

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—MAY, 1890.—No. 5.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—WHAT CONSTITUTES THE CHURCH?

BY HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., NEW YORK.

ETYMOLOGY is an unsafe guide to a word's meaning, for usage carries off a word oftentimes very far from its etymological meaning. "Dilapidation," for example, could etymologically be applied only to a *stone* house, yet we apply it properly now to a wooden house as well. Who would restrict the word "cynosure" (so often used regarding beautiful women) to its etymological meaning of "dog's tail"? The explanation of the Greek word for "church" by its etymology, so often made by writers, is an error. When the word *ἐκκλησία* was used in the time of our Lord, it simply meant an "assembly," and was the translation of the Hebrew "qahal," which is translated in the English by "assembly" and "congregation." The word occurs only three times in the Gospels, and they are all in Matthew. One is where our Lord says "upon this rock I will build my *church*" (ch. xvi : 18), and the other two are in ch. xviii : 17, "tell it unto the *church*, but if he neglect to hear the *church*." In other parts of the New Testament than the Gospels it occurs 112 times, and in all of them (except the three in Acts xix, referring to an assembly of citizens) refers to the people of God as an organization. The *ἐκκλησία*, though simply an assembly, was more or less an organized assembly. Even that boisterous crowd in the theater at Ephesus (Acts xix), which is called an *ἐκκλησία*, pretended to be organized. The town-clerk made a contrast between it and an *ἐννομος ἐκκλησία*, as one that would be *legally* called, but the session being in the theater points to an organized assembly rather than a mob.

If, therefore, we follow usage, the church in its original sense, as denoted by the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, is the congregation of believers in an orderly form. That it consisted only of believers or of professed believers is evident from its very appointment and purpose. Christ appointed *disciples*, and gave such his precepts and his commission to disciple others. The command left room for false disciples. There

was one in the twelve whom Jesus chose to be the very types and leaders of the rest. Hence the definition of the church will include false disciples. Still, to be false disciples they must be professed disciples. The church, therefore, is not a pure institution. Its principles are pure and its holy Head is pure, but the church at large has unholy elements within it. It is most important to note this, for it has a bearing on church-originated laws and church-originated doctrines.

The word "church" in the New Testament is used for the organized disciples of Christ (1) *as a whole*, as in Matt. xvi : 18, Acts xx : 28, 1 Cor. x : 32; (2) *as a local body*, as in Matt. xviii : 17, Acts viii : 1, 1 Cor. xvi : 19. It is interesting to note that when the disciples were in Jerusalem only, the word "church" was indicative of both the church as a whole and the church as a local body, but when other cities contained disciples we find the differentiation marked by the phrase "the church which was at Jerusalem." And then we find the plural as well as the singular used for the church as a whole : "then had the churches rest" (Acts ix : 31), "as in all churches of the saints" (1 Cor. xiv : 33). It becomes an interesting and important question as to the relation between the church as a whole and the church as a local body. A careful search of the New Testament shows that the only earthly power exerted over the church as a whole was that of the apostles and those whom they expressly sent as their delegates. "The care of all the churches" is claimed by the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. xi : 28), and we see Peter and John going down to Samaria with an authority and power that Philip the preacher did not possess (Acts viii : 14). The Epistles of Paul, Peter, John, James, and Jude show the same apostolic superintendence of the whole church. Titus and Timothy had special charges given them to act in the apostle's name (see 1 Cor. iv : 17, 2 Cor. viii : 6, xii : 18, 1 Tim. i : 3, Tit. i : 5). Besides this apostolic oversight, which was accompanied with a miraculous power possessed by no others, we find no general government of the church at large. When we speak of the miraculous power possessed only by the apostles, we do not mean that no others wrought miracles. We refer only to the special miracle of conferring "the gift of the Holy Ghost," *i. e.*, the speaking with tongues (see Acts viii : 14-19, xix : 6, 2 Tim. i : 6, Gal. iii : 5). This miraculous power was peculiar to the apostles, and also in their administration of discipline we see a power exercised by them to smite with sickness or death, such as we find in no others (see Acts v : 5, 10, xiii : 11, 1 Cor. v : 5, 1 Tim. i : 20). The churches individually had elders who governed them (Acts xiv : 23, xx : 17, 1 Tim. v : 17, Tit. i : 5, James v : 14). These were also called "bishops" (Acts xx : 28, "overseers" in the old English version is the Greek "bishops," Tit. i : 7, compared with verse 5), and no other rulers of the church are mentioned. There

were prophets and preachers of various sorts, but the government of the churches was entirely by the local elders. Now the question comes "Did the apostles who ruled the whole church have successors?" If not, then we have no universal government, but simply the local government by elders. It is on the assumption that the apostles had successors that Rome has built her colossal organization. With the additional assumption that Peter was ruler over the other apostles, it was easy to establish a world-wide hierarchy with the Pope at its head.

As to Peter being ruler over the other apostles, there is not the slightest hint of it in the New Testament. He was prominent among them, and is named first in all the lists, but there is not a single mention of his rule. The passage depended upon for Peter's supremacy is that of Matt. xvi: 18, 19: "Thou art Peter (Cepha), and upon this rock (Cepha) I will build my church; and the gates of hell (Hades) shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The only apparently distinctive gifts to Peter in this charge of our Lord are (1) that the church should be built on him (for in the Aramaic, which doubtless our Lord spoke, "Peter" and "rock" are precisely the same word), and (2) that he should have the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The binding and loosing were given equally to the other apostles. (See ch. xviii: 18.) The building of the church on Peter cannot mean that Peter was to be its head or lord. In Ephesians, ch. ii: 20, we find that the church is built on the apostles and prophets (comp. Eph. iii: 5), and the context there very clearly shows us that the inspired teachings of these apostles and prophets are the foundations alluded to. We must use the same interpretation here in our Lord's charge to Peter. He was to be the foundation of the church in common with his fellow-apostles and prophets as inspired teachers. We have now left as belonging to Peter only the gift of the keys. The Roman Church maintains that the keys represent all authority. But we have seen that the authority of teaching, and thus being the foundation of the church, and the authority of binding and loosing were given equally to all the apostles. Hence Peter did *not* have all the authority, and we must seek another definition for the keys. We may readily find it in that which follows, the keys representing the power to bind and loose, phrases which in the Jewish phraseology refer to the laying down of the law either in injunction or exception. (See Lightfoot *in loco*.) In this case the keys are appropriate as opening the door of duty and shutting the door of prohibition. Or we may view the keys as having a historical meaning, and referring to Peter's opening the door of the church, first to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and

secondly to the Gentiles, on the admission of the Samaritans or Cornelius, on both which occasions Peter was the chief instrument used by God.

In any case there is no power to rule over the other apostles given here to Peter. Furthermore, Peter is specially rebuked by our Lord again and again. (See Matt. xiv : 31, xvi : 23 ; Luke xxii : 34, John xxi : 22), and his denial of Jesus made him conspicuous in their general abandonment of the Master. Paul, besides, was obliged to rebuke him at a much later date (Gal. ii : 11). In the face of this history to call him a ruler over the apostles is absurd.

The other assumption of the Roman Church, that the apostles had successors, is equally without foundation. The distinctive characteristic of the apostles was that they were chosen by Jesus himself and had personally seen Him. In no place do we find Jesus telling them to appoint successors. The commission ends with themselves. Elders were to be continued, but not apostles. It is true that a class of men called apostles existed after the twelve had passed away, but they were not rulers in any sense, (see the *Didaché*), but itinerary evangelists, under the control and order of the elders. If the apostles as rulers of the church were to be continued, surely their title would not have fallen to a class of men who had nothing to do with ruling.

In both assumptions, therefore, the Roman Church is false. Peter never ruled the apostles, and the apostles as rulers never had successors.

We are left to separate churches governed by elders as the normal condition of the church at large after the apostles had passed away.

This being the constitution of the original church, we see how the unity of the church was a spiritual unity and not an external unity of government.

When the presiding elder in a local church extended his presidency over churches in smaller places in his neighborhood, the beginnings of a hierarchy were formed. The principle that made this parochial bishop a diocesan bishop soon wrought out the archbishop, and then the metropolitan, and then the patriarch, and finally the pope. Without any apostolic miraculous credentials this hierarchy was constituted, and then the figments of apostolic succession and Peter's supremacy continued in the pope were coined and made current in the church throughout most of the world. The church thus became a worldly kingdom, although Christ had said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Earthly possessions were acquired and earthly crowns assumed until the church became *the* earthly kingdom over all other earthly kingdoms with power to make and unmake princes, and with power of life and death over every human being. To fortify this earthly power the false doctrines of auricular confession, penance, absolution and purgatory were either invented or used, and above all the

right of the church to *make doctrine* was asserted. By these means the Church of Christ became an antichrist. It warred with carnal weapons and against flesh and blood; it allied itself with human pride, passion and vice in order to maintain its earthly power; it excluded the Word of God from its services and from the homes of the people; it made its services spectacular and in a foreign tongue so that edification was impossible; it multiplied pictures and images and so promoted pagan superstition by which it enslaved the masses, it made itself, as represented by its hierarchy, the mediator instead of Christ, and more completely to set Christ aside, exalted men and women, saints (so called) and the Virgin Mary, to be the objects of adoration. All this was the natural result of leaving the simplicity of the original form of the church and allowing human pride to take the place of brotherly love.

Now, we hold that the Church of Christ is not at all this historic thing that is so marked with worldliness and crime, that the kingdom of Christ, which is "not of this world," is not to be traced by worldly exhibitions, and that historic successions of men calling themselves bishops are no evidences whatever of a true church. The church is spiritual, and is only so far visible and organic as the spiritual forces make it so. The spiritual life is the only sign of a true church. When a church has become a great human power, wearing an earthly crown and wielding an earthly sword, it is no church at all. The vital characteristic of a church is gone. The church is where Christ dwells, and only there. Hence, the only true succession is the spiritual succession, and what we call "Church History" is very largely but the history of antichrist. The Church of Christ is composed of all believers, governed by their local bishops or elders, and adopting such rules of decency and order (1 Cor. xiv : 40) as their spiritual life suggests. That tares should be mixed with the wheat, that bad fish as well as good should be in the net, we are aware, but we are not told that the tares are to take possession of the field or that the bad fish are to monopolize the net. There is a limit to the commingling, beyond which the church is no church, and the organization is no longer of God, but of Satan. The synagogue of the Jews becomes the synagogue of Satan. It is, then, no longer a church. An apple may have some specks in it and still be an apple, but a rotten apple is no apple at all. It is simply filth to be thrown away. A church may have its defects and be a church, but when it hangs on the historic bough all rotten its historic position cannot save its character. It is a rotten thing to be thrown away. The spiritual church is everything, the historic church is of secondary importance, and of value only as it is spiritual.

Hence, the Reformation of the sixteenth century was no founding of a new church, as the Romanists say, but the manifestation of the

only true church succession, that of Scriptural doctrine and spiritual life, while the Roman Church, as an organization, was the rotten apple, perfectly historic and perfectly worthless. The Church of the Reformation, historically considered, will suffer the same sloughing off from the true church that the Roman Church suffered, the remnant with spiritual life being the nucleus of the Millennial Church, if this Church of the Reformation becomes worldly and unfaithful, as it certainly is becoming in many parts. An adherence to any outward organization, however historic as the Church of Christ, is directly against the words of Scripture: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. . . . Come out from them and be ye separate, saith the Lord" (2 Cor. vi), if the historic church, thus clung to, becomes antichristian in conduct or doctrine. It is this false adherence to a mere external claim that introduces all forms of error into the church and perverts the gospel of Christ. It is this which has welded Church and State together, and so given rise to the most fearful abominations of spiritual tyranny. It is this which has secularized and paganized the church, loading it with the commandments of men. The only deliverance from this corruption is in the recognition of the church as a spiritual entity, having an outward organization only sufficient to maintain decency and order. The external must be subordinate to the internal. The spiritual church, and not the historical church, is Christ's church, and it should be the aim of all Christians to be spiritual rather than historic. If we are spiritual, God will take care of the history. What He demands of us is not a perfect organization, but a perfect heart. The law of decency and order (1 Cor. xiv: 40), to which we have referred, will prevent all extravagancies and irregularities without being a cast-iron clamp checking the church's development and healthy growth. Expediency may make changes in externals in perfect conformity with this law of decency and order, and so open the way for God's free spirit to act upon the hearts and lives of His people. The unity of the Church of Christ is a spiritual unity. The attempt to make it an organic unity resulted in the frightful atrocities of the Inquisition. A worldwide organism with one human head is man's idea of the church, not God's. The Bible recognizes Christ only as the church's head. He is the spiritual head, and He has the church as His spiritual body. This body is compacted and fitly joined together, not by an outward human power, but by that which every spiritual joint supplieth, edifying itself in love. It is that unity which Christ prayed for (John xvii), not a visible unity, but a spiritual unity, like that of the Son and the Father, and like that of Christ with His people. The only visible unity that naturally belongs to such spiritual unity is that of brotherly love, brother welcoming brother, and church welcoming church the world over, agreeing to differ in the non-essentials, both of doctrine and gov-

ernment. It will be just in proportion as Christians view the spiritual tie as the bond of unity that they will make the visible union the plainer and the more effective before the world. As long as they fail to see that the spiritual tie is the bond of unity, so long they will emphasize their outward forms, seeking a unity in that wrong direction, and marring their spiritual power.

We put our principal thoughts in two propositions :

1. Any company of true believers meeting to worship in an orderly manner is a Church of Christ.
2. Any company of unbelievers, no matter what their historic connections may be, is no church at all.

II.—AN OLD ENGLISH RELIGIOUS SATIRIST.

BY PROF. T. W. HUNT, PH. D., PRINCETON, N. J.

WE refer to William Langlande (Langley), in many respects, one of the most notable characters of the era before us. Born in 1332, and dying in 1400, the same year with Chaucer, he may be regarded as Chaucer's contemporary, as he stands with this first national English poet on the very border-line between the old and the new in our history. Born at Cleobury Mortimer, in Shropshire ; a lowly clerk or student ; dressed in the "long clothes" of his clerical habit ; living, as he tells us, "not only in but *upon* London," in his simple, unaffected way, he lived his life and did his work and thereby placed all later England under bonds to his fidelity.

His great allegorical and satirical poem, "The Vision of Piers Plowman," is not only the greatest religious poem of the time, but in its thought and spirit, suffers nothing by comparison with any subsequent vernacular poem of a similar order. Strictly a vision, as it purports to be, and presented in the dress of allegory, it is so full of practical suggestion ; of dry humor and kindly pleasantry ; of scathing invective and lofty ethical maxim ; that the English critic is often at a loss just where to place it in the list of native literary product. It is safe to say, however, that, more than all else, it is a satirical poem of a specifically moral cast, and might be called our first example in English of a high type of religious satire in the form of verse.

We find, it is true, a large satirical element in the oldest English homilies, proverbs and moral odes, and in such later examples as "Handlyng Synne" and "The Pricke of Conscience." Still later in our history, satire abounds in the writings of Lydgate, Skelton, Tyndale, More, Wyatt, Latimer, Ascham, Gascoigne and Lyly, but nowhere do we find so extended and unique satire in verse, definite in its aim and Christianly devout in its spirit. "Piers the Ploughman's Crede," an anonymous poem of a later date, and a severe attack upon the Friars, had it been longer and of a more catholic spirit would naturally have been its nearest and closest rival. The poem before

us is sometimes called, a Vision of Malvern Hills, in Worcestershire. It is more correctly studied as a picture of London and metropolitan life. Without entering, in these pages, into a critical comparison of the three great texts of this poem, it will suffice to say, at present, that as it lies before us, it consists of a Prologue and seven separate sections, each under the name of a Passus. In the Prologue, the vision is of a field full of folk—the busy, selfish, sinful world—lying between the Tower of Truth and the Dungeon, the abode of error. Here the old dreamer sees all classes and conditions of men—plowmen, beggars, priests, princes, merchants and pilgrims—plying their respective callings and eager to succeed. In Passus I. is the vision of the lovely lady, Holy Church, who explains to the dreamer the meaning of the Tower and the Dungeon, and talks of faith and works and love. In Passus II. Lady Meed (Reward and Bribery) and Falsehood appear; as, also, Theology is seen, successfully objecting to their unholy alliance. In Passus III. Meed and Conscience are the leading characters, as are Meed and Reason, in Passus IV. In Passus V. is the striking portraiture of the Seven Deadly Sins—Pride, Luxury, Envy, Wrath, Avarice, Gluttony and Sloth—in which the old Shropshire satirist is at his best, and we note not a few Davidic utterances against sin which the Christian world may not “willingly let die.”

In Passus VI. Piers himself is seen as a simple plowman, ready to guide inquiring pilgrims on their way—a section of the poem that might profitably be read in these days of industrial agitation, as a social corrective. In the closing Passus, we read the Plowman's Pardon, obtained directly from God himself. As a worldly prelate questions its validity, and Piers proceeds with indignant emphasis to confirm it, the dreamer awakes and the poem closes with a suggestive comment on the worthlessness of Papal bulls and the supreme importance of a good life at the great day of doom so near at hand,

“Whan dede shullen rise,
And comen alle bifor cryst, acountis to yelde.”

Satirical to the last, he tells these papal hirelings that “a pouchful of pardoun there” and “indulgences double-folde” will be valued only at a pie crust.

Thus ends a poem instinct throughout with the love of goodness full of mental acumen and verbal aptness; as racy in its style as it is faithful in its teachings; a very gospel to the English yeomanry of the day, and, first and last, a religious satire of the highest order. Accessible, as it now is, in the Clarendon Press Series of Old English Texts, no one of our clergy can read it and not be invigorated by it and confirmed in his efforts against all error. We can but regret, however, that the fullest benefit of such a masterpiece is denied many of us, in that our education, called liberal, has not made us thoroughly familiar with these Old English days and Old English writers.

If we inquire more closely as to the leading forms of satire which this interesting poem embodies, we may note them as political, social and religious, with special emphasis upon the last form. The author was living in the time of the French and English wars. John, Duke of Lancaster, was in conflict with the Commons. The Wars of Normandy, the murder of Edward II., the imprisonment and deposition of Richard II., the death of Edward III., and the famous Wat Tyler's Rebellion were matters of contemporaneous history. In a word, it was the old struggle between the aristocracy and the commonalty; between the tyranny of kings and classes and the natural rights of man as man. Langlande's poem bristles with satirical allusions to these great events, never failing to champion the cause of the people and to insist that the next best government to theocracy is a true democracy.

So, in the line of social sarcasm, this humble dreamer is quick to see and rebuke every form of caste and rank and "high degree." From his innermost English soul he abhorred all parade of birth and wealth and even learning, and enjoyed nothing more keenly than to expose to ridicule all self-assumed importance. He would say no "God save you" to any one who demanded it on the ground of a supposed superiority. While, as a loyal citizen and subject, he kept safely within the pale of English law, he called no man master and bowed the knee to God only.

It was, however, within the sphere of moral and religious life that his satire was the sharpest and the most effective, as it was most needed and most frequently provoked. Hence, his insistence upon truth and purity, upon solid worth against all pretense; upon honesty of method and aim; upon justice to the poor and friendless. Especially in the domain of theology and ecclesiastical life, did he vent his indignation against haughty prelates and time-serving officials; against superstition and blatant error, against a worldly-minded clergy, forgetful of their curacies; most of all, against the revolting friars of his day who, for the sake of a few florins, would explain away any article of the creed. Nothing within the scope of English irony is more pointed and trenchant than his well-deserved allusions to these well-fed and indolent hirelings, who sought to fleece the flock over which they were appointed, and thought more of "bely-joye" than of aught else. Some of these references it may not be amiss to cite:

"Pilgrymes and palmers, pihted hem to gidere
To seke seynt James,
And hadden leve to lye, al here lyf after."

"I fonde there Freris, alle the foure ordres
Preched the peple, for profit of hem-selven
Glosed the gospel, as hem good lyked."

Of the civil and ecclesiastical lawyers, he writes in the bitterest terms.

"Thou mightest better mete, the myste on Malverne hulles
Then get a momme of here moothe, but money were shewed."

In the vision of the Seven Deadly Sins, his moral innuendo reaches its climax. Pride is represented as humbling herself as she vows she would unsew her garment and set therein an "hair shirt," to subdue the flesh. Luxury vows "to drynke but myd the doke." Blear-eyed Avarice mistakes the French word, *restitucioun* for robbery. Gluttony asserts his repentance only after imbibing all he can carry, while Sloth, in the person of a priest, knows Robin Hood better than his Pater Noster and his creed. Here and there, throughout the poem, some of the soundest prudential and ethical maxims are couched in a semi-satirical form and read as a leaf from Franklin's "Poor Richard's Almanac."

"Faith with-ovte the faite (deed),
Is as ded as a dore-tree."

He is not, he says, to be asked to have mercy

"Til prechioures prechyng be preved on hem-selven."

Physicians, also, must take their turn, as he says:—

"For northereres aren mony leches, lorde hem amende.
They do men deye thorw here drynkes, ar destine it wolde."

Thus sings the old poet for the good of his fellows, and we are struck with the eminent timeliness of his song. He wrote in the age of Edward III. as Bunyan did in that of Cromwell, and each fulfilled his mission. It was an age when satire was demanded in England as it was in Rome, in the days of Juvenal. Mere argument and direct address would not have sufficed. Writing without restraint, he wrote for all classes of men. Choosing as his chief character the plowman at his plow, with his rustic garb and honest face, he puts into the mouth of Piers these pertinent lessons of wisdom and morality.

Two or three of his special qualities as a religious satirist deserve attention.

We note, at the outset, his Christian *charity*. Love was with him the grace of the graces, and when, as a public censor, the temptation to harshness and vindictiveness was naturally strong, he says what he says in the spirit of good-will. Incensed as he was by the open abuses of the papacy, he was ever conservative rather than revolutionary, tolerant of all rightfully-established ceremonies, and often winning by his conciliatory method where he could not have won by other means. He dealt out his stern rebuke to kings and courtiers with all the incisiveness of Knox and Cromwell, and yet in loyal deference to civil order. Had he lived in the days of the Stuarts, he would have written just as pointedly, and yet have done it so discreetly as to have walked in liberty past the prisons of his less judicious colleagues. As to his *courage* in satire, he was the Luther of his day. Such a feature is, indeed, involved in the very idea of successful satire, and must

be embodied as a vital element in the personality of the satirist. Langlande was thus bold and, when necessary, defiant, even though vacillation would have been natural. The Romish hierarchy was against him. Monks and Friars were closely watching his movements. When, however, he sees the Pope of Rome or Avignon deceiving the people in the name of religion; when he sees the pampered mendicants filled with "the grace of guile;" when, as in the days of the Florentine plague, curates leave their charges for safer quarters; when revelry and extortion, gay attire and sumptuous feasts, long prayers and greed for gold, were the order of the day among church dignitaries, then his spirit was stirred to its depths and he used that strong, Saxon satire which was a part of his natural endowment. What he opposed, from first to last, was fraud—behind the chancel and at the altar; beneath the embroidered surplice of the priest; "spiritual wickedness in high places;" flagrant wrong under the guise of goodness. To denounce it as he did and when he did demanded the courage of Knox, and no amount of studied concealment could successfully hide injustice from his view. He had a mission to fulfill, and he fulfilled it.

Here we note his *conscientiousness* as a satirist. He was, in no sense, a satirist from a literary point of view as Horace was, in Latin letters, and Moliere, in French, and Pope, in English. He did not pen this poem merely as an author with his eye upon aesthetic effect. As one of his editors has expressed it, "His satire is that of a man who is constrained to speak out the bitter truth, and it is as earnest as is the cry of an injured man who appeals to heaven for vengeance." It is, indeed, under the sense of a kind of personal injury that he cries out for redress—injury to the English Commonwealth; injury to good government, good morals and true religion in England, and thus injury to himself. Critics have spoken of the seriousness of his satire. It was, of a truth, sedate, as is all genuine satire addressed to moral reform. Beneath all pleasantry and play of humor there was a Senecan solemnity of manner, eminently becoming a poet who thought more of truth than of effect, more of Christianity than of rhythm and metre. Langlande never could have written satire as Rabelais and Butler wrote it—for literary pleasure or polemic triumph. He wrote it as Caedmon wrote his "Paraphrase" and Latimer, his "Homilies." It is in "this intense moral feeling" that Milman and others note his superiority to his age. In a day when Romish intolerance was enslaving human reason and sealing the Scriptures, he was pleading for liberty of faith and opinion, and, in an era of widespread profligacy, pleading for chastity and purity. This poem is thus a kind of Protestant evangel nearly two centuries before the Protestant Reformation, and we are not surprised at its popularity among the Elizabethan Reformers and later English Puritans. Thus he predicted that very overthrow of the monastic system which took place under Henry VIII.;

spoke of the duty of overthrowing the Saracenic order; taught that salvation was by Christ only; depicted the coming trials and triumphs of the true church, and awoke from his dream in tears and faith. We believe in the logical and ethical continuity of history, and how forcibly such a providential sequence appears in the work of Langlande and Wiclif as related to the subsequent work of Latimer and Tyndale! Milton reveals to us his indebtedness to this lowly dreamer. Even the dissolute Byron was charmed by the purity of his life, while the Do Wel, Do Bet (ter) and the Do Best of this Shropshire singer—what was it after all, but the biblical conception of the Christian life—the “Pilgrim’s Progress” of the fourteenth century! Langlande was more than an Old English satirist. He was an Old English preacher and teacher and reformer, working on his evangelical poem, as Wiclif was translating the Bible into English. Wiclif, the university scholar and theologian, and Langlande, the simple minded poet-farmer of Mercian England—how different, and yet how similar! Differing in their antecedents and abilities and literary work they were alike in this—that as to how they lived and what they wrote and taught, they regarded themselves as “the servants of the Most High God,” and servants, also, of the English people on behalf of Christ and Protestant Christianity.

III.—PANTHEISM, THE FOUNDATION OF PROBATION AFTER DEATH AS ASSUMED IN THE “NEW THEOLOGY,” AND OF THE FINAL SALVATION OF ALL MEN.

BY O. T. LANPHEAR, D.D., BEVERLY, MASS.

“PANTHEISM,” says Prof. Allen, “has never been defined. Associated in the minds of many with the opprobrium of a deistic antipathy, it is also used in another and a higher sense.”* If Prof. Allen had given a definition of pantheism in what he claims to be “its higher sense,” he might have saved his readers from the liability of misapprehending his meaning, certainly in those instances where he seems to confound the divine immanence with a pantheism which fails to distinguish the Being of God from the world. Had he and other advocates of the “modern” or “new theology” been sufficiently precise in expressing their thought, they might have had less occasion to complain of having been unjustly called pantheists.

Though the word pantheism was first used in the eighteenth century, yet by usage it stands for views as old as philosophy. Though its meaning has expression in different forms of philosophy, yet it would seem to have been set forth with sufficient clearness, both in concise definition and in extended description.

“Pantheism,” says Krauth, “was a word first used by Tolland to designate the monistic doctrine which identifies the totality of being

* Continuity of Christian Thought, p. 427.

with God. Not that each thing is God, but that the whole essence or substance proper is God, and the entire phenomena are the necessary phenomena of God's nature.* So, any system which ignores the divine personality, or hinders us from saying Thou to God is pantheistic and fatal to the Christian religion, whether the system teaches that "God is the soul or vital principle, and matter the eternal body which God vivifies"; or, as by the Eleatic School, that "the universe and God are identical"; or as in the system of Spinoza, that there is "one only substance, eternal, manifested in extension as matter, in thought as mind"; or the idealism of Plato, "who did not recognize an extra-mundane God"; or according to Aristotle that "human souls are only the divine reason in individual existence, thus showing that he had little idea of personality"; or with the Neo-Platonists, that "the world is the effluence of God as fire emits heat, and that the soul of man is a mode of God's existence, a portion of his substance, and whose destiny is absorption in the infinite Being;" or according to the mysticism of the Alexandrian School, that the logos, or reason in God, is reason in man, that in the pursuit of truth, therefore, supreme authority should be ascribed to "God within us," and not to the Scriptures; or, according to the teaching of Cousin, in harmony with that of the Alexandrian School, that reason is not a faculty of the human soul, but is God in man, and who defines mysticism in philosophy as the belief that God may be known face to face, without anything intermediate, as in all systems of philosophy which teach the identity of God and the human soul, including that of the Brahmans and the Buddhists; † or with Schelling, that "Deity is the whole sum of consciousness immanent in the world" ‡ or with Hegel, that "the Divine consciousness is absolutely one with the advancing consciousness of mankind." § If thus pantheism inheres in a variety of philosophical systems, and with such subtlety of expression that it is not always apparent until after close inspection, it all the more becomes those who desire only to know and follow Christian truth to be on their guard against its deceptions. Yet all the more should they be on the alert if there is evidence that the influence of this error is the prevailing tendency of the times. Of the past as well as the present it has been well said, that "almost all the great departures from the simplicity of the truth as revealed in the sacred Scriptures have assumed more or less distinctly a pantheistic tendency." || President Hopkins has designated the present as "a period when the thought of the world, so far as it separates itself from the Bible, tends toward pantheism. Modern infidelity has various names and forms, but the

*Johnson's Cyc. (Reference is sometimes made to other than original sources because more accessible to the general reader.)

†Hodge's Theol., vol. 1, p. 61; and on the whole subject. ‡Morell's Philos. p. 454

§ Morell, p. 477. ||Hodge, Vol. 1, p. 328.

substance is that and under whatever form it is sure to chill and dwarf a man and disintegrate society." * It is significant that Uhlman, though endeavoring to work out a reconciliation between Christianity and modern culture, and living in friendly intercourse with Hegel and Schleiermacher, nevertheless felt obliged to call attention to the danger which threatened Christianity arising from the pantheism of their systems, since he could conceive of Christianity in no other character than that "of moral theism, a religion distinguishing God and the world, a God not depending for individual consciousness on his human manifestations, but existing personally and independently as a free self-conscious spirit." †

More extended evidence, however, of the need of guarding against this error would seem unnecessary, so long as some of the advocates of the new theology claim, without disguise, that pantheism is essential to it. The Rev. J. B. Heard says in respect to the Being of God that, "unless we can make an approach to what for want of a better term we must call Christian pantheism, our theology, on the most fundamental question of all, will strike a note to which modern science will have no response;" and lacking this "response," theology must, in his estimation, "fossilize." ‡ After such a statement it could hardly be charged with "opprobrium" to ask whether the meaning here intended is the same as what Prof. Allen calls the "higher sense" of the word, and also to consider its merits.

Mr. Heard seems to realize that "a Christian pantheist is a contradiction in terms;" yet when he says that "what in Spinoza was an evil dream of science is now a sober reality;" and when we find that Spinoza held that "all things are but modes of God's infinite attributes," or, in his own words, "*Deus est omnium rerum causa immanens, non transiens;*" § (God is the *immanent* cause of all things, not *transcendent*;) and when again Mr. Heard says that "instead of the transcendent Deity of the past, men now think of Him as the immanent center of force from whence proceed all the forces of the universe," then it does not appear that Mr. Heard is much troubled about his "contradiction in terms." This "sense" of pantheism is certainly low enough, giving no promise of any Christian place for the word so long as under it the universe is held to be only a correlation of forces with a common center.

Some of the new theologians, with less apparent self-contradiction, only insist on the divine immanence, or soften the statement by admitting the divine transcendence. So the Andover theologians hold "a modification of a prevailing Latin conception of the divine transcendence by a clearer and fuller appreciation (in accordance with the highest thought of the Greek fathers), of the divine immanence."

*Baccalaureate Sermon 1866. †Essence of Christianity, Sec. 2, 7.

‡Old and New Theology, p. 58. § Morell, p. 127.

* Prof. Allen also refers to the Greek fathers, "in whose minds the divine immanence was the underlying thought in their consciousness of God,"† claiming that as opposed to this view "the Augustinian theology rests upon the transcendence of Deity as its controlling principle,"‡ also that "Calvin positively rejected the doctrine of the divine immanence,"§ so as to maintain the isolation of God from the world in harmony with Deism. But that neither these men nor their followers deserve to be represented as in agreement with those deistical writers who deny God's omnipresence and assert only a presence by operation from a distance, is plainly evident from their statements respecting the divine immensity and omnipresence.

"God's immensity," says Hodge, "is the infinitude of His being, viewed as belonging to His nature from eternity. He fills immensity with His presence. His omnipresence is the infinitude of His being viewed in relation to His creatures. He is equally present with all His creatures, at all times and in all places. He is not absent from any portion of space, nor more present in one portion than in another. This of course is not to be understood of extension or diffusion. Extension is a property of matter, and cannot be predicated of God. If extended, He would be capable of division and separation, and a part of God would be here and a part elsewhere. Nor is this omnipresence to be understood as a mere presence in knowledge and power. It is an omnipresence of the divine essence. Otherwise the essence of God would be limited."¶

"By virtue of God's immensity," says Shedd, "He is omnipresent. Immensity and omnipresence are thus inseparably connected, and are best considered in reference to each other. Omnipresence has respect to the universe of created beings and things; to space as filled. Immensity has reference to this, and to what is beyond; to space as void. God is said to be beyond the universe (*extra mundum*), not in the sense that there are spaces beyond the universe which He fills by extension of substance, but in the sense that the universe does not exhaust His immensity, or is equal to it." Again Shedd says: "The presence of mind is wholly different from that of matter. Spiritual substance is present, wherever it is present, as a complete whole at every point. The human soul, for example, is present as unity and totality at every point of the body. It is not present as the body is, partitively, or by division of substance. God, also, as the Infinite Spirit, is present at every point of space as a totality. He is not present in the universe by division of substance, but as unity, simple and undivided." And again, in discussing the divine personality, he says: "God does not struggle out into self-consciousness by the help of the external universe. Before that universe was created, and in the solitude of His own eternity and self-sufficiency, He had within His own essence all the conditions of self-consciousness. And after the worlds were called into being, the divine personality remained the same immutable self-knowledge, unaffected by anything in His handiwork."¶

Enmons says: "That a cause can operate where it does not exist, is utterly inconceivable; and therefore the presence of the Creator must be

* *Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 16.

† *Continuity of Christian Thought*, p. 2. ‡ *C. C. T.*, p. 3. § *C. C. T.*, p. 299. ¶ *Theol.*, Vol. 2, pp. 383-4.

¶ *Dogmatic Theol.*, Vol. I, pp. 189, 340.

co-extensive with His works. It is no less a conclusion of reason than a dictate of revelation that God 'fills heaven and earth.'**

"God," says Charnock, "is most simple; His essence therefore is not mixed with any being. God is not formally one with the world or with any creature in the world—by His presence in it, nor can any creature in the world no, not the soul of man, or an angel, come to be essentially one with God, though God be essentially present with it. He fills heaven and earth; He is as much a God in the earth beneath as in heaven above (Deut. iv: 39); entirely in all places, not by scraps and fragments of His essence."†

Calvin says: "Surely His (God's) immensity ought to inspire us with awe, that we may not attempt to measure Him with our senses; and the spirituality of His nature prohibits us from entertaining any earthly or carnal speculations concerning Him. For the same reason he represents His residence to be in 'heaven;' for though, as He is incomprehensible, He fills the earth also, yet seeing that our minds from their dullness are continually dwelling on the earth, in order to shake off our sloth and inactivity, He properly raises us above the world."‡

"Augustine says God is not to be regarded as everywhere diffused, as the air or the light; *Sed in solo coelo totus, et in sola terra totus, et in coelo et in terra totus, et nullo contentus loco, sed in se ipso ubique totus;*" (but entire in heaven alone, and entire in earth alone, and entire in both heaven and earth, and comprehended in no place, but everywhere entire in Himself.)§

Now, it is absurd to compare these writers with deists in this instance, for deists deny God's omnipresence as to essence, and assert only a presence by operation from a distance. These writers maintain God's transcendence from His immensity, and His immanence from His omnipresence in the world as to essence, if by His immanence it is meant that He is present in the world and remains present in the world; a God at hand as well as a God afar off. But if, by the divine immanence, the pantheistic doctrine is meant that God is formally one with the world, or with any creature in the world, so that His essence is mixed with any being, or so that in any manner His being is confounded with the world, or identified with the world; then it is certain that in this sense these writers do not hold the divine immanence, for they are as far from pantheism as they are from deism. Therefore when the new theologians say that Calvinists do not hold the divine immanence, it must be the pantheistic view which they have in mind, and which they themselves hold. This is further evident from their reference to the Greek fathers of the Alexandrian school as authority, according to whom the *logos*, or reason in God, is reason in man, "God within us;" thus confounding the being of God with the being of man. This is also evident when Prof. Allen says that "the statement of Hegel may differ in form from that of the ancient Greek theology, but it is the same thing essentially;"|| and "that Hegel was the continuator in the mystic succession from John

*Bib. Sac., Vol. VII., p. 257. †Divine Attributes, p. 238. ‡Institutes, I., 13.

§Hodge, Vol. I., p. 334.

||C. C. T., p. 431.

Scotus and Eckhart, who are each accredited pantheists; also, when Mr. Heard says that the new philosophy may be described as monism, and that "the soundest thinkers on the side of exact science are all enrolled on the side of monism;"* and also when the new theologians generally speak of their doctrine of the divine immanence as "approving itself in the best philosophy of our time," by which it is understood that reference is made to the pantheistic writers already cited.

Again, the advocates of the new theology do not always express themselves clearly respecting the personality of God. They call Him the Father, but by this it is not certain that they regard Him in any sense as a person. The monists call Him the "All Father," or the "All," without ascribing to Him personality. Emerson, as a pantheist, could say that "man is conscious of a universal soul within or behind his individual life; reason universal, not mine, or thine, or his; but we are its, considered in relation to nature we call it Spirit, the Father."† The Andover theologians say that "the central point of Christ's personality falls into the central point of absolute personality."‡ But according to Hegel, "God is not a *person* but personality itself, *i. e.*, the universal personality which realizes itself in every human consciousness as so many separate thoughts of one eternal mind."§ Thus, whether God be called the "eternal personality," or the "universal personality," or the "absolute personality," His personality is that into which all finite personalities fall; so that man is not to be individually considered as a person, for it is God which in man attains personality. Accordingly, Christ's personality by falling into the central point of absolute personality, would not differ from the personality of all other men. Nor is it apparent that by asserting that the central point of Christ's personality falls into the central point of absolute personality, His personality is made to differ from that of all other men; for, carrying out the mathematical figure, it cannot be supposed that the absolute personality is of any different nature at the central point of its area than at any other point within its circumference. Thus God is the only real Being of which the world is the ever changing phenomenon. That this view of the personality of Christ pertains to the new theology, finds proof in the admission of Dorner, that "the foundations of the new Christology were laid by Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher," which, as has been well said, "is equivalent to saying that the new Christology is founded on the principles of the pantheistic philosophy;"|| and that "this kind of Hegelianism is an arrogant pantheism, differing from atheism only in form."¶

* O. and N. T., p. 60. † Essay on Nature, p. 25.

‡ Prog. Orth., p. 30. § Morell, p. 473.

|| Hodge, Vol. II., p. 428. ¶ Bib. Sac., Vol. VIII., p. 311.

(To be continued.)

IV.—SECRETS OF PULPIT POWER, WITH EXAMPLES.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D. D., PHILADELPHIA.

PREACHING is the foremost of the Fine Arts. He who is both an attractive and effective preacher, and attractive without ceasing to be effective, has touched the highest summit of the art.

No doubt there are *secrets* of pulpit power that must ever remain secrets, mysteries not to be unveiled by speech. Poets, artists, musicians, have always failed to impart the genius of creative skill. Wilkie, when asked how he mixed colors, could only reply, "with brains;" and many have been the attempts to discover or disclose the mystery of success in making thought mighty and massive, and speech convincing and persuasive.

But there are *some* secrets that may be communicated. The preacher is a man, and much will depend on his manhood; he is a speaker, and much hangs on his manner as well as matter; he is a teacher, and much of his success must be traceable to his training and power to impart; he is an ambassador, and most of all depends on his being prepared and fitted properly to represent his Master and Sovereign.

We propose, as briefly as possible, to discuss some communicable secrets of pulpit power, and to illustrate by examples; and, because there is a physical as well as spiritual side to the theme—because voice, manner, gesture, the skilful use of the organs of speech and the faculties of thought are as truly factors in the problem as is moral and spiritual life, it may be well to consider each of these in its place. Nothing is to be despised that contributes, however little, to that grand product, a true preacher of the gospel.

We instinctively feel a sort of contempt for a mere pulpit elocutionist, who "speaks his piece" and goes singsong through his sermon. "One subtle element of unreality in the pulpit," says Robert Collyer, "is the pulpit tone, and the pulpit manner, too, and I mean by that, everything that a man puts on for effect, compared with what springs spontaneously out of his nature." Yet who can tell the added effectiveness of the reading of the Scriptures if the Bible were naturally and expressively read, as Kean read Shakespeare or recited Macaulay! Mrs. Siddons so threw her whole soul into the words of a fictitious character that it overpowered Young, that great tragedian, so that, although himself at that time acting the villain in the same play, he could not help sobbing aloud. And yet the preacher will read David's lament over Absalom, or that exquisite story of the woman anointing Jesus with her tears, in Luke vii., or the 51st Psalm, as though he had no soul himself.

We would not have a man practise attitudes and gestures before a mirror, but why should a preacher habitually hitch his shoulder, cross

his legs, toss his head or do any other absurd and ungraceful thing which would be ridiculed in a professional reader? There was a famous clergyman in New York City who habitually raised himself on tiptoe and came down on his heel when he grew vehement, and whose uniform gesture when he would be emphatic, whether the sentiment were tender or terrible, pathetic or denunciatory, was the *clenched fist!* The idea of entreating a sinner to take refuge in Jesus, and assuming a pugilistic attitude for the enforcement of the persuasive appeal is simply preposterous. And then think of the fashionable monotone now alarmingly prevalent. One of the late moderators of the General Assembly, a man having a voice singularly flexible and variable and musical, intoned his grand opening sermon as though he were chanting like a swinging Dervish. All these mannerisms are unnatural and often paradoxical. They should be banished from the pulpit; and a little elocutionary training, taken in time, might prevent all such chronic absurdities in pulpit oratory.

True oratory calls no attention to itself. Its art is the art of being natural, and all excrescences are unnatural and abnormal. The highest perfection of oratory is to speak so easily, gracefully, simply that the hearer forgets the speaker in the speech. Dr. Emmons' two rules of rhetoric were: "1. Have something to say; 2. Say it;" and rightly understood those two rules cover all oratory. To get first thought worth presenting, and then present it so clearly, so forcibly that the speaker is only a translucent pane for light to stream through, where the pane is unseen because of its perfect transparency—that is the climax of perfect oratory. When a man is absorbed in that result—getting at the mind and the heart of the auditor, he will not despise simplicity or even repetition, for, as Mrs. Stowe says, "Some minds are like a bale of cotton, downy, soft, benevolently fuzzy and confused," and only by being repetitiously simple can the speaker impress them.

Such laws apply especially to *illustration*. The architectural maxim, "never construct ornament, but ornament construction," is the axiom of oratory. An illustration must illustrate, *i. e.*, let in light. Hence it must not be for its own sake, but for the sake of the theme. If introduced to display learning, or technical knowledge or historic research it may exhibit pedantry or ingenuity, but it violates good taste.

In Elocution, *pronunciation* is of no small importance. Never *chew* words. A young speaker once asked, "Can virchude, fortichude, gratichude, or quiechude, dwell with that man who is a stranger to rectichude?"

That fellow was of course a *scheident*. The office of the Preacher nowadays includes that of the Educator. The pulpit is, like the stage, a school of grammar, and of correctness and elegance of dic-

tion. But it is not so much on this ground that it behooves the preacher to look well to his choice and use of words, and even to the correctness of his pronunciation. It is of great moment that nothing in the preacher *divert the hearer's mind* from the truth which he presents. The sacred orator, as we have said, must be simply a pane of glass through which the light of God streams; and to be such a transparent and translucent medium, the preacher must be lost sight of, like a perfect pane. One bad mispronunciation may arrest the attention of a cultivated auditor and so arouse his critical faculty that the point of the argument or the pertinency of the illustration may be lost upon him; just as some slight interruption in a railway train may turn the eyes of a passenger from a surpassingly beautiful scene, which is left behind, before his attention is again released to observe the landscape. A man or woman with a quick, correct ear may find the mind dwelling on these mistakes in speech, and for the time oblivious to the argument which is the vital matter of the discourse.

Closely related to pronunciation is good *enunciation*. It is a mistake to suppose that the faculty of making oneself heard, in a large or ill-constructed audience-room, is the power of speaking with a loud and strong voice. Sometimes that produces a deafening and confusing echo. But to speak with a clear, distinct utterance, giving every syllable its fair share of enunciation, and faithfully giving *consonants* their place as the definers of vowel sounds—that is to be heard.

We know a man famous for good enunciation who speaks with an ordinary, conversational tone, and often with but little volume of voice, but in the largest hall he is heard by everybody, even those whose hearing is not acute, because he habitually enunciates every word and syllable.

When at school I was practised by a very sagacious teacher of reading and speaking upon a fragment of one of Binney's speeches. It is the best exercise for such practice that I have ever met in the English tongue. Any man who will read it aloud, and over and over again, until every vowel and consonant gets its normal share of attention from tongue and teeth, palate and lips, will find himself able to read any paragraph in the English tongue with new control over his organs of speech. As both an exercise in vocal gymnastics and a test of enunciatory skill, we give the paragraph entire, italicizing specially difficult passages.

“What are sufficient causes of war let no man say, let no legislator say, until the question of war is *directly and inevitably before him*. Jurists may be permitted with comparative safety to pile *tome upon tome of interminable disquisition upon the motives, reasons, and causes of just and unjust war*. *Metaphysicians may be suffered with impunity to spin the thread of*

their speculations until it is attenuated to a cobweb; but for a body created for the government of a great nation, and for the adjustment and protection of its infinitely diversified interests, it is worse than folly to speculate upon the causes of war, until the great question shall be presented for immediate action—until they shall hold the united question of cause, motive, and present expediency, in the very palm of their hands. War is a tremendous evil. Come when it will, unless it shall come in the necessary defence of our national security, or of that honor under whose protection national security reposes, it will come too soon—too soon for our national prosperity—too soon for our individual happiness—to soon for the frugal, industrious, and virtuous habits of our citizens—too soon, perhaps, for our most precious institutions. The man who, for any cause, save the sacred cause of public security, which makes all wars defensive—the man who, for any cause but this, shall *promote or compel this final and terrible resort, assumes a responsibility second to none, nay, transcendently deeper and higher than any* which man can assume before his fellowmen, or in the presence of God, his Creator.”

Another secret of pulpit power is found in the *avoidance of all imitation*. Some member of a presbytery—a country brother—complained that the city clergymen dressed too well, and thus made an undue distinction between themselves and their rural brethren. Dr. Breckenridge, always ready for debate, straightened up his tall, lithe form and indignantly denied the charge. In a burst of eloquent anger he declared that he was ready to *change clothes with any brother on that floor*. In an instant a short, fat man—as broad as long—waddled into the aisle, and called out wheezily, “Mr. Moderator, I’m his man!” The vision of Dr. Breckenridge’s arms and legs protruding from the baggy clothes of the other, upset the dignity of the presbytery, and spoiled the eloquence of the speaker.

The anecdote is capable of a higher application. Every man should be willing to be himself and “wear his own clothes” rhetorically. He cannot exchange garments with any other man without rendering himself ridiculous in the eyes of discerning people. Individuality is closely akin to originality, and originality to freshness.

There is no man with a complete set of faculties, who, under patient training, will not develop *a way of his own*, and that way is his best possible way. No other man can excel him in that for which he is best fitted. Let him therefore find out his own fitness and give it room, scope for exercise. Imitation of others cramps and cripples individuality, and makes a normal originality impossible. From the hour when, consciously or unconsciously, a preacher slavishly patterns his own methods after another man, his freedom of movement and development ceases.

Rev. Dr. Wadsworth of Philadelphia was a pulpit genius. He had, withal, marked idiosyncrasy, which closely approached idiosyncraziness. His whole style was peculiar, and his gesticulation often marvelously awkward and angular. But he was himself, and there was

something fascinating about his very awkwardness, for it was characteristic. But scores of inferior men have sprung up who have tried to imitate his style and even to ape his awkwardness! And they have been singular failures. A prominent orator says of him: "He was one of the most awkward and ungainly men in the pulpit. Every 'action,' as we call it, went in the face of the whole school of elocutionists, and was as unexpected as it was extraordinary. But the preacher was a man of a mighty power; he caught you first by that, and then by-and-by you saw that every movement he made had a delicate kinship to the movement of his soul, and then you cared no more for the contortions. But I have often seen men whose movements were governed by the elocutionists with most exquisite grace, that I could not bear to look at. It was an elaborate lesson they had learned, and they were conducting an exhibition. It is always sad to see this, saddest of all in the pulpit."

In all oratory, the speaker must have regard to his *climax*. He must aim to bring his thought to its highest level, and *then stop*. There may be recapitulation without mere repetition, and such a recapitulation helps climax. Vehemence should be restrained until the sermon approaches its close; then, just as the supreme exertion of power is that which lifts the capstone to its place at the apex of the pyramid, so the orator's supreme effort should *close* his discourse. A sermon is not a pious soliloquy or meditation. It is an appeal, founded on argument, and enforced by illustration and application. Under the inspiration of accumulated thought and feeling, the orator naturally rises even to louder and more emphatic vocal utterance as he reaches the summit of his effort, and hence a growing intensity of emotion and vehemence of elocution strike the hearer, who is borne upward and onward by the speaker, as perfectly natural and necessary.

Such preaching is adapted to make the auditor hear to effect. When men heard Cicero they exclaimed, "How beautifully he speaks;" but when they heard Demosthenes, they set their teeth and clenched their fists and shouted, "*Let us go and fight Philip!*" Other preachers made Louis XIV. think of themselves; but Massillon made that monarch think of himself and of God. O for more such preaching! And who shall tell us that the gifts and graces, the training and discipline, which help even the orator's eye and hand, voice and tone, attitude and gesture, to hold the attention and sway the conviction of the hearer are to be despised or treated with contemptuous and careless neglect?

That was a wise veteran who said that three things make a preacher: "Arrangement, natural delivery, and a preaching spirit." The first two are not to be overlooked even in the last. We should be glad to dismount the modern preacher from the two stilts of intellect and

culture, and bring the pulpit orator down to the level not of common place but of common sense; and to banish by ridicule and remonstrance, by elocutionary training and by emulation of the best models, all that superficiality and artificiality which make the preacher at best a tame and weak pretender to the high art of effective sacred oratory.

V.—CHARLES LAMB AND CHILDHOOD.

BY REV. NEWELL WOOLSEY WELLS, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE life of Lamb discovers one characteristic upon which little stress has been laid by his biographers. He has been pictured to us poring over the old folios by which he set such store, handling them with an affectionate fondness, conversing with them in a sort of confidential familiarity, warming over their imparted secrets, or whispering into their marginal ears the secrets of his own well-stored mind. We have seen him, evening after evening, in the company of his devoted cronies, with their "old familiar faces," and heard him stammering out his ludicrous jests or profound criticisms till it had to be acknowledged that the palm for the best thing said must be awarded him. Or else we have watched him devotedly caring, with his unparalleled fraternal affection, for her whose life with its dark tragedy was his own life's deepest shadow. But we have not been accustomed to think of him as the champion of children, their devoted friend and lover, the defender of their rights and avenger of their wrongs.

And yet when we take up that which has been left us of the life's work of "the gentle Elia," which is, indeed, after a sort his autobiography, what a wealth of testimony is afforded as to the existence and power of the sentiment to which we have alluded. In his letters, his poems, his unapproachable essays, it is ever finding an expression, until we are compelled to the conviction that it constituted one of the deepest and most potent forces of his strange and sad, yet winsome, life, and contributed much toward making him "the most lovable of men."

It was one of the peculiarities of Lamb that he was very closely drawn to things and persons that were despised or overlooked or forgotten by others. In this respect he has well been called a "Good Samaritan." He did not throw the mantle of his protection about such objects indiscriminately. His selections were grounded, not upon the mere fact that others looked with indifference or disdain upon the objects of them, but upon some trait of attractiveness invisible to others, and visible to him only because he looked for it. English literature has been greatly enriched for us by his possession of this idiosyncrasy. To him we are largely indebted for the renewal of interest in the old writers who had passed into the oblivion of a universal indifference. It was his delight to direct attention to what had hitherto

escaped it, the beauty, the humor, the pathos, the power of many lines that had been covered from observation by the literary deposits of later times. He was the Layard or the Schliemann of English literature, though declaring himself "no Herculean raker." By patient labor in a field utterly neglected, labor that was without any great encouragement, but not without many obstacles, sneers and taunts, he managed to exhume treasures, buried for centuries, "as good as anything in Herculaneum," and set them in a light where a public appreciation was inevitable.

It is not to be wondered at that the mind of Lamb should have turned itself to that which of all things most truly represents the helplessness, the ignorance and the fallibility of humanity—childhood; to discover its treasures and seek their preservation.

For some reason he never married, and the sweet comfort of parentage was never his. The "Alice W." of his early devotion became the wife of another. "The children of Alice," wrote he, "call Bartrum father." Yet the parental instinct was very potent within him.

This, it doubtless was, which led him to give himself up to dreams of the olden days and their cherished hopes, a habit which characterized him to the very last. There is something very pathetic to us in his expressions of sympathy for "the child Elia that 'other me' there in the background." In the growing solitude of his advancing years, by a quaint fancy he adopted himself as he was when a boy. So he says in his *New Year's Eve*: "Being without wife and family I have not learned to project myself enough out of myself, and having no offspring of my own to dally with, I turn back upon memory and adopt my own early idea as my heir and favorite." With such pleasant conceits he sought to cheer himself in the hours when oppressed most heavily with the consciousness of his loneliness.

It is not because childhood *per se* had any strong claim upon Lamb that he manifested an attachment for it. The mere fact of disparity in years or in strength or in wisdom did not seem to him sufficient to warrant any extraordinary sympathy. There must be some recommendation before he allowed his "tender concern" to go out toward a child. Where these were not present, there he gave full swing to that "contrariness," as Mr. Ainger has called it, which was so prominent a characteristic of his disposition. He showed no mercy toward a parental pride that was ostentatious; it became the shuttlecock of his humor. With what mischievous yet innocent malice he deals with it in his "*Bachelor's Complaint of the Behavior of Married People!*"

"When I consider how little of a rarity children are—that every street and blind alley swarms with them—that the poorest people commonly have them in most abundance—that there are few marriages that are not blest with at least one of these bargains. How often they turn out ill and defeat

the fond hopes of their parents, taking to vicious courses which end in poverty, disgrace, the gallows, etc., I cannot for my life tell what cause for pride there can possibly be in having them. If they were young phœnixes, indeed, that were born but one in a year there might be a pretext. But when they are so common. . . .

“ . . . ‘Like as the arrows in the hand of a giant, even so are the young children,’ so says the excellent office in our Prayer Book appointed for the churching of women. ‘Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them, so say I; but don’t let him discharge his quiver upon us that are weaponless.

“ . . . Children have a real character and an essential being of themselves; they are amiable or unamiable, *per se*. I must love or hate them as I see cause for either in their qualities. . . . Oh! but you will say, sure it is an attractive age—there is something in the tender years of infancy that of itself charms us. That is the very reason why I am more nice about them. I know that a sweet child is the sweetest thing in nature, not even excepting the delicate creatures which bear them, but the prettier the kind of a thing is, the more desirable it is that it should be pretty of its kind. . . . *I was always rather squeamish in my women and children.*”

It was not, however, mere physical beauty or intellectual brightness, or moral attractiveness that evoked Lamb’s regard. The joys and the sorrows, the hopes and the fears, the temptations and the cares of childhood, all served to draw from him verbal and actual expressions of sympathy and charity. His own childhood experiences led him ever to identify himself with children, and to endeavor to secure for them that which his advancing years taught him would have been better could he have known it in his own early days.

Remark his concern for childhood. It was his conviction that at that sensitive and impressionable season of life, when the imagination is most alert, the senses most acutely susceptible to external influences, and the mind receiving its permanent bent, nothing should be done to beget fear, evoke superstition or awaken distrust. Recalling the time when, through the ignorant officiousness of his old nurse, whose disciplinary methods were worse than the faults she sought to correct, as well as through the terror-starting illustrations of his father’s Stackhouse Bible, “night-time, solitude, and the dark were his hell”—for, from his fourth to his eighth year, he never laid his head upon his pillow “without an assurance, which realized its own prophecy, of seeing some frightful spectre”—his sympathetic heart went out to other little ones who might be passing through a kindred experience. Wordsworth had suffered with him these inquisitorial tortures.

“Huge and mighty forms, that do not live
Like living men, moved slowly through the mind
By day, and were a trouble to my dreams.”

And Burns has told us of what the influence upon his whole life was of the tales poured into his infant ears by the old woman, residing in his family, who had such an easy acquaintance with “devils, ghosts, fairies, brownies, witches, warlocks, spunkies, kelpies, elf-

candles, dead-lights, wraiths, apparitions, cantraipts, giants, enchanted towers, dragons and other trumpery." "It had so strong an effect on my imagination, that to this hour, in my nocturnal rambles, I sometimes keep a sharp look out on suspicious places; and though nobody can be more sceptical than I am in such matters, yet it often takes an effort of philosophy to shake off these idle terrors."

In very similar language Lamb assures us that, while time had served to allay his fears in a large measure, yet it was only in measure. He was able to say that "though he had an occasional nightmare, yet he did not, as in early youth, keep a whole stud of them;" but the diminution in the number of his ghostly and unwelcome guests did not leave him any the less pitiful toward those who must number their spectral visitants in the manifold plural. He would have children trained to associate the hours of darkness with visions of beauty, not with "gorgons and hydras and chimeras dire." His concern in this particular brings to mind that "pretty domestic trait" which Mrs. Austin records of Sydney Smith. "One of his little children, then in delicate health, had for some time been in the habit of waking suddenly every evening; sobbing, anticipating the death of parents and all the sorrows of life almost before life had begun. He could not bear this unnatural union of childhood and sorrow, and, for a long period, each evening found him at the waking of his child with a toy, a picture-book, a bunch of grapes, or a joyous tale, mixed with a little strengthening advice and the tenderest caresses, till the habit was broken and the child woke to joy and not to sorrow."

It was Lamb's belief that the fears of childhood are self-born; that even where children are reared without the knowledge of goblin or apparition, these will crowd themselves in without assistance, among their "thick-coming fancies." With Burke, he believed that darkness, in its very nature, is awe-inspiring. And for this reason he would have special care taken to prevent any increase of a perfectly natural fear among children. There is a world full of tender concern in that single sentence which he penned: "Parents do not know what they do when they leave their babes alone to go to sleep in the dark;" for "even the nurse-child of optimism will start at shapes, unborrowed of tradition, in sweats to which the reveries of the cell-damned murderer are tranquility."

Equally solicitous was Lamb for the proper intellectual training of children. It was this that led him, together with the sister to whom his life was so constant and devoted a sacrifice, to simplify the plays of Shakespeare into tales that should prove "easy reading" for the very young, and so prepare the way for an acquaintance with the plays themselves in aftertime. Not often has true genius been willing thus to humble itself for the proffering of such "cups of cold water" to "the little ones," and, even where the willingness has been present,

not often has there been a corresponding ability. The success of this attempt to meet an intellectual want of childhood, confirmed to Lamb the truth of the promise that the reward should not be lost. Though, as Lloyd wrote, the

“desolation of the very childless
Had been his lot,”

yet a great host of children might bear testimony that he was to them what Hood called him in relation to himself—their “intellectual father.”

No less anxious was he as to the right disposition of the moral forces of childhood. How he inveighs against the introduction of skeptical thoughts into youthful minds, thoughts that tend to subvert the credulity that is “the child’s strength.” “Next to making a child an infidel,” he wrote, “is the letting him know that there are infidels at all.” This offending of a little one, which, the divine Truth-teller declared, entitled the offender to a millstone about the neck and a hopeless burial in the depths of the sea, and concerning which Sydney Smith asserted that “he would a thousand times prefer that his child should die in the bloom of youth rather than that it should live ‘to learn to disbelieve,’” was to him the head and front of all offences. True, he delighted to tell them “strange, wild stories,” and loved to see the “trusting wonder” of their little faces as they listened, but never once did he give expression to thought or sentiment whose tendency was to undermine their reverence for the true, the beautiful or the good. He knew how quickly the seed of distrust grows up in the heart, into a great upas tree, the poisoner of every high thought and noble purpose and innocent joy; and his hand was stayed from the planting of it.

His nature was such that he entered into the joys of childhood with the eagerness of perfect sympathy. He loved to listen to “the voices of children at play.” The noises of children, playing their own fancies as I now hearken to them by fits, sporting on the green before my window, while I am engaged in these grave speculations at my neat, suburban retreat at Shacklewell—by distance made more sweet—inexpressibly takes from the labor of my task. It is like writing to music. They seem to modulate my periods. They ought at least to do so, for in the voice of that tender age there is a kind of poetry far unlike the harsh prose accents of man’s conversation. I should but spoil their sport and diminish my own sympathy for them by mingling in their pastime.” How delicate that touch! And yet he was not always content to be a passive observer of their pleasure. The daughter of the well-known dramatist, Sheridan Knowles, was not infrequently led by him through the crowded streets of London to see the sights. Percy Fitzgerald says that she told him how, in these junketing expeditions, they never passed a Punch and Judy show, but

always stopped and saw the play to the finish, she taking pleasure in it, and he delighted in her pleasure.

It was this love of childish joy that led him to plead for the retention of those landmarks which were a source of so much gratification to children. How much more is suggested than is written in that passage of his essay on "*The Old Benchers of the Inner Temple*":

"The artificial fountains of the metropolis are fast vanishing. Most of them are dried up or bricked over. Yet, where one is left, as in that little green nook behind the South Sea House, what a freshness it gives to the dreary pile! Four little winged marble boys used to play their virgin fancies, spouting out ever fresh streams from their innocent-wanton lips in the square of Lincoln's-inn, when I was no bigger than they were figured. They are gone, and the spring choked up. The fashion, they tell me, is gone by, and these things are esteemed childish. Why not, then, gratify children by letting them stand? Lawyers, I suppose, were children once. They are awkening images to them, at least. Why must everything smack of man and mannish? Is the world all grown up? Is childhood dead? Or is there not in the bosoms of the wisest and the best some of the child's heart left to respond to its earliest enchantments?"

He who could write thus, we may well believe, would not, like Thomas Coventry, make "a solitude of children wherever he came."

For needy childhood his sympathies were broad and deep. The picture has been drawn, by one who was a witness of the scene, of Lamb catching a glimpse of some ragged urchins peering wistfully through the windows of a pastry shop, feasting their eyes upon what they never expected would reach their mouths. For a moment he stopped to enjoy the pleasure of an anticipated benefaction, then plunged in impetuously, and soon emerged with his hands full of cakes, which he distributed among the overjoyed gamins.

And who can forget his description of those famous annual feasts which Jem White gave the chimney sweeps, "those solemn suppers," invitation to which was limited to the "younger fry," "infantry," as he facetiously called them? How he revelled in watching "the nostrils of the young rogues dilate at the savor" of the "hissing sausages" that were to form their principal viand! How he exulted when "the universal host would set up a shout that tore the concave, while hundreds of grinning teeth startled the night with their brightness," as Jem gallantly imprinted a salute on "the chaste lips" of "old Dame Ursula," the cook! And with what delight he saw "the sable youngers" lick in "the unctuous meat" and find "prodigious comfort" in the fanciful toasts of their generous patron! It is a merry picture, but beneath all the merriment we may readily distinguish that generous sympathy with childhood in its privations which formed so marked a characteristic of the "gentle Elia."

There is another picture which his hand drew in his essay on that "popular fallacy" that "Home is Home though it is never so Homely." It is a picture in marked contrast with that which we

have just seen, though inspired by the same loving sympathy. It is a picture of childhood in the hovel of the poor. One can hardly read it with clear eyes. It is true to life. Its duplicate can be found in many a street of many a city. We have seen it again and again. Memory has it in fast colors. It will never out. It is the picture of aged childhood; childhood out of which poverty has drained the last drop of cheer and left a shrivelled, premature, old age instead.

"The innocent prattle of his children takes out the sting of a man's poverty. But the children of the very poor do not prattle. It is none of the least frightful features in that condition that there is no childishness in its dwellings. Poor people, said a sensible old nurse to us once, do not bring up their children; they drag them up. The little careless darling of the wealthier nursery, in their hovel is transformed into a premature reflecting person. No one has time to dandle it; no one thinks it worth while to coax it, to soothe it, to toss it up and down, to humor it. There is none to kiss away its tears. If it cries, it can only be beaten. It has been prettily said that "a babe is fed with milk and praise." But the aliment of this poor babe was thin, un nourishing; the return to its little baby-tricks and efforts to engage attention, bitter, ceaseless objurgation. It never had a toy or knew what a coral meant. It grew up without the lullaby of nurses; it was a stranger to the patient fondle, the hushing caress, the attracting novelty, the costlier plaything, or the cheaper off-hand contrivance to divert the child; the prattled nonsense (best sense to it), the wise impertinences, the wholesome lies, the apt story interposed, that puts a stop to present sufferings and awakens the passions of young wonder. It was never sung to; no one ever told it a tale of the nursery. It was dragged up, to live or to die, as it happened. . . . The children of the very poor have no young times. It makes the very heart to bleed to overhear the casual street-talk between a poor woman and her little girl. . . . The questions of the child, that should be the very outpourings of curiosity in idleness, are marked with forecast and melancholy providence. It has come to be a woman—before it was a child. It has learned to go to market; it chaffers, it haggles, it envies, it murmurs; it is knowing, acute, sharpened; it never prattles."

It is now many years since we learned to think upon Charles Lamb with sentiments in which affection clasped hands with admiration. And as time passes on and we come into an ever-increasing familiarity with his character, as it finds an unconscious portrayal in his writings, we discover no occasion for any change in our sentiments. No man can purely love children and be, in turn, beloved by children, and be himself impure. To come through a life as long as that of Lamb, a life characterized by such strange vicissitudes, a life whose experiences might well have served to uproot all tenderness and destroy every bond of sympathy with child-life—to come through such a life without losing any of its best sentiments, without forfeiting any of its most prized confidences, without breaking any of its noblest attachments—this is enough to warrant love as well as admiration. In the presence of that characteristic which this paper has sought to emphasize, we take a new delight in repeating the words that were written by the

then Laureate, Wordsworth, as his highest tribute to the worth of Charles Lamb :

“Oh ! he was good, if e'er a good man lived.”

VI.—THE NEW GENESIS : A SCIENTIFIC MEMO.

BY JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., LONDON.

THE sun had risen high into the heavens, transfiguring a thousand cloudlets into islands of the blessed, and making old earth ashamed of herself for looking so young and gay in spite of an age which even the family Bible had marginally noted as not less than 4004 before the Christian era. All this pomp of light, and all this miracle of time-killing, came and went, yet the whole thing ended in nothing, so far as this important memo is concerned. There need not have been any sun at all, and if there had been one, he need not have kicked such capers in the open theatre of the sky. It was with the coming of the stars that history began to be made that day, for it was on the starry evening of that very day, when the sun-mocked earth sobered down from his unbecoming frivolity, that we assembled as a mixed but united party. We were not infidels, though we were of different ages ; nor were we loose characters, though one of us, hereafter called by the name of his favorite, but, as he contended, unintoxicating wine, was fond of Madeira, bottled in 1840. We were, I say, variously assorted. Two of us were Fellows of the Royal Fraternity, three of us picked up a genteel but not luxurious living by writing science for transmarine magazines, two were men of property, and two were genuine men of the world who openly admitted that in what they flatulently called “ the rugged programme of life ” there ought to be a place somewhere, if not too near, for unaffected and undemonstrative piety ; in plainer words, for a piety that knew its own quiet corner and kept to it.

We met for a purpose. We met to displace Moses, or whoever he was, and to write a new account of creation. We met as men of progress. If we could get the account of creation right, we could either ease off the heavy end of the Commandments or leave Gentile morality to fashion and to fire (I hope I do not alliterate too strongly) its own ethical canons. I know there should be another *n* in canon in order to justify the use of the term fire, but men who are interested in cosmogony will never stoop to the details of orthography. We wanted to put Moses right. We wanted to come out in a row of figures that creation could take some pride in. Not for the world would we part with the Bible, like infidels ; we simply wanted to open it with a statement worthy of modern research and calculation. We went round to each other's houses in order that we might revise the Bible under various social conditions, knowing, as the magazine members of our company put it, that a good deal depends upon environment and atmosphere.

We fearlessly began with the very first verse of the Bible. We were gallantly led by the junior scientist, who said in a high tone: "Gentlemen, we must rise to the greatness, I will add, to the sublimity of the occasion."

We all cried, "hear, hear"—Madeira said it twice.

The junior was encouraged. He said that though he had reckoned upon practical unanimity, he must admit that he "had not counted, upon such ebullience of reconstructive feeling." Some of us did not quite follow his meaning, so we loudly repeated, "hear, hear."

"What I propose," said the junior, "is that we advance not only with boldness but with precision. Science," he continued, "is not content to replace one generality with another. We must come to figures."

"Certainly," said the men of property.

"Have you any figures to suggest?" I inquired.

"I hope not," said the junior; "I have no figures to suggest. I have figures to announce and insert."

"Just what we want," said Madeira. "The very ticket in fact."

The junior continued: "Gen. i: 1. Fourteen hundred and eighty-two billions of ages ago there was a stir—"

"Where?" Madeira suddenly exclaimed.

"A puzzler," said I.

The junior was fretted. "Sir," said he, fixing his excited eyes on Madeira, "in great speculations we must assume something—"

"I think not," was my interruptive reply; "we want to account for things, not to assume them. Remember," I continued, being encouraged by the kindly smile of the senior scientist, "the people expect us to give them clear and credible statements."

Madeira supported me. I wish he had used a more suitable expression, but as I am bound to report him *verbatim*, I must do him justice. "If," said he, "we assume anything, why not assume the whole hog?"

One of the magazine writers echoed "hog?"

The junior then said, "If you prefer it we can dismiss the term stir and substitute the word motion—there was a motion."

"What was there to move?" the senior scientist benignly inquired.

"Another puzzler," said I, and, corrupted by the manners of Madeira, added, "and a choker, too."

"Gentlemen," the junior impatiently exclaimed, "a truce to this folly. I must at least assume what I may call a spectral tuft of mist—"

"Where did it come from?" we all exclaimed.

"How could there be mist without air?" the men of property inquired.

We all rose and turned to the window to see such an array of stars

as can be but rarely seen in our climate. They seemed to focalize themselves upon our chamber. A million thick they stood on that unmeasured field; yet there was no noise of movement, no ruse as of a crowded host. Even Madeira was quieted by that solemn tranquillity. No man spake a word, for the vision awed us into silence and made us feel that speech would trespass upon a diviner eloquence.

In a few moments we settled down, and in a few moments more I said, "Let us come to the origin of man."

The junior was ready. "On that point," said he, "I thought of simply stating that fifteen hundred billions of ages ago man appeared—"

"Stop," said I; "you are making man older than the earth!"

"How's that?" the junior inquired.

"Why," said I, "you said the earth was only fourteen hundred billions of ages—"

"Very good, then," the junior replied, as if the slip were a mere trifle, "reduce accordingly, say thirteen hundred billions of ages—"

"You cannot be particular to half an hour," said Madeira, "or even to a fortnight, for that matter; besides, I think you have given man time enough for reflection."

"Then," said the junior, "let us say in the simplest possible terms, terms which even the ordinary mind can at once appreciate, thirteen hundred billions of ages ago the noble outline of Humanity was seen emerging from the outworn skin of an ourang-outang—"

"O, hang it," said Madeira, allowing feeling to prevail over science. The men of property agreed. The men of social habit gave the junior to understand, as if resenting some implied personality, that the less said about ourang-outangs the better, and a good deal better, too. The magazine writers thought, with all due respect, that the animal had been needlessly introduced.

"Come," said I, "at this rate we shall make no progress. I propose that the senior scientist be requested to write out a Genesis that will express his maturest thoughts, and that he can recommend as a scientific substitute for the Mosaic Cosmogony. His researches will be invaluable to us."

The junior interrupted me. Said he, "if not taking too great a liberty I may own that I have such a Genesis in my pocket at this very moment, and if agreeable I can read it. I did not like to tell you at first, I only tell you now that we may save some time."

The senior scientist (quiet and modest) urged the immediate reading of the paper, and we all joined him in the request. The junior scientist was overjoyed. Here are two or three extracts from the new Genesis:

"Fourteen hundred and eighty-two billions of ages ago there was an infinitesimal and sub-microscopical deposit of carbon—"

(Madeira groaned.)

which simple substance commenced a series of eccentric and immeasurable gyrations, revolving at a pace—technically called a velocity—which no mathematical formulæ can even rudely express—

(Our social friends groaned.)

when suddenly there struck out a primary compound, ages afterward known as quartz—

(“Eh?” said Madeira with interest.)

and in course of millenniums primary compounds fell into secondary compounds yielding carbonate of lime, gypsum and silicates—

(The magazine writers groaned.)

and then began the mysterious process of crystallization. After countless æons we come upon the formation of chemical rocks, igneous and aqueous as the case may be, both kinds having concretionary, nodular, or sparry textures—

(I groaned—groaned deeply.)

ages after ages came Feldspathic lavas, Augitic lavas—

(Madeira stood bolt upright. The magazine writers yawned. The men of property turned pale.)

The junior scientist added: “Gentlemen, in this way you strike a deadly blow at superstition, and without using scientific technicalities in undue measure you at once awaken the clergy and place yourselves in the very van of progress.”

After a momentary pause I said, “Now let us look at the Genesis of Moses. Let us have a taste of the old Bible. This is how it reads: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

“Never until this moment,” exclaimed the senior scientist, “did I truly feel the grandeur of Moses. It covers everything as to time. Compared with that duration all your billions are but a drop in the bucket.”

“My old mother's Bible for me,” said Madeira.

“We have not mended it yet,” said I.

Said one of the magazine writers, “I see by contrast what I had not seen before. If we want to know what the Bible is we have only to try and replace it. It is like trying to get enough candles together to make up for the loss of the sun.”

Almost involuntarily we all went to the window again, and looked on the planetary glory of the night. Certainly the revelation was grand. Purity, peace, order, immensity—the words were all but legible on the unfolded scroll. To my surprise it was the senior scientist who said as he reverently gazed on the scene:

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

“I can almost hear the song,” said one of our number.

“What song?” said the junior scientist.

Then I was moved to speak, for my spirit was hot within me. Said I: “You, junior, were right when you said you must assume something. The power which the Bible assumes is God. That personal-

ity comes into the record as if by right eternal. Without explanation or apology it stands at the forefront. But this is not all. If this were all it would amount to nothing. The assumption is made possible by the moral character of the Being whose existence is assumed. From beginning to end the character is righteous, merciful, holy. The character of God is the defence of God. It is not mere power, or mere majesty, by which God is typified; it is holiness, love, justice. Human infirmity never dreamed ineffable holiness. If the holiness had been measurable, it might have been one of the poor miracles of human imagination; but it is ineffable, unspeakable, infinite, and therefore beyond the reach of limited faculties. On that character we have a right to found an argument. Such a character cannot be associated with an act of wild and misleading misrepresentation. God is in the Bible but the personality of Truth, Justice, Honor, Love, Righteousness; for the Bible, therefore, to open its record with a lie is a moral impossibility. Hence we go on saying with tender reverence and thankfulness, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

"*And the earth,*" said the senior scientist, laying significant emphasis on the first word. After a pause he added, "A wonderful combination: there seems to be a great loss of dignity to 'the heavens' by associating them with so small a speck of matter as 'the earth,' but in reality there is no such loss. We might read the verse thus: 'In the beginning God created the great and the small, the majestic and the insignificant, the grandeur of immensity and the simpler pomp of earth'—all atoms in the sight of Him whose universe is but a diamond on the Hand that made it."

Such a testimony, coming from such a man, made it easy for me to say, Let us pray, and easy for the others reverently to comply.

SERMONIC SECTION.

JESUS THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD.*

BY CARL GEROK, D.D., COURT-
PREACHER IN STUTTGAART.

Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on Him that sent me. And He that seeth me seeth Him that sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness. And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to

*Preached on Jan. 5, 1890. Nine days later he peacefully breathed his last. Translated from the German for the HOMILETIC REVIEW by Mrs. J. H. W. Stuckenbergh, Berlin, Germany.

judge the world, but to save the world, etc.—John xii : 44 : 50.

How glad we are at a friendly glance from the sun in this dreary winter season! The days are so short and the nights so long! The sky is so gray and the earth so desolate! For weeks at a time the mists hardly disappear and the dismal pall of clouds oppresses both body and soul. How good it seems when the sky clears up for an hour and a golden sunbeam flashes down here into the house of God, or tomorrow into our own dwellings, an-

nouncing to the workman and his shop, to the official at his desk, to the invalid through the parted curtains, "The sun still hangs in the sky, the days are growing longer gradually, and far off in the distance spring is coming."

Now, my beloved, what the sun is to the earth-world in nature's kingdom, Christ is for humanity in God's kingdom. "I am come a light into the world," we hear Him say in the gospel for to-day, "that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness."

From Christmas-time onwards the days slowly grow longer and light gradually gains the upper hand over darkness. Just so in spiritual life, whether among humanity as a whole or in the individual. Since Christ's appearance it has gradually been growing lighter among men. And wherever Jesus arises within a human heart it grows light within, around and above that one, as we read in an old Latin hymn :

"If thou set foot within my heart,
My inner being fills with light,
The evil one departs for hell,
Love's fire then grows bright."

Behold, then, *Jesus the Light of the world.*

1. *He illumines the darkness* in the world.

2. *He condemns it.*

Let that be the motto of our meditation to-day.

O Jesus, beautiful Christmas sun, irradiate me with thy best gift: give me thy light for Christmas cheer. Impart to me the blessed art how I may always live in light, and always glow with Christmas fire.

1. *Jesus the light of the world* brightly illumines the darkness of the world. He says that himself in those imposing words: "I am come a light into the world that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." He is light, therefore, wherever he moves, or abides, He produces light. There

are grand natures which are like a brilliant meteor that flashes its path across the sky only to burst and be extinguished. There are enlightened spirits that shine like lovely stars in their own age, but their age wanes, day dawns, and in the light of day their brightness fades.

Jesus is not a vanishing meteor, not a fading star, in the human firmament; no, He is the perpetual light of the world, the all surpassing sun of spirits.

He is light from God's light. "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me." What man, even the wisest and best, could repeat these words in Christ's sense without an assumption that would indicate madness and border on blasphemy! But He knew, "I and my Father are one." His word is truth without mediation of a human teacher, it is derived immediately from the blazing fountain of Divine truth, therefore as we listen to Him we hear the Father. His life is a life in light leaving no clouding of sin, penetrated throughout by the light of Divine holiness, righteousness, goodness and mercy; therefore beholding him we behold the Father.

So spotless, bright, a figure of heavenly beauty, He appeared among men in the garb of a servant and in a dreary, degenerate age, took up His abode in the midst of His nation. Unchanged, we still find Him in the midst of sinful humanity; and because He is light Himself, He produces light in the world so that the darkness is illumined within and around us.

Take the natural man; what darkness within his head and his heart! What darkness in his head! Think of the stupid, bestial ignorance in which many heathen nations live and die! With what monstrosities of the imagination they people heaven and the earth! What cari-

captures of divinity they enthrone in their temples, perhaps a rude imitation of some animal, or some other horrible or ludicrous image! What ignorance of divine things; what gloomy labyrinths of superstition, even in the midst of Christianity, among people who reject Christ and know nothing concerning Him!

But, "I am come a light in the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness!" O gracious mouth to utter such comforting words! O friendly light of truth, shining upon us out of the word of God!

God is a spirit, God is light, God is love. Our Father who art in Heaven! What life words, what luminous thoughts opening up a whole heaven of comforting truth, so that the phantoms and the hideous creations of superstition vanish from sight as the tatters of mist melt in the sun!

Left to themselves, what darkness also within the hearts and consciences of men! Think of the sinful abominations among the heathen—ferocious, bloody, filthy abominations, not only in their relations to one another, but even penetrating to their very temples, to the steps of their altars and beneath the very eyes of their gods! But also look down into the dark depths of your own soul, into the gloomy corners of your own heart, at the calculating selfishness abiding there, at the base passions raging there and giving rise to wicked thoughts and sinful lusts. Reflect on the dark sin-spots of uncleanness and unrighteousness in our hearts and lives, which we would like to hide from God, from the world, from our own better selves; on those gloomy hours of self-condemnation, of self-contempt and of despair with oneself to which even the truest life is subject, and from which even the most frivolous cannot escape!

Who brings light into this dark-

ness? The world finds the whole subject beneath its notice, but there is no escaping it. It makes light of sin, but cannot get rid of sin. It covers the abyss; that does not fill it up.

But there is One who brings light even into such a night. "I am come," He says, "a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in darkness." Not even in the darkness of the service of sin. Wherever the light of Christ penetrates into a human heart it produces light; it enables a man to recognize what he is and what he ought to become; he begins to be ashamed of sin, and to hunger and thirst after righteousness. Wherever the announcement of the forgiveness of sin is accepted in faith, the heart becomes light and free with the assurance, "Mercy has been granted me, mercy, when I did not deserve pardon." Wherever Jesus has control of our hearts and His word illuminates our life, there wicked thoughts and evil passions slunk away, just as those products of the night which shun the light vanish with the rising of the sun; then, there is no longer need of concealing one's life from God and man; we no longer wander in darkness, but in light.

Only try it, dear Christian! Permit Him who is the light of the world also to be the light in your own heart, in your own house, in your own life. You will not repent of it; it will become brighter around and within you. How much darkness, my beloved, we see not only within ourselves, in our inmost natures, but also round about us in our external life! Just now, how much gloom there is in many a house in our city! No doubt many present here to-day brought a heavy heart into this house of God because they left at home a domestic cross, and when they go home from church that family cross will have to be

taken up again. How many mysteries in the world which we cannot comprehend; how many bitter experiences in our own lives which we do not cease to feel pain at; how many anxieties for our own future or that of our beloved ones, concerning which we cannot feel at rest!

Who brings light into this darkness? Not the world, far as I know! That is the universal lot; don't take it too much to heart. Or, that is the inevitable process of nature; submit to her eternal laws! Or, that is the struggle for existence; fight your way through well as you can! Or, that is the curse of existence; bear its burden until you return to the nothingness from which you emerged. That is about all the comfort that modern thought, in prose and poetry, can give you for the misery of this world; it leaves us in the dark groping our way.

"But I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in darkness!" That is what He says, He, the light, the comfort, and the salvation of the world. The belief in the eternal wisdom and love of a Father in Heaven which control the course of the world, which also guide my career, which, even in mysterious leadings know perfectly well to what end they are sent; that they are thoughts of peace and not of punishment, which even through the afflictions of these times are to train us for a better world, to lead us through the night of death and the grave to light, to the light of eternal life, where at last all the shadows of this earthworld are illumined, all the mysteries of this life will finally be solved for the liberated spirit. This faith which Christ brought into the world, O what a friendly light it diffuses over the entire course of the world and also over our insignificant career, over our own life and death and the destiny of our beloved ones! And

in the light of this faith with how much more confidence we can take our first steps in the year just begun—whose ways for us are still veiled in mist.

That, my beloved, is the light which Jesus brought into the world for all who believe on Him. We cannot force this light upon any one, cannot compel any one to accept this faith. We cannot prevent any one from calling this light darkness, or from ridiculing what is to us blessed truth, calling it mockery and delusion. "Paul, thou art mad"; already 1800 years ago an apostle of the faith was obliged to hear that from a fashionable worldling. But of this we are assured, and believers of all ages will bear the same testimony: It is a blessed thing to live by the light of this faith, a blessed thing to die by; and as long as the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in the world we may cry out into the darkness of this world what the Christmas angel sang to the shepherds, what the advent star proclaimed to the wise men: Seek Jesus and His light, there is no other help!

2. Jesus is the light of the world, illumining the world's darkness wherever He is accepted, but whoever rejects Him is by that act condemned. "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." With these words He parries the responsibility of the judgment, at the same time announcing a heavy penalty for those who refuse to hear His words, or to see His light.

Very true that the world's Saviour did not come to judge the world but to bless and to save it from the impending judgment. He did not con-

demn sinful humanity but showed it the way of salvation. He has not condemned a single soul, but called sinners to repentance. He did not chide when He was insulted, He loved those by whom He was hated, and blessed those who cursed Him. And although He pronounced a "Woe" upon hypocrites, it was for the sake of arousing their conscience; and if He spoke of a fire He had come to kindle upon earth, He did not intend the devastating torch of war, or the persecuting mania of religious hatred, but the pure fire of the Holy Ghost, the noble flame of zeal for His kingdom, the light of truth, and the fire of love which are to set the hearts of His followers all aglow and to illumine and warm, to purify and renew the world.

Wherever a different idea has prevailed, whenever and wherever the gospel of love has been promulgated with fire and sword, where funeral pyres have been kindled and anathemas pronounced in the name of Jesus Christ, there he has been wretchedly understood and wretchedly served, more miserably than by those sons of Zebedee who wanted to call fire down from heaven upon His opponents, and did not know what manner of spirit they were of.

And yet, my friends, even without fire and sword, the light which Christ brought into the world brings condemnation upon the world. "He that receiveth not My words," says the Lord, "hath One that judgeth him." We might say he condemns himself. It is already a penalty, already condemnation, that he shuts himself out from the blessings and the consolations of the divine Word, that he abides in the darkness when he might spend his life in light.

But not only that. "My word," says the Lord, "shall judge him." His word is light, which also diffuses its clear shining into the dark-

ness of those who reject Him, whether they like it or not; and they find it disagreeable, uncomfortable; it strikes them with fear and terror. Light is in itself a judgment upon darkness, for it reveals the secrets and brings into prominence all the unsightly things hidden by that mantle. Thus God's word perpetually judges the children of light. It throws their foolishness into prominence through the convincing power of its truth, from which they cannot wholly withdraw. It brands their sins, for the holy earnestness of its commandments finds some echo in their own inmost conscience. It compels them to recognize their wretchedness by contrast with the heavenly peace of those who believe,—an experience for which the children of darkness secretly envy the children of light, although openly they may subject them to ridicule.

Thus, my beloved, the Word of God judges those who despise it already in this world. As light it shines in the world beside them, and they cannot extinguish it. As light it throws its condemning beam into their very hearts, and they cannot escape it. And then, when inner restlessness compels one who rejects divine grace to feel the truth, "You are pursuing a wrong course, your happiness has a shaky foundation;" when a voice in his inmost heart pleads for the Word of God with its touching admonitions and earnest warnings that had been heard in childhood, afterwards forgotten, and finally rejected, and the thought comes, "After all, what if it were true? Is not that the fulfilment, 'He that rejects me hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him'?"

"It shall judge him," the Lord continues to say, "at the last day." On that great day of eternity which shall bring all things to light, the Word of God will manifest its power

of judgment; the light of Jesus Christ its power to condemn those who have it by their side and yet despise it, who feel it within them and reject it, nevertheless. Beloved soul, are you willing to run the risk of its penetrating your being too late, of being startled when the Lord says: "I am the light of the world"?

All life is found in Thee,
And all the light of life;
My Lord, let not for me
Thy radiance prove in vain!
Since Thou art light for all the world
My life illumine, too.
O Jesus, till in realms above
Thy glory there I view! Amen.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

"Falsely so Called."

BY REV. D. P. PUTNAM, D.D. [PRESBYTERIAN], LOGANSPORT, IND.

Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of Science, falsely so called.—1 Tim. vi : 20.

I HAVE been requested by a number of friends to present from the pulpit a careful review of the claims and teachings of the so-called Christian Science. It has seemed good to me to do this, not by way of entertainment at all, nor yet for the purpose of antagonizing any one in the community, but simply for the purpose of helping devout serious-minded people to know from Scripture the position which we should take in reference to this subject. In presenting the subject I shall be guided by two inquiries. First, what are the teachings of Christian Science? Second, how do these teachings compare with God's word and the testimony of our senses? My method in brief will be simply to hold up these teachings before God's word as before a mirror that you may see how they look.

To begin with I may say that this is not the first time in my pastoral experience that I have met this form

of error or "Science, falsely so called." I have dealt with it before in other places, and when it comes into a community it always reminds me of one of those epidemic diseases which can be best met by careful nursing and good diet. There is some danger in such an epidemic of error, but Christian activity and a wholesome diet of Gospel truth is the best remedy. The very name of this error which, they have assumed, is precisely the same (except one is the Latin and the other is the Greek word) with that of the Gnostic heresy which appeared in the first Christian century, and is referred to in the text, "Science, falsely so called." In many respects the two errors are the same. "God is to be understood and demonstrated instead of believed and feared" (or loved?) is one of their cardinal principles. See "Science and Health," page 407.

In seeking to know just what are the teachings of Christian Science I have not gone to any of the so-called healers or teachers in the community, but I have taken the one book, "Science and Health" which they circulate and furnish to their patients, and which itself claims to be, and is acknowledged to be, the highest and supreme authority on the subject (pages 375 and 11), and from this book, by Mrs. Dr. Eddy, of Boston, I shall largely quote to show the real teachings of the leaders and promoters of this error and delusion.

Another thing I wish to note in the beginning, namely: I do not propose to take up in detail all the teachings or positions of Christian Science. It does not seem needful to do so. It would take too long and be too tedious. A better way is to examine as to a few underlying principles or claims, and if these can be shown to be errors, really contrary to the word of God it becomes us to throw aside the whole

subject and all its advocates, and have nothing more to do with them as being unworthy of our confidence. This is the way we do in the ordinary affairs of life. If you find a teacher or an advocate presenting principles which subvert the very foundations of sound morals and good government, you do not stop to argue all the details of his doings and teachings. You dismiss him on the spot.

Coming now to the teachings of the so-called Christian Science, let us note—

I. THE FIRST ERROR. Its view of the Divine Being is identical with *Pantheism*, though this might not be admitted. This is an error with which Christian scholars have been familiar for centuries. And it is a fundamental error. The word *Pantheism* means literally All-God, and the teaching of it is that *all is God and God is all*, and there is *no real existence, no substance but God*. You and I are but parts or emanations or manifestations of God, just as the wavelet or spray that is dashed up from the sea is for the moment separate from the sea, yet is a part of the sea, and returns to it to be lost again therein, so you and I and every human being are simply a manifestation, a movement of the Divine Being. There was Divinity in Christ, but so is there Divinity in you and me and in every other human being, and there was no Divinity in Christ which is not in you and in me. Man was and is the idea of God, the conception of eternal mind, co-existent and co-eternal with it. Man was forever in God, or mind" (p. 378).

Mrs. Eddy in her book claimed that she "discovered metaphysical healing and named it Christian Science" (page 11) in 1866, but if she is familiar with history she must have known that this error of Pantheism, which runs all through her book and underlies the whole system, is centuries old, and was common in

Egypt and India hundreds of years ago, and is the underlying principle of most of the old heathen religions of the East, and has made its appearance again and again in the history of the Christian Church. It is no new discovery to say that God is all and all is God. But in order that you may see that I do not misrepresent, let me quote from this book, "Science and Health." "All is mind and there is no matter" (p. 360). "There is but one I, one mind, one spirit, because there is but one God" (p. 159). Isn't this Pantheism? I quote exactly. "God never created matter, for there is nothing in spirit out of which matter could be created" (p. 380). "*Matter is finite illusion.*" Notice that last statement, found on page 406, and which will be referred to again further on. Here I must stop just long enough to notice it. "There is no matter." "*Matter is a finite illusion.*" That stone out there which you stubbed your toe against, has no real existence. It is an illusion, a "finite illusion." And your toe itself has no real existence. It, too, is an illusion, "finite illusion," and the pain you felt, it is an illusion. You only thought it was a stone. You only thought you had a toe, and that you hurt it. Now, this is ridiculous, you say, but it becomes serious, and such ridiculous philosophy becomes a most dangerous error when this author, on page 317, calls "sin" itself an "illusion."

But let us return again to further statements concerning the Divine Being. In speaking of how to treat disease it says, (page 350:) "We can never treat *both* mind and matter, for there is but one existence, and that one is immortal mind." Again, "God includes all, and is reflected by all that is real and eternal" (p. 377). Again, on the same page: "God is mind. He is Divine Principle, not person." Here is the boldest kind of a denial of the very existence of

a personal God. God is not a person. He is a principle. You and I have no creator, no Heavenly Father. We are simply the "ideals," the manifestations of a principle. There is no finite soul or spirit" (p. 404). Is not this enough to turn every true lover of the Bible away from such a book as this, and away from any one who advocates its teachings? Thus this first error leads directly to

II. THE SECOND ERROR, namely, this: The teachings of Christian Science preclude all need and all possibility of prayer. If our God is only a "principle," and no "person," as this author declares, then we may as well pray to a stone as to God. Again, if God is all and all is God, then we ourselves are a part of God, and if we are to pray at all we may as well pray to ourselves, for if we are anything we are a part of God, and that is exactly the position to which this author practically comes in reference to the subject of prayer. Here it cannot be claimed that Christ was a part of God, and yet he prayed to God, and not to himself. It is never correct to say that Christ was a *part of God*. He was *one of the Persons in the Godhead*, and during his incarnation was subject to the Father, another Person in the Godhead, for our sake, and therefore he prayed. Our author talks indeed of prayer, but not as you and I would, who have so long found comfort in pouring out our complaints before God, and communing with him, just as our children find comfort in nestling in our arms and telling us all their joys and their sorrows and their wants. This author talks indeed of prayer, but not as Jesus Christ did who taught us to say, "Our Father, who art in Heaven." In substance, she teaches us that prayer is *simply a thinking to ourselves*, a conjuring up to ourselves and within ourselves of longings and desires and pur-

poses, and not seeking to fix them upon anybody outside of ourselves, but only thinking them over, and musing upon them, and then going out to accomplish our desires for ourselves. And this kind of prayer, she says, "will be answered, inasmuch as we shall put our desires into practice" (p. 484). Am I not right in saying that her teachings would lead us, if we pray at all, to pray to ourselves? Again, she says on this subject: "Prayer cannot change the science of being. A request that another do our work for us never does our work. The habit of pleading with the Divine mind, as one pleads with a human being, perpetuates the belief in God as humanly circumscribed" (p. 483).

Now, I cannot stop here to justify the Scriptural doctrine of prayer, but certainly all here present will admit that God has invited and commanded us to pray, and has promised to answer our prayers when presented upon the announced conditions, and it is enough for us to know and believe that we have a personal God—our Heavenly Father—who will hear our prayers and answer us in his own best way. It is not needful that we should understand how He does it. There is no room in Christian Science even for the prayer, "God, be merciful to me a sinner," for this author expressly says, after calling God a principle, "Person may pardon, but principle reforms the sinner" (p. 483). But certainly the sinner must be pardoned before there can be any reformation.

III. But now we come to the THIRD ERROR, namely, the doctrine of healing. And in this Christian Science contradicts the facts of consciousness, the testimony of our senses and the teachings of Scripture. And how any one in the normal exercise of his rational powers can be taken by these claims I cannot understand, except it be that he

is uninformed, or is a religious enthusiast temporarily carried away by the pious form of certain fair sounding platitudes. It takes an ignorant person, one not well informed in the history of religious truth and error, or else a morbidly religious person, to be led away by this error. I can give you a conception of these claims only by quoting statements from this book which run all through it, and are repeated again and again.

The underlying principle is thus stated: "Mind is God, and therefore cannot be sick," "What is termed matter cannot be sick" (p. 293). Therefore, "Man is never sick, for mind is not sick and matter cannot be" (p. 341). Therefore, again, "Sickness is a delusion" (p. 342). Here it is well to state that I propose to hold no argument with anyone who puts forth such statements as these, for they dispute the very testimony of our senses and deny certain fundamental facts of our being of which we are conscious. When a person assumes such a position as this it is impossible to hold an argument with him, for there is no common ground to stand upon, and the only way to deal with him is simply to hold up a mirror before him in order to let the rest of the world see how really irrational he is.

Of course it may be readily admitted that mind has great influence over the body, and that there are many imaginary ills which may be removed by the assertion of one mind against another, or by one's own mind over itself, and it may be admitted that mental trouble often aggravates all forms of sickness, but when this author teaches, as she does just in these words, "The utter control the mind holds over the body" (page 325), she is teaching an absurdity, and one which contradicts the testimony of our senses! For example, this author

says: "Tumors, ulcers, tubercles, inflammation, pain, deformed backs are all dream-shadows, dark images of mortal thought that will flee away before the light" (p. 301). The only difference between these diseases is the thought about them in the mind. Indeed, their only existence is in the mind. Well, just tell that to a man that has the lumbago, or the inflammatory rheumatism; tell him it's all a "dream-shadow," and see what he thinks of you!

Thus it appears that Christian Science cures people, not by the power of God, not by prayer, but by convincing them that they are not sick, and that there is no such thing as sickness. That is the whole of it. There is no sickness. It is all an illusion, and you are well, if you only think so. That you may see that I do these people no injustice, let me quote more fully and more definitely from this book.

In discussing what is the matter with a person who is said to be sick we have this statement: "Mind determines the nature of a case": that is, the mind determines whether it is a boil or the headache, the scarlet or the typhoid fever that you have. Again this book says: "Inflammation, tubercles, hemorrhage and decomposition are beliefs, images of mortal thoughts superimposed upon the body." Again: "You say a boil is painful, but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests your belief in pain, inflammation and swelling, and you call this belief a boil" (p. 339). Well, it is some time since I had a boil—or rather since I had the belief, the illusion which the doctors and all the rest of us called a boil—and it really does not seem to me as though a delusion, a mere belief, would have left the big scar which I carry here on my forearm! I am still old-fashioned enough, like the

most of the world, to continue to believe that it was a real boil I once had on my arm! Listen again: "To the Scientist *sickness is a dream*, from which the patient needs to be awakened" (p. 296). And again listen: "You say indigestion, fatigue, sleeplessness cause distressed stomachs and aching heads. Then you consult your brains in order to remember what has hurt you, when *your remedy lies in forgetting the whole thing*, for matter has no sensation, and the human mind is all that can produce pain" (p. 20). And yet once more: "You would never conclude that flannel is better than controlling mind in warding off pulmonary disease, if you understood the science of being" (p. 141). "You call it neuralgia; I call it illusion," says this author (p. 324). Those thrills of pain which you had in your face, which went shooting up over your head—you didn't really have any; you only thought so. It was an illusion. "To prevent or cure scrofula and other so-called hereditary diseases," the remedy is given thus, in so many words: "You must destroy the fear and belief in these ills, and in the possibility of their transmission" (p. 326).

One peculiarity of Christian Science is that it positively and absolutely forbids the use of any means. No medicine, no drugs, no outward applications to the body whatever are to be allowed. The mind cures all. This is a cardinal principle. The most virulent and contagious diseases are thus to be treated without any medicine whatever. "All disease is the result of hallucination." "Christian Science handles the most malignant contagion with perfect assurance" (p. 31). The only hint at any exceptions whatever is in the case of broken bones. The book says (p. 328): "Until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of mind, it is better to leave the adjustment of

broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon." The non-use of medicine is thus sought to be justified. This author says (p. 316): "I account it sinful and idolatrous to have more faith in drugs, diet, air, exercise, cleanliness, than in God, Truth and Love to keep the body harmonious and make man undying." It is certainly sufficient to put over against this absurd statement, another to this effect, that we ought to be devoutly thankful to God that in the world about us he has provided the means for making the soothing poultice, the warm flannel, the healing herb and the correcting drugs for the relief of the pains and sufferings which have somehow worked themselves into our lives, and we put honor upon Him and exalt His benevolence by the proper use of them, and we offend Him by their non-use; and when we make them in devout trust we ask Him to bless their use to the purpose to which He intended them.

If my purpose were simply to amuse you, I could go on quoting other statements of this character almost without number. With one more statement I will pass on to the next error. On page 338 of this book we learn that "a patient thoroughly booked in medical theories" (this would include the doctors, of course) "has less sense of divine power and is *more difficult to heal* through mind than an aboriginal Indian, who never bowed the knee to the Baal of civilization." This is exceedingly significant as showing that, small mental capacity, and ignorance, and lack of information, by their own showing, furnish the best patients for Christian Science. It is a premium on ignorance, and that the whole of Christianity is against.

IV. THE FOURTH ERROR of Christian Science which I will notice is in mistaking the purpose of Christ's coming into the world, and in its

confusing and contradictory statements about sin and sickness in connection therewith. The greatest trouble in this world is, and always has been, not sickness, but sin. We could get along very well with all the sickness there is in the world, if we could only get rid of the sinning. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." What was lost? A body lost in a sick bed? Nay, men's souls lost in sin. And again He says: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world" (gets a sound body and has health all his life) "and lose his soul." And again it was said of Jesus before His birth: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from"—what? From sickness, from pain, whether the pain be real or a "delusion," as this author calls it? Not at all. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people *from their sins*." And this is the one great purpose of his coming. And yet this book presents Christ as simply and only a healer of sickness! Indeed, it says in so many words that "healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing in Christian Science" (p. 330). And it calls both sickness and sin a delusion, or illusion, using both words. It heals the sick by convincing him that he never was sick, and it reforms the sinner "in one and the same" way by assuring him that he has never sinned. Sin is an illusion. But it may be asked, Did not Christ come healing the sick and restoring to health? And was it not told long before his birth that he would do this? Certainly this is true, and this he did. But if sin and sickness both be an "illusion," as this author repeatedly asserts that they are, we can be certain that the Son of God would never have left the glory he had with the Father to come down into this earth to bear our sins in his own body on the tree, and to suffer and

die as he did, the just for the unjust! "Sin and sickness an illusion!" Indeed! *Then God himself is an illusion, and we are illusions, and life itself is but the dream of a dream!*

From such absurd conclusions we are saved by the testimony of our senses, by the facts of our own consciousness, and by the testimony of Scripture. Here is where so many people make a mistake. It is not a question as to whether God is not just as able now to heal the sick as when Christ was upon the earth. Of course he is. But the question is to know from God's word what was the purpose of Christ's healings, and whether God's purpose is to do the same kind of works now? The purpose of miracles was to attest in an authoritative way the divine mission of Him who performed them. They were rarely used, and at distant intervals, even in Bible times. They did not always convince of truth even then, and if they were commonly and continuously used in the history of the Church they would lose their power to convince the world of God's truth, just as the wondrous facts of nature have done, because they are so common. Why, the blooming of a rose, the growth of an ear of corn, ought to speak to us of God's power just as loudly as would a miracle.

Just here it may be noted that the instances of healing which Christ performed and all his miracles, were entirely secondary purposes in his life. They were not the chief purpose of his coming. They were simply to "bear witness" of Him, as he himself said, solely to prove his divine mission.

You remember the case of the paralytic who was brought into the house and set down before Jesus in order that he might be healed. The first and only words that Jesus spoke to him were, "Man, thy sins be forgiven thee." Thereat certain of the Jews were greatly shocked,

saying, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" Jesus rebuked this, and then said, "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins"—(Christian Science says that "healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing" (p. 330)—Christ says "that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith unto the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee, Arise and walk." Of course the healing was an expression of Christ's benevolence, but the one great purpose of it, as he asserts, was to prove that Christ had "power on earth to forgive sins." And we ought ever to remember that the mission of the Christian in this world, like Christ's, is to stop the sinning of the world far more than to stop its sicknesses. Of course the Christian heart filled with love and compassion will do all it can in ministering to the suffering bodies of mankind, but the soul as being immortal claims the chiefest attention. Righteousness is more than health. Sin is a worse evil than sickness, and if I truly, wisely, want to stop the world's suffering I'll best do it by doing all I can to stop the world's sinning. God help us to save men from sinning. They need this far more than to be saved from sickness.

When Christ was about to leave the earth he said to his disciples, "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father." And these disciples did perform precisely the same kind of works which Christ had done until the Spirit was poured out upon them, and until the Christian Church was thoroughly established under the dispensation of the Spirit. Then these miracles which had been the props to support the Church till it was fairly established were removed. But, in addition to

this, here is a statement by Christ that "*greater works* than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father." And what were these "greater works"? Why, it was the conversion and sanctification of sinners. That was greater. It was the turning of men from guilt and sin to the love and service of God.

When in all of Christ's ministry was there such a scene as that on the day of Pentecost, when thousands, under the preaching of Peter and the influence of the Spirit, were "pricked in their hearts," and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered, "Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." What for? For the healing of the body, for the stopping of pain? Nay. "Repent and be baptised in the name of Christ for the remission of sin." Ah, that's it. Sin is the trouble. That's what Christ was after.

We imagine sometimes that we would like to have stood by and seen some of Christ's miracles, as, for example, we would like to have stood by the grave in Bethany with those sisters and seen Lazarus come forth in his grave clothes, come forth just simply because Christ called to him. But do you know it is a greater wonder to me when God's Spirit speaks to the dead consciences of men, and awakens their souls to righteousness, and leads them to forsake sin, and to love and serve God. It is a greater work, greater and more blessed in results, greater because it is a work that lasts eternally, greater because it manifests more clearly the marvellous compassion and love of God, greater than it would be to call back the dead to live in their bodies again for a few more years of suffering and of sorrow, and possibly of joy and of pleasure, in this world.

There are men in this audience who a year ago were leading lives of vice and sin and profanity, and who

to-day are praising God and leading pure lives, and begging their fellow men to stop their sinning and likewise lead lives of sobriety. This is the "greater work" that we ought to be giving ourselves to, and if these so-called healers would only seek out such cases, if they would seek out the sinning ones and lead them in prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, instead of seeking out confiding mothers and leading them to deny to their helpless babes the commonest ministrations of medical skill, and expose the whole community to contagion; if they would look up the sinning and erring of all kinds and lead them to God and an holy life, instead of seeking out helpless consumptives whose steps are just tottering on the verge of the grave, and who are ready to grasp at phantoms; if they would do this kind of work we could have some patience with them. As it is, patience has almost ceased to be a virtue!

Ah, my friends, there is another world than this! The highest and best good that God has to give us does not come to us in this world! The highest good is not health of body, but it is holiness of heart, purity of soul! And in order to this highest good, God sometimes, in love, whose wisdom we cannot understand, requires his own dearest children to suffer—suffer and endure, and like the Captain of our salvation, He makes them perfect through suffering!

How well do I recall the case of a lad of some fourteen or fifteen years of age, "the only son of his mother, and she was a widow," whom I knew in my former home, who has now for four years been helpless on his bed with hip disease. More than two years ago I found one of these healers devoutly posing by the side of his sick couch! And yet, through all these years, the gentle, Christian spirit of this lad has been suffering

through the pains of his body, and he has been chastened—chastened I know not why, but one day I expect to meet that boy, made perfect through suffering—meet him in the better land, and then I expect our Heavenly Father will give us reasons for the suffering.

In conclusion, we may be sure, my friends, that there are some things in regard to this mystery of sickness and in regard to this deeper mystery of sin, which in this world, at least, we can never understand. And there is no little mystery about ourselves, too, as to how we can be both soul and body—matter and spirit united—but there is enough that is plain and simple about this dear old Book, and about ourselves also, and about the Bible as suited to our wants—enough to keep us from going very far astray, if we are only willing and submissive.

Let us give ourselves to the work of stopping the sinning of the world just as much as we can! What a blessing it would be if we could only get men to dislike and dread sin as much as they dislike and dread sickness! How careful it would make them! May God help us all to offer that first of all prayers, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and then may God help us to lead a life of humble trust until we come to that better world "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

THE REASON OF HOPE.

BY LYMAN ABBOTT, D. D. [CONGREGATIONAL], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts; and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.—1 Peter iii: 15.

THERE is here a play upon the words in the original which we fail to see in our version. It seems in English as if there were a contrast

between the giving the answer and the reason, when, in fact, they are the same. We might read it: Be ye ready always to give a *justification* to anyone who would require you to *justify* the hope that is in you.

The Bible is a book of hope. The Christian religion is a religion of hopefulness. The religion of Confucius is one of memory and duty. It teaches to remember and worship ancestors, but gives little hope. The religion of Buddha is also one of duty. The message it gives to mankind is: There is no escape from the misery of life, except by escape from consciousness. The religion of the Stoic had no hope. It could only say to man, Endure. But the religion of Christ is bright with hope. It comes to man as succor comes to the shipwrecked mariner on a desert island, as the bugle notes of reinforcements come to the hard pressed soldier.

Let us look at some of these bugle notes of hope. "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? . . . Hope thou in God" (Ps. xlii: 5). "We are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope. . . . If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it" (Rom. viii: 24). "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xv: 13). "We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . for the hope which is laid up for you in heaven" (Col. i: 3). "The riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you the hope of glory" (Col. i: 27). "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil" (Heb. i: 19).

Now Peter, realizing that the Christian religion is a hopeful religion, says to the strangers scattered abroad, to whom he writes: You must have a *reason* for the hope that

is in you; you must not be content to look only on the bright side of things and shut out the dark side, to hear only peans of peace and not to notice the sounds of battle. You must have a reason for this hope in times of darkness and trial as well as in seasons of sunshine and joy.

Let us try and answer this question: What are the Christian's reasons for hope; hope for ourselves; for our families and for our nation?

First, we believe in a God of hope. We believe that God created the world, that He is a God of foresight and love, that He knew what He was about when He made life, and that He will bring out of our imperfect life here a nobler and a better one. We believe that, when He sowed the seed, He knew that there would not be a gathering in of tares, but that the wheat would overbalance the tares in the last great harvest. We believe He is a God of hope, and that He understands human nature better than we can. He saw the darkness, but yet He hopes; and so we can hope.

Again, he has given a definiteness to the hope. We look at the savage in his degradation; he is not the true man; he is only the beginning of man. We look at society and we say, This is not God's ideal of man. Finally we come to the New Testament, and we see the life of Christ, Jesus of Nazareth. He was the type of true manhood. In Him we see what God meant man to be. He represents what you and I are to be if we fulfil God's plan. As we look at this pattern, we hear the voice of God saying, You also are to be the sons of God. So we gather inspiration from the thought that this is what God intends man shall be.

How shall man become this? I look at an acorn. It says to me, By and by I shall be a great tree; by and by the birds will nest in my branches; by and by I shall be a shelter to those who dwell under my

roof; by and by I shall carry many over the great Atlantic. But, I say to the acorn, can you be all this? Yes, *God* and I! So man will be like the great Pattern; for it is God and man. We see by faith, more and more, that God is doing this. We see Him moving and shaping man more and more in accordance with His purpose. If we could have seen the world in its first stage of creation, in its chaotic condition—"without form and void"—and if, then, any one could have said to us that this was to become a place where man should dwell in happiness and glory, that from all that should come order and beauty, we should have scoffed at the idea, unless we could have seen that God was there, that His Spirit was brooding over the water and bringing out this great result. So we look on humanity, in its defects and imperfections, and we say: This is but the chaotic state; God is at work; He can change all to beauty. God is in human history and is bringing order out of chaos.

But there are limitations of our hope. We must be willing to look at the dark side sometimes. Some hopes may be disappointed. Our desires may not be realized. We have hope for America; but Egypt, Babylon, Greece, Rome and other great civilizations have perished. We are not sure what plan God is to work out in this our beloved nation. But whether the nation perishes or lives, we know that humanity will still move on. God's purposes are sure. We know that we love purity and truth all the more because there are some in our own dearland who are working against them. We are not sure of religious organizations. We are not sure that Congregationalism was the apostolic church. Congregationalism is not the great thing, but humanity. All things that mould human life may change, but man lives on. The tools are noth-

ing, but the building; and that which God is building is manhood. The battle of the Reformation has passed, but the conception of the Reformation—that God is mercy as well as justice—remains.

To-day we are debating on probation and a future life, as if we knew all about them, when how little we know! Churches, creeds, nations may disappear, but human character will grow and grow, because God is begetting man and working out His ideal manhood. These things are but His instruments. The seed enters the ground, and out of it comes the tulip, the lily, because God is working in it. Because we believe that God is working within man we have a sure hope of the future, for God knows what He is doing.

This, you say, is a large outlook, but how about myself? I don't care so much about the race as my own individual life. There are no large things with God and no little things with God. It is not a strange declaration of Christ's that the hairs of our heads are numbered, and that not a sparrow falls to the ground without his notice. The little things are the determining things. It is the small rudder that guides the great ship. We believe in a God who not merely deals with nations or with masses, but one who looks on every cradle, on every soul. We have a true hope that cheers our hearts and is with us in darkness as well as in light. We believe in one whose mercy is "from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him."

In closing I want to turn to a second text, "Without hope in the world." Atheism is hopeless. Can there be a nation without God? Do you write over that precept, "Put not your trust in princes," put your trust in politicians? Without God there is no hope for a nation. There is no hope for a church, if there be not an open door to

take in the love of God. What is your hope for your children? If there is no God to guide, you might as well attempt to lead them through the great wilderness of Sahara as to hope to guide them safely through this life, fraught with its many dangers. What is your hope for yourself? Do you carry God to your work, to the store, in society? Do you live with God? Will He be with you in the judgment day? When you stand before His bar, will it be before a familiar friend whom you can gladly meet face to face? Our hope rests in God. We believe that there is One working in humanity who is shaping all according to His wise purpose. This is the reason of our hope. God grant that each one of us, in all the varied experiences of life, may say,

"In God is my hope."

THE RECOMPENSE OF SACRIFICE.

BY CHRISTIAN VAN DER VEEN, D.D.
[REFORMED], OLIVET, MICH.

For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.
—Matt. xvi: 25.

No word occupies a larger place in our Lord's life. It is one of the few words recorded in all the gospels, and is recorded on four different occasions.

1. In the charge to the twelve: to reconcile them to the necessary self-denial in their task (Matt. x: 39).

2. At the first announcement of His sufferings: to vindicate them against Peter's remonstrance, and to indicate His own reconciliation to them under this law. Thus the text.

3. In connection with the full bringing in of the New Dispensation—the kingdom of God: as a warning against the dangers of that day, and as a reconciliation to its experiences (Luke xvii: 33).

4. At the visit of the Greeks: again as a vindication of His suffer-

ings and an indication of His reconciliation to them (John xii: 25).

The twofold sense of the words, life, lose, save, in the passage proves the existence of two opposite worlds. In the better of these is the revelation of eternal good as the gain of sacrifice.

The passage calls attention

I. To the law by which this is regulated.

II. To the condition upon which it is enjoyed.

I. The law.

1. It is an *original* law. Inwoven in the very time of creative life. This is not made for itself, but for others, and finally for God. The peculiar glory of the creative is its capacity of being used. The glory of God is His ability to use. Upon this relation is based, and by it only is possible, the simplicity and harmony of the universe.

2. It is a *universal* law. All things come under it. The higher the phase of life the more plainly the law works in it. The Son of the Father gave us its clearest setting forth in His life, and attained by it to His greater glory (Phil. ii: 9). There is a death that destroys; it is the wages of sin. There is a death that saves; it is an eternal ordering.

3. It is a *permanent* law.

As such Christ fulfilled it (John xii: 24).

As such He enacted it for His disciples (John xii: 26).

As such His disciples accept it (Gal. ii: 20).

The passing to a higher life is always preceded by the sacrifice of the lower. All life is from God, the product and proof of love, which is essentially sacrifice.

II. The conditions upon which this gain is enjoyed.

1. *Patience*—that is, a quiet waiting for the will of God. The sense of dependence, which is the essential condition of created existence. An appreciation of the value of

nearness to God, the degree of which determines the character of the life.

2. *Trust*—that is, absolute assurance of the beneficence of the divine ordering. God has what we need. The method of His communication depends on His sovereign pleasure. The announcement of the method should bring to us certainty and hope. Risk all confidently, and fearlessly prove God's kindness.

3. *Love*—that is, an absorption in others so great that for their sakes we can forget ourselves. God and His creatures may drift apart, but they may also forever come nearer together. Then He consummates a fuller life, and perfects existence. The abiding condition is to draw near to God, to cling to Him, to lose ourselves in Him, who is our true life.

"WHAT IS THINE OCCUPATION?"

BY REV. F. A. SWART [METHODIST],
EAST SAGINAW, MICH.

What is thine occupation? and whence comest thou? What is thy country? and of what people art thou?—Jonah ii: 8.

IN secular life God intends every man to have an employment. The world is continually asking, "What is thine occupation?"

So, too, in the Christian life. Illustration: "The parable of the talents." "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another as good *stewards* of the *manifest* grace of God" (1 Peter iv: 10). Or, as Paul says, "Having gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us" (Rom. xii: 6).

The world of sin inquires of the church: "What is thine occupation?" A religion that cannot give a valid reason for existence will, and ought to, die.

Spiritualist, what is thine? Universalist, thine? Atheist, Moralist, what is thine? Christian, "What is thine occupation?"

God's calls to duty are all *special*

calls. Illustration: Jonah, Moses, Joseph, Elijah, Paul, Wesley.

So are His calls to *you* and *me*. And what is our response? Often like that of Jonah.

In the midst of our flight from duty, when we are seemingly lulled into a sleep of indifference by, or perhaps in spite of, the raging tempest of evil around us, we are rudely awakened by the cry, "What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us that we perish not," and then naturally follow the searching questions of the text.

Notice who utters this cry. It is the cry of a lost world. The church has been sent into this world on a *special* errand, with a *special* message; but many of her members are fleeing from duty; many have filled their ears with cotton and are asleep over a volcano of human hate; are tossed skyward and hellward by the tumultuous waves of social unrest, and still sleep on, every lift of the wave bearing them further from duty and divine destiny.

O sleeping saint! what meanest thou? *Arise*, call upon thy God! Hear you not the cry from lands groping in heathen darkness? See you not the out-stretched, appealing arms of the down-trodden and oppressed? Listen to the widow's wail and the orphan's prayer! Intemperance, lust, avarice, are rampant. The storm is upon us.

"Awake, Jerusalem, awake!

No longer in thy sins lie down;

The garment of salvation take;

Thy beauty and thy strength put on."

"Shake off the dust that blinds thy sight,

And hides the promise from thine eyes;

Arise, and struggle into light;

The great Deliverer calls, 'Arise!'"

Think of the woe and wretchedness about you. "What is thine occupation?"

In conclusion, note the other pertinent queries of the text.

"Whence comest thou? What is thy country? and of what people art

thou?" Are you of God's people? Citizens of the household of God, of a heavenly country? What, then, should be "thine occupation"?

The church should be a nursery—not a nursery for *adults*, but for *babes*.

Men and women in the church should be nursing fathers and nursing mothers.

"What is *your* occupation?"

THE MODEL COUPLE.

BY REV. W. G. THRALL [LUTHERAN],
BURLINGAME, PA.

They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.

—Luke 1:6.

"A MINISTER and his wife," one naturally says, "why, they should be a model couple." But as now, so in the day of Zacharias and Elizabeth, there were many priests who would not make very commendable patterns for their flocks to follow. Whether ministers of the gospel or not, as professing Christian disciples we may profitably study the characters of the text.

I. A model couple, in that they were *personally* righteous—"both." The notion seems to prevail, and not inconsiderably, that in some way the grace, holiness and gospel virtue of one member of the home, may account to the credit of another, as that of a godly parent for a godless child; or that of the pious wife for the indifferent husband. How often the remark is heard by the pastor, "Oh, my wife belongs to the church." If the wife has sufficient grace to meet the demands of her own personal experience—and that means a great deal—if she lives with a godless husband, the first example is yet to be found when there is a surplus that may be appropriated to the credit of the delinquent companion. That is the *model* ideal home, where the sweet harmony of

the gospel reigns in the hearts of each and every member.

II. A model couple, in the reality and sincerity of their religious life. "Righteous before God." Not so difficult a matter to attain acceptable righteousness in one's own estimation, to get on friendly terms with the conscience. And it may require but little more effort to put a thin veneer of righteousness on the outside and appear "blameless" before the world. But to "live righteous before God," who looks beyond and below external appearances, down into the very desires and impulses of the heart—that means very much more; that is, as the Irish boy put it, "to be clane on the inside." The ideal is to be acceptably righteous to one who is familiar with our inner, private life. Transparent as the pillars in St. Mark's Cathedral of Venice, which were brought from Solomon's temple, though durable and substantial as the rock, yet so clear as to let the light glow through them.

III. A model couple, in continued daily righteousness. This is implied by the term of the text, "walking in all the commandments and ordinances." Some essay to keep the commandments while they neglect some of the ordinances appointed of the Lord. There is quite a difference between the two orders of divine requirements. The one referring to those moral ethics intended to give fashion to our religious temper and deportment on all occasions; the other to those divine institutions we are required to observe. Professing loyalty to the former, yet neglecting the latter, or some important ones, as the Lord's Supper. But this model couple observed them all. Theirs was not an occasional step into the path of duty, just when and where it is pleasanter and easiest, but a life-course of continual "walking" in the way of holy requirement. The common tendency is to keep

some of the commandments—the easiest—and omit those requiring effort and sacrifice.

IV. A model couple, in that they were "blameless." This may not imply sinlessness, or "perfection" in that sentimental sense now and then insisted on by some of the "saints." They may have made many mistakes, committed sins, but dominated by the ever present impulse of righteousness and the purpose of obedience and loyalty, they were "blameless." We may do very little to promote the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom—yea, much that tends rather to hinder, yet, if we have done the best possible under our human weakness and in the spirit of loving fidelity, we may stand faultless—perfect before God.

V. A model couple, and blessed as they naturally would be, with a holy generation. Their son was filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. There is no surety, but the very strong probability, that the religiously devout, virtuous parents will transmit to their offspring the same spiritual tendencies. "Like stock, like fruit." The blessed word furnishes us this photograph of a symmetrical Christian life. We may profitably contemplate it, for in it are delineated by the gospel artist, the principal features of an acceptable, enjoyable Christian life.

A DIVINE TEACHER.

BY G. S. PLUMLEY, D.D. [CONGREGATIONALIST], GREENFIELD HILL, CONN.

We know that thou art a teacher come from God.—John iii : 2.

SOME claim that signs are indispensable to establish the divine origin of Christianity. So thought Nicodemus, trained in a tradition of his nation to look for a sign from heaven.

But Christianity rests on a much broader and firmer basis. The signs

of the Lord Jesus Christ were symbols of His greater power, wrought, not to gratify the curiosity of those who thronged him, nor to satisfy their demand for credentials, but from the overflow of His Divine might, His sympathy with the suffering and sorrowing, and as evidences of similar and higher sway in His domain of the spiritual world. Had we merely His signs to prove the truth of His claims, they would be insufficient, for false religions parade their miracles. If essential, at the beginning of the Gospel kingdom, why not still indispensable? Skeptics may well, in that case, demand them of Christian teachers to-day. No, the foundation of Christianity is broader and grander than signs, transcending them as the Lord Jesus Christ transcends His mightiest works.

The imperishable foundations of Christianity are the life of the Christ and the character and results of His teachings.

I. THE SINLESS LIFE.

With very many, sin against God is a trivial matter. Men now are prone to regard inherent sin as of small guilt. Outward crime, seriously injuring others, is deemed sin. But that sin is deep, polluting, heinous, though latent in one's character, is lightly estimated. Our Master, however, calls the tree corrupt before it has borne its evil fruit. Temptations do not create, they only bring out wickedness.

Behold one completely free from this sinful character, His every emanation pure, His mind, will, affections, and life infinitely holy, every act, by testimony of friends and enemies, so spotless as to annihilate criticism! How inevitable the conclusion, this is not of earth. This teacher is from God.

II. THE CHARACTER AND RESULTS OF HIS TEACHINGS.

1. Pure. 2. Irresistibly powerful. 3. Adapted to all classes and condi-

tions of men. 4. Appropriate to every generation. No change or vicissitude of time outlives them. They never grow old, but are always pat. Changes may be wise in methods of presenting them, but themselves so imperishable, they are indispensable to each soul as it comes into being.

5. Elevating. The teacher came from God. By his teachings he lifts up to God. The Son of God became the Son of man, that the sons of men might become the sons of God. "The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life."

THE NAME OF CHRISTIAN.

BY REV. R. S. MACAULAY, D.D.,
IRVINE, SCOTLAND.

The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.—Acts xi : 26.

THIS text suggests, with the new name,

I. *Separation*, external and visible.

(a) Jews separated from forms and formalism of Judaism.

(b) Greeks separated from pollutions of idolatry.

II. *Incorporation*, external and visible. Union and harmony existing in reality and in appearance between all disciples.

III. *Relation to Christ*.

(a) Those were then called Christians who lived for and by Christ.

(b) Christ lived in and for them. His hand was with them.

Consider, 1. Our *privileges* as specially anointed with the same anointing, to the same relationship of sonship, to the same official honors, to the same moral nature and character.

2. Our *obligations*. His name our banner. The world for Christ, the Lord : Christ.

GOD'S LOGIC OF SIN.

BY REV. J. T. WIGHTMAN [METHODIST],
BALTIMORE, MD.

And for this cause God shall send them

strong delusion, that they should believe a lie ; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.— 2 Thes. ii : 11, 12.

1. EVERY one who takes pleasure in unrighteousness is under a strong delusion.

2. Every one who is under a strong delusion believes a lie.

3. Every one who believes a lie has rejected the truth.

4. Every one who rejects the truth will be judged by God.

5. Every one who shall be judged by God shall be damned.

6. Therefore every one who receives the truth as it is in Jesus shall be saved (ver. 13).

EVERY ONE.

BY REV. M. H. BIXBY.

Every one in his watch.—Nehemiah vii : 3.

1. Every one—a place.
2. Every one—watchful.
3. Every one—faithful.
4. Every one—efficient.
5. All in one—invincible.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Only True Brotherhood. "And Cain talked with Abel his brother; and it came to pass when they were in the field that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."—Gen. iv: 8. And John i: 41—"Andrew first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, we have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. And he brought him to Jesus." Samuel H. Virgin, D.D., New York.
2. Satan at Church. "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them."—Job i: 6. Rev. W. E. Archibald, Ph.D., Topeka, Kas.
3. The Trials and Triumphs of Asaph's Faith. "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory."—Psalm liv: 24. (Take in the whole Psalm.) J. H. Montgomery, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
4. Finality and Progress. "I have seen an end of all perfection, but thy commandment is exceeding broad."—Psalm cxix: 98. Rev. Fergus Ferguson, D.D., Glasgow, Scotland.
5. The Church the Promoter of Education, Morality, and the Defence of the Sabbath. "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."—Isa. lx: 12. G. H. Smyth, D.D., New York (Harlem).

6. The Praying Christ. "And it came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God."—Luke vi: 12. "And it came to pass, that, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples."—Luke xi: 1. Rev. James H. Atkinson, Liverpool, England.
7. The Athletic Young Man. "Beloved, I pray that in all things thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."—John iii: 2. Rev. A. F. Forest, Glasgow, Scotland.
8. Sustenance Through Service. "I have meat to eat that ye know not of."—John iv: 32. John Humpstone, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
9. Liberty of the Christian Life. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."—John viii: 36. Phillips Brooks, D.D., Boston.
10. Christ's Reasons for Present Speech and Former Silence. "These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. . . . But these things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said unto you at the beginning, because I was with you," etc.—John xvi: 1-6. Alexander MacLaren, D.D., Manchester, England.
11. The Facts which Convince the World. "Of sin, because they believe not on Me; of righteousness, because I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."—John xvi: 9-11. Alexander MacLaren, D.D., Manchester, England.
12. Immortality in Christ. "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory."—Col. i: 27. Alexander McLaren, D.D., Houston, near Glasgow, Scotland.
13. "One Thing I Do." "One thing I do. . . . I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."—Phil. iii: 13, 14. Rev. W. H. P. Founce, New York.
14. The Deceitfulness of Sin. "But exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."—Heb. iii: 13. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, London.
- ("What time I am afraid, I will trust in Thee."—Ps. lvi: 3.)
4. "Looking Backward." ("I have considered the days of old, the years of ancient times. . . . I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High."—Ps. lxxvii: 5, 10.)
5. Christ's Marvellous Self-control. ("Then Pilate saith unto Him, Hearst thou not how many things they witness against Thee? And He gave him no answer, not even to one word: insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly."—Matt. xxvii: 13, 14. R. V.)
6. The Magna Charta of the Christian Church. ("Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe," etc.—Matt. xxviii: 19, 20.)
7. The Anointing of the Spirit Necessary to a Successful Ministry. ("The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor: He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted," etc.—Luke iv: 18.)
8. Christ the Subject of Witness and Wonder. ("And all bare Him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth."—Luke iv: 22.)
9. The Advantage of Impunity over Friendship. ("I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his impunity, he will rise and give him as much as he needeth."—Luke xi: 8.)
10. The Master of all, the Servant of all. ("One is your Master, even Christ."—Matt. xxiii: 10. "I am among you, as he that serveth."—Luke xxii: 27.)
11. The Skepticism of Prejudice. ("Nathaniel said unto Him, Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"—John i: 46.)
12. The Matchless Legacy. ("Peace I leave you; my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you."—John xiv: 17.)
13. The Childhood and Manhood Experience of Christian Life. ("When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."—1 Cor. xiii: 11.)
14. The Relation of Creed to Conduct. ("But, having the same spirit of faith, according to that which is written, I believed, and therefore did I speak; we also believe, and therefore also we speak."—2 Cor. iv: 13. R. V.)
15. The Justice of God in the Salvation of Men. ("If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."—1 John i: 9.)
16. The Logic of Love. ("Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."—1 John iv: 11.)
17. Watchfulness a Preventive of Fatal Surprise. ("Remember, therefore, how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast and repent. If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee."—Rev. iii: 3.)

SUGGESTIVE THEMES.

1. God's Sovereignty Displayed, in Natural Law. ("And then the Lord's wrath be kindled against you, and He shut up the heaven, that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit."—Deut. xi: 17.)
2. Sin's Subtle Secrecy. ("Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret faults."—Ps. xix: 12.)
3. The Day of Fear, a Time of Trusting.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

APRIL 28-30.—MAY 1-3.—PETER'S of the better sort, were built in the DENIAL.—John xiii: 38. form of a square, including an open Those Oriental houses, especially space, called the court. Into this

court, the rooms of the house on all the four inner sides opened. Through the wall fronting the street there ran a low arched passage by means of which people got from the street into the open inclosed court and from thence into the rooms of the house surrounding the court. This low, arched entrance was called the porch. Into a house of this general plan, yet noble and elegant enough to be the palace of the high-priest, the mob who had arrested Jesus in the garden now hurry him.

Off there in the garden, in the tumult when Jesus was arrested, the disciples had been smitten with fear and fled. But one of them, whom we know to be John, quickly recovers himself, and, keeping as close to Jesus as the mob will let him, and being himself known personally to the high-priest, enters with the mob and with Jesus into the high-priest's palace, and stands bravely by Jesus through all the questioning and cross-questioning by Annas, the ex-high-priest, and by Caiaphas, the then high-priest, which goes on there.

But, far-off, back on the edges of the crowd who are taking Jesus to this palace, not near enough to be discovered by the flaming of the torches, another of the disciples, timidly and dodgingly and distantly follows. That disciple was Peter. At last, after the crowd have gone into the palace with Jesus, Peter thinks he also will attempt entrance. Probably John had noticed Peter distantly following. John seems to have had the influence at least of a personal acquaintance in the high-priest's house. Somehow he knows now that Peter is seeking entrance, and coming himself and speaking to the servant who is in charge of the entrance-gate he procures the admission of Peter.

Jesus, there in the high-priest's house, is standing in a room opening into the central and enclosed court,

undergoing various and capricious examination. Now the significant thing is that Peter, having thus gotten admission into the high-priest's palace, *does not go bravely into that room where Jesus is*, but does wait without that room in the open court. In this court there is a throng of officers and servants. The court is open to the sky and the night is cold. So a fire is kindled and these gather around it. There is Jesus on trial in that room yonder. Here is Peter, his sworn friend, in the court, taking hidden and unsympathetic place with those about the fire.

Well, perhaps the glow of the fire falls on Peter's face and discloses his features in some sudden flash, and one of the maid-servants, there amid the throng around the fire, looks at him earnestly and declares, This man also was with *Him*--that Jesus being examined in the room yonder. And all at once the heart dies out of Peter, and he denies, saying, Woman, I know Him not.

It is not very comfortable there, with the flash of the fire pulling him out of the secrecy of the darkness all the time, and with so many eyes to see and ears to hear. So Peter leaves the throng about the fire, and goes into that low arched way leading from the court into the street and called the porch. There are hiding shadows, and a little congenial loneliness as well. But there also is that maid-servant who has charge of the entrance gate. It is not so dark in the porch but that something about Peter awakens her suspicions, and she says, This fellow also was with Jesus of Nazareth. And, again, Peter denied with an oath—I do not know the man.

Well, the throng and the fire are, after all, a safer place than the porch and the shadow and the cat-eyed maid who can see, even in the dark. Sometimes bluster will help a man out. So Peter leaves the shadowed porch and goes back into

the court and into the throng around the fire, and begins to enter into conversation, hoping thus to divert this uncomfortable attention from himself. But it was well enough known that the most of those who followed Jesus were Galileans. And anybody in Jerusalem who heard a Galilean speak could mark him at once, for the kind of accent at the cultured capital was very different from that of the rough country people who lived in Galilee. And pretty soon, in an hour or thereabouts, somebody there in the throng, hearing Peter talk, turns squarely on him and declares, Surely thou art one of them for thy speech betrayeth thee. Then began Peter to curse and to swear, saying—I know not the man.

And immediately the cock crew. There had been a cock-crowing once before at Peter's first denial. But somehow he had not noticed it. But now, this second cock-crowing, sounding out shrill and clear in the early morning, brings him to his senses, brings to him in sudden and overwhelming memory his Lord's prediction of this very denial which only a few hours before Peter had been so sure was utterly impossible. And besides, just then—either from the room itself in which Jesus had been standing, or more probably, as Jesus was being led through the court to another and further period of rude and cruel questioning—the Lord turned and looked upon Peter. And, remembering all, Peter went out and wept bitterly.

I think we need a swift vision of the various circumstances to appreciate clearly the reasons for Peter's fall. Consider these reasons, and meantime make personal application of them.

1. *Self-confidence.* In the old Grecian story, it is said that Thetis, the mother of Achilles, foreseeing the early death of her son, endeavored to countervail the decrees of

destiny by dipping him in the river Styx, whose waters rendered one invulnerable. But the heel by which she held the babe was not wetted, and the hero was slain by a wound in his heel. There is an Achilles-heel in the character of every one of us. "Blessed Jesus, Thou hast bought us, *Thine we are,*" I heard the Sunday-school children singing. There is the only hope for these young hearts, or ours. Not in confidence in self, but in confidence in Christ. "Lord, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest." That is the trouble with you, Peter—that tremendous I.

2. *Following afar off.* John in the crowd, into the high-priest's house, in the room *with Jesus* close to Him could not deny. Peter, dodging along the edge of the crowd, in the court, in the porch, anywhere *but in the room*—how easy to deny. Brave confession is not only duty, it is safety.

3. *Bad company.* Those hostile people in the court and in the porch—what business had Peter with them anyway? Do you remember the story of the canary which sang wonderfully until it was placed *among sparrows*?—there it could do no more than copy the sparrow's pitiable chirp.

MAY 5-10. — HOME RELIGION. — Luke viii: 39.

First—Christ thought of its importance. Very naturally, we would say, this thankful man out of whom the demons have been cast, when Jesus, just departing, has gone on board the boat which is to take him to the other side, anxiously asks that he may go with Jesus. But Jesus does not suffer this. The duty of this man is not to tarry at the Lord's side. It is his duty rather *to return to his home*, and become his Lord's witness.

Possibly the man thinks it would be a safer thing to keep in the Lord's

bodily neighborhood, lest the demons come back again. Doubtless it would be a more *pleasant* thing. Possibly gratitude prompts him to consider it the most *fitting* thing. It is also just possible that he considers it a *larger* and more *prominent* thing that he should constantly follow Jesus and be pointed at every where as the one out of whom a legion of demons had been cast.

But Jesus has another and retired and more important duty for him. He is to become a witness for Jesus *in his home*. There in his own family, in the circle of his acquaintances, he is to bear testimony for his Lord. He is to sanctify and beautify his home with the light of the new life which Jesus has kindled in his soul.

Second—We should be careful to carry religion into the home because home is the place of the *most sacred* relationships. Husband, wife, child, brother, sister—such relationships are furthest back and holiest among which one can stand. If it is one's duty to be religious anywhere, it is most one's duty to carry into and to keep among such relationships the purity, love, courtesy of religion.

Third—We need religion in our homes because the *commonness* and the *constancy* of the home-relationships are apt, at least, to induce in us a semi-forgetfulness of them. It is a law of life that continuance of impression results in lack of sensibility toward impression. One may go on here in flagrant violation of duty, in criminal forgetfulness of holiest promises, because of the simple dulness of insensibility, and wonder why home is not happier; why the wife droops, or why the husband has so many friends to see at night, or why the children like the street so much better than the home, and never wake up to find that the sufficient reason is in his own or her own heedless apathy toward the home-claims. It needs the

constant quickening of religion; it needs the fresh alertness of that religious spirit which goes through life with the constant question: "How can I please my Lord?"—to keep the nerve of sensibility alive and thrilling to the uninterrupted touch of these home-relationships.

Fourth—We need religion in the home because home is the most *hopeful place* for religious service. The child in the religious home has the best chance of being the quickest led to Jesus.

Fifth—*Home* religion is the best test of the *reality* of one's religion. One unbends at home. One is himself or herself at home—the bad self too frequently. And we get to think, since home is such a free place every way, that we have a kind of right to let out our badness there. But a true religion is a *perpetual* restraint. And if one will not allow himself an unholy carelessness *even* in the home, we may be quite sure he will nowhere; and thus a home religion is the deepest and ultimate test of a thorough-going religious sincerity.

MAY 12-17.—THE PERSONAL QUESTION.—LUKE ix : 25.

Here is the keyboard of a musical instrument. Some of the notes are higher and some are lower. Yet all are equally legitimate musical notes, and all are necessary to the sounding of the entire harmony.

Here is the keyboard of motives by which a human soul is played upon—I mean that keyboard which God uses, not that the devil uses. Some motives you may call lower and some higher. Yet all are motives rightful and all are motives needful that the soul may sing back answering melody to God.

In our Scripture our Lord lays finger upon the motive of an *enlightened self-interest*. To choose wrong and to get at last the wreck of wrong, though in that choice you become for the time the possessor of the

whole world, is a bad bargain; is everything considered, the worst thing you can do for yourself. The motive touched, you see, is that of a true self-interest. Call it a lower motive if you please. Francis Xavier sings of loving God:

"Not with the hope of gaining aught,
Not seeking a reward;
But as thyself hast loved me,
O ever-loving Lord."

And that, you say, is the highest, noblest, most celestial motive—pure love which thinks only of its object and nothing of the reward its object can bestow. And what you say is true. But it is also true that other motives must be struck in order that this highest one may be. One of these lower motives is that of a true self-interest. It may be lower; but it is still a motive right and necessary. And God does appeal to it.

For an enlightened self-interest is *not* selfishness, though it is often crudely and carelessly confounded with selfishness. If God should say to you, Be sure you enter heaven, because there is only just so much heaven, and if you do not get in somebody else will; seize your chance therefore, and get in first, and so crowd others out—that would be an appeal to selfishness. For selfishness is the love of self *beyond* others; is the determination to get the best for oneself at cost of others. But an enlightened self-interest is the desire to be the best and to get the best one can and ought *without injury* to others. Certainly nothing can be truer or more right than that I, a soul weighted with an eternal destiny, desire and determine to reach the most shining destiny possible for myself. It is not a question as toward others. Nobody will have less of heaven because, by God's good grace, at last I enter it. It is a question for myself. It is a question which demands answer from a true self-interest. And to this rightful and legitimate motive God does ap-

peal when, as in our Scripture, He beseeches me not to make a bad bargain for myself, and though I may win the world yet lose myself.

First—Urging the motive of an enlightened self-interest our Lord here appeals to *something real*, viz., "Himself"—that *inner self* in every man which we call the *soul*. How do you know that there is such a thing as inner self or soul? You have never seen it, touched it, tasted it, smelled it, heard it. How do you know it to be anything possessing *real existence*? How do you know that it is not a property of matter, that all there is of you is not material organism, and nothing more?

(a) Because *I am conscious* of something more. (b) Because there are results flowing forth from me which transcend the realm of matter, and must therefore belong to the higher realm of spirit, *e. g.*, feeling, will, thought, memory, joy, sorrow, love. (c) Because this *inner soul* frequently dominates the material body, *e. g.*, Robert Hall and his life-long pain.

Now Christ spoke to this real inner self or soul, urging upon it the motive of an enlightened self-interest.

Second—This inner self, this soul, is that by which, in the sight of Christ, the man is *tested*.

(a) External position does not lift a man in the sight of Christ, *e. g.*, Nicodemus. (b) Nor does great possession, *e. g.*, rich young ruler, rich fool. (c) Nor does outward largeness of giving, *e. g.*, Pharisees and widow's mite. It is the soul, of what sort *it is*, which tells the man.

Third—This inner self or soul is *accountable*. "What is a man advantaged?" Only to an accountable being could such a question be addressed.

Fourth—This inner self or soul is *immortal*. One cannot lose being, but he can lose well-being.

Very personal and searching the question of our Scripture, though a

man win the world, what is he advantaged if he lose himself or be cast away? If he plunge himself into lasting ill-being?

MAY 19-25.—THE GREAT TRUST AND THE GREAT NECESSITY.—Psalm lix: 17.

First—*A great truth.*—Some one has said “a life without suffering would be like a picture without shade.” In life we need suffering of this sort or that, that we may discover and illustrate the satisfying truths for life. We may hold these truths as points in a taught orthodoxy amid the glare of the noonday, but they cannot be made one's own except amid the shades of suffering. I like the Psalms because so many of them are such close records of a personal experience.

There was David—how brightly shines about him the noon of a radiant prosperity. The conqueror of Goliath, the commander of the armies next the king, the king's son-in-law and so a member of the royal family; the trusted idol of the nation, the man whose paths among the people are ovations, on whose head the aged call down blessings, in whose presence the maidens break into tuneful praises.

But David has much to learn before he can be fitted for the duty which God means for him; before he can become the kind of king which God sees Israel is needing, before his harp shall be so attuned to all the truths of God that his songs can become inspired solace for sufferers through succeeding ages. For many of these truths which he must learn that he may sing them, are truths which can be taught him only amid the shades of suffering.

So now the scene changes, apparently most disastrously for David; the bright noon is suddenly piled thick with cloud and storm. 1 Sam. xviii: 5-9; also chap. xix.

Well this 59th Psalm is David's

Psalm amid this sad eclipse of fortune. Very graphically does this Psalm describe it all—the spying treachery, the malignant slandering tongues, the murderous purpose (verses 3, 4, 6).

Well, I suppose David believed the Great Truth when the skies were so bright above him. But I am sure you can see easily that now, amid these shades of a so strange suffering, this truth must get to be to him an intensely vital one, must not be now in his creed only, but must become a part and parcel of his experience, must become a truth than which nothing can be truer, more precious; must become a truth against which, as against a mighty pillar, he could lean his failing soul; this truth—viz. *That for those who trust Him, God is strength.*

And consider how this great truth David, amid these shades of so strange suffering, was just now learning so thoroughly, is a truth now triumphantly borne out in the history of David. God was, for David, *conquering* thought. The anointing; the subsequent story; Saul, who sought to slay David by the sword, perishing by his own sword.

Also consider how God was for David *day by day* strength. Here was this crisis; and yet for this crisis God had provided David's wife, who by her woman's wit delivered him. 1 Sam. xix: 12. See also numerous other instances: 1 Sam. xix: 18-14, Jonathan's friendship, 1 Sam. xx: 1-23, David's escape from the encompassed mountain, 1 Sam. xxiii: 19-27. So *day by day* God was strength for David.

Also consider how God was *educating* strength for David. Tribes envious of each other; the hand of Saul upon the helm of state; the kingdom in terrible disorder—to grasp that kingdom into unity; to repair and annihilate the results of that bad rule; to harmonize and

overcome the jarring jealousies of the separate tribes; to organize them into a compact nation; to make them strong by an equal administration of law among themselves, and to inspire them and marshal them for conquering clash with their enemies round about them—do you not plainly see, for such a task a quite peculiar man was needed. He must be firm and yet gentle; sagacious and yet fair; assertive yet patriotic; determined yet broad. And this is to be David's task—to make of that germinant, jarring Hebrew kingdom what God had promised it should be; what it ought to be. And as you study the details of David's life, can you, after all, conceive a better kind of education for the task God means for David? Is it

not plain that God was for David *educating* strength?

As David needed God for strength so surely do we. (a) That our old natures may be conquered. (b) Amid our troubles. (c) Amid our prosperities that they do not ruin us. (d) In death.

Great, wonderful truth this—truth worth getting into one's soul at any cost; *God is the strength of those who trust Him*; satisfying song that for any soul—Unto Thee, O my strength, will I sing.

Second—A great necessity—viz: *personal appropriation* of this, Divine strength. Sings David, "Unto Thee, O my strength." (a) Thus you can be a *strong* Christian. (b) Thus you can be a *joyful* Christian. Even amid his so sad trouble, David *sings*.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

Studies in the Psalter.

BY TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.
THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD
PSALM.

A Burst of Grateful Praise.

THE title affirms that this Psalm was composed by David, and although this has often been questioned, the objection has never been made good. The point is of small importance, for the meaning and use of the lyric are the same, whether it were a very early or a very late composition. Its simple and regular structure, its finished completeness, its tender pathos, its devout recognition of God's fatherly love, its confessions and its invocations have made it a favorite vehicle of thankful praise among the pious of all ages. It is ushered in with a joyful acknowledgement of Jehovah's mercies as experienced by the writer himself, and closes with a triumphant appeal to every portion of the universe and, above all, to the hierarchy of heaven to unite in glorifying the one supreme ruler of the world. The divisions are: 1. Personal mercies acknowledged (vs.

1-5); 2. The divine perfections in themselves and as manifested to God's people (vs. 6-18); 3. A summons to all creatures to join in the ascription (vs. 19-22).

I. Praise for Personal Favors (vs. 1-5).

Bless Jehovah, O my soul,

And all that is within me, bless His holy name.

Bless Jehovah, O my soul,

And forget none of His benefits:

Who forgiveth all thine iniquities;

Who healeth all thy diseases;

Who redeemeth thy life from destruction;

Who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies;

Who satisfieth thy desire with good,

And thy youth renews itself as the eagle.

The singer calls upon his soul to bless Jehovah, that is, to praise Him with devout and grateful affection. His earnestness appears by the renewed summons to "all that is within" him, *i. e.*, every faculty of his nature, reason, conscience, will, heart; his whole spiritual being. The special object of praise is God's "holy name," which means as elsewhere the manifestation of His divine perfections, those by which He is separated and distinguished from

all other beings. The negative statement in verse 2 looks back to the frequent directions in the Pentateuch not to forget Him who brought the people out of Egypt, forgetfulness being the secret spring of ingratitude. All translators* render the last phrase as it is given in the common version and the revised, "all his benefits," the grammatical force of which is "you may forget some, but not all," which is certainly not what the Psalmist means. Precisely the same Hebrew is rendered in Amos viii: 13, "never forget any of their works." And so it should be here. A truly devout worshipper will forget none, even the smallest of Jehovah's favors. The following clauses specify the nature of these benefits. First comes forgiveness, which is not only the greatest in itself but the basis of all the rest. Without this the most prosperous of men walks with the sword of Damocles over his head. But he who remits sin also removes the bodily plagues which are its penal consequence. (The term may include maladies of the soul.) Deliverance from death follows as one of God's mercies. This is expressed by "redeeming," i.e., delivering at great risk and cost from destruction, or, as some prefer to render, from the pit (of the grave or of Hades). The next clause is one of singular beauty. The poet conceives God's mercies and kindnesses as woven into a crown which His own hand places on the head of the believer. In verse 5 the word rendered *mouth* every where else means *ornament*, which is unsuitable here. It is better to fall back on the Sept. and the Vulgate and take the meaning *desire*. This Jehovah satisfies with good, not fancied or momentary, but real and permanent. The result is that the Psalmist's youth is renewed when in his old age, and he is made strong and lusty as the

*Noyes, Conant, Alexander, Perowne, Cheyne, D. Witt. Segond alone has *aucun de ses bienfaits*.

eagle, a common image of strength and vigor (2 Sam. 1: 23; Is. xl: 31). The apostrophe after *eagle* in the common version has no support in the Hebrew and should be omitted, since it misleads by suggesting that the writer held or employed the fable that the eagle did actually renew its youth. Nor does it help the matter to refer the phrase to the yearly moulting of the feathers, for this is common to all birds. The sense is well given in the Prayer-Book version, "Making thee young and lusty as an eagle." This is the strongest of the feathered race; its eye can gaze upon the sun and its wing rise above the storm. Spurgeon says, "He who sat moping with the owl in the last psalm (cii. 6), here flies on high with the eagle." Such a change is enough to make any man cry, "Bless Jehovah, O my soul."

II. Jehovah's Mercies to His People (vs. 6-18).

Jehovah executeth deeds of righteousness,

And of justice for all that are oppressed.

He made known his ways unto Moses,

His acts unto the children of Israel.

Jehovah is merciful and gracious,

Long suffering and plenteous in loving kindness.

He will not always contend,

Neither will He keep His anger for ever.

Not according to our sins hath He dealt with us,

Nor according to our iniquities hath He requited us.

For as the heaven is high above the earth,

So mighty is His loving kindness toward them that fear Him.

As far as the east is from the west,

So far hath he removed our transgression from us.

Like as a father hath compassion on his children,

So Jehovah hath compassion on them that fear Him.

For He, He knoweth our frame;

He remembereth that we are dust.

As for mortal man, his days are as grass;

As a flower of the field, so he flourisheth.

For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone;

And the place thereof knoweth it no more.

But the loving kindness of Jehovah is from everlasting

To everlasting upon them that fear Him,

And His righteousness to children's children,

To such as keep His covenant,

And to those who remember his precepts to do them.

Here the sacred poet passes from his own experience to that of the church at large. It has been truly said that all grateful exercises must begin with the consideration of personal mercies. But they do not, can not end there. The soul rises by a spiritual instinct to a larger, more comprehensive view of God's gracious administration as embracing all his people. First, mention is made of those doings of the Most High by which the injustice of man is redressed and the divine righteousness and justice displayed. From this general statement the singer passes to the great historical example furnished in Jehovah's dealings with the covenant people. The reference to Moses points to the prayer he is recorded (Ex. xxxiii : 13) as offering, "Show me now thy ways that I may know thee," whence we learn that "His ways" here are not those in which God's precepts require man to walk, but those in which God reveals himself to His people; or the course of His dispensations toward them. The knowledge thus imparted was afforded by experience as well as by the significant proclamation of Jehovah's perfections made to Moses as he stood in the cleft of the rock (xxxiv : 6, 7). This fine statement, wholly unequalled in all profane literature, became a sort of formula of Israel's faith, and hence reappears again and again in psalm and prophecy and prayer (Pss. lxxxvi : 5-15, cxlv : 8, Joel, ii : 13, Neh. ix : 17). Hence it is copied here in v. 8, as showing that Jehovah is not merely gracious to his people as creatures, but forbearing and merciful to them as sinners. Not only is He slow to anger, *i. e.*, waiting a long time before He lets it loose, but even when He does contend in a judicial way with them, this is not of long continuance, nor does He keep his anger forever (Is. lvii : 16, Jer :

iii, 5). The explanation of this follows in the next couplet. God's procedures are not regulated by his people's sins, but by His own gracious purpose. "The past tense has reference to the previous history of Israel as a nation, but involves the statement of a general truth." The comparisons in vs. 11 and 12 set vividly before us the infinite power and the complete unreserve of grace. It is bestowed upon "them that fear God," a common description of the righteous, who are more particularly characterized in ver. 18. God's love like himself is infinite. It cannot be measured by all the measures of the universe. David expresses in poetry what the New Testament puts in prose that the height and depth, the length and breadth of the divine love passeth knowledge (Eph. iii : 18). The removal of sins to an indefinite distance suggests the idea both of pardon and of renovation. The pathetic comparison in ver. 13 confutes those who deny to the Old Testament the notion of a divine fatherhood. Here it is in its best form. Whatever a human parent feels that is kind, tender and loving toward a child, that does God feel toward his people.

The reason of this infinite tenderness is given in the following couplets, viz., the frailty of man, which is set forth by images often used in Scripture. It is familiar to God. As our Maker, he understands how we are made. It is not strange that what comes from dust should return to dust. Man at his best estate is vanity. The grass may be luxuriant and the flowers very beautiful, but they are short lived. A passing wind, or as some say, a mere breath, is sufficient to wither their vitality, and then they disappear without leaving a trace behind. So is it with mortal man. He passes away and the place which once knew him knows him no more. The point the poet makes is that as an earthly

father's love and tenderness are awakened and stimulated by the feebleness and helplessness of his child, so our Father in Heaven takes note of the frailties and weaknesses of his people on earth, and in consequence manifests to them his condescending forbearance and compassion. The endurance of these stands in sharp contrast with man's short life and the transitoriness of his doings. "The grace of God like an eternal heaven arches over all them that fear Him." It is from everlasting to everlasting; it knows no beginning and shall know no end. His righteousness, *i. e.*, his faithfulness to his covenanted promise, prolongs the blessing to children's children, even to a thousand generations (Deut. vii : 9). But the blessed truth is guarded against perversion by the description of its objects. Thrice are they spoken of as them that fear Him (vs. 11, 13, 17), and still further as those who are faithful to His covenant and yield a practical obedience to His precepts. The divine mercy is unspeakably great, but it is not indiscriminate. It is not a compromise with sin but a victory over sin.

III. The Summons to the Universe (vs. 19-22).

Jehovah hath established His throne in the heavens.

And His kingdom ruleth over all.

Bless Jehovah, ye angels of His,

Ye mighty in strength, that fulfil His command,

Harkening unto the voice of His word.

Bless Jehovah, all ye His hosts,

Ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure.

Bless Jehovah, all ye His works,

In all places of His dominion.

Bless Jehovah, O my soul.

The opening couplet, in asserting Jehovah's unlimited dominion, at once sustains the assurances just made and introduces the closing appeal for a universal ascription of honor and praise. First, the poet calls upon the angels, the highest order of finite intelligences, heroes of might, who habitually execute God's commands and ever stand

ready to catch the least intimation of His will. Let them strike their harps to a new song and raise a yet loftier note of praise as they look down from heaven's battlements and see the manifestations of God's adorable perfections to His people on earth. Next, the summons is to the "hosts of heaven," which may mean, as Delitzsch says, the innumerable spiritual beings gathered round the angels of higher rank, the ten thousand times ten thousand who compose the heavenly hierarchy, but doubtless refers to the planetary and other bodies, the bright array which illumines the sky by night, "sun and moon and stars of light," which although inanimate may be said to do God's will, and which in the 148th Psalm are expressly summoned to "praise the name of Jehovah." By their very existence the heavens are declaring the glory of God, and the firmament is showing forth the work of His hands (Ps. xix: 1), but they are asked to yield a heartier obedience and render a nobler anthem to the Being who gave existence to these mysterious and glittering orbs. But the poet is not yet satisfied. He calls upon angels and heavenly bodies and men and every other creature, in air or earth or sea, animate or inanimate, throughout that immense and immeasurable empire of which Jehovah is the head, to join in the ascription of blessing and honor and power to Him who sitteth upon the throne. And at last, with exquisite felicity, he comes back to the point from which he started, and summons his own soul to join the chorus of universal praise. No activity in summoning others to this delightful duty could be a substitute for His own personal participation in the work. He calls on all God's works not to take his place but to join him that together they may make the ascription what it should be. The Psalm ends as it began, without a

single word of supplication. All is praise, humble, grateful, rapturous praise.

Sincere and earnest praise is a higherspiritual exercise than prayer, however intense and believing, for the latter springs from the sense of personal need, while the former looks away from self and seeks only to have the Lord duly honored. As such it meets the strongest instincts of the godly man's soul, and hence is represented as the chief employment of the just made perfect, who rest not day or night, setting forth the glories of Him who was and who is and who is to come. It is not strange, therefore, that saints on earth have always taken a special pleasure in this Psalm, which is such an exuberant burst of grateful praise. When, after the great victory at Leipsic which struck the decisive blow for religious freedom in Germany, Gustavus Adolphus entered Augsburg, the city of the Protestant Confession, he went straight to the Church of St. Ann and caused this Psalm to be sung. Nothing less seemed adequate to the occasion. Nay, the last of the Scottish martyrs, James Renwick, who was executed in the Grass Market of Edinburgh in February, 1688, at the early age of twenty-eight, and who emulated, not only the resignation, but the transport of the early sufferers for Christ, could find no better words in which to express his triumphant faith, and his sense of the privilege granted him that he should lay down his life for his unseen Lord, and so his death-song was this precious utterance of the old Hebrew saint. Hence it was a usage in the Scotch Church to sing this Psalm when they celebrated the Lord's Supper. In the liturgy of the Reformed Church of Holland it forms the principal part of the post-communion service.

The Sixth Seal.

BY HOWARD CROSBY.

IT seems to be an error in many commentators that they fail to sustain the figurative character of prophetic language, and so by mingling the figurative and literal destroy the symmetry and lose the meaning. In the book of the Revelation our Lord is represented in the midst of the seven candlesticks with a two-edged sword coming out of his mouth (ch. 1: 16). The fact that the sword is not in his hand but in his mouth should guard us from supposing that it was a carnal sword to destroy flesh, and yet when that sword is used (ch. xix: 15) in smiting the nations a carnal smiting is imagined, and so the great battle of Armageddon (ch. xvi: 14, 16), taken to refer to the same period, is viewed as a great carnal contention. Consistency requires that we should count all the action of the divine sword as the action of God's word on the souls of men. The sword of the spirit is the word of God (Eph. vi: 17). When Christ says that he came not to send peace, but a sword (Matt. x: 34), he spoke of this same sword of his word, which would provoke in opposition the carnal sword, 'tis true, but it would do this by its own piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit (Heb. iv: 12). If we use this method in interpreting the sixth seal, we shall not have a view of material prodigies and physical convulsions, but a figurative statement of great spiritual catastrophes and political changes.

The sixth seal has been generally regarded as exhibiting the final catastrophe. Whether it does this, or exhibits the similar but earlier condition of things preparatory to the millennial period we need not here discuss. In either case we hold that its true interpretation of details is this. The earthquake (Rev. vi: 12), is the political shaking of the time, severe and alarming. The sun, moon

and stars represent the dignitaries of the church, that are to lose their power and fall into the political disaster suddenly and all together, as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when shaken of a mighty wind. The heaven is the church in its then false form, which shall be rolled up like a scroll. Each mountain and island, each worldly institution and independent system shall be unsettled, and every class of men shall be represented in confusion and fear, as in vain they call on their worldly institutions to shield them from the impending wrath of Him who is Love ("the wrath of the Lamb"). If this be the true interpretation, then that period will be one of political convulsion and the overthrow of a false and worldly church, while the careless and proud, who have trusted to their philosophy or their inventions, will see in terror the kingdom of Christ established and will fly for refuge to their vain devices. The seventh chapter shows the establishment of the victorious kingdom of our Lord. The apostle-prophet has three views of this period, the catastrophe view (ch. vi: 12-17), the sealing view (ch. vii: 18), and the glory view (ch. vii: 9-17. All this belongs to the sixth seal.

A word touching the fifth seal. This represents the period of *awaiting*. It is preparatory to the above scenes of the sixth seal. But it is not the martyrs' bodies that we see buried under an altar. It is rather

living men kneeling before the altar of incense (representing prayer). The word for "under" (*ὑποκάτω*) is used in Plato's Symposium, of the position of one reclining at a feast next below another. So here these are not *beneath* the altar, but *next below* it, as kneeling before it in prayer to God. They are souls, not dead bodies. The word "slain," like all these words, must be used figuratively. It refers to all the oppressive oppositions of the world. The true people of God, oppressed by the wicked elements of the world, are kneeling before God and asking when the holy vengeance of God would come and deliver the church. Their earnestness is met by two responses from God. Their holiness is intensified ("white robes were given unto every one of them"), and they are told that a short period of further oppression was still to come before the day of their deliverance and the destruction of the church's enemies should arrive. Thus the fifth seal is simply the true, pure church, the remnant, the real children of God (not any external church), waiting prayerfully for the millennial or the paradisaic day, as the case may be. The point of this sketch is not to insist upon the given rendering of these passages, but to call attention to the necessity of being consistent in interpreting the figurative language of the Revelation, and not making a mosaic of figurative and literal, as is commonly done.

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

The Tendency from Aesthetics to Ethics.

THE dominion of aesthetics has been long and powerful. Not only is this true of art, where it is natural and even necessary, but also in literature and in life. What an emphasis has been placed on the artistic element in literature, such as the style, the beauty of language, the aptness

of the figures and the harmonious arrangement of parts. Writers have gone to painting, to statuary and to music for the rules in their composition. So essential has the form become that the thought is not rarely treated as of secondary importance. Sentences are quoted for their sound, not for their meaning, and

beautiful illustrations are regarded as having a value of their own independent of the thought illustrated. Literature is thus treated as a picture to be beheld and admired for its beauty; it is esteemed because it gratifies the taste; it is not read for appropriation, but merely for the sake of æsthetic contemplation. Not profit, but pleasure fixes its value. There are exceptions of course, but how largely this is true becomes evident from the general literature which gains the greatest popularity.

In life we find the prevalence of æsthetics in what are ordinarily called the cultured classes. Who is so ignorant as not to know that modern refinement is largely veneering, culture shallow, politeness hollow, and the "best" society a vain show? The lies lived in society have furnished material for many of the most powerful novels and dramas. The mere form is exalted while the substance is ignored, and not seldom external beauty and elegance are sought in proportion as there is inner emptiness or rottenness. Thus the representative and the symbolical elements so powerful in æsthetics are substituted for the realities which constitute the true life. Æsthetics is degraded from its lofty mission to adorn and commend truth, and is made to minister to what is false and foul.

To this abuse of æsthetics we must add the prevalent enthusiasm for art. Of this we see evidences in the home, in churches, in public buildings, in the popularity of theatres, of operas, and of music in general, as well as in the passion for art revealed by tourists. When we take all these things into account we have much reason to call this the age of æsthetics or of æstheticism.

One who digs below the surface will discover that a reaction has set in. It has become evident that it is not by mere contemplation, but

by appropriation, that men live. Thought is turning from the adornment to the nature and value of the object adorned. Critics demand that there be harmony between form and substance; and in spite of the common plea that æsthetics has nothing to do with ethics, the writer who makes crime beautiful and vice attractive is sure of the severest condemnation. Aside from all religious considerations nature and human life teach that the bad is ugly and only the good lovely, so that even a Godless realism cannot wholly ignore the laws of truth and justice.

The excessive prevalence of æsthetics is intimately connected with the passion for pleasure, which is so marked a feature of our age. In æsthetic contemplation free play is given to the emotions; the pleasure in art is its great attraction. Hence the sensitiveness and passion so common among artists and those who live in art. From the refined pleasure of æsthetics it may be but a single step to the more vulgar pleasures. Not seldom is an excessive devotion to art, but the culmination of a life of pleasure. In its proper place art is truly refining, but when perverted it becomes the companion and promoter of effeminacy and voluptuousness.

The passion for pleasure is one of the alarming symptoms in European cities. One need but listen to the speech of the masses and of the cultured to learn how largely men live for mere amusement. Things are valued for the pleasure they give; even religious services are enjoyed or not enjoyed, and their value is determined by the pleasure they give. But such proportions has this passion for pleasure assumed that thoughtful men are startled, and are inquiring whither it must lead.

These things are helping to turn the tide from æsthetics to ethics, but they are not the chief factor

This factor is found in the awakening of society to the condition of the masses. They themselves have become conscious of their condition and are resolute in the determination to make others aware of it likewise. The refined classes are threatened with a loss of that dominion which they have exercised so long; the laboring classes are feeling that they have the majority and they are determined to make their power felt.

This rising of the masses into prominence, power and dominion is revolutionizing thought as well as society. That ease which has so long luxuriated in æsthetics is disturbed. As society involves all that is human, it is discovered that the social problems involve and effect all the interests of humanity. These problems, it is admitted, are mainly ethical, pertaining to the relations and duties of man to man. The deeper thinkers admit that in ethics rather than in political economy the leaven for the salvation of society is to be found.

Amid these overwhelming problems the utter inefficiency of mere æsthetics is felt. It gives no bread, it cannot satisfy the turbulent demands of socialism, it cannot convert the soul. If the masses are to enter upon a better condition they need training and culture, such as art cannot give. There must be ethical development if they are to be blessed by increased material prosperity.

The demands which are thus made are pushing æsthetics into the background and forcing ethics to the front. Hence, while philosophy in general is neglected, great prominence is given to the study of ethics. New works in this department abound. Some of them are on an atheistic basis, attempting to base morality on nature or on man as purely a natural product.

In this tendency from æsthetics to ethics it is significant that voices

are heard opposing the cultus of genius. "Goethe and No End" was the theme of Du Bois-Reymond when inaugurated rector of the Berlin University a few years ago. Goethe has in fact been lauded *ad nauseam*, and the reaction is manifest on the part of critics. Amid the deification to which genius has been subject it is worthy of note that a living philosopher contrasts the literary genius with the moral reformer, and places the latter far above the former. To all these symptoms must be added the earnest appeals and vigorous efforts of Christians to bring religion nearer the masses. Personal work to meet personal needs and to promote personal exaltation are deemed the great demands of the hour.

All this must be attributed largely to the seriousness of the situation. The upheaval in society is disturbing the æsthetic gratification of the refined classes, and is making supreme the ethical and economical interests of the laboring classes. Not a few hear the muttering thunders as they come nearer and nearer; when and where the lightning will strike no one knows, but that it will strike there is no question. The very uncertainty adds to the feeling of restlessness. The problem now absorbing attention is the best measures for helping laborers to rise into better condition and to avert the threatened dangers of socialism. Here æsthetics is by no means useless, but it cannot do the chief work required. Religion and morality must now prove their converting and saving power. The substance is needed first and then the best form must be given to it. The problems are too serious and too momentous to be touched by the spirit of sport or by the spirit which loses itself in æsthetic contemplation. No age has made a more urgent demand for the most radical and most thorough work for

the regeneration and salvation of society.

Two Model German Pulpit Orators.

In the homiletic journal *Halte was du hast*, Dr. Gottlob Meyer gives a study of Gerok, court-preacher in Stuttgart, and of Max Frommel of Hanover, both of whom died in the month of January. He ranks them among the six German preachers of the age who are most important for homiletic study, the other four being Koegel, Brueckner, Emil Frommel (brother of Max and court-preacher in Berlin) and Funke.

Dr. Meyer declares that in point of form Gerok's sermons possess two excellencies, namely, language of perfect beauty and intelligible to all classes, and a strictly logical but simple train of thought. Aside from the contents, we find in these two characteristics the many-sided attractiveness of these sermons. Dr. Meyer defines perfect beauty of language as consisting in the precise expression of the thought, in the vivid manner of the expression, and in the manifold variation of the forms of expression. These three characteristics are found in Gerok's sermons. For every thought he had the right word; he put every idea into bold relief, and for every notion he had an abundance of expressions. In this precision we see the clear thinker and trained theologian; in the vividness we behold the poet of rich fancy; in the variety of expressions we discover the master of language. One learns precision in the school of science; the art of putting thought into bold relief is learned from the school of nature and of human life, while we go to literature in order to attain fulness of expression. This threefold schooling makes the preacher and the pulpit orator. Precision is the enemy of confusion of ideas; by putting ideas strikingly and vividly abstractions are avoided; by means of

variety of expression monotony is overcome. Gerok is pronounced the model of German pulpit orators during the century so far as form is concerned.

The logical yet simple train of thought is worthy of study as well as the beauty of the language. Every sermon from the corner-stone to the cope-stone is a work of artistic architecture. Every sentence fits exactly into the preceding one, and leads to that which follows. Yet nothing is artificial, but perfectly simple. In his earlier sermons we find the poetic fancy in conflict with the logical arrangement, but in later years the two were harmonized. In respect to form Dr. Meyer compares Schleiermacher and Gerok, and gives the latter the preference. Both are strictly logical; but in Schleiermacher's sermons the thought is constructed artificially, while in those of Gerok the thoughts follow each other naturally, so that the simplest hearer can recall the train of ideas. This excellence of Gerok detracts from his merit as a poet. Many of his poems are synthetic sermons in a poetic garb. But the poet was, first of all, a preacher. His sermons are all synthetic, consisting of theme, of division, mostly into three parts, each of which has symmetrical subdivisions. His introductions referred to the church year, to some fact in nature or in human life, or was taken from the context. He closed with a recapitulation of the thoughts, with a verse, often of his own composition, or with a prayer.

When we examine the content of his sermons we find it first of all biblical; the fundamental saving truths of Scripture are the kernel of his discourses. Theologically Gerok belongs to the biblical realism of the Wuerttemberg school. He regards his text as a word of God, a jewel that ought to receive a beautiful setting. He enters upon no

speculation as to whether it is really a jewel or but a common stone; that is already settled in his mind. A thorough exegesis is the presupposition, but not a content of the sermon. Since edification is his chief aim, he adheres to Luther's translation even at the expense of the original text. He treats the text as a subject for meditation rather than for profound analysis.

Gerok's sermons are also textual. He makes the leading thought of the text his theme, while the subordinate thoughts furnish his divisions. He repeatedly preached from the same texts, but always with new divisions and fresh points of view.

To the biblical and textual we must add the practical element as characteristic of Gerok's sermons; that is, he makes a direct application of the truth of Scripture to the heart and life of his hearers. He is never a doctrinaire, not even when he discusses dogmatic subjects. The practical content generates the popular form which made Gerok so eminently a preacher of the people.

In Gerok's case the saying that the success of the sermon is in the delivery was not true. His sermons are said to be more effective when read than when they were delivered. His attractiveness in the pulpit was mainly in his venerable appearance and in the perfection of his rhetoric.

From Gerok we turn to Max Frommel. His sermons are biblical-confessional, but the latter element is not made too prominent. The heart of every discourse is confession of the fact of redemption through Christ. From this as the centre the whole sphere of the Christian life, with its facts, its tasks, and its expectations is illuminated, tested, and valued. Prominence is continually given to the objective fact of redemption and to the demand for subjective faith. Frommel's biblical preaching was sup-

ported by the power of experience, so that every sermon is the proclamation of truth personally experienced. His discourses are eminently didactic. Being a strict Lutheran he was intent on teaching what he regarded as true and sound doctrine. Yet he never becomes wearisome or monotonous, since he resorted to art, science, nature, history and life for illustrations.

In respect to form we find his language dignified and choice, especially adapted to the educated. His periods are short and often highly rhetorical. Yet it must often be left to the hearer to discover the logical connection of contiguous sentences. The structure of his sermons is simple. The introduction, usually short, is followed by the theme, which is drawn from the text, and is brief and striking. His divisions, generally two or three, are usually announced after the theme. The divisions rarely have sharply defined subdivisions. There is a certain freedom as well as manifoldness in the composition. The last division is frequently short in comparison with the rest, the orator hastening to the conclusion. The peroration is brief and mostly an outlook toward the perfection of heaven.

In Frommel as well as in Gerok we find rare beauty and power of language, clearness of thought, and a wealth of illustrations. In respect to form they have a facility and perfection which remind one of Goethe. In point of rhetoric the palm belongs to Frommel. When we consider the content of the discourse we find a similarity in both preachers in that they seek to proclaim the pure doctrine of Scripture, to be in harmony with the confession, to make their sermons textual, and to give a practical application to the truth proclaimed.

The difference of the two preachers, so far as form is concerned, consists first of all in the length of their

sermons, those of Gerok being on an average twice as long as Frommel's. The reason for this is found in the long liturgy used in Hanover. We also find Gerok's style more popular, that of Frommel more measured. The periods of Gerok are longer. The structure of his sermons is more careful, but at the same time, there is in it a degree of monotony, a defect which Frommel avoids. In logical acumen and lucid arrangement Gerok is superior to Frommel. In point of content we find Gerok's sermons more practical, those of Frommel more instructive; Frommel the more profound in conception, Gerok the more detailed in the application. We thus find a diversity of gifts, but the same spirit.

The Life of Dogmas.

A GENERAL awakening and growth of consciousness are among the marked characteristics of the age. Evils that have long existed are now seen and felt and studied as never before. The prevalence of socialism must be attributed in a great degree to the fact that the laborers have become conscious of their condition in contrast with the wealthier classes, feel with intensified keenness their needs, realize their possibilities, and are aware of their power to enforce their demands. So when we come to the church we find evidences of a new awakening. This is chiefly practical, on account of the great demands made by practical needs of the day. But we also see an awakening in another respect: there is a growth in the consciousness of the possessions of the church. What was formerly taken as a matter of course is now tested in order to determine its validity. It is feared that error may have been held as truth, and that precious truth may have been overlooked. Hence criticism of Scripture, of history, and in fact in every department. Condemn as we may the theological

tendencies of the day, many of them spring from the laudable desire to know and possess the truth.

The awakening of the Protestant consciousness of Europe is seen in the dogmatic discussions. The sense of the dogma is but one of the many points of consideration. Others are such as these: What is the origin of the dogma? Wherein does it differ from a doctrine? What is its genesis? What element of the dogma is purely scriptural, and how much depends on the philosophy and general view of the time when the dogma was formed? Is the dogma finished, or has it a life which is susceptible of growth? Is the life of the church at any period the product of the dogma, or is the dogma but an expression of the life of the church? What is the relation of the faith embodied in the dogma to the actual faith of the church? Wherein does Protestantism differ from Catholicism in respect to the authority of the dogma? All these questions give evidence of the intensity and depth of the desire of evangelical Christianity to become fully conscious of its dogmatic possessions.

From the Reformation till the present it has never been doubtful that the evangelical church regards doctrine as not a dead thing, but as a living seed. But it has often been ignored. Now, however, we find that the life of dogmas is admitted and emphasized on all hands, from the most liberal to the most conservative. While this is admitted in all dogmatic discussions, the application of the admission differs, some holding that the dogma is to live in church, its life being made likewise the life of believers; while others claim that the life of the dogma is to develop the dogma itself so that the creed of the church changes, and others also hold that a dogma may live for awhile and then die, so that it is fit only for burial. Hence we

find persons who regard the dogmas as finally settled, while others advocate the development of dogmas and the change of creeds, and others still reject certain dogmas of venerable antiquity or, perhaps, oppose altogether what they call dogmatic Christianity.

An address on "The inmost Life of Dogmas and their Power of Evolution," by Prof. Sabatier of the Protestant theological faculty in Paris, discusses some of the burning questions in reference to dogmas. He shows that dogmas are not dead but that they live and grow. In the analysis of the dogma he finds two factors, namely, the element of religious life furnished by the piety of the church, an element at once practical and mystical; then the intellectual or theoretical element, which is the envelope and expression of the former. The intellectual factor is necessarily variable; but the permanent factor is found in the perfect revelation of God in the religious and moral consciousness of the historic Christ, which revelation is the constant source of the Christian life of the church and of its members through faith. Of this life the dogmas are the explanation in the sphere of intellect. The professor maintains against rationalism that dogmas are necessary, and against orthodoxy that they are not unchangeable.

He regards the evolution of dogmas as not merely possible but also necessary. Christianity itself, he claims, has followed the law of adaptation. It was Hebrew in Palestine; in passing into the Hellenic world it received a Greco-Roman coloring. He declares that the dogmatics of the fourth and fifth centuries were constructed by the aid of ideas taken from the reigning philosophy, and that it is an illusion to believe that all came from the Bible and from the Bible alone. By affirming the immutability of the dogmas of that

period it is not the Gospel which is declared to be eternal, but Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno. Since the middle ages three great intellectual revolutions have taken place: the Reformation; the discoveries in astronomy and geology; and historical criticism, which, the professor thinks, is about to modify our whole conception of the Scriptures. These great revolutions in thought must affect dogmatics.

Stress is laid on harmonizing the dogmas with modern thought—just what is emphasized by the Ritschl school in Germany. Hence it is argued that the church should not leave the evolution of the dogmas to chance, but should take an active interest in its promotion. In the days of scholasticism the task of the dogmatician was easy. Now it is more difficult, since he must be a man of the age, open to the scientific influences of the day, while at the same time belonging positively to his church. These are all required in order that he may promote the reconciliation of the principles of the church with contemporary scientific thought.

E. Ménégoz, another French Protestant writer, contrasts what he calls the Parisian theology with German dogmatic tendencies, and claims that the former is peculiar and pursues its own course. The Parisian theology, he says, respects the past and may be called historic-dogmatic. It is historical in that it endeavors to understand the past, but it does not attempt to make the past development the norm for the present. That theology cherishes the old tree without plucking it from its native soil and transplanting it where it could not strike root and thrive. The Parisian theology is dogmatic in that it seeks to give to contingent and transient religious thought a permanent form. From the old tree it plucks vital seeds, plants them in a new climate, and cultivates them so

as to bear fresh fruit. Thus this theology is at the same time conservative and progressive; it meets the demands of the religious conscience as well as of scientific thought. The confessions of faith produced in the first centuries, and the Reformation, are to be conserved, and they are to be interpreted according to the faith and the liberty of their authors. This is declared to be the rule for the theologian, the pastor, and the church, a rule which is in harmony with the demands of history and also with the sacred right of the individual conscience.

—

Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D.

ANOTHER eminent theologian must be added to the large list of German scholars who have died since the beginning of the year. On the 23d of February, Dr. Delitzsch had completed his 78th year, and on the 4th of March his death occurred. Of the recent German theologians he probably was known personally to Americans more than any other; and his influence on Hebrew scholarship in America and England was second to none. After being professor in Rostock and Erlangen he came to Leipzig in 1867, at whose university he has been one of the chief attractions, especially to foreign theological students, since that time. The vast influence he exerted by his lectures and by training students in his *Seminar* was supplemented by his works, said to number nearly one hundred. Being of Hebrew descent, it seems but natural that his strength should have been devoted to the Semitic languages and scholarship, and in particular to the Old Testament. Besides his eminence in his specialty he was regarded as one of the most many-sided of the German theologians. While his commentaries and other works on the Old Testament are placed in the first rank, he also wrote valuable books on the New Testament and on various subjects

pertaining to Scripture, to Christian doctrine, and to the Christian church in general. He translated the whole New Testament into Hebrew, in order to make it more effective in bringing the Jews to Christ. A number of editions have appeared, and the book is published and circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In his *Biblical Psychology* we have an application of psychology to Scripture; and in other works evidence is given of an interest in philosophical studies, particularly in their relation to the Bible and to Judaism. His investigations have also made contributions to comparative philology, most of all his researches on the relation of the Semitic to the Indo-Germanic languages. Together with Klaproth, Gesenius, Raumer, and others, he contended that a direct relation between them exists. Among the Christian Semitic scholars he was recognized as best versed in Talmudic and Rabbinical literature, and this extensive knowledge furnished him valuable material for his interpretations of Scripture, and in describing the manners and customs of the Jews.

His works are too numerous to mention here; many of them are well-known, being among the most esteemed books in ministers' libraries. His theological position was conservative, and he was regarded as one of the most prominent leaders of Lutheran orthodoxy. In later years he admitted a number of the results of recent Old Testament criticism, but never went to the extreme of Volke, Graf, Wellhausen, and others of the negative school. His published recent address on the "Gulf between the Old and the Modern Theology," shows that he does not regard this criticism as affecting the position of evangelical Christianity. He himself cherished unshaken faith in Christ and in Scripture—a faith permeating all his writings and consti-

tuting the essence of his devout life. With his great reverence for Scripture as a divine revelation he united the freedom of the Christian respecting the mere letter of Scripture. Among the eminent critical scholars of the Old Testament he was one of the most conservative; but conservatism no longer has the same meaning as in the days of Hengstenberg. Like so many other German scholars, Delitzsch retained his mental vigor and freshness till old age, and he was cut off in the midst of his labors. For 48 years he was an academic teacher, having begun his career as such in 1842 at Leipsic, where he spent some 27 years as *Privat-Docent* and professor.

German Socialism.

THE elections of Feb. 20 showed a startling increase of socialistic votes. In Berlin, called the city of intelligence, where the government and the police authorities have strictly enforced the socialistic law to prevent the spread of socialistic agitation, the social democrats cast 126,522 votes, over 20,000 more than all the other parties. The government parties had only 36,593 votes; the liberals as many as 75,317. That with its enormous power and all its officials the government has so small a constituency is very significant. Indeed, the vote throughout the empire has been interpreted as a severe condemnation of Bismarck's internal policy. The government parties have lost about one million votes since 1887, and the government is no longer able to secure a majority from these parties. The election was a decided victory for the more liberal elements in politics.

The growth of socialism in Berlin affords an interesting study. In 1867 there were 67 votes; in 1871, 2,056; 1874, 11,279; 1878, 56,146; 1884, 68,582; 1887, 93,335; 1890, 126,522.

Just before the election Dr. Treitschke, one of the eminent professors

of the University and Ranke's successor as Prussian historian, spoke of the evil effects that would be produced if the social democrats should cast one million votes at the election. But instead of that number they cast 1,341,587, a larger number than any other party except the Catholics. The growth of socialists in the empire is indicated by the following votes: 1871, 124,655; 1884, 550,000; 1887, 763,128; 1890, 1,341,587. From 1871 till the present, the social democrats in parliament have been as follows: 1, 9, 12, 9, 12, 22, 11, 35, the number now elected.

One need but study these figures in order to appreciate the fact that the socialistic problems are at present the weightiest in the internal affairs of Germany. And yet while these figures are so startling they cannot tell the whole truth. The encouragement and strength thus given to socialism no figures can express. The socialists feel their power and know that they need but exert it to gain their ends. The laboring classes constitute the majority; and all the powers of agitation and organization are used to make them a unit. The strength of the movement is in the large cities. Already in 1887 the votes cast in the 14 largest German cities were 36.7 socialistic, which percentage has greatly increased now. But the movement has also spread to the country. There its effects are not only felt in the dissatisfaction of the masses, but also in their increasing alienation from the church. Past success has made the leaders more determined and hopeful, and they are inspired by it to work the more vigorously for the final victory.

The Emperor has not only called an international congress to consider the problems of labor and the protection of laborers, but he is also intent on securing the best means for meeting the just demands of the workingmen. It is admitted that

they have just grievances, and that these give them their strength. From the Emperor through all classes of society the social questions are now studied as never before. And not a few are surprised that in Christian lands the rich could live in ease and luxury while entirely ignoring the wretched condition and the just claims of millions of their brethren about them. Most astonishing of all is it that the church and the ministers of Christ's religion showed so little heart for the needs of the masses crying to heaven for relief—and to be avenged.

Now the church is being aroused—now when it is, perhaps, too late—at least too late to do the work it might have done years ago. The complaints of socialists against the church are bitter, because they believe it was leagued with the wealthier classes against them, and because it left them in their suffering until they arose to help themselves. What the church attempts now is interpreted as the result of the dangers which threaten the church and society rather than as the product of love for the poor and suffering. Socialism looks upon Christians as the priest and Levite who pass by the stripped and wounded man who had fallen among thieves, while socialists are the Samaritans who came to his help.

The religious journals are full of discussions of socialistic problems. Some, of course, continue to indulge in vain denunciations of socialism, without thoroughly studying the movement and without discriminating between the right and the wrong in it. Many are now anxious to find in the church remedial agencies; but their discovery and application are difficult. Laborers have proved themselves more powerful in affecting laborers than all the influences exerted by the pulpit, the church, and the wealthier classes. The Catholic Bishop Kopp has appealed

to the churches of his diocese to organize labor associations, his aim being to have the laborers instructed in moral and spiritual affairs, but alas, in matters pertaining to their temporal welfare. He regards it an urgent duty on the part of Christians to promote the right relation between capital and labor. Protestants are also urging the formation of similar associations. In many parts of the land the church finds that its efforts for the organization of workingmen came too late or can effect but little, since the socialists have so largely alienated the laborers from the church. And then it is painfully evident that the machinery of the established church is too unwieldy to inaugurate promptly the extensive and effective measures required to meet the needs of the hour.

Catholics have thus far dealt more successfully with the social problems than the Protestants. This is mainly due to the unity and authority of the Catholic Church. For direct, united and universal action the government of that church is without a parallel. The Pope has called upon the entire church to make a specialty of the demands and needs of the poorer classes. In its eleemosynary institutions Catholicism has the means of great influence over the poor. Statistics show that the number of Socialistic votes is much smaller in Catholic than in Protestant districts. In the formation of Catholic labor associations German Catholicism has been quite successful. There are 232; the statistics of 232 associations are known; they contain 52,239 members.

The class distinctions promote class hatred. Hence religious authorities appeal to Christians to avoid everything which brings into marked contrast the difference between rich and poor. In Berlin the rented pew system is vigorously attacked, because it is a discrimination

in favor of the rich. A significant order has just been issued by the Consistory of Berlin. Pastors are ordered to inform the girls who are to be confirmed that they must appear in a black dress on the day of confirmation. Some of the daughters of the rich heretofore appeared in white, which the poor could not afford. If any now appear in white at confirmation the pastor is ordered to refuse to confirm them. The aim is to wipe out all distinctions between rich and poor in the house of God.

To say nothing of the government, it is evident that a crisis of the most serious character has come upon the church in respect to social matters. All its powers must be exerted to the utmost to make good its past neglect, to retrieve its losses, and to meet the overwhelming demands now made. Nothing is clearer than that the neglect of the poor on the part of Christians, so long bitterly complained of, must cease, and that their temporal as well as their spiritual welfare must be placed on the hearts of the followers of Christ, as it lay on the heart of the Master. Above all, the deep love and earnest sympathy of the Gospel are needed. While it would breed despair to underestimate the power of the Gospel to meet the needs of the masses, it will likewise be fatal to underestimate the ability, the resoluteness and the courage of the socialistic leaders and of their supreme power over the masses.

Notes.

Russia.—From a recent French work on religion in Russia the following facts are taken :

Next to the Jews, the families of the "black" or lower clergy furnish, in proportion to their numbers, the largest contingent of Nihilists.

The chiefs of the Nihilist party have thought of forming an alliance with the principal representatives of

"Raskol," that is, the party of the extreme orthodox dissenters from the national church, being a strange combination of religious conservatism and revolutionary atheism.

Sontaief, who converted Tolstoi to his religion of non-resistance, was a peasant. His doctrine has several features in common with Buddhism.

Aside from the idolators of Siberia there are thirty million subjects of Russia whose religion is foreign, namely: 1,500,000 Armenians, 5-6 million Lutherans, 9-10 million Catholics, 3-4 million Jews, and about 10 million Mohammedans. Buddhists abound in Siberia and extend even to the borders of the Volga.

Italy.—Luthard's *Kirchenzeitung* says it is easy to determine the religious future of Italy if the liberal press of the country is made the authority for settling the question. According to that we have on the one hand anti-religious culture and on the other a mass of religious superstition which plays no part in public life. The culture superior to religious prejudice is declared sure of final victory over the religion of fanatics and fools. But liberalism is always unable to estimate aright the value of religion, and the Catholic church undoubtedly will derive the benefit of this inability to appreciate the religious needs. Only by a conservative Christian government can the papacy be successfully resisted. The ruling parties in Italy are neither Christian nor conservative, and the strong language used against them by the Popes shows that the curia does not fear the government. The true hope of Italy is in the promotion of evangelical principles.

Dr. Adolf Harnack.—Professor Harnack has been elected a member of the Academy of Sciences in Berlin, the highest scientific and learned association in Berlin, dating its ori-

gin to the philosopher Leibnitz. It consists of two sections, the first called mathematico-physical, the second philosophico-historical. To the first belong men like Helmholtz, Du Bois-Reymond, Virchow, Hofmann, and others eminent in science, while the other contains the names of Zeller, Mommsen, Curtius, and a number of linguists and historians. Heretofore the theological faculty was represented only by Dillmann, and he was not chosen as a theologian, but because he is an orientalist and the first living authority on the Æthiopic language. Harnack has been chosen for his services in the history of the church and of dogmas. It is claimed that his method of historical research has significance for other than purely theological disciplines. He is the youngest member of the Academy, not yet having attained his thirty-ninth year. In recent decades only one instance occurs where a member elected was still younger, that was in the case of H. Diels, who was but thirty-three years of age.

When some years ago the philosophers Zeller and Harms were elected members of the Academy, it was interpreted as an evidence that empirical science was becoming more ready to recognize the claims of philosophy. Perhaps the election of Hamack indicates greater willingness on the part of science and secular scholarship to recognize theology than has been apparent for some time. Formerly the number of theologians in the Academy was larger than has been the case for many years. Schleiermacher and Neander were members, and during last century many theologians were elected, among them Speuer, the leader of Pietism.

Dr. W. J. Mangold.—The theological faculty of Bonn, which last year lost Professor Christlieb, has now met another loss by the death of Professor Mangold. He taught

in Marburg from 1852 till 1872, in which year he went to Bonn as professor of exegesis of the N. T. He died in his 65th year in the midst of his labors. During the winter he lectured on the Sermon on the Mount, on the Synoptical Gospels, and on Biblical Theology of the N. T. Among his published works are discussions of Romans and of the Pastoral Epistles. He was a contributor to Herzog's Encyclopædia and to Schenke's Bible Lexicon, and edited the third edition of Bleek's Introduction to the N. T.

Imperial Utterances.—On many occasions Emperor William has given expression to his desire to see religion promoted among all classes. For attendance at divine service he himself sets the example. Besides the Dom, which is the Court-Church, he is seen most frequently in Trinity Church, where Dryander preaches, and in the Garrison Church, where Emil Frommel is pastor. During the voyage to North Cape last summer the Emperor himself on Sunday conducted on board the ship the religious exercises prescribed for the marine service. In a recent address at a banquet, referring to his travels, he said: "Whoever at sea has stood on the bridge of the ship, and alone, under God's starry heavens, has entered his own heart, cannot deny the value of such a voyage. I wish that many of my countrymen might experience such an hour, in which a man gives an account to himself of his aims and of his attainments. That would cure undue self-exaltation, which is needed by all of us."

Significant is likewise the imperial order respecting the instruction of cadets. The memory is not to be burdened with historic details, but especial attention is to be devoted to the study of the age and to the condition of the fatherland. While faith and piety are the aim of religious instruction, particular stress is

placed on the ethical element, be- tolerance and love for our fellow-
cause it makes supreme the spirit of men.

CURRENT ENGLISH THOUGHT.

BY JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., CITY TEMPLE, LONDON.

IN some parts of the British Islands we are by no means as tranquil as we might be on the subject of orthodoxy. There are always young and ardent minds arising with new propositions and bold ventures, and there are always ready for service mature and obstinate minds ready to stand by old paths and venerated standards. The difficulty is to keep both sides in Christian temper. Religion is even worse than politics for exasperating the minds of men when they once betake themselves to controversy. It is pitiable to read the various papers which have been recently published in which able, enlightened, and honest men are referred to in terms of intolerable contempt. I, for one, earnestly believe that it is wholly unnecessary to be violent in order to be orthodox, and distinctly a breach of Christian manners to adopt the language of slang when characterizing honest men who have even blundered in theological speculation. But this is the condition all the world over, that once let an orthodox critic come across a heterodox believer and his words are likely to be stings, or to be so unkindly expressed as to divest themselves of all helpful influence. How is this? Is there anything in orthodoxy that spoils the temper? Cannot men who are discussing the highest questions open to the human mind conduct themselves peaceably and hopefully towards one another? If I could read the various papers and judge them solely by their tone, I should in many instances credit the heterodox writers with Christianity and utterly throw out the orthodox writers as men who simply do not know how to behave themselves in decent society. There is

no man upon earth who can be superior to a Scotchman when he is of the right quality. He simply stands alone in largeness and grandeur of nature. But let the Scotchman once get wrong, let him be excited on theological matters, and no man upon earth can use more rasping and occasionally unjust exaggeration. Obstinacy is a characteristic of the Scotch mind. When the obstinacy is in the right direction it is invaluable; when it drives its victim in the wrong direction it is simply intolerable. Personally I look to Scotland for a new theological reformation. I do not want it to come to-day or to-morrow; it must come slowly, gradually, silently; but when it does come there will be no mistake as to its completeness and reality.

Meditating upon this matter of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, creed and no creed, church standards, and the like, I accidentally came upon an expression of opinion by the venerable Dr. James McCosh, of Princeton. I have always held Dr. McCosh in the highest esteem, in view of his brilliant character and great mental capacity, to say nothing of his long-continued and most able service to the cause of truth. In *Our Day* Dr. McCosh has discoursed upon the matter of creeds in this way: "I confess that I should like to have in the Presbyterian church a shorter and simpler creed than the Westminster Confession." That is exactly what I have been contending for. Shortness and simplicity are by no means inconsistent with definiteness and thoroughness. Highly wrought metaphysical statements can only be designed for a few minds, and indeed can only be mastered and appropriated by such.

What we want is something that can be appreciated almost instantly by the common mind of the church. I therefore agree with Dr. McCosh when he continues: "At the same time our creed, be it shorter or be it longer, must contain all the saving truths embraced in the consensus of the churches." In this sense shortness would be only condensation. I am quite of opinion that in a dozen or twenty lines a man like Dr. McCosh could put down, in unmistakable language, all the points which the evangelical church would consider to be really vital. Dr. McCosh adds: "If the divines of the 17th century have used an unguarded expression; if they have sanctioned a doubtful doctrine, or stated a truth imperfectly, let us correct it as speedily as possible." Dr. McCosh may have had in his mind an admission which he made earlier in his article, namely: "There are some passages in the Confession of Faith and in the Larger Catechism of which it may be doubted whether they are founded on the Word of God, and which are offensive in their expression." This is a noble statement by a noble man, and it ought to make the way easy for such readjustment and restatements as would relieve the conscience without lessening the responsibility of many earnest students and ministers.

Not long ago we had some remarkable revelations with regard to the use that is now made of certain city parochial churches. It appears from statistics which can be relied upon, that there are 60 churches in the city, and the total value of the livings is £41,814. The population in 1861 was 113,387. [It should be remembered by American readers that in speaking of "the city of London" we are speaking of the small central portion of the metropolis which is technically so designated.] In 1881—that is, 20 years

later—the population had fallen to 50,579, and the probability is that even that number is now considerably reduced. The church accommodation provided by the churches of the technical city amounts to 32,455 sittings, and to occupy these sittings there are only 6,731 people, even if every one of them went to church. But this accommodation includes such buildings as St. Paul's Cathedral and the Temple Church, which, if omitted, would leave the church-going population at 3,853, nearly one-half of whom are officials, choristers and school children. An analysis of the attendance upon city churches results in some curious discoveries; for example, the congregation of one church in the city is given as two; in another case the average attendance is four, and in another eight. It is stated, on unquestionable authority, that there are 12 churches which are attended by less than 25 persons, 17 others where the attendance is below 50. One church in particular has room for 700 attendants, and on the day on which the statistics were taken its congregation amounted to the astounding total of four! There is a grand church in Newgate street known as Christ Church; it was built for 2,000 worshippers, and on census-day it was occupied by 61. My American readers will naturally feel considerable pity for the incumbents of such deserted edifices. They will wonder how such abandoned parishes can sustain a ministry at all. I must, therefore, in order to relieve their commiseration, remind them that the incomes of the clergy are not dependent upon voluntary or popular subscriptions in all cases. One of the all but deserted churches compensates its clergyman to the extent of £2,400 a year; his whole parish includes only 327 inhabitants, 150 of whom occasionally attend his ministry. Another

cleric receives £2,000 a year, while his congregation does not exceed 80. Seven churches in the city receive more than £1,000 a year each. This is a state of things which could not exist in a new country like America, and if it did exist there it would soon be put an end to. I do not begrudge any clergyman his income, but where the clergyman himself does nothing for it, I think it becomes a public question as to whether the hard-working curates of a national church ought not to receive some benefit from what ought to be regarded as national property. I heard a dignitary of the Church of England say the other day that, in his opinion, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that one-half of the clergy of the Church of England are almost in a state of starvation. The dignitary in question was speaking very hardly of the democracy of England; he had hardly a good word to say of the working classes or agricultural laborers; whereupon I ventured to remind him that for any number of centuries he liked to name these very people had been under the care of the clergy of the church of England, and we had a right to fasten responsibility upon the clergy for the state of the people. He was fair enough to admit that this reasoning was good, and he went further and declared that it was unquestionable that up to a comparatively recent period the incumbent of the parish took very little notice of anybody beside the squire.

This reminds me that there is another aspect of the position of the Established Church which must not be ignored. As a Nonconformist I gladly admit that in many instances, perhaps in countless instances, the clergy of the Established Church were never working so hard as they are working to-day. I cannot take an optimistic view of the prospects
* of English Nonconformity. I know

that in this matter there are leading men among us who would directly contradict my estimate of the facts of the case. The English Church is improving its preaching, is extending its missions, and is making its influence felt in the consideration of social problems. The High Church party is out of sight the leading influence in the Establishment. The Evangelical party has not among it a single man of predominating power. Once that party could boast the possession of some of the most famous orators in modern Anglicanism. Such men as Henry Melville, Dean Close, Dean Boyd, Canon McNeile and Canon Stoyle, of Manchester—by personal magnetism, by spotless character, by oratorical ability, by apostolic zeal, these men succeeded in wielding a very high, and often a very noble influence. There is not a single name on the Evangelical clergy list that comes within sight of these great leaders. The High Church party wisely avails itself of the Evangelical element. It must not be supposed that High Church preachers do not preach the Gospel, in the sense of laying down with great earnestness and simplicity such fundamental doctrines as the fall of man, the redemption of the world by the cross of Christ, and the essential influence of the Holy Ghost. I have heard the most famous preacher in the High Church pulpit, and, but for certain tones and one or two occasional references, I should have thought I was listening to some Methodist revival preacher, or to a man like your own Mr. Moody—full of fire, holy passion and apostolic consecration. I am not sure that the English Nonconformist is less disliked by the Evangelical than by the High Church party. The Evangelical party has no love for Nonconformity. As to personal friendship and social intercourse, there is no need whatever to complain, yet I

have noticed that even where the intercourse has been most cordial there has been an undertone of conscious superiority on the part of the Established Churchman. It is impossible to get this virus of patronage out of the blood of the clerics. I do not hesitate to blame Dissenters themselves a good deal in this matter. It is too true, many Dissenters are only too glad to court church recognition and to accord to the establishment honors which belong to the Christian Church as such, apart altogether from national status or profession. The effect is that the churchman is a sacerdotalist even in the very act of claiming to be an Evangelical. His sacerdotalism may differ in some respects from sacerdotalism as usually recognized, but in the heart of it there is a priestly element which is subtle and powerful. The way in which even Evangelical clergymen make inquiry regarding Nonconformist habits and practices would be remarkably innocent, and even Chinese-like, but for a suspicion that the innocence is too infantile to be regarded with approval. Nonconformists have only to do their own work and carry on their own missions energetically in order to establish their claim to the attention and confidence of the age. But this they are called upon to do, and the English Church has a right to see that Nonconformity can prove its ability to overtake the religious wants of the community. The theory of the national Church is that it goes everywhere, into every hole and corner, and supplies the means of grace to people who would otherwise be left in a state of heathenism. I do not say that the fact corresponds with the theory; it is enough to indicate what the theory professes to be and to do. When, therefore, English Nonconformity stands up and claims attention, the Church has a right to ask what it

can do, what it proposes to do, and what it has in reality done. Nonconformity, therefore, has not only to conduct a controversy, but to establish a character and to acquire an influence by large and thorough service.

Two distinct statements might to-day be made with regard to the condition of the English pulpit, using that term in its completest sense. It might be said with truth that never were there greater and more useful preachers in the English pulpit than can be found to-day. They are men of learning, men of eloquence, men of consecration, men who really live in their work, because they really love it. On the other hand, it might be said that never was the English pulpit so burdened with incapable aspirants as to-day. Men who are totally without divine fire try to obtain congregations, and the people will not respond to their spiritless appeals. They are men of a certain measure of technical culture; they acquire a knowledge of alphabets, of languages, and of philosophy; in conversation they are enlightened and full of resource, but the moment they enter the pulpit they seem to leave behind them every element of power. The people will not receive them. In all such matters the people are excellent judges. They do not care for pedantic controversies, for ever-contending theologies, and for hairsplit distinctions; they follow the men who speak broadly and generously to the heart in the name of the Cross of Christ; men of sympathy, men of tenderness and men of large experience. The bookworm has no place in the pulpit. The hermit must keep to his own monastery. To-day England is calling out for men who understand the meaning of hard work, practical difficulty, daily sorrow, and the mute necessities of aching and troubled hearts. There

is indeed a complaint that men of so-called culture are deserted, while men who can lay no claim to technical education are followed by great throngs. Personally, I have to testify that I never knew the people leave any man's ministry because it was too great. I have known pedants left, and have rejoiced in their abandonment. Such men do not know what culture is. They have a certain narrow conception of it, but in its larger inclusions, in its fullest outgoings and capabilities, they know nothing. A man may know all the alphabets under the sun and yet not be a man of culture. It must be understood that culture is a far larger word than scholarship, and that education is an infinitely completer word than intelligence. The question will always be, What does the culture come to? What is the intelligence worth in the practical ministry of the Word? Archaic scholars have their work to do, and by all means let them do it; but do not let them imagine that they are called upon to teach the common

people. Other men are called to do this work, and are proving the reality or the divinity of their call by the results of their ministry. It is pitiable to hear how school-mastering is put upon a level with philosophy, and how pedantic acquisitions are matched against the gifts of God in the form of spiritual genius and spiritual expression. But we need not trouble ourselves with these things, for they are not to be settled by bandying words to and fro. I have always had confidence that the people would settle these things for themselves. The people are fickle, but given proper time and space they always come to a true estimate of the men who seek to win their attention to the highest subjects. I have faith in the people. As a man who owes nothing to anybody but the people, I must be permitted to speak a word for my own order, and to thank God that the ministry of the Gospel is evidently not in the hands of pedants but in the hands of men who are hungering for the bread of life.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

The Importance to the Preacher of Knowing.

BY WILLIAM C. WILKINSON, D.D.

It follows, from the definition of invention, formerly submitted by the present writer in the pages of this periodical, as being the process of finding in things that we know adaptations for the effecting of things that we purpose, that, given a certain endowment of the faculty to invent, the prosperity of the process of inventing, in any particular case, will depend solely on the amount of appropriate knowledge in possession of the inventor.

Solely on this condition, we say, and yet so absolute a statement requires to be qualified somewhat. Mere quantity of appropriate knowledge held in possession by the inventor, is not all that is necessary.

The knowledge possessed, besides being suitable—that is, besides containing potential adaptations to the purpose had in view by the orator, must also be well at the orator's command.

It is his inventive faculty, no doubt, actually exerted in invention, that must chiefly be relied upon to give to the orator his needed mastery over the things that he knows, for the uses of his oratory. But there is such a thing as making knowledge available for practical use in oratoric invention, in ways other than the exercise itself of inventing in oratory. That exercise, though certainly the best way, is not the only way. Familiarity with our own knowledge—with our own "knowledges," one feels like following Dr. Storrs in saying—however acquired, is helpful.

We ought, therefore, to form the habit of going frequently over our stock of knowledge so as to have it all freshly familiar to us.

This we can do in many ways. We can reflect. We can reflect, pen in hand. The pen is a marvellous magnet to draw thought out of the brain. We can employ the law of association of ideas. We can seek likeness, we can seek difference, we can trace relation of cause and effect, we can perceive nearness or remoteness in time, the same in place, we can combine by synthesis, we can separate by analysis. But we can reflect aloud and in company—that is to say, we can converse.

We just now said that the pen had singular power to make the brain fruitful of thought. But the pen, magical as that instrument is for this purpose, is yet not equal to the tongue. One of the most useful accordingly of all methods for quickening thought, and preparing the bullion of knowledge for mintage into the current coin of expression (a large part, the largest part, it is well constantly to remember, of the orator's business), is conversing. Oratory is itself only an art of conversing, in which the orator talks not simply to, but also with, his audience; they replying to his speech in a thousand silent ways which he, if he be truly an orator, understands and regards. The conversation is conducted in a strain of discourse on the part of the orator, transformed and adapted, certainly, in elevation of tone, in dignity of diction, in volume of personal force employed, to the just demands of the particular occasion, but remaining, nevertheless, throughout in idea a true conversation.

Valuable to the orator as is an ample store of material in knowledge upon which to draw for invention, it still must be borne in mind that the process of accumulating the material, the act itself of investiga-

tion, as distinguished from invention proper, so far from being a part of the strictly oratoric function, is even an exercise of the mental powers not favorable to the discipline of the orator. The student's habit, and the orator's habit—these are two things entirely different. They are indeed in a relation of some hostility to each other. The student acquires, and the orator imparts. To get, and to give, are obviously somewhat contrasted activities of the mind. You, of course, must get, in order to be able to give. But the process of getting is so unlike the process of giving that the orator is not helped at all as orator, but hindered rather, by performing the function of student. Hence, chiefly, perhaps, arises that phenomenon so often remarked upon, the overburdening of talent with acquirement.

Still, student the orator must be. He cannot escape his necessity. The only thing for him to do in the case is to reduce the injurious effect of study on his habits as an orator to the smallest possible amount. This he is to accomplish, not by studying the least possible, but by studying a great deal in the least injurious way possible. He must study *as an orator*. That is, he must never allow himself to forget, in the course of his acquiring, that he is acquiring in order that he may impart. He must study, not as a student, but as an orator. Not as one who desires to know, but as one who desires to tell.

This method of study, properly pursued, will not lead to any superficiality of attainment. On the contrary, it may be made to conduce to exactness and thoroughness of comprehension on the part of the student. The man who tasks himself to learn a thing so that he may report that thing, will find it needful often to look a second and a third time at what otherwise he would have passed over with one hasty glance,

There is, to be sure, a temptation close at hand here. If I read to find arguments *rather* than to find truth, I may be misled. Against this danger, however, it is possible to guard one's self. The safeguard lies in this maxim: Read to find truth *and* to find true arguments for the truth found.

For the preacher, at least, such a course is obligatory. He happily has no necessary, unescapable professional relations that can confuse his moral sense, and make him think it right to struggle for victory instead of for truth. Of course, I know that also the minister has his personal interests to be in him a bribe and seduction to conscience. But his ostensible engagements as minister, what might be called his professional engagements, all bind him to be loyal to truth, and to truth alone. The preacher, therefore, by eminence among orators, is reprehensible if he practices ways not consistent with supreme regard for the truth. Let him study accordingly to invent arguments indeed, but always to invent true arguments, sound arguments, and not merely to invent effective arguments. The preacher must not only convince, he must convince of the truth. And he must not only convince *of* the truth, he must convince *by* the truth.

With this stern restriction laid upon the exercise of his faculty to invent, the minister may pursue his investigation safely—indeed, in order to make himself the best orator possible, he must so pursue his investigation—with a constant conscious purpose present to his mind of using as an orator what he discovers as a student. He will thus most successfully counteract in his own case the tendency of the recluse, studious habit to unfit its subject for contact with men in the eminently practical relation of the orator.

The utility to the preacher of becoming thoroughly conversant with

the acquired contents of his own mind, as we have now been recommending that he do, is too obvious to need further enforcement. The orator sustains to his knowledge something like the relation of the mechanic to his material. A cabinet-maker has a certain stock of material in his shop. An order comes in for the making of some piece of furniture. He says: "I have just the proper material for that work. I was overhauling my stock only yesterday, for another purpose, and I came across exactly the thing that I want for this." That cabinet-maker's recently revived familiarity with his material, helps him. He knew before, we will say, that that piece of wood was there; for he had bought it. But now he recollects it, and simultaneously perceives its adaptation to its use. It is somewhat thus that the orator profits by fresh acquaintanceship with his accumulations of knowledge. You cannot overhaul your various knowledges, and take new account of them, too often.

It is, in addition, to be observed, that this frequent manipulation, so strongly enjoined upon you, of your acquired facts and ideas in reality a process of adding to their sum. For instance, if you know this, and also that, then if, by comparison of the two things known, you perceive their likeness, you not only know those two things themselves better than before, but you know a third thing additional, namely, that those two resemble each other. The like is true if the collation is one of contrast rather than of comparison. If by analysis of a thought you discover that it contains certain elements, then you know one thing more than before, namely, that such and such elements make up that thought. The thought itself is better known, and, besides this, there is known now the analysis of the thought. A similar truth holds of all the va-

rious processes of reflection. You knew terms severally, before you reflected. Now you know, besides the terms by themselves, the relations of the terms to each other. And knowledge of relations is quite as important to the orator, as knowledge of the several things related. For what the orator finally deals with is, relations, rather than facts or ideas. More truly, it is facts or ideas in their relations. The orator's whole work in invention, it will profit him constantly to remember, is finding relations of facts or ideas; that is, relations of adapt- edness in what he knows to the bringing about with his hearers of what he purposes.

Familiarized knowledge, knowl- edge elaborated in processes of thought, is accordingly in fact aug- mented knowledge. It is not merely the same knowledge better known. It is also more knowledge. We might then return to our first statement on this point, and make the state ment over again *without* the qualification. We now simply ex- plain without qualifying, and repeat, that any particular process of ora- torical invention (a certain fixed en- dowment of the inventive faculty in the orator being presupposed) will be prosperous strictly in proportion to the amount of knowledge, appro- priate to the purpose in view pos- sessed by the inventor.

Hence follows with irresistible force a certain practical conclusion: It is of the highest importance to the orator that he be a widely and well accomplished man. There is nothing whatever within the range of human knowledge that it may not sometime behoove the orator to have learned. He should cultivate a spirit of large and catholic hospi- tality for facts and ideas. Nothing, however apparently remote, but may serve his turn. The orator will himself grow with the growth of his knowledge, and breadth and

height and fullness and weight of personality are a great force for the orator. To be a voice merely is a most unworthy ideal for the orator. Be a man, too, behind the voice— and ever greater than that.

And yet there is a sense of true self-abnegation in which the preach- er may justly and profitably think of himself as only a voice. "The voice of one crying" in announce- ment of Christ, this John the Bap- tist declared himself to be. But of this same great simple soul, who thus disparaged himself to a voice, what was the testimony borne by Christ? "Verily I say unto you among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."

Desirable, however, as it is for the orator that his knowledge be multifar- ious, it is hardly less desirable that he prosecute his pursuit of knowledge upon a plan graduating his method- ical attention to its different kinds, according to their probable compar- ative utility to him for the purposes of his own peculiar office. In sub- sequent papers we shall venture to make some suggestions on the sub- ject of such a graduating plan for the acquisition of knowledge by the preacher.

The Pastor Among His People.

BY J. E. TWITCHELL, D. D., NEW HAVEN, CONN.

NO. I.

THE word "pastor" or "pastors" is found nine times in Scripture—eight times in the Old Testament and once in the New. It invariably means a "shepherd," one who watches over and cares for the flock—leading, guiding, defending, as far as possi- ble providing food and shelter for the sheep, and seeking to save them from harm of every kind.

One of the most beautiful and im- pressive scenes of Scripture record is that of the Bethlehem shepherds "keeping watch over their flocks by

night," when an angel in the sky announced the birth of Christ, and then a great chorus of the heavenly host sang, "On earth peace and good-will towards men."

It is easy in imagination to picture those hillsides where the flocks were sleeping, and where the wakeful shepherds were watching over them when the sweetest anthem this world ever heard echoed in the sky above those hills; easy, too, with our knowledge of shepherd-life in Palestine eighteen hundred years ago, to picture those same shepherds, in the morning leading forth their flocks to the greenest pastures and most refreshing waters that could be found. We, however, get our truest and most comprehensive view of the relation of a shepherd to his flock, when we remember that whatever the size of the flock, he could call each one of the sheep by name, and that each one of the sheep knew the voice of the shepherd and followed him, when they would give no heed to the voice of a stranger.

Pastor! SHEPHERD! This is the pastor's office, and his work to *shepherd the flock* committed to his care.

In speaking or thinking of the minister's vocation, we are not to forget that he is to be a "preacher of the Word;" nor are we to forget that no minister, for any length of time, can maintain himself in any prominent pulpit of the land unless he "feed the flock of God," bringing forth "things new and old" from the marvellous treasure-house of truth. It is equally true, however, and should not be forgotten, that no minister, be his sermons never so impressive and profound, ever did *best work* unless he was a "pastor" or "shepherd," as well as preacher of the Word.

For a preacher to meet the wants of his people he *must know* them— their joys, sorrows, hopes, fears, struggles, triumphs, surroundings,

besettings, what their difficulties are, what they are thinking about—in a word, their *spiritual condition*. Here is where many a minister fails. He lives apart from his people—does not mingle with them, does not know them and thus cannot adapt himself, to their condition.

The great doctrines of Scripture may be preached with all earnestness and fidelity; the great principles of the gospel expounded and urged with more or less of power upon a people of whom little if anything is known; but if the divine message in any large measure is to accomplish its mission, it must have adaptation to the present experiences, and the present demands of those addressed. Hence the great importance of a preacher *knowing his people*—to say nothing of the additional interest his people will take in him and in his message because they recognize him as personally interested in them.

This paper is written especially for young ministers who are just entering on their work, and for older ministers who are about to begin work in a new field. Before assuming these new duties and large responsibilities, they should, if possible, secure an accurate roll of all the church members, and of all the families connected with the parish. It is a sad mistake and a great misfortune to begin pastoral work without some such roll. Scarce anything is more embarrassing than for a pastor to go hunting for his people, not knowing who they are, or where they live or anything about them. If the pastor's parish be a *country* one, the whole definitely-outlined field belonging to him for care and cultivation, then this roll to which I refer is less essential. But even then he should know as much as possible about the parish before he begins to explore it. If the parish be a *city* one, including many different families on many different streets,

mixed up with members of other parishes, some with slight attachment to his own or any other church some just come, and some about to go, then it is of exceeding importance for him to have a complete church and parish directory in hand before he enters upon his work or as soon as possible thereafter; of exceeding importance also for him to be informed of the exact relations of these different families and persons to the church of which he is pastor.

It is possible for a minister in the beginning of his ministry among his people to be misinformed concerning them, and thus be prejudiced for or against them; possible also for him to know too much of truth about them, and thus be unfitted to meet them as he ought. The danger, however, is that because he knows too little about them, he will make many a serious blunder. In almost all churches and parishes there are those who, from one cause or another, have become alienated from the church, are only occasional attendants upon its services, or are wholly neglecting them. The pastor should be made acquainted with all such cases, and be given any points concerning them which may be of service to him as he seeks to win them back.

We will now suppose this church and parish directory in hand, and these facts in his possession. As soon as possible after entering the field, he should seek his people in their homes and places of business. This is a matter of *prime importance*. Shall he take one of his deacons or one of the prominent members with him on his first round among the people? That depends. If his object be merely to be aided in finding his people, ascertaining where they live and securing an introduction to them, so that afterwards he shall be able easily to find their homes and recognize them as he meets them, then a wise pilot is helpful. But if

his purpose be to become acquainted with his people, to enter at once into their confidence and affection, and put himself into personal sympathy with them, so as in the very beginning of his ministry to meet their peculiar wants, then he had better *go alone*, and take his time, remaining long enough in each home to see something of the home life, to become familiar with the children's names and faces; long enough to show an interest in their personal toils and trials—long enough, in a word, to make them feel that he is to be their *pastor*, as well as their *preacher*—a real friend and brother in whom they can confide, and to whom they can look for counsel in all matters temporal and spiritual. I have tried both ways—have gone with the deacon, and have gone alone, and am free to say that I prefer the latter plan. It seems more voluntary, more friendly, more unofficial. It often saves embarrassment to one party or the other, perhaps to both; and it gives opportunity for words that would not be wisely spoken in the presence of another.

Shall the pastor on this first round among his people introduce the subject of personal religion and pray with them? That depends! If the way is open speak freely of the church and of soul relation to Christ. If there be found peculiar cases of trial or bereavement, and prayer seems invited or especially appropriate, *pray*. Many a most sacred union between pastor and persons or families has been insured on their first meeting, through wise Christian counsel and the tender committal of cares and sorrows unto God. Here often is a golden opportunity. But never in this first visit or in any subsequent one dwell on the church or any personal affairs if they are found *unwelcome*.

I have known many a minister, meaning well, anxious to prove him-

self a faithful shepherd lose all influence over individuals and families by dwelling on the darker providences of God with which they have been visited, or pressing the subject of personal religion, or by assuming to pray with the family when such things were an intrusion. Time, place, conditions, surroundings, are all to be considered. The pastor's object, first, last, always, should be to *make friends* of his people, so that he can influence them for good. When they have learned to love him he can lead them—never before, never otherwise. He is not to be their lord, nor their father-confessor;

nor is he to sit in judgment on them. He is the rather to be their counselor, teacher, guide, comforter, "*shepherd*," so ascertaining their needs as that he can truly be their servant, helping them to bear burdens, and leading them into large realms of satisfying, saving truth. If he keep this thought in mind, and in all his association with the people work with this end in view, he will be a "*pastor*" unto them.

In our next paper we will note the different classes of parishioners found in almost every parish, and suggest methods of shepherding each class.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Criticism and Reply.

In the HOMILETIC for February, page 160, Dr. Crosby gives a very ingenious article upon Michael and Gabriel. It is easily to be imagined that Christ might appear to His people as the "first of the chief princes;" for elsewhere "the angel of the covenant" is generally recognized as the Messiah. But will Dr. Crosby please explain Jude ix? To say that Christ "*durst* not bring against the devil a railing accusation," is hardly consistent with the Scripture truth that Christ is equal in power with the Father. Besides, would He say, "The Lord rebuke thee," when He was himself the Lord? Would the Son of God speak of himself as one that "*stands in the presence of God?*" (Luke i: 19). The improbability of His announcing His own incarnation adds weight against a *purely imaginative* theory. It does not seem to me at all incredible that the names of two of the angels of God—the chief ones who care for man—should be given, while the names of the subordinate officers of the heavenly host are suppressed.

A. W. LEWIS.

YARMOUTH, N. S.

TO WHICH DR. CROSBY REPLIES.

In reply to the queries of Mr. Lewis I would say:

(1) That "*durst*" as used of the Son of God is not harsh, when the reference is to a sinful act. It is in this sense we say "*God cannot lie.*" We do not reflect on the divine omnipotence in either case.

(2) The Son of God *does* say "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan," in the passage quoted from Zechariah iii: 2, by Jude.

(3) The Son of God *does* stand in the presence of God in Daniel vii: 13. He does the same in the Zechariah passage, where "the angel of the Lord" in verse 1 is "the Lord" of verse 2. Comp. Genesis xviii: 2, 16, 17, 33; Joshua v: 13, vi: 2, and Judges xiii: 21, 22.

The theory is not "*purely imaginative*," when the Son of God is so often called "the angel of the Lord."

HOWARD CROSBY.

The Authority Asked and Given.

MESSRS. EDITORS: Will you please obtain and give reference to authority for Dr. John Hall's statement in the January HOMILETIC REVIEW, page 1, lines 14-18. E. S. LEWIS.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

To which DR. HALL kindly responds:

"As your correspondent may not have the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, at hand I transcribe for him the concise statement of a familiar historical fact which it contains.

J. HALL.

NEW YORK, Feb. 5, 1890.

"Nicholas Breakspere, known in history as Hadrian IV., was the only Englishman who ever filled the papal chair. Urged by the ambition proper to his office, and perhaps by an Englishman's natural pride in being able to confer favors on a King of England, he granted a bull to Henry II., in 1155, which contains this passage:

"There is no doubt, and your nobility acknowledges, that Ireland and all islands upon which Christ the Son of Righteousness has shone, and which have received the teachings of the Christian faith, rightfully belong to the blessed Peter and the most Holy Roman Church."

Believing that Henry was likely to use his power for the good of religion and of the church, he granted Ireland to him, reserving all ecclesiastical rights and making one penny from each house payable yearly to St. Peter.—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th Edition, Vol. xiii., p. 258.

Still Further Criticism.

EDITOR HOMILETIC REVIEW.—I earnestly protest against the passage in the article of Rev. J. S. Ives, in the paragraph at the bottom of page 124. February number. It is in exceedingly bad taste, and a breach of denominational courtesy to intrude such views as that in that place. His assertion in the same paragraph that the child should be treated as a Christian in order that he may become a Christian, is as shockingly lacking in scriptural support as in common sense.

O. G. BUDDINGTON.

WILMINGTON, DEL.

[We give the brother the benefit of his criticism, while we do not think it called for. The offence consists of a quotation giving the views of an individual who happens to favor infant baptism. There is no argument or attempt to use the fact for any denominational purpose—simply a bald statement of it, and that for a very laudable end. We can see no "breach of denominational courtesy" in it. Some little latitude must be given to our writers, and can be given without trenching on distinctively denominational lines. We sincerely seek to conduct this REVIEW on the broad common ground of Evangelical Christianity, with no manifest leanings towards any particular denominational creed or form of church polity.

As to the last item of criticism, so severely expressed, the writer will find multitudes in all denominations, of our most intelligent, thoughtful, and spiritually minded Christians, differing in toto from him. It is too important and too fundamental a subject to be discussed here, or dismissed with an invective.—EDS.]

The Last Supper.

IN October HOMILETIC Dr. Pierson gives, in his "Cluster of Curiosities," an account of Da Vinci and his famous "Last Supper." Is it not a curiosity worthy of remark that the great painter has represented the Lord and his disciples as seated at the table in ordinary chairs of no earlier date than the beginning of our own history in this country? And careful observation will discover another thing that is curious, if not indicative of some peculiar notion in the mind of the painter. It is this: notice that Judas has turned himself around to ask the question, "Is it I?" In doing so, his elbow rests far upon the table. At the point of his elbow, careful observation will discover the salt-cellar overturned,

and the salt spilled out on the table cover. Did Da Vinci have in mind a superstition about the misfortune of spilling salt? Or did the superstition arise from the curiosity in the great picture?

F. H. ROBINSON.

IF, as Dr. Pierson in "A Cluster of Curiosities," in October HOMILETIC, says, "Gen. Lew Wallace wrote 'Ben Hur' to prove the divinity of Christ," he made a mistake by not having Him rise again. Would it not be better for the world, better for the church, better for us all, if Mr. Wallace would write a new edition, or at least another chapter of "Ben Hur" on the resurrection of Christ, thus proving beyond a doubt His divinity. It is proved in the Bible and ought to be in "Ben Hur." C. R. THOMPSON.

EAST HICKORY, PA.

A Question or Two.

In the paper on "The Literature of the Office and Work of the Holy Spirit," in the December HOMILETIC the writer says (page 507), "but the Holy Spirit, to whom I continually pray, I seem not to know."

1st—Is there any authority in the Scriptures for praying to the Holy Spirit? Is there an instance given?

2d—Would it be considered reasonable in a man of culture to "continually pray" to a person or power which he "seems not to know?"

LANSING, IA.

A. L. H.

Our Weak Sermons.

No doubt there are times during a

ministerial career that grave apprehensions are entertained regarding particular sermons which have been given. Sometimes we have thought that our efforts have been at a fearful discount—the sermon has not pleased our imagination. Yet, notwithstanding, we have given it careful preparation and prayer that the Lord may bless and prosper the application of His word to the hearers.

There is no doubt that the evil one if he can suggest by tempting us to undervalue the work of the ministry, and it may be the work of the Sabbath-school, will try to produce in our minds low conceptions of the work in which we are engaged. I may say that when we are weak then we may be strong, if we look to Him who can give us strength and all necessary blessings. Sometimes our apparently weak efforts prove more profitable than we think, and through the weakness of the flesh we are known by Him and He knows our desires and prayers. It is a remarkable fact that there have been times when what we have considered weak and poor has produced, by the blessing of God, remarkable results for good. Thus we are forcibly impressed with the words of inspiration, "that God's word shall not return void, but shall accomplish that which He pleaseth." Seek to live near to Him that He may use us for His glory and make us out of weakness strong.

(REV.) THOMAS HEATH.

PLYMOUTH, ENGLAND.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

The Gospel in One Sentence.

If any man THIRST, let him COME unto me and DRINK.—John vii: 37.

THESE words were spoken on the last and great day of the Feast of Tabernacles, in fact, the last feast day of the year, a Sabbath, dis-

tinguished by ceremonies of a very unusual solemnity and significance. Joy now burst into jubilant praise. The priests, as on every day of this festival, at the time of the morning sacrifice brought water in vessels of gold from the fountain of Siloam,

which flowed under Moriah, and poured it on the altar, chanting, Isaiah xii: 3. "With joy shall ye draw water from the wells of salvation." This was undoubtedly a memorial of the smiting of the rock in the wilderness, by which the thirst of the people was quenched. And at this moment the trumpets broke into loud triumphant peals, and the general joy was so overflowing that a proverb originated: "Whoever has not witnessed this scene has never seen rejoicing at all."

"Whoever has not witnessed this
Has never seen ecstatic bliss."

What a time was this for the blessed Lord, from whom, as from the Temple of the Holy Ghost, the waters of life proceed, to stand in some elevated position and make proclamation in the ears of all the assembled multitudes: "If any man THIRST, let him COME unto me and DRINK." We call this the gospel in a sentence, for here we have:

I. Conscious need, expressed in *thirst*. The deep craving of the human soul, which only that agony of thirst can express, and which nothing but Christ can supply. Oftentimes this sense of need is scarcely definite and conscious. Men know only that there is what Cowper calls "an aching void." "Thou, O God, hast made us for thee, and our heart is restless till it rests in thee!" (Augustine.)

II. Voluntary approach: "*Come unto me.*" Nothing can be simpler, yet it is absolutely necessary. The banquet is provided and free; but the hungry and thirsty must *come*. God calls, invites; he does not compel or drive. The will must respond to his invitation. Matt. xi: 28-30.

III. Personal appropriation: "And *Drink.*" "Take, eat," said our Lord at the supper. Even approach is not enough without appropriation. Faith makes these blessings mine. The offer accepted, there is a transfer of the offered good; but no transfer until accepted and appropriated.

Compare this passage with John iv: the woman at the well, and note the progress in the unfolding of the truth.

Warning and Teaching.

For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. . . .

Behold a greater than Solomon is here, etc.

Behold a greater than Jonas is here,—
Luke xi: 29-32.

THIS whole passage must be carefully examined. Christ is here compared to Jonah and Solomon. Jonah's work was to warn of coming judgment; Solomon's work was to teach wisdom. Christ was far greater than both, His warnings more terrible, His teachings infinitely wiser. He, therefore, is the true Tree of Life, whose fruit is for *meat*, whose leaf is for *medicine*.

The Queen of Sheba came to Solomon for wisdom; Jonah had to go to Ninevah, for warning repels and must be sounded in unwilling ears. But both warning and teaching are equally necessary. The admonitions and rebukes that repel are as needful as the ethical teaching and holy example that draw and attract. Men may come to us to be taught, but they never come to be warned. A full gospel deals in both warning and invitation, law and grace. The blessed Christ who sweetly taught ignorant disciples and answered them hard questions, faithfully told sinners the truth about sin and wrath.

The gospel has two sides: practical and severe rebuke for evil and error; tender and loving counsel for believing penitents. It warns those who are in danger; it teaches those who are seeking light. Yet in both its object is to save and rescue souls. Warning comes first, and teaching after. "Warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

Prayer Service.

The New Revelation on Prayer.

Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive that your joy may be full.—John xvi: 24.

THERE is a plain statement here of an advanced truth as to *prayer in Jesus' name*. It is something of which the Old Testament saints and even the New Testament disciples, up to this time, had not known. That saints in olden time had asked in some other merit than their own, and for the sake of a higher righteousness, is evident from such Scriptures as Daniel ix: 18, etc. This asking in Jesus' name must mean something more than even His disciples had hitherto been able to understand.

The *name* represents the *person*, and hence the *character*. To ask in Christ's name is not simply to append, to our prayer, the phrase, "for Jesus' sake," however sincere our dependence may be in His vicarious work. It means to ask by virtue of our own *identification with Christ*, as members of His mystical body. The believer's oneness with Christ by faith is a truth not revealed in the Old Testament, and not understood by New Testament believers until after His death and resurrection. That truth forms the highest summit of New Testament revelation, as set forth especially in Ephesians and Colossians. From the hour of our true acceptance of Him by faith we are one with Him, and all that is true of Him is true of believers according to their measure and capacity. In Him they have died and risen, and are potentially exalted and enthroned. All the highest promise and power of prayer is *based on this unity*.

Prayer is essentially not a natural yearning or asking, but a supernatural process in which each of the three persons of the Trinity is concerned. First, the Holy Spirit, indwelling and inworking in the be-

liever, inspires the spirit of prayer. He moves in the heart, awakening holy desires and longings after God which no words can express and which are therefore called "unutterable groanings" (Rom. viii: 26-27). This is the intercession of the Spirit in us.

Secondly. The Lord Jesus, our mediator, at the right hand of the throne of God, *presents* our prayers. But for His intercession they could not be received by the Father, for, although awakened by the Holy Spirit, they are mingled with much human imperfection and sin. The incense of our devotion rises to God not without many corrupting, defiling, human elements. These our Lord Jesus refines away. He receives this incense, and in His golden censer offers it before the heavenly altar. This constitutes the intercession of Christ for us.

Thus we have "through Him, access by one Spirit, unto the Father" (Ephes. ii: 18). True prayer cannot but be answered, for it involves both the intercession of the Spirit and the intercession of the Son.

PRACTICAL REMARKS.

1. The Privilege of Prayer. What a low estimate to place prayer on the level of *duty* and lose sight of the delight of exercising a privilege so unspeakable.

2. The Power of Prayer. It cannot but be effective and effectual, because the activity of the Spirit and the Son is inseparably connected with it.

3. The Conditions of Prayer. Faith and fellowship with God. If we be not united to Christ by faith there can be no asking in His name. If we indulge sin or neglect duty we hinder the fellowship with the Spirit on which depends His holy intercession or free activity within us.

Funeral Service.

They rest from their labors and

their works do follow them.—Rev. xiv: 13.

WHAT this text means in its fullness of application no one now knows. But its suggestions are manifest and manifold.

I. God's dear saints at death enter into *rest*—rest not indeed from service, but from *labor*, which implies the disagreeable, exhausting, discouraging side of toil. In the higher sense of service they rest not day nor night, serving God in His temple. But the hindrances without and within all cease, and the service is unmixed delight.

II. Their works do follow them. This in a threefold sense is true:

1. Follow them in witnessing to their fidelity.

2. Follow them in contributing to their reward.

3. Follow them in perpetuating their influence for good.

A Communion Service.

That ye also may have fellowship with us.—1 John i: 3.

ONE of the great words of John's epistles is *fellowship*. The thought is beautifully presented here. The early disciples came into *contact* with the Lord, seeing, hearing and touching him. Their communion and fellowship was immediate and personal, and their contact with other disciples who had not seen the Lord was also immediate and personal, and so by declaring to them what they had seen and heard they introduced them to the fellowship of the Lord Himself. Christian history forms a chain of many links, and as we trace back link after link till we come to Him from whom all hang in dependence we feel the unity, the solidarity of the Christian brotherhood and testimony. The Lord's Supper is the *expression of this visible fellowship*.

1. Immediately connected with the existing body of disciples.

2. Links every new commemoration to all the preceding.

3. And so unites every body of disciples to the Lord.

Installation Service.

Like people, like priest.—Hosea iv:

9. Comp. Isaiah xxiv: 2.

THEME: The mutual assimilation of minister and people. The minister makes the people and the people make the minister.

I. The minister's influence.

1. As a preacher and teacher—upon the conceptions of truth and duty, the understanding of the Word of God, and the practical conduct of the people.

2. As a man, in his own example and life.

3. As a pastor, in his pastoral intercourse with his flock.

4. As a public leader of reforms, etc.

II. The people's influence.

1. In getting him audience. Giving him their own ears and attention and gathering in others.

2. In making him eloquent. Gladstone says, "Eloquence is pouring back on an audience in a shower what is first received from the audience in vapor."

3. In making him spiritual. They can encourage him to spiritual growth and culture; to earnest and edifying preaching. They can pray for him and help him to feel that they want and wish only spiritual *food*.

4. In making him a power for good. Aristotle says, "Truth is what a thing is in itself, in its relations and *in the medium through which it is viewed.*" Goethe says, "Before we complain of the writing as obscure we must first examine if all be clear *within.*" In the twilight a very plain manuscript is illegible. So the attitude of a hearer largely limits the power of a preacher; the coöperation of a church member may indefinitely increase the effectiveness of a pastor's work.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.**The Age of Reforms.**

BY REV. WILBUR F. CRAFTS, NEW YORK.

"THE womb of the present is big with reforms; it is as when Gad was born—his mother cried, 'A troop cometh.'" This was the one hopeful sentence in a preacher's pessimistic address at a Sabbath Reform Convention. Journeying homeward from the Convention, I took out my note book to verify the striking sentiment, and was able to jot down more than a hundred "Reforms" now in the air. They are in the air as fruit is in the air, some of them very green, some of them almost ripe. They seem to be connected with separate trees, but he who climbs a little and looks over the wall finds that they are mostly on converging branches of the one great tree of Christian civilization, the hundred lesser branches being connected with a score of larger ones.

One of the branches whose fruit seems nearest to the joy of harvest is one of the newest, Ballot Reform, whose lesser limbs are the official ballot, the secret vote, universal registration, severe punishment of bribery and intimidation, the disfranchisement of drunkenness, and ere long of ignorance—this last, in the opinion of an increasing number, being the solution of the chief political difficulties of both North and South.

This leads us to a second bough, whose fruit is also nearing ripeness, namely, Immigration Reform, which is not only much discussed in the papers, but has taken tangible shape in several excellent bills in Congress, the main point of which is to make it necessary for an intending immigrant to bring a certificate from one of our foreign consulates—it should be the one nearest his home—certifying that he is suitable material for the making of an American citi-

zen. In addition to such laws something is being said and done with reference to strengthening the conditions of naturalization, to make it mean Americanization.

Another branch whose fruit is suddenly becoming prominent and promising, is Lottery Reform, which is represented by several bills in Congress that are intended for halters for the Great National Robber, whose lair is Louisiana. The legislatures of Kentucky, Louisiana, Georgia and North Dakota have all had this public enemy before them during the present season. If the pulpit and religious press do not miss their opportunity, lotteries will soon be placed with duelling among the antiquities.

The branch of International Reform is about to gladden us with the International Copyright, but the substitution of permanent International Arbitration for War is still "in the green."

The Purity branch is giving much promise and already yielding some fruit. The "age of consent," chiefly through the efforts of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, has been raised in many States, although in none has it yet reached the standard of some European governments, 21 years, while one of our States, Delaware, puts it just outside the cradle, at 7 years. The minor limbs of this branch are the movement for stronger divorce laws, which has attained great vigor of late; and the Polygamy limb, on which Mormonism is being hung; and the effort to remove the double standard of morals as between man and woman, a far more important issue than the double standard of money. Beautiful blossoms on this bough are the White Cross, and the White Shield Societies.

The fruit of the Temperance branch is slowly but surely ripening, the National Commission of Inqui-

ry to obtain authoritative statistics, being the nearest to ripeness, and next to it, perhaps, the movement in which States' Rights assists Prohibition to forbid licensing states to sell liquors in Prohibition states on the plea of inter-State commerce. The abolition of *infernal* revenue from liquors, in order to separate the Government from complicity with the liquor traffic, is apparently far from ripe, and even total abstinence and prohibition, that have been growing so long, promise to tax our patience and fortitude some years yet before the whole land shall rejoice in their sweetness. Minor limbs of this temperance branch are the lesser forms of prohibition, which may be accomplished in many places where the full prohibition is yet in the future, namely, forbidding the sale of liquors to minors, restricting saloons to one for each 500 or 1,000 of the population, Sunday closing, law and order leagues to enforce prohibitory features of liquor laws, and removal of all screens that hide the violations of law. The heaviest cluster of ripe fruit in the Temperance bough and fullest of promise for the future, is the movement for compulsory temperance teaching in the public schools, which has already been achieved in more than half the land.

Another promising branch is Sabbath Reform, about which, even as I write, are gathered the representatives of the great governments and the workingmen of Europe, that have found the "Holiday Sunday" to be a toilsome Sunday. In our own land the churches and labor organizations are together promoting a petition, larger than was ever before presented to any human government, asking that men in the military and mail service, and on the railroads may no longer be deprived of their God-given right to the weekly rest-day. A very prominent limb of this

branch is the proposed Sunday law for the Capital, the only part of our country, except some parts on the frontier and one State of the "Wild West," that does not protect the Rest-Day by law.

Never since the world began has Labor Reform been so fruitful, and its branches so stirring with the breeze of thought as now. An International Labor Conference is discussing the work of children and of women, whether and how much they are to work at night and in mines. There is place only to enumerate the manifold limbs of this great branch: Early closing; Saturday half-holidays; prohibition of child-labor; equal wages for men and women; the protection of railroad employees by compelling the companies to use all safety appliances; government management of the telegraph, already about to be achieved; city ownership and management of gas and water-works, already realized in some places; the people's ownership and management of railroads, already seriously discussed; the suppression of trusts; and the complete Nationalism of which these are the buds. Other limbs of Labor Reform are the eight-hour law, "single tax," and graded taxation.

Another increasingly prominent branch is Charity Reform, that seeks to correct the hoary error that promiscuous alms-giving and charity are synonymous, whereas the former is only a counterfeit of the latter.

Next to this branch is another closely allied to it—Sanitary Reform—whose most prominent limb is tenement house reform.

Then comes the growing branch of prison reform.

A branch that is fast becoming one of the most prominent of the whole tree, is Educational Reform, whose largest limb is the maintenance of the Public School System against the attacks of Parochial Sectarian edu-

cation. Branching out of this is the proposition to extend the common school into the Indian reservations, as a part of the settlement of the Indian question. "How can we retain education in Christian morals in public schools, while shutting out sectarian instructions?" is another important limb of the educational branch; and yet another is manual education.

Another branch is Judicial Reform, whose most prominent part just now is Jury Reform to the extent of (1) making something less than a unanimous verdict sufficient to convict, or acquit; (2) providing for the panel being made up in an absolutely impartial manner; and (3) providing against the exclusion of persons of intelligence, who have read about the case, but declare themselves capable of deciding fairly upon the evidence.

The Woman Suffrage branch grows slowly but steadily with its various minor branches, education suffrage, municipal suffrage, that have already been introduced quite extensively.

There are a number of minor branches also; such as the appointment of Police Commissioners for great cities by state rather than city authorities as a solution of the problem of the great cities; closely allied to this is the suppression of party politics from city elections and uniting all friends of law against the forces of lawlessness; the taking from governors the pardoning power and investing it in a Commission or Court of Pardons; opening colleges impartially for both sexes; the question of maintaining State Normal Schools and State Universities; non-partisan tariff reform by a Commission similar to the Inter-State Commerce Commission; capital punishment by electrocution; forbidding the sale of pistols, except as poisons are sold, with careful re-

strictions; funeral reform in the way of more economy and less display, with no Sunday funerals except in cases of real necessity; international co-operation for the suppression of the slave trade; general adoption of the plan of electing public weighers, by whom coal and other necessities of life are to be weighed for the public, to prevent fraud; stringent laws against the sale of opium, except upon the written prescription of reputable physician; more attention in the public schools to the art of expression, since ours is a "Government by talking."

There are two large branches remaining to be mentioned, Civil Service Reform, which some think is itself in need of reforming in the way of making the examinations turn more largely upon other tests—of sobriety, same as Jefferson intimated; nothing unfits men for Civil Service more than drinking habits.

The deepest reform of all, one that needs the clearest thinking just now to avoid both extremes, is that branch of reform that deals with the connection of Christianity and the State, proposing on the one hand to acknowledge God in the Constitution, to give the Christian elements in our Government an unquestionable legal basis, and on the other, an amendment to the National Constitution, forbidding *State Legislatures* to make an established religion, as only *Congress* is now forbidden to do, there being nothing in the National Constitution to forbid Utah, when it becomes a State, to establish Mormonism, or New Mexico Catholicism.

Any pastor or religious editor who overlooks these living problems, gazing skyward absorbed in theological castle-building, is unworthy of the place he occupies and the opportunity he loses, as well as of the age in which he lives.

BRIEF NOTES ON BOOKS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO CLERGYMEN.

By J. M. SHERWOOD.

A. C. Armstrong & Son. "The Unknown God, or Inspiration Among Pre-Christian Races." By C. Loring Brace. 8vo. pp. 386. This work appears in a neat and fitting style. The former works of Mr. Brace, particularly his "Gesta Christi, or History of Human Progress Under Christianity," have made him favorably known as a careful and instructive author. The present work will add to his reputation. The title—"Paul's Text on Mars' Hill, 'The Unknown God'"—is a happy and striking one. The aim of the book is to trace and bring to light the ancient beliefs of mankind respecting God. In doing this he adopts the "modern method" in studying ethnic or heathen religions, that is, to find what good there is in them; how the men of other races and times regarded the problems of the universe; to search among the men of all races and ages for "some evidences of the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, and to discover traces of God and higher inspirations in the remotest annals and records of mankind." In a word, this volume is a search for the footprints of the Divine Being on the shifting sands of remote history. A pleasing and not difficult task; and the result is a series of highly instructive and suggestive illustrations drawn from Hametic, Semitic, Akkadian, and Aryan races. For the most part we think the author has done his work skillfully and well. And yet we think he has fallen into the common error of writers along this line of investigation. His traces of the "Divine footprints" are sometimes more fanciful than real. He uses "inspiration" and other terms in the popular, loose sense, and not in a strict theological sense, so that his language and reasoning are apt to be misleading. He fails to discriminate and sift in his estimates of heathen systems, and thus impairs the value of his deductions. There is occasionally a manifest straining to make his point. Notwithstanding these defects of the book, viewed critically from a scientific standpoint, it is highly readable and confirms Paul's words, "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him."

The same publishers have added another volume to their "Expositor's Bible" series, Judges and Ruth. By the Rev. Robert A. Watson, M. A., author of "Gospels of Yesterday." We have more than once expressed our high opinion of the value of these Expository Lectures on all the books of the Bible by a large number of the foremost Preachers and Theologians of the day. The Armstrongs have likewise issued another volume in their series known as "The Sermon Bible." The present

one embraces from Isaiah to Malachi. This work aims to give in a cheap convenient form the substance of the best homiletic literature of the times. It is a sort of drag-net process gathering in outlines of sermons, skeletons, references to sermons already published, to theological treatises, commentaries, etc., from every available source. Used with severe discretion it may prove helpful to the preacher.

The same publishers send us "Studies in Literature and Style," by Theodore W. Hunt, Ph.D. Professor Hunt is not unknown to the readers of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW. During the past two or three years he has been a frequent contributor to its pages, and his articles—chiefly in the department of Old English Writers—have attracted wide attention, both because of the rich mines of classic English literature of the olden time which he explored and developed, and because of the great purity of style in which his thoughts were clothed. Hence we were prepared to welcome a volume on "Literature and Style," from his chaste pen, and to expect no little delight and instruction from it; and this expectation has not been disappointed. The book is worthy of the man whose "studies" have been so long among the classics of the English tongue, and worthy of the theme which he has happily chosen for discourse. The work is one which we can unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly recommend to students, to ministers, to public speakers and writers, and to the general reader who is interested in "studies" of this improving and elevating kind.

The purpose of the book is to state, discuss and exemplify the representative types of style with primary reference to the needs of the English literary student. In a brief introductory chapter the author discusses the Claims of Literary Studies. He then proceeds, under several successive chapters, to consider the Intellectual Style, the Literary Style, the Impassioned Style, the Popular Style, the Critical Style, the Poetic Style, the Satirical Style, the Humorous Style, Matthew Arnold's English Style, and Emerson's English Style, giving numerous apt examples, drawn from the wide field of English literature, under each topic discussed. In a concluding chapter he treats of "Independent Literary Judgments." This naked outline gives the reader an idea of the wide scope and character of the work. But the book must be read and studied as a text-book to understand and appreciate its wealth of wisdom and teaching to the English student of the grandest living language and literature of the world.