

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

Vol. XXXII.—OCTOBER, 1896.—No. 4.

REVIEW SECTION.

I. THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST A FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE.

BY BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PRINCETON, N. J.

It has been customary in the past to look upon the resurrection of Jesus as the very citadel of the Christian position. Friend and foe have been at one in so regarding it. Upon it, as his Gibraltar, the Christian man has entrenched himself. It has seemed to him to be the rock on which he could securely build the house of his faith, and upon which the rain may descend and the floods come and the winds blow without effect. Similarly it has seemed to the assailants of Christianity, that so long as this rock stood unconquered all their engineering was in vain.

It appears now that all this is a mistake. The importance of the resurrection of Christ, we are told, has been greatly exaggerated. It is not denied that from the beginning Christians have looked to it as their support and stay. It is not denied that it has been their enthusiastic conviction of its reality that has from the first enheartened them in their Christian living, and given force to their proclamation of the Gospel. Professor Harnack, for example, allows that "the firm confidence of the disciples in Jesus was rooted in the belief that He did not abide in death, but was raised by God," and that their conviction of His resurrection, because it was "the pledge of the resurrection of all believers," became "the mightiest power through which the Gospel has won humanity." But he thinks it a matter of profound indifference to us whether this conviction was sound or a delusion. "The conviction of having seen the Lord," he tells us, "was no doubt of the greatest importance for the disciples and made them evangelists; but what they saw can not immediately help us." "To believe on the ground of appearances that others have had is a frivolity which will always revenge itself through rising doubts." It can, indeed, never be neces-

sary "to have faith in a fact:" religious belief must not hang on history and must be independent of all facts, "which would hold good apart from that belief." Whether Christ rose from the dead can not, therefore, be of moment to the Christian; all that is of any significance is the religious conviction that He was "not swallowed up in death, but passed through suffering and death to glory, that is, to life, power, and honor." "Faith has nothing to do with the knowledge and the form in which Jesus lives, but only with the conviction that He is the living Lord." And in the case of the resurrection of Christ this detachment from history is especially well for Christianity. For there is really no sound reason for believing that Jesus rose from the dead in the literal sense which has been attached to those words. "The mere fact that friends and adherents of Jesus were convinced that they had seen Him . . . gives to those who are in earnest about fixing historical facts not the least ground for the assumption that Jesus did not continue in the grave." The candid historian will indeed feel bound to surrender the fact of the bodily resurrection of Christ to the assaults of recent criticism.*

The effect of this new attitude toward the resurrection of Christ, if it could be justified, would obviously be to turn the flank of the Christian position. Christianity has concentrated her defense at this impregnable point, and feels herself safe until it be captured. The new foeman bows politely and declares that he prefers to enter the Christian domain by some other road; the so-called Gibraltar, if it be rock at all, and not a mere stage construction of laths and brown cloth, holds no key-position and may best be simply neglected. Christianity is not built on the rock of fact in any case, he tells us; it is a castle in the air, adjusting itself readily, as it floats over the rough surface and solid earth, to all sorts of inequalities and changes of ground, and is best entered by disengaging ourselves from the soil and soaring lightly into its higher precincts. No doubt the professed purpose of this new determination of the relation of Christianity to fact is to render Christianity forever unassailable from the point of view of historical science; if it is independent of all details of history it can not be wounded through the critical reconstruction of the historical events which accompanied its origin. But the obvious actual effect of it is to destroy altogether all that has hitherto been known as Christianity; the entire detachment of Christianity from the realm of fact simply dismisses it into the realm of unreality. Men may still call by the name of "Christianity" the possibly "iridescent" dream which still remains to them, but a "Christianity" which stands out of relation to historical facts is plainly a very different thing from the old Christianity, all of whose doctrines are facts, and which was, above all things, rooted in historical occurrences. And this is particularly apparent with regard

* A. Harnack, "History and Dogma," E-T., vol. i., pp. 85, 86, note: compare the later tract, "Christianity and History," p. 84.

to the
indiff
wholl
from I

It
more
tures
reccion
It wou
broadl
Lord
reccion
His s
The ea
urrecti
32; iv
that sp
i. 21;
vior; t
all the
lar two
the sup
In a co
hath no
are alik
of their
tion of
him an
so that
preache
on their
on its
the wh
pending
fact. A
bleness
it as his
of belie
readers.
raised,"
well tha
the othe
of such
the apos

* Comp
adduced.

to the facts of the resurrection of Jesus. If Christianity is entirely indifferent to the reality of this fact, then "Christianity" is something wholly different from what it was conceived to be by its founders, and from what it is still believed to be by its adherents.

It is to be borne in mind that neither Professor Harnack, nor the more radical members of the school he so brilliantly represents, ventures to deny that the conviction of the reality of Christ's bodily resurrection formed the center of the faith of the founders of Christianity. It would certainly be difficult for any candid mind to doubt a fact so broadly spread upon the surface of the New Testament record. Our Lord Himself deliberately staked His whole claim upon His resurrection. When asked for a sign, He repeatedly pointed to this sign as His single and sufficient credential (John ii. 19; Mat. xii. 40). The earliest proclaimers of the Gospel conceived witnessing to the resurrection of their Master as their primary function (Acts i. 22; ii. 32; iv. 33; x. 41; xvii. 18). The lively hope and steadfast faith that sprang up within them they ascribed to its power (1 Peter i. 3; i. 21; iii. 21). Paul's whole gospel was the gospel of the risen Savior; to His call he ascribes his own apostleship, and to His working all the elements of the Christian faith and life. There are in particular two passages in his epistles which in an almost startling way reveal the supreme place which was then ascribed to the resurrection of Christ. In a context of very special power he declares roundly that "if Christ hath not been raised" the Apostolic preaching and the Christian faith are alike vanity, and those who have believed in Christ lie yet unrelieved of their sins (1 Cor. xv. 14-17). His meaning is that the resurrection of Christ occupied the center of the Gospel that was preached by him and all the Apostles and that had been received by all Christians; so that if this resurrection should prove to be not a real occurrence the preachers are convicted of being false witnesses of God, the faith founded on their preaching is proved an empty thing, and the hopes conceived on its basis are rendered void. Here Paul implicates with himself the whole Christian community, teachers and taught alike, as suspending Christianity on the resurrection of Christ as its fundamental fact. And so confident is he of universal accord on the indispensableness of this fact to the very existence of Christianity, that he uses it as his sole fulcrum for prying back the doctrine of the resurrection of believers into its proper place in the faith and hearts of his skeptical readers. "If dead men are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised," is his one argument, and he plies it as one who knows full well that none will deny the one if it be seen to involve the denial of the other. In some respects even more striking are the implications of such phraseology as one meets in a passage like Phil. iii. 10. Here the apostle is contrasting all the "gains" of the flesh with the one "gain"

* Compare R. M. Edgar, "The Gospel of a Risen Savior," p. 27, and the passages there adduced.

of the Spirit, Christ Jesus the Lord. As over against "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord," he declares that he esteems "all things," as but refuse, the heap of leavings from the feast that is swept from the table for the dogs, if only he may "gain Christ and be found in Him;" if only, he repeats, he "may know Him and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed to His death; if by any means he may attain unto the resurrection from the dead." The structure of the passage represents the very essence of the saving knowledge of Christ to reside in knowing "the power of His resurrection." That is to say, Paul finds the center of gravity of the Christian life no less than of the Christian faith in the fact of the resurrection of Christ.

It would seem, then, as if it would not be easy for Christians of to-day to ascribe to the resurrection of Christ a place more fundamental to Christianity than was given it by the first preachers and authoritative founders of Christianity. We are possibly more apt to fail to apprehend the variety of the aspects in which it presented itself to them as lying at the very roots of their Christian faith. It will, therefore, doubtless repay us to remind ourselves cursorily of some of the various ways in which the resurrection of our Lord evinces itself as fundamental to the Christian religion.

It is natural to think, first of all, of the place of this great fact in Christian apologetics. It is quite obvious that it is the fundamental fact of Christianity from this point of view. Opinions may conceivably differ as to whether, as a mere abstract proposition, it would have been possible to believe in Christianity as a supernaturally given religion had Christ remained holden of the grave. But it is scarcely disputable that, in the actual circumstances, His failure to rise again would have thrown the gravest doubt on the validity of His claims. And it admits of no doubt whatever that the fact that He did rise again, being once established, supplies an irrefragable demonstration of the supernatural origin of Christianity, of the validity of Christ's claim to be the Son of God, and of the trustworthiness of His teaching as a Messenger from God to man. In the light of this stupendous miracle, all hesitation as to the supernatural accompaniments of the life that preceded it, or of the succeeding establishment of the religion to which its seal had been set,—nay, of the whole preparation for the coming of the Messenger of God who was to live and die and rise again, becomes unreasonable and absurd. The religion of Christ is stamped at once from heaven as divine, and all marks of divinity in its preparation, accompaniments, and sequence become at once congruous and natural. And as the resurrection of Christ is (despite Professor Harnack's scoffs) "the most certain fact in the history of the world,"—attested as it is by evangelists and apostles, by Paul himself, and the five hundred brethren whom he summons as cowitnesses with him; by the course of events itself which otherwise would remain inexplicable, by

the
throu
His
the e
and t
so no
the st
its div
cross t
no log
of alm
power
two th
which
Christi
But
place in
immort
veil of
reality
not beg
live in t
heaven-
conform
given th
forty da
tion with
to earth
not but r
as those
after it s
not all, li
been bro
most inti
other side
tho their
of God, a
those of u
their hand
from whic
has been b
by the res
again and
damental
tality.
Equally

the monument of the Christian Sabbath persisting as its witness through all ages, by the visible power of God sealing the testimony of His servants through His efficient working in the hearts and before the eyes of many, and by the divine success and progress of the gospel and the resurrection in the first age and through all subsequent ages—so no fact can be conceived of more power to break down opposition to the strange doctrines of Christianity and to vanquish the world before its divine Lord. From the empty grave of Jesus the enemies of the cross turn away in unconcealable dismay. Those whom the force of no logic can convince, and whose hearts are steeled against the appeal of almighty love from the cross itself, quail before the irresistible power of this simple fact. Christ has risen from the dead! After two thousand years of the most determined assault upon the evidence which demonstrates it, that fact stands. And so long as it stands Christianity, too, must stand as the one supernatural religion.

But the fact of Christ's resurrection holds no more fundamental place in Christian apologetics than it does in the revelation of life and immortality which Christianity brings to a dying world. By it the veil of sense was lifted and men were permitted to experience the reality of that other world to which we are all journeying. We can not begin to estimate the value to those first disciples who were to live in the world as part of it while they held their real citizenship in heaven—to become fellows with Christ in His sufferings and be made conformable to His death—of the visible and tangible proof which was given them by the presence of the resurrected Lord with them for forty days, of the reality of the life beyond the grave. This association with one who had died and yet lived—lived not through a return to earthly life like Lazarus, but in the power of His endless life—could not but revolutionize their consciousnesses, and enable them to endure as those who had actually seen the invisible. No wonder that thereafter it seemed as if death had no terrors for these men. If they had not all, like Paul, been caught up to the seventh heaven, heaven had been brought down to them and had been made to enter into their most intimate experiences. They knew that there was life on the other side of death, that the grave was but a sojourning place, that, tho their earthly dust-dwelling were dissolved, they had a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. And those of us who come later may see with their eyes, and handle with their hands, the Word of life. We can no longer speak of a bourne from which no traveler e'er returns. The middle wall of partition has been broken down and the boundary become but an invisible line by the resurrection of Christ. That He who died has been raised again and ever lives in the form of a complete humanity, is the fundamental fact in the revelation of the Christian doctrine of immortality.

Equally fundamental is the place which Christ's resurrection occu-

pies relatively to our confidence in His claims, His teachings, and His promises. By it the seal was set to all the instructions which He gave and to all the hopes which He awakened. He Himself staked, as we have seen, His credit on His rising again. He declared that no sign should be given that adulterous generation but the sign of Jonah, and that he would restore in three days the destroyed temple of His body. Had the sign failed all His claims would have fallen with it. And as the sign did not fail, but after three days He returned from the bowels of the earth according to His word, He has evinced His ability to perform all His words. It is He that had power to lay down His life and take it up again; who has said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" who has promised to be with those that serve Him "always even unto the end of the world;" who has announced to them the forgiveness of their sins. It is another instance of the challenge, "Whether is it easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk?" That He could not be holden of death, but arose in the power of His deathless life, gives us to know that "the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." And the fulfilment of these explicit predictions do but point us to a deeper fact. The Lord of life could not succumb to death. Had Christ not risen we could not believe Him to be what He declared Himself when He "made Himself equal with God." But He has risen in the confirmation of all His claims. By it alone, but by it thoroughly, is He manifested as the very Son of God who has come into the world to reconcile the world to Himself. It is the fundamental fact in the Christian's unwavering confidence in "all the words of this life."

There is even a deeper truth than this. The resurrection of Christ is fundamental to the Christian's assurance that Christ's work is complete and redemption is accomplished. Our stripes were laid upon Him and He bowed His head and died. And is that all? Is it enough to say that He "was delivered up for our trespasses"? Or must we not be able to add that "He was raised for our justification"? Else what would assure us that He was able to pay the penalty and deliver those who were bound? That He died manifests His love, and His willingness to save. That He rose again manifests His power, and His ability to save. We are not saved by a dead Christ who undertook but could not perform, and who lies there still, under the Syrian sky, another martyr of impotent love. If we are to be saved at all, it must be by one who did not merely pass to death in our behalf, but who passed through death. If the penalty was fully paid by Him, it can not have broken Him, it must needs have broken upon Him. Had He not emerged from the tomb, all our hopes, all our salvation would be lying dead with Him unto this day. But as we see Him issue from the grave we see ourselves issue with Him in newness of life. Now we know that His shoulders were strong enough to bear

the burden that was laid upon them, and that He is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through Him. The resurrection of Christ is thus the indispensable evidence of His completed work, His accomplished redemption. It is just because He rose again that we know that the full penalty was paid, the ransom was sufficient, the work was done, the sacrifice was accepted, and we have been bought with a price and are His purchased possession forever. Because Christ has risen, we no more judge that "if one died for all, then all died," that "the body of sin might be done away," than we know that having died with Him, "we shall also live with Him"—with Him who "being raised from the dead, dieth no more." In one word, the resurrection of Christ is fundamental to the Christian hope and to the Christian confidence. All our assurance of salvation is suspended on this fact.

It is but to concentrate our views upon one element of this hope when we note specifically that the resurrection of Christ is fundamental to our expectation of ourselves rising from the dead. That He rose from the dead manifests the salvation which He brings to man as one which works through supernatural power and produces supernatural effects. And we have not exhausted the scriptural view of the power of His resurrection until we perceive that His resurrection drags ours in its train. When He arose men saw the great spectacle of the conquest of death, the reversal of the curse pronounced on man's sin, the presentation to God of the first fruits from the grave. When He arose, it was not merely as an individual who had burst the bonds of death; as Paul's language suggests, "the resurrection of the dead" had come (Rom. i. 4)—it was the beginnings of a great harvest. In Christ's resurrection, therefore, the Christian man sees the earnest and pledge of his own resurrection; and by it he is enheartened as he lays away the bodies of those dear to him, not sorrowing "as the rest that have no hope," but with hearts swelling with glad anticipations of the day when they shall rise to meet their Lord. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will he bring with Him." Had Christ not risen from the dead, could we nourish so great a hope—that what is sown in corruption shall be raised in incorruption, what is sown in dishonor shall be raised in glory, what is sown in weakness shall be raised in power, what is sown a body under the dominance of a sinful self shall be raised a body wholly the servant of the Spirit of God? Is it not evident that the resurrection of Christ is fundamental to the Christian's hope that the dead in Christ "shall be raised incorruptible"?

We have touched only on some of the outstanding aspects of the bearing of the resurrection of Christ on our Christian faith and life. But enough has been said to show that we have in it a decisive proof of the divine origin of Christianity; a revolutionary revelation of the reality of immortality, a demonstration of the truth of all Christ's

claims and the trustworthiness of all His promises, an assurance of the perfection of His saving work, and a pledge of our own resurrection. Are these things not fundamental to Christianity? If we can be content with a Christianity without them, we may satisfy ourselves with a "Christianity" to which it is indifferent whether Christ actually rose from the dead. A "Christianity" which can dispense with the immediately supernatural, to which the preexistence and the proper Deity of Christ are unknown, which discards the expiatory work of Christ, and which looks for no resurrection of the body—may readily enough do without the fact of the resurrection of Christ. But when it comes to that, may we not also do very well without such a "Christianity"? What has it to offer to the sin-stricken human soul? What is it to him to be assured that One lived two thousand years ago, the aroma of whose holy life shines through all the rust of the ages and impresses the observer of it with the conviction that He must have found a God of love with whom He could walk in the midst of this world of thorns? Here and now, in his own heart he finds a God of justice, where wrath is inextinguishably revealed against all unrighteousness. Enough for us that for a Christianity which will meet the needs of sinful man, a Christianity which does not offer him merely the impression of a holy life, but provides him with salvation by a divine Redeemer, a resurrected Lord is indispensable. The fact of the resurrection of Christ is, in a word, certainly fundamental to a Christianity that saves.

II.—THE DANGER TO MODERN CIVILIZATION FROM POPULAR SHIBBOLETHS.

BY W. S. LILLY, BARRISTER, LONDON, ENG., AUTHOR OF "ON
RIGHT AND WRONG," "ON SHIBBOLETHS," ETC., ETC.

WE live in an epoch of individualism. That is an unquestionable fact. And it is a fact which—like most facts—has two sides, a good and a bad. In the first place it represents a vast gain which has accrued to this age—"the heir of all the ages." Sir Henry Maine, in his well-known work on "Ancient Law," tells us that the history of the progressive societies of the Western world, during the last two thousand years, may be described as a movement from status to contract. No doubt this is so. At the dawn of civilization, we find small traces of personal freedom. The rights which make up what we call civil and religious liberty are the outcome of the sufferings and struggles of countless generations. They labored, and we have entered into their labors.

"Young children gather as their own
The harvest that the dead have sown;
The dead, forgotten and unknown."

Now what Maine, writing from the point of view of scientific jurisprudence, calls a movement from status to contract, we may term, if we view the matter philosophically, the evolution of the individual person. The essence of personality is freedom. "The freeman," Aristotle writes in the "Metaphysics," "is he who belongs to himself and not to another." The great truth is now accepted throughout the civilized world, that this freedom is man's sacred and inalienable birthright. A man is a person, not a thing. And it is from personality that all human rights spring; rights—as it is not superfluous to point out in passing—which if we translate them from the abstract into the concrete, are conditioned by the social organism wherein each man is found.

Now if we look to the history of the matter—and, as will appear later, I have a special reason for so doing—there can be no question at all that Christianity has been a most potent factor in the evolution of the individual person. Hegel goes so far as to say that the Christian religion introduced the idea of personality into the world. I think that is too strongly said. But, unquestionably, the Christian religion enlarged, strengthened, and consecrated that idea by its doctrine as to the sublime and infinitely momentous relations between the human personality and the divine. Christianity, a learned historian has said, recreated the individual. That phrase is worth bearing in mind, for it expresses picturesquely a great truth. If I may quote words of my own:

"By its assertion of man's moral liberty and responsibility, the church poured into the nations, crushed and degraded by imperialism, a new virility, freeing and invigorating the human faculties, while by her self-made constitution, her elected rulers, her deliberative councils, she kept alive the free democratic traditions which Caesarism had almost strangled, and trained the barbarian tribes, who entered her fold, in the principles and exercise of true liberty."

No doubt the feudal system which arose in the Middle Ages—I am far from denying that in other respects it was a beneficial discipline—was, in some sort, a retrogression from those principles. It was a military organization of society tending to annihilate individual rights and to shut up men in categories of dependence. But, side by side with aristocratic feudalism, its corrective, befriending opposite, was the church, still largely democratic, insisting upon the supreme value of human personality, upon the indefeasible rights springing therefrom, upon the absolute equality of men before Him with whom we have to do, and in whose name she delivered her message. It would take me too far—nor is it necessary for my present purpose—to show how in that great contest between the spiritual and the temporal power, specially associated with the name of Hildebrand, not only ecclesiastical but civil freedom was vindicated and preserved. Nor can I do more than point out how that freedom suffered an eclipse, in well-nigh every European country except England, during the period of absorbing and

absolute monarchy which followed the Renaissance. In the Catholic Church the democratic element, still so conspicuous in the Middle Ages, disappeared; nor has it, up to the present time, again vindicated itself. Her synods ceased to be real deliberative assemblies. The voice which from the earliest times the faithful had possessed in the choice of their pastors—*suffragium de persona*—was no longer heard. And, by a curious irony, the violations of her independence of the secular power were called manifestations of freedom; as when the encroachments of Louis XIV., in the plenitude of his despotic arrogance, were styled the Gallican Liberties.

It is curious and significant that the great protest on behalf of the rights of the individual person which startled the modern world into new political life was made by no Christian teacher, Catholic or Protestant, but by Rousseau. It is curious and significant that the protest eventually embodied itself in that vast French Revolution, which starting on its career with professions of reverence for Christianity, was soon to assume a distinctly anti-Christian character. But so it was. And yet the truths underlying the humanitarian theories that filled the heads of the leaders of the French Revolution—theories immediately derived from Rousseau—were in fact merely ideas borrowed from the Christian religion and sadly mutilated, we must add, in the borrowing: ideas which the accredited teachers of that religion had long forgotten to teach. Liberty, equality, and fraternity, in the proper and only sane acceptation of the words, are dogmas of Christianity—fundamental dogmas we may say. Of the travesty which they received from Jacobin fanatics, I need not here speak. My present point is that underlying the excesses and atrocities of the revolutionary publicists was the great verity of the sacred and inalienable rights of human personality—a verity which is of the essence of Christianity. That verity, we may thankfully recognize, is now deeply impressed upon the public mind and conscience of the civilized world, never again, we may hope, to be effaced. And that we may confess as being due, in no small degree, to the teaching of Rousseau and to the influence of that vast political movement in which, so to speak, Rousseau's teaching became incarnate.

Now it may be said, "What has all this to do with the title standing at the head of the present paper?" I answer, everything. I begin by saying that we live in an epoch of individualism. The good side of this individualism I have sufficiently indicated. Let us now look at the bad. Well, to put the matter briefly, the bad side of contemporary individualism is that its conception of society is rather numerical than dynamical. It ignores elements in the body politic far more important than mere numbers. It does not sufficiently realize that human society is properly conceived of as an ethical organism. The crying want of the present day is a rational organization of democracy. But I must not here dwell on that. Looking at the civilized world as

it is, we find that preponderating political power is almost everywhere in the hands of the many. And nowhere can it be said that the many are what Burke called "men of light and leading." They have, of course, their opinions. But those opinions are seldom the result of prolonged inquiry, of profound meditation. "Half our knowledge we must snatch, not take," said Pope. This is true, in a degree, of those of us who are most amply endowed with leisure—even truer than it was in Pope's day. But it is emphatically true of the vast multitude of men in respect of the social and political questions which they are, in one way or another, called upon to judge. And those who are in the way of guiding them, whether in the press or on the platform, are by no means disinterested counselors. A political speaker or journalistic writer seeks not to teach, but to please, by confirming his readers or his listeners in the opinions they already hold. To this end his arguments are adapted. But, indeed, it is seldom that he employs anything which can in strictness be called argument. He finds phrases far more effective. The illustrious Berryer confessed that he had always succeeded best with commonplaces. And it is a matter of notoriety that catch-words, war-cries, nicknames, are far more serviceable than syllogisms in a political campaign.

These are what I mean by shibboleths. I am far from denying that they have their legitimate uses. They serve the office of labels, and sometimes they truly denote the thing to which they are applied. But they more frequently serve to mislead and to confound the true issue. In a work published a few years ago, which may perhaps be known to some of my American readers, I examined at length some of them, just now very popular: Progress, Liberty, the People, Public Opinion, Education, Woman's Rights, Supply and Demand. These seven shibboleths appeared to me fairly to represent a body of opinion specially characteristic of the times. But, as I remarked, "they exist in the vast majority of minds as mere nebulous notions; like the algebraic X they denote an unknown quantity; they are symbols in problems which are never worked out." And my object in that work was to assist, if I could, in working them out.

The employment of shibboleths is, however, by no means confined to matters appertaining to the public order. They are not unknown in the province of philosophy. The word "hypothesis," for example, is largely employed as a shibboleth. And the object of those who so employ it is, I suppose, to lead us to regard man's most august beliefs as mere speculations, which may be true or false, but concerning which we can have no certitude; which are, as the phrase is, only matter of opinion. Thus, I read the other day in a brilliant work by a French writer:

"The theistic hypothesis is on the same footing precisely as are other hypotheses; it is entitled to no special distinction among them. Materialism, at all events, goes by the facts."

Well, but to speak of the theistic hypothesis is a mere abuse of the word hypothesis. "Belief in God and in another world," writes Kant, "is so interwoven with my moral nature, that the former can no more vanish than the latter can be ever torn from me." On the other hand, materialism, notwithstanding the clearness and simplicity of its explanations, *is* a mere hypothesis, in the proper sense of the term; and, I may add, it is an hypothesis contradicted by physiological experience.

It appears to me, then, that in this age of the world, we may adopt Viola's lament, with far ampler warrant than existed in Shakespeare's time, "Words are grown so false that I am loth to prove reason with them." And assuredly, here is a very considerable danger to civilization. The foundation on which civilization rests is ethical. It is really based, not on military prowess, or naval supremacy, or colossal industries, or world-wide commerce, but on what Shakespeare finely calls "the moral laws of nature and of nations." Those laws are great elemental verities independent of the opinion of the largest and loudest multitude. To put falsehoods in their place—which is a special danger of an age dominated by shibboleths—is assuredly to undermine civilization. You may decree injustice as a law, and make that the foundation of the public order; but—do not doubt it—the doom of the edifice reared thereon is certain. When the floods come and the winds blow, fall it must, and great will be the fall of it.

I need not enlarge upon this. It is too plain. What then is the remedy against this danger? It appears to me to be education, in the true and proper sense of the word. Now education is not knowledge.

A man may, as Montaigne said, have his memory full and his understanding empty. Education is really the formation of character, of which intellectual instruction is but one instrument, and not the most important one. Far more important is the enlightenment of the inner vision to discern truth, and the discipline of the will to embrace it. The education which will qualify a man for the right exercise of political authority must cultivate in him a sense of moral responsibility, and a habit springing from that sense of carefully and scrupulously considering, to the best of his power, the facts involved in the public issues presented to his judgment. People in England talk sometimes of the game of politics. In America it is more customary, I believe, to regard politics as a trade. Both conceptions are wrong, and imply forgetfulness or denial of some of the weightiest duties which can devolve upon human beings.

Well, I look to education to change all that—education in that proper sense of the word on which I have been insisting. "To make the people fittest to choose and the chosen fittest to govern," said Milton, "will be to mend our faulty and corrupt education;" and assuredly we may say the same, with perhaps even greater warrant. We must so mend it as to make it truly an ethical discipline, fitting a

man, in an age of shibboleths, to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good. And, speaking for myself, I do not believe that it can become this, unless it is touched with celestial fire and consecrated by religion. Kant admirably speaks of religion as "the representation to ourselves of the moral law as the will of God." I do not believe that ethics can work upon the vast majority of men without such representation. Christianity has been a main agent in creating that individualism which is a chief gain of this age. Christianity alone can safeguard it. "Be good Christians and you will be excellent democrats," said Pius VII. when bishop of Imola, in a once famous pastoral: "*Siate buoni Christiani e sarete ottimi democrati.*" The dictum sums the matter up.

III.—LORD BYRON'S LIFE AND TEACHINGS.

BY PROFESSOR T. W. HUNT, PH.D., LITT.D., PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, N. J.

LORD BYRON was born January 22, 1788, and from the date of his first publication in 1807 was a conspicuous figure in English literature. The main feature of his character is its apparent self-contradiction. Eager to obtain the title of Lord, when it is offered he receives it in silence. Proud of his Norman ancestry, it was this very ancestry that disgraced his lineage and history. The very personification of selfishness, he was generous to a fault. Boldly confessing that he disliked everybody, it exasperated him to feel that any one disliked him. Stung to the quick by the critics, he boasted of his disregard of all public opinion. Self-exiled from his land and home, it irritated him to feel that he was banished by his countrymen. Fond, when abused, of villifying the land and people of England, his country was still the center of his thought. Versed from a child in Scripture, he falsified its teachings and reproached its adherents. Ambitious as he seemed to be for intellectual successes, we see him so unsettled as to make continuous mental work impossible. An ardent lover of nature, his home was mainly in cities. Fond of Scotland as the scene of his early boyhood, he took frequent occasion to reproach her. A sworn hater of men, his friendships were often intimate. Morose in temperament, he was always in the center of gayety. As the editions of his poems multiplied, he refused to accept his dues to silence his creditors and procure him the comforts of life. Love for woman was the best inspiration of his life, and yet, his devotion to his sister excepted, he never knew what pure affection was. Jealous and suspicious, he was also forgiving. At times submissive in trial, he was again openly defiant and cursed the day of his birth. He condemned Chaucer for his questionable morals, and yet much of his own verse is openly immoral. At Venice, translating the Armenian Scriptures into Eng-

lish, he was acting at the very time the part of a rake. Holding that all governments were alike detestable, he died in Greece a martyr to democratic liberty. A professed patriot, he yet hoped that Napoleon would fertilize the fields of France with the bones of English invaders. Ridiculing the idea of his alleged resemblance to the frivolous Rousseau, his confessions, if written, would be the companion volume of that of the dissolute Frenchman. Byron is thus a personal contradiction, one of the puzzles of English letters, outranking even Jonathan Swift in this regard.

In plain English, he was a libertine, despite the fact that this is still a disputed question among contemporaries and later critics.

We are told that, even if conceded, the palliations are quite sufficient to blunt the edge of the accusation. We are aware that his means were limited; that his uncle was a misanthrope; that his father was a rover and seducer; that his mother was a passionate termagant, and that, as he said, "he had a home without a hope." We recall also the apology made for his character in his unrequited love; that he was mercilessly handled by Edinburgh and London critics, and misunderstood by the British public, and that he had strong natural propensities to what was wayward. Despite all these explanations, however, a careful study of Byron will reveal his malicious libertinism. He deliberately buried his head in slime. Devoid of high moral aim, he courted vice and left no open avenue of sin unentered. Reference is often made to his expressions of penitence, and yet they were but partial, occasional, superficial, and unscriptural. Hence he wrote and taught as he lived. Skeptical when a child, and the bosom friend of skeptical companions, he made it a part of his work as a dramatist to undermine all religious foundations. One of his avowed tenets was, that a man was the slave of his passions. "I hold virtue," he said, "to be a mere feeling, and death an eternal sleep." There was something unusually morbid about the badness of Byron. Goldsmith and Burns had their vices, and yet how differently we view them! Byron represented himself as the hopeless victim of *ennui*, tired of society and the world and finding nothing new in sin, so that it is strange that any critic can justify his life or the ethical temper of his verse.

Mr. Dewey, in commenting on "Don Juan," remarks "that the charge of immorality alleged against it is founded on a wrong notion of art in its representative character," and adds: "It is not for the poet to assume the gowns and bands of the moral preacher when he delineates vice, and Byron was too consummate an artist to worship nature in the line of loose expression." He further adds: "While treating love in its most sensual aspects, Byron has so etherealized the passion as to submerge the corporeal in the spiritual element; that tho the loves are often illegitimate, the fervor is so intense that we feel the body is but the passive agent of the soul." If this is correct ethics,

r:
w
si
et
ps
to
fac
bel
lus
of
dec
suc
flan

put
sibl
tells
who
mean
whoi
again
V
ideal
it is
large
his po
signif
writte
terest
Two
Senna
of the
poems
for Th
Harp
melodi
poet's
conflict
"Hour
bey," a
In his d
"The l
ment of
formed
"Cain;"
seen thi
Fugitive

we have been misguided,—by which a halo is cast about the head of sin and the sinner; by which the basest passion is said to assume “an ethereal flush” and shade off into the spiritual. The carnal and the psychical are hopelessly confounded, and the debauchee is encouraged to persevere till his excesses take the form of spiritual ecstasy. In fact, Byron gloried in his lower appetites and tendencies; parading before his readers the attraction of illicit love; putting a premium on lust, and going out of his way, if need be, to foist upon others a view of the goodness of badness. We fail to see how an English critic can declare that “Byron has carried into the heart of the irregular passions such fervor of spirit as to make them burn with a light to which the flames of conjugal affection are tame.”

This is the curse of the Byronic influence and teaching, that it has put the illicit in the place of the lawful and reversed, as far as possible, all moral distinctions. It would seem to be true, as MacDonalld tells us, “that the Byron fever is a disease belonging to youth as the whooping-cough to childhood.” It is a disease, we may add, by no means confined to youth, but successfully attacks those of riper years whose common-sense and common morals are supposed to be proof against assault.

With these facts in mind as to Byron's life and character and ideals, it is not a little surprising that when we examine his verse, as it is expressed in lyrics, descriptive sketches, and dramas, we find so large an element of apparently ethical teaching. The very titles of his poems and collections of poems are sufficient to indicate this. Most significant in this respect are his lyrics entitled, “Hebrew Melodies,” written in 1814, when he was twenty-six years of age, and full of interest as showing his practical acquaintance with the Old Testament. Two of these, “The Vision of Belshazzar” and “The Destruction of Sennacherib,” are well known to all students of British verse. Some of the others, tho less familiar, are equally beautiful. Such are the poems, “She Walks in Beauty,” “The Wild Gazelle,” “Oh! Weep for Those,” “When Coldness Wraps this Suffering Clay,” and “The Harp the Monarch Minstrel Swept.” These and kindred Jewish melodies seem to have been written as the genuine expression of the poet's mind, and are but another proof of that inward and unceasing conflict of flesh and spirit to which he so often refers. So, in his “Hours of Idleness,” such selections as “On Leaving Newstead Abbey,” and “A Tear,” are in the same minor and meditative strain. In his descriptive poems we note such titles as “The Curse of Minerva,” “The Prophecy of Dante,” “The Vision of Judgment,” “The Lament of Tasso;” and in his dramas such examples as “The Deformed Transformed,” “Heaven and Earth,” “Manfred,” and “Cain;” while even in “Don Juan” and “Childe Harold” there is seen this somber thread from first to last. In his “Miscellanies, or Fugitive Pieces,” including odes and sonnets and snatches of song,

the reader is impressed with the frequency of reflective and often pathetic sentiment.

It is in one of these poems, called "Stanzas," that we read some of his most impressive lines:

"Tho gay companions o'er the bowl
 Dispel awhile the sense of ill,
 Tho pleasure stirs the maddening soul,
 The heart—the heart is lonely still.
 Give me again a faithful few
 In years and feelings still the same,
 And I will fly the midnight crew
 Where boisterous joy is but a name.
 Without a sigh would I resign
 This busy scene of splendid wo,
 To make that calm contentment mine
 Which virtue knows, or seems to know."

So, the lines in "Childish Recollections," and in "The Dream;" and in his "Euthanasia," reminding us of Bryant's "Thanatopsis," tho devoid of its hopeful strain, as it closes—

"Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen,
 Count o'er thy days from anguish free,
 And, know whatever thou hast been
 'Tis something better not to be."

So, the references might be multiplied, as "Churchill's Grave," "Prometheus," and "The Prayer of Nature," recalling Pope's "Universal Prayer," beginning—

"Father of Light! Great God of Heaven!
 Hear'st thou the accents of Despair?
 Can guilt like man's be e'er forgiven?
 Can vice atone for crimes by prayer?"

In some of his dramas, as "Cain" and "Manfred," this more subdued thoughtfulness of soul gives way under pressure to a more violent and desperate expression of feverish unrest with himself and the world.

One of the great reasons why Byron's name and influence are still among us, and why what we may call Byroniana would itself fill a library, is found in the presence, throughout his verse, of this philosophic pondering over men and things, this Faust-like effort to solve the problem of life. This apparently serious purpose is never in abeyance. No theologian or moral reformer could more continuously seek to realize it than did he, be the quest never so fruitless. In this sense Byron was a kind of moral inquisitor as to the nature of God, man, and the universe. Inasmuch, moreover, as in his own character and aims he was out of sympathy with the moral order of things, and yet passionately seeking its solution, there is a pensiveness in his verse which often takes the form of pathos and sadness and at times

of
 of
 m
 pa
 th
 to
 fut
 bre

 for
 tha
 the
 tim
 that
 was
 aban
 It w
 the
 write
 hims
 man
 have
 him
 spring
 Byron
 himse
 human
 Hence
 explan
 prevail
 similar
 good h
 of hun
 environ
 Hen
 such pr
 "Beppo,
 his "En
 ciad," a
 colleague
 irony, an
 we find i
 fine, Byr
 so on the
 had he at
 Dickens

of wild despair. It is this that gives to his verse that subjective type of monolog which all students have discerned, producing what Stedman calls "melancholia" in literary art. Hence, the frequent comparisons between Byron and Shelley. However different otherwise, they were alike in this, that they sought on totally erroneous methods to adjust the relations of God and man. It is this semi-delirious and futile effort that makes his poetry a hopeless cry for light, a heart-breaking refrain over the foreboding outlook and destiny.

It is a significant fact that Lord Byron was born but one year before the outbreak of the French Revolution, and hence belonged to that school of revolutionary poets whose restlessness and excesses were the first fruits of general European disturbance. So turbulent was the time on the continent and at home and so turbulent his own nature that he scarcely knew where he stood or for what he stood, whither he was tending or just what he wanted, and may be said thus to have abandoned himself without reserve to the wildest caprices of the age. It was natural, therefore, that he should boast of being a misanthrope, the Timon of his day and nation. It is thus that Dewey is forced to write: "Neither experience of the world nor converse with nature or himself could ever check that biting spirit of ridicule, that sneer at man and his ways which overflows all his works and which seems to have been one of the ingrained principles of his nature. It also shut him out from that hearty sympathy with social life which is the main-spring to the successful embodiment of character." The fact is that Byron was out of sympathy with man because out of sympathy with himself in his best instincts and deepest needs, and always studied human nature from the side of suspicion and misinterpretation. Hence the bitterness of the enmity which he often evoked and the explanation of that "anti-Byronic fever" which, between 1840-60, prevailed in England with such a force. In this respect he was similar to Rousseau, a "patrician on principle," and, on principle, a good hater of his race. One of the explanations of the notable absence of humor in his verse is found in this deep-seated detestation of his environment.

Hence the natural rôle of Byron as a satirist, as seen especially in such productions as "The Age of Bronze," "The Vision of Judgment," "Beppo," "Don Juan," "Childe Harold," and shorter poems. In his "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," we have Byron's "Dunciad," a stinging onslaught on Jeffrey and Gifford and their editorial colleagues. Satire with Byron always assumes the form of sarcasm, irony, and the mock heroic, and never those more genial forms which we find in Burns, Thackeray, and the best novelists of the time. In fine, Byron was a cynic rather than a satirist, or, if a satirist, mainly so on the side of invective, ridicule, and destructive criticism. Even had he attempted it, he could not have succeeded in the pleasantry of Dickens and Lamb and Sidney Smith. His taunting references to

Southey, Coleridge, and Wordsworth remind us of those equally senseless utterances of Carlyle relative to some of the most gifted authors of his time.

Viewed in any aspect whatsoever, Byron was unbalanced. Want of equipoise, mental and moral, was his greatest need. Hence his thinking and his poetry and his life were often chaotic, devoid of light and anything like orderly purpose. When in his thirty-sixth year, the year of his death, he writes as if at seventy—

"My days are in the yellow leaf;
The flower and fruits of love are gone;
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone!"

He had tried all methods of solving life's problems but the best, and insisted on throttling all the better instincts of his nature. Despite the despondent tendencies of modern thought and life, the old Byronic fascination has largely lost its charm, and the world is craving an order of literature marked by sanity and hopefulness and health and good cheer; the fresh and honest utterances of the human heart, and loyal withal to the interests of truth and goodness.

IV.—HUMOR AND EARNESTNESS: CAN THEY COEXIST?

BY H. L. WAYLAND, D.D., LL.D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

THE idea prevails that the exercise of humor is incompatible with earnestness, that he who has important work on hand must needs be very serious in manner, and that conversely a man who is very solemn and grave is *ipso facto* a man of great moral momentum—is, in a word, a conservative. On the other hand, he who sometimes wears a smile, and whose discourse is irradiated with wit, is apt to be marked out as a trifler whose words are unworthy the attention of the serious-minded. Perhaps one may be allowed to indulge a doubt as to the absolute truth of this dictum. The owl is more solemn than the eagle; but it does not follow that he has a higher flight or a broader outlook.

I recently heard a clergyman say:

"In my callow days I preached one Sunday in a smallish town. I had a written sermon, and had a lively sense of its many excellences. But, to my chagrin, the plain farmer people, one after the other, dropped off to sleep. There was one hearer, however, with whose attentiveness and with whose almost preternatural solemnity I was greatly struck. His eyes did not wander from me; his seriousness well comported with the day and the place. Desirous of knowing something more about him, at the close of the service I described him to a member of the congregation, telling where he sat, and asking who he was. The reply was, 'Oh, that is Charlie. He lives over in the poor-house; he is not more than half-witted.'"

The theory that brightness, and even humor, can not exist along

with earnestness, certainly derives no warrant from the example of Him of whom it was said, "Never man spake like this man." I imagine Him smiling as He took the little children in His arms; I think of Him as entering into the spirit of the children in the marketplace who in vain tried to draw the other children into their games. I recall the fact that His first interview with Simon was marked by a play upon his name, which we should call a pun. I am reminded of Mr. Spurgeon's sermon before the Baptist Missionary Society in Exeter Hall, upon "The Faith of Abraham," in which, after alluding incidentally to the want of faith on the part of Abraham's nephew, and to the many moral slips which came from this want of faith, he added almost involuntarily, half-sadly, half-mirthfully, "Ah, he was a poor Lot!"

I am sure that a smile, perhaps a laugh, on the part of the disciples, not seldom responded to our Lord's vivid illustrations of some absurdity. How He pictured a blind man fruitlessly endeavoring to find his way, and another man, equally blind, who patronizingly steps forward with the offer, "Poor, afflicted brother, I will show you the way! Do not be afraid!" And so he takes him by the hand, and presently both are struggling to extricate themselves from the neighboring ditch. And I imagine that the hearers had little difficulty in applying the illustration to those whose capital in trade was great solemnity in manner, while their vision of truth was much on a level with that of their blind neighbors.

Then there was the beam-carrier and mote-extractor, who painfully felt the sliver in his neighbor's eye, while unconscious of the massive timber which shut out from his vision the whole horizon. How much we see of this sliver-and-timber business! It was not limited to Judea, nor to the Pharisees, nor to the first century. Here is a man who is trying hard to do what is right, to serve God and to bless his fellow-men; but he is imperfect, he is inexperienced, he often falls short; no one is more aware of it than himself or laments it more bitterly. And here is a man whose proud profession is that he makes no profession, who holds himself independent of all laws, who does not make the least effort in the direction of goodness, but who feels himself entitled to criticize the occasional failings and shortcomings of his struggling but not always successful neighbor, and who says, with an offensive air of moral patronage, "Let me cast out the mote that is in thine eye."

Not less bright, not less witty, is our Lord's delineation of those persons who go about with a moral sieve, and strain out the tiny gnats from the air they breathe. They pride themselves on their exemption from some latitude in doctrine, from some unguardedness in speech, from some omission in ceremony or ritual, while they open their mouths wide enough to gulp down the camel of decorous avarice, the two-humped dromedary of pride, the hippopotamus of scheming

ambition, the rhinoceros of infamous politics, the elephant of secret alliance with the saloon, and I know not how many moral pachyderms besides.

Not dissimilarly, our Lord unites the soundest sense and the highest principle with humor. In His precept, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you," he supposes a person who is bearing some sacred vessel from the temple, or some consecrated vestment, to be pursued by a herd of outcast scavenger dogs. Thinking to conciliate and divert them, he throws down at their feet his holy burden, with what result might be supposed. Here is a man carrying pearls, who is pursued by filthy swine. He casts down the pearls, which, precious to him, are utterly valueless to them; and they, after sniffing at them, pursue him with redoubled vehemence and anger. "So," our Lord says, "when you try to conciliate the world by giving up principle and righteousness, it does not avail. Worldly men care little for it, and they despise you for having renounced it." And when we consider how complete a master our Lord was of the art of expression, we can readily understand that all these utterances had a significance which our cold intonations in vain endeavor to convey. I am sure the people smiled even where they writhed.

Was there ever a more sharp, biting sarcasm than was exhibited when Elijah "mocked" the priests of Baal as they went through their contortions and their athletics and their limpings, while the blood spurted from the gashes which they had made in themselves, while the air was resonant with their intense and agonized shriekings? "Cry aloud, for he is a god! Either he is musing, or he has gone aside, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked." Did not Isaiah show himself master of pungent humor, mingled with the most resistless logic, when he illustrated the folly of idolatry? "The carpenter heweth him down cedars and he taketh thereof and warmeth himself; yea, he kindleth it and baketh bread; yea, he maketh a god and worshipeth it, he worshipeth it, a graven image, and falleth down thereto. He burneth part in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh, and is satisfied; he warmeth himself and saith, 'Deliver me, for thou art my god.'" I think those who heard the prophet could hardly have suppressed a smile even tho the sarcasm was so emphatically at their expense.

There are persons not a few who might have added much to the wisdom used in the creation of the world; it is a pity that they were not consulted. When the Creator, in making up the being called man, was putting in conscience, they would have said, "Yes, that is right, put in a great deal of that." And reverence? "Yes, yes, that is all right." And self-interest? "Oh, yes, we could not get along without that." And respect for one's superiors? "Yes, that is ab-

solu
in n
deri
bat
l
Moo
of w
"I d
vent
Anot
ion;
come
Chris
send
was
with
of an
broth
crow
of the
H
the sp
used.
or ske
did n
and w

V.—LI

By P
To

WE
last, to
determi
of the
inces.
ness to
ask, in
place, V
As a
the trea
Whenev
which, s
the cont
itself.
revenues

solutely indispensable." But when the Supreme Being was putting in mirthfulness and humor, they would have stopped Him with shuddering, hasty protest, "No, not that; that would spoil the whole batch!"

I know few men at once more witty and more earnest than Mr. Moody. In a recent address, he illustrated the use that may be made of wit, of quick repartee. In an evangelistic meeting, a scoffer said, "I do not think much of Jesus Christ. I think that the man who invented illuminating gas has done more for the world than Christ." Another speaker replied, "My friend has a perfect right to his opinion; I suppose he would carry his view into practise. Now, when I come to die, I shall send for a man who can talk to me about Jesus Christ, the Savior of sinners; but I suppose that our friend would send for the nearest gas-fitter." The response was as effective as it was bright. And Mr. Moody told of another instance where, notwithstanding the rain, quite a crowd was standing outside the doors of an evangelistic meeting, altho there was ample room within. The brother who was conducting the meeting, went out and said to the crowd, "I will say to you what the whale said to Jonah, 'Come in out of the wet.'" The crowd laughed and followed him into the meeting.

Humor used for its own sake, or used to awaken admiration for the speaker, or used to give needless and wanton pain, is very badly used. But humor used to expose the hollow pretenses of hypocrites or skeptics or opposers, may be a great power for good. The Creator did not greatly err when he endowed man with the power of humor and with susceptibility to the influence of wit.

V.—LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TEXTS FROM RECENT DISCOVERIES.

BY PROFESSOR J. F. MCCURDY, D.D., LL.D., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO, AUTHOR OF "HISTORY, PROPHECY, AND THE MONUMENTS."

THE FATE OF THE PEOPLE OF NORTHERN ISRAEL.

We begin our present brief study by recalling the statement made in our last, to the effect that the fate of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes was mainly determined by the policy of Assyria toward its subject states, and the fortunes of the people themselves by the policy of Assyria toward its conquered provinces. Having already disposed of the former of these topics, it is now our business to deal with the latter. Naturally we follow two lines of inquiry. We ask, in the first place, What became of the exiles of Samaria? and, in the second place, What became of the people of Israel who were left in their homes?

As a preliminary, however, we must understand something of the nature of the treatment dealt out by the controlling empire to its conquered provinces. Whenever the abolition of a seditious government was decreed—a measure which, as we have seen, was only undertaken after repeated acts of rebellion—the contumacious district was immediately made an integral part of the empire itself. That is to say, it was deprived of whatever autonomy it possessed. Its revenues came directly and wholly into the hands of Assyrian officials instead

of being, as before, largely paid over in the form of tribute by the king of the semi-independent state. While the ordinary administration of justice might be allowed to go on as before, the decisive word came from Assyrian judges. The militia consisted henceforth of soldiers sworn to the service of Asshur. In the supreme matter of religion, while the local deities were tolerated on the principle of expediency, and also, indeed, by virtue of the essentially local character of all ancient ethnic religions, the great gods of Assyria were acknowledged as supreme over all.

Such was the treatment accorded by the later Assyrian rulers to a conquered land and to the people within the land. But it often happened that the relations were very much complicated by an entirely novel set of conditions. I refer to a twofold change in the whole situation effected by the system of deportation, which was made by the great Tiglath-Pileser a standing measure of Assyrian policy. By virtue of the transfer of a large portion of the population to a foreign region and the introduction of distant outsiders to take their places, the relations, both of those who were deported and of those who were allowed to remain, were materially affected. Both sections of the inhabitants of the state (Samaria for instance) were now brought into contact with a strange people. Such new relations ordinarily were, as they were designed to be, fatal to national force and unity. The whole system was in fact designed to break up national sentiment as well as national cohesiveness. When it is remembered that every ancient community was absolutely grounded upon social and religious solidarity, the distinctive influence of this national disturbance and dislocation becomes at once obvious. We can follow out the operation of the system in any given instance with perfect confidence in the general accuracy of our conclusions, especially in such a case as that of Samaria, where the conditions are fairly well known.

Before proceeding with this interesting twofold inquiry a single remark is advisable. It is not to be supposed that this process of national and racial obliteration was necessarily carried out with cruelty or even with harshness in all its details. Barbaric atrocity, of which God knows the Assyrian rulers perpetrated their full share, tho no more than their share, among the ancient nations, was reserved for occasions of signal punishment. In the later stages of the Assyrian régime it was fully understood that in the social and political sphere the most effective as well as most woful measures were those which were most farreaching and gradual in their operation. Hence the laws of social and religious action and interaction were allowed to work their way, when once preparation had been made for their operation upon a scale sufficiently large.

It was in January of 721 B.C., that Sargon, the founder of the last and most powerful dynasty of Assyrian kings, came to the throne. Samaria was then at the end of its resources. It had perhaps, indeed, already been taken. In any case the fate of the conquered city was at the disposal of the newly acceded king. The terms imposed seem to have been less than usually harsh. The bulk of the population were allowed to remain for a time at least in their own country, and presumably in the possession of their own property. The 27,290 persons who were deported, according to the official enumeration, included the leaders of the revolt and their families. By this we are to understand that most of the people of influence in the city of Samaria itself were removed. The people of the country districts were not at first disturbed. We are, however, just now concerned with those who were sent away, not with those who remained. Sargon's account does not tell of their destination. For this information we are indebted to the Bible narrative. The passage in question, 2 Kings xvii. 6, which is virtually repeated in xviii. 11, needs to be slightly amended in order to be intelligible. It is to be read: "The king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them on the Balich and the Chabor rivers of

Gozan, and in the cities of Media. By "Assyria" is here meant Assyrian possessions, and the specific distinctions were districts on the principal northern tributaries of the middle Euphrates, and the territory which was afterward known as Media.

As is quite natural, the attention of Bible readers has been very greatly directed to the question of a possible survival in considerable numbers of the exiles of Israel. Let us look at the conditions a little more closely. Under what circumstances would survival have been possible? In the first place, there must have been a considerable number of exiles living close together in a single district. Social organization would otherwise have been impossible. Secondly, they must have been fairly well organized religiously. It was the religious issue which, as a matter of fact, usually decided the fate of such exiles. The consolidating effect of common rites and ceremonies, and of the usages of religion generally, was a cardinal necessity for the perpetuation of any community. In a foreign land such observances were, as a rule, impracticable. The very primary condition, that it was the god of the land that was worshiped by each and every nation, made it difficult to continue in captivity the distinctive cult of the homeland. Moreover, the new residence must be of such a character as to admit of industrial and social progress on the part of the immigrants. Otherwise they would be absorbed in the nearest community, or be dispersed and separated beyond possibility of reunion.

Now when we consider the chances of the exiles of northern Israel under these conditions, we must remember, first of all, the general fact that the very purpose of this Assyrian system of deportation was to put an end to the community thus sundered and dispersed. If the Samarian captives escaped the common fate the occasions must have been exceptionally favorable. But, as a matter of fact, were such conditions as those above adduced actually present? The Samaritans were sent to two localities, not to one. Rather, they were sent to separate districts within these two distinct regions. At the very lowest estimate they must have formed four distinct communities. Almost certainly they were still further divided, and had little chance to form any community at all. Some were placed along certain rivers of Mesopotamia. No cities are named. They were to be apparently agricultural laborers or shepherds or both. Others were transported, perhaps two thousand miles away, over plain and river, mountain and valley, to the "cities of Media." Here the outlook was still more unfavorable. For all that the latest research, materially aided by the cuneiform inscriptions, has brought to light with regard to the Medes at that early era in their history, makes it clear that they were politically in a most unsettled and rudimentary condition. The population was divided up into small settlements. The new inhabitants of the Aryan race were slowly acquiring a foothold in the country, but that only here and there. They, like their predecessors of non-Aryan origin, were divided up into small communities, as was the case with the peoples of all the mountain region to the east of the Tigris. We learn from Sargon's inscriptions that he desired greatly to add this little-known territory to the Assyrian realm. But his operations there were not undertaken till several years after the fall of Samaria. We may, I think, take it for granted, that the deportation of Samaritans to Media was not direct, perhaps not immediate. Consequently they were not transplanted to Media till they had been for some time directly under Assyrian administration either at home or elsewhere. They were thus rendered still less capable than ever of forming a permanent settlement in their place of exile as a separate community. In all probability they were portioned out as the chattels of chiefs of the country who by force or treaty had been made temporarily loyal to Assyria. The political changes which went on very rapidly in Media during the following century—the relaxing of Assyrian control, the increase of Aryan immigration, the consolidating of the Aryan settlements, the

rise of the Median monarchy—would complete the divisive forces, and render utterly impossible the separate survival of these far eastern remnants of Israel.

But the survival of the exiles of Jerusalem in Babylonia at a later date may be pointed to; and it may be asked, Why the Samaritans may not also have been preserved as well? The answer has been already implied. Two points may be explicitly emphasized as alone decisive. In Babylonia the exiled Jews found a highly civilized organized prosperous state, where an opportunity was afforded for mutual intercourse as well as for industrial progress. Again—and this is of principal consequence—the Jewish colonists were, as regards religious organization and habit, far beyond the Samaritans. One only needs to read the prophets Amos and Hosea to learn how little religious unity there was in the northern kingdom even in the comparatively prosperous times which preceded the collapse, the disintegration, and the degradation of the era of the downfall. That the captives of Judah did survive at all in any form is indeed a singular phenomenon. But with them the work of the prophets had not been altogether in vain. And they had enjoyed besides the privilege of the temple, the purer worship, the promises of a better future, the unbroken dynastic rule of the house of David.

A word or two will suffice to dispose of the other question as to what became of the people of Israel who remained in Palestine. Survivors of the "Ten Tribes" are usually looked for outside of the land of Canaan. It would be much more reasonable to look for them at home. But here again the religious issue was paramount and decisive. Indeed, it was largely to prove this very thing that the book of Kings was written; 2 Kings xvii., tho it does not tell the whole story, contains the motives of it, and gives the solution of the whole question. This chapter, more than any other in the Bible, illuminates and is illuminated by the religious and political ideas and policy of the Assyrians as revealed in their own records. From it we learn how it was that the Samaritans, combined with the Eastern foreigners who had been transplanted thither to take the place of deported Israelites, became predominantly heathen, and therefore were forever excluded from the commonwealth and the hope of Israel. The subsequent history is complicated, and this is not the place to follow it out. Nor is there any need. The opprobrious epithets "Samaritan" and "Cuthæan" were synonymous on the lips of the later Jews. Tho the perpetuation of the bitter prejudice was unreasoning and cruel, there were the strongest kind of historical reasons for its existence. What might have been the fate of the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman province of Samaria, if Jehovah had not been dethroned before the loss of its political independence, may also be plainly read between the lines of this memorable chapter.

FOR more than eight years the University of Pennsylvania has been sustaining excavations at Niffer in Northern Babylonia. . . . Then, as the results come to hand, the texts are translated, and the photographs reproduced in the most accurate manner by Professor Hilprecht of Pennsylvania. . . . Hitherto we have been accustomed to look upon Sargon of Accad and his son Naram-sin, who founded a great Semitic empire in Babylonia about 3800 B.C., as belonging to the "gray dawn" of history. It is true that the art of their day is highly advanced, like the art of the earliest period to which we have yet been able to push back the history of Egypt. It is more highly advanced, indeed, than the art of the period following. But Sargon and Naram-sin seemed to belong to the number of "the world's gray fathers" simply because we knew no history of an earlier time. That is all altered now. Nipur, the ancient name of the modern Niffer, where these excavations are being accomplished, was already a city and shrine of hoary age when Sargon began to reign.—*Expository Times*, September, 1896, p. 530.

SERMONIC SECTION.

REPRESENTATIVE SERMONS.

THE BOND OF LOVE.

BY REV. RICHARD McILWAINE, D.D.
[SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN], PRESIDENT OF HAMPDEN-SIDNEY COLLEGE, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY, VA.

Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God.—
1 John iv. 7.

THE religion of our Lord Jesus Christ differs from all others in this: it affects, and appeals to, and governs the heart. Other systems have laid hold upon other powers of our nature, but the Gospel is distinctive in constraining the affections, in seizing the motive and controlling forces of the soul, and in bringing them into subjection to its loving claims. It is true, indeed, that the divine revelation is not neglectful of any part of our being. Tho' it appeals to reason, enlightened and instructed by truth, often it addresses the imagination, bringing up before it the most lively images of good and evil, of blessing and cursing for time and eternity. Not infrequently it addresses itself to the sentiment of fear on the one hand, and of hope on the other, portraying the hour of death with its solemn realities, depicting judgment with its dread scenes, and unveiling heaven and hell with the objects which should awaken desire and aversion in every human soul. But all this is done only as a means to an end; it is to move the heart, to draw the soul away from things of sense and sin, to introduce it into the love and fellowship of God, and to produce in it that holy sympathy with the divine nature which shall cause it to dwell in love as it dwells in God.

In whatever aspect we view our religion, we find this grand motive prin-

ciple constantly confronting us. Love is inscribed upon the entrance door to our temple. It covers and overshadows the throne and fills the mind of the eternal Trinity. It meets us at the cross, invites us away from the paths of sin, and receives us into fellowship with God and communion with His people. "God is love!" "Beloved, let us love one another!" It sounds like the dulcet strains of some enchanting melody; it issues from a heart all full of divine affection—it floats upon the air in liquid, hallowing accents, penetrating the soul with resistless, moving energy, and stirs up within us the very breathings of holy desire. "Beloved," says the apostle; the word is spoken by one who loves—"beloved let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God." This is the trembling, joyous, confident outgoing of the Christian life after fellowship, and friendship, and kindness, and sympathy in Christ. How simple and yet how urgent this appeal! The heart is dissatisfied in loneliness and seclusion. It pants for a reciprocation of its own kindly and peaceful thoughts. It can not find rest in itself, and conscious of the love of God, ascending in incense of love to the heavenly throne, it seeks hallowed communion with those who are bound to God in love and hope.

The love spoken of in the text is not merely a sentiment. It is a pure and holy affection, a controlling principle of action, a consuming, abiding life. It would be a great mistake to regard Christian love as a passion, as a state or quality of heart unconnected with activity, as a mere negation of enmity or dislike. A large part of its force consists in its positive aspects, of the exhibition of active energy in outward

conduct. Its full measure is only realized when besides restraining us from its opposite vices, it impels and directs us into that course of conduct which is consistent with its high and imperious claims. With the Bible so full of exposition of this shining Christian grace before us, we need be at no loss to understand its nature.

The New Testament is at once a dissertation on, and an illustration of, its meaning. All its phases are revealed and amplified in this blessed book, and its claims are pressed upon us over and over again with loving reiteration. Take the thirteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians as the basis of your studies on this subject; ponder the epistle from which our text is taken; meditate upon the twelfth chapter of the Romans, or refer to some of the touching discourses of our Lord just preceding His final agony and death, and in each and all of these you will find the true characteristics and importance of Christian love tenderly sketched.

This is the chief of the Christian graces; the keystone of the arch which gives beauty and symmetry and permanency to the others. It is the crowning glory of the Christian character; the essential element of Christian perfectness; the highest exhibition of Christian excellence. This is that grace which adorns and beautifies the Christian profession before men, which shall hallow and illustrate it in heavenly glory. It is greater than faith, for "faith shall be lost in sight;" it is higher than hope, for "hope shall be swallowed up in fruition," but love shall never fail. It is the music which shall ever regale the ear, and delight the soul in paradise; the fountain at which the saints of God shall ever drink; the atmosphere which the ransomed ones shall ever breathe; the hallowed bond which shall ever unite the happy inhabitants of heaven in perpetual and ever-strengthening concord.

What a Divine quality is love—Christian love! It is opposed to envy, to jealousy, to pride, to haughtiness, to

injustice, to evil thoughts, to wrong desires, to unkind and ungenerous words, to sharp and offensive acts. "It thinketh no evil." It wishes no harm. It doeth no wrong. It is not given to falsehood, to fault-finding, to suspicion. It is not apt to mark the infirmities of others; to dwell with pleasure upon their weaknesses, foibles, and sins; to give currency to statements which will be damaging to the good name or peace of its neighbors. It is not concerned to stir up strife, to intermeddle with other people's affairs, to disseminate injurious rumors, to promote dissension, to alienate friendship, or to create trouble. It is neither hasty nor vindictive; lustful nor grasping; litigious nor severe; but is kind, gentle and peaceable; considerate of the good of others, forbearing to their faults, forgiving their injuries, casting the mantle of charity over their infirmities; promotes their welfare, and does them all the good which it is in its power to render. Love heals divisions, softens asperities, removes alienations, promotes friendships, binds human hearts together in sweet and pleasant union, cherishes amiability and gentleness of temper, puts far away unholy feelings, and brings Christians to associate together as members of a common brotherhood—as a holy band, living and laboring for the glory of God, as children of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.

It is almost needless for me to state that this divine affection is not congenial to the natural heart. Once it sprung up in the soul as its native soil, and flourished and grew in unmarred beauty; but since sin entered into the world, it is exotic, and must be nurtured with sedulous care when it has once been implanted by the Spirit of God. That it originates in heaven, we are forcibly taught again and again in the Scripture. In the verse from which our text is taken, the apostle says, "For love is of God," and in another place the apostle Paul says, "The fruit of the Spirit is love." It comes down from

above as one of the ascension gifts of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is a quality imparted in the new birth as that which allies us to the divine nature.

This grace, then, is an essential characteristic of the renewed nature, a necessary and unvaried constituent of that heart within which the holy seed has been planted. It must exist wherever the Spirit of God reigns, and thrive and prevail wherever the soul has entered upon divine life. Without love, our nature is insensible and dead; with it, it is full of the very substance of the religion of Christ. Everything connected with the Christian's hope is adapted to produce it; every duty incumbent upon us imperatively demands it; all our high and holy expectations fully warrant it. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." "He that loveth not, abideth in death."

From whatever point of view then we consider this affection, we see that it is of vast importance. The motives which constrain us to its exercise are manifold and impressive. If we think of God, He is love. If we meditate upon redemption, whether in its inception, its execution, or its design, we are met by love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent His Son to die for us." If we wish to assure ourselves of our interest in the kingdom of Christ, then in loving hearts we have full proof of our acceptance as the children of God, "for he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him," and "we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." If, too, we wish to illustrate the virtues of the Christian profession, "to show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of," etc., then here is the sphere in which we must live, and move, and have our being, for "hereby shall we know that we are Christ's disciples, if we love one another."

It is needful, dear brethren, that Christians have love to one another; needful for our comfort and spiritual

peace; needful that the light of truth may shine in our lives; needful because of the relation that we sustain to the Kingdom of God and Christ. Children of the same Father, we acknowledge that "God who is rich in mercy, who for the great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace are ye saved) and hath raised us up together and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the ages to come, He might show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness to us through Christ Jesus. Believing in the same Savior, we come to the same blood of the atonement to be washed from all uncleanness. Eating the same spiritual meat, we all drink the same spiritual drink, for we drink of that spiritual rock that follows us, and that rock is Christ. We are all the temples of the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of God dwells in us; we are one body and one spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." We have the same home in this world—the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood; we look forward to the same heaven in the next world, the church of the first-born in heaven. Quickened by the same grace, controlled by the same truth, participants in the same blessings, enjoying the same hopes, comforted by the same consolations, affected by the same scenes, our sympathies kindle and move under the same influences; we rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.

And how beautiful is Christian love among the many members! How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. It is sweet, and elevating, and joyous to him whose heart is filled and overflowing with it. It is cheerful and inspiring and blessed to him who receives and rejoices in it. What charms it lends to the Christian life! What

grace it bestows upon the confession of Jesus! What sorrows it heals; what good it performs; what mischiefs it averts; what comforts it gives; what happiness it creates! It is surely a ministration from heaven; a divine influence graciously sent down among the children of men, to alleviate the pressing distresses of this present life, to lighten up its darkness, to gladden its desolations, to win and to hallow the soul, and to draw it away to a better world, even unto immortal life. "Beloved, let us love one another; for God is love; and every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God."

"Love much! Earth has enough of bitter in it,
Cast sweets into its cup whene'er you can;
No heart is so hard, but love at last will win it,
Love is the grand, chief cause of man,
All hate is foreign to God's first plan.

Love much! Your faith will be dethroned and shaken,
Your trusts betrayed by many a fair, false lure;
Remount your faith, and let new hopes awaken,
The clouds obscure them, yet the stars are pure;
Love is a vital force, and shall endure.

Love much! Men's souls contract with cold suspicion,
Shine on them with warm love and they expand,
'Tis love, not creeds, that from a low condition
Leads mankind on up to heights supreme and grand;
Oh! that this world could see and understand!"

THE SON comes from heaven to earth to do the Father's will, and the Father's will is to bless and heal. It is impossible, therefore—it is inconceivable—that He who comes simply to do that will on earth, as it is done in heaven, shall reject or repel a single soul that turns to Him. This would be to leave that will undone; nay, it would be to run right athwart and counter to it. Therefore, "him that cometh to Me I shall not cast out." — *D. J. Vaughan.*

THE PUBLICAN A MODEL OF TRUE PIETY.

BY PROFESSOR DR. FRED LOOFS, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE.*

And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves, etc.—Luke xviii. 9-14.

BELOVED in the Lord: The parable just read in your hearing is one of the most interesting pieces in the Scriptures. From earliest youth we have been so familiar with these words that their true and full force may be lost upon us. Our experience with these words is the same as we have with so many things around and about us, namely, that so many things known to us from earliest childhood are not so thoroughly appreciated as they would be if we had become acquainted with them only in a later period of life. If we would understand the full significance of the words of our text, we must try to think ourselves into the thoughts of those who first heard this parable from the lips of our Lord. What may have been their thoughts when they heard Christ say of the Pharisee that he thanked God for being better than other people? Did they possibly think that the Pharisee was a liar or a hypocrite? I do not believe so. The Pharisees had the reputation of being pious people. Outwardly they were all such, and the Pharisee in our text was doubtlessly not any worse than the rest of his sect. And when, then, the Lord continues His parable and speaks of the Publican, who modestly had remained standing back of the Pharisee and had not dared to lift up his eyes to heaven, but stood

* The author of this sermon is professor of church history in Halle, and is an exceptionally brilliant and prominent young doctent. He is generally accredited to the Ritschl, or liberal, school of theology, but belongs to the positive wing. This sermon was actually preached, being delivered in the village church of Jeinsen, in Hanover, and is a fair sample of a German "professor's sermons" addressed to a congregation of plain peasant Christians.—*Tr.*

afar off and ventured to speak only these words: "God be merciful to me, a sinner!" no doubt, then, the original hearers all had perhaps overcome their ill will generally entertained by the Israelites toward the Publicans, and they doubtless expected the Lord to close His story with the statement that this penitent Publican was none the less acceptable to God than was the honored Pharisee. Certainly the conclusion which the Lord does actually draw had not at all been expected. This judgment comes like a flash of lightning out of the clear sky. It was incomprehensible to them that the Publican should go down to his house justified rather than the Pharisee. The Lord finds absolutely nothing to commend in the righteousness of the latter.

In truth this was a hard saying, an impressive lesson for those to whom the Lord first addressed this parable. There were people who claimed that they were pious, and accordingly people who were satisfied with their spiritual attainments. It was to people of this kind that the Lord expressly states at the end of His discourse: "Every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

That it would be unnecessary in our days to interpret this parable in this sense can, in truth, not be claimed. Self-righteousness is one of the leading virtues of the old man, a blemish found in every Christian congregation. Among us, too, it would certainly not be superfluous to take these lessons of the text impressively to heart and to emphasize the truth that all our good deeds are before God as filthy rags. But we will rather look at the words of our rich text to-day from a somewhat different point of view.

As often as we in our times read this text we justify Christ entirely in His judgment. But is His judgment of Christ really just as natural as would seem to be the case? Is it really so natural to praise the righteousness of

a Publican, who was doubtless no better than the rest of his *confères*, and exalts him above the average Pharisee and his righteousness? True, we would all answer with the text, that this was because of his confession of sins. But we should not only know what to answer, but also try to understand what is implied in this answer. Our text, accordingly, suggests the problem:

Why did the Lord declare the Publican to be a model of true piety and righteousness?

I. Because the Publican's prayer came from the depth of his heart.

II. Because in his prayer he gives the true God all the glory.

III. Because he shows how it can be possible for us to do really good works.

May God grant us His spirit properly to consider these points!

I. There are various kinds and types of piety among men also in our day. We read of pious heathen, of pious Jews, of pious Christians. And among Christians, too, we hear of the piety of the Roman Catholic monk and of the piety of a Protestant believer. In fact even among evangelical Christians the ideas as to what constitutes piety are not in perfect agreement. But however much men may differ in their conception of this idea, on one point at least all German Christians have always agreed, namely, that true piety is an affair of the heart, and because this is the case, the Publican is a model of genuine piety.

In order to recognize this fact let us look first at the Pharisee. He represented a type of piety that has always been popular, consisting in external regularity in church attendance, in strict obedience to the letter of the law and the ecclesiastical ordinances of his communion. The Pharisee actually does more than is demanded of him, for he fasts twice a week and gives tithes of all he possesses. Indeed, he was pious as are so many formal Christians of our day. And yet the Lord is unwilling to recognize this piety.

He finds no heart-piety in the man. The Pharisee thanks God that he has not committed theft, and the like. Indeed, my good man, but have you never read, in Deut. vi. 5, that God asks that you shall love Him with all your heart? Do you not know that God wants your heart? (Prov. xxiii. 26.) Do you not know that while man sees what the eye beholds, God sees the heart? (1 Sam. xvi. 7.) Of this the Pharisee had probably never thought. He plainly shows what it was that filled his heart. He thanks God that he is better than others, also than this Publican. How did he know that the Publican was a sinner? It was an expression of the real state of his own heart that prompted this uncharitable judgment.

How entirely different was the conduct of the Publican! There is no reason for believing that he had not participated in the sins common to people of his class, such as injustice, extortion, and the like. And he might have done as so many do, justified his conduct on the ground that others did the same, that when among wolves one must howl with them. But nothing of the sort comes from his lips. He attempts no excuse of his conduct. He knows himself guilty and will confess his sins. In his heart he has felt the heinousness of his transgression, and for this reason he does not attempt any justification of his misdeeds. So keenly does he feel his wrong that he can only utter the deep prayer: "God be merciful to me, a sinner!" This prayer it is that makes the Publican a model of heart-piety.

We can not look into the heart of any of our fellow-creatures. In the case of those who are especially near and dear to us, we, indeed, often say that we can see into the depths of their hearts. This is the case in all true marriages and deep friendships. And yet we only can claim this. Even in the hearts of those whom we deeply love there are thoughts which are not revealed to us, sentiments and feelings that are hidden to our eyes. And does

even every one of us know his own heart? He who really knows this must acknowledge that the Publican was right, and like him must feel impelled to utter, as the sentiments of his innermost soul: "God be merciful to me, a sinner!"

It is true that not all believe this. But of him who does not, I ask that he should imagine that a fellow-creature could really see into his heart. If it were an enemy, certainly we hope he would be able to see that he has been judging wrongly, that you are better than he thinks you are. But imagine that some one who is especially dear to you, your father or your mother, your husband or your wife, could, with their eyes, penetrate the deepest recesses of your soul, would they think better of you than they do now, or worse? In regard to the correct answer to this question, no true man can be in doubt. Indeed, and alas, there are so many things in our hearts which we, with God's grace, are able to suppress and keep out of sight, which even our nearest kith and kin dare not see. In our souls is hidden an abundance of evil and sin, as Paul confesses (Rom. vii. 18). "A world of unrighteousness," as John Calvin says; and these are the things which God sees and according to which He judges us in our natural state. Therefore, with the Publican, the true Christian will at all times pray, "God be merciful to me, a sinner." Here we have a model of piety.

II. All kinds of piety, be it Gentile, Jewish, or Christian, are dependent upon the ideas entertained by men concerning their God or their gods. When the Roman father every morning and at every family festival brought as a sacrifice to his god what was in accordance with religious custom of the people, this man was considered pious, even if he was a worthless, wicked character. A Roman did not consider it his duty to repent of those acts which a Christian regards as sin. In his estimation the gods did not trouble themselves about such acts. There could be no

true piety among the Romans because they had no true conception of God. And the same is true of modern Mohammedanism. Because these people do not know the true God, they can not exercise that true piety which distinguishes between right and wrong.

The same rule applies to us Christians. You are not for that reason a true Christian and believe in the true God, because you happen to be born of Christian parentage. This must be a matter of your own personal heart conviction. He who thinks unworthily of God, who does not honor the true God, but makes for himself a God according to the desires of his own heart, such a person can not possibly be truly pious. This is demonstrated by the text before us. The Pharisee thanks God that he is better than others. He has no idea or conception of that God who demands a pure heart. He speaks to God as he would to a good neighbor. He even reminds Him of the multitude of his own good works. Just as if this could satisfy the just demands of God just as if fasting and tithes had been instituted for God's sake. That God, "who is not served by men's hands" (Acts xvii. 25), the Pharisee knows not; that God he knows not to whom nobody can give what will perfect His glory. And for this reason, because he entertained a false idea concerning God, therefore the Pharisee continued in his pride and superficiality, and could bring forth no genuine piety.

How foolish of him! is undoubtedly the thought of many among us. If he had only opened his Old Testament he could have been better informed. Yes, indeed! But matters are no better in our own day. It is, indeed, true that we Christians know full better what kind of creature the true God is—for He has been revealed to us in Christ—but still, how many regulate their ideas of God in accordance with their own wishes? They think "the dear God" in heaven will be satisfied with us, if we will only be good, moral men and women; that He will close

one eye to our weaknesses and imperfections, as we do Him many favors by going to church, helping the poor, contributing to various causes, and the like. Oh, how many have such thoughts of the "dear God"! And in such cases true piety can not possibly exist. The real God is a different Being from the popular "dear God." The latter expression is [in German] indeed a beautiful one, but it is not accidental that it is not found in the Scriptures. These speak of the Almighty God, of the Just God, of the Holy God. And it is just this holiness of God that we so often forget. True it is that God is Love (1 John iv. 16); but yet He is also the Holy One, who will have nothing of sin and who hates sin. Indeed, just because He is love, therefore He can not do otherwise than hate sin, which only drives us to destruction.

And he who would give all honor to this holy God can not approach Him in any other attitude of heart than that of the Publican, praying that God would have mercy on him, a sinner. And he can also say, Have mercy! Of God's mercy the Pharisee knew nothing. And yet in this very thing God's glory appears the greatest. To show mercy is a leading prerogative of a king. To appeal to God for mercy, is to acknowledge Him as our King and Master; and He Himself wants us to make use of this His privilege. If we despise this privilege, then we are as little true children of God, as that child is a child that refuses to accept its parents' forgiveness. Just for this very reason God has sent His Son Jesus Christ, our Savior, that He should bring to the world God's grace. To this Savior of sinners, for whose sake God is willing to be merciful to us, we should cling with true, fervent, devout Christian piety. And this it is that we learn from the Publican's prayer. This is a prayer addressed to the true God, and gives the honor to Christ, our Lord and Savior. Therefore the Publican's prayer is a model and a type.

But how can this be so? He is an

unrighteous and unjust man. He has committed so many sins. This problem is solved by the next part of our discourse.

III. In his evil deeds the Publican is certainly no model or guide. But he had been a lover of evil and wrong. That Lord who has told us that not all who cry Lord! Lord! shall enter into the Kingdom of God, could not have pointed with the finger of approval to the Publican, if this man had not become an entirely different creature. This certainly is not the intention of the Lord, to say that in some miraculous way the faults of the Publican had suddenly become virtues, his evil deeds good. This is not the method in God's Kingdom. God is a God of order. The God who causes the flowers to grow and does not bring them upon the earth as perfect products, also produces a growth in the spiritual life of man. The new life, too, proceeds from a small germ. But he who would become a new man must know how such a germ looks. We learn this from the Publican. He is not transformed in a miraculous manner; he no doubt will have been troubled by his old, sinful habits and inclinations all along. But his sins had been forgiven. He was for this reason justified; *i. e.*, regarded as just, received in mercy, notwithstanding his sins, and thereby his heart had been changed. Before this he did not venture to lift up his eyes to heaven; now he had free access to grace (Rom. v. 2). Before this his conscience had troubled him; now joy and peace filled his heart. Now he could do really good works. "Good works," says Luther, "must come out of a truly childlike, joyous heart." Such a joyous heart the Publican had heretofore not had. Now he has this through his faith in God's grace. Now he was apt and in a condition to do deeds acceptable to God. That the new spirit in the Publican produced the fruits of a true Christian life, is not expressly stated in our text, but that such necessarily would be the conse-

quences we know from God's own words and revelation. They are as necessary to genuine faith as fruit is the necessary product of a healthy tree; and, on the other hand, in the nature of the case they can come from no other source. In finding the grace of God the Publican had also found the key to a truly Christian life. God grant that this lesson may not be lost to our hearts! Amen.

THE ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF THE GOSPEL.

BY HENRY C. MABIE, D.D. [BAPTIST], BOSTON, MASS., SECRETARY OF THE BAPTIST FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Much more.—Romans v. 9.

I WONDER if we have made as much as we ought of that tremendous power wherein God turns to the contrary the devices of sin and Satan. I have chosen for our meditation this morning two short words which occur four times in the fifth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans, the words, "Much more." First we read in the 9th verse of the fifth chapter: "Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." And in the 15th verse: "But not as the offense, so also is the free gift. For, if through the offense of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." And in the 17th verse: "For if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." And in the 20th verse: "Moreover, the law entered that the offense might abound; but where sin abounded grace did much more abound."

I. I wonder if we shall ever get the meaning of the Gospel word, grace; if we shall overcome our habitual constant temptation to doubt the sufficiency of the grace of Jesus Christ to

deliver us out of the depth of sin into which we have fallen, to give us victory over our habitual weakness and habitual unbelief, so that we shall at last triumph over our besetting sins. I suspect that a great majority of people are deeply impressed with the question of how far the Gospel itself, altho it is a divine Gospel and wells up out of the eternal love of the infinite Father and was purchased for us with the infinite price of the precious blood of the Son of God—whether even that Gospel can reach to our extremity and do for us what we all feel to be needed and yet concerning which we have so grave a doubt? Is it not a fact that for a long period in the history of the Church of God the conception of paradise regained is about the maximum of expectation that has been entertained? Many there are that feel all their lives that they must go through life weighed down with the sins of chagrin and failure. But if God will help us in this part of the New Testament to look this morning from God's point of view upon this whole problem, I am persuaded that our difficulty in respect to the lack of assurance and faith in the comfort of this Christian life will be done away with. Here on earth we say when a convert is won: "The sinner has found a Savior." But from the heavenly point of view the angels are saying: "The Savior has got a believer;" and it makes a tremendous difference which is our habit of looking at things.

The parable of the sheep was to illustrate not the coming of the sheep into the fold of the shepherd, but the satisfaction of the shepherd in the recovery of his sheep; and in the story of the lost coin, not the satisfaction of the coin at having got back safely into the purse of the housekeeper, but the joy of the housekeeper that she had found that which she had lost; and in respect to the prodigal son, the thing which is emphasized is not the supreme satisfaction of the lost boy when he found himself once more safely housed under

his father's roof, but the thing to be emphasized was the joy of that father that he had got the boy again. That ought to be the basis of our confidence if we shall get to heaven and enter into the triumphs and glories there; the thing that helps us evermore in the discovery of God's mind and heart, of Christ's interest in us, of the Holy Spirit's love, about which we have been hearing so much for the last two or three days.

II. Now, we would think it a great thing if we were to be restored to the original innocence of Adam. But the Gospel does vastly more than that. It is not simply to give us the old days that our first father had in Eden. God undertakes to destroy us to bring us into the new Eden, and I verily believe that the new spiritual race in Jesus Christ which God is undertaking to create is as much above the original race of unfallen Eden as Adam is above any variety of apes. There is a new creation going on in the universe of God. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation," because redemption of this world means something more than bringing it back to where it was before it fell. It means to establish it and transfigure it and glorify it, and perpetuate it in Jesus Christ, who is unspeakably more and diviner than the first one, with all his innocence.

I read to you this morning that remarkable chapter at the conclusion of the Book of Esther in order to bring out that principle which everywhere runs through the Bible, but is rarely dwelt upon, and which before this morning I have never attempted to preach upon—that great principle of turning the tables upon the soul's enemy and upon God's enemy. Now, redemption in Jesus Christ is an attempt not only to save man, but to turn the tables upon his enemies. The attempt of redemption is not only to repair the damage which sin has wrought, but, so to speak, to make sin pay the damages. I don't mean by

that in any sense that the Atonement can be dispensed with, but I do say that Christ undertakes more than to restore men, or else why do we find this language all through this chapter—much more, much more, much more, much more?

But let us go back to the fifteenth verse in Romans, fifth chapter: "But not as the offense, so also is the free gift." When the grace of God takes hold of a sinner it not only makes good the lapses and the loss which he has been enduring through sin, but comes down upon him with a new and diviner blessing than before. Here is a bank that in these trying times has lapsed, has failed, has become unable to make payments. It would be a great thing if a capitalist would come in and advance money enough to restore that bank to its original standing, and that would be only a restoration; but suppose in addition to that some one were to endow it with unlimited resources so long as time should stand, so that the bank could never be under the least risk of failing again. That would illustrate Paul's thought in this fifth chapter of Romans.

Jesus Christ, when he undertakes a work, does not undertake it with any doubt or suspense in His mind as to His ability to bring it to completion. He looks on His work with unbounded confidence in His ability to perform it. How many of us poor sons of Adam through original sin in the race are burdened with physical limitations and infirmities? But, cheer up, brother, for Christ will turn the tables on those things that hinder and depress and discourage you, and you will have the highest blessing God can give. Much more Christ is more than sufficient for all my needs. I say He turns the tables on our foes. We are always tempted to think of sin as an irretrievable calamity. Sin is an awful thing, no doubt; nobody can exaggerate it. But there is a deeper thing in this universe than sin. It is atonement. That was the purpose of God, to redeem man be-

fore man fell, before man was created even. That involved the last Adam; God thought of him before He permitted the first Adam to come on the plane of action at all; and so, altho to us it is a discouraging outlook, yet from God's point of view it is not on the whole discouraging, because God looks down and sees the power and process whereby one of these days He will put a new heart into that force that is running away with the human race, and we shall go into the divine presence.

III. May I just recite briefly some of the elements which I think should enter into this? God looking at the first Adam, when he was created, saw that he would fall. He must create a free agent. He seemed to say, "I will run the risk, in view of a more glorious race than the race of Adam, which runs away over in the future beyond him." God says, "I am going to develop a new spontaneity in the human race, so that, in the great future yonder, people will rise up in Jesus Christ and will say: 'I delight to do Thy will, oh God!'" And so He might, through a process of incarnation in Christ and of atonement wrought out through Christ.

When Mr. Moody preaches to the thousands of penitent men he is glad to know he can offer grace to sinners, and it is the most joyful hour in the human soul's experience when it acknowledges sin and confesses it and says, "Lord, my sin abounds." Where sin abounded grace was more than sufficient. It is only the fallen sinner that can plead for mercy. It is only he that can welcome the all-sufficiency and the more than sufficiency of the Savior's atoning blood. I think it no exaggeration of the truth to say that God resolved that after the fall of Adam and Eve every child born into the world was to have his very existence on the basis of that atonement that was promised and provided. Now we are apt to think of the race of Adam being perpetuated as if sin, the great calamity, had come into the

world, and nothing to relieve it or nothing to even stay it. Think a moment; we don't believe that.

We believe that all the griefs of original sin are met in the atonement concerning every infant child in this world. I suppose the consensus of Christian thought at once takes that ground that the atonement covers the case of infirmity and depression in the infant. If that is so, the whole infant world is in relation to the second Adam, because it was God's love and purpose to have it so. But there comes a time when the infant grows up and begins to assert its will and pride, and chooses to remain in relation to the first Adam. The truth is, as the Bible puts it, we are born into this world in relation to the first Adam and also to the second. I do not believe that a child would ever have been born into this world except with his relation to the second Adam. Do you know why Eve was called Eve? The very word means life. She was the mother of all living, the very perpetuity of the race is conditioned on that atonement that God had eternally purposed from before the foundation of the world. You remember that God said to the serpent that this seed of the woman that is coming shall bruise thy head. Do you remember when that first son was born to Eve, how she explained, "I have got a man by the help of the Lord"? There never would have been a man, woman, or child born to her except on the basis of that purpose of Jesus Christ to come into the world to offset the awful calamities.

Why, it is the first fact a man meets that Christ has been here before him, who died for him, died for the sins of the world, and all the man has to do is to fall in with that grace of God in Jesus Christ. Now in that way God undertakes to turn tables on the fall of man and on the sin of the race of the first Adam. It is not to put us back into the old Adam, but to put us forward into the new Adam above the old.

Now, another way in which the tables are turned is true of resurrection life and power, which always enjoins upon us that self-denying, self-dying, self-sacrificing habit which is at the basis of our Christian life. You know the Bible abundantly teaches us not only that Jesus Christ is our Savior, but that we are perfected through our sufferings as our Lord and Savior was through His sufferings. How abundantly that is shown in the sixth of Romans. There was a time when we thought, Christ has died for me; that is all I need. That is all we need to do to be justified. But as we get on in the spiritual life we soon see that we are born to die with Christ, to suffering and to sin. As we die the resurrection life of Christ is to enter into us and lift us up and give us our standing and our growth and our power.

My brethren, there is no such thing as deepest hell, for it may be deeper and deeper and deeper; and there is no such thing as a highest heaven, because it may be higher and higher and higher, and the Gospel we have to preach is a Gospel of grace, a Gospel of turning the tables.

PERJURY AND PROFANITY.*

BY WILLIAM R. TAYLOR, D.D.
[PRESBYTERIAN], ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.—Exodus xx. 7.

ACCEPTING the words in their common meaning, we may say that three things are forbidden in this commandment: perjury, profanity, and irreverence. We will take them up in order.

I. Perjury is false swearing. It is calling God to witness that we will tell the truth, and then, knowingly and intentionally, telling a lie. Perjury in the moral and religious sense, therefore, is

* This sermon is one of a series recently preached in the Brick Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N. Y., on "The Ten Commandments."

a much more comprehensive thing than perjury in a legal sense. In law the word has come to possess a very restricted meaning, applying only to false testimony willfully given by a person to whom a lawful oath has been administered in a judicial proceeding, in a matter material to the issue or point in question.

Technically, in the eyes of the law, therefore, false testimony under oath in a matter immaterial to the question at issue would not be perjury. Making a false affidavit is not necessarily perjury. False swearing between private parties, however solemn or however important, is not perjury. Violation of an oath of office, or of an oath of allegiance, is not perjury. The law takes no knowledge of these things or deals with them under other names.

But etymologically, as well as morally and religiously, all of them come under the head of perjury; for each is a breach of oath, and that is what constitutes, in distinctive form, the crime—the sin of perjury.

Now what is the idea underlying the administration of oaths? Simply this. Let us say, for instance, that I happen to have some information which you want and need. It is of the greatest importance to you that you should know the exact truth. It is a weighty, solemn matter. I am ready to tell you. But you can not see my heart. You do not know whether I will speak truly or not. You say to me: "Will you lift your hand to the God of heaven and so swear that you will tell the truth?" I say: "I will." And I do. When it is done, what have I done? I have virtually said: "I realize fully that I am in the presence of Almighty God, the Searcher of hearts. He knows all things. He hears what I say. He knows whether it is true or false. If I speak falsely I know I shall incur His wrath and punishment—I shall be a liar unfit for His company, fit only for companionship of the false and corrupt. Fully realizing all this, I tell you thus and so." Or, let us say, that

you propose committing an important trust to me. Again you do not know my heart. You do not know whether I will prove faithful or not. And you say: "Will you solemnly swear that you will fully discharge the trust committed you?" And I; lifting my hand and my eyes to God—cr touching or kissing His Book, in token that I know and receive for true what that Book tells about Him, realizing that He is ever watching to see if men are faithful to their contracts or covenants—I swear that I will be faithful to you.

The oath has created no new or additional obligation. I am no more strongly bound to tell the truth, or to be faithful to you, after the oath than I was before. The oath has served just two purposes—first, it has impressed me anew with the solemnity and binding authority of the always existing obligations to truthfulness and faithfulness; and, secondly, it has assured you that I am so impressed.

It is to secure these two ends that men, both in their private dealings, and in their governments, have resorted so generally to the use of the oath.

This being its nature, it is strange that any men should seriously object to oaths as essentially wrong—as the Quakers and Mormons do, for example. Oaths are surely a natural outcome of man's personal relations with God, and Scripture furnishes abundant precedent for their use. The taking of oaths was of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. God Himself is said to have sworn by Himself, because there was none other for Him to swear by. Our Lord consented to be put upon His oath by the high-priest. And Paul's letters and speeches contain not a few solemn adjurations.

So the practise is right and proper whenever the occasion is of sufficient import to make it desirable; and in the administration of law and government it is wholesome and necessary. From the President of the United States down to deputy sheriffs, our officials are sworn in when they assume office. In

our courts the judges preside, the lawyers plead, the jurors serve, and witnesses testify under oath, all to be faithful and truthful. Every naturalized citizen must take the oath of allegiance. Men are at liberty to prove, if they can, that our law and government should be absolutely colorless with regard to religion; that it should make no mention of God and take nothing for granted with regard to the divine authority of the Bible; but it is useless for them to assert that this has been or is the position of our country, with this use of the oath meeting them at every step, intended to bring men face to face with God for the purpose of making them truthful and faithful.

The state has done right in regarding perjury as one of the most serious of crimes. Its penalties are among the most severe that are inflicted. The temper of the courts is not more stern toward any crime. If allowed it would dissolve the very foundations of society.

I suppose the temptations to perjury in some cases are almost overwhelming. To save a relative from the prison cell, or, perhaps, even from the gallows or the electric chair; to keep or gain a fortune; to preserve a fair name from disgrace,—God grant that no such temptation may come to any of us! But let us root the resolve firmly in our hearts that no calamity which may befall shall ever tempt us to lift our hand to the God of heaven and call on Him to witness that we tell the truth, and then tell a lie. "Shall I lay perjury upon my soul; no, not for Venice." Many a man and many a woman has gone to the stake or the rack and suffered the loss of all things, rather than utter a lie. I wonder if you and I are made of that sort of stuff. God grant it!

I was much gratified in conversing with two prominent lawyers, to hear them both say that, in their judgment, there is comparatively little perjury, in the strict legal sense, and that it is not increasing. One of them said that

what there is is chiefly confined to the ignorant who do not understand the nature of an oath. The other, an ex-district attorney, said that in the thirteen hundred cases which he tried during his term, there were only two convictions for perjury. It is quite possible that the comparative certainty and the severity with which the laws against perjury are enforced have quite as much to do with its prevention as the moral impression produced by the taking of the oath has; but I believe that the idea of the solemnity of an oath administered to a witness has, generally speaking, a strong hold upon the minds and consciences of the people.

One of the great needs of our time is that our various officials, of every degree, should realize that the oaths administered to them on assuming office are equally as solemn and binding as oaths administered to witnesses, and that their violation is morally, if not legally, perjury. Invoking the God of heaven as witness to the purity and integrity of their intentions, and to assure their fellow-citizens that they may safely trust them, they swear that they will execute the laws and perform their whole duty faithfully. If they do not; if they wink at violations of the law; if they show improper favors to friend, or use their power to injure their enemies; if they administer their office with regard to personal or party ends instead of for the good of the whole people, they are perjured men.

Of course it would not be right nor fair to press this too far. We should not expect the impossible. I fancy that the best and the ablest of us, if we should be put into the positions of some of our public officials whose course we may criticize, would find ourselves confronted with difficulties in the way of enforcing all the laws which would prove insurmountable. No man should be held responsible for the immediate reformation of unlawful conditions of society which have been growing up for generations. But

what we have a right to demand, and what we ought to do all in our power to help and bring about, is that our officials should realize that their oath of office is precisely as sacred and binding as that administered to a witness in judicial proceedings, and that if they disregard it the brand of the perjurer is on them. I believe that there are multitudes of men holding public office, whom nothing could induce to go upon the stand to commit perjury, even if they knew they would not be punished, men who realize the disgrace of a witness who perjures himself, who do not realize that the use of their office for personal or party advantage, the enforcement or the non-enforcement of law according to the dictates of political expediency, is a violation of their oath and therefore perjury.

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain! Thou shalt not swear in the name of thy God to a lie. For the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain!"

II. And now we come to the second thing forbidden in the commandment, namely, profanity.

It is a horrible vice, and one to which, as I understand, the Christian nations are especially addicted. I have seen it stated on what would be considered very respectable authority, to say the least, altho I have not been able to verify the statement, that profanity is a thing almost, if not quite, unknown among the devotees of the great Oriental religions. The Mohammedan, it is said, will not tread upon a bit of written or printed paper lest he should unwittingly trample upon some saying of his God. Mohammedans, Buddhists, Confucians, Shintoists have other and worse vices, but this one, it appears, they have sense enough to avoid.

To think of the holy and reverend name of the Infinite God, the Faithful, and of Jesus Christ, man's Friend and Redeemer, and the loving Father of us all, being used by men to help them in

giving vent to their anger and hatred, to bolster up their lies, to inflate their braggart talk, to give some strength of reasoning to their coarse or feeble wit and to be mixed in with the obscene talk which flows like a stream of filthy sewage from their mouths!

A college acquaintance of mine, who was inclined to be dissipated, was standing at the bar of a saloon, drinking with a number of men, some of them considerably older than himself. On taking his wallet from his pocket to pay for his drinks, a photograph fell upon the bar which one of the older men recognized as the portrait of his own daughter. In an instant his face flamed with anger, and only the interference of the bystanders prevented a fight. He felt, and justly too, that it was an insult and an outrage that a man should bring the picture of a pure young girl into a place like that, and that it should be exposed even by accident, and for the briefest moment in those contaminated surroundings. How much more of an insult and an outrage it is that the name of God should be dragged into the false, the vile, the passionate, or the trifling conversation of men!

Men can not realize what a wicked, depraving thing profanity is, or they would not practise it as they do. It is a wanton insult and defiance of God. Tho it is true, as has been said, the men probably do not fully realize the wickedness of it, they are not constantly conscious of sin in indulging in it. No one but a slum child, or one who has heard profanity from his infancy onward, learns to swear easily. He has to brace himself for his first oath; and after it is uttered, his face blanches, and there is a peculiar wash-out, "all-gone" feeling around his heart. And I do not believe that, however habitual the practise may become, a man who was brought up with any decency ever swears without realizing that he is defying and insulting God.

Profanity always tends to destroy

the susceptibility to religious impressions. "No one can learn to swear without ceasing to pray." The defiance of God in this one particular tends to form a habit or rather a state of defiance in all other particulars. Not only the tongue, but the soul becomes profane and averse to all that is sacred.

Profanity corrupts and depraves the heart. It is not hard to see why. It casts God and everything that is sacred out of the life. Every oath is a repeated repudiation of God for good. It feeds the passion of anger and therefore brutalizes. It weakens obligations of truth, so that the swearer is almost invariably a liar, by the moral law that vices act and react on each other—just as, on the other side, virtues act and react on each other. Men, not only swear because they are wicked, but they are more wicked at heart because they swear. There is a tremendous reversionary power over character in the language which we habitually use. Frivolous language will by and by make a frivolous nature. The language of purity and nobleness will go far toward making one pure and noble. And so the language of devils and the damned will help to form in us the nature of devils and the damned. We naturally expect to find, and do find, the most and the worst profanity among the most depraved people. They swear horribly, because they are horribly depraved. But that is not all the story. They are horribly depraved, partly at least, because they swear horribly.

Profanity not only injures those who indulge themselves in it; it injures also those who hear it. It perpetuates and strengthens the vice in others who already practise it. It spreads it with all its sinfulness and depraving power to the young and innocent. It shocks and wounds the feelings of those who love God and the Savior whom others blaspheme.

And not the least element of its wickedness is that there is so little temptation to it. The only excuse

that is ever offered is that of momentary uncontrollable passion. But that accounts for only a very limited amount. All the rest is absolutely causeless, senseless, useless. There are very strong temptations in the way of personal advantage to theft and falsehood. Intemperance and licentiousness have the excuse, in their earlier stages, of pleasure—in their later stages of an imperious and well-nigh resistless physical appetite. But profanity pleases no sense, gratifies no passion, brings no profit. It impairs rather than increases a man's credibility—for a swearer's word is always at a discount. It is a mark of weakness, rather than of strength of character.

Fearing lest my own observations might be one-sided and optimistic—for ministers are apt to see men when they are on their good behavior—I appealed to a friend who sees much of men who consider themselves, and are considered, gentlemen, in the club of which he is a member. He assures me that while a man who swears, under serious provocation, does not lose caste, a man who should make a habit of swearing would lose caste.

This is probably a very true statement. It is not very high ground, to be sure. It makes no recognition of the essential wickedness of profanity. But it is valuable testimony to the fact that among the men who constitute the main element of what is recognized as our best society, the practise of profane swearing is regarded as vulgar and disgusting, and as a sufficient reason for denying to a man the title of gentleman. I believe that there is less and less profanity, every year, among the polite and refined, and it is coming—nay has come—to be generally regarded as the mark of coarse, low-bred people. It only needs a little more thought on the part of gentlemen who lay no claim to being religious, to bring them to accept the diction of that polished old scamp, Lord Chesterfield, that "a gentleman never swears."

From the testimony of not a few whom I have known, the habit of profanity, when once formed, is an exceedingly difficult one to break. But watchfulness, a resolute determination to control the temper, prayer to God for help, and good-nature will accomplish wonders.

III. Of the third thing forbidden in the commandment, irreverence, I shall have to speak to you some other time. For I find no small temptation to make these sermons too long.

But just let me say here, never jest with Scripture, with sacred hymns, or other things with which people's devout thoughts are associated. In telling a story don't repeat the profane exclamations of the characters of the story. Don't allow yourself the use of these expressions which are on the borderland of profanity, and they are gayly used—"My God!" "O Lord!" "For God's sake!" "O heavens!" When you enter a church to worship be cheerful and greet your friend, but don't be frivolous. Don't stare around—which is bad manners as well as bad religion. When a congregation prays, you pray too; or at least show sufficient respect to the place and the service to bow your head and close your eyes. The rude irreverence that many Protestants show during prayer in church—sitting bolt upright and looking around—is a reproach and sin. Our Roman Catholic and Episcopalian brethren are, as a rule, an example to us in their reverence. When you sing, whether you have the poorest voice in the congregation or the best voice in the quartet choir, don't sing thoughtlessly or for display, but to worship God, and to inspire others to worship Him.

Condemning Words.—Matt xii. 37.

Consider some of the ways by which words are used that minister to our condemnation.

1. At the head of the list profane swearing. 2. What St. Paul calls "foolish talking." 3. Petulant and complaining language. 4. Misrepresentation and slander. 5. Angry words.—*J. N. Norton.*

THE GREAT AWAKENER.

By REV. Z. H. LEWIS [BAPTIST],
LANDAFF ROAD, CARDIFF, WALES.

Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awaken him out of sleep.—
John xi. 11.

JESUS was at PERÆA when He uttered these words to His disciples. He had lingered there after hearing of Lazarus' illness in order that the glory of God might be manifested in His awakening. The Savior had a new truth to teach the small family at Bethany and also to His disciples. "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there to the intent ye may believe." He desired to teach them the grand truth that He was the resurrection and the life, and His friend Lazarus' death gave Him an opportunity to reveal this truth to His disciples and through them to the world.

First of all notice the title which Jesus gives Lazarus—friend.

In the second place notice the title He gives death—sleep.

In the third place notice the great Awakener.

I. The title Jesus gives to Lazarus—friend.

This is a very rare title in the Bible. Only one Old-Testament saint is honored with it, viz., Abraham (James ii. 23). Jesus also bestowed it only upon a few: "Henceforth I call you not servants . . . but I have called you friends," and as friends they were qualified to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven. He further tells men how to become His friends: "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you" (John xv. 14, 15). In Prov. xvii. 17, a friend is defined to be a person who loves at all times. A true friend's love is not spasmodic, but regular; it must not be hot to-day and cold or lukewarm to-morrow. The perpetual desire of the true friend is expressed in Ruth's language to Naomi: "Entreat me not to leave thee or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest I will go, and

where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

II. The title Jesus gives to death—sleep.

Lazarus has not ceased to live, he is simply resting. Now tho this term is frequently used in the Old Testament, in the hands of Jesus it gains a new meaning. Death was an enigma to the Old-Testament saints. Tho they called it a sleep, they were not quite sure of an awakening. But to Jesus death was no enigma at all. To Him it was no more than a sleep—it was rest from labor and trials and sorrows. So in this fact Jesus teaches the certainty of the resurrection. If death is a sleep, then there must be an awakening. And this truth Jesus Christ and His apostles often emphasize. There is a resurrection. The body will be raised up. This truth is gloriously adumbrated in Daniel xii. 2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

III. The great Awakener: "I go that I may awake him."

No other person could utter these words truthfully. No human voice could awaken Lazarus. So here we see a person who is more than man: Himself the resurrection and the life. Now what Jesus did with Lazarus is symbolical of what He will do with every other such sleeper on the great resurrection day. When that day comes He will tell His angels and His saints: "Our friends are sleeping down below, but the hour has come to awaken them. I go that I may awake them from their long rest and give them bodies like my own."

Heathenish Sorrow.—John xi. 11.

1. Immoderate grief when we idolize our departed ones. 2. Hopeless sorrow when we grieve as if death were the annihilation of our loved ones. 3. Faithless sorrow when we forget in our affliction that a God rules in heaven. 4. Inconsolable grief when we obstinately put aside consolation.—*Karl Gerok.*

THE CHANGED NAME.

By "A HEARER."

Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel.—Gen. xxxii. 28.

I SUPPOSE if each one were asked his name, he would give his "family" name. But suppose you were asked to give your "character" name, what would it be? There is a philosophy in "nicknames," for they often name the person according to some prominent trait of character.

There would be a startling revelation if each were named according to his character. Here is a very incomplete list of some of them: Mr. Two-face, Mr. Drive-sharp-bargains, Mr. Take-advantage-of-a-man-when-he-is-down, Mrs. Gossiper, Mrs. What-will-the-world-say, Miss Follow-the-fashion, Mr. Sunday-saint-and-Monday-sinner, Mr. Condemn-what-you-do-not-like-and-justify-what-you-are-weak-in, Mr. Gad-about-among-all-the-churches, Mr. No-good-at-the-prayer-meetings, Mr. and Mrs. Rambler-on-the-Sabbath-day.

Let each one be honest before God and name himself.

"Jacob" meant "supplanter"—"layer of snares." With this deceitful trait of character in him why was it that God loved Jacob and hated Esau? Because Jacob possessed latent principles on which God could work and develop a grand character. He was like the marble in the rough which responded to the sculptor's chisel until it became a figure of imposing statuary.

Esau was like the sandstone which would not take a polish but would crumble away under each succeeding stroke of the hammer and chisel.

Contrast the two lives up to this time and we find that Esau is rather the better; but let us withhold judgment until God is through with him. It is also true that some men are mean and contemptible in their dealings before conversion, and even afterward do crooked things. The world is severe; but wait until they pass through

God's school of discipline before we pass judgment on them.

Jacob was deceitful, crooked, untruthful. How does God deal with him in order to transform him into the beautiful character he was before he died?

I. God brings him in contact with one who is his match in these vices.

After Jacob secured the blessing, he had to flee from his angry brother. He went to Laban, his uncle, entered into partnership with him, worked seven years for Rachel, but was given Leah instead, and he had to work seven years longer for the one he loved.

Ask Jacob when he is through with Laban, what he thinks of sharp dealing and trickery, and he answers you in Genesis xxxi. 41.

In this way God often deals with His children. If deceitful, crooked, sarcastic, etc., He often matches you in these, and when you see your own sin magnified and intensified in the worlding, you despise it and forsake it.

If tired of God's service, He often allows you a trial without it. For an example look at Israel (Amos viii. 11, 12). For their answer after a sore trial in captivity read Psalm cxxvii. 1-6. Was not Israel glad to return to her God? So shall we be if we forsake Him.

II. Jacob had to meet his old sin again. He had to meet his wronged brother.

Surely twenty years would efface the memory of it—but no! it comes back even brighter than ever. Laban and he had a bitter quarrel and God directed him back to the land of his father. But Esau was there. He sends a man ahead to inquire how his brother feels; but the messenger returns with the alarming intelligence that Esau is coming to meet him with four hundred men. How the old sin is intensified! What can he do? He does the only thing possible for him to do. He falls prostrate before God and cries to Him in distress (Gen. xxxii. 9-11). He rises comforted. He prepares a present (Gen. xxxii. 13-21) and sends it

before him. How hard it is to meet an old sin! But there is plenty of the old Jacob in him yet, and he has to be further subdued and listen how God does it.

III. Jacob has to meet God alone (Gen. xxxii. 24).

But he must be subdued. The divine touch must come (vs. 25). He can withstand no longer; but he clings for a blessing (vs. 26). The man asks him his name. His whole past life, as signified in his name, appears in flashes before him, but he admits it and answers, My name is Jacob—"supplanter," crooked, deceitful. The acknowledgment of it is no sooner made than forgiveness is granted and the name is changed (vs. 28).

No more Jacob,—“supplanter”—but Israel, “a prince of God.” What a change! What do you think of Jacob now? He is subdued. Day breaks and he crosses the brook. He divides his company and moves on to meet his brother, a weaker but wiser man (Gen. xxxiii. 1-3). God preceded the meeting and softened the heart of Esau. What a reconciliation there was that day (vs. 4)! What joy follows the righting of an old wrong of long standing! Jacob presses his gift (vs. 11).

Once more God's rod falls upon him and this time—

IV. God shows Jacob himself once again in his children.

How humiliating to see the very deception he practised on his brother transmitted to his children and played on himself by them, in the selling of Joseph and representing to their father that he was dead.

Now, God used all this discipline to transform Jacob into the Israel he was when he came to die. Look at the venerable old patriarch—made meet for God's abode of purity through sanctified discipline. Christian, is God's treatment of you harsh? If so, it is that He may sanctify you. Have you fully surrendered to Him? Or are you resisting His efforts to purify you from all sin? Is your name changed?

P
n
v

B

the
:
are
cor
der
:
wh
ity.
wit
4.
sug
ranc
5.
of
fifth
G
idea
ClTh
for
shop.
(Sho
about
ing th
on fol
gests
I. (n
not n
togeth
God n

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

[The "Hints" entered below with a pseudonym and * are entered in competition for the prizes offered in the November number of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW (see page 476). Our readers are asked to examine them critically from month to month in order to be able to vote intelligently on their comparative merits.]

HINTS FOR CHILDREN'S SERMONS.

Qualities that Make for Greatness.

But this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before. I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.
—Phil. iii. 13, 14.

IMPORTANCE of Pauline characters.

1. "This one thing I do," suggests the first quality—will.

2. "Forgetting those things which are behind," suggests second quality—concentration. This age of specialism demands it.

3. "Reaching forth unto those things which are before," suggests third quality—enterprise. Living in the "now" with forethought.

4. "I press toward the mark," suggests fourth quality—perseverance.

5. "For the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," suggests fifth quality—high aim.

Great power in an all-controlling idea.

Christ our highest guiding star.

E. L. *

Lessons from a Watch.

THE preacher generally goes to Bible for text. To-day go to jeweler's shop. Take a watch for our subject. (Show watch. Get children to tell all about it they can. Tell them interesting things, and dwell with illustration on following points). The watch suggests:

I. Our Divine Maker. Watch does not make itself, nor grow, nor come together by chance. Neither did man. God made us.

II. A purpose in our creation. Watch made to tell time; man to glorify God. Take back to maker if it will not fulfil purpose.

III. Our tendency to yield to temptation. Watch affected by electricity. Wanted: Non-magnetic boys and girls in face of evil.

IV. The Immortality of the soul. If take works out of case works still go. Soul lives after leaves body.

V. How to become Christ-like. Wheel in watch moves slowly, imperceptibly, yet marks hours. So we grow good quietly as the beautiful flowers grow. MOONLIGHT.*

HINTS FOR COMMUNION SERMONS.

Why Glory in the Cross of Christ?

But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.—Gal. vi. 14.

PAUL'S glory during his first thirty years centered round himself—was false. The world-glory passes away forever—true glory abides forever. Paul gloried in the cross as we do—

I. Because it delivers (a) from the bondage of sin, (b) from Satan, (c) from the wrath of God. Illustrate by heroes and battles in which we glory—because they deliver.

II. Because it reconciles. It unites God and man, removing the estrangement by the precious blood of Christ. Mr. Moody tells a story of a wilful boy who was reconciled to his father by his dying mother. Calvary unites again the estranged.

III. Because it crucifies. Show the full import of "crucified unto the world." 1. Dead to the world. 2.

Alive to Christ. 3. Complete surrender to Christ. Illustrate (a) by Paul's own experience; (b) your own experience.

IV. Because it gives new life. All life comes from Christ by Calvary. Show how the Holy Spirit makes us new creatures in Christ by the blood.

V. Because it uplifts and saves eternally. Teaching the cross saves and that alone. It is the fulcrum on which the Gospel lifts men up to God and heaven. ALEPH-BETH-THETA.*

The Heart-Touching Appeal of Christ to His Disciples.

Will ye also go away?—John vi. 67.

In the context Christ speaks in a spiritual sense. He is to be food for the soul, the living bread. This life from heaven must become a part of man's life. "Their fathers ate manna but are dead, but he who eats of this bread," etc.

In what sense are His body and blood meat and drink?

I. Note here the turning-point in the history of Christ's ministry.

A test has been applied, and many have gone away, etc. Now Christ asks, "Will ye also go away?" Do these important truths which you must know overcome your faith?

While the multitude surround with hosannahs, when hunger is satisfied with the loaves and fishes, it is easy to be loyal. But now the tide has turned. Christ enters into that travail of soul which must culminate on Calvary.

The hour is at hand when friends are most needed. "Will ye also," etc.?

The enemy is bold and aggressive.

II. The question is applicable to us. Where Christ's cause has enemies to encounter earnest effort is needed amid discouraging environments.

The multitude is on its way to do evil. Christ is pleading. The needs of the church evident. Temptation and pleasures oppose. "Will ye also go away?" ZAY.*

HINTS FOR FUNERAL SERMONS.

The Resurrection of Christ an Incitement.

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, inasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.—1 Cor. xv. 58.

THIS verse is the practical and logical conclusion of the chapter.

I. Christ's resurrection is based on:

1. The testimony of many witnesses. See vers. 5-9.

2. His resurrection, admitted by some objectors of that day to a general resurrection, carries with it the resurrection of all men, since it is illogical to grant the resurrection of one and deny it in the case of all others.

3. The fact that grace, truth, and power come from Christ now.

4. Present personal Christian consciousness. "Forasmuch as ye know [not, will know] that your labor is not [not, will not be hereafter, but, is not now] in vain in the Lord."

(a) Note the use of the present tense of the copulative in this clause, tho omitted twenty-three times in the same chapter, is significant and a proof of the fourth subdivision.

(b) Thus, in every age we have testimony of the resurrection of Christ which can not be—

(1) Disproved or (2) explained away without leading to universal agnosticism.

II. Hence the exhortation:

1. Be steadfast. 2. Be unmovable. 3. Be always abounding in the work of the Lord which leads here and now to (a) victory over sin; (b) personal Christian consciousness of Christ's resurrection. X.*

Death Asleep—1 Cor. xv. 6.

Sleep the new Christian name for Death. The new Christian name for a burial-place: Cemetery (= Sleeping-place).

1. Merely an incident in a continuous life. 2. Sleep has the prospect of awakening. 3. A brief passage in our continuous existence.—*Preacher's Homiletic Commentary.*

Death a Disperser.

He that dasheth in pieces is come up before thy face; keep the munition, watch the way, make thy loins strong, fortify thy power mightily.—Nahum ii. 1.

THERE are various agents at work to scatter the human family: (a) The spirit of exploring. (b) Increase of population. Abram and Lot. Gen. xiii. 6. (c) Sin and its results. The prodigal. Jacob.

But the mightiest is death. "He dasheth to pieces." No way of avoiding its stroke "for we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which can not be gathered up again." 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

Its forerunners are mighty to sever us: (a) Old age. (b) Feebleness. (c) Sickness. Bosom friends are put at a distance. For days we must not enter the room. But death puts us not in different rooms but in different worlds. "Lover and friend hast thou put far from me, and mine acquaintance into darkness. Psalm lxxxviii. 18. In many instances it breaks up a comfortable home, and snaps the last link that connects the family with certain societies. It comes near to us oftentimes: "Before thy face."

This fact calls on us: (1) To keep our armor bright. (2) To hold ourselves in readiness. (3) To watch diligently. (4) To fortify ourselves without and within. CELT.*

HINTS FOR REVIVAL SERMONS.

A Decision that All Must Make.

Who is on the Lord's side?—Exod. xxxii. 36.

MOSES comes down from the Mount, finds idolatry in the camp of Israel, and demands of every man, whom he will serve?

That every man place himself in a position not to be questioned is as urgent to-day.

By nature man is the servant of sin.

Ye must be born again. Out of Christ there is no salvation.

Righteousness and sin are in the world as opposing forces, and with one of these we are identified. Christ asks, "Who is on the Lord's side?" There is no neutral ground, not for is against. No one else can decide for us.

I. Many reasons may be urged concerning this decision:

1. It is the side of duty.
2. It is the side of right.
3. It is the side of safety.
4. It is the strongest side.
5. It is the side agreeing with right reason.

6. It will be the side of final victory.

II. Reasons are apparent to all why we should forsake the side of sin.

It is the side of injustice, hatred, envy, malice and defeat.

3. Note the necessity of immediate decision:

1. Because of the influence we exert.
2. Conscience may be seared.
3. Forbearance may cease.
4. We do not know when the privileges will end. ZAY.*

Ruth's Choice.

And Ruth said, Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people; and thy God my God; where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried; the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.—Ruth i. 16, 17.

STATE briefly the events that led to this choice—the famine in Judah—the emigration to Moab—the occurrences there—the action of Orpah—then comes—

* THE CHOICE OF RUTH.

I. What she chose:

1. The Companionship of Naomi, *i.e.*, the companionship of the saints. "Whither thou goest, I will go."

* Put this outline on blackboard or chart.

Where do God's people go—to the saloon? the theater? etc.

2. The **H**ome of Naomi—of God's children. "Where thou dwellest I will dwell." The true home of God's children is in heaven—"I am a stranger . . . here."

3. The **R**eligion and people of Naomi.—"Thy people shall be my people: thy God shall be my God."

4. The **I**nheritance of Israel. (1) The land. 1 Kings viii. 36. (2) The oracles of God. Rom. iii. 2. (3) Covenants, the promises, etc. Rom. ix. 4.

5. The **S**tranger's reception. (1) A hearty welcome. Ver. 19; ch. ii, 10-14. (2) Adoption into the nation. Ch. iv. 11; Matt. i. 5.

6. The **T**rust—the life of trust. Ch. ii. 12.

As Moses in his memorable choice chose Christ, esteeming His reproach greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, so Ruth. Running through, her choice, is Christ.

II. Its nature—wise or foolish? Why?

III. Its results—what, good or bad, and why?

IV. Urge all to make same choice now. "Choose this day," etc. "Now is the accepted time," etc.

ROCK ISLAND.*

HINTS FOR MISCELLANEOUS SERMONS.

Three Crucifixions.

But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world.—Gal. vi. 14.

To glory in anything is to have a high esteem for and a large personal interest in it. Jewish leaders gloried in the law, etc.

Paul is very emphatic, "God forbid," etc. The cross was the supreme object of his regard and the supreme power of his life.

Observe here three crucifixions:

I. The crucifixion of Christ. He

glories in the cross of Christ. Not the wooden cross but that for which it stands.

1. It is the only hope of the ruined world.

2. It is the only measure of divine love.

3. It is the only victory over Satanic power.

II. The crucifixion of the world. "The world is crucified to me."

1. As furnishing life's aim and inspiration.

2. As providing life's joy.

3. As shaping life's relations.

III. The crucifixion of self. "And I [am crucified] unto the world."

1. As a participant in its sinful pursuits.

2. As a sharer in its sinful gains.

MAR.*

The Prodigal at Home.

And he arose, and came to his father.—Luke xv. 20.

His return home was but the beginning of a new life. Conversion only the first step. He was to meet with—

I. Difficulties. Perhaps—

1. Some reaction in feeling. 2. Old temptations. 3. Growing sense of past sin.

II. Duties.

1. Negatively, leave the old life behind. 2. Positively, do active work.

III. Encouragements.

1. Sense of being where he belonged. 2. New associates. 3. Protecting influences of father's house. 4. Easier to do right as time went on. 5. Sympathy and help of father.

Great inducements in this home life to the impenitent.

Great opportunities and responsibilities of the Christian. EHUD.*

The Lost One's Return.—Luke xv. 11-32.

1. The son at home.

2. The son far from home.

3. The son at home again.—Watson.

SUGGESTIVE THEMES AND TEXTS.

Texts and Themes of Recent Sermons.

1. True Husband Love. "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them."—By Rev. W. W. Morton, Allegheny, Pa.
2. The Family and the Nation. "At the same time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people."—Jer. xxxi. 1. By Stephen W. Dana, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
3. The Power of Vision on Opened Eyes. "And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha."—2 Kings vi. 17. By M. M. G. Dana, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
4. The Weight of Sin. "And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me."—Gen. xxxii. 26. By Henry G. Weston, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Crozier Theological Seminary.
5. Vanity a Besetting Sin of Womankind. "If a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself."—Gal. vi. 3. By Charles B. Mitchell, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.
6. A Lesson in Christian Citizenship. "Let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ" (revised Version, "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the Gospel of Christ.")—Phil. i. 27. By William H. Campbell, D.D., New Orleans, La.
7. A God Who Weeps. "And when he was come near he beheld the city and wept over it."—Luke xix. 41. By John K. Mason, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
8. Good City Government. "Except the Lord keep the city the watchman waketh but in vain."—Psalm cxxvii. 2. By Rev. Dr. Pickard, Louisville, Ky.
9. Lessons for the Home. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands. . . . Children, obey your parents."—Eph. v. 22; vi. 1. By J. B. Hawthorne, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.
10. God's Favor to This Nation: An Independence Day Sermon. "He hath not dealt so with any nation."—Psalm cxlvii. 20. By J. W. Love, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.
11. Religion, or the Law of God, is Our Life: a Sermon to Traveling Men. "For it is not a vain thing for you, because it shall prolong your days in the land, whither ye go over Jordan to possess it."—Deut. xxxii. 47. By Bishop Thomas F. Gailor, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.
12. The Divine Fire on Earth. "I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled?"—Luke xii. 49. By Alexander McLaren, D.D., Manchester, England.
13. A Great Life. "And the life which I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God."—Gal. ii. 20. By Rev. M. Fizzell Bowenizer, Belfast, Ireland.

Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. The Power behind Natural Law. ("God hath taken away the cattle of your father, and given them to me."—Gen. xxxi. 9.)
2. A Good Law Touching Chief Magistrates. ("Thou shalt in any wise set him King over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set King over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother."—Deut. xvii. 15.)
3. The Superstitious Element in a False Faith. ("Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest."—Judges xvii. 13.)
4. The Men We Despise. ("And when the Philistine looked about and saw David, he disdained him; for he was but a youth, and ruddy, and of a fair countenance."—1 Sam. xvii. 42.)
5. Permanent Employment. ("I will bless the Lord at all times; his praise shall continually be in my mouth."—Psalm xxxiv. 1.)
6. The License System. ("Wo to him that buildeth a town with blood, and establisheth a city by iniquity!"—Habakkuk ii. 12.)
7. The Perquisites of Persecution. ("Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."—Matt. v. 12.)
8. The Misjudgments of Infidelity. ("Then he which had received the one talent came, and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewed."—Matt. xxv. 24.)
9. Testings and Attestings. ("No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better."—Luke v. 39.)
10. The Glory of God in the Reception of Men. ("Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God."—Rom. xv. 7.)
11. The Definiteness of the Christian Aim. ("I therefore so run, not as uncertainty; so fight I not as one that beateh the air; but I keep under my body."—1 Cor. ix. 26, 27.)
12. The Discipline of Content. ("I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content."—Phil. iv. 12.)
13. The Passing and the Abiding. ("The world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."—1 John ii. 17.)

ILLUSTRATION SECTION.

SIDE LIGHTS FROM SCIENCE AND HISTORY.

LIMNINGS FOR TEACHERS FROM
NATURE AND LIFE IN THE
ORIENT.

BY DAVIES MOORE, A.M., B.D.,
SINGAPORE, MALAYA.

MAN'S FELLOWSHIP WITH NATURE.

—"And God said to Jonah, Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd? . . . Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity for the gourd."—Jonah iv. 9, 10.

In the mid-tropics the gourd flourishes with prodigal exuberance, spreads forth on all sides with wonderful quickness its moist, thick leaves, and if provided a support, such as Jonah's extemporized booth would have made, interlaces its broad foliage so as to form an admirable covert from the sun's glare and heat. The prophet appears not only to have appreciated the welcome shade of this plant, but to have indulged toward it a sentiment of unselfish love. With no friend at hand in whom to confide his griefs and fears he, like many another vagrant soul in nature, found fellowship in this humble vine, attributed to it understanding and sympathy, and came to regard it as a friend reciprocating with him sentiments of tenderness and love. Then happened the catastrophe of the worm. Smitten at its root the gourd perished in a night, and when the man saw its foliage hang lifeless his heart died out of him. He seemed to have lost his only friend, and however childish his feeling perchance may seem to us it must have been very real to have called forth that bitter revolt against the loss of his vegetable comrade: "I do well to be angry, even unto death."

But are we to regard this feeling of Jonah as a weak sentiment? Plainly God did not do so. Rather He laid hold upon it and played upon it as a redeeming feature in the character of this son of Amittai, and evolved from

it a larger pity, a sentiment broad enough to encompass the whole alien, erring population of Nineveh. That was no weak sentiment in one of our strong poets which sang about the meanest flower having power to call forth, from the heart that knows how to respond to the messages and thrills of nature, "thoughts that often lie too deep for tears."

"Blessed are the clean in heart for they shall see God," and hear His accents in many a leafy haunt and woodland avenue.

—
OUT OF THE BITTER COMES SWEET.—Some of the most delicious of Malayan fruits are encased in rinds of exceeding bitter taste. Here, for instance, is the Mangosteen, in delicate lusciousness fit food for angels' dessert. But the melting morsel is contained in a purple woody covering so saturated with astringency as deeply to stain steel upon its lightest touch. Hordes of intelligent ants and beetles are aggravatingly aware of what lies behind the mangosteen's alarming exterior. But among them all there is not one sufficiently brave to insert for the second time a tooth into that essence of bitterness. It looks as tho the prodigious yearly harvests of this cooling fruit were intended by the Creator but for man. Certainly, the only creature that can share it with him is the monkey, whose similar constitution needs it too, and there is not more than enough for both. So the Creator has placed one of his most precious fruit-gifts in a box—so bitter that none of the depredators dare attempt it. How minute the divine regard!

—
AN EXAMPLE OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION APPLIED.—In the Chinese written language there is a primitive symbol denoting "spiritual beings,

prayers, and sacrifices." This character is composed of three perpendicular lines resting at right angles in a horizontal line drawn above. Right over this figure is placed another horizontal line. One stands in a sort of awe before this eloquent symbol, believing, as we are told, that it has an antiquity greater than Abraham. We may accept it as a Chinese picture of the ladder upon which Jacob saw the angels of God ascending and descending. That ladder the ancient Chinese fathers had beheld spiritually before Jacob lived, and had written down the great spiritual fact of communion between heaven and earth by means of the symbol described above, and called by them "Shih." The horizontal line in which the three perpendiculars rest represents Heaven, or God; the lines proceeding downward may stand for communication between heaven and earth; and the one horizontal line inscribed above the whole denotes The Unity, or The One, or that the god whom the Chinese fathers adored three thousand years before the Advent of Christ was the one God besides whom there is none other. *Vide* Professor Legge's "Religion of China." This sacred Chinese character a Christian teacher took for his text the other day before a company of educated English-speaking Chinese, who appeared to be deeply impressed by the fact, new to them, of this significant altar their venerated forefathers had erected in the Chinese written language to the one true God. It came as an inspiration to them that at the period of its early purity the religion of China had found a place for "revelation," and had lifted up a monotheistic altar, which endures till the present, and is known by the ancient name of "Shih." The teacher then went on to show how Christianity is the hoary faith of China supplemented by a later revelation. The sacred and prophetic "Shih" may therefore stand to the Chinese of today as an apt emblem of the descent to earth of the Son of Man, of the Cross

of Calvary, that unites heaven and earth, and of the ascent from earth to heaven of all God's righteous ones "rectified" (to use the word of Confucius) not by laws of Confucius or of Moses, but by faith in the Christ of these two great men, who was the final revelation of God.

—

A LITTLE LEAVEN LEAVENETH THE WHOLE LUMP.—This formula represents very exactly the case of malarial fever which is such a destroyer of health and life in the hot, moist latitudes of Malaya. A little of this leaven, of this poisonous matter, enters through some unguarded door in the human economy. Under favored conditions of unwary exposure to heat or sudden change to chilly air the malarial germs multiply rapidly. They form in the body a new colony, which, unless beaten back by superior strength and numbers of the blood corpuscles, subdues and destroys the colonies of human cells, slays the faithful defenders of heart and brain, and soon converts the whole beautiful human fabric into a mass of poisoned matter ready for the grave and the worm.

What a picture of the spiritual life unguarded by grace! Even one germ of evil allowed to enter the heart and fostered there is bound to develop and multiply and spread moral disease through the entire man. It is the little leaven which will surely work and thrust forth its destroying network on every hand until the whole head is sick and the heart is faint with it, and the lovely spiritual fabric falls down into the death in trespasses and sins.

—

A HEARTLESS SPOUSE.—I have read a strange bird story in an old Malay book called "Hikaiat Abdullah." It is one that would do good to the soul of Samantha Allen and her disciples. The bird is said to be a species of woodpecker, making its home in the darkness of the Malayan jungles. The story says that never more than a pair of these birds is found in one wood,

for which one must be grateful, if the legend about the male bird be true. When the female has hatched forth her young ones, the "Hikaiat" informs us, the male at once sets about plastering up the hole in the tree's trunk which leads to the nest. He prosecutes this work assiduously until the orifice is securely filled in, and his female is entombed beyond the possibility of egress. The male has an object in doing this, and it is said to be nothing less than the procuring for the young ones food in the shape of the dead and wormy body of his mate. This saves him the trouble of fetching the food to his rising family, and his mate becomes the sacrifice to his own evil, laziness. There are plenty of men who act this way, and every woman should beware of getting a man who will incarcerate her in a place called home, and there leave her a sacrifice to maternal cares, while he enjoys the lazy hours of his saloon or club.

THE POWER OF SUPERSTITION.—During the late war between China and Japan the Chinese residents of Singa-

pore were greatly perturbed by the recurring news of the Chinese reverses. Many others refused to credit the telegrams, affirming it impossible to believe, that China could be worsted in such a war. The temples were thronged with devout worshipers bringing, every day, their offerings to heaven for the success of the Chinese arms. Early one morning the first visitors to the large temple were greeted with an omen of success. In the hand of the war god in the temple they beheld an additional sword. None of them seemed to suspect that the weapon might have been painted into the hand of the picture during the night by a wily priest, but its appearance was greeted as a token of coming victory for China, and large crowds repaired to the temple to see the wonder. The news was published throughout the city, and, as one of our English dailies remarked, the miracle was believed in even by educated classes of the Chinese. Looking at the issue of the war the priests would now interpret that silent oracle as a prophecy of Japan's victory.

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

The Book and the Christ.

In the volume of the Book,
It is written of me.—Psalm xl. 7.

It is doubtful whether eleven words in the English Old Testament are to be found more pregnant with suggestion. A book and a person are here presented so mutually related that the book foretells the person and the person fulfils the book. Yet there is every reason to suppose the book could not thus forecast the person of the Messiah, for it was complete as to the Old Testament four hundred years before His birth.

Notice six features about the book,

and as many more about the person. First, as to the book :

1. Antiquity, yet accuracy. The oldest extant volume, written in the infancy of science and not dealing with science except in the most limited way, compelled to teach science yet using an elastic phraseology that without forecasting scientific discovery is found to accommodate itself thereto in a singular way. Take, for example, the 38th of Job, one of the most ancient of poems, perhaps the most ancient, yet abounding in scientific references the most marvelously accurate.

2. Prediction fulfilled in history. About six hundred prophecies, yet

marvels of forecast. Noah's prediction (Gen. ix. 25-27), of whose remoteness there is no doubt, outlines the entire history of civilization and the destiny of the three great races, Hamitic, Japhetic, Semitic. Examine the prophecies about Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, etc., and behold them fulfilled with a literal accuracy that astonishes the candid mind. Most of all the three hundred and thirty-three predictions about Messiah, entering into details of His life, which by the law of compound probability could not by one chance in eighty-four billions meet in one person and time without divine control.

3. Unity. Where all conditions forbade. Written in three tongues, by over forty writers, in over sixty different treatises, yet teaching one doctrine, all obviously parts of one book, showing one superintending mind. The unity itself is sevenfold, historic, prophetic, scientific, ethical, symbolic, organic and Messianic. Even apparent contradictions result only from our imperfect apprehension.

4. Simplicity. Notwithstanding the sublimity of the themes treated, not one mere flight of rhetoric—no abstruse discussions, technicalities; not even an illustration used for its own sake. Language and similes all within compass of ordinary understanding, never calling attention to itself. Every writer here is self-oblivious. While there is much that is divinely mysterious, all that pertains to our duty is perfectly simple and apprehensible.

5. Spirituality. The lofty level of teaching here is beyond any book ever produced by man. Thoughts too sublime for human language are here given a form of presentation—sometimes parables in action instead of words, like Christ's assuming the slave's posture to wash His disciples' feet. Ideas of God and divine things which never could originate with man because they are even yet a mystery to the natural man.

6. Power. Power to save, sanctify,

transform. The Word of God has about it a peculiar energy of its own—what Demosthenes called *κινῶσις*, not "action," but the power to movement and act. No other book ever was mighty to save—men are taught, uplifted, instructed, ennobled by the purest of human literature; but no one ever dared claim for any other book what the Word of God claims for itself, the power to beget men on God's image.

About the person of Christ there are six corresponding features which distance all comparison. We simply mention them:

1. His perfect humanity—a typical and representative man. Not a Jew only, but a man.

2. His perfect divinity. Another and a higher nature inexplicable without admitting that He was the Son of God.

3. His absolute unselfishness. Never before such entire loss of all consideration of self in service to others and obedience to God.

4. His unique wisdom. Even enemies confessing never man spake thus.

5. His solitariness. A sublimity of character absolutely unapproachable in every respect, unassailable for a vice, fault, or defect.

6. His authority. We feel His right to teach as never man taught, and His power to control human minds and hearts. To Him manifestly belongs the sovereignty of men.

Analysis of Transformation.

This is a very thoughtful analysis, by an anonymous writer:

"Transformation, How Effected—2 Cor. iii. 18.

1. The attitude of the believer
"With open face beholding."
2. The sure result
"Changed into the same image."
3. "The Almighty agent
"By the Spirit of the Lord."
4. The consequent steadfastness
"We faint not."—Chap. iv. 1.

The same word in the Greek rendered in different passages as: Transfigured (St. Luke x.)—Transformed (Rom. xii. 2.)—Changed (2 Cor. iii. 18).

The direct work of the Holy Spirit and the object of the present Dispensation.—To transform the natural into the Divine.

The Incarnation the foundation of the Doctrine—and the Fact—God in Man, Christ Jesus, the Heavenly Bridegroom, waiting for each Member of His Body to be conformed to His likeness. Chap. iii. brings out this teaching strikingly in strong contrasts by showing the two dispensations as glorious. Yet, in all its revelation the present Christian dispensation exceeds the Jewish in glory.

Thus we read of the Ministration of Death . . . the Letter . . . The Spirit—Condemnation . . . Righteousness—A veil . . . An open face.

The present is not one of visible glory, but a revelation of the moral glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The word glorious is used in connection with the believer now—Glorious Liberty (Rom. viii.); Glorious Gospel (2 Cor. iv.); Glorious Church (Ep. v.). Hence we learn the Spirit's work is transforming us into the likeness of character to Christ.

By the word—Born again of incorruptible seed (1 Pet. i. 23). Cleansing (Ps. cxix. 9). Sword of the Spirit—operating power (Ep. vi. 23).

Process of transformation—"Beholding." Attitude of believer—"open face," nothing between.

"Earth-born clouds" often come between—my work—my cares—my family schemes—the world's standard.

God reveals Himself to waiting souls. Let us turn aside. Moses was with his sheep when attracted by the burning bush (Ex. iii. 3). "I will now turn aside." Notice v. 4. "When God saw that he turned aside he called unto him."

Two means of Beholding: Study of the Word—Secret Prayer.

Result of work—"blessed in his deed" (James i. 25).

Revelation of God to the soul in the midst of daily duties: The Shepherds of Bethlehem—Stephen an instance of a glorified man, filled with the Holy Ghost; a transfigured face (Acts vi). In the midst of a cruel death. "Behold I see the heavens opened," etc. A view of the visible glory—and a revelation to the world of the grace of the Lord Jesus within. "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge" (Acts vii.).

The sure result.—The same Image—the lowliness of Christ—the steadfastness of Christ—the gentleness of Christ.

The Agent.—The Holy Ghost—to be filled—as Stephen—to yield to His lordship—His guidance—His influence.

Then amid discouragements we faint not; like Peter we say our "Nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net."

We need transformed men and women for His work. A steadfast gaze into an open Heaven, then a testimony of what we have seen and heard.

A Young Man's Letter.

A VERY intelligent and devoted young man in Britain writes a letter which I venture to put before my readers. He says.

"There is an appalling moral laxity in business which is scarcely dreamed of by ministers and Christian leaders. Competition has been fast becoming keener and is driving business men and business 'houses' to do things they would once have scorned to do as 'respectable' business establishments. The public clamors for cheapness, and prices have been brought down much quicker than the cheapening of production warrants. In many cases goods have to be sold below cost, and some firms—hard pushed—will put in a lower grade for a higher. It does well enough, and other firms must follow or close the door.

"How common is adulteration in food and drugs! Law proceedings under

recent acts have given indications of what is going on out of sight. In the drapery trade 'flannel' resembles flannel in name and finish, and yet there is not one thread of wool in it. 'Linenet' tho finished to look like linen, has not a particle of flax about it. They are both woven from cotton only.

"In 'most respectable' dressmaking warerooms and such places, we see girls employed at illegal hours, taught—required—to rush from the workroom at a signal which indicates that the factory inspector has entered the building.

"In our linen manufactories we find lower qualities commonly substituted for higher—because the customer will not likely find it out. We know that the United States customs impose fines from time to time on 'respectable' Belfast firms for fraudulent declaration of value of their imports to the States. The shipper prepares a fictitious invoice for the consul, and this is sworn to by the shipper, or by his agent under power of attorney; but privately an additional amount is debited the consignee in the books of the shipping house. While only a few cases are exposed, the practise is common.

"There are many other dodges to avoid payment of duty. In shipment to one market we may often find a yard or two of coarse linen or even a piece of cotton wrapped round a fine linen web, so that it may pass for less value than it really is. If you won't do this for your customer he will take his trade to some one who will.

"In other cases, arrangements are made so that bribed custom officers of other countries may have a seeming excuse for purposely made 'mistakes.'

"The temptations in business generally come gradually, insidiously. An apprentice proudly starts on his business career—leaving school and boyhood—and he learns to do these dishonest things before he knows what he is doing, and then, if after a little he suspects their honesty, he has been accustomed to do them. 'Everybody'

does these things, his fellows do them; his seniors and his manager do them. respectable Christian church-goers—yes, and may be church officers and Sabbath-school teachers—do them. 'It is business, you know!'

"How can a lad make a stand against such forces? It is a miracle when he does. But often he compromises the matter somehow; somehow stifles conscience, persuades himself he must be in error, the thing can't be wrong, or he gets behind such excuses as 'I am only carrying out orders.' 'It must be done or business must be given up—and competitors do it.' 'The customer is getting value, tho he does not get what he thinks he is getting,' etc., and soon custom and habit smooth things over and prepare the way for larger sins.

"Often the first step is in connection with some trifle which the tempted thinks it would be ridiculous to fight about and make a fuss, but the bad principle is there all the same.

"We are taught of two ways to get a frightened horse out of a burning stable—make him follow another animal not afraid of fire, say a goat, or pin and harness him fully as usual and lead him out.

"There is a lot in the harness of business, especially in large concerns.

"It is just time something was said. It is just time some of the stronger ones came to the help of young lads and even older lads who with semi-lulled consciences are going on in this sin and taking their part in building up a rotten system of business. O Lord! our eyes are turned to Thee."

The Continental Watershed.

BARTON W. EVERMANN, PH.D., describes the meadow near Yellowstone Park from which water flows into both the Pacific and Atlantic, furnishing a new illustration of those critical points in life which determine the opposite directions of the whole current of thought, desire, love, and purpose.

ILLUSTRATIONS AND SIMILES.

PROVIDENCE IN THEOLOGY.—Can any thoughtful mind fail to be struck with awe as he ponders on the pregnant fact that, by the agency of such minds as those of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, the Church should have unconsciously provided for the reception of modern theories by the omission of fruitful principles and far-reaching definitions, centuries before such theories were promulgated, and when views directly contradicting them were held universally, and even by some of those very men themselves who laid down the principles and definitions referred to? Circumstances so remarkable, such undesigned coincidences which, as facts, can not be denied, must be allowed to have been "preordained" by all those who, being Theists, assert that a "purpose" runs through the whole process of evolution.—*Mivart*.

THE QUEEN-BEE AND THE GOSPEL.—An old missionary, on the eve of embarking for his field of labor, once held up before my eyes something that resembled an elegant bird-cage, and asked me to guess what it contained. Said I, "I have not the least idea—a fairy queen, perhaps, for it looks like a palace." "It is a palace," he said, "and it shelters a queen; I am taking a queen-bee to India, to improve the native breed of honey-makers."

Beautiful emblem of the Gospel of Christ, which redeems human nature from its wild state, and enriches and sweetens this life as a foretaste of that which is to come!—*W. A. P. Martin*.

THE HIGHEST WAGES.—The highest wages in the world are earned by good mothers. The mother who does an honest day's work, week in and week out, in faithful and faithful care of her children, is on a large salary, and she will be rich sooner or later.—*H. C. Trumbull*.

THE POWER OF BOOKS.—You despise books! you, whose whole lives are absorbed in the vanities of ambition, the pursuit of pleasure, or in indolence. Remember that all the known world, except only savage nations, is governed by books.—*Voltaire*.

TRUSTING OUR FACULTIES.—We can reason only by the use of our own intellectual faculties. We can not transcend these faculties to prove that they themselves are trustworthy. If one denies the reality of knowledge no proof can refute the denial. Every reason urged in proof of the reality of knowledge assumes that reality and derives all its force as an argument from the assumption. Every reason urged to prove that our intellectual faculties are trustworthy, can be a reason only because those faculties are trustworthy. It is therefore illegitimate and useless to attempt to prove the reality of knowledge or the trustworthiness of our intellectual powers. So far as the question is concerned, we do well to say with Goethe, "I have never thought about thinking." The speculation which entangles itself in this fruitless discussion merits the mockery of Mephistopheles in Faust: "I tell thee, a fellow who speculates is like a beast on a dry heath driven round and round by an evil spirit, while all about him lie the beautiful green meadows."—*Samuel Harris*.

TWO KINDS OF BENEFICENCE.—That is the highest kind of kindness which is spontaneous and self-motived. It is well to be easily moved to beneficence either by the sight of need or by the appeals of others, but it is best to kindle our own fire, and be our own impulse to kindly thoughts and acts. We may humbly say that human mercy then shows likest God's, when, in such imitation as is possible, it springs in us, as His does in Him, from the depths of our own being. He loves and is kind because he is God. He is his own motive and law. So, in our measure, should we aim at being.—*Alexander McLaren*.

THE SEDUCTIVE SPIRIT OF EVIL.—The blind and cowardly spirit of evil is for ever telling you that evil things are pardonable, and you shall not die for them, and that good things are impossible, and you need not live for them. And if you believe these things, you will find some day, to your cost, that they are untrue.—*Ruskin*.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

ST. PAUL'S CLASSIFICATION OF WIDOWS.

BY PROFESSOR E. J. WOLF, D.D.,
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

Honor widows that are widows indeed, etc.
—1 Timothy v. 3-16.

IN these days of much sociological thought and more sociological talk, it is well to draw attention to the Bible method of dealing with the social problems. It is well known that the modern regard for the needs of the poor, the blind, the deaf, and the various

other classes of unfortunates, received its main inspiration from the Gospel and especially from the Gospel according to Luke. But going back of all this it will be found that the Mosaic Law made full provision for meeting and remedying the evil social and civil conditions that are to-day threatening the stability of our institutions and civilization. In the study of this provision of Law and Gospel much light for the future will doubtless be found.

The humane and tender consideration for widowhood which the New Testament Church inherited from the

Mosaic Covenant, offers a brilliant contrast to the proscription of these unfortunate females by some pagan religions, which subject them to pitiless indignities, condemn them to irremediable wretchedness, and doom them to the unspeakable anguish of a hopeless existence. This contrast furnishes a striking proof of the proposition that our conceptions of humanity are noble and kind in proportion as our conceptions of Deity are lofty and pure.

The writer refrains reluctantly from presenting here in detail the provisions of the law safeguarding the rights of widows, and providing for their needs and securing to them all the privileges of the covenant. It must suffice to remind the reader that along with orphans they were viewed as under the immediate care of Jehovah, who not only like a father stretches forth His merciful hand to relieve their distress, but also like a judge lets fall His avenging hand upon any who wrong or oppress them.

The earliest records of the New Testament bring widows before us as peculiar objects of divine consideration, one of them being portrayed as serving God night and day with fastings and prayers in the temple, another as placing out of her extreme poverty a richer gift into the Lord's treasury than all the rich from their abundance, another one as receiving back from the dead her only son, and still another as overcoming by her importunity an unconscionable judge who feared not God nor regarded man. The first apostolic letter makes the visit to the widow and the fatherless in their affliction an un-failing requisite of pure and undefiled religion, and almost the very first chapter of church history and about the first problem that created misunderstanding in the church, had to do with the daily ministrations to the widows, whose numbers were so great that some of them suffered neglect when the church, not yet sufficiently organized, distributed her daily alms.

There were doubtless always many

widows in Israel, yet the disproportionate number of them in the earliest decades of Christianity, before persecution had thinned the ranks of the men, is a matter of such surprise, that it has called forth various explanations, as it elicited sundry exhortations and directions from the Apostles. Possibly that class would more readily than any other embrace the Gospel with its comfort and hope for the afflicted. Possibly the multiplication of widows arose, in part, from the Christian law of monogamy, polygamist believers divorcing all their wives but one. Possibly the laxity of divorce among the Jews would leave a large number of widows by divorce, many of whom became believers. Possibly, too, not a few would avail themselves of the liberty recognized in 1 Cor. vii. 13-15, and withdraw from unbelieving husbands. These, and even betrothed virgins who from any reason failed to consummate the marriage which had been contracted, came under the category of widows, and thus from a variety of causes vast numbers of these bereft ones taxed alike the charity and the wisdom of the church. For, with all the love and human sympathy which the Gospel inspires, it is not un-mindful of the fundamental tenets of economics, it does not countenance indiscriminate charity, and it warns quite as earnestly against the abuse of beneficence as it promotes its legitimate exercise.

In the principal pastoral of the New Testament, St. Paul devotes one half of a chapter, nearly one sixth of the whole first epistle to Timothy, to the distinctions which obtain in the multitude of widows, and institutes a classification which determines for each one a position appropriate to the peculiarities of her widowhood. He not only notes differences of age, isolation, and godliness, but marks also a dividing line between those whose support devolves properly on the church, and those whose support justly devolves on their own kindred. He discriminates also between the necessitous class,

who are to receive aid, and another class, who, while perhaps equally necessitous, are capable of engaging in some form of church activity, receiving employment instead of bounty. And, finally, there is another class, whose proper place is neither in the charity of the church nor in its activities, but in the founding of a second home.

Expositors are generally agreed that vers. 3-8 distinguish the widows who may look to the church for relief from those who are to look for support to their children or grandchildren, while vers. 9-16 distinguishes a class having special qualifications—registered widows, appointed to official station—from younger widows, who, in terms not at all complimentary, are inhibited from this office, and advised to contract another marriage and to confine themselves to the discharge of domestic duties.

The first distinction made by St. Paul is that between "widows indeed," and "any widow having children or grandchildren," ver. 4. The "widow indeed" answers to the description in ver. 5. The real widow, who is such in the full sense of the word, is not only bereft of her husband, but is absolutely destitute, left in complete earthly isolation, and, in contrast with those characterized in vers. 4-6, has neither children nor grandchildren, nor any means of a livelihood.

The Greek *χήρα* contains in its root the idea of loneliness, the English equivalent "widow" etymologically means lack. Such a one, the Apostle says, has the essential characteristic of widowhood. She is emphatically entitled to the name, and therefore is properly a beneficiary of the church. Utterly alone and forsaken, having no earthly kindred on whom to rest a hope for maintenance, "she hath set her hope on God." "In supplications and prayers night and day" she is exercising that hope, putting her trust solely in God, and since the church represents God, and His grace and providence are

always mediated to mankind through her agency, it becomes the church to respond to this hope of the true widow and to fulfil it in God's name.

This is what is meant by "Honor widows that are widows indeed." To honor has here a wider sense than simply to pay due respect, a consideration to be withheld from no one, 1 Pet. ii. 17, and certainly not to be denied to a widow who "hath children or grandchildren." The idea is that of respectful and affectionate support, a substantial and tender care for one so venerable and so helpless, as is very evident from the "double honor" which is to be paid to the elders "who labor in the word and in teaching," ver. 17, and from the Savior's exposition of the command to honor father and mother in Matt. xv. 4-6.

A second class of widows does not fall under the category of widowhood entitled to the church's "honor." "If any widow hath children or grandchildren," descendants removed to what ever degree, she is not to look to the church for charitable relief, but to those of her own blood who owe their very existence to her. These are "first to show piety toward their own family," to treat with dutiful affection, as Bengel puts it, a widowed mother or grandmother that is dependent, before the church is called on to assume their support. Grace does not abolish the obligations of nature, nor dissolve the ties and responsibilities of blood. The discharge of social duties, accordingly, especially the reverential and helpful assistance due to afflicted parents, is not only pronounced "acceptable in the sight of God," but a severe rebuke is administered to children who fail to make proper provision for decrepit and helpless widows of their own household. Such unnatural ingrates, whatever their oral profession, are to be classed with apostates, they deny by their works that they are under the power of the Christian faith, they practically disprove the reality of their professed faith, and are, therefore,

"worse than an unbeliever," one who has not embraced the faith. A great principle of universal application dare not be overlooked here, namely, that true faith in God can only coexist with true love for man, and proper devotion to God is inseparable from proper devotion to those whom God has united in the sacred bonds of nature, which are not annulled, but strengthened and perfected by faith."

Verse 9 brings before us a third class which differs from both the former, not only in being subject to enrolment as widows, but also in being required to possess certain qualifications. Heretofore no condition was laid down for a widow except that she be "a widow indeed," necessitous, absolutely without kindred to care for her; now she must have passed a certain age, she must have had but one husband, she must have eminent standing for Christian virtues, a well-tryed experience in rearing children, dispensing hospitality, and relieving distress. These prerequisites are so much of a piece with those demanded of men desiring to be bishops and deacons in chap. iii, that we are forced to the conclusion that these registered widows were assigned to administrative duties corresponding in a measure with the functions of those officials. They are to minister and not to be ministered unto. All the conditions laid down for them would give proof of a humble, self-denying disposition and of ripeness and strength of character marking a person for distinction, for efficient and responsible service.

There is no other evidence of such an order of females existing in the Apostolic Church, and there is no warrant for confounding these registered "widows" with the order of deaconesses which was instituted at a later period and which consisted of younger women. Remembering, however, the practical common-sense with which primitive Christianity was endowed and the feminine seclusion of the Orient, one may readily see how an Apos-

tle would perceive, in the ministration to females, the care of orphans, the nursing of the sick and the aged, a sphere for the employment of certain widows of high standing, which would in every way be better than their subsistence on charity,—a sphere enabling them to earn a livelihood while discharging some of the most sacred and commendable offices of the church.

But from this position of activity and influence the "younger widows" are to be excluded. They not only lack the discipline which has trained those of more advanced years for delicate and difficult activities, but they are likely to be still susceptible to the tender passion, to cherish a desire for marriage, and thus to give a divided heart to the service they have assumed for the church, and they are likely in various ways so to compromise their relation to the church, and therefore their relation to Christ, that on the one hand they become spiritually disqualified for a work which is to engage all their powers for life, and on the other hand they pervert the duties of their office, household visitations, confidential relations, etc., into opportunities for idleness, vulgar gossip, and the vice of intermeddling with the business of other people.

For these "younger widows" it is better to marry and assume household duties, than to stand pledged to a church service which they might dishonor by unseemly behavior. Morality in the sphere of nature is far better than religious activity tainted by carnal propensities and vulgarity of speech or action.

Altogether, then, St. Paul describes four classes of widows who are to receive the attention of the church: 1. The real widows, vers. 3, 5, who are to receive charity. 2. Those having descendants who are to be supported by these. 3. Those who are sixty and upwards and possess other requisites, who are to be employed by the Church. 4. The younger widows generally who are counseled to remarry.

SCHOOL OF BIBLE STUDY.

BY D. S. GREGORY, DD., LL.D.

THE PROPHETS OF THE RESTORATION.

THE Written Prophecies of the Old Testament came to a close with the *Prophets of the Restoration—Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*—who appeared after Cyrus had overthrown the Chaldean Monarchy and established the Persian or Medo-Persian Empire in its place. Their mission covers a period of about a century. It was the *Restoration of Jerusalem as a Religious Center* for the Jews and for the World, until Christ should come, and the Reestablishment of its Religious Condition with that end in view.

The way had already been prepared for the *restoration* by the missions of Ezekiel and Daniel. See "The Prophets of the Exile," in the September number of THE REVIEW, p. 249. The return to Jerusalem of a remnant of the Babylonian Exiles came by the *Decree of Cyrus*, the Persian king (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23)—whom Isaiah two centuries before had called the shepherd and the anointed of the Lord (Isa. xliv. 28; xlv. 1), and whom the Spirit of Jehovah had appointed to the task—B.C. 536, in the first year of his reign at Babylon, granting permission for their return.

Comparatively few—a *faithful Remnant*—were willing to exchange the worldly wealth and comforts they had found in heathendom for the inconveniences and privations that must necessarily attend their return to their motherland. *Successive Companies*, however, returned at intervals to Jerusalem—in 536 B.C., under Zerubbabel; in 458 B.C., under Ezra; in 445 B.C., under Nehemiah.

[The *First Company* went up from Babylon, 536 B.C., when the seventy years of exile were completed, led by Prince Zerubbabel, a grandson of Jehoiachin (1 Chron. iii. 17-19) and the High Priest Jeshua or Joshua. It consisted

of nearly 50,000 Jews, bearing 5,400 vessels of the Temple. Their mission was, in accordance with the decree and commission of Cyrus, the *Rebuilding of the Temple* and the *Restoration of the Religious Position* of the Chosen People at Jerusalem as a center, preparatory to their long waiting for the coming of Messiah.

The Samaritans, their aid in building having been declined, succeeded in *stopping the work*, by means of calumnies and false reports that reached the ear of the king. The rebuilding was interrupted in the reign of Cambyses, and the rebuilding of the city walls strictly prohibited by pseudo-Smerdis. Darius Hystaspis, sixteen years after the work of rebuilding had been begun, gave the Jews permission to proceed, and, animated and encouraged by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, they completed and consecrated the Temple in 516 B.C. It remained without the Ark of the Covenant which had been lost, and with the Holy of Holies vacant.

The *Second Company* went up 78 years after the first in the reign of Artaxerxes (probably Longimanus), the son of Queen Esther in 458 B.C., led by Ezra, a scribe in the law of Moses and a descendant of Seraiah the High Priest. The *special mission of Ezra* was the *Restoration of the Law*, or rather of the Divine Religion of Salvation in its fuller development and more complete form. In the prosecution of this mission several important things are to be noted:

1. The *Completion of the Canon* of Old Testament Scriptures, by gathering into it and editing all the Sacred Books.

2. The outward *Reformation of the People*, by calling them to repent, and to put away their heathen wives and all their evil practices.

3. The thorough *Instruction and Training of the People* in the Divine Religion as embodied in the Canon, in order to start aright the new and more spiritual development in faith, life, and worship.

The *Third Company* went up, 13 years later, in 445 B.C., or 91 years after the first, and was led by Nehemiah, the cup-bearer of the same Artaxerxes. The mission of Nehemiah was the *Restoration of the Civil Condition* of the Jews preparatory to their waiting for the Advent.

Tidings of the unhappy condition of the People reached Nehemiah and led him to make successful application to the King, who invested him with the necessary authority. He went up to Jerusalem, *Rebuilt the Walls* with the cooperation of Ezra, in spite of the Samaritans, and after 12 years devoted

to this work returned to Persia. Later, during the reign of Darius Nothus, he was a second time governor of Jerusalem, when with the cooperation of Malachi he set vigorously to work to *Reform the Abuses* that had sprung up during his absence.]

Those who went up in these successive companies completed the *Religious and Civil Preparation of the Jews* for their waiting for Messiah.

The *Prophets of the Restoration* cooperate with Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, in starting the Chosen People in their new religious development in Judea which was to continue, after the close of prophecy, for five centuries the *Religious Center of the World*, but, until the Advent, without supernatural manifestation.

First Prophet of the Restoration— Haggai.

Haggai, the first of the prophets sent to the Jews after the Exile, was probably one of the company that returned with Zerubbabel. It is also probable that he belonged to that small number, once mentioned by him (chap. ii. 3), who had seen the glory of the first Temple. It was his special task to *Epedite the Rebuilding of the Temple*. He appeared as a prophet under Zerubbabel and Joshua, sixteen years after the decree of Cyrus, in the second year of Darius Hystaspis, when that monarch authorized the resumption of the work of rebuilding that had been so long interrupted.

There were *Two Occasions* when his influence was especially needed.

The *First Occasion* was on the issuance of the *Permission to Resume Rebuilding*. The people had become indifferent to God and religion and to the work of rebuilding, and were devoting themselves to the furtherance of their own private fortunes and interests.

The *Second Occasion* was when the work was so far completed that the People began to *Contrast the New Temple with the Old*, and were filled with discouragement and despondency.

The *Book of Haggai* contains *Two Parts or Prophecies*:

Part First. An Exhortation to rebuild the Temple, called out on occasion of the decree of resumption. Ch. i.

Part Second. Discourse to those who had resumed the rebuilding, to console and encourage. Ch. ii. This embraces:

1. Consolation in view of the Contrast between the New Temple and the Old. (Ch. ii. 1-9.)
2. Rebuke of merely formal righteousness that prevented the divine blessing. (Ch. ii. 10-19.)
3. Encouragement by the promise of the future glorification awaiting Zerubbabel, a shoot of David's Royal stem, and the downfall of all worldly thrones. (Ch. ii. 20-23.)

Second Prophet of the Restoration— Zechariah.

Zechariah, who was of priestly descent and who also returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, began his work as prophet only *two years later than Haggai*, to whom he attached himself and with whom he cooperated in urging the *Rebuilding and the Restoring the Religious Condition of the People*.

Zechariah was peculiarly the *Messianic Prophet* of this period, his Messianic prophecies being second only to those of Isaiah in their importance and distinctness. As Hengstenberg has said:

"The principal object which Zechariah had in view was, as beseeemed a true prophet of God, not to urge forward the outward work, in itself considered, but throughout to *Produce a Complete Spiritual Change in the People themselves*, one fruit of which would necessarily be increased zeal in the work of building the Temple."

In this work he was called to deal with *Two Classes*:

1. True believers, who had become discouraged by the contrast between the New Temple and the Old and between promise and fulfilment.
2. The hypocrites, who had accompanied the true believers from Babylon

in considerable numbers, under the influence of merely worldly motives and hopes, many of whom threw off the mask of hypocrisy as soon as their disappointment came.

The prophecies of Zechariah take very various forms, combining simple discourse (as in ch. vii., viii.), with prophetic intuitions and images (as in ch. ix.-xiv.), and with visions and symbols (as in ch. i. 8.-vi. 15).

The *Book of Zechariah* may be regarded as made up of *Three Parts*, as follows:

Part First. A Prophetic Picture, in Eight Visions, of God's providential dispensations toward both the Jews and those nations that had oppressed them,—given to the Prophet in the second year of Darius. Ch. i.-vi.

[Regarding this part Keil (*Introduction*, vol. i. p. 424) says:

"These visions, which stand in an intimate relation to each other, start from the present condition of Israel, representing the destiny of the New Theocracy, its goal and its glorification, with an ever-increasing precision in the delineation of its several conditions and relations; and thus they give a complete picture of the future fortunes of the people of God."]

Part Second. A Consolatory Discourse—given in the fourth year of Darius—occasioned by a question and petition addressed by the people to Jehovah, and containing prophecies of prosperity and enlargement to Jerusalem, but accompanied by warnings and exhortations. Ch. vii., viii.

Part Third. A Prophetic Picture of the future fortunes of the Theocracy, with the Messianic view and age predominant. Ch. ix.-xiv.

This embraces *Two Subdivisions*, separated by appropriate headings:

1. The prediction of *The Struggle of the Theocracy with the Powers of the Gentile World*, with its victory and their subjection, by the Advent of Messiah and under his official authority as Shepherd. (Ch. ix.-xi.)

2. The prediction of *the last Assault of the Powers of this World* upon Jerusalem; the conversion of Israel to the

Messiah whose death had been caused by their sins; the destruction of the Old Theocracy and all the foes of Jehovah; and the final completion and glorification of the People of God. (Ch. xii.-xiv.)

Third Prophet of the Restoration— Malachi.

The prophecy of Malachi, the last of the Prophets of the Restoration, closes the *Old Testament Canon*. He probably prophesied about a hundred years after Haggai and Zechariah. Probably he was contemporary with Nehemiah and Supported his Reformatory Efforts during his second visit to Jerusalem, by his prophetic message, about the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

Of Malachi's personal history nothing is known. He manifestly lived in a period marked by moral and religious decline and by formalism and hypocrisy. His prophecy is therefore entitled, "*The Burden of the Lord to Israel.*"

[Before the Captivity ungodliness manifested itself in two prevailing forms: *Idolatry and Dead Works*. The Exile cured the former and more prevalent form, but it developed the latter and made it more offensive, so that it had full and sole sway in Malachi's day. In his prophecy Malachi has always distinctly before him the *Self-Righteous Jew*, and his message was intended to warn and guard the People against the *Pharisaism already Crystallizing* among the Chosen People, and which during the centuries till the Advent was to be at once their great religious curse and blight and their protection against apostasy by raising an impassable barrier between them and the heathen world. For this self-righteous formalism the prophet rebukes both priests and people and points them to the advent of Messiah.]

The form of the conclusion makes it manifest that *the Jews were to expect no more Prophets* until the Forerunner of Messiah (John the Baptist, the second Elijah) should come.

The *Book of Malachi* may be regarded as made of *Three Parts*, portraying the future relations of Jehovah to His People:

Part First. Jehovah is loving, long-

suffe
disp
ple.
Pa
and l
Pa
cous
The
parti
them
strict
the S
fear
Elijah
appea
In
fore,
last o
sation
of the
growi
Peopl
a Rig
ious
reach
with
tide o
Chose
at the
World
meet-
waitin
presen
sufferin
His Pe
Judge
Mala
in this
of Can
to the
The Fa
the las
nounce
ment of
In th
that fe
Restora
Chosen
future
the sam
all the
ten Pro

suffering, and compassionate in His disposition toward the Covenant People. Ch. i. 2.-ii. 9.

Part Second. Jehovah is the only God and Father of His People. Ch. ii. 10-16.

Part Third. Jehovah is the righteous and eternal Judge of His People. The prophet, in the name of Jehovah, particularizes their sins, and assures them that "God shall appear as the strict Judge of all the ungodly, and as the Sun of Righteousness to those that fear His name, and that the second Elijah shall appear to prepare for His appearing." Ch. ii. 17-iii.

In summarizing his mission, therefore, it may be said that Malachi, the last of the Prophets of the Old Dispensation, appeared after the Restoration of the Religious System, to correct the growing abuses among Priests and People, and to give a new impulse to a Righteous Development of the Religious and National Life, which should reach on to Christ. He cooperated with Nehemiah in seeking to stay the tide of corruption, and to leave the Chosen People *in the proper attitude, at the Physical Center of the Ancient World*—where the three continents meet—and *at its Religious Center—in waiting for the Advent of Messiah.* He presents Jehovah, not only as the long-suffering and only God and Father of His People, but also as their righteous Judge who will lift them up at the last.

Malachi cooperated with Nehemiah in this work, and thus the last Chapter of Canonical Jewish History is the Key to the last Chapter of its Prophecy. The Failure of the returned Jews leads the last Prophet to close with the announcement of the separating Judgment of the Last Days.

In this way Malachi finished the task that fell to the three Prophets of the Restoration, leaving the eyes of the Chosen People intently fixed on the future Christ and His Kingdom. At the same time he completed the task of all the Prophets who uttered our Written Prophecies.

[In connection with the general and more recent commentaries and histories, already referred to in the course of these "Studies," the student will find help in the historical accounts of the period intervening between the close of the Canon and the Advent. "Jewish Antiquities" of Josephus, Prieux's "Connections," and the Revised Version of the Apocrypha, will be found of special service.]

It has been seen in the course of these Studies, how the writings of the Prophets fell in with and supplemented the History; how the Poetry, didactic and lyric, laid the foundation for a rich and complete religious life; how the Books of Moses, with their revelation of the Divine Religion and the record of its historical introduction into the world, lay back of all, furnishing the sure foundation of all; and we have seen History, Poetry, and Prophecy all joining to turn the thought of the Ancient World toward the true God and His Christ as the only hope of mankind, since all earthly institutions had proved inadequate for the world's salvation.

We have thus completed our survey of this wonderful Book, made up of many books. We have these many writers—living and writing at irregular intervals through a whole millennium of heathenish darkness; of every conceivable temperament and temper; writing in every style of composition, in history and chronicle and romantic story and idyll, in poetry, didactic, lyric and epic, in satire and denunciation of the present, and forecast of future wo and blessing; scattered across the great Oriental Empires, and in the most diverse circumstances favorable and unfavorable; unknown to one another and unacquainted with each other's works—producing ONE BOOK of marvelous unity. Is it not God's Book?

The Outline that follows is an attempt to give a comprehensive view of the Unity of the Old Testament as brought out in the "School of Bible Study."

OLD TESTAMENT.—DIVINE RELIGION OF SALVATION IN OLD AND TYPICAL FORM.

[*Aim*—To Deliver Fallen Man from Sin and Satan, and to Restore to Obedience to God=Kingdom of God.]

FIRST STAGE—The Historical Introduction of the Divine Religion into the World by Moses.

FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES—Pentateuch.—FIVE PHASES in Introduction of the Religion.

A. **Genesis**—FIRST PHASE.—Origin of the Religion and of the People Chosen to be its Depository and Guardians.

B. **Exodus**—SECOND PHASE.—Establishment of the Theocracy, or Jehovah putting the Religion into the Depository: (1) Revealing His Nature in the Deliverance from Egypt; (2) Giving the Law and Covenant at Sinai; (3) Setting up His Throne in the Tabernacle.

C. **Leviticus**—THIRD PHASE.—The Way to Worship and secure Salvation from Jehovah on His Throne in the Tabernacle; (1) Law of Sacrifice, or the Way of Salvation Typified; (2) Law of the Priesthood, or of the Agents in Salvation; (3) Law of Purification, or Conditions of Salvation; (4) Law of Sacred Festivals, or Special Seasons of Grace.

D. **Numbers**—FOURTH PHASE.—Organization of the Chosen People—Tribal, Religious, and Military—about the Tabernacle to Keep and Guard the Divine Religion and Plant it in Canaan. [Repeated after an interval of 88 years, with a New generation.]

E. **Deuteronomy**—FIFTH PHASE.—The Second Giving of the Law, or the Moral and Spiritual Preparation of the New Generation for Planting the Religion in Canaan.

SECOND STAGE—The Development of the Divine Religion in the World. [In THREE PHASES—in the History, the Poetry, and the Prophecy.]

FIRST PHASE: THREE TIMES THREE HISTORICAL BOOKS.—Three Stages of History, or of the Development in National Life.

A. FIRST GROUP—THREE HISTORICAL BOOKS—Strict Theocracy, its Trial and Failure. Jehovah ruling with Tribal Rulers, Priests, and "Judges."

1. **Joshua**—FIRST BOOK.—Establishment of the Chosen People and Divine Religion in Canaan, by Joshua, with Jehovah's Throne among them at Shiloh.

2. **Judges**—SECOND BOOK.—Trial and Failure of the Chosen People in their Care of the Divine Religion under the Strict Theocracy, through their Disobedience, with four Series of Chastisements and Deliverances by the "Angel of Jehovah." Jehovah's Throne Removed.

3. **Ruth**—THIRD BOOK.—Origin of the Line of Chosen Kings and Preparation for the Monarchy.

B. SECOND GROUP—THREE DOUBLE HISTORICAL BOOKS.—Institution, Trial and Failure of Theocratic Monarchy.

1. **Samuel**—FIRST DOUBLE BOOK.—Deliverance of the Chosen People and Religious Reformation, by Samuel, and, after Trial and Failure of Saul, a King after the People's Heart, the setting up of David, a King after God's Heart, and Jehovah's Everlasting Covenant with him.

2. **Kings**—SECOND DOUBLE BOOK.—Civil History (mainly) of Reigns of David and Solomon and the Successive Kings of the Two Kingdoms—to the Captivity—being the Book of *Jehovah's Care over the Kings*, as promised to David.

3. **Chronicles**—THIRD DOUBLE BOOK.—Religious History of Chosen People—omitting Kings of Israel—to the Decree of Restoration by Cyrus—being the Book of *Jehovah's Covenant Care over His People*, as promised to Abraham.

C. THIRD GROUP—THREE HISTORICAL BOOKS.—Reestablishment in Canaan, now become the Center of the World, under Foreign Rule, to await the Advent.

- 5. CHRONICLES**—THIRD DOUBLE BOOK.—Religious History of Chosen People—omitting Kings of Israel—to the Decree of Restoration by Cyrus—being the Book of *Jehovah's Covenant Care over His People*, as promised to Abraham.
- C. THIRD GROUP**—THREE HISTORICAL BOOKS.—Reestablishment in Canaan, now become the Center of the World, under Foreign Rule, to await the Advent.

OUTLINE VIEW OF

1. **Ezra**—FIRST BOOK OF FOREIGN RULE.—Return of the Remnant of Jews to Jerusalem, by decree of Cyrus, and Rebuilding of the Temple.
 2. **Nehemiah**—SECOND BOOK OF FOREIGN RULE.—Rebuilding the Walls of Jerusalem and Restoration of the Civil Condition of the People, to Prepare for Awaiting the Advent.
 3. **Esther**—THIRD BOOK OF FOREIGN RULE.—The Jews of the Dispersion as the Special Objects of God's Care, as exhibited in their Deliverance in one of the Greatest Crises in Jewish History.
- SECOND PHASE**—TWICE THREE POETICAL BOOKS.—TWO PHASES of the Development of the Practical Religious Life.
- A. **FIRST GROUP**—THREE DIDACTIC BOOKS.—True Philosophy of Religious Life—to produce Rational Conviction that Piety or Obedience to God brings Blessedness and Success.
 1. **Proverbs**—FIRST DIDACTIC BOOK.—Positive Teaching that Piety is the Way of true Blessedness and Success; Impiety, of Wretchedness and Failure.
 2. **Job**—SECOND DIDACTIC BOOK.—First apparent Exception—Remarkable Piety and great apparent Misery and Failure.—Shown to be only Apparent by Job the Best of Men.
 3. **Ecclesiastes**—THIRD DIDACTIC BOOK.—Second Apparent Exception—Great Impiety with great Apparent Prosperity—Shown to be only Apparent by Solomon, the Wisest and Worst of Men with the best of Opportunities.
 - B. **SECOND GROUP**—THREE LYRICAL BOOKS.—To Awaken Devotional Feelings toward Jehovah—from the Religious, Domestic, and Patriotic Sides.
 1. **Psalms**—FIRST LYRICAL BOOK.—Divine Training-Book of the Heart, presenting Jehovah in every Aspect, but especially as the Conquering Messiah and as the Suffering Servant of God.
 2. **Song of Solomon**—SECOND LYRICAL BOOK.—To Awaken Affection toward Jehovah the Author of Home and Domestic Affection through the Marriage Love of Christ and His Bride.
 3. **Lamentations**—THIRD LYRICAL BOOK.—To stir Love to Jehovah as Author of National Blessings through the Patriotic Feelings.
- THIRD PHASE**—SIXTEEN PROPHETICAL BOOKS, in FOUR GROUPS. Presenting Successive Stages in the Spiritual Development of the Divine Religion, under the Hand of Jehovah, in Relation to the Coming Messiah, and in Connection with the Phases of National History and their Struggles with the Great World-Monarchies.
- A. **FIRST AND DOUBLE GROUP**—SEVEN PROPHETS OF THE ASSYRIAN PERIOD.—Seeking to save Israel and Judah from Destruction by Assyria.
 - A. *Four Prophets for Idolatrous Israel*—Fail. 1. **Hosea**. 2. **Amos**. 3. **Jonah**. 4. **Micah** (for Judah also).
 - B. *Four Prophets for Judah*—Succeed. 1. **Joel**. 2. **Isaiah**. 3. **Obadiah**. 4. **Micah** (for Israel also).
 - B. **SECOND GROUP**—FOUR PROPHETS OF THE BABYLONIAN PERIOD.—Seeking to save Judah from Destruction by Babylon—Fail.
 1. **Nahum**. 2. **Habakkuk**. 3. **Zephaniah**. 4. **Jeremiah**.
 - C. **THIRD GROUP**—TWO PROPHETS OF THE EXILE. Seeking to Save a Remnant and Prepare them for Restoring the Temple as a Religious Center for the World. 1. **Ezekiel**. 2. **Daniel**.
 - D. **FOURTH GROUP**—THREE PROPHETS OF THE RESTORATION.—Guiding in the Return from Exile, the Rebuilding of the Temple, the Restoration of the Civil Condition, and the Preparation for the Future and Messiah.
 1. **Haggai**. 2. **Zechariah**. 3. **Malachi**.

PASTORAL SECTION.

HOW A PASTOR MAY INTEREST
HIS YOUNG PEOPLE IN MEN-
TAL CULTURE.

BY BISHOP JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D.,
LL.D., TOPEKA, KANSAS.

SOCIETY has made ample provision for the intellectual culture of all children and young people in the public schools. We pride ourselves as a people on the fine buildings put up at the public expense, the teachers we train, the money we appropriate, the books we publish, the conventions and institutes we hold, the superior scholarship we command in the teaching profession, the sympathy our public schools receive from the distinguished leaders of the higher education, and the scientific thoroughness we are able to promote through the Bureau of Education at Washington with the philosophical, scholarly, experienced, sympathetic, and practical William T. Harris, LL.D., as Commissioner of Education. All this the pastor has to begin with when the problem is put before him, How to interest the young people in mental culture.

There, too, is the press. See the dailies—from eight to sixteen pages for a penny. And the magazines—we dare not begin to name them—at ten cents a copy, many of them—on finest calendered paper, and by the magical art of photography containing whole pages of superb illustrations. There is no end to the magazines. They are found everywhere, every month. And the books, large, small, thick, thin, history, fiction, travel, adventure, science, art, religion. The shelves are crowded. "For a song" you can own an encyclopedia. The poor man who cares for it can have a large library. In all this the pastor

finds still more help in the solving of his problem.

And then there is the public library, where the best can be had for the asking, at least in the large cities; and the Y. M. C. A.; and the public spirit of the age developing in all communities is giving us free libraries even in the smaller towns. Here a poor girl may borrow books she can not buy, and a boy sit down on a stormy day and with light, warmth, and a comfortable chair revel in the stories of the past, in the new revelations of science, in the inspiration of biography—all in books by the best writers, printed and bound in fine fashion, for the nonce his own—and he is a poor boy no more. All this the pastor has to aid him when once he awakens to the glorious truth that in Christ "all things" belong to him and his, the saints and the saints-to-be of his parish.

Indeed, in many homes connected with his church are private libraries containing one or two great dictionaries—the Standard, for example, which makes one dictionary enough—and an encyclopedia, "The History of Ready Reference and Topical Reading," by Librarian Larned of Buffalo; a commentary or a huge concordance, a series of biographies which, by the way, make the best kind of historical reading; a series devoted to classic authors—essays, stories, poems. The family thus enriched has on its shelves enough light and power to make their home better than the old palaces where there were few books. One wonders if pastors ever take into account the potential cooperation they have on shelves and center-tables in the homes that officially belong to them. The interrogation point we start out with hooks up answers everywhere!

Time would fail us to tell of the picture-galleries, now and then public,

now and then in a loan collection; but all the while in every town are pictures, if no more than engravings, which brought together would make an admirable beginning for studies in art. The architecture of the town stretching along the street gives fine opportunity to study and equally to be shocked, and nowhere is there such opportunity for teaching by contrast as in the architecture of an average town.

Ministers rarely take into account the large number of intelligent and sometimes cultured men and women in every town, possessing unused knowledge, ability, and tact, which rightly utilized might make for the promotion of general education in all the churches.

There are so many eager souls in every parish who do not know how to begin nor really just what to do in the matter of self-improvement. The field is large, discouragingly large, and without aid and inspiration the work seems almost impossible. There are so many questions that come up, and there is no organized plan for eliciting answers. There is so much going on in the town that unless one has a mind and a heart for this higher kind of work he will easily yield to the prevailing pressure. There is so much "society," and so much social caste. People are so timid and distrustful. There are so many rich people, and even educated people, who have a fancy that it will not be well for poor people and working people to acquire a taste for literature and science and art. They sometimes think, if they never dared to say, that "it would be better for society if people would remain in the spheres to which God assigned them;" that higher education "unfits folks to serve their betters;" that all such effort at popularizing education "only excites ambitions that are never to be realized." Then again ministers have so much to do in looking after the spiritual interests of the church that it is accounted out of place and neglect of his professional duties to look after

the education of the people outside of religious lines. Conservative and saintly souls say: "Let the minister seek the salvation of dying souls; let him keep urging his people to grow in grace; let him be a minister of the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ, and not a teacher, professor, or reformer in secular and social lines." This is "goodish" talk and not really sensible.

What may a minister do who believes that it is a part of his religious commission to secure the consecration to God of all talents which God has given to His disciples—the members of this particular parish? It is the object of this paper to give a few practical answers to this question:

1. Let the minister stand by the public school, and urge young people not only to complete the grammar-school course, but to enter into the high school and finish the course of study there prescribed. Many a boy leaves school prematurely through lack of argument and persuasion on the part of his minister and of authority on the part of his parents. To the end of his life he regrets the unwisdom of his course. Let the minister protect young people against this folly.

2. The minister may represent the college, and in sermons, lectures, and occasional educational clubs, prove to hitherto inconsiderate young people the practical value of college education. We have no doubt that if the ministry were to perform its duty in this respect the attendance upon the colleges of the country might be increased from thirty to fifty per cent. in a single year. How few ministers there are who frequently and systematically, publicly and privately, appeal to the people in behalf of the higher education.

3. The minister may have his finger in the public library, know its contents, urge his young people to patronize it, indicating to them the books they would do well to read, and encouraging them to form the habit (for it is very largely a habit) of going to the library,

taking out books, and becoming interested in them.

4. The minister may organize classes for courses of lectures and lessons on a great variety of subjects, and enlist public-school and other professional educators and the unemployed scholarship of the town. In a village church a few persons might be found who would be willing to spend one evening a week in the study of geology. A few might prefer biology, half a dozen might be enlisted in philosophy, a larger class might be organized for the study of history and literature. In this way the many might be enlisted in pursuits for which they have taste and in which they may soon gain both enthusiasm and skill. Why should there not be five rooms in the church occupied one, two, or more evenings a week with students in different departments of learning who find this the only possible time and opportunity for personal improvement? How much more effective and attractive a prayer-meeting would be in a church thus consecrating itself to the promotion of the higher ends of life; for there can be no want of harmony between scientific and literary pursuits as incidents of personal growth and the more important pursuit of personal holiness.

5. The minister may organize reading circles, University or Chautauqua Extension lecture courses, and he may bring together on afternoons the more intelligent women of his church for reading and study in the higher ranges of religious literature. There are women to-day devoted to the study of Christian Science and Theosophy who know nothing about the wealth of literature multiplying with every year relating to the great problems of life, theology, philosophy—books on the evidences, books on the relations of science and Christianity, books on Christ and His relation to the present age: Christ in art, Christ in society, Christ in government, and Christ in the rich, sweet, deep experiences of Christian life. Why are not our young

people broadened in their views touching prayer, that the prayer-meeting instead of being a burden, perfunctory in its conduct, formal in its spirit, may be through the larger thought made a source of inspiration and strength?

6. A minister may promote intellectual life and at the same time the Christian faith of his young people by discussing in a frank and careful way the doubts which trouble them. We fear that many ministers have but little idea of the problems which puzzle the young men and women of our times, and there are not wanting ministers who, instead of appreciating the difficulties under which such young people labor, meet their protests or inquiries with rebuff and rebuke.

7. The minister may fight the fierce foe of low and baleful literature, the degenerate stuff so aptly characterized and justly condemned by Max Nordau. It would appeal to American parents to see an exhibition of the books clandestinely circulated among sons and daughters, and that sometimes in connection with the social life of the public school. Nothing so dwarfs and withers the intellect as the literature of passion and sensuality. What are our ministers doing to detect, condemn, and destroy this foe of purity and power?

8. Finally, let the minister transform his church into a school of character ministering to the health and vigor of all faculties which at the altar of the church have been transformed and consecrated to God. Let him prove that mental culture is a part, an essential, integral part of Christian growth. Let him command the talent that can teach and inspire, and let him rally about the church the young life that so sorely needs control, direction, and inspiration. And the church will not suffer from lack of spiritual health because she has turned on the full power of intellectual light. Ignorance is not the mother of devotion. Mental apathy is not promotive of either ethical or spiritual life.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

OCT. 4-10.—CHRIST SEALED BY THE FATHER.

For him hath God the Father sealed.—John vi. 27.

Several times in my reading I have met this confession of the historian and skeptic David Hume as to the result of his skeptical philosophy upon himself: "I seem affrighted and confounded with the solitude in which I am placed by my philosophy. On every side I see dispute, contradiction, and distraction. When I turn my eyes inward I find nothing but doubt and ignorance. Where am I? Or what am I? From what cause do I derive my existence? To what condition shall I return? I am confounded with questions. I begin to fancy myself in a very deplorable condition, environed with darkness on every side."

Robert Ingersoll, uttering that pathetic but hopeless oration by his brother's grave, says: "Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no word; but in the night of death hope sees a star, and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing."

"A star," "the rustle of a wing"—and that at best is all, and there is little hint of sort of star or wing!

This is the question—Is such mood, as is expressed in these quotations, needful for a man?

I think our Scripture a glad, strong note of certainty in quick reply to all such quavering uncertainty. The revelation of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is even a sunburst of certainty. Gazing at Him we may be sure instead of doubtful. "For Him hath God, the Father, sealed."

In that old Orient a seal was authentication. And the meaning of our Scripture is that Christ has been so evidently and sufficiently authenticated by God that men need be in no doubt either as to Him or as to His mission; that men may exchange questioning and doubt for clear-visioned certainty at it shines forth from Jesus Christ.

(A) God sealed, that is authenticated, Jesus Christ by prophecy.

Jesus Christ did not come into this world unheralded. Back in the gloom of the first transgression at least a little glint of prophecy lit up the gloom. And as the centuries took up their slow processions, more and more the reverend and lifted heads of inspired prophets caught the foregleams of the coming Day-Spring, rejoiced themselves in the sweet light, and gave heart to the weary watchers, as of that light they told.

(B) God has sealed, that is authenticated, Jesus Christ by His sinlessness.

Christ never acknowledges sin. "It is the grand peculiarity of His piety that He never regrets anything He has been or done; expresses nowhere a single feeling of compunction or the least sense of unworthiness." Rather, this is His challenge—"Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Rather this is His dying self-assurance of an inviolable rectitude: "Father, I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do." The moral character of Christ is unique and compelling. One was telling me of some discussions with the learned Brahmans of India. This was the thing that attracted and held them—the moral glory of this "peerless Christ." He who is such character must be the truth.

(C) Also, God has sealed, that is authenticated, Jesus Christ by miracle.

Miracle is the natural accompaniment and retinue of the incarnate One.

(D) Also, God has sealed, that is authenticated, Jesus Christ by His achievement. The spread of Christianity is the authentication of Jesus Christ. Handful of timid and unlearned followers; Judaism opposing with its 1,500 years of ritual and conviction; Paganism opposing with its culture and voluptuousness and persecutions; and the youthful Jesus, swordless, announcing precepts in direct opposition to the natural heart—the phenomenon of history is the victory of Christianity.

(E) Also, God has sealed, that is authenticated, Jesus Christ by His Resurrection. The most buttressed fact in history is the Resurrection of Christ. Therefore:

(a) Men may be sure, what Jesus Christ, thus authenticated, declares must be the truth.

(b) Men may not expect any further revelation. Necessarily Jesus Christ is the culminating revelation. Heb. i. 1.

(c) We are not to expect further sacrifice for sin. The Romish mass is impertinence and idolatry.

(d) Accept Jesus Christ. Trust Him, follow Him, rejoice in Him, live by Him and in Him. He is the certainty and answer for our questionings, doubts, fears.

OCT. 11-17.—STARTING WELL.

And the woman bare a son, and called his name Samson: and the child grew, and the Lord blessed him. And the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan between Zorah and Eshtaol.—Judges xiii. 24, 25.

Samson is a signal illustration of starting well.

(A) He sprang out of a religious parentage. Says quaint Bishop Hall, "When I see the strength of Manoah's faith, I marvel not that he had a Samson for his son. He saw not the messenger, he heard not the errand, he examined not the circumstances; yet now

he takes thought—not whether he shall have a son—but how he shall order the son which he must have; and sues to God, not for the son which as yet he had not, *but for the direction of governing him when he should be.*"

And this faith and earnest piety of Manoah, Samson's mother shared. It was from a deeply religious parentage that Samson sprang.

This is a great and utmost blessing. The law of heredity is an undermost, controlling, constantly acting law. Yet, sceptred as is this great law of heredity, it is ever to be remembered that this law is never so masterful as to accentuate that other imperial law of a personal responsibility, and, by the grace of God, the ability of a choice of righteousness on the part of each separate soul.

But to be born of a godly parentage, as Samson was, is a huge blessing; is an immense impulse toward starting well.

(B) Samson started well because his was a youthhood guarded from excess.

Samson was to be, even from his birth, a Nazarite—one who was peculiarly consecrated to God. And that consecration was to be signaled by abstinence from everything which could, in any wise, injure and defile. He was not to drink strong drink, nor wine, nor was he to eat any unclean thing. In this strict fashion, if you so choose to call it, from all possible excess was his youthhood to be defended.

Hard, narrow, puritanical, perhaps you say. But, as quaint Bishop Hall exclaims, "Never wine made so strong a champion as water did here. Daniel and his three companions kept their complexion with the same diet where-with Samson got his strength."

Immense likelihood of starting well in a youthhood so guarded.

Health, knitted, compacted, the strong pillar upon which afterward the man could lean was in it.

Clean life, as well, was in it. What Milton sings is true:

"He that hath light within his own clear
breast
May sit i' the center and enjoy bright day.
But he that hides a dark spot and foul
thoughts,
Benighted walks under the mid-day sun,
Himself his own dungeon."

Be you a Nazarite toward all defiling things.

(C) Samson started well because his was a youthhood within which noble purposes began to stir. "And the child grew, and the Lord blessed him; and the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the Camp of Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol."

Oh, to have high ideals! Mean to be something! Mean to do something! Welcome all such promptings. Christian Endeavor is a great aid here.

But, notwithstanding all this starting well, the sad fact remains—the life of Samson was a huge failure. Samson was strong, but he was not strong enough apart from God. Tennyson wonderfully and melodiously sings the secret of a really, true strong life; of the sort of life which can alone fulfil, in the best and highest senses, all the possibilities of starting well.

"Strong Son of God, Immortal Love,
Thou seemest human and divine;
The highest, holiest manhood, Thou.
Our wills are ours, we know not how;
Our wills are ours, to make them Thine."

OCT. 18-24.—JESUS OUR BROTHER.

For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.—Hebrews ii. 3.

I have met a most significant Chinese legend. As the legend goes, the three great religious teachers of the celestial Empire, from their heavenly abode beholding with profound sorrow the degeneracy of their people, and mourning that their life-work seemed so entire a failure, returned to the earth in order to find some suitable missionary whom they could send forth as reformer. They came, in their wanderings, to an

old man sitting as a guardian of a fountain. He talked to them so wisely and so earnestly of the great concerns which they had most at heart, that they came to the conclusion he was the precise man for the duty they wished done. But when they proposed the mission to him, he replied: "It is the upper part only that is of flesh and blood; the lower part is of stone. I can talk about virtue and good works, but I can not rise from my seat to perform any righteous acts."

Is not the legend significant? Is it possible to tell more accurately the usual human state? Who does not know immensely better than he does? Who, tho he can talk well and wisely of high and holy deeds, has not often felt a petrified inability of will toward translating the dreaming of holy deeds into the substantial and veritable doing of them? Not yet has the plaint of the ancient Roman poet ceased—"I know the better, but the worse I follow." That man there, sitting by the fountain with clear head and with urging heart but—with stone legs, must not our own experience declare that he is, too frequently, a most true symbol of ourselves?

But what no philosophy, Chinese nor of any other sort, can do, Christianity can accomplish. It can confer ability. It can change the stone legs to flesh. And it can do this by its surpassing and vivifying touch of the Brotherhood of Christ.

(A) Our Lord Christ is brother with us in our nature. Heb. ii. 14, 16. A great theologian tells us, and truly tells us, "Jesus Christ had no earthly father; His birth was a creative act of God breaking through the chain of human generation." That is the truth we need to see and seize—that birth was a veritable intrusion of the Divine into our nature. He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh.

(B) Our Lord Jesus is our brother in suffering. Heb. ii. 10. There is no nimbus round His head such as the artists paint. He knew the suffer-

ing of (a) Patience. (b) Weariness.
(c) Pain.

(d) Of the constant contact of sinlessness with sinfulness.

(e) Of resistance to temptation.

(f) Of desertion by friends, etc., etc.
No touch or tone of suffering we know and feel He did not share.

(C) Our Lord Jesus is our brother in death. Heb. ii. 14.

(D) Our Lord Jesus is our brother in the disclosure of a possible human destiny. He rose, He ascended in our nature.

And all this intimate brotherhood with me, He is not ashamed to own.

Come back now to our man with the stone legs. There he is helpless, knowing much, able to do little. And here is the mighty truth which shall be able to change his limbs of helpless petrification into limbs of glorious ability—this truth that Christ is brother with him.

Consider how—

(A) This Christ is brother with men for reconciliation. Heb. ii. 17. Ah, those stone limbs of his are his own fault. He has brought them on himself. But Jesus has become his brother and wrought out for him such atonement that even his self-damaging may be forgiven.

(B) But this Jesus, who is our brother, does not leave the man there, simply forgiven for his stone legs, but helpless in ability toward the future. For Jesus is brother with him for sanctification. Heb. ii. 11. And the first step in sanctification is the impartation of a new life. By the power of the Holy Spirit, working His transcendent birth from above, our Brother gives us the energy of the new life.

(C) Also, Jesus is brother with him for succor. Heb. ii. 18.

First—Here is comfort for despairing Christians.

Second—Here is light on the future. He, not ashamed to be brother with us, will surely, at the last, bring us to all the fruitions of such glorious brotherhood.

OCT. 25-31.—WHAT TO DO ABOUT SIN.

Sow to yourselves righteousness, reap in mercy; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek the Lord, till he come and rain righteousness upon you.

Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped unquity; ye have eaten the fruit of lies: because thou didst trust in thy way, in the multitude of thy mighty men.—Hosea x. 12, 13.

Tho these words were spoken originally to ancient Israel, they contain principles applicable to men of every race and of all times concerning the right human action about sin.

First Principle—Actually come to moral thoughtfulness: Break up your fallow ground. Fallow is yellow, the color of ground that has been plowed ready for culture, but has been thereafter neglected and uncultivated. Do not allow yourself in any such moral posture toward the fact of sin; actually come to moral thoughtfulness about it. There are many reasons why you should do this:

(a) Because this probationary life is passing. Here is an arithmetical calculation: 70 years = 25,550 days. A man of 20 has remaining but 18,000 days, a man of 40 but 11,000, a man of 60 but 3,000. And we are not sure even of these days. Amid the narrowing margins and uncertainties of life, the risk of carelessness about sin is a risk too great altogether. Come to moral thoughtfulness; break up the fallow ground.

(b) Because character is steadily fixing itself. Salvation is the forgiveness of sins and also deliverance from evil bias. Salvation causes the soul to love what God loves and to hate what God hates. You need change from natural evil bias to such good bias of salvation. Do not wait about it. Do not let evil bias still further fasten you in and toward evil. Come to moral thoughtfulness about the effects of sin; break up the fallow ground.

(c) Because you cannot conceive of God in any other way than as against

sin, and therefore, as long as you hold to sin, as against you. Here are some true and startling propositions suggested by another:

1. God is good.
2. Good is what ought to be.
3. Evil is what ought not to be.
4. Therefore, God, who is good, must be on the side of the good which ought to be.
5. Therefore, God, who is good, must be against the evil which ought not to be,
6. Therefore, if I hold to or allow evil, God, who is good, must be against me.

So come to moral thoughtfulness about such facts incontestable; break up your fallow ground—actually do it.

Second Principle—Recognize the great law that like causes produce like effects. "Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity."

In the realm vegetable the law holds that like causes produce like effects.

In the realm animal it also holds.

In the realm of business it holds also.

In the social relations too. He that would have friends must show himself friendly.

And in the realm of the relation of the soul to God, the same law, that like causes produce like effects, sways scepter. Sow prayerlessness, neglect of Scripture, want of moral earnestness, profanity, sinful indulgence—such causes can not issue in the approbation of God, must issue in results diametrically the opposite.

And you are no exception to the great and steady law!

Third Principle—Seek ye the Lord. Such seeking means repentance—that is, turning from sin; and faith—that is, turning toward God.

Fourth Principle—The Divine reply to all this. God will come and rain righteousness upon you—forgiveness, justification, sanctification, daily help, Heaven.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

"Quoting Scripture."

REFERRING to the article in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW of August, in which is quoted the advice, "Pack your sermon with quotation from the Bible, that is, preaching the Word," I have had frequent occasions to listen to a preacher who follows that advice to the very letter. He constructs all his sermons according to the above plan. One of the difficult things to do is to follow him through an entire discourse and not get muddled. The result is people weary of it and say they do not like that kind of preaching. You are correct in stating that the construction of a sermon upon this plan requires the greatest "skill" and the nicest

"discrimination" in the arrangement and quotation of Scripture. For instance, such a preacher delivered a funeral sermon in my hearing without notes or Bible before him. In speaking of the death of Christ he made the astounding statement—"He died the death of a transgressor." No doubt he meant to say "And He was numbered with the transgressors" (Isa. liii. 12). At least I supposed he meant to say that; but when he immediately backed up his statement by his usual method of quoting Scripture, by saying "for the soul that sinneth it shall die" (Ezek. xviii. 4), I was astonished beyond measure.

W.

ANDOVER, N. Y.

SOCIAL SECTION.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

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

MEN are playing with fire. The sport may be exciting, but it is very dangerous. Conflagrations are almost sure to follow, and it is not likely that the incendiaries will be the only ones to be buried under the ruins.

Libertinism is mistaken for liberty. The people are proclaimed sovereign, and then each one thinks himself free to do what he pleases, and men club together, arrogate authority unto themselves, make themselves a law unto themselves and others, and thus annul the real law and inaugurate anarchy and tyranny. Liberty, the word used to infatuate men, which inspires revolutions, which razes bastiles, and in whose name crimes unnumbered are committed, liberty may be the emptiest of sounds. If gambling, intemperance, robbery, injustice, inhumanity are free, it means the reign of crime and iniquity. The essential inquiry is, What is free? Is it the scoundrel or the honest man, the traitor or the patriot?

Liberty gone mad is one of the most dangerous maladies of the times. The State is regarded as a contract between parties, to be held sacred or destroyed as the contractors see fit. Constitutions and laws are treated as if made by men, subject to their wishes and whims. This notion is the root of mob rule, of violence and excesses of all sorts, and of anarchism. The State, the constitutions, the laws, which men invent and manufacture, are of questionable validity. So far as states and governments are genuine they have their basis in the very nature of things; they spring from the character and the needs of society, and they derive their ultimate authority from the very constitution of human nature and human society. Behind the valid constitution

and law lie principles which are eternal and imperative, which can be discovered and applied, but which can neither be made nor altered.

Here are the inevitable limitations which men are bound to recognize: Men have no right to enact what laws they please; by passing an unjust law they themselves become lawless. Governments, in order to be on a firm basis, must rest on other principles than merely the consent of the governed. Suppose this consent is that of thieves and pirates; suppose that the aim is mere selfishness; can there be stability? States based on false and unjust principles can not last. The evils inherent in them become sources of iniquity and foster revolutions. The iniquities in states become the inspiration for the destruction of the state. Righteousness is the only hope of the state's perpetuity.

Restraint is a hard lesson to learn; events, however, are teaching its necessity with unmistakable emphasis. There is no liberty but within the limits of truth and right; its essence is law and order. At a time when license and libertinism threaten to undermine all legitimate authority the State, the Government, the Constitution, and the law must assert and enforce their supremacy at all hazards. At the close of the nineteenth century we cannot afford to forget that at the close of the eighteenth horrors without a parallel were committed in the mistaken names of liberty, of individual rights, and of the sovereignty of the people.

The Church: The Laborer's Point of View.

The American Federationist for August contains an important correspondence on the relation of laborers to

the church. Rev. H. F. Terry, of Hyde Park, Mass., addressed Mr. S. Gompers, President American Federation of Labor, in order to get his aid in solving this vexing problem: "Why so many intelligent workmen are non-churchgoers?" Mr. Gompers is the president of by far the largest labor organization in the United States, its members numbering over half a million. As he speaks, in his answer, for himself and his associates, we regard his utterances as carrying great weight respecting the attitude of laborers to the church. The first question he answers is this:

"What reason would be given by your associates, who do not attend church, for their absence from church?"

His reply is as follows:

"My associates would answer that the spirit now dominating our churches is no longer in touch with their hopes and aspirations; that the churches have no sympathy with the real causes of the misery or severe burdens which the workers have to bear; that the pastors and ministers have no conception of the workers' rights denied them and wrongs borne by them, or, should they have the conception and knowledge, they have not the courage to publicly proclaim it from their pulpits; that the means and methods which my associates have by experience learned to be particularly successful in maintaining their rights and securing improved conditions—*i. e.*, organization of the trade unions—have been generally frowned down upon with contempt, treated indifferently or openly antagonized by the ministers and the apparently stanch supporters of the church.

"The church and the laborers have drifted apart, because the latter have always had their attention directed to the "sweet by and by," to the utter neglect of the conditions arising from the bitter now and now.

"The reason my associates would further give for their non-attendance at church would be that they have come to look upon the church and ministry as the apologists and defenders of the wrongs committed against the interests of the people, simply because the perpetrators are the possessors of wealth, who manifest little fear that it will be more difficult for them to enter the kingdom of heaven than it is for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle—whose real god is the almighty dollar, and who contribute a few of their idols to suborn the intellect and eloquence of the divines, and make even

their otherwise generous hearts callous to the sufferings of the poor and struggling workers, so that they may use their exalted positions to discourage and discountenance all practical efforts of the toilers to lift themselves out of the slough of despondency and despair."

The second question is:

"What remedies would you propose to bring your associates into closer touch with the church?"

Mr. Gompers replies.

"I would say a complete reversal of the present attitude, as indicated in my answer to your first question, would, perhaps, be most likely productive of the results you desire."

He admits that there are exceptions to the attitude of ministers as described above. Laborers are glad to attend the ministrations of such as seek to promote the interests of the masses, to heighten and broaden their manhood and womanhood, and to touch their hearts to the core by deep and everlasting sympathy.

His reply closes with these words:

"He who fails to sympathize with the movement of labor; he who complacently or indifferently contemplates the awful results of present economic and social conditions, is not only the opponent of the best interests of the human family, but is *particeps criminis* to all wrong inflicted upon the men and women of our time, the children of to-day, the manhood and womanhood of the future."

Whether the view of laborers respecting the attitude of the church toward them is true or false, it is this view which must be taken into account in all efforts to win them back to the church. There are ministers who have a heart for workingmen and yet fail in their efforts to reach the laborers. The reason is that they can not put themselves in the place of the toiling masses. The successful worker among them must know their truths and their errors, their just instincts and their passions and prejudices, their rights and their wrongs; he must sympathize deeply with them, must know just what is adapted to their peculiar situation and views and needs, and must love them sufficiently to bear with their erroneous opinions and to labor to put correct ones

in their place. It is one thing to preach effectively to those in the church, but quite a different thing to reach those whose standpoint is altogether different. One must get into the heart of the masses in order to win that heart for the Gospel of Christ.

In England the fact that one must put himself in the place of laborers in order to reach them is recognized by appointing men of their own class to work for their spiritual welfare. The workingman who feels like his fellow-laborers is thought to be able best of all to interpret the Gospel to their needs. The same method has been tried on the Continent and in the United States, and has worked admirably. This is simply the adoption of Paul's rule: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. To them that are without law, as without law . . . that I might gain them that are without law."

That the apostle could do this is proof that those of one class may reach those of another by occupying their standpoint. A striking testimony in this respect comes from Germany. Dr. John Mueller, a scholar and theologian, devotes himself to those alienated from the church. His success demonstrates that the estranged ones can be reconciled to Christianity. He is not an ordained minister, and this is said to be in his favor, since the prejudices which ministers encounter do not affect him. He has entered the thoughts and hearts of the alienated, understands modern life and the application of the Gospel to its needs. But he also understands theology, the church, and the average Christianity of the age. He reckons with the aversion of many men of culture to the church; so he invites his hearers to rooms in hotels, to concert halls, to club houses, and to other secular places. The themes he discusses are timely, as these: Moses or Darwin; The Historic Christ; What is Faith? The Spiritual Degeneracy of the Times. These are

subjects which are needed among the masses as well as among the cultured; but many other themes are specially adapted to laborers. The Gospel is so rich in these themes that one need but understand them and the needs of the people in order to have the conditions for the most fruitful Christian activity.

In all Christian lands there are vast multitudes who are not reached by the ordinary services in the churches. Can these services be made more effective so as to attract these multitudes? If not, what other means are required to win to Christianity the alienated masses? Have we not gone so exclusively to the church as to forget Christ's command: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature"?

The Evangelical Social Congress in Germany.

The seventh annual meeting of the Social Congress of Germany was held at Stuttgart at the close of May. The actual membership numbers eight hundred and thirty. The attendance at this meeting was large, including many who were not members. At a public evening meeting from three to four thousand persons were present. The regular sessions were attended by seventeen hundred persons. There were numerous representatives of the press, and many preachers and others in prominent positions. The following are mentioned among the professors present: Wagner, rector of the University of Berlin, Harnack, Kaftan, von Loden, Titius, of the same university, Delbrueck, Newmann, Max Weber, Rathgen, Sohm, Gottschick, Gregory, Haering, Simons, Baumgarten, Rein, J. Weiss, and von Kirchenheim. This gives some idea of the influence attained by the congress. It was organized by evangelical Christians of all shades of belief for the purpose of meeting the urgent needs of the laboring masses so far as this is the province of Christianity, and to counteract the destructive influences of the

social democracy. Christ is the center of union, the Gospel is the basis of activity, and love to the brother the inspiration. The congress has thus far furnished a platform on which the orthodox, liberals, and members of the Ritschl school met to discuss the social needs of the day and the relief offered by the spirit and teachings of Christ. Minor confessional differences are lost in the concentration on this great aim. The object is to bring the united wisdom of the church to the solution of the social problem. Hence preachers and laymen, professors of theology, of political economy, and of other departments of thoughts, and men in official positions and prominent in practical affairs, have engaged in the discussion of the great social themes which agitate and distract the nations. The congress has emphasized the fact that material interests and industrial problems are closely related to ethics and religion, and that consequently they concern theology and the church as well as political economy and the state.

In Germany the greatest advance has been made in determining the relation of the church to the social problem. Nor has this advance been merely theoretical. The urgent social needs and the efforts to meet them are transforming the life of the church.

Of the numerous utterances of Christendom respecting the social questions of the day we place those of this congress among the most important. Its meetings are for conference; each speaker is responsible for his utterances; by comparing views it is hoped to get new light; it is not the purpose to give dogmatic or authoritative deliverances.

Brief references only can be made to the papers and discussions. Professor von Loden read a paper on "The Right and Limit of the Pastor's Social Activity." He showed that the church accomplishes most for the solution of the social problem by fulfilling its immediate calling—by training men on the basis of the Gospel to become

Christian personalities who recognize in their relation to God the conditions for their proper relation to their fellow men; especially is the church, by means of pastoral activity and the congregational life, to promote the welfare of the individual members, to protect them against destructive influences, and to exert its powers to overcome the evils resulting from differences of rank and station, of culture, and of material condition. The church ought to promote the healthiest social organization. Since Christians depend greatly on their social condition and environment, the church has a right to criticize the social status, to insist on needed social changes, and to work for the establishment of such social conditions as are in harmony with Christianity and will further the welfare of Christians. Not only is this a right but also the duty of the church. All the elements of culture are involved in the social status, so that the church is not the only factor to be considered; and the realization of the best social condition must be left to those who by competent knowledge and by their calling are adapted to the work. The pastor as a pastor, as a Christian, as a citizen has a right to utter his convictions respecting the best means of improving society. The limits of his social activity are fixed by his calling. He is not to become merely an agitator, a partizan, or the advocate of a class, to the exclusion of other interests. The pastor ought always to be the friend of the poorer classes. "The church ought never to seem intent only on the conservation of what exists."

Rev. Planck emphasized the fact that the very position of the pastor involves social activity. The social problem is thrust upon him by the different ranks and the different material conditions in his congregation. He contributes his part to the solution of the social problem by preaching, by pastoral visitation, by instructing the young, by using the press, by uniting with existing associations, and by

means of new organizations. By solving the social problem he understands "the removal of unhealthy social and industrial contrasts in society." But why should the pastor labor for the solution of the social problem? Because he recognizes the intimate connection between industrial conditions and ethical and religious affairs; because it is his duty to apply the text of the Gospel to existing economic conditions; and because as a pastor it is his duty to keep his members in the gospel and the church, and to win to the same those who are alienated.

Professor Delbrueck discussed the question of the unemployed. He announced himself as an adherent of individualism, but declared that individualism needs socialism as its complement. The limits of each can not be definitely fixed. Respecting the unemployed he said that the higher a calling is, the greater is the number of those who seek to enter. "Where is the need of employment greatest? Among the candidates for law, theology, and philology." He discussed various methods of employing the unemployed, but was unable to give a solution of the problem.

One of the speakers at the congress quoted a significant saying of von Treitschke respecting the right of the pastor to take an active part in the social problem. "I must say that the Code Napoleon, with its denial of the right of the pastor to form an opinion on political matters, is simply the product of military despotism. When I read this I seem to hear the spurs of a soldier. Thus speaks a soldier who has no conception of the true character of the church. Whoever forbids the church to speak on the subject of politics talks nonsense. Such laws can not be executed, for religion according to its essence touches all heights and depths of human life. It can not be otherwise—the pastor ought to rebuke moderately whatever seems to him wrong in the state. It would require

an enervated, spiritless church to deny the noble right to affect the community of men morally. . . . Like genuine art, religion should draw within the sphere of its influence all the realms of human affairs. . . . In times of need the state experiences the value of the active support of the spiritual powers of the church."

One of the preachers declared that Jesus Himself forbids the view that the church is merely to dispense the means of grace or that the Gospel teaches only the doctrine of redemption and grace. The Gospel is the proclamation that the kingdom of God has come, the church itself is a band of brothers, it is a manifestation of brotherly love. The preacher ought to help the people out of their social ills. Other pastors equally emphasized the need of the social activity of churches and preachers, and the same idea was expressed in a resolution adopted unanimously by the congress.

One of the important facts connected with the congress is the position given to woman in connection with the social question. A special conference was held on the "Activity of Woman in the Community." Mrs. Lippmann, of Berlin, delivered an able address in which she advocated an enlarged sphere for woman in social affairs, especially in helping to solve the social problem. Professor Wagner announced that he fully agreed with her statements. He declared that the former prejudice against admitting women to lectures in the universities was disappearing. Some seventy, mostly foreigners, have attended lectures in Berlin. Not only did no difficulties result from this, but the tone of the lecture-room seems to be elevated by the presence of young ladies. "They are especially diligent, do not absent themselves from lectures, and are marked for their penetration even in departments severely scientific." Other men of prominence not only advocated an enlarged sphere for woman respecting the social problem, but also

showed that there are places where she can work more efficiently than men. A resolution was unanimously adopted in favor of giving woman greater opportunities in work connected with the social condition.

Among other important subjects which received elaborate treatment are

the following: "The Need of a Reform with Respect to the Homes of Laborers," and "The School and the Social Problem." We can not, however, at present give any idea of the discussions. For the above we are indebted to the account in "*Die Chronik der Christlichen Welt.*"

SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL STUDY.

By J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D.

Sociology.

Sociology is the term invented by A. Comte to designate what he calls Social Physics or the Science of Society. The word is a compound of Latin and Greek, and for this reason has been objected to as a barbarism. In spite of this objection, Sociology has been generally adopted and stands for one of the most important departments of human thought. The fact that Comte made the study of human society a part of physics has had a marked influence on sociological writers in France, England, the United States, and other countries. The tendency to treat Sociology as a natural science has been very strong and in some instances has given it a materialistic flavor. It is, however, clear that Comte's views, which are universally admitted to have been defective in many respects, are not authoritative for future investigators and can not determine the course to be pursued in the development of the science of society.

Long before Comte and the introduction of the term Sociology important sociological ideas became current in literature. Vico, the Italian thinker, Montesquieu, Turgot, Kant, and Herder are among the writers worthy of special mention. Herder, preacher and theologian, historian, poet, and philosopher, contemporary of Goethe in Weimar, anticipated many ideas of Comte and the later sociologists.

Sociology aims to subject human so-

ciety to scientific treatment. Thus far the results have been unsatisfactory; indeed, the best that has been done by the most eminent writers is only tentative. The subject is comparatively new; it is vast and comprehends an endless variety of details, and its numerous factors are involved, if not inextricably complicated. One need but know the facts of the case to appreciate the confusion and conflicting views in the realm of sociological thought. Thus there is no agreement respecting the definition, the scope, the material, the division, the method, and the relations of Sociology. Nevertheless it has become evident that the subject is of momentous importance and profound interest. It is growing in popularity among thinkers, and specialists in different countries are intent on its development. Sociology promises to become the science of the future, and many see in it possibilities of the utmost importance.

Various processes of historic evolution and numerous dominant factors of the age have thrust society into the foreground. Science has long been absorbed by the study of nature and brutes; even man was sunk into the brute, and then studied in the brute creation. But man has learned to appreciate man; if formerly the emphasis was placed on what connected him with the rest of the animal world, now the distinguishing features of humanity are likewise emphasized. Sociology is the science of man; not of man as a

mere individual or as isolated, but as a social factor, as a constituent element of society; it is the science of humanity as a great social organism. In Comte and other sociological writers it is evident that somehow the whole of humanity must be included in the social organism, though as yet the success of the attempt is very limited.

The immense importance of Sociology becomes apparent so soon as the subject is apprehended as aiming at the interpretation of humanity as a social organism. Social humanity thus becomes the theme—its nature, its factors, the relation of the factors to one another, the social organism formed by them, the dependence and the independence of the individual in this organism, the laws for the formation of human society, the evolution of this society, and the laws and conditions of social progress. One need but glance at these subjects to learn that all the highest concerns of society are involved.

Sociology teems with the greatest problems which the human mind is capable of considering. The solutions which have been found have revealed greater problems than those solved. Some of the problems involved in Sociology will serve to bring the subject more clearly before the mind and to indicate the work which remains to be done.

1. Society as the object of sociological inquiry must be defined. It is not what we mean by company or the *élite* of a place; it is more than the society of a particular nation or time; society in the sociological sense is inclusive of man in his social capacity whenever and wherever he may be found. Sociology thus includes humanity in all places, in all ages, and under all circumstances. This enables us to understand why Sociology has so largely been treated historically. Great stress has been placed on ethnology in order to trace the evolution of society from the lowest stages to the highest forms of civilization. The genesis of society

is largely an interpretation of society itself.

2. In what sense is society an organism? Respecting this much confusion prevails. Any number of individuals can not possibly constitute an organism in the same sense as an individual is an organism. The social factors are not organic cells; they are analogous to them, but they are also independent personalities. If the individual loses himself in the organism as the cell does, he loses essential personal functions and degrades the very society he helps to form. Human society is an organism in a figurative, not in a literal sense.

3. During the reign of physical science the attempt to subject Sociology wholly to physical law was natural. Thus human society was treated as interpretable by means of biological and physiological processes. This method has proved inadequate and the results are failures. The resort to cosmic forces and cosmic processes to explain social phenomena is but an appeal from mysteries to greater mysteries. Even when the stress is placed on the psychological interpretation of social phenomena, the question remains whether the psychology adopted is recognized as having other than physiological forces. Are reason, ethics, religion materialistic products, evolutions of brute forces by means of physical laws, or do they differ in kind from what we know as material phenomena? So far as the higher interests of humanity are concerned this question is fundamental.

4. Efforts to construct a science of society are made without inquiring in what sense such a science is possible. Are the social factors, personalities, subject to the same kind of scientific treatment as numbers in mathematics or as the elements in chemistry? Is the personality an entity for scientific analysis like a rock or flower? We cannot make our physiology as scientifically exact as our chemistry, nor our psychology as scientific as our physiology; yet Sociology is infinitely more complex

and much less subject to scientific analysis and method. But little reflection is required to show that Sociology can not be a science in the sense of mathematics and chemistry. As a science it is to be classified rather with psychology, linguistics, ethics, and history; in other words, it is a human rather than a natural science. In order to avoid ambiguity it might be better to define Sociology as the Philosophy of human society.

5. Sociology is largely a study of institutions, educational, religious, political, industrial. Sometimes the nature and development of institutions have been regarded as the essence of Sociology. But if in Sociology we have nothing but pedagogics, theology, politics, and political economy, why not develop each of these subjects separately and not take the trouble of introducing a new subject called Sociology? The objection has been urged repeatedly. The answer is that Sociology includes all society, not merely what are called social institutions, such as the family, the church, and the state. It gives the laws for social gatherings, which are not institutional. Besides, it considers the social institutions from the sociological point of view, not as abstractions but as social forms, subject to social laws and social evolution; and it considers them as not isolated, but as united, as constituent parts of the same social organism. The sociologist is not content with inquiring into what the church is *per se*, he wants to determine what it is socially, what its place and function in society are, and how it is related to the other constituent elements of the social organism.

6. The relations of Sociology are important for understanding its nature and sphere. It is intimately related to natural science, for human life rests and depends on nature. But for the mastery of our subject humanistic studies are especially valuable. It is not enough to determine man's place in the material universe; what he is, what

he has become, what he has done, what he can do, are essential problems. Anthropology, ethnology, linguistics, psychology, political economy, political science, ethics, theology, and history as embracing all human thought and activity, are closely connected with Sociology, and are essential for understanding its nature and development.

This meagre outline of the most comprehensive of human disciplines must suffice. Ignorance sometimes confounds it with the social problem and with socialism, which lie within its realm and occupy but a small part of its vast area.

Whatever aid may be given by the extensive literature on the subject, the sociological student should be prepared for independent thought and research. Comte's "Sociology" can be studied to advantage in Harriet Martineau's condensation and translation. Herbert Spencer's sociological works are well known. They are valuable contributions, but in many instances are characterized by breadth rather than depth. American scholars are now devoting much attention to the subject. Lester F. Ward's "Dynamic Sociology" is the most elaborate work produced in this country. Some of its discussions are very able, but its crass materialism is shallow. "Bascom's Sociology" occupies the Christian standpoint. "Principles of Sociology," by Professor Giddings, the latest book on the subject, has some very valuable discussions, but as a whole it is not satisfactory. German thinkers have pursued an independent course and have done excellent work. Among the best works in Sociology is Schaeffle's "Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers."

Bacon said: "I can not call riches better than the baggage of virtue—the Roman word is better, *impedimenta*—for as the baggage is to an army, so is riches to virtue; it can not be spared nor left behind, but it hindereth the march; yea, and the care of it sometimes loseth the victory."

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

New York State Free Labor Bureau.

What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of Hosts.—Isaiah iii. 15.

"You have no conception of the terrible stories of privation which daily come to my ears. Men and women whom I know to be sober and industrious come to me with tears in their eyes, begging that I find them something to do." Such was the statement made to us recently by John J. Bealin, Superintendent of the New York State Free Employment Bureau, recently established in the metropolitan city. The bureau was opened July 22 last, in conformity to the law of May 28, 1896. This law provides that such a bureau shall be opened in every city of the State having a population of 1,500,000 or more, New York city thus being the only city which at present comes within the law.

The bureau is located on 14th Street near First Avenue, within easy reach of the great tenement population of the East side. During the first six weeks of its existence more than 6,000 applications for work have been made. At least 20 per cent. of those applying are women. There are applications now coming in at the rate of 500 a week.

As might be expected applications from employers of labor have not been nearly as numerous. Places have been provided for about 250 during the period. The bureau does not attempt to create work nor has it any connection, political or otherwise, with any of the State or city departments. It acts solely as an exchange in the labor market. Among the questions asked the applicant are the following:

Name? address? age? nationality? occupation? read or write? married or single? number of dependent children? when last employed? how long em-

ployed? and how long idle? wages received? cause of idleness? etc.

The name of the applicant is entered upon the books and places are supplied, so far as possible, in the order of application. At the end of one month the application must be renewed. When the opportunity for employment comes the applicant receives notice on a postal card, and he, with several others, is usually brought face to face with the employer at the bureau. The bureau makes no attempt to investigate into the trustworthiness of the applicant for work. The statement made by him is given to the employer, who investigates for himself.

The work of the bureau is done entirely without charge to both worker and employer. In this respect it differs widely from the numerous private employment agencies in the city. In these private offices the charge is never less than four dollars, of which two dollars comes from the laborer and two dollars from the employer. In addition to this there is usually required an agreement for the payment of ten to fifteen per cent. of the wages received. The law expressly provides that in the management of the State bureau no fee or compensation shall be received under penalty of a heavy fine or imprisonment.

The sum of \$5,000 was appropriated for conducting the bureau, which is barely sufficient to pay the salaries of the superintendent, his two assistants, the office rent, and the necessary incidental expenditures. There is no money for advertising or replying to advertisements in the daily papers, or for other means of bringing employers and employees together.

There is a list made up each week of the applicants for work with their addresses and occupations, and of the applicants for help, and these lists are sent to the town supervisors throughout the State to be posted in conspicu-

1
1
2
g
de
bl
sh
Ti
soi
rec
in;
Ph
No
caj
em
hur
I
ban
que
enc
mak
wor
foll
"Y
jurio
socia
incon

CONF
OF
By E

ONE
structi
that of
the em
the th
seen in
which
and pu

ous places. Most of the applications for workers come from the districts outside of New York city. Of the 250 who have been placed in employment, a large portion were women domestics.

Bankers' Views of Drinking Employees.

They shall not drink wine with a song; strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it.—Isaiah xxiv. 9.

ONE of the cheering signs of the growth of temperance is the increasing demand that persons holding responsible positions in the mercantile world shall be free from the drink habit. This receives a fresh illustration in some replies which have recently been received from twenty-six of the leading bankers of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities. Not one of these banks has a paid-up capital of less than a million, and their employees number upward of eight hundred.

There is an unwritten law which bars out the drinker. In reply to the question, "From your business experience do you find that habitual drinking makes employees less efficient in their work?" such statements were made as follows:

"Yes, it causes unnecessary expense, is injurious to the health, leads to improper associations, and produces a mental condition incompatible with the highest efficiency."

"Yes, because such a habit takes from a man a most essential requisite in our business, namely, a level head."

"They can not keep their minds on their work; consequently make many errors."

"Habitual drinking makes an employee unsteady and unreliable, and hence unsafe."

"The temptations to do wrong are more frequent."

How these banks treat drinkers in the matter of employment and promotion to places of trust is shown by the replies to other questions:

"We insist upon total abstinence as far as practicable."

"Will not take on a drinking man if we know it."

"Such as practise total abstinence are preferred."

"We would not at all employ persons addicted to the use of intoxicants."

"We employ only abstainers."

"Would discharge habitual drinkers immediately."

"Men of good habits are in themselves evidence as to the standing of an institution like ours."

"When we ascertain that any are drinking we endeavor to put a stop to it."

"We will have only sober men on our staff."

"All understand that habitual use of stimulants would undoubtedly lead to discharge."

These replies might be greatly extended, but they are typical of the position taken by these men of wealth and influence on the evils of drink. The liquor habit is a serious drawback to the holding of a place of responsible employment.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

CONFESSIONS AND RETRACTIONS OF AN EMINENT SCIENTIST.

By E. H. DEWART, D.D., TORONTO, CANADA.

ONE of the most interesting and instructive soul histories ever published is that of the late George John Romanes, the eminent expounder and defender of the theory of Darwinian evolution, as seen in his "Thoughts on Religion," which since his death has been edited and published by Canon Gore, the edi-

tor and one of the writers of "Lux Mundi." In some respects it is unique in religious literature. In this little volume Canon Gore places before us the means of tracing the process of thought by which an acute thinker and learned champion of anti-Christian agnosticism, without any external influences, came back to a position in which he admits the force and reasonableness of the arguments for Christianity being a divine religion.

As Moses was "learned in all the

wisdom of the Egyptians," Romanes was certainly thoroughly learned in all the wisdom and philosophy of the school of skeptical science which rejects revealed religion. It is therefore of very great interest to study his criticisms of the fallacies that kept him so long in an attitude of antagonism to spiritual religion, and to note his reasons for accepting arguments in support of Christianity which at one time he deemed futile.

Not that those who are in sympathy with evangelical theology will accept all his later views and arguments; yet they are a most significant confession of the inadequacy of the beliefs he formerly avowed and defended with great positiveness. Others may have retraced their steps between as widely separated extremes; but I do not remember any case in which an author of equal learning, intellectual acuteness, and authority as a master in skeptical sciences has so frankly criticized and retracted his former views because he deemed them untenable.

The main interest of this book is found in the unfinished notes in which the writer gives his later religious conclusions. But there is also given a summary of one of his earlier works which shows his extreme anti-theistic views at that time, and two unpublished articles which give evidence of a transition back toward his early religious faith.

In 1873 George Romanes gained the Burney prize at Cambridge for an essay on "Christian Prayer Considered in relation to the Belief that the Almighty Governs the World by General Laws."

At this time he was only twenty-five years of age. In this essay, assuming, for the purpose of argument, the reality of a personal God and of the Christian Revelation, and also the belief that God governs the world by general laws, he admitted that for anything science had revealed answers to prayer might take place, even in the region of the physical, without any violation of the laws of nature. But

not long after this he repudiated the position taken in this essay, because he rejected the truth of its assumption respecting the existence of a personal God.

In 1876 Mr. Romanes published anonymously, "A Candid Examination of Theism, by Physicus," in which strongly skeptical and anti-theistic opinions are positively asserted. As the latest notes, entitled, "A Candid Examination of Religion," are written with direct reference to this work, a few quotations from the chapter in the earlier work in which his conclusions are summed up may be given, to show his extreme views at the time.

He says: "We first disposed of the conspicuously absurd supposition that the origin of things or the mystery of existence admits of being explained by the theory of Theism in any further degree than by the theory of atheism. Next it was shown that the argument, 'our hearts require a God' is invalid, seeing that such a subjective necessity, even if made out, could not be sufficient to prove—or even to render probable—an objective existence."

The argument that "all known minds are caused by an unknown mind" he pronounced inadmissible. "The theory of the freedom of the will" he declares "at this stage of thought utterly untenable." He condemns John Stuart Mill's idea of design, but admits that creation may imply intelligence.

Again he says: "I regard it as of the utmost importance to have clearly shown that the advance of science has now entitled us to assert, without the least hesitation, that the hypothesis of Mind in nature is as certainly superfluous to account for any of the phenomena of nature as the scientific doctrine of the persistence of force and the indestructibility of matter is certainly true." Nothing is more striking in the "Candid Examination of Theism" than the dogmatic positiveness with which he affirms his conclusions. He says: "I am quite unable to understand how any one at the present day, with the

mo
thi
bel
Ag
me
Go
any
ver
leav
tabl
It
to :
adoj
bold
to tl
He
indi
one
than
tend
decl
that
the
lovel
In
and l
of st
the n
admi
ence
elucis
mind
In th
Roma
skept
from
In l
of De
argun
design
Natur
waste
plies :
and sa
'fair
quent,
'whole
been a
ers th
in Ron
them
suppli
tagoni

most moderate powers of abstract thinking, can possibly bring himself to believe the theory of free will" (p. 24). Again: "There can no longer be any more doubt that the existence of a God is wholly unnecessary to explain any of the phenomena of the universe, than there is doubt that if I leave go of my pen it will fall on the table" (p. 64).

It is unnecessary to quote further to show the extreme conclusions he adopted. But he did not adopt this bold disbelief without doing violence to the religious instincts of his nature. He says: "So far as the ruination of individual happiness is concerned, no one can have a more lively perception than myself of the possibly disastrous tendency of my work." He frankly declares: "I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness."

In his Rede lecture of 1885 on "Mind and Motion" there are signs of a change of standpoint. He severely criticizes the materialistic account of mind. He admits that the advance of natural science is steadily leading us to the conclusion that there is no motion without mind and no being without knowing. In the unpublished articles which Mr. Romanes left there are, in spite of their skepticisms, signs of drifting away from his extreme anti-theism.

In 1889, in a paper on "The Evidence of Design in Nature," he combats the argument of Mr. S. Alexander against design, viz., that "the fair order of Nature is only acquired by a wholesale waste and sacrifice." To this he replies: "But if the 'wholesale waste and sacrifice' as antecedent, leads to a 'fair order of Nature' as its consequent, how can it be said that the 'wholesale waste and sacrifice' has been a failure?" Canon Gore considers that the most anti-theistic feature in Romanes' essays is the stress laid in them on the evidence which Nature supplies, or is supposed to supply, antagonistic to belief in the goodness of

God; but that as he came to apprehend more clearly the light which the character of God, as revealed in the Christian religion, casts upon the mystery of suffering, the force of pessimistic arguments was largely deprived of weight. It seems to me that the main difference between the anti-theistic and his later standpoint is that in the former he excludes every arbiter but the speculative reason; in the latter he recognizes spiritual insight rather than reason, as our chief guide. If in his anti-Christian period our author unduly exalted reason by making it the only instrument by which we can obtain a knowledge of things relating to the spiritual world, it seems to me that in his last notes he goes to the other extreme of unduly magnifying the faith-faculty, as if it were sufficient, without the aid of reason, to apprehend and attest religious truth. We can not dispense with reason in the study of religion, because it is the faculty by which we estimate the value of evidence. But when he speaks of himself as a "pure agnostic" Romanes seems to mean simply that scientific reasoning can not find adequate grounds for belief in God. He uses reason in a sense similar to that in which Kidd uses the term in his "Social Evolution." But this "pure agnostic" must recognize that God may have revealed Himself by other means than scientific ratiocination. He holds that God is not unknowable, but unknown, by reason. The main purpose of these latest notes is to show that the appropriate organ for the ascertainment of moral truth is not reason, but faith and intuition. We can not see why all the powers, intellectual and moral, should not be united in the discovery and attestation of religious truth. Some things in the "Thoughts" seem to imply this.

But we are not so much concerned with the mental processes by which Professor Romanes came to admit the force of the evidence for the truths of Christianity, as with the fallacies he rejected and the religious conclusions he

finally accepted. Tho he elevates the ordinary phenomena of nature into the sphere of the divine in a way that has a close affinity with modern rationalism, yet he says: "Unitarianism is only an affair of the reason—a merely abstract theory of the mind, having nothing to do with the heart, or the real needs of mankind. It is only when it takes the New Testament, tears out a few of its leaves relating to the divinity of Christ, and appropriates all the rest, "that its system becomes in any degree possible as a basis of religion." He frankly admits that further thought has enabled him to discover serious errors, or rather oversights in the very foundations of his "Candid Examinations of Theism." "In that treatise," he says, "I have since come to see that I was wrong touching what I constituted the basal argument for my negative conclusion." In these "Notes" he discusses "Causality," "Free Will," "Faith," "Regeneration," and other Christian truths, in a way that recognizes the positive strength of the historical and spiritual evidences of Christianity.

We have shown how dogmatically Professor Romanes repudiated the doctrine of human freedom, yet in these later notes, discussing the question whether our volitions are caused or not, he says: "If determined from without, is there any room for freedom, in the sense required for saving the doctrine of moral responsibility? I think the answer to this must be an unconditional negative." He who had formerly denied that theism cast any light on creation now admits that "if there be a personal God no reason can be assigned why He should not be immanent in nature, or why all causation should not be the immediate expression of His will, and that every available reason points to the inference that He probably is so." Tho Professor Romanes seems to deny the distinction between the natural and the supernatural, and reaches his conclusions in a somewhat peculiar way, yet he comes in the end

to substantially orthodox ground on most points. Some of his statements are eminently suggestive. A few examples will illustrate his latest position and views:

"The antecedent improbability against a miracle being wrought by a man without a moral object is apt to be confused with that of its being done by God with an adequate moral object."

"It is a further fact that only by means of this theory of probation is it possible to give any meaning to the world, that is any *raison d'être* of human existence."

"It is also a matter of fact that if Christianity is truthful in representing this world as a school of moral probation, we can not conceive a system better adapted to this end than is the world, or a better schoolmaster than Christianity."

"Therefore it is as absurd to say that the religious consciousness of minds other than our own can be barred antecedently as evidence, as to say that testimony to the miraculous is similarly barred."

"I take it, then, as unquestionably true that this whole negative side of the subject proves a vacuum in the soul of man which nothing can fill save faith in God."

"All this may lead on to an argument from the adaptation of Christianity to human higher needs. All men must feel these needs more or less in proportion as their higher natures, moral and spiritual, are developed. Now, Christianity is the only religion which is adapted to meet them, and, according to those who are alone able to testify, does so most abundantly."

"It is the absence from the biography of Christ of any doctrines which the subsequent growth of human knowledge—whether in natural science, ethics, political economy, or elsewhere—has had to discount. This negative argument is really almost as strong as is the positive one from what Christ did teach."

"Only to a man wholly destitute of spiritual perception can it be that Christianity should fail to appear the greatest exhibition of the beautiful, the sublime, and of all else that appeals to our spiritual nature, which has ever been known upon our earth."

"The teleology of Revelation supplements that of Nature, and so to the spiritually minded man they logically

18
an
of
o
me
ath
the
lig
thi
per
pos
tion
emi
be f
neot
misc
asse
his r
are
est s
son I
fiden
to be
study
dinar
Can
sor, a
fully
faith
dentl
quote
tings
surpri
that t
death
with ti
he had
entious
SYM
II. E
Absen
By W.
It is
country
estant c
largely
masculin
attendan
church.

and mutually corroborate one another."

These are remarkable utterances from one who had declared that theism no more accounted for the universe than atheism, and who boldly denied that the order of nature indicated an intelligent mind. The most significant thing in this remarkable religious experience is that the views set forth so positively as the unquestionable deductions of science, by one of the most eminent scientists of our days, should be formally repudiated by him as erroneous conclusions, based on false premises. The positiveness with which he asserted his views strikingly illustrate his remark that scientific men as a class are quite as dogmatic as the straitest sect of theologians. There is a lesson here for those who assume so confidently that conclusions which claim to be the result of scientific methods of study are not to be questioned by ordinary mortals.

Canon Gore visited the dying professor, and in conversation learned more fully of his restoration to the religious faith that he had at one time so confidently rejected. The thoughts I have quoted from his last fragmentary writings prepare one to receive without surprise the statement of Canon Gore that the writer "returned before his death to that full deliberate communion with the Church of Jesus Christ which he had for so many years been conscientiously compelled to forego."

SYMPOSIUM ON CHURCH ATTENDANCE.

II. Erroneous Explanations of the Absence of Men from the Churches.

By W. S. PRYSE, D.D., CARLINVILLE, ILL.

It is a well-known fact that in this country the membership of the Protestant churches is composed far more largely of the feminine sex than of the masculine, and the same is true of the attendance upon the services of the church. The ratio is about two to one,

not more than one third of the enrolled members of these churches consisting of the masculine sex. It is a rare thing to find a worshipping congregation, a Sunday-school, a prayer-meeting, or other religious assembly, in which the feminine element does not largely predominate.

If there is any possibility of devising effectual measures and organizing effectual means to reduce the inequality between the sexes in the church, by converting and gathering in the men in greater numbers, such measures can not be set in operation too soon. Not that we would have fewer women in the churches, but that we would have many more men. Not that we would disparage in the least the value of woman's work and influence in the church, but that we would reach out, by some more efficient methods, after the great absent, perishing host of men, to save and enlist them in the service of the Lord Jesus.

But in order that this may be done, we must first obtain a clear and full view of the causes which, in the present state of things, are operating to prevent the conversion of men in greater numbers, and thus produce the present disparity between the sexes in the membership of the churches. There is doubtless urgent need for an exhaustive discussion of this subject, based upon thorough observation, and leading up to clear, practical conclusions for the guidance of the church in the use of measures for reaching, holding, and saving the men in larger numbers. Such a discussion I do not presume to undertake. My purpose is to present, necessarily in brief and condensed form, the results of my own observation and reflection, in the hope of stimulating interest and thought with respect to this difficult problem of church work.

Before suggesting what seem to me to be in the main the actual causes of the estrangement of so large a portion of the masculine sex from the church of Christ, it will be well, and perhaps necessary, to clear the way by briefly

disposing of certain erroneous explanations, or spurious reasons for the fact, which are sometimes given, the most of them by irreligious men themselves.

1. One of these is the notion that religion is inconsistent with a manly character, or that a religious life is unmanly. This notion sometimes finds expression in the claim that as a rule the manliest men do not attend church; sometimes in the assertion that "religion is well enough for women," implying that it is not well enough for men; and sometimes in the more respectful and specious suggestion that the Christian ideal of character embodies the feminine, rather than the masculine qualities of excellence. Of course if it can be shown that religion in the Christian sense is inconsistent with the highest manliness of character, the whole question before us is disposed of, and the divine claim of the Gospel is disposed of also.

But is there any truth in the allegation? On the contrary, it springs from a two-fold misconception in the minds of those who entertain the idea, a defective conception of true manliness, and a mistaken or imperfect conception of the Gospel of Christ. The notion itself is refuted by all the facts in the case. It is refuted most conclusively by the character of Him who is at once the Author and the great Exemplar of Christianity, in whom all the teachings of His Gospel are embodied in complete symmetry, the Man, Christ Jesus, whose character, as we study it, progressively raises us to the highest, noblest conception of manliness of which we are capable. It is refuted also by the character of the best and most conspicuous exponents of the Christian faith in all ages, the apostles, martyrs, defenders, reformers, missionaries, and philanthropists of the church. It is refuted by the character of the best Christian men of to-day, who, to say the least, do not suffer by comparison with irreligious men. It is refuted by the Gospel itself, which in the entirety of its ethical teaching

holds up to the world the ideal which, in its union of all strong and gentle qualities, all gracious and heroic elements, is the perfection of genuine manliness. It is refuted by the demonstrable and triumphant fact, that it is Christianity which, by the combined influence of our Lord's teachings and character, has corrected the false standards of manliness that once prevailed, and has given shape to the world's highest present conception of the manly character.

In short, no one can assert that true religion is inconsistent with manliness, unless his own idea either of manliness or of the Christian religion is low, mistaken, and unworthy. The irreligiousness of so many men is not to be accounted for by any repugnance of true manhood to the Christian life.

2. A second erroneous explanation of the disparity in question, is the alleged superiority of the masculine sex in intelligence, or in intellectual power and independence. This explanation, for obvious reasons, is seldom openly expressed, but it is sometimes covertly insinuated, and is no doubt secretly cherished by many irreligious men, for whom it contains the grateful balm of a subtle self-flattery. But how stands it before the bar of truth? It contains not only the direct assertion that men are superior to the women in intelligence, but also the intended implication that the highest intelligence is not favorable to Christian faith. Is either supposition true?

As to the first, who will seriously maintain that the women of our time in this country are, on the average, inferior to the men in education and culture? It is admitted that in the limited class of those who have devoted their lives to the higher intellectual pursuits, the men still lead in numbers and attainments. But a more general comparison of the sexes throughout our country will tell a different story. It will show that a good degree of education is far more generally diffused among the women than the men. In

all our villages, towns, and even cities a far larger number of girls than of boys in our common schools pursue their studies to the completion of the high-school course. By far the greater number of literary societies or circles formed for study and the mental improvement of the members are composed wholly or mainly of women. Take this one significant fact, that in many communities and among a large portion of our people, the young women are educated so far beyond the young men of their own class, and are so superior to them mentally and morally, that they can not find suitable or congenial husbands. The point I make, and it is decisive for the question, is simply this, that a fair measure of educated intelligence is far more widespread among the women than among the men in this land.

But even if the contrary were true, it can not be shown that superior intelligence leads men away from the Gospel of Christ. This supposition may be disposed of by a short and decisive method. It may readily be shown that the great majority of the loftiest intellects of modern times, the leaders in every department of thought, have bowed before the Cross of Christ. In philosophy, science, literature, art, law, medicine, statesmanship, the greatest names, the imperial minds, have, in the large majority of cases, been those of Christian believers. A host of the greatest minds in every province of thought have left the emphatic testimony, that in the Gospel of Christ they have found full satisfaction not only for their spiritual wants, but also for their intellectual questionings. The evidence of facts abundantly proves that there is no opposition, but rather perfect harmony and affinity, between superior intelligence and Christian faith.

3. The assertion is sometimes made that "women are naturally more religious than men." This, of course, is a very indefinite statement. In what sense are women naturally more relig-

ious than men? There is a sense in which all, men and women alike, are equally religious, in that they possess a nature which requires religious faith and craves religious help. But in another sense all, women and men alike, are equally irreligious, having a natural aversion to a genuine religious life. Women who grow up in a worldly, unchristian atmosphere are as destitute of religious feeling, as devoid of the Christian spirit, as are men under the same conditions.

It is probably meant by the allegation, that there is something in the feminine temperament which peculiarly predisposes women to religious faith. But what is this something? Is it a stronger or quicker emotional nature, rendering them more susceptible to religious impressions? I am confident that the only difference between the sexes with respect to the emotions is in the outward manifestation of feeling. Men do not as readily show their feelings, but are naturally, when uncorrupted, as capable of the best emotions and affections as are women. No woman can be more tender-hearted than are men who have been subject to good influences, and no man can become more hardened than do women under evil influences.

But is it meant that woman, from the conditions of her life, is less self-reliant than man, and therefore more disposed to feel and acknowledge her dependence upon God? It is often the case, however, that strong, masterful men are precisely those who most fully realize and freely confess their spiritual dependence upon divine grace and help; and on the other hand that weak, irresolute men are the very ones who cling most obstinately to the delusion of their spiritual independence and self-sufficiency. Indeed it is almost invariably the mark of a strong nature to recognize clearly its own limitations, and to realize strongly its nothingness in comparison with God; while it is frequently the case that weak natures fail to do either. Many of the strong-

est characters of the past centuries have been men of deeply religious spirit, who have felt profoundly their need of God and have found in their conscious dependence upon Him the invincible element of their strength.

It may well be doubted also whether woman is less self-reliant than man. Tho weaker in body, how often she shows herself to be as strong and resolute in spirit. How often man, strong in body, proves to be strong in nothing else, and woman, weak in body, proves to be weak in nothing else. In how many families the strong hand that upholds and directs all is that of the wife and mother. In how many instances woman takes up the burden, with resolute energy and tireless patience, which disheartened or recreant man has abandoned.

That there are mental as well as physical differences distinguishing the sexes can not be questioned, but it can not be shown that these are such as to predetermine either sex more than the other, apart from external influences, either to religious faith on the one hand or to unbelief and irreligion on the other.

4. There are men who dispose of the question by frankly declaring that in their opinion the women are "better" than the men, that their instincts are purer, that they are less viciously and more morally inclined. The sensual passions and wayward tendencies, which lead men so generally into sinful indulgences, are not so strong in the feminine nature, and therefore do not constitute so serious an obstacle to a truly Christian life in the case of the women as in that of the men.

This explanation is a plausible one at first view. But it is hardly consistent with the contention of many others, that woman is less moral in certain respects than men. With respect to the sense of honor, of honesty, of candor, and other virtues, it is asserted by a class of thinkers that women are distinctly inferior to men. It may be

sought, perhaps, to harmonize the two contentions, by asserting that in one set of virtues woman is stronger, and in another she is weaker than man. However this may be, the latter view may be allowed to offset the former, and to nullify its force as an explanation of the disparity between the sexes in the church. It may be left to the advocates of the two views to settle it between them, whether women are more generally religious than men because they are more, or because they are less, moral by nature.

A decisive objection to this, or any explanation of the disparity, which attributes it to a natural or innate difference between the sexes arises from the fact that such explanation casts a serious reflection upon the divine Author of human nature. It implies that in the very constitution of the two sexes, He has placed such a difference between them, as to give the one a positive and permanent advantage over the other with respect to the attainment of the supreme end of life, the development of moral character, and the eternal salvation of the soul. To uphold such a view is surely to charge the Creator with unfair partiality or actual injustice in the creation of the sexes. There is no escape from this inference, except by falling back upon the equally objectionable position, that the gospel of eternal redemption has not been as fully and perfectly adapted by its divine Author to the requirements of the one sex as of the other. For myself I can not accept a solution of the question which casts so dark a reflection upon the Creator, impugning His wisdom and goodness, either in the formation of the sexes or in the adaptation of the Gospel to human requirements. I can not believe that God has incorporated such an inequality or injustice in the constitution of the sexes, as places the members of one at a great disadvantage, spiritually and eternally, as compared with the other. Nor can I believe that in the preparation of the Gospel of salvation, He has failed to

adapt it as fully and perfectly to the one as to the other.

Observe the small children of the two sexes living together in a Christian home, and you will discover in them no diversity of moral tendency. Observe the older youth of both sexes who have grown up in such a home, shielded with equal caution from contact with evil and trained with equal care in moral principle and religious character, and you will find no greater propensity to sin and no less regard for religion in those of the masculine sex than in those of the feminine. Let the conditions influencing their characters be the same, whether good or bad, and the results will be very much the same.

5. Neither can the question under consideration be disposed of by the assertion that Christianity is in a state of decline, and that women, being more conservative or less progressive than men, cling longer to a decaying religion. With respect to some of the lands in which a corrupt form of Christianity prevails, this might be given as a fair explanation of the state of things. But in this and other leading Protestant countries it is far from applicable. The refutation of it is ready at hand, in the statistical evidence that the religion of the Gospel is not declining but steadily advancing in our land, having made a constant and immense gain upon the population during the present century. This refutation is fortified by the fact that the stolid inertia, which the assertion ascribes to woman, is a mark not of feminine nature as such, but of that bondage to ignorance and superstition which, as we have seen, can not be imputed to the women of this country. And in this connection it is worthy of notice, and significant, that the great increase in female church-membership during the past fifty years has been exactly synchronous with the grand advance in female education during the same period.

Not long since a prominent pastor sent a circular letter to some two hun-

dred young men in his city, most of them non-churchgoers, in which he requested them to communicate to him the reasons why so many young men hold themselves aloof from the churches. It might be thought that answers so obtained would throw a flood of light upon the problem before us. But in point of fact many of the answers given were mere pretexts or excuses for the neglect of personal religion. And in those instances in which honest and sincere reasons were given, they can not be regarded as distinctive causes for the disregard of religion by the men, for they are such as might be and are assigned with equal pertinency by irreligious persons of either sex. The reasons which lie consciously in the minds of irreligious men for their indifference or antipathy to religion, and the erroneous notions which such men usually entertain concerning the Gospel and Church of Christ, are not the actual causes of their irreligion, but are rather effects to be themselves accounted for, effects arising from the same causes which have produced the irreligious temper of mind itself. They are a part of the general phenomenon, the causes of which we are seeking.

Carlyle's View of the Labor Question.

CARLYLE taught that work is a social function, and property a social trust. Again, he discerned and proclaimed that the great economic problem of the age is the proper division of the fruits of labor; and that we can no longer leave that division "to be scrambled for by the Law of the Strongest, Law of Supply and Demand, Law of *Laissez-faire*, and other idle laws and unlaws." "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work, is as just a demand as governed men ever made of governors. It is the everlasting right of man."—*W. S. Lilly.*

EDITORIAL SECTION.

SERMONIC CRITICISM.

How to Make a Sermon.

THE criticisms called out by the brilliant and dashing article in the July number of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW*, on "The Building of a Sermon," have emphasized the diversities of opinion on the question—all-absorbing to the young preacher—"How to make a sermon."

The *Saturday Review* recently summarized the opinions of many of the prominent preachers in the Church of England, as given in answer to solicitation and embodied in a small volume. We quote briefly from the summary :

"Dr. Boyd Carpenter (Bishop of Ripon) recommends order, and to avoid fire in the exordium. The Dean of Norwich hints that a sermon may be over-prepared, warns them against divisions in a sermon, and bids them avoid In Conclusion. Dean Farrar [one of the most brilliant sermonizers in England] recommends swiftness, the knowledge of books, condemns books of anecdotes, and prefers the poets. Archdeacon Sinclair [one of the most popular Church of England preachers and writers with Dissenters] recommends commonplace books (that is, books of good notes and extracts made by the preacher himself), and commentaries, approves of lessons in elocution to get a good style. The principal of Ridley Hall thinks holiness is the great secret. The principal of Wycliff Hall decries paper, and self-consciousness and want of system. The Rev. Webb-Peploe [whose style to those who read his sermons seems to indicate a purely extemporaneous manner] contradicts much of this, and is all for paper. The Rev. Hay Aitkin recommends simple talking, and to avoid a monotonous voice. The Rev. Henry Sutton says 'prayer and pains,' and that anecdotes should be real."

Such a jumble, verging upon universal contradiction, should hardly be taken to indicate that there are no helpful rules for the preparation of sermons. They may indicate something like the following, among other things :

1. A very good preacher may be a very poor teacher of the art of preaching. He may never have given any attention to the technique of sermon-

izing, or to the philosophy of the sermon or of the human nature to which it is addressed. Hence, when he attempts to enlighten the world he simply makes himself ridiculous.

2. Such preachers, when so appealed to for their opinions, naturally give prominence to their own peculiar views and practise. A man in whose experience the commonplace book is a prominent factor makes that conspicuous; one who has devoted much time to elocution emphasizes that; the extemporizer insists upon extemporaneous efforts, while the habitual writer exalts the "papers."

One of the ablest theological teachers this country ever produced used so to dwell upon the importance of having something important to say, that he almost forgot the importance of saying it so as to reach men. A clergyman of another denomination, having heard him preach the opening sermon at an ecclesiastical gathering, said inquiringly to a friend of the theologian: "So that is the great Dr. Blank?" "That is Dr. Blank," replied the friend. The inquirer concluded: "Well, he may be a very great theologian, but he is a pretty poor preacher!"

All these classes of men would make poor teachers of the art of preaching, and their advice might quite generally be found to be valuable in the inverse ratio to their prominence.

The *Saturday Review*, in setting up for itself, emphasizes the fact that "spoken style differs altogether from written style." The *Belfast Witness*, in commenting upon this—resting its conclusion on worthless etymology rather than on human nature—says :

"This is the secret of the whole matter. If a sermon is written, and in essay style, it is no use reading it well or reciting it from memory. Sermon is *sermo*, speech, spoken matter, and the whole difficulty is to speak off-hand and yet be compact, orderly, and well thought out without writing at all."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Twentieth Century's Call to Christendom: Responses from Some of the Leaders.

THE editorial note in the September number of THE REVIEW, bearing the title given above, was sent out a few days since to some of the leaders in the various branches of the church and in the various forms of church activity. Brief answers were asked to the following questions:

1. Is the proposed movement timely?
2. Does not the present crisis make it imperative?
3. What means can be used to make it most powerful and successful?

The quick and hearty responses from strong men in various positions and branches of the church indicate the deep interest awakened by it. We felt that the great crisis that is upon us and the fact that the church is now within a few weeks of entering upon the twentieth century of the Christian era with her great commission yet unfulfilled, should be enough to rouse sleeping Christendom, if Christians could be brought to realize them. The responses to the appeal, some of which we give below, coming in the vacation season, make it plain that the "Call" has struck a responsive chord in earnest Christian hearts.

The following letters are from men recognized as leaders in the work of training the rising ministry, representing various Christian denominations and institutions. They emphasize the urgent need and are valuable in suggestions regarding means to be used.

President Franklin W. Fisk, D.D., LL.D., of Chicago Theological Seminary, writes out of the full experience of long years in a leading seminary of the Congregational body:

Your able article in the September number of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, entitled "The Twentieth Century's Call to Christendom," I have read with great interest and profit. It seems to me a most timely discussion of a subject of utmost importance to the churches of Christ at the present time.

You ask me to reply briefly to the following questions, viz.: 1. Is the movement (a movement all along the line for the immediate evangelization of the world) timely?" I reply that it seems to me most timely. God, by His providence, is clearly indicating that now is the time for this individual and concerted movement of all Christians to bring this world into loving loyalty to Christ. 2. "Does not the present crisis make it imperative?" It appears to me to make this movement a pressing duty, which the membership of the churches can not disregard without infinite peril to themselves, to their churches, and to the world. To the third question, "What means can be used to make it most powerful and successful?" I would reply that the "brief suggestions" made in the article itself "for aid and guidance," seem to me to be as wise and practicable as any that can be given, viz., that each Christian at once set himself to work in his own sphere, and in every way in his power, for the world's evangelization; that he stir up Christians about him to do the same; that he try to arouse every Christian organization with which he is connected, to similar effort; and that in all this, waiting for no one, he hasten to do "present duty by taking advantage of present emergencies and opportunities." When once the churches of Christendom shall become thoroughly aroused to their great duty, to enter at once, with all the resources at their command and with reliance on the Holy Spirit for success, on the subjugation of this world to Christ, the way will open before them, and means and methods will not be wanting.

President Henry A. Buttz, D.D., LL.D., of Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J., the foremost Eastern Methodist seminary, responds as follows:

Your letter containing the excerpt concerning "The Twentieth Century's Call to Christendom" is at hand. I concur most heartily in your view that the celebration of the "nineteen-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Christ" by a great forward movement for the immediate evangelization of the world is both timely and important. Certainly this anniversary of the "world's Redeemer" will be celebrated most fittingly

by the whole Christian church in the manner suggested in your call. It will afford a fitting opportunity to arouse the Christian Church to activity, and to urge God's people everywhere to consecrate themselves, and their means to the salvation of the world.

As to your second consideration, namely, the best method of accomplishing this result, I am not able to speak with definiteness without further time for consideration. My heart is with you, however, in this grand movement, and I trust that the means employed may be such as will best promote the prosperity of Christendom, both at home and abroad.

President T. D. Witherspoon, D.D., LL.D., of Louisville Theological Seminary, a leading training-school for the ministry in the Southern Presbyterian Church—a man whose "summer campaigns" in gospel work in the mountain regions of Kentucky have impressed him most profoundly with the needs of these unevangelized portions of our country—urges a call to prayer for the ministry and for the outpouring of the Spirit. He writes:

I have read with deep interest the "Twentieth Century's Call" of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW. No appeal could be more timely, and it is meet that this bugle-note should be sounded by a periodical that reaches more pastors and evangelists than any other serial, probably, in the world. The awakening must begin with the ministry. The pulpit must be on fire if the pews are to be aroused. What is most needed is the descent of the Holy Spirit in power upon the ministry. I would therefore urge that THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, and the whole religious press, give emphasis to the responsibility of the ministry of the gospel in this crisis; that the churches be asked to offer prayer for the ministry that it may be baptized with fire, and that every possible agency be set on foot which shall bring into active and effective service the large reserve force of the ministry that is now practically idle as far as immediate and strenuous effort for the salvation of men is concerned.

George Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A., Professor of the Harmony of Science and Revelation in Oberlin Theological Seminary, and editor of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, most widely known both as scientist and theologian, writes:

In answer to your inquiries I would say that of all times in the world's history the present is one which demands a revival of

effort for the conversion of the world through the proclamation of all the doctrines of the Christian religion. What the Wesleyan movement was among the common people of England a hundred years ago is what in kind, tho perhaps not in form, is needed for the close of this century. The political, educational, and sociological movements are far from sufficient. Indeed their inherent weakness when alone is becoming more and more apparent. I know of no means to make the Gospel more powerful except its clear presentation and its fervent preaching, accompanied by the gifts of the Holy Spirit given in answer to prayer.

I confidently expect that the continued failure of political and sociological efforts will give such renewed emphasis to the spiritual needs of man and to the provision for meeting them made in the Gospel, that we shall witness the Pentecostal seasons so much needed and so abundantly promised in the Bible. May God speed the day!

Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken, D.D., LL.D., of the University of the City of New York, long prominent among educators, writes from his home on University Heights:

The church exists for the fulfilment of no duty more than the evangelization of all nations. The present condition of the peoples of the world makes this duty more pressing now than ever before. I have not wisdom enough to attempt to name the steps which the church should take more than she is taking now, to hasten the evangelization of all peoples. Your own words in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, insisting upon the church's fulfilment of her commission, are likely to be valuable means to the desired object.

The following are some of the responses from men who, as Secretaries, are connected with and giving shape to much of the Christian work of the church for the world. They indorse and urge on the movement, and broadly but specifically outline what is to be done to make it world-wide and effective.

Rev. Charles H. Payne, D.D., LL.D., long a successful pastor, then president of the Ohio Wesleyan University, and now Secretary of the Education Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, writes thus, "on the wing":

I pause long enough to assure you of my hearty approval of the movement and of my cordial cooperation in carrying it forward. I certainly believe the movement to be most timely. Something must be done and be done quickly to arouse the church to a realization of its supreme duty to save the whole world. The movement ought to have the united support of the entire church.

One of the grandest results would be the bringing together of the united forces of the church to fight the allied powers of evil in this country and over the whole earth.

The religious press ought to be a unit in such a measure and it should, and doubtless will, receive support from the secular press. Christian pulpits everywhere should lend their powerful aid. All religious bodies should give it indorsement and every form of help. All religious organizations and societies within the church, including young peoples' societies and all the great boards of the church, should be enlisted.

A proper organization of the movement should be made as soon as practicable that would include all the local churches of all denominations, and by large popular gatherings in great centers as well as by the diffusion of stirring literature arouse, inspire, and unite the entire church of Christ. God speed the movement and give wisdom to carry it forward to glorious success!

Secretary D. J. McMillan, D.D., of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, who won his position by his work as a home missionary in the wild West, writes from the Presbyterian Building on Fifth Avenue:

Your "Twentieth Century's Call to Christendom" seems to me to be most timely. If we celebrate the resurrection each week, and still more elaborately each year, why not with greater enthusiasm the birth at the completion of a century? Besides it was nineteen centuries before Christ that the covenant with Abraham and the rite of circumcision were instituted marking the beginning of a new era in the Church of God, which was itself about nineteen centuries after the first promise of a Savior, and before the advent of the great antetype of that covenant and rite and the beginning of the Christian era.

And now a new crisis is upon the church. All Christendom is ready and the unconverted world is ready for a mighty forward movement. Why may we not mark the new era by going into all the world? The church has more money, more consecrated lives, better equipment, more perfect facilities for communication and travel than at any previous time. It has freer access to the unevangelized masses in its own countries and

to the heathen world beyond, than ever before, and than it may ever have again if we allow the rivals and enemies of the truth to seize the opportunities that are open to us.

It is significant that just at this time the representative and adviser of the mightiest potentate of the heathen world, is on a friendly visit to the Christian nations for the purpose of studying the secret of their power and prosperity.

"Power to its last particle is duty," and opportunity is command. The present crisis therefore is as imperative as God's command to Moses at the Red Sea. If the church is able and the world ready, what wait we for?

Let us sound this call through every religious paper, in every synod and other ecclesiastical convocation, from every pulpit in the land, in every Sabbath-school, to every class, in every Young People's Society, and let it echo through every Y. M. C. A. hall; let every organization that bears the name of Christ take up the call, and with God's blessing and sanction we shall open the era of the final conquest of the world for Christ.

Rev. Josiah Strong, D.D., author of "Our Country," General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States of America, a man who from his position has his finger always on the pulse of Christendom, writes, putting tersely and plainly the one question that Christendom wants answered, and that the church must answer:

There never has been an hour since Christ gave the great commission when a movement among Christians everywhere for its immediate fulfillment would not have been timely; and as the years and centuries pass, the obligation would seem, if possible, to grow more imperative.

The proposed movement, if I understand your suggestion, consists in a deeper personal consecration to God, which shall lead to personal Christian work. Undoubtedly such consecration and such effort on the part of all Christians would bring every human being to the feet of Christ early in the next century. But how induce such consecration? How arouse Christians to such work? These are the great questions. If you will answer them, you will render the greatest possible service to the kingdom of Christ.

We give two responses from Evangelists widely known and having the confidence of the Christian world. These beloved brethren are already at work along the lines indicated, having

felt the pressure of necessity, the one seeking with his myriad helpers to rouse to activity the lay element, or the entire membership of the church, and the other with his numerous assistants trying to move one of our great cities.

Dwight L. Moody, who has been more prominently before the Christian public than any other man for more than a generation, on the point of leaving home, directed Mr. Fitt, Superintendent of "The Bible Institute Colportage Association," to respond for him as follows:

He would say that he believes the proposed movement for an immediate evangelization of the world is timely. He believes that there never was a moment since the parting commission of our Lord, that such a movement would be out of season, and the sooner the church is awakened to activity the better. Mr. Moody does not know what will become of this country unless the influence of the Gospel is more generally diffused.

During the recent conference for Christian workers, Mr. Moody emphasized very strongly the need of just such activity as referred to in the article in *THE HOMILETIC REVIEW*. His idea was to set the church-members to work, as he does not believe that the country will ever be evangelized without their help.

Several meetings on Round Top were devoted to this question, and cottage meetings, open-air meetings, house-to-house visitation, and personal contact with the people along other lines seemed to be the methods most advocated. As the people will not go to hear the Gospel in the churches, Mr. Moody proposes to bring the gospel to them in their homes, workshops, on the street, and wherever else he can catch them.

Rev. J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., pastor of Bethany Presbyterian Church founded by Hon. John Wanamaker in Philadelphia, and one of the most earnest and successful evangelists of the day, responds heartily to the "Call," telling of the movement already inaugurated in Philadelphia. He writes:

First. The proposed movement is most timely. God's promises are all for the present, and the warrant of Scripture is, that we may expect the blessing when we claim it. I believe the fields are white unto the harvest.

Second. The present crisis is an opportunity for service not likely soon to be repeated. What you say of the nineteen-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Christ is an inspiration, and I believe it. Add to this the unsettled condition of humanity, and the fact that men's hearts are failing them for fear, and it seems to me, if we do not meet the crisis, we shall forever be held responsible before God for failure.

Third. As a means to making the effort successful, I would suggest: Every pastor searching his own heart, to see if he be ready for service; then appealing to the members of his church after the same manner; then calling a conference of his brother ministers, and then together moving to take the cities for God. Such a movement is now on foot in Philadelphia. For its successful accomplishment, prayers of Christians are asked everywhere.

Suggestions Regarding What Should Be Done.

FROM communications received from various quarters we are led to suggest the following things as needing to be done in preparing the way for the forward movement proposed:

1st. A new baptism of the Holy Spirit should be sought most earnestly for all ministers of the Gospel, since upon them, as the divinely appointed leaders, rests the chief responsibility.

2d. Arrangements should be made to set at work in our great centers the multitudes of ministers now unemployed, for which work such a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit will consecrate and fire them.

3d. For every church and Christian agency and association there should be sought a new consecration, and it should be given its rightful place and full play in pushing the movement for Christ in its own way and in its own sphere.

4th. Every church-member should be roused to understand that he has been called of Christ to be a coworker with Him in evangelizing the world, and be set at work in his appointed place. Peter practically reads out of Christ's Church all that are either *workless* or *fruitless* (2 Peter i. 8). The entire membership must be roused.

Power of the Supernatural Over Man.

CORRUPT human nature struggles in vain to get rid of God. The struggle has always been in vain, but man always returns to it. The Italian philosopher, Vico, expressed this truth, on the scale of history, in his *theory of ricorsi*, the theory that "the history of civilization is composed of successive cycles, each cycle embracing a divine, a heroic, and a human age, each cycle ending in corruption through wealth, the movement then reverting to the primal stage of another cycle"—or back to *God*.

Comte, who probably borrowed the hint from the greater Vico, reduced the history of the race to three stages—the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive—and thereby succeeded, as it seemed to him, in "conducting God to the confines of the universe and bowing Him out" as no longer necessary. But the Nemesis came, and even Comte was forced to bring back the supernatural by introducing his "Grand Being" as a God for himself and the French people. God was not to be gotten rid of.

So the "scientists falsely so called," who have been so long dominated by Comte's positivism, are being forced back to the acknowledgment of the supernatural. Regarding this reactionary trend, *The Independent* recently said:

"Nothing is more striking than the present development of thought, as related to religion and theology, than the return to the Christian view of the reality of the supernatural world. We have been passing through a dreary period characterized by bold and sometimes desperate attempts to get rid of the supernatural altogether, to remove it beyond the sphere of human interest and recognition, or to extend the natural so far as to remove the line of demarcation and make the two spheres one. The futility of these attempts to solve the highest problems of existence by denying their reality or their importance, is beginning to be asserted again, and in circles of too much influence to be easily overlooked."

God will not down at the bidding of these would-be conjurers. Professor

Romanes, whose spiritual history is given by Dr. Dewart in the present number of this REVIEW, is one of the best recent illustrations of the hold of the supernatural on the human soul.

Is There Hope for Armenia?

FROM the point of view of human diplomacy the case of Armenia has at times seemed almost hopeless; but great moral issues have God back of them, and God will win in the end.

The Eastern Question has had connected with it the greatest national crimes of the nineteenth century; but note how it is running its course. The great Powers of Europe have done their best to uphold Turkey in her work of oppressing the Christians of southeastern Europe and southwestern Asia, but their efforts are becoming more and more futile.

At the opening of the second quarter of the century Greece, then the principal source of Turkish revenue, became free, by a special providence and practically in spite of Great Britain and France, which Powers however limited the area of Greece in the interests of the Turk.

At the opening of the second quarter of the century Great Britain joined with France in the Crimean War to wrest from Russia her treaty-right as protector of the Christians of Turkey,—which they accomplished, having apparently crushed Russia.

Twenty years later the butcheries of the Turk in Europe became unendurable, the great Slavic rising occurred, and regenerated Russia came to the rescue and, at an immense cost of blood and treasure, forced the Turk to make the Treaty of San Stefano which provided freedom for the Christians of the Turkish Empire. But Beaconsfield, through the Congress of Berlin and by two iniquitous secret treaties, one with Russia and one with Turkey, overthrew that treaty and substituted the Treaty of Berlin, which remanded the Christians of the Macedonian belt and

of Asiatic Turkey to slavery again, in the interest of the British and Hebrew Shylocks, who held the Turkish bonds by which the expenses of the wars had been paid.

The Turkish exactions necessarily became more severe, for the debt had greatly increased and fewer Christians remained to be taxed. They fell especially upon the Armenians, the chief merchants and bankers of the empire. By 1890 to 1894 all these peoples had been so robbed and impoverished that nothing was left but confiscation and butchery, and that has to be renewed yearly to meet the needs of the Turkish butcher.

The next and last victims would be the Greek Christians of the Hellenic or Macedonian belt in Europe, and then there would be no more Christians to furnish taxes and no more Christians for the Turk to butcher!

But England seems to be waking up to that fact. The policy by which, in the interests of the Turk, Beaconsfield iniquitously brought the Powers to concede to Great Britain the right of

control in Turkey, and pledged her support to the Turk in peace and war, has hampered Lord Salisbury and the Government up to the present time.

The astute Russian, Lobanoff, naturally took advantage of it to thwart the ambitious schemes of the British. But God, who still reigns, has removed Lobanoff, and it seems that that Grand Old Woman, Queen Victoria, now in full sympathy in this matter with the Grand Old Man, is reaching out with a strong hand—as she has sometimes done before—to put an end to the awful state of things. Let Christendom stand back of her and the Eastern Question will be solved speedily and righteously. And let us remember that God is wiser and mightier than the Powers and the diplomatists.

It is the standing disgrace of the so-called Christian nations that, altho the real Eastern Question is simply one of justice and humanity, the Satanic diplomacy of Europe—in the interests of the Shylocks who own the Turkish bonds and the Machiavellis who shape politics—has been able for this whole century to defy the moral sense of Christendom and to balk all efforts to put an end to the blackest crime of the ages.

HELPFUL DATA IN CURRENT LITERATURE.

IN THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for July, published at Oberlin, Ohio, are some able and discriminating articles, among them "Some Misapprehensions Concerning Calvin," strong and conclusive, by Dr. O. T. Lanphear; "Origin and the Return to Greek Theology," giving a graphic sketch of this "father of church science" and reconciler of science with Christian faith, noting the defects of his spirit, method, and system, and bringing out the relations of his teachings to present theological drifts, by Rev. James W. Falconer, of Newport, N. S. Dr. Jacob Cooper, of New Brunswick, N. J., furnishes a sympathetic review of "Gladstone's Edition of Bishop Butler's Works," in which he outlines the "Analogy," and shows how modern scientific and philosophic investigations have furnished what may have been regarded as missing links in Butler's argument, and welded all the links into an indissoluble chain. "The Hebrew Cosmogony Again," by Charles B. Warring, "Individualism and Societism," by Z. Swift Holbrook, and "The Restriction of Immigration," by Edward W. Bemis, are all timely and worthy of careful reading.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is doubtless the richest repository of discussions of current, expository, exegetical, archeological, and other kindred topics. Many of the critical theories of the day are sifted in its pages, and the leading books estimated. In the

August number are contributions from Professors Sayce, Cheyne, and many other men of note. One of the ablest articles is Dr. W. L. Baxter's rejoinder to Professor Peake's criticism of Dr. Baxter's reply to Wellhausen. Professor Sayce declared that Dr. Baxter's work has made "mincemeat" of Wellhausen; the doctor is equally effective in dealing with Wellhausen's champion. He reduces the critical question involved to its simplest terms. He says:

"What the public want to know is, 'Has the whole Christian world been trained to believe a lie?' a most stupendous and imaginable lie! Were holy men 'borne along by the Holy Ghost' in the deliberate work of completely altering most essential facts? Have we the formula, 'the Lord spake unto Moses,' scores of times as fiction, and hardly once as truth? The question, 'Is Wellhausen consistent?' is important, and I treat it fully (and with that Mr. Eeran and Mr. Peake seem to think I am exclusively occupied). But the title of my *Thinker* articles puts a deeper question, which I canvass still more anxiously, the question 'Is Wellhausen right?' I deal with that throughout my volume. Is it Proof, or Imagination, that he offers us? Is he the Samson, who has leaned and brought down the temple? Or, is he the child, blowing its airy soap-bubbles against the 'Impregnable Rock?'"

The *Expository Times* is invaluable for setting scholarly men thinking.