age.

Unquestionably there are certain phases of the social movement in which the Church ought to take the

lead. The burning questions are largely ethical; who can answer them so well as Christians? Especially in one respect does the mission of the Church seem unmistakably clear. Capitalists alone cannot solve the social problem. They look at it from their own standpoint—cannot put themselves in the place of the laboring classes, and have not the conditions for an impartial inquiry and decision. The laborers are likewise limited in their views and experiences, and are naturally partizans. If the problem is to be solved, men must undertake the task who rise above the contending parties, who survey the whole field, and base their decision on an impartial view of all the facts. Preachers are in the very best position for this impartial view, their principles elevating them above the prejudices of the parties, and their calling making them the friends of both classes. They are the natural mediators between them. It is also their calling to emphasize the moral and spiritual factors as the ultimate grounds of action, thus lifting men to a higher plane than that occupied by purely economic considerations. While in this work of mediation and reconciliation the pastors ought to take the lead; they should be backed by all Christians to whom Christ's teachings are a higher law than partizan prejudice.

This mediation between the hostile classes does not exhaust the social mission of the Church. Scarcely any demand is now more urgent than that the rich and poor, capitalists and laborers, be brought into more intimate personal relations than has heretofore been the case. What other institution can do this so well as the Church, which is based on the idea of the brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God? It might be of inestimable advantage if they could meet on the basis of personal equality and discuss the questions of mutual interest in the light of the Gospel, which they profess to believe.

Respecting the labor problem, we are in the era of investigation rather than in that of dogmatic and final decisions. We are moving tentatively, inquiring and groping our way. A vast field for Christian study is open to believers. Social unions for the ethical and religious consideration of the great social problems are needed. Under the lead of the pastor, they might be made very efficient. But there is still another open door. More is known about social duty than is practised; and societies for the special purpose of putting into practise the evident social teachings of Christianity might give the Church new interests, new impulses, and new power.

Launch Out Into the Deep.

THE emergence of the submerged classes from Norway to Sicily, and from the western border of Russia to California, is one of the most striking characteristics of the age. Everywhere the phenomenon is arresting the attention and exciting deep interest. Monarchs, statesmen, legislators, scholars, capitalists, and laborers are watching the movement with intense concern. Von Gerlach says of German revolutionary socialism, "Nothing can arrest this potent solvent which we behold at work under our eyes, and which is sweeping away all ancient institutions." In Germany the socialist movement is compact, solid, resolute, comparing in organization with the German army and with Roman Catholicism, apparently moving resistlessly forward like a glacier, that crushes whatever attempts to check its progress. Its aspect is most threatening, but no one can foretell its future. The movement in the Latin countries—Italy, Spain, and France—is more sporadic and violent, liable to sudden outbreaks, dangerous because it may at any time burst forth without warning, like an avalanche. The French Republic is

menaced by socialists and radicals, and if they unite they may overturn the present Government, and either inaugurate a socialistic era or prepare the way for a new Napoleon who can master the revolutionary forces. In the Anglo-Saxon nations, England and America, the movement is more practical, aiming at immediate relief from pressing necessities and at an actual improvement of the existing condition rather than considering the socialistic state to be established at some future time. Nevertheless some form of socialism has also made progress in these countries. Only last September the representatives of two million laborers in England voted in favor of the socialistic state, after the same had been defeated year after year at previous meetings.

What excites most attention in these movements is the spectacular elements, the things which appear on the surface, such as the agitations among the masses, the chronic discontent of laborers, the strikes and the violence attending them, together with the threats of revolution and the advocacy of anarchism. These are the subjects which fill our papers, and which are uppermost when the social question is the theme of the platform and the pulpit. Just now we are in danger of being absorbed by these details, as if they were the essence of the whole matter. It is like picking up a bit of lava at the crater and pronouncing it Vesuvius. Yet the volcano itself is one thing, and the fragments it casts up are quite another. So long as we are lost in contemplating the results of the eruptions without fathoming the meaning of the eruptions themselves, we cannot expect to gain the mastery of the social movement.

Specialists in this department are very scarce in America. They must increase before we can hope to deal successfully with the momentous themes thrust upon us by the social crisis. Extensive as is the interest in the subject, the indications are that very few are prepared to devote to the social problem that patient and profound study which the importance of the theme demands. Men of means and leisure, professional men and scholars, are perfectly content to leave the matter to laborers, the very ones whose culture and toil unfit them for grappling with many of the deep problems involved.

We need but look at some of the deeper problems of the social agitations in order to learn the necessity for leaving the shallows and launching out into the deep, if the most fruitful work is to be done. They are among the profoundest and the most vital themes connected with human existence. Such questions as the following are involved in the social movements:

Have all men an equal right to nature and its products, or have a few the right to a monopoly of them?

How did the few get their exclusive use of nature and the wonderful privileges conferred by this use?

Has every man a right to existence? If so, he must have the right to the means of existence. Who shall furnish these—the state, the community, or society? Does society owe every man a living? This seems to be recognized by the establishment of almshouses and other charitable institutions.

Has every one who wants work a right to employment? If so, who shall furnish it? In the German Parliament Bismarck said, in 1884, that Prussia recognized the right of every man to employment. But when the unemployed, on the strength of his admission, demanded work, none was furnished; and to this day their demand has not been complied with. Is the state able to create work, and can it afford to do so?

Not a few are asking seriously, we are tempted to say ominously, whether according to right and humanity, to say nothing of Christianity, one man can possess more than he needs if others have not enough?

Private property has been denounced as the source of injustice, of greed, of theft, murder, prostitution, and other corruptions. Millions insist on making the community or state the chief or sole owner. Shall communism or socialism supersede our present system?

How about the unearned increment? Is it the result of exploiting labor?

Shall the accumulation and concentration of wealth be limitless? Shall the state try to control inheritances?

Might and privilege have heretofore been the chief makers and executors of the law. Shall this continue to be the case, or shall equity and humanity prevail?

Numerous other momentous questions are involved—questions which affect not only economics, but also our Churches and our civilization. They require profound philosophy for their apprehension, to say nothing of their solution. Shall now these themes, which involve our highest interests, be left to the arbitrament of class prejudice and passion, or shall they be impartially studied, and then settled on the principles of right and Christianity? Surely to ministers of the Gospel the first and strongest appeal with respect to the social question is that it be profoundly studied and thoroughly mastered. Why can they not take the lead in passing from the shallow view to the deep, from exciting details to the underlying principles, and from the pimples on the surface to the organic disease, of which they are but the manifestation?

Papers on Social Science and Comparative Religion.

By Rev. B. F. Kidder, Ph.D.

IX.—Some Phases of German Socialism.

Socialism is not, as some suppose, the vagaries of harebrained revolutionists. It is a carefully thought out scientific system. It represents the convictions of men who are terribly in earnest; and it cannot be denied that they have something to be earnest about.

Socialism is a power which no civilized government any longer ignores. But its movements are such as cannot ultimately be controlled by a police force whose function is to keep the peace with a club. It represents an evolution—perhaps a revolution—whose hand can be stayed only by securing to society in some better way than that which it proposes certain general results at which it aims.

There are inequalities in society which seem to be inevitable. There are other inequalities which are the result of injustice. Man's blood cries from the ground against his brother, and the cry of the laborer who has reaped down the fields and whose rightful share of the product has been kept back by fraud, has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Something has gone wrong in the management of human affairs.

The socialist believes that he has found the deep seat of that wrong. He boldly parts company with orthodox theology, declaring that the trouble is not in depraved human nature, but in a false basis of society; and he sets about to remedy the evil by a revolutionary scheme, social, economic, political, which has never been equaled in magnitude, and whose far-reaching consequences probably no mind has adequately conceived.

The promulgation of this remarkable philosophy began within the present century, and the development of the socialistic idea as a practical force in the state belongs to the last half of the century. The English Socialist Owen laid his scheme for a socialistic community before the House of Commons in 1817. Saint-Simon's speculations took a definite socialistic direction during the same year. Fourier published his great work, "*Théorie des Quatre Mouvements*" in 1808, but it had no influence until the theories of Owen and Saint-Simon were on the

wane. Louis Blanc published his "*Organization du Travail*" in 1839, and Proudhon his book on property in 1840. Neither of the four master minds of German socialism—Marx, Rodbertus, Engels, or Lassalle—published anything of great importance much prior to 1850. The first volume of Marx's great work on capital, which has not inappropriately been called the "Socialists' Bible," was not published till 1867.

There have been endless minor differences and controversies among socialists, but the current of socialism pursues everywhere the same general direction. There can be little doubt that it is widening and deepening in every civilized country of the world. Its strongest development has been attained under the contributions of German thinkers, and on German soil German socialism as a practical force began in the Berlin insurrection of 1848, when King Frederick William IV. of Prussia was compelled to make important concessions to the laboring classes. The birthday of the Social Democracy did not come till about fifteen years later, when Ferdinand Lassalle boldly announced as a program for the workingmen of Germany that they unite as an independent political party, demand free and universal and immediate suffrage, and then, by the power of the ballot, proceed to put their theories into practical operation.

The development of this new political force was at first slow; but during the last two decades it has swept forward with a rapidity and an increasing momentum that has been hardly less interesting to the student of social science than appalling to the emperor and royalists of Germany. Its actual voting force to-day is probably one eighth of that of the whole empire.

Its support comes not from the slums, as many suppose, although the slum vote is unquestionably represented, but from the great middle class, where brain power is always at its highest average. There are university professors, bankers, and others of like standing among its ardent advocates. Dr. Albert Schäffle, one of the foremost political economists of Germany, himself a monarchist, but a man of great candor, said a few years ago: "*The seats of the greatest wealth of foreign commerce, of industry, of constitutional life, of the highest public offices and professional institutions for art, science, education, social intercourse*—viz, half Berlin, the Hanse towns, Hanover, Frankfort, Munich, Mannheim, and others—*are to-day represented by and for the proletariat!*"

The expression would need to be intensified adequately to set forth the present situation. Not one half simply, but five sixths of the representatives in the Reichstag from Berlin are Social Democrats. And the spirit of social democracy is widely permeating the army. The limited public expression of that spirit in army circles is not, for obvious reasons, any criterion of its real prevalence; but the time is liable to come when its expression will be in no degree uncertain.

What is the genius of social democracy? Karl Marx, in "Das Kapital," has given the scientific basis of socialism. He reaches the conclusion that, as labor is the creator of wealth, "*the real unit of value is labor power.*" He shows that the value of any product of labor above that amount which is necessary to cover the cost of the laborer's subsistence and the wear and tear of the instruments employed constitutes a *surplus value.* This "surplus value," as profit, goes to the capitalist, who, by successfully manipulating it in the further employment of labor and the securing for himself of further "surplus value," becomes richer and richer, while the laborer sinks more and more into the condition of helpless, hopeless slavery.

Socialism would do away with this private exploiting of capital and make land and all means of production the

property of the people collectively, so that the people might enjoy the fruit of their labor.

Not all the great leaders of German socialism have proposed the same ideal state. But the social democracy of to-day is unanimous in declaring that the whole present competitive system of industry must be replaced by universally cooperative methods. Every qualified member of the new commonwealth must perform a certain share of labor, and from the common store each shall receive "*according to his reasonable needs.*" Earlier programs declared in favor of each receiving according to the amount and the quality of the service rendered; but this would inevitably give rise to undemocratic distinctions.

In this new society no one is to be exempt from labor with the hands. The artists, the men of letters, the philosophers, the scientists, may follow their own bent in the afternoon; but in the morning they must cultivate the fields, or carry brick or mortar, or perform some other similar service for society. There is to be no aristocracy even of labor in the new Utopia of social democracy, but a brotherhood of man that shall be all-embracing and complete.

When and how these results are to be accomplished, social democracy has not been in great haste explicitly to announce, but the general program cannot be misunderstood. The leaders of the movement have been frank to confess that they do not dream of realizing their hopes in the near future, but the time required for the accomplishment of the end in view does not at all dishearten the disciples of this new philosophy.

How are these results to be accomplished? Not by bombs and riot and the violent destruction of the present social order. These things belong to anarchy, not to socialism. Anarchy and social democracy parted company during the conference at The Hague in 1872, Karl Marx presiding, when the anarchists were expelled from the body. It is true that the manifesto which Marx and Engels prepared for the conference of German communists held in London in 1847 contained this expression: "Communists declare openly that their purposes can only be attained by the forcible subversion of all existing social arrangements"; and Herr Bebel (the present leader of the social democracy) and others do not hesitate to declare the doctrine of force. But it is not the force of anarchy but of law to secure that for which the will of the majority shall have declared.

How, then, does social democracy purpose to secure its object? Not by compelling the rich to divide their fortunes with the poor; not by obliging the industrious and the frugal to support the lazy and the improvident; not by the periodic leveling of the distinctions between the various members of society; nor by the abolition of capital; nor by the abandonment of government—that is, social order. All these and many other similar ideas have been wrongly ascribed by the ignorant or the uncandid to the socialistic philosophy.

Social democracy would proceed and thus far has proceeded along legitimate and logical lines. By the suffrage of a free people, it would increase its power in the governing body. Gradually it would absorb into the state first those institutions which are of the most universal public use, such as mails, telegraphs, and railroads (results already accomplished in Germany and, more or less, in other countries); and eventually it would bring under the control of the people, collectively, all land and means of production.

It is readily seen that this scheme, although so startling, does not present an altogether new idea in government; it is rather a universal extension of the department of public service.

Socialism does not forbid private possession, or ownership, or even in-

heritance of property. The laborer may use the product of his labor for present needs and enjoyment, or he may lay it aside for future use, or he may bestow it upon others. *Socialism simply forbids the private ownership of productive capital.*

The new socialistic estate would not be unwilling to reimburse the present possessors of productive capital, but *this compensation would not be in sources of income, but in useful commodities.* It is evident that the fortunes of even the Rothschilds and the Vanderbilts would thus, in time, melt away. Under the new social regime, every competent member of the social body must be a laborer, and thus a producer.

It seems to be the most literal and rigid application of Paul's doctrine, "If any would not work, neither should he eat"; or that older Scripture, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Socialism believes that too many are eating bread in the sweat of other people's faces. In the new social state, money would of necessity disappear. As a medium of exchange it would be replaced by certificates issued by the state, and, as a standard of value, by the average labor day. Marx explicitly affirms that the idea of "labor power" as a standard of value is the corner-stone of his whole system.

Socialism, through certain of its leaders, has announced the startling proposition that, in the new order of things, the family will cease to be an institution of society. This was boldly set forth in the communistic manifesto prepared by Marx and Engels. The same view has also been held by many leaders of the social democracy. But it cannot be laid to the charge of all; and the subject may be dismissed, for the present, as not constituting a necessary feature of the new social revolution.

Again, it is undeniable that the present spirit of social democracy is anti-religious. August Bebel, in a speech before the Reichstag, May 31, 1881, set forth his position in these brief but unmistakable terms: "We aim in the domain of politics at republicanism, in the domain of economics at socialism, and in the realm of what is to-day called religion at atheism." But irreligion, like "free marriage" or "free love," is not a necessary feature of German or any other form of socialism.

How shall this new social revolution be met? The only sane way to deal with any revolutionary movement is to meet it fairly.

The socialistic philosophy presents its stronger as well as its weaker points.

Among the stronger points there are three, which, to my mind, are preeminent:

1. If the new social order could be made practicable, it would realize in a larger degree than the present state *the reign of the people.* Not that this idea would be perfectly realized, even by the most sanguine dream of social democracy, for the central bureau of management, which would be absolutely essential for the conducting of affairs, must represent delegated power. Yet the spoils system would be swept away, corruption and oppression would lose their grip, and the painful inequalities of society would be reduced to a minimum.

2. *It would give every man a chance.* Theoretically, most men may have a chance under the existing order; but, practically, it is too often a chance to starve, or to serve the great manipulators of productive capital at a starving wage.

3. It would avoid, in large measure, the waste caused at present by the middleman. The merchant who receives goods from the manufacturer and sells them, at fair profit, to the consumer conducts as legitimate a business, under the present order of things, as any other man. Yet it cannot be denied that, if this service could be dispensed with, it would shut off a tremendous waste. And besides, if the

middleman could become a producer, it would vastly increase the store of human products, and thus contribute (with other causes) to make their cost to the consumer a mere fraction of what it is at present.

Can this dream of a social Utopia ever be realized? There are strong reasons for believing that it cannot, at least, by the program of social democracy.

1. In the first place, the cornerstone of the whole system, namely, that "labor power" of itself is the true unit of value, is defective. No such standard exists, or can ever be made to exist, so long as the same amount of labor power, when directed by one man, may be made to yield perhaps five hundred times as much as when directed by some other man. This being true, the theory that "surplus value" belongs, necessarily, to the laborer falls to pieces. The brains and the courage of the great captains of industry are a tremendous factor which the socialistic scheme has not adequately recognized.

2. To the average mind it seems as though the proposed new state, even if it were to be set up, would fall to pieces under its own weight. Among other burdens which would rest upon the bureau of management would be the responsibility of assigning to each member of the socialistic body (who would no longer be free to follow his own inclination) the particular work which he is best suited to perform—an impossible task!

3. It may be gravely questioned whether the new social state would be able to furnish its members adequate incentive and opportunity for achievement. The best minds are always a long way in advance of the crowd. But here they would be handicapped. If, for example, there had been a socialistic state when Fulton conceived the idea of his steamboat, the idea is about all that would have gotten into the current of actuality, for the whole scheme would immediately have been sunk by popular prejudice. As it happened, private brains, and push, and capital had a chance to carry the enterprise through to success in spite of the crowd.

It is to be feared that, in a socialistic community, where every new movement must be directed by the people at large, or by their representatives, most of the great achievements which have marked the progress of the race would have been slow in materializing.

4. A still graver objection against the scheme proposed by social democracy is that *it is unjust toward the most worthy*. It fails to reward skilled labor. It puts steel on an equality with pig iron. The ideal state will surround every citizen with such conditions that it will be possible for all "pig iron" to become "steel"; but it will compel every man to stand upon his own mettle, the test of his own quality. This is nature's universal law.

5. The *general aim* of the socialistic movement has much in it to command the admiration of Christendom, for it would release the weak from the tyranny of the strong. It would substitute the principle of cooperation for that of competition, helpfulness for strife. But it fails to realize that this cannot be done in a purely mechanical and arbitrary way. The value of favorable conditions is not to be ignored; but the history of civilization shows that all true growth has been from within. *All true progress must be from within out.* Before every great achievement there is a great idea; before every moral victory there is a moral purpose.

The civilization of the state is simply the general intellectual and moral average of the people who compose the state. When that general average of mental and moral force rises, then those institutions of society which hinder the movements of that larger, freer life must be swept away, or at least so modified as to give room for that life.

There are general conditions and in-

stitutions of society to-day that do violence to the spirit of justice, freedom, equality, brotherhood. They belong largely to a barbarous and a feudal past. They are the gigantic evil against which the whole socialistic movement is directed. That movement can no more be stayed by the storming of tyrants than the sea could be stayed by the lashes administered by Xerxes. The only question is, Will the unjust conditions be removed by evolution or by revolution? Will burdens and relationships be readjusted so that every human being shall have a fair chance, or will these demands be resisted till the pent-up floods burst forth in a revolution that shall sweep away the old foundations of society?

Germany is awake to her peril. Many reforms have been introduced by the state which look toward relief. Among them are such measures as compulsory insurance against sickness and old age, state employment of labor, etc. But these are hardly a beginning. Infinitely more must be done, or it is a foregone conclusion that social democracy will yet try its far-reaching revolutionary experiment.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

Spiritual Heredity.

BY REV. A. W. MACLEOD, PH.D., THORBURN, N. S.

ALL plants and animals transmit their distinctive characteristics to their offspring. Man, created in God's image, begets children who partake of his stature, complexion, contour of countenance, color of eyes, and entire physical likeness. Intellectual, mental, and moral likeness is transmitted. Distinguished painters, warriors, orators, senators, statesmen, and poets, in many instances, repeat their skill and glory in their children. It was long believed that only sinful tendencies were transmitted; that the good which men did was interred with their bones, while the evil lived after them. Only recently have the power and scope of heredity been carefully observed. Its possibilities for good to the race have not been and as yet cannot be fully estimated. Science corroborates God's Word in affirming that good is stronger than evil, and where honestly practised must prevail. As a vehicle, heredity may convey grace as well as depravity. Does not God's Word warrant such an assertion? It is not God's purpose that godliness should descend from parent to child? Is not this clearly taught in such passages as Mal. ii, 15, Gen. xviii. 19? The spirit of God in the parent was expected to manifest Himself in the child. He was to come upon Abraham's children and also to dwell within them, making them holy to the Lord. This law underlies both old and new dispensations; it is included in God's covenant with His people. They and their offspring were accounted holy; sound principles taught in youth were transmitted in ordinary generation; the covenant seal was applied and the Holy Spirit was given them; they were a godly seed. As the Jewish child was born a Jew, with all the proclivities and principles of his nation, so the Christian child is born in the principles and spirit of a Christian. Christ, the hope of glory in the parents, begets Christ in the offspring disposing to holiness, purity, and truth. Union with Christ secures His riches for posterity. Can we forget that the godly life of Hannah lived again in greater glory in her illustrious son? Can we forget the mantle of Zechariah and Elizabeth, of Lois and Eunice? Surely the Apostle Paul makes distinctive the great fact of spiritual heredity in this passage in his second letter to Timothy (i. 5): "When I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that

is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother, Eunice; and I am persuaded in thee also." Here the Apostle recognizes that not only disposition leading thereto, but even faith itself may be transmitted. The faith of his ancestors was not sought in vain in Timothy, their son. Not only faith in Christ, but special excellence and consecration, high spiritual power may be transmitted. Noted piety may shine brighter in the children than in their parents. A notable example is at hand in the life of the late Dr. Duff. Where did young Duff catch the missionary idea, so rare in his youth? While on a visit to the Scottish Highlands, Rev. Charles Simeon, one of the zealous founders of the Church Missionary Society, and one of the most consecrated men of his age, called at the little village of Moulin to see the Rev. Mr. Stewart. Seeds scattered in that Highland manse grew. Mr. Stewart's preaching changed. There was more of Christ and Him crucified in every sermon after that visit. The electric thrill of the new life-giving sermons seized James Duff and Jean Rattray, and through them flowed into their child, Alexander Duff. The Rev. Philip Henry frequently thanked God that his children and grandchildren were the sealed ones of the kingdom, the lambs of his own flock. He fully expected them to follow the Lord. It would appear that the faith of this eminent man was surpassed by that of his pious and devoted son, the Rev. Matthew Henry. So it should be throughout the entire Church of God. The divine life in the parents should be expected and earnestly sought in their children. If it is wanting, the fault lies not in God, but in the parents. If they accept God's covenant promise, rest upon Jesus Christ and look for His spirit in their children; if they daily follow him, committing their entire lives to His keeping, then their Christ-like life in germinal form must of necessity repeat itself in their offspring.

"The children of such a stock," says Dr. Bushnell, "are born not of the flesh only, or the mere natural life of their parentage, but they are born, in a sense most emphatic, of the spirit also; they are tempered by grace, which is becoming in them—in a sense, an inbred quality."

In view of this law, how great is parental responsibility! Holy parents should nurture holy children; entire families should grow up in Him in love, purity, and truth, as the branches on the tree. The Spirit of Christ comes in fulness and power upon all who yield themselves to His guidance, looking unto Christ. He blesses parental teaching, sweetens parental discipline, and molds the child-nature. He transforms the home into a school of Christ. Its atmosphere, life-plan, motives, ends, and aims center in Christ. There the germinal seed finds genial nutriment, and early shows its presence. The children do not know when they began to love Christ any more than they know when love to their parents began in their hearts. But as time advances, they grow in grace, bearing fruit, increasing in love to God, abounding in good works, even as their parents did before them.

Other things being equal, practical godliness, consistent Christian character, and ardent love to Christ in the parents often appear in richer degree in their children. How frequently does the child surpass the parent in strength and depth of faith! John the Baptist, Charles and John Wesley, and Spurgeon are examples. If all parents would utilize the power of heredity for godliness, they would soon usher in a new era; they would speed the day when all should know the Lord. Instead of rearing ungodly sons and daughters, to be evangelized in later life, the Church would in all her families be rearing a godly seed and increasing vastly in spiritual power. Her children would early love Christ, never knowing when that love first

began. They would arise to call their parents blessed. Thus fortified within, how speedily could the Church turn her undivided attention to missions and speedily win the *whole world to Jesus Christ!* Let parents live with Christ, cultivate His spirit, nurture their little ones in His atmosphere, lead them to the sunshine of His presence in full dependence upon His Spirit, and then *be assured of His promise—a godly seed.*

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Conference, Not Criticism—Not a Review Section—Not Discussion, but Experiences and Suggestions.

Evading Responsibility.

A CLERGYMAN in a union meeting touches the question of dancing. It occurs to him, perhaps suddenly, that good people hold different views on this matter. Mentioning that fact, he propitiates both sides in this way: "I do not dance; I don't know how. I shall teach my boys to dance, of course."

The writer's mental criticism was: "If I believed dancing was the right thing to teach my boys, 'of course' I would sit up nights to learn. If I did not believe it right for me, I would not have it taught to my children."

A Christian minister is nothing but a Christian called to teach others of Christly truth and life. If he feels a thing to be inconsistent for him as a Christian teacher, let him look his responsibility squarely in the face and say, "I could not consistently do that." If other Christians feel that they consistently can, let him have all proper charity for their different views. But let him not flinch from the inference which men must draw, that what is unsuitable for the Christian ministry is somehow below the true type and ideal of Christian living. Let him not gloss the matter by any subterfuge, but leave them to adjust it with their own consciences before God.

A FORMER PASTOR.

Belittling an Issue.

AT a recent meeting of protest against Sunday opening of saloons, it was painful to see how certain clergymen tried to steer between opposition to this particular shade of vice and a lenient, if not genial, toleration of appetites and fashionable usages that might demand alcoholic gratification. They were so afraid they might be thought to be too earnest even to be "temperance fanatics," or possibly "cranks," that they spent more force in taking the edge off their protest than they did in protesting. One, a pastor of an important church, smoothed his utterances down into "*I don't consider it a mortal sin* to take a glass of wine." Well, who does? But how many of a plain audience would make the theological distinction between *mortal* and *venial* sins? How many Protestant clergymen admit it?

A reformed man, who had long held out, came to that "temperance" meeting, heard that speech, went straight to a saloon, and was drunk before midnight.* Apologies to the devil will not conquer the saloon, sustain the tempted, nor rescue the fallen. Let us dare to be in earnest.

A TEMPERANCE WORKER.

Answer to "Student's" Request.

1. THE expression "*the dead*" is plural in the Greek of the text cited. It does not refer to Christ directly, but doubtless to those saints who had departed this life, and who were the victims of much suffering before that departure took place because of their faith in Christ. In apostolic days it could be said, "All that will live godly

* The fact came to me direct from the president of the meeting.

in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." Many, because of their avowal of faith in Christ and espousal of Him by submission to Him in the act of baptism, suffer in many instances even unto death.

2. The term *for* in the text cited does not indicate purpose, as in Acts ii. 38. The Greek word, which is translated *for* in 1 Cor. xv. 29, is *uper*. It means "in view of, in respect to," etc. The meaning of the passage is obvious. Many, because of their faith in Christ as "the resurrection and the life," and because of their faith in Him as the Son of God, the great Teacher, the One having all authority in heaven and earth, did not hesitate to acknowledge by submission to Him in the ordinance of baptism. This exposed them to persecution and peril. If the resurrection of Christ is false, if the dead in Christ will never triumph over mortality and the grave, why should others, in view of the dead and what caused their death, go forward and put on Christ (in hope of the resurrection) in the ordinance of baptism, and thus expose themselves to persecution and a like fate, if there be no resurrection of the dead and immortality? Why should Paul or any one in his day stand "in jeopardy every hour"? He said: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The early Christians, because of the earnestness and thoroughness of their convictions that Jesus is the Christ, and that He arose from the dead, and that the hope of a resurrection to immortality is through Him, did not hesitate to proclaim their faith in Him by submission to Him irrespective of what may have attended others who had preceded them in the faith. They were baptized for the dead—they were baptized in view of" those who became martyrs to the faith. They could live in jeopardy every hour because they had respect as to the resurrection of the dead. W. O. MOORE.

"The Retoucher's" Sermon.

ONE day while making pastoral calls I visited one whose work was that of "retouching" pictures in a photograph gallery; and as the conversation turned to her work she gave me the following points, which are wonderfully full of illustrative value: The "retoucher" finds that there are always blemishes and spots of imperfection even in the fairest countenance, which, although invisible to the eye, the sunlight has faithfully photographed and made visible. Again, the "retoucher's" work is to ink out the wrinkles which time and care have made, and to lighten up the faces. (A wonderfully beautiful thing connected with the last point is that the artist can always make the faces *lighter*, but never *darker*.)

With what force do the comparisons now present themselves—that the sunlight of God's truth searches the character and brings to light the hidden blemishes of the soul, so that the self-righteous and moral appear just as they are in need of Christ's cleansing power! How beautiful, then, comes the other thought—that we all have the power of rubbing out, somewhat, the care-marks upon the faces of men and women, and making them grow lighter! Would that it might be true of us as of the "retoucher," that we ever make faces *lighter*, but never *darker!*

CLINTON W. WILSON.

LYONS, IOWA.

That Morning Prayer-Meeting.

SOME three years ago one minister said to another, who was proposing to have galleries placed in his church, "Did you ever hear of any person being converted in a church gallery?" The question at once arose in my mind, "Why may not people be saved in the gallery?" Surely while there are disadvantages in addressing from the pulpit those sitting above the lower congregation, yet may not the Word and Spirit convince and convert people seated anywhere within the sanctuary? I said

this shall be tested, and immediately appointed for the next Sabbath a morning prayer-meeting in the gallery, with the request that the united petitions ascend for the salvation of souls in that special portion of our church edifice. What was the result? That Sunday night in that crowded gallery a number of persons rose for prayers, and for six Sunday nights in succession others did likewise, and from that day to this those early Sunday-morning prayer-meetings have been a power and blessing. They are still continued with unabated interest, and the results of the preparation there received are felt in every department of our Church. This is a most important service in the Lincoln Park Baptist Church.

ROBBINS.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

Disarmament of Nations.

BY CHAPLAIN C. C. BATEMAN, U.S.A., FORT ASSINABOINE, MONT.

CHRISTIANITY was never so nearly triumphant throughout the world as now, and never were the forces which dispute its progress more active or powerful. The so-called "Christian nations" are at once the most skeptical and warlike. Preachers of peace, they are none the less skilled in war; affecting a profound belief in the sufficiency of God as shown upon their coins and coats-of-arms, they make ample and exhausting provision for vengeance swift and terrific. They trust in Providence, but after the Napoleonic method, which placed Providence on the side of the strong battalions; or with Cromwell, who seemed to entertain misgivings about Providence unless the gunpowder was dry. That was a caustic observation made by a celebrated Frenchman, that "Christian nations are never so much at peace with themselves as when at war with their neighbors." It is literally, sadly true that love of peace incites civilized men to war. This paradox, if we may not use a stronger term, is made particularly conspicuous from the fact that the sacred and secular literature of these nations abounds with prophecies and pictures of an age to come,

> "When the war drum sounds no longer and the battle-flags are furled,
> In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

In writing of this unrealized dream of prophet and poet, Huntington has graphically said: "The imagery that pictured that foreseen splendor was drawn from social reconciliations, swords beaten into plowshares, Ethiopia stretching out her hands, the wolf lying down with the lamb, tyranny and hatred vanished from the family of nations. In these generous predictions we hear the mighty forechant of that universal anthem which is to rise from all the round world, Christianized and consecrated at last."

The disarmament of nations is the most stupendous problem confronting modern Christianity. But of the millions who bear the Christian name, how many are seriously concerned with this problem? The Quakers or Friends are alone in making disarmament an article of faith. It is more than likely that war will put an end to itself, and indirectly Christianity may be the efficient means. The stimulus given to the inventive faculty under the tuition of Christian institutions may finally make battles so expensive and destructive that nations will "learn war no more" solely from considerations of economy. This hope long deferred, this consummation devoutly

sought, is, perhaps, far from realization by such a course of events. The art of war along modern lines is capable of indefinite expansion; indeed, it may be we are only beginning to learn how to take human life and destroy property. Experts in ordnance inform us of probable domains yet unexplored in the making and use of high explosives. The dynamite bomb may be a toy when compared with the infernal machine of the future. When aerial navigation succeeds, we shall have flying batteries against which no defense now in use will avail, and no known precautions can be taken. A rain of dynamite and steel upon a city would be such as no Sodomite ever witnessed.

Is war, under any circumstances, justifiable? I think it is. I think John Ruskin has shown in his lecture entitled "War" when armed conflict is right and when it is wrong. Our two wars with Great Britain were right from the American side, and wrong from the English side. Our war for the preservation of the Union was right in so far as it preserved the Union and liberated the slaves. Our war with Mexico was wrong, and no specious argument can ever jusitfy it. Some of our Indian wars have been waged in the cause of right: more of them have been unholy and shameful conflicts in defense of wrong.

War has played an important part in the progressive drama of civilization. If waged for liberty, it is noble, because the object sought is dearer than life itself. In resisting the invader and in breaking the power of the oppressor, war has brought to light some of the highest examples of true heroism. It cannot be denied that there are instances where the ultimate effect of war has made men more humane. But because war reflexively has done much good, it does not follow that war, for the most part, is anything less than a crime against society. Its whole tendency is backward and downward into barbarism and lust. Who may recount and call the roll of those vast armies of the dead slain in war?

Think of Julius Cæsar whispering to a friend that his triumphant celebration of his conquest of Gaul cost one million human lives! Three millions of men under Xerxes slain; one million men, women, and children slain in the siege of Jerusalem; Troy, with her one million five hundred thousand dead; but what are these to that awful record of Genghis Khan, the chief of all butchers, who, within less than fifteen years, caused the death of more than sixteen millions of human beings? Within authentic time, fifty millions have fallen in war or as the consequences of war.

There are no authentic figures showing the number of men killed in our Revolutionary War. Of the War of 1812, reports show that 1,887 men were killed and 3,737 wounded, or a total of 5,614. In the Mexican War 1,547 men were killed or died of their wounds, and 3,420 were wounded. The statistics of the Civil War are very imperfect, but the collation up to date shows that 110,070 were actually killed in battle, 249,485 died of disease, etc., and 275,175 were wounded, making a total of 734,630. It is believed that the number reported killed in this war is quite too small, since no account is taken of the thousands reported "missing," and the many who died from disability soon after their disharge.

The cost of wars in the United States has been as follows:

Revolutionary	$135,193,703
War of 1812-15	107,159,003
Mexican War	100,000,000
Rebellion	6,189,929,908

The estimated cost of Indian wars from 1776 to 1886 has been $696,339,277.

Lieutenant-Colonel William Ludlow, military attaché of the United States embassy to the Court of St. James, has made a careful study of the military systems of European

governments, and contributes some interesting information to the January number of *The North American Review*.

The following are Lieutenant-Colonel Ludlow's figures, showing the population and the military strength of six European nations:

COUNTRIES.	Population.	Military Strength	
		Peace.	War.
Germany.....	50,000,000	584,584	2,700,000
France.....	39,000,000	523,755	2,715,570
Austria.	43,500,000	299,150	1,590,820
Italy..... ...	31,500,000	247,288	1,909,000
Russia in Europe.	110,000,000	977,500	2,722,400
Great Britain....	40,000,000	220,509	1,170,000

"With the exercise of the most rigid economy short of weakening her equipment, Germany expends $160,000,000 annually on the army and navy—considerably over one third of the revenue. France, though burdened with an enormous debt, pays $180,000,000; Italy, crushed under the weight of indebtedness, expends $80,000,000 a year, and the expenditures of Austria-Hungary are about the same. Great Britain spends $160,000,000. To the actual outlay in money to maintain the armies and navies of the continent must be added the incidental loss of the withdrawal from profitable occupation and the maintenance in economic idleness of huge armies of 200,000 to 1,000,000 men."

It should be further emphasized that there are no indications anywhere among the great powers of lessening interest in warlike preparation. On the contrary, so far as possible each year sees an increased expenditure upon armies and navies. I quote from "The Army and Navy Year Book of 1895," edited by Lieutenant Lewis S. Van Duzer, U. S. N., an expert:

"The program of new construction for the British navy, which was published during the spring of 1894, provides for a distribution of the work over a period of five years, beginning April 1, 1894, and ending March 31, 1899. The whole of the scheme is not yet definitely settled, but it is said to contemplate the production of 120 ships of all classes. Three years and a half are allowed for the construction of battle-ships, two and a half for first-class cruisers, two for second-class cruisers, and one year for torpedo-boat destroyers; but these times will probably be exceeded unless future allotments of money are more generous than those made in the present budget. In the fiscal year 1894-5, it is proposed to commence seven battle-ships of the first class."

Concerning France, Lieutenant Van Duzer says:

"In 1892, the French Admiralty adopted a program of future construction, which is the most extensive plan that has been put forth by any nation. It provided for an expenditure of $200,000,000, distributed over ten years. The list of vessels to be built consisted of 10 battle-ships, 1 coast-defense ship, 9 first-class cruisers, 19 second-class cruisers, 17 third-class cruisers, 4 torpedo transports, 2 torpedo-depot ships, 5 torpedo-catchers, 8 first-class despatch-boats, and 7 gunboats. Torpedo-boats were not included.

"The budget for 1895 calls for an expenditure of 277,516,311 francs. The effective force of the navy will consist of 42,205 men and 1,842 officers. For ships under construction, the ordinary appropriation is 32,150,000 francs, and the extraordinary, 3,500,000. For ships in dock-yards 27,000,000 francs are appropriated."

Neighboring powers look upon these preparations with envy, and seek new loans only that they may equal or outdo them. Russia's naval ambition is greatly in excess of her ability to arm and equip a new navy or reorganize the army.

Italy, poor as she is, devotes 23,360,000 lire to new construction during the current year, 1895.

In Germany the naval budget for new construction amounts to nearly $19,000,000, which is over one million less than last year, owing to opposition of the Reichstag to increasing the navy. The building of a huge battle-ship this year is guaranteed. Bismarck once said, "Germans fear no one but God." Was this sarcasm?

The United States, though one of the largest of the powers, is far behind the great nations of Europe in strength of army and navy — and should be. It is feared there is a

growing ambition among Americans to see their country become a naval power of the first order. Since we must contend with a warlike spirit among other nations, we cannot for the present abolish the navy; and since we must contend with internal forces not wholly patriotic or American, we must needs maintain something of an armed force under direction of State and Federal authority. Beyond the necessities in each case, our recourse must be had to the ballot, not to the bayonet; to the pen of the diplomat, not to the sword of the soldier. Vast military establishments are foes of popular government and popular rights. The armies of the world must eventually be disbanded if civilization is to survive. The burden cannot always be borne. For many years there has been maintained in Paris a Peace League. The society has enrolled some of the most distinguished names known to current history. It seems to have been effective in removing by intelligent discussion questions which might have become occasions of war; but, so far as I am informed, the labors of the League have not generally been directed toward disarmament. Much of the literature produced by this body is of extraordinary interest. It has been suggested that here lies the splendid opportunity of the pope of Rome. If the Catholic authorities at Rome will abolish their show of military force about the Vatican and give themselves no further anxiety about the temporal power, but address their energies to the disarmament of the European continent, they will win for themselves a generous fame, and disarm their enemies alike with their friends. I can conceive of no way by which the pope could secure such universal regard as by steadfast devotion to disarmament. The opportunity will not, I fear, be embraced. Disarmament will come by intelligent Christian progress rather than by any appeal, however strongly made at the Vatican, to the powers. Catholics have not done their duty in countries largely influenced by their Church. Precisely the same may be said of Protestants. The criticism applies with equal force to both grand divisions of Christendom. Protestants are as warlike as Catholics, and just as loath to surrender themselves wholly to the cultivation of the arts of peace.

SERMONIC CRITICISM.

Verbal Criticism.

"THE ordinance of bap-*tism*"—so said an accomplished preacher on a recent Sunday.

Bap-*tism* is an unknown word in the best usage. The Century, International, and Standard dictionaries all give *bap*-tism, with no hint of any alternative pronunciation.

"The word is ob-so-*lete*." By no means. It may be *ob*-so-lete, but ob-so-*lete* is a pronunciation likewise unknown.

"Between *each one*" we heard in a recent pulpit notice in reference to the arrangement of a series. *Between* must apply to as many as two objects, and properly never to more than two. "Between *one*" is impossible.

Honest Claim of Discipleship.

Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 1). A good brother actually paraphrased this text, "Be ye followers of me *in as far* as I am of Christ." Paul never said anything so weak. Over and over he claimed to set an example of true Christian living: "Walk so *as ye have us for an example*" (Phil. iii. 17). "Those things which ye have . . . *seen in me*, do" (Phil. iv. 9). "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblamably we behaved

ourselves among you that believe" (1 Thes. ii. 10). He expected the same of other ministers, writing to Timothy, "*Be thou an example* of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity" (1 Tim. iv. 12). In the midst of the shipwreck, before officers, crew, and soldiers, with whom he had been shut up on the long voyage, he could confidently say, "God, *whose I am, and whom I serve*" (Acts xxvii. 23). How immeasurably it would weaken this to say, "Whose I humbly hope I am, and whom I am feebly and unworthily trying to serve." Much (though not all) of the shyness that expresses itself in such phrase is conscious inconsistency masquerading as humility.

The Church and the world need Christians so consciously stanch and true that they may dare to say "Whose *I am*, and whom *I serve*," "even as I also *am* of Christ."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A "Homiletic Review" Index.

WE are sure our readers will be glad to know that an index is now in preparation, to be issued in the form of a volume, which will cover the entire history of the HOMILETIC REVIEW. It is to be complete in every respect, making it possible to refer easily to any article upon any subject that may have been treated in the pages of this publication. It will also contain cross-references, so that if one is desirous of reading what may have been said upon the different phases of a given subject, it will be possible for him to do so without difficulty. If, *e. g.*, he is studying the subject of love, he will be able to see at a glance what has been published under the heads of benevolence, charity, liberality, etc. There will also be a complete textual index. The index will also enable him to tell instantly what the character of the article referred to may be, whether an extended discussion or but a suggestive hint or illustration. No one who desires to get the largest benefit from the REVIEW can afford to do without this comprehensive help.

"The Argument for Christianity."

To pastors who are called upon to deal with honest doubters among those to whom they minister we cordially commend this work from the pen of George C. Lorimer, D.D. (American Baptist Publication Society). It presents in a popular and at the same time scholarly way the evidences of Christianity. It is marked by a manifest acquaintance with the literature of the subject as well as with literature in general, and so thoroughly canvasses the ground of apologetics as to leave little to be desired. The style of the writer is one that fascinates the reader, and holds the attention well from start to finish. In its method of treatment it shows a marked originality. It may be well characterized as helpful to all classes of readers, and deserves a wide circulation.

Slights on the Ministry.

IN paying his respects to the ministers who had tried to prevent him from delivering one of his lectures in Hoboken, a few days since, Col. Ingersoll said: "You cannot blame them for their views. They get them in sectarian colleges, and sectarian colleges are what might be called the storm center of ignorance. They come out like the lands on the upper Potomac, as described by John Rogers—almost worthless by nature, and rendered wholly so by cultivation."

To all of which we reply that a man who makes a "hit" by striking a blow at his own father is one who has reached a level of moral degradation that renders his judgment as a critic as harmless as his action as a son is unworthy.

Printed in the United States.