

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CANADIAN
Methodist Quarterly.

VOL. III.]

JULY, 1891.

[No. 3.

INSPIRATION AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM.*

THE subject suggested to me, as I understand it, is, How far is the doctrine of Inspiration and the Divine authority of Holy Scripture affected by modern Biblical criticism? Are the ascertained results, not the theories and hypotheses, of a valid, not of a fanciful and speculative criticism, such as to make it necessary in any degree to modify traditional views of the Bible as the Word of God? And if so, how far, within what limits, according to what principles, is such modification to be admitted?

That there is ground for such an inquiry cannot, I think, be denied. A revolution is taking place in the history of theology, and the Bible cannot but be affected by it. Not only are men's views and opinion changing, but their very standpoint is so rapidly being altered, that men with twenty-five or fifty years between them hardly understand one another's language, or mental attitude. The advance of scientific knowledge, of historical, geographical, archæological discovery; the establishment of the science of textual criticism: the labor and concentrated attention bestowed upon Biblical literature—these and other causes have almost metamorphosed Bible study, so that the commentators of half a century ago have become in some respects antiquated, and problems press upon the reverent

* A paper read at the London Wesleyan Ministers' Meeting, 16th March, 1891.

student of to-day, of which our fathers knew and might be content to know little or nothing. Two facts only I name to establish the proposition that there is ground for inquiry: The publication of the Biblical articles in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and the fact that *Lux Mundi* is in its eleventh edition, mainly because of the essay on inspiration.

X If it be answered, as well it may, that all these things do not concern the simple Christian who reverently reads his Bible to find the way to heaven, and that ministers will do well to make that the main factor in their consideration of this matter, the reply at once must be, Perfectly true: it cannot be too strongly insisted on. That is the first truth in this investigation of ours concerning the Bible, and it will be the last; about that there is no controversy. But it must be added that in this, as in all else, the minister must lead his people, and to this end must have his own ideas clear on a number of questions he does not bring directly before them; that further, a large proportion of his most intelligent hearers keenly feel a number of the difficulties I have hinted at, and if the minister does not know precisely where he stands in this matter, he will not be a leader at all, or only the blind leader of the blind, both falling into the ditch. There is abundant proof to-day that leadership is needed; men are crying out for it, and many ministers are only regretting their inability to give it as they would.

You do not expect me to lay down any dogma or formulary on this subject. There is none such. In the undivided Church of the early centuries, the Anglican Church, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, there is a notable absence of definition as to the exact doctrine of inspiration, as if the Church had been guided by the Spirit of God to abstain from formulating theories which might prove to be untenable. Neither do you expect from me a personal confession of faith which could be of no importance to any one but myself, useful here only as a mark for subsequent speakers to practise shooting at. But I understand that I am asked to offer some suggestions as to the present state of opinion upon a subject as to which even such a writer as Professor Banks states that additional light and

leading are not only "desirable" but "necessary." Respectfully, therefore, I ask that my desultory remarks shall be judged as only of the nature of suggestions from one who has pondered, according to opportunity, this most important, most difficult, and, just now, burning question.

The present position, then, seems to be something like this: An ecclesiastical doctrine of inspiration, of greater or less antiquity has been in possession of the field among orthodox evangelical Churches, according to which the Bible has been viewed as a compact whole, from end to end the words of God, every part of it divine in the same sense, infallible in every detail, inspired in every word, accepted as the sole authority on all questions, established in its place as the ultimate arbiter on the evidence of miracles and prophecy, acknowledged as such almost without question by all teachers and members of these Churches. Now, there is an uneasy feeling that this elaborate structure is more or less undermined. It stands erect, apparently uninjured, but there has been much digging and investigation going on at the foundations beneath, so much sapping and mining on the part of what is known as criticism, that it appears as if at any moment a collapse might come and the authority of the sacred Scriptures be shaken to its very base. "What are we to say?" I have been asked again and again by ministers and intelligent laymen, What is the worth and strength of this criticism, and how is the doctrine of inspiration affected by it?

Is there any inconsistency between an unhesitating belief in the inspiration of Scripture, so that it may be revered as the Divine Word, an authoritative revelation, the ultimate arbiter of faith and practice, and a reasonable and valid Biblical criticism, searching into all possible questions concerning the books of the Bible. I am strongly persuaded there is no such inconsistency, but much depends on the way in which the subject of inspiration is approached. Now, I should answer: the doctrine of inspiration is the very last thing we come to in a time of searching inquiry and unsettlement of foundations. It is not wise to begin with that, and make the authority of the Book the basal tenet of faith. All are agreed

that the Bible is divine and human, pervaded by the influence of the Divine Spirit as no other volume or volumes, yet human literature, composed and handed down under the conditions of ordinary literature. The theory of inspiration concerns the precise relation between these, the character and degree of influence exercised by the Divine Spirit over the minds of human writers. We must not begin with that—we cannot. We cannot if we would, and we should not, if we could. The question whether the Bible is or contains the Word of God; whether inspiration be verbal, plenary, dynamic, may be very important: though, so far as I have watched such controversies, they seem too often to degenerate into mere strifes of words.

Far better begin with that which gives to this collection of books its unity, its character, its vitality, its authority, viz.: the fact that it contains the records of the revelation of the Living God—a series of revelations rather, culminating in the one consummate manifestation of God the Father in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. A long and multifarious record is given us in these books unfolding God's nature, His dealings with man, all within certain limits and for certain ends, but mainly for man's practical guidance and personal salvation; this revelation claiming to be itself supernatural, unique, complete, and all-sufficient for those purposes for which it was given. Inspiration is the name given to the special influence exercised by the Spirit of God in the preparation of that record, and it is clear that it is possible to adopt:

1. Too low a view of that influence, not sufficiently recognizing the sacredness of the substance.
2. Too high a view, which in its anxiety to preserve the sacredness propounds an untenable doctrine that defeats its own end.

But if we want to get at a satisfactory doctrine, we must not begin with that subject or at that end. It is not well to say "Inspiration *must* imply this or that." Butler has shown how dangerous it is to argue thus, how prone man is to degrade the divine by endeavoring to exalt it according to his own ideas. We must argue not deductively and *à priori*, but *à*

posteriori and inductively. Some may be afraid of so doing lest old landmarks should be lightly removed. On this subject let me quote Dr. Pope: "The Bible is a divine-human collection of books, the precise relation of human and divine in which is a problem which has engaged much attention, and has not yet been, though it may be, adequately solved. The Holy Ghost never defines inspiration as applied to the whole body of Scripture: we have to construct our theory from the facts, and our theory must take those indisputable facts as it finds them." ("Comp. Theol.," Vol. I., pp. 175, 191.)

But in these days we cannot begin so. Criticism is at work, and must neither be ignored nor defied. How foolish, how wrong, to do either! Criticism means examination; will not the Bible bear examination? Suspicion of criticism may be godly jealousy, but it may mean mere prejudice, an unwillingness to face facts. What we have to be jealous of is a criticism with tacit assumptions concerning the supernatural—criticism only in name, because it hides in its premises the statements which it afterwards triumphantly produces in its conclusions. There must be the greatest care as to the assumptions of this criticism, its methods, its canons, its hypotheses. An unsound criticism must be met, not by denunciation, but by sound and sober criticism. What is the reason why so much criticism is rationalistic, so that the very name bears with some an ill savor? I fear largely because Rationalism has done so much more minute and thorough work of investigation, and orthodox commentators, while anxious about edification, have not pursued Bible inquiries with the thoroughness or scientific precision which is necessary to-day, if work is to be useful and lasting.

Behind, then, the question of inspiration, or the kind of divine influence exerted, come several previous questions. X

1. Are these books genuine, what they profess to be, written by the men whose names they bear?

2. Are they authentic, the stories in them to be believed, or myths, legends, unverifiable traditions?

3. If both, are the writers trustworthy in the details of their narratives, accurate in method, or loose and careless, though honest?

4. Are all the books in the collection deserving of a place here? Why are there so many? Why not more? Are these different from the rest?

5. Then, if all are genuine, all authentic, all trustworthy in minute details, and determined by a satisfactory canon, then we may ask at length: What is the relation between the divine and the human elements in their composition, so far as that can be determined?

It is by raising these questions that the inquiry of our day has seriously affected the structure of belief in inspiration, and a large number of difficulties that men have in mind when they vaguely say, "I don't know what to believe about inspiration," emerge at a much earlier stage, and must be dealt with on other grounds. I may add that many of them emerge at an altogether later stage, and belong properly to the right interpretation of Scripture. These are difficulties caused by mistranslation, misunderstanding of the true scope of the narrative, misunderstanding of the relation between Scripture and physical science and the like—all topics which concern the correct interpretation of the Book which, more than any other, needs to be used with care.

It is, of course, impossible in five minutes to describe the present attitude of scholarly criticism to the books of the Bible, nor is it necessary to do so. It may, however, be well to sum up the results of the minute and exhaustive investigation and re-investigation given to the sacred books of late, by saying that it has spread all along the line and with somewhat varying results. In some cases there has been triumphant vindication, both of the genuineness and authority of a given book, admitted by hostile critics; in others the traditional authority has been shown to be untenable, without affecting the substance or value of the book itself; in many cases a measure of doubt still remains, or critics are divided into two or more camps, each preserving its own views. The discussion of the Pentateuch question has more or less clearly demonstrated its composite character, and enables us to trace the documents which have been interwoven into its structure, while the attempt to bring down the body of the legislation to a period after the exile

remains a speculative theory, full of difficulties and incredibilities, though at present strongly in favor amongst many scholars of repute. Throughout the Old Testament signs of editorial care, of compilation, have been brought to light. In the Psalms we possess a series of collections, the dates of which it is somewhat difficult to trace, the attempt to bring these down to a late date being involved in the Pentateuchal theory just spoken of. The writings of the prophets are not so largely assailed by criticism, though the Isaianic authorship of the latter part of the book which goes by his name is now given up by the best scholars. Zechariah is thought by many to be composite in structure, and the controversy concerning the date of Daniel is by no means ended. In the New Testament the received dates of the composition of the three synoptic gospels is on the whole established, though students are still busy with the problem of the construction of these narratives, how they came to take the form they have, and what is their true relation to each other, while the attack on the genuineness, and therefore on the authority of the fourth gospel, has been triumphantly repelled, as shown in the last volume of Bampton Lectures. There are four unquestioned epistles of St. Paul, and the arguments in favor of the genuineness of the rest have never been answered. The Pauline authorship of Hebrews, like the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes, is now by most abandoned.

All this is highly controversial matter. The above are not statements of my own opinions, and they would be attacked on both sides by those who think that too much weight has been given to current criticism, and by those who think that not enough weight has been given to it. But it is no object of mine to take up any position on any of these debated topics; I only wish to show what is the actual history of recent discussion, and how the question of inspiration must be affected, while these controversies are going on. It is natural for devout students of Scripture to become somewhat impatient. There are those who would meet all these inquiries as impious. They are completely equipped with a theory of inspiration, that the whole Bible may be proved apart from these examinations to

be divine from end to end, and that the authority of the Word of God should silence such inquiries and give us peace again. Such persons fail to see (1) that this is impossible. It is the authority of the Book which is in question, and which must be re-established upon a basis good against the unbeliever, as well as for the believer. (2) That none of the inquiries need affect the simple faith of one who reads his Bible for edification, while they are of the highest importance for those whose work it is fully to understand and intelligibly to teach from this Book as the rule of faith and practice. (3) That out of these investigations and controversies, more or less disturbing at the moment, as out of many more battles besides, good will come, if the Church of Christ be faithful. It is that we may learn more concerning the Book of books, understand it better, have larger views of God's Word and ways, that this has been permitted. But to gain this we must be content to wait awhile, begin with the premises of the argument, not with its conclusions, make the pyramid rest upon its base, not upon its apex. The inspiration of Scripture—*i.e.*, the everywhere operating influence of the Divine Spirit throughout these books, which are many, yet one—is indubitable, undoubted; the precise relation between the divine and human elements is much more difficult to define, and that topic must be postponed till some others have been satisfactorily settled.

But where rests the authority of Scripture, if we do not begin with its inspiration and infallibility? We cannot accept the view that it depends on the authority of the Church; still less on the Coleridgean doctrine that the Bible is true because it "finds me," commends itself directly to my heart and conscience. True, the doctrine of the Bible is connected both with the doctrine of the Church and the doctrine of conscience, but no satisfactory basis of authority is to be found in either of these. If we cannot appeal to the Bible as a standard, it may well be said: Where are we?

The answer is, the Bible is a standard, though not to be appealed to like the Koran, as a message from end to end sent direct from heaven. Its authority rests ultimately not upon the book as a composition, but upon the revelation recorded in

it. In establishing its authority we must go to the Lord Jesus Christ—make the doctrine of Scripture Christo-centric. True, we can only reach Him through the record, but we can do that, without any elaborate theory as to what Scripture as a whole is. St. Mark's gospel, and the four unquestioned epistles of St. Paul are more than enough to bring us into His presence, and to enable us to answer the question: What think ye of Christ? As to the question: Do you believe in Christ because you believe in the Scripture, or do you believe in the Scripture because you believe in Christ? The Christian may say: "I cannot well separate the two;" but if I am pressed for a logical answer it must be the second. I believe in Jesus Christ, God's Son our Lord, in the revelation there made of the divine, and from that starting point I find Christ stretching forth His arms on either side to establish the authority of Holy Scripture. Backwards to the Old Testament to which He constantly appeals as the authority for the Jew, and within certain limits for all men, as the Scriptures which, in so many ways, testified of Himself, the chief value of which to-day consists in the way they lead up to Him. Forwards to the New Testament as He sends forth His apostles with the message commissioned by Himself, giving them authority to proclaim that which was afterwards recorded by those whose qualifications and credentials can be freely examined and have been satisfactorily established again and again.

I shall not stay to work out this argument, but ask you to bear in mind how much it contains when establishing the substantial authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. *For those who believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, there is an irremovable basis for the doctrine of Holy Scripture as a sufficient, complete, infallible guide in things pertaining to God, the sole authoritative rule of faith and practice.* When we pass from this to a close consideration of the form of the book or books, the precise way in which it has pleased God that this record should be made and come down to us, and the exact degree of influence exercised by His Spirit on the minds of the writers, the true relation of the history, the science, the theology of their own times, it is quite

clear that large questions are opened up. If we begin with preconceived ideas of what the revelation from God must be, many will be disappointed. It is quite clear, for example :

1. Our Bible is a translation. We cannot imitate the Church of Rome, which, according to the council of Trent, virtually takes the Vulgate as infallible.

2. It is not altogether easy to reach an accurate text. Both in the Old and New Testaments a minute, scientific investigation, not yet ended, is to determine this.

3. When we have obtained this, the form in which the revelation has come down to us, the form of the books and narratives, what seem gaps on the one hand and repetitions on the other, shows that here we have a human literature, embodying a divine message not to be discerned at a glance, but which *makes* us think, compare, examine, weigh, judge.

4. In the simplest passages, the history of interpretation shows how many meanings may be attached to them, so that the infallible Book requires an infallible interpreter, if we are to have an infallible guide as Rome understands it. A Protestant who understands the meaning of his own creed should be an ardent and reverent student of the Bible, but not a Bibliolater.

5. The way in which the New Testament writers use the Old Testament shows the complexity of the whole subject. Reverence and appeal to authority are everywhere manifest, but also a measure of freedom for which we are hardly prepared, and an evident desire to dwell on the substantial meaning rather than the form of the record, the spirit rather than the letter of the Word.

When we examine the books more closely the same need of intelligent discrimination appears at every turn.

(*u*) He who holds that these books are indeed the Word of God is compelled to examine into their form and structure, the distinction between poetry, history, and prophecy ; to inquire in what sense, to what degree, God may be said to speak—*e.g.*, in the book of Job, in the speculations of Ecclesiastes, in the visions of the apocalypse, he is compelled by the very variety of form and complexity of the questions raised to think and to

distinguish, if he would understand and rightly receive the divine message.

(b) The nature of inspiration is raised by the acknowledged fact of the *progressive* character of the divine revelation herein contained. The unity of the Bible is not mechanical, but organic—represented by the growth and development of the plant, not by the erection of a monolith. The law is *παιδαγωγος* to lead us to Christ, and the stages of development can be ascertained, and must be intelligently distinguished. The book of Genesis and the book of Chronicles have their places in the history of the kingdom of God, but before we can understand the nature of the guidance given to the writers we must have some insight into the character of the place they occupy.

(c) The meaning of the canon raises the same considerations. Why are there these books and no others in the inspired canon; why not Ecclesiasticus as well as Ecclesiastes, Hermas as well as the Apocalypse; why not dispense with Esther or the epistle of Jude? The answer would be a long one, but investigation shows how the Jews at the end of the Old Dispensation and the Christian Church at the beginning of the New were marvellously guided in the choice of books whose subject, character, or authorship fitted them for a place in the revelation of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An "inspiration of selection" was vouchsafed both to the writers and to the compilers of the sacred canon of Scripture.

It is needless to say that the view of this Book as a revelation, based on the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, implies the general accuracy and trustworthiness of the writers. There can be no room in a true theory of inspiration for forgeries, "cooking" of narratives, pious frauds, inventions, myths, the rewriting of history or prophecy to suit the times. This is not to say that the literary habits of all generations are the same; that we take up the books of Samuel as if reading Macaulay or Carlyle or Freeman, judge by the same views of history, expect to find the same methods or aims. This is not to say that Ecclesiastes must have been written by Solomon because it contains his name, or that the terms "Moses" and

"David" are never used with latitude and freedom for that which David and Moses did not actually write. But it does imply that frauds, however "pious," are utterly out of place in the revelation of the All-Holy, in any part of the testimony concerning Him who is a Faithful and True Witness. Simplicity, ignorance, primitive habits of thought and speech may be expected, where such are in place; but, if the Bible contains "cunningly-devised fables," though it may be an interesting collection of documents for historians or antiquarians, its authority as a sacred record and as a rule of faith is gone.

Biblical criticism may even point out the existence of much which we should not have expected in Scripture, which yet does not interfere with its sacredness or authority. Analysis has been very busy of late years, many think far too busy. Yet it has its place, and synthesis will follow in due course. If, e.g., we are taught to see two or three narratives, where formerly we saw only one; two or three hands at work on a single book, more of what we should call editorial supervision, of compilation, than we should have associated with the sacred documents, we need not be startled or disturbed. When we stand close to a Raphael or a Turner with a hand-glass, we perceive only rough dabs of paint. We may so stand that we can see nothing else, but the master-piece remains for all that. Many of the critics' conclusions on these points are the merest dreams of a restless literary imagination, some are wildly speculative, some are demonstrably false, not to say self-contradictory. But if some of them that have to do with processes of composition, details of authorship, prove to be true, neither the authority nor the inspiration of Scripture is necessarily interfered with.

It will be expected that such a record will be preserved free from error. It must imply freedom from such error as would interfere with the object for which the revelation was given, else it fails to be a divine revelation. But will it not mean freedom from all error, absolute infallibility in every detail? We should answer: We must wait to see whether it be so, not begin with the absolute certitude that it is so of necessity, and refuse to give credence to it at all, unless it has been thus pre-

served from the slightest mistake. For the Bible as a series of records touches on a thousand subjects, and it is a large question how it may please God to deal with human writers as they deal with an immense variety of topics besides the one for which especially they were commissioned to write. Take, for example :

Physical Science. Is it to be expected that the sacred writers should anticipate the conclusions of modern times? Most will answer, No; the record would have been unintelligible to their contemporaries. Arguments have been drawn from Scripture against the views of Galileo, of Lyell, of Darwin, it being assumed in each case that whatever seemed to contradict the language of Scripture must be false. Therefore the sun moves round the earth, the universe was created in six days, of twenty-four hours each, evolution in any shape is impossible! It is surely wiser to understand the scope and meaning of revelation before we assume that it was ever intended to teach physical science. On the other hand, there is a marvellous agreement between the outline of Genesis i. and modern scientific discovery, so that while not expecting it to be scientifically accurate, a distinguished scientific teacher has said one would only need to alter a word or two in the Bible account of Creation to harmonize it completely with the latest conclusions of physical science.

The discrepancies of Scripture have been much exaggerated—both as regards their number and importance. Genesis i. and ii. are clearly two narratives, not necessarily discrepant. In the synoptic gospels the very variations are evidence of independence; if they had absolutely coincided they would have lost much of their weight. If the accounts of the blind men at Jericho, of Peter and the cock-crowing, of the synoptics and John as to the day of Christ's death, appear to be discrepant and hard to reconcile, we must remember how often this happens in contemporary narrative till the explanation is known; how scanty the record and our knowledge of the facts. Still, the perpetual recurrence of difficulties of detail in minor matters should prevent us from dogmatizing as to the impossibility of mistake in any single particular.

On questions of history the authority of these books varies according to circumstances. Some are contemporary records, some very early and valuable, others later; all may be shown to be trustworthy. But it would be dangerous to set up a theory of the impossibility of mistake in detail, so that the authority of the Scripture as a whole would be gone, if any such were pointed out. This has been a fruitful cause of scepticism. Especially we should not do so without the clearest evidence from Scripture itself that the writers claimed this absolute and unerring knowledge. We need not then be disturbed by the evidence of clay cylinders, which may very easily be wrong in dates, but which may on the other hand be right.

This is not, of course, to say that we are lightly to assume the existence of error. In hundreds of instances the Scripture has been proved correct where for long this has been doubted or strenuously denied. So far from disparaging the accuracy of Scripture in trifles, the more careful and minute our study, the greater will be our marvel at the fidelity of these records in the minor as well as the more important matters with which they deal. Sixty-six books, by so many authors, covering a period of 2,000 years, searched through and through by keenest eyes, and pierced by sharpest weapons of criticism, what books like those of Scripture could so have stood the test? The words of the Lord are pure words: "As silver tried in the furnace of earth, purified seven times." Yet if in the vessel grains of sand or morsels of lead should be found, they do not lessen the value of the mass of pure, white, shining silver, of precious, refined gold. It is a distorted vision that will look upon the specks of alloy till it cannot see the massive, pure metal; it is a mistaken fidelity to suppose that because the sacred treasure is pure gold, therefore the earthen vessel which contains it is itself of gold throughout. The vessel must hold the treasure safely and well; "Heaven soon sets right all other matters."

No attempt has been made here to lay down a theory of inspiration. I have tried to show the lines on which to rest a faith in the plenary inspiration of Scripture as a trustworthy,

adequate, and unerring record of God's revelation of Himself to men, without our being afraid of the fullest inquiry, of any result of sound and valid criticism. Especially does it seem at present important to keep well before us the great end and aim of all revelation—"That we might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." Then questions of form, of detail, of vehicle, will fall into their own subordinate place. We lose nothing by keeping before us with a single eye the great ends for which the Bible was written—even the Old Testament Scriptures *δυνάμενα σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν*, "able to make wise unto salvation" through faith in Christ Jesus. We may lose much by being too eager about the means which we think necessary for securing those ends. Jewish Rabbis were praised for making "a hedge round the Law," but that ended in their paying chief attention to the hedge, and neglecting the spirit of the law it was meant to protect. In forming a theory of inspiration we cannot be wrong in putting the first things first, and keeping the secondary things second. This will preserve us from many mistakes, and it will keep us from being impatient of inquiries which are as wholesome as they are inevitable, while it enables us to await with calm confidence the answers to some questions for which we may have to wait for some time to come. Thus in spite of the little clouds of dust raised by battles of critics here and there, the chariot of God rolls on its course. "Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, which is in righteousness," and "through patience and comfort of the Scriptures" we shall embrace and ever hold fast the "blessed hope of eternal life which is in Jesus Christ our Lord."

W. T. DAVISON, M.A.,

*Tutor in Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Richmond Theological
Institute, London, England.*

THE GOSPEL OF JUSTICE.

“And the common people heard Him gladly.”—MARK xii. 37.

How shall we reach the masses? Cry of the modern Church.

THESE two quotations mark the opposite poles of Christian preaching. The Gospel was popular with the masses of Judea; the cry of the modern Church is: “How shall we reach the masses?”

What is the matter? Why the change? Why is it that the Gospel which the “common people” of Palestine journeyed out into the wilderness to hear, has little or no charm for the “common people” of to-day?

Is it that the Gospel was good for the Jew, but has no particular bearing on the modern American? At least, this avenue out of the difficulty is hardly open to the professed Christians; for, not to quote the many passages in which it is plainly stated that the Gospel is intended for the Gentiles, the Christian Church is now preaching to as many of these “modern Americans” as it can reach what it claims to be the Gospel of Christ. Hence it is by no means in a position to question the fitness of that Gospel for our day. Indeed, if the whole Christian movement has not been a blunder—if the Gospel is divine—whatever good message it had for the Jewish “common people,” it clearly has for the wage-earner of America at this moment.

Can it be that the “message” is simply a spiritual one, teaching but the way to heaven? This idea is not new enough to copyright. It is the logical and commonly received conclusion deduced from a tremendous amount of modern preaching; the good things that come in this life to one practising Christian principles, being considered as only incidental to the journey in the straight road to the Golden City. Christ came, is the fair inference, not as the radiator of love, but as the star of hope. He came not to bring justice to His people here and now, but to preach patience and humility, that they might

hereafter reap a rich reward. That were a grand message, were it no better; but as one humble soul sees it, speaking with reverent lips, the Christ who had no word for the oppressed of earth could not be trusted for His promises of heaven. When did a false prophet arise who did not propose to pay the debts of time in the gold of a future life? Should the suddenly rich, the monopolists, those who have filched the savings of the people, all who live by the labor of others, meet in secret council to frame a religion under which they would like the world to live; what better could they enact than that the oppressed would bear with Christian humility their oppression, and that the wronged would live on with silent lips, looking for right only beyond the grave? And yet that is in practical effect the Gospel heard to-day in many an upholstered pew—the gospel of charity on the part of the rich and humble gratitude on the part of the poor—of exhortation to the rich to give, that they may evidence their goodness, and of promises to the poor of a fairer distribution of God's mercies in the future life. And then we wonder, wonder, wonder at the awful perversity of the poor who *will* spend the Sabbath in God's sunlight, having taken us at our word that the Gospel has nothing particular for them until after death.

But that being the true Gospel—the Gospel of Christ—why were the “common people” of Judea so eager to hear it? They had a tolerably easy way to heaven as it was, and the Jew is not an especially unworldly and fanciful specimen of the human race. He is not given to enthusiastic interest, for mere curiosity's sake, in matters that profit him little. Perhaps he may have been something drawn by the fact that this preaching was not popular among the upper classes. It seems, indeed, to have been recognized as the friend of the laborer and the enemy of all parasites. The passage: “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin (*i.e.*, perform church duties to gain heaven), and 'ave omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith,” would attract the attention of every victim of injustice in the land, and promise, with the spread of the new religion, immediate justice and prompt mercy.

Surely it is plain that the poor of Judea saw more than a new road to heaven in the Gospel; and, just as surely, what the Jew saw, is there now.

It would be trifling with a serious reader to delay a moment to discuss the possibility that the Gospel has done its world-side work—that society is now constructed after the divine ideal—that, whatever unjust burden the Jew carried, every man is now where (under God's justice, mercy and love) he ought to be. With rich monopolists and starving women and children, this supposition is not arguable.

Then if the Gospel has as good a message for the American wage-earners as for the Jewish "common people;" if that message tells of justice on earth as well as hope of heaven; if there is among the laboring people of to-day a sense of injustice; and if, while the workingman of Jerusalem followed in his eagerness the Preacher of the Gospel into the wilderness, the workingman of America can hardly be coaxed into our best or our worst of churches to hear our best or our worst of preaching; then there is room for at least a strong suspicion that the Gospel preached from the modern pulpit is not in all points the same as the Gospel preached on the hillsides of Judea.

This answer has come to me a thousand times—the Judean preacher was the Christ; but after careful thought, I became reverently satisfied that Christ *would* not use His infinite power of eloquence to draw struggling men to an empty Gospel. He *would* not exalt the preacher; but be far more likely to lose the preacher in the truths He preached. I do not believe that, when God trod the earth to bring a message to men, He used the arts of the popular preacher to attract their attention to what, otherwise, they would care little for.

In instituting a comparison between the Gospel of the first and that of the nineteenth centuries, it is necessary to obtain a clear, if not very full, idea of what the Gospel preached by Christ meant to the Jew. The Jew, it must not be forgotten, was surrounded by economic conditions wholly different from those in which we live. He knew practically nothing of monopolies, tariffs, interest-bearing investments, land diffi-

culties, the curse of the liquor traffic, gigantic gambling in stocks and real estate, and all the festering wrongs that gangrene our young democracy. There were no great factories where the flower of childhood was begrimed with dust, and no hideous sweating system, starving women to the brink of temptation.

Still, the Jew had his difficulties. The provisions of the old Mosaic law, which forbade him to do more than lease his land, and struck from his wrists the manacles of debt on every jubilee year, had not been so carefully conserved by the Pharisee dispensers of the law as certain other enactments touching his offerings at the Temple. These Pharisees had made the remarkable mistake of neglecting that part of the old gospel requiring justice between man and man in their holy eagerness to get everybody safely into heaven; and in a coincidence still more remarkable, this mistake redounded to the wealth and power of the neglectful Pharisee. Hence the Jew could now sell himself homeless—and worse. Other grievous burdens, no doubt, came from the same quarter, for the religion of the people had fallen wholly into these corrupt and oppressive hands—hands that, we are told on high authority, bound heavy burdens and grievous to be borne and laid them on men's shoulders, but would not move them with one of their fingers.

These were, indeed, mild tyrannies when contrasted with those of our modern Christian civilization; but they wrung from the Great Preacher the deepest sympathy for the oppressed and the bitterest denunciation of the oppressors. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye devour widows' houses," He cried.

This seems fairly direct preaching, and yet it is inconceivable that the eminently correct Pharisee, the exponent of the law, did anything that shaded on the illegal. These widows, in all probability, were unable to earn their bread, and so their benevolent Pharisee neighbors, feeling proper religious sympathy with their distress, kindly relieved them of the houses they could not support and gave them money instead with which to buy food. Bless you, what could they do better? The Sanhedrim must have highly approved the action; but

Christ said, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees," and I fancy that His style of preaching was very popular with the widows, who felt in their hearts that there should be some way in which they could earn an honest, independent living. We know, at any rate, that it was unpopular with the Pharisees. The rest of that passage is significant—"and for a pretence make long prayer." How did Christ know it was a "pretence?" He tells them, "For ye devour widows' houses," and refuse these women a fair chance at the opportunities God intended should come to all to make a living on His earth and under His sunlight. Then there were those "that sold and bought in the Temple." It is plain from the passage in St. Mark xi. that the stalls of these merchants who trafficked in the Temple would be convenient, and the "common people" were not likely to have religious scruples beyond those of the Pharisees! Then why unpopular? It is not hard to see. Given a national church to which all the people must come, and a corrupt sect in control, would the mart in the Temple be likely to be opened equally to all comers, or would a favored few be ensconced there to sell to the worshippers at temple prices; and would it be wise for the worshipper who desired to stand well with the rulers of the Church and the nation to refuse to buy? How much of this is purely fanciful may be judged from the fact that Christ called it "a den of thieves." Had we such a political church in Canada, controlled by the dominant party, it would not be impossible to name some of the men who would have stalls in the temple. Neither are the Jews very much slower than we in looking out for the main chance. In a day when the heavier burdens of a more complicated political system were not yet laid upon the people, this infant monopoly in the Temple could be easily a keenly felt grievance; and well might the "common people" follow the Preacher who "cast out them that sold and bought in the Temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold doves." "And the Scribes and Chief Priests heard it and sought how they might destroy Him (sounds as if they were interested in that monopoly), for they feared Him, because all the people were astonished (joyfully, it is evident) at His doctrine."

Although the major burden borne by the Jew was undoubtedly that of a corruptly governed Church, still it was a Church through which the worshipper could get to heaven. If the sole work of the Church be to provide future bliss, then there is no reason to doubt that the Jewish Church was accomplishing its full mission. Still Christ was not satisfied with it, and again and again does He bend its formalities and apparently disarrange its direct line heavenward to minister to the wants of common mortals right down here on the footstool.

Take the case of the plucking of the corn on the Sabbath day. Here a practical violation of the sanctity of the Sabbath was made; and why? Because "His disciples were an hungered." And in defending this act of humanity against the Pharisees, to whom the starving of a man was a little thing to the breaking of a rule, He asked them, "Have ye not read what David did when he was an hungred, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God and did eat of the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him?" This popular Preacher, whose methods bore the stamp of divinity, would hold in abeyance the most sacred ordinances of the Mosaic law while a hungry man ate. The shewbread was, in a sense, God's bread, and yet Christ taught that a hungry man had a *right* to take it. Is it any wonder that the hungry of Judea flocked to hear this doctrine?

But it is when He comes to deal with the men who, in the name of religion are oppressing the people, that the Man of Peace unsheathes the sword of the Gospel. There is no nice weighing of motives. There is apparently no calculation as to how such preaching will affect the funds of the Church. Christ knew that it was not "charity," but "love," "that covereth a multitude of sins." Neither was there any chance to mistake who was meant. The persons arraigned were the leading men of the community—the men who, as the sequel shows, had the power of life and death over the Preacher himself. They were the men of influence, the men of wealth, the men of office, the men of religious reputation. They were men who robbed the lower classes, not through marked selfishness, as is the case in

our day, but under the cloak of serving the Church of God. They were men hard to raise a cry against—men of clean lives, men so reputable that, though the common people loved the Christ, their word at the Roman court crucified Him.

And yet the Preacher says: "Beloved brethren, there are many grievous burdens borne by the poor to-day. Thriftlessness, indolence, hard times have done their work, and there are homes this morning without food, and families almost without hope. Those of us who, under the blessing of God, have been permitted to gather of this world's substance, must open our hearts—and our pockets, too—in charity more than ever. Investigation shows that the number of widows without homes is increasing yearly in Jerusalem, and there are many worthy families, as yet quite safe from the gaunt wolf, who are fighting a hard, hard battle to keep on their feet. To such I would counsel faith in God. Our father Abraham had never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread. Keep pure your robes of righteousness by frequent attendance at the temple, and, although all your wish may not come to you, you shall not be wholly forsaken. Those whom God has prospered must remember that generosity will not be without its reward."

I seem to be quoting from the wrong book of sermons. I should have turned to Matthew xxiii., and begun, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers." And then should have gone on down through that terrible denunciation spoken by Him who was Love, on down through "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye devour widows' houses." "Ye fools and blind." "Full of extortion and excess." "For ye are like unto whited sepulchres, full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness." "Ye serpents; ye generation of vipers; how can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

Not a word about charity, but one scorching, scathing, indignant denunciation of the robbers of the people. Is it very difficult to guess why "the common people heard him gladly?"

Coming to the vital part of the question—for, after all, I fancy few would contend that Christ compromised with abuses or passed by on the other side cases of admitted injustice, as one who had no remedy—it is obviously not fair to arraign the modern Church with anything like indefiniteness. Hazy charges and scattered criticisms are notoriously easy to make. But I shall endeavor to be at once fair and explicit throughout, and, as a first measure of fairness, will lay down a few principles by which, in my opinion, the work of the Church should be judged.

1. The Christianity of my faith is omnipotent, omniscient and omni-humanum. It is not an alleviation of the ills of life, but a cure. It is not intended to merely patch the fabric here and oil the machinery there, so that this great multiple whole we call the world may grind and creak and blunder on without utter collapse; but it is capable of making out of present materials an ideal world in which every man, woman and child will be just where, in divine justice and infinite love, they ought to be.

2. It is endowed with sufficient vitality to bring the world in line with its teaching, if it be let fairly loose among the sons of men. Man's will is omnipotently free, but man has been given a judgment that will recognize an infinitely good thing at first sight—when he gets a chance to see it. There could be no guarantee, of course, that, were "the good thing" swathed and bandaged out of shape and seated on the lap of Mammon, the human judgment would then recognize its virtues.

3. There is no wrong, no injustice, no mistake in the universe for which Christianity has not an abundant remedy. It is utterly impossible that it should see a wrong and pass on with dumb lips.

A Christianity that has not these attributes must be a failure, and a Christianity that is a failure, must be a fraud. There is no resting place between a perfect Christianity and black despair. A Christianity of compromise is a contradiction of terms.

For eighteen hundred years various and varied doctrines

under the name of Christianity have been before the world. No man, alive or dead, would admit that all that has been called Christian merited the name; but all men would agree that Christianity has been taught during some portion of this time in some form or other. If we exclude the small class who do not believe in Christ, all men would to-day contend that Christianity was being taught somewhere at the present hour; and these claims cannot be dismissed in a light manner. Men have died and men have lived for them; but surely it is not unbecoming to ask that they stand up for measurement by Christ's standard—"By their fruits ye shall know them." It is an awful thing to challenge the authenticity of any professed Church of God, but good men the world over and history through have, with fearful hearts but stout consciences, again and again accepted the responsibility on the ground that it was an infinitely more awful thing to allow a body of men to intercept the bread of life, and distribute in its place the stones and false doctrine to a starving race.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." The claim that the Christian Church has brought much of our modern civilization is disputed in some quarters, but it has always seemed to the writer that the denial of this claim was badly founded. It would be curious, indeed, if the religion of Christ had been kept alive through these eighteen hundred years—if some Christians had lived and labored—and all had resulted in nothing. Then the comfort in having given birth to modern society is not so great a one that there need be quarrel about it. For now, right in the midst of this nineteenth century civilization, with every Christian land covered with a forest of church spires, there are hideous wrongs, mighty injustice and cruel dishonesty. The devil seems to have ordered a charge of that wing of his army, commanded by Mammon, and everything has taken "the print of the golden age." Nine-tenths of humanity in Christian lands are down, and one-tenth are masters. Where are rallied the forces of the Christian Church? Oppressed humanity wants to find them.

The proof of this condition of affairs has been given *ad nauseum*, but has unfortunately been largely confined to

extreme cases. When we are told that a poor seamstress in New York gets, for most exhausting labor, a miserable pittance—not nearly sufficient for food alone—the clergy of our land condemn the outrage in most unsparing terms.

“ Alas ! for the rarity
Of Christian charity,
Under the sun,”

we quote; but we never touch the principle, the legitimate and inevitable outcome of which is the starving seamstress and the fat Jew. The reason why the seamstress starves is because she does not get what she earns, and somebody else gets more than he earns; because somebody else steals from her what is hers; because the eighth commandment is broken; and it is just as much stealing when the seamstress does not starve as when she does, when it is a clerk or an iron moulder that is robbed and not a helpless woman. The remedy for this case is not charity, but honesty. All that is needed is the simple, honest rule that every person shall have what he earns and what is voluntarily given him, no less and no more.

In the Province of Ontario, the average annual wage for all classes of “workers” (exclusive of brain workers) is \$420.07. Of this amount, \$369.62 is spent on an average in food, clothing, rent and fuel; leaving \$50.45 annually for all of life that lifts man above the animal. This, remember, is not a case of a few of the harder pressed men, but is the average of the workingmen of the Province; and a Province, too, virtually without slums. It means that out of \$50 a year, these men—industrious, honest, capable—must furnish their homes, educate their children, pay their taxes, buy any books they get, and purchase such of the bright things of life as they would like their families to enjoy.

Do these men get all they earn?

They work, most of them, in smaller or larger establishments controlled by owners. We have no statistics of the wages of these “owners,” but we know that, as a matter of fact, many of them have elegant homes, costly equipages, can educate their children without difficulty, can tour and entertain as they please, and, it is suspected, spend more on their “living” than

the average \$369. These "owners" work, when they work at all, in the same establishment as their employees. In practically all cases they provide the capital, either from their own pockets or by borrowing. Counting off a fair interest on that capital, their wages are still enormously larger than those of their employees. Do they earn—i.e., do they contribute to the value of the products of the institution—ten, a hundred, five hundred times as much as the clear-headed foreman who is on duty from 7 a.m. until 6 p.m. every day? Either they do, or they are taking advantage of their position to rob that foreman. How can we get at the value of their labor? it will be asked. It might not be altogether wrong to try their own plan. They make competition the test of the worth of a workingman. They say, "We want certain work done; who will do it the cheapest?" and when they do hire a man, it is with a tacit understanding that if any one else offers to do it cheaper, the former must come down in wages or leave. So let us define the duties of "owner" and advertise for applicants. Then in a few years when a class of professional "owners" has been established, when the keen tide of competition sets in, when owners, out of a job, finding bare homes and cold hearths, go back to sell themselves at a lower price, we may get at the comparative value of the labor of an "owner." It must inevitably fall below his actual value, but it would likely accomplish the desired end, bringing him on a level, for purposes of comparison, with his workman.

There need be no haziness about the meaning of the phrase, "The value of the labor of an owner." He earns whatever he contributes in labor to the product of his shop or factory at any point between the raw material and the completed article placed legitimately in the market. If he plans to bring the product of his shop into a new market, and thus benefits in some way or other mankind, he earns what that service adds to the value of the article. But if he plans to keep up the price—to form a "combine"—to starve and flood the markets just at the right time to prey on the necessities of the people—that is not "earning." That is plotting to rob the public, and should be treated as any other plot or conspiracy against the public weal.

It seems clear, then, that if an "owner" be shorn of his power to make other men work at his price or starve—his right to go into the crowded labor market and buy at the lowest figure, pocketing what he clears in the wages of his purchase—his legal authority to rob the weaker man—in other words, if the owner becomes simply honest, then in many cases his earnings will be seen to be exceedingly small.

There are establishments in the city of Toronto where, in the last ten or fifteen years, the owners have made their hundred thousands and their millions, while the workmen measure their prosperity by the smallness of the mortgage on their little homes. Both owners and workmen have put blood and life and heart into the business, and the owner has pocketed the earnings, allowing food to the workman on the same principle as he allows oil to the machine. "That is his right," declares the law; "That is his right," admit the people; "That is his right," moan the workmen; "That is his right," proclaims the Church; and the owner, sustained by this universal verdict, believes it to be his right, lends to the Lord most liberally of his substance, and loyally supports the Church that supports him. And the workmen—he admits the case on the authority of society and the Church, until an infidel socialist says, "No, it is not fair." The workman knows it is not fair, and he follows the infidel who promises relief, and forsakes the Gospel that preaches but patience and gratitude for charity. "It is not fair!" A million to one man—a living to another, and yet both are industrious, and the cleverness of one man is not as a million to nothing compared with that of another. It is the case of the New York seamstress repeated—one person appropriating the earnings of another. That, in the direct language of Scripture, is theft.

What is the attitude of the modern Church toward this wrong? Non-interference, where it is not defence. Who ever heard a clergyman in a reasonably influential Church in our day, claim for the workman a right founded on justice and common honesty, to a share in the profits of his employer's business? Who ever heard him tell the millionaire in the front seat, kindly but unmistakably, that he had in his pocket

money that belonged to Jack Armstrong, one of his employees, whose wife could not come to church for lack of a respectable dress. You have heard about the dress likely, but coupled with suggestions of the poor-box and charity. Who has not heard clergymen insist with indignant eloquence upon the sacred rights of property, and assail, with caustic virulence, Socialism, Communism, Trades-Unionism, and all other movements that threaten to force the fingers that tighten on the earnings of the people? The modern Church stands with open eyes and closed lips before this giant system of robbery, and assures the robbed that the Gospel has nothing for them but the droppings of charity from the melted bullions of the rich, and a heaven of bliss if they bear with patience and meekness their wrongs upon earth. Where the preacher is unusually clever, he talks of compensations, and tells of cold-walled palaces into which love never enters, and asks the thick-fingered toiler if he would exchange his affectionate wife and warm-hearted children for the empty home of the miser; but when the workman goes out from the church and finds loveless misery in the hovels and bursting happiness in the palaces just as surely as he finds the reverse—only the misery is infinitely blacker and the happiness infinitely brighter—then he knows the miserable lie of the preacher's sham comfort, and turns away from a Gospel that is not only empty, but tries to lure him with false lights.

The case elaborated is but one out of many. Modern society is studded with injustice. This is universally known and universally admitted. The inequalities of the lots of men have passed into a proverb. One lad is born to wealth, power, and all the possibilities of life; and another lad is born in penury, doomed to labor throughout a life-time for mere subsistence. The hackneyed truth is true—the rich are growing richer and the poor are growing poorer. And the Church is preaching the Gospel of the Nazarene—the Gospel of universal brotherhood—the Gospel that, if divine, must have a potent remedy for all wrong—the Gospel of Him whom the "common people heard gladly," and the rulers plotted to destroy—in such a way that the pews are filled with the pleased and gratified rich, while

the poor are out in darkness, the prey of every godless agitator who contrives to strike the feeblest glow-worm of a light.

It is quite fair that the Churches should ask of a critic "What, then, shall we preach?" even though the best that the critic can do is to mail them a copy of the Bible. Still they might note that Christ's method seems to have been to crush the wrong, and thus make room for the spontaneous growth of the right. He found the temple a den of thieves; and He simply drove them out. He found the Scribes and the Pharisees oppressors of the people; and He did not propound an elaborate remedy, but scourged them with the whip of His divine wrath. It seems clear that, even if there be no remedy in sight for an obvious wrong, it is the duty of the Church to attack the wrong and trust in God for the result. Still the common-sense of many has already suggested cures for rampant evils. It sounds like an axiom to say that the way to prevent an employer from pocketing much of the earnings of the employed is to divide the profits of the business, according to the earning power of all concerned, after a fair interest for the capital has been allowed its owner. This reduces the matter to a mere mathematical problem—the solution of which will not be so much as commenced so long as the Church defends the right of the employer to the whole of the surplus. The old Jewish law, which God framed for the guidance of the only people in whose government He has openly taken part, is full of hints. Nor can they be ruled out of court by the old, old device of claiming that the Jewish law must be taken intact or not at all. The law is based upon certain principles, and the myriad details are merely the application of these principles to surrounding and peculiar circumstances. These principles, it must be remembered, were given by God to His chosen people; they are eternal, and if put in operation to-day, would revolutionize society. Take the jubilee law, as set forth in the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus. There, under an elaboration of detail, lies the principle that the land belongs not to the individual but to the community. God did not wait for Mr. Henry George to discover that; He told it to Moses. The people plainly were not ready at that time for any very complicated system by which the

occupiers of the land could share the advantage with the rest of the community—indeed, a great majority of the people must live directly upon the land—so the principle was applied, first, by dividing the land among the tribes and then among the families; and secondly, by absolutely forbidding any man to sell one inch of his portion under any circumstances. He could lease it for fifty years—presumably the time he would personally have the use of it—but at the end of that period it came back to his children and grandchildren, according to the law, in spite of all the legal documents and vested rights in the world. That is, a man could sell his claim to the land, but never the land. No man owned the land. It was God's gift to His children; and every Jewish babe was born with a right to a corner of the vineyard in which to earn his living without fear of or favor from any man on earth.

That was simple justice. 'Reverently it may be said, God could do no less. Surely men ought not to be sent upon earth to live or not to live—to live easily or to live hard—by the arbitrary permission of others. If a man has a right to own land, a man has a right to own all land. If a man or men own all land, they have a right to prevent me from living on any land. If I may not live upon land, I must die. Therefore, private ownership of land leads logically to placing the power of life and death, arbitrarily and absolutely, in the hands of some men. All this and more, Mr. George has put with tremendous persistence before the world.

And the Church? The Church, except for a whisper here and there, is dumb. If the teaching of the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus is not fatal to private ownership of land, in the modern sense, then all laws of logic and exegesis fail. If that chapter is not inspired, the Old Testament must be thrown away. The Church cannot deny either the teaching or the inspiration, and live; and yet she is a dumb dog. The same Church can open its pews to the Duke of Westminster with his fabulous rent roll, and to the family of the man whom high rents drove to bankruptcy, and bankruptcy to suicide; and interest both in the missions to Ceylon. It is clever, but is it the Gospel? Ground rents are everywhere breeding poverty

and ministering to arrogance. The greatest Monte Carlo of earth—gambling in real estate—was never in madder frenzy than now. Private property in land is admittedly the mother of all other monopolies. Away back in the wilderness Moses told of a remedy; but the Moses of to-day—the Church militant—has lost the chart, and has nowhere to lead the people. What wonder that the golden calf of infidel socialism is worshipped, and that the modern Moses, so long dumb, is forgotten.

There are men who impugn the motives of the Church in thus failing to come to the assistance of the Lord's children against the mighty. Very bitter things are said on the line of charging the leaders of the Church with modifying the Gospel to please the principal contributors to the funds. These attacks, while perhaps excusable, are based upon a misunderstanding of the situation. It must not be forgotten that the ministry is made up of men—not a picked twelve—not an army of martyrs—but human men. Nor must it be lost sight of that a tremendous number of them preach the Gospel, as a lawyer pleads, from a "brief." They are earnest enough, work hard enough, mean good enough, but they never look below their college or church-prepared "brief." Still that only shifts the responsibility, it will be said. But then the collegians teach from "briefs," the fathers are in a measure constrained to tread unquestioning the paths of usage—paths that began to be made away back when the upper classes of Rome politically embraced Christianity, and strangled in that embrace the practical brotherhood of man. Still the attention of the clergy should be called to a coincidence. Let us suppose a case. Given a reasonably intelligent people; the Gospel of Christ; a selfish and powerful upper class; a cowardly and pliant clergy. As this "upper class" meets the naked Gospel of Christ, they go away sorrowful, for they have great possessions—they go away and take their possessions with them. Now suppose that the natural desire of the Church for the sinews of war and an uneasy longing on the part of the upper class for a chance to gain eternal life should unite to slowly and almost unconsciously prompt the clergy to soften the rigor of that

sweeping demand, "Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor," into "Give generously to the poor and to the Church;" and suppose that the upper class came into the Church on that basis; and suppose that here and there a Judas betrayed what was left of the Gospel to gain the golden applause of the leading pews; and suppose that the clergy were gradually being driven to so conform the Gospel as to make comfortable the seats of the financial bulwarks of Zion, and at the same time were restrained from making too glaring charges lest the intelligent common people would cry out at once, "This is not the Gospel." What do you think would this supposed clergy preach under these supposed circumstances? My fancy is that it would be a Gospel with a great deal of heaven in it; a Gospel that mourned the inequalities of this world, but promised the fullest compensation in the next; a Gospel that preached humility and patience and obedience to the poor, and charity and beneficence to the rich; a Gospel with a profound respect for vested rights; a Gospel that would delay justice until the judgment; a Gospel that could be preached forever and no foolish people would think of selling their lands and houses and laying the prices thereof "down at the apostle's feet" as a common store for all of God's family; a Gospel, in short, that the rich could hear and remain rich, while the masses went out of the fold and away into the wilderness in search of Him who once preached to them there a common brotherhood and a common Fatherhood.

Regular church-goers will easily recognize the coincidence spoken of—that this suppositious Gospel so foully born is so very like the Gospel of the modern Church; and should they be of a conjectural turn of mind, they will imagine what a comfort both Gospels must be to the man who wishes to be a son in God's family, while his brothers are fain to pick up the crumbs that fall from the kennels of his dogs.

The marvel that comes oftenest to my mind is not at the difficulty with which the Churches reach the masses, but at the large number of the laboring world that are brought into the fold; for, barring the whip of future punishment, what is there in the modern Gospel to bring into allegiance any workingman

who is above charity and below justice? The great wrongs of his life find no avenger—no champion in the Church. Here and there a clergyman—and oftener a philanthropic layman—lifts his voice for the down-trodden sons of toil; but how often it is for pity and how seldom for right? The Gospel of to-day is typified in that woefully perverted passage, "Faith, hope and charity; but the greatest of these is charity." God's pen of inspiration did not write "charity;" it wrote "love"—brotherly love—Fatherly love. "Charity" permits Dives and Lazarus and modern Christian society; "Love" teaches Damon and Pythias and the brotherhood of man.

It would seem as if this Gospel of charity and humility had soaked into the very arteries of modern Christian life. We are all the time laboring with anguished hearts to help the victims of our hideous system, but we—that is, we Christians—never apparently think of breaking up the system itself. The Socialists, the Communists, the Nihilists, the Nationalists, and a dozen other un-Christian societies—not anti-Christian necessarily—are waging war against the system; but we, with the twenty-third chapter of Matthew clasped shut in our Testaments, are following the senile methods of the old temperance societies which saved the drunkards but never thought of closing the saloons. Even so great a heart as General Booth seems to have no better plan than to cart away the products of this machine to some unoccupied, because undesired, part of God's world. In "Darkest England," he says:

"What a satire it is upon our Christianity and civilization that the existence of these colonies of heathens and savages in the heart of our capital should attract so little attention! It is no better than a ghastly mockery—theologians might use a stronger word—to call by the name of One who came to seek and to save that which was lost, those Churches which, in the midst of lost multitudes, either sleep in apathy or display a fitful interest in a chasuble. Why all this apparatus of temples and meeting-houses to save men from perdition in a world which is to come, while never a helping hand is stretched out to save them from the inferno of their present life? Is it not time that, forgetting for a moment their

wranglings about the infinitely little or infinitely obscure, they should concentrate all their energies on a united effort to break this terrible perpetuity of perdition and to rescue some at least of those for whom they profess to believe their founder came to die ? ”

The whole book, from which this is a passage, is a magnificent appeal on behalf of the white slaves of London, but there is not in it a brighter ray than charity. The whole burden of Mr. Booth's complaint is that the Dorcas society side of the Church is not as active as it should be. It is intensely humiliating to one who believes that Christ not only did not die in vain, but that He did not live in vain, that men who deny the Nazarene should offer to the oppressed masses an infinitely better remedy than any proposed by the emissaries of the Church ; and that the Gospel should be robbed of this glory when the Bible is full of bolder and more radical remedies than any proposed remedies—complete to the standard of perfection.

What is the Socialism of the day but the brotherhood of man coupled with anarchy and not with divine order ?

What is Nationalism but a fanciful elaboration of the same idea with God left out ?

What does Henry George preach but a modern application of the plain and basic principles of the Jewish jubilee law ? And yet the Christian Church stands by, while the masses are rushing hither and thither, mad to escape from the cruel pen in which the capitalist and the landlord are crushing them ; and, carefully covering with priestly robes the Christian Socialism of the Bible, preaches charity and humility—charity and humility.

Criticism of the doctrine of the clergy, if well founded, must be fatal to their power. A clergyman's methods, his life, even his morals, may be false, and the doctrine remain untarnished ; but if the doctrine be false, his office of priest is vacant. A prophet of God, amid all his imperfections, must preach a perfect Gospel. He can compromise with no wrong, palliate no evil, nor swerve a hair's breadth to avoid an avalanche of consequences. Wherever a wrong appears, thither must his guns point, treating all between as but fortifications of the enemy. When a priest stops to count consequences, he disrobes himself.

These are propositions that all will accept. A clergyman cannot be dumb from expediency. Then, keeping in mind this truth of the necessary perfection of the Gospel, some questions press for an answer.

Is there no wrong, when honest industry appears to bring to one man bread and to another man fabulous wealth ?

Are there no indications that go to show that the superior cleverness often seen in the latter man does not display itself so much in producing more than the other man, as in so manipulating the circumstances that the latter can take from the former, legally, a part of what the former produces ?

Is this stealing ?

Should one man have, arbitrarily, the power of life and death to any degree over another man ?

Has not one man such a power, to a degree, when he can decide, to a degree, whether the other man shall have an opportunity to earn his living ?

Is not the logical outcome from this state of affairs this:—If one man, or a company of men, owned all the land and controlled all the capital, they could sentence, legally, the rest of the race to death.

Would not the only escape from this sentence be a violation of the present laws ?

Does this not indicate the existence of an injustice—though not oppressive enough to force a revolution—at the present time ?

Is it right that one man, because he is the owner of a plot of ground, should receive \$10,000 through his neighbor's industry and enterprise ?

In speculating in real estate, is there a *quid pro quo* given any more than in gambling ?

Does the Church tacitly allow its members to fall below the highest mark of honesty ?

That once done, can it effectively call a halt anywhere ?

Is it not possible that the efforts of some Churches to purify politics are so hopelessly in vain, because having relaxed from perfect honor, no permanent compromise with dishonor can be established ?

Is the Church to-day actually stemming with much effect the tide that has set in toward the principle that "success brings its own justification?"

Is, in short, the Church preaching the whole Gospel of the Christ?

"How shall we reach the masses?" A Church preaching justice would do it. A Gospel drawn not only from the Sermon on the Mount, but from the arraignment of the Pharisees, would do it—a Gospel that has melted charity into love—a Gospel that would preach Christ the meek and lowly, and Christ the just and mighty. Such a Church would not have its collection plates filled or passed by men in whom the people did not believe. Such a Church would be the idol of the masses. They are chilled to-day with distrust at the cold sneer of infidel socialism, and yet the lash of their wrongs is driving them toward this, the only jagged opening in the wall of their prison. Again, again and again have they looked toward that curtained alcove where sit the priests of God; but they do nothing except point upwards to the pictured angels in the roof of the prison, and send their more zealous brothers to bind up wounds and distribute charity. Meantime the prison is growing lighter and prettier, perhaps, but stronger and more hopeless. Every now and then desperation musters a grim column for a mad sally. Then the priests fall back and it goes leaderless to destruction, or else, winning a rare success, gains a new gas jet in the fetid atmosphere. A year ago, John Burns, the Socialist, led such a column from the London docks, and Cardinal Manning, the Romanist, tried to stand between the rebels and the rifles of the guards; and the Protestant priesthood waited for a lull to preach repentance. The drift to-day is toward the bloody gap of Sans-culottic Socialism. But what if the Church of God made another opening in the wall and, declaring that all men were brothers, invited the people to take possession of the promised land? Escape would then be over the roadway of right and not across the volcanic chaos of wrong. Love, and not hate, would lead the way; and whatever the Pharisees and the Scribes might think, the common people would again hear Him gladly.

ALBERT R. CARMAN.

THE TEXT, THE SUBJECT, THE SERMON.*

THE Substance of pulpit discourse is an affair of theology; the Form is an affair of Homiletics. It is with Form or Method, not with Substance or Matter, that this paper has to do. "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord:" and yet the human element in preaching is real and important. The divine operates through the human. "Truth, indeed, is the arrow, but man is the bow-string that sends it home."

It is necessary, even in this day, in some quarters, to defend the study of Systematic Homiletics. The inevitable reaction against the cold and formal preaching of a past age, brought about by the revival of evangelical religion, swept Homiletics almost entirely off the field. Logic was denounced as lifeless; Rhetoric was vain, and all elaborate oratory contemptible. A glorious liberty was claimed. Every man became a law unto himself, and did that which was pleasing in his own eyes.

But a better day is dawning. Preachers are beginning to appreciate the importance of true methods. Logic is seen to be the science and art of reasoning, the line of Bessemer steel along which the human mind, by the very necessity of its constitution, moves from premise to conclusion. Rhetoric is not a juggling with words and phrases, but the science by which truth, in all its parts, is applied to the whole mind in order that the understanding may be informed, the affections kindled, the will influenced. And Homiletics is beginning to be regarded, not as the trickery of the demagogue and mountebank, but the application of the principles of effective speech to the construction of pulpit discourse.

The threefold subject of this paper is designed to cover the whole field of Homiletics, and its discussion is meant to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. Important questions are, by the exigencies of space, left untouched. The questions raised seem to be all-important, and the principles stated fundamental.

* Read before the Toronto Ministerial Association, by Rev. J. A. Macdonald, Editor of *Knox College Monthly*, and at their request given to a wider circle of preachers.

First, then, comes the Text. But let it be noted that for the production of a good Gospel sermon a text, as the word is commonly used, is not absolutely necessary. Custom has laid its hand on us here as elsewhere. Use and wont have made a text a necessary part of a sermon. Preachers everywhere conform to custom, and prefix to their sermons a verse of Scripture; but immediately they resent the bondage and disregard the text and all its claims. This misuse of Scripture is to be deprecated. Making a text a point of departure, or a peg upon which to hang a discourse, is at once dishonoring to Scripture and unworthy of honest men. Scripture quotations do not make a sermon scriptural. Unless the tone and spirit be Biblical, the prefixing of a text will not suffice. Indeed, it may sometimes be advantageous, as it is reasonable and honest, to preach, as apostles did on more than one occasion, without a text at all.

But conforming to custom and taking a passage of Scripture for a text—and the custom has many and great advantages, as it gives the preacher his true position as a prophet of God, and gives the sermon its true authority as based on the very words of God—conforming to custom in this matter, What is the preacher to do with his text? How is he to use it? Is he to allow it to determine the structure of his sermon; to divide it mechanically, and enforce its several doctrines and truths separately? Or, is he to master his text, catch its spirit, classify its separate parts, unite all in one organic living whole, and bring its one great dominating thought to bear on the hearts and consciences of men? If he is to produce a rhetorical discourse, that is, a sermon calculated to influence the will of his hearers he must not do the former, and he must do the latter.

Allowing the text to determine the form of discourse has done infinite mischief to the art of preaching. It has introduced great confusion. Because of it sermons are classified as Topical, Textual and Expository—the Topical being based on a clause, the Textual on a verse, the Expository on a more extended passage. This classification, although adopted by many great and scholarly men, is misleading and unscientific, as it is

founded on a vicious principle. It is simply a question of the lineal measurement of the text, an affair of the foot-rule.

The purpose of a text is not to provide heads for a sermon; its purpose is to supply the preacher with an idea from God, a theme, a subject, which subject it is the preacher's business to discuss for practical ends. Unless a passage of Scripture contains a subject, a theme, it is not a proper text; it may serve the purposes of an undisciplined mind, but it will not provide the true preacher with a basis for a sermon.

The Subject, then, is the principal thing. For that we are to seek as for hid treasure. God's Word is an exhaustless mine. Beneath its surface lie gems richer than the jewels of the mountain or the pearls of the sea. But it yields its wealth only to patient toilers. The ignorant and indolent gather, it may be, a few specimens; but the prizes are not for them. Let us be very sure of this, that the Bible is a sealed book to the sluggard. The words of God are like the words of men, their meaning does not always lie on the surface.

"Words, like Nature, half reveal
And half conceal the soul within."

And it is that "soul within" that is the true theme of a text, the vital subject out of which a living sermon grows; and not until we have grasped that has the text become ours.

How, then, are we to so master our text as to gain its true subject? It is here the trained mind has the advantage of the untrained. It is here that finished study and discipline reveal themselves. It is here that scientific analysis, critical exactness, and logical power are called into play. The unscholarly man, the blunderer in exegesis, the despiser of lexicons and grammars, the stalwart champion of the Bagster Bible with wide margins, the deluded victim of short cuts to the ministry—it is here his ignorance, his inefficiency, his folly is made manifest. He is brought face to face with a great text, written by a man he has never known, in a country he has never seen, to a people separated from him by continents and oceans, by centuries of time and, farther still, by differences of thought and circumstance; written, too, in a language he has never

read, the idioms of which he cannot understand, the spirit of which he has never breathed. What is he to do with such a text? He can do only what the unskilled man in other departments does: the best he can, and run the risk of failure.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the importance of Exegesis. By means of it we lay bare the hidden meaning of our text. The grammar and lexicon, Biblical philology and exegesis—the preacher who would discourse with freshness, authority and power cannot afford to neglect these.

But the preacher must do more than examine and master his selected text if he would grasp his subject firmly and discourse upon it with effect. He must know its setting. If possible, he must study its author, his history, mental and spiritual peculiarities, and his point of view. He must also know the people to whom it was first addressed, their history and circumstance. Then, too, he must master the argument of the entire book from which the text is taken, its dominant thought and purpose, whether history, poetry, prophecy, gospel or epistle. Dr. A. B. Davidson uttered a truth of vast importance, that should be burned into the consciousness of every preacher, when he assured his students in Edinburgh that they need never hope to preach the truth of any one verse truly and with authority until they had mastered the entire book, its history, meaning and message.

And is all this enough? No! surely not. Philology, exegesis, Biblical theology, geography, history—all these are but tools. The preacher needs them all; but with them he needs a sympathetic soul, the poet's brooding spirit, the prophet's master-passion. It is with Revelation as it is with Nature, only choice souls are granted audience. Only he that hath ears can hear. Nature never blabs her secrets to a stranger. College training may assist expression, but only the hearing ear can catch the voice

“ Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man.”

Shakespeare and Wordsworth and Burns and Ruskin and Ten-

nyson are the bosom friends of Nature, and see into the life of things. They stay close by her and are patient,

“ Knowing that Nature never did betray
The heart that loved her ;”

and their waiting souls are satisfied. Nature speaks to them not in parables, but as friend to friend ; while to the world of vulgar natures or of cold-blooded scientists she is dumb, or speaks a meaningless jargon.

As with Nature, so with Revelation. The Spirit of the one is the Spirit of the other. To feel His presence anywhere, we must be humble, reverent, pure of heart. The poet must have the mind of the preacher, and the preacher must have the heart of the poet. Matthew Arnold had everything needful to a great poet, save the one thing needful, the poet's brooding, passionate soul. Many a pulpit holds a man of scholarly attainments, rhetorical skill and moral earnestness, but, lacking the poetic insight and imagination, the glow, the unction, he is not a preacher, he is not a true prophet of God. He may have correct methods and beautiful forms ; but the Spirit that sweeps through Nature and Revelation for poet and preacher alike, has never inspired him or breathed into his sermon the quickening breath of life.

This study of the text, this fixed gaze, this toil and travail of soul, all this may take time and weary the flesh. But there is no royal road, there is no short cut. The peripatetic revivalist may shun severe study and searching thought ; the commonplace plagiarist may rely on his homiletic magazines and volumes of skeletons ; but the true preacher, the workman that needeth not to be ashamed, must be a student, if he would show himself approved of God. It is only in this way that things new as well as old are to be brought out of the treasure-store of God. It is only after such analysis, study and meditation that the great texts of Scripture will yield up to the preacher their living, life-giving subjects. It is only then that the soul of the text goes into the preacher's blood.

And what a moment it is when a new subject is seized, when out of unhopeful chaos order is seen emerging, and the brood-

ing, creative spirit is rewarded! What preacher has not known such moments of joy and exultation? His joy is like the joy of a mother when she feels for the first time her first-born's breath. He exults like a discoverer when he sees an unknown continent heave in sight—

“Then feels he like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken.”

Having chosen a suitable text, and having mastered its living subject, what then? Then comes the Sermon. But what is the sermon? It is the subject amplified, evolved, developed. The subject is the sermon in embryo. The spirit of life within bursts the bonds, and the subject grows into the sermon.

In order to this proper development it is important that the subject be properly conceived: not abstractly but concretely, not logically merely but rhetorically. It is in this partition and rhetorical development of the subject that the illogical mind makes fatal mistakes. What incoherence, what retrogressions, what cross-divisions many sermons are guilty of! Things in the heavens above, in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth are jumbled together in hopeless confusion. The preacher may think this gives variety, and may call it versatility; the more thoughtful among his hearers are offended and the rest befogged. The human mind seeks after unity; and if the sermon lacks unity the hearer carries away no definite idea, no distinct impression, and, operated upon by a dozen warring influences, speedily forgets what manner of man the preacher said he ought to be.

It is necessary, therefore, that there be unity, not only in the subject, but also in the discourse. The development of the subject must be along one line, and in direction of the practical end in view. Three rules of the college professor, Rev. Dr. Proudfoot, to whom whatever is good in this paper is due, come to mind: (1) Reduce your subject to the form of a practical proposition. (2) Have a definite object in view, or a definite impression to be produced. (3) Have one principle on which analysis or division is made in explanation, and one principle on which arguments are invented or arranged in confirmation.

It is helpful to study the form the subject of our text assumes. Is it a duty to be explained and enforced? Is it a principle to be stated and illustrated? Is it a life and its lessons? Is it a doctrine to be expounded or proved? Is it a truth to be shown in its relations and bearings? Answer questions like these, and the principle on which your subject is to be divided and developed will be apparent.

When this point is reached the really difficult work in sermon-preparation is over. The sermon lies before you in outline. What follows is the filling up, the amplification, illustration, illumination. It is here that systematic theology comes to our aid. It is here our own personal experience is of importance. Our own spiritual history, our insight into character, our knowledge of the wants and experiences of men, our sympathetic touch, our imaginative power, our wide reading, history, psychology, poetry, whatever has been thought, or said, or dreamed by man, is here made tributary to the preacher in his lofty work.

And so the preacher moves resolutely along the clear line of his sermon. He does not drift, the sport of every passing fancy, the victim of every untoward circumstance. He advances. And as he advances he gathers strength, takes a wider sweep, and increases his momentum. There is no waste of force. Every sentence tells. The power put into one head is gathered up and with new power infused into the next. He informs the understanding, awakens the emotional nature, and then with all the power of God's truth and his own personality he bears down upon the will. And by God's blessing his appeal will not be in vain. That God, who is Himself a God not of confusion, but of peace, who uses means, and who has made man a rational, logical being, capable of weighing evidence and choosing among ends, will not withhold the promised blessing from His servant who brings his best powers of mind and heart, and honors God's real word to man and God's real laws written on the constitution of man, and who, in utter dependence on the Holy Spirit, travails in soul, and toils as though success depended on human effort, and yet trusts implicitly and waits as the husbandman for the early and latter rain.

Such a sermon may not be possible at first. Indeed, if the standard is true and noble, it will be compassed about by many difficulties, and attainable only after many failures. But if we are true and faithful, every attempt brings the ideal nearer. Nor will such a sermon be an accident in the week's history; it will be the event, the resultant, the outcome of the week. It will be the sum of all that we have met. Whatever of nobleness, of truth, of victory the week has known will add power and richness to our sermon; and if we have been indolent, or selfish, or sinful all week, by so much will our sabbath discourse suffer in range and power.

It may be some will shrink from this high call and choose an easier way. There is an easier road to present popularity. It were a simple matter to draw a crowd. Itching ears are easily tickled. But who that prostitutes himself for vulgar ends, and plays fantastic tricks before high heaven, can answer conscience, or think calmly of the Master's reckoning day? Wood, hay, stubble—all this bulks in the world's eye, but the searching fire will make short work of it at last.

The true preacher will not complain if the conditions of success are exacting. The man who is in earnest and has a passion for preaching; the man whose sermon deals with the awful truths of God, eternity, and human destiny, having for its purpose the awakening of conscience, the renewing of will, the transforming of character in order to the eternal salvation of the human soul, and having for motives the deathless passion and constraining love of Jesus Christ, the joy of success and the terrible possibility of failure; the man who has learned by experience how difficult it is to produce a really excellent sermon, a discourse at once speculative and practical, imaginative and moral, designed to affect human character, not as the political appeal, for the hour, but profoundly and permanently, and that, too, in an age more than any preceding age critical and fastidious in its tastes, exacting in its demands, distinct and rapid in its mental processes, intolerant of dulness and impatient of circumlocution, clamoring for a scientific method, a concise statement, a direct movement, an age, withal, busied about a hundred things besides religion; the man who is brought face

to face with the intrinsic dignity, splendid opportunity and tremendous responsibility of the modern pulpit, will regard no toil too great, no method too severe, no expedient too trivial, if it but make his pulpit discourse a little more thorough in instruction, a little more powerful in appeal, a little more winning in persuasion.

J. A. MACDONALD.

HOW IS THE SIN OF THE WORLD TAKEN AWAY?

PROBABLY there are few thinkers who have not had an agony of doubt, or rather, perhaps, of questioning, to find the link which bound them individually, at once to the sin which crucified the Lord, and the benefits of His atoning work. No new doctrine is to be propounded in this endeavor to answer the question, *How* is the sin of the world taken away? but only an explanation of the problem, *How* am I to be delivered from the consequences of my sins? or, *How* does the death of Jesus on my behalf deliver me from them? as shall be clear and exhaustive of all demands.

The term "the *sin* of the world" we owe to the Baptist, John. It is one that has always commanded attention, but has probably not been honored with fullest faith. We are so accustomed to see and think of the plural form "sins," and to feel that the atonement must cover all the forms of sin, that we are apt to look upon the Baptist's word "sin" as a kind of truth—a word which need not be understood as singular. When, however, we remember John's character, his Essenic concentration, his Elijah-like fire, his intuitional accuracy (a heaven-born instinct), the force of his word will be most apparent. It is little likely that this phrase was used without intending all the meaning it could have. If it have this it has all. Let it be observed how the herald challenges attention, and concentrates it upon one simple issue, in few words indeed, but of such tremendous import. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin

of the world." No weak mind could have borne such a burthen; but it is a fitting one for the mighty John, of whom the Master said, he is a greater prophet than all others of woman born. From that point, therefore, we observe the work of Jesus thus marked out as the Lamb of God. He meets and often *overpowers* sin—this is clear; but as time goes on, the herald's declaration seems to be falsified, and instead of His taking away sin, sin's dogged persistence wove so closely the meshes of a net to entangle *Him* that escape was impossible, and He seems to fail in the conflict. The issue announced by John was Jesus against sin, an issue which, though for final adjudication must be tried by the standards of eternal truth in the eternal courts, yet would seem to need for man's benefit, success; and yet to human sight He seemed to fail, and this because the issue became confused by the falsehood, "This is not the Christ," therefore, how could He (Jesus) take away sin. The purblind Sanhedrim, with Jesus before them, tried to wrest the case from its true setting, and not only ignored the true criminal, sin, as pursued by Jesus, but by an amazing perversion of justice tried to convict Him of treason to Cæsar,* whilst professedly arraigning Him as a false Christ. On that trial scene how heaven's hosts must have gazed with wonder as to whereunto it would tend! But God's ever-acting laws compelled a triumph even here. Just at that point of the trial, when the divine silence of Jesus before the falsehoods of the false witnesses had irritated the high priest past endurance, with a strange mal-appropriateness, the fateful compulsion of a higher power (for His statement had no relevancy to the statement about pulling down and building the temple), he asks: "Art thou the Christ?" and he answers, "Yes!" It only needed another word to complete their condemnation before the eternal courts, and they quickly supplied it. "He hath spoken blasphemy." "He is worthy of death." There the whole scene is left for the generations to read, and, though all

*"We found this fellow perverting the nation," etc. (Luke xxiii. 2.) "The charge was intended to represent the result of their previous judgment *εὐρομεν*"—(Alford.) The testimony of the many false witnesses "who agreed not together" (Mark xiv. 56), as observant Peter noticed, is not recorded; but Luke has in this place presented the sum of their testimony.

the wily subtlety of devilish spite sought to put the false charge upon the cross, "He said, I am King of the Jews," and the roused-up passions of an ignorant mob sought by blatant riot to blot out the value of that trial scene, it stands a manifestation clearer than noonday that Peter's charge was true, "Ye denied the Holy and Righteous One and killed the Prince of Life." Jesus "could not deny Himself," but "bore the contradiction of sinners against Himself" even unto death. Clearly, therefore, thus far the conclusion is that which Jesus bore to death was the denial of the Jews. Was this the world's sin? Delved to the bitter root of it, what is this sin of the Jews? Denial of Jesus as the Christ, therefore, of course, denial of Jesus being any manifestation of God. Now, the closest study of sin must reveal this fact that through all its sinuosities, subtle, vicious, ignorant, the foundation is always denial of God. Sometimes it is an actual denial of His existence, more often of His manifestations. Upon this broad foundation the million-fold sins of the world have their start, however many may be their names; they are only the localisms, the provincialisms of the devil's kingdom; the generic term "denial" (or unbelief) covers all and explains all. The man who takes a life, or another's gold, denies, in the one case, God's likeness, and in the other, His law. In like manner all sins have their base there. All sin is denial of the Deity, *i.e.*, either in Himself or His manifestations. The old, old story of Adam's fall is new and repeated every day. He denied God in His law, and preferred to eat of the tree-of-evil,* denial of God. The liberty of self-will seemed a sweet and tempting fruit of that denial. Thus he and all his kind, down to the man who, to-day, perjured himself with broken oath, and lying lips, are in the same transgression. Peter, fastening the condemnation upon ruler and scribe, fastens it, of necessity, upon *the world*, whose sin in many forms it is: "Ye denied the Holy and Righteous One."

* Not the tree of knowledge-of-good, this knowledge he had, nor the tree of knowledge, except so far as it was evil, and it was, therefore, the tree of knowledge-of-good-and-evil; that is, the personal acquaintance with the difference between good and evil, by the new knowledge of the latter.

That Jesus "bore our sins in His own body on the tree" is the simple and necessary statement of a bold and truthful exegete, who, whilst he uses the plural form, "sins," so that every *species* of sinner may have hope, of necessity includes the singular—the genus. His death was the concrete embodiment of the world's denial—a tragedy in which every sinner has his part. The verdict "He is not the Christ" being only another form of the world's denial of God's manifestations. The Lamb of God beareth (or taketh) the sin. Peter states the absolute truth for the world: "Ye killed the Prince of Life;" the large, the absolute statement, encloses that which the merely relative truth would allow to escape. It was the Roman who relatively killed the Lord, but all deniers are constructively His murderers; and so Peter gathers them all into the one condemnation, "Ye killed the Prince of Life." But even in the last resort, leaving out of the case, that is, Peter's words, the *bare facts* remain; denial of the Deity was essentially the verdict, whose penalty Jesus suffered; denial of the Deity is essentially the world's sin, therefore Jesus bore the world's sin.

The reasonableness of the atonement will become clear upon the basis thus laid down. The manifestations of Himself, giving the opportunity to men, for faith in, and acknowledgment of Him, never failed. God so loved the world that fruitful seasons told His presence, and written law His personal control. At sundry times and in divers manners He spake in time past unto the Fathers, and in fittest time gave the most perfect manifestation of Himself, which man could comprehend, "Emmanuel," to "reconcile the world unto Himself." The question then to be decided was: Is this the Christ? Many associated truths are proved by Christ's unique personality; man's original intuitional and constitutional excellence; his power to bear life's proper burdens, to resist temptation, to glorify the heavenly Father, to win immortality; but the doctrine of the *atonement*, needed for its maintenance the proof that "this is indeed the Christ." We do not discuss it here, that is settled; there is no atonement, no vicarious suffering, if He be not God made flesh; but just as surely, there is

vicarious suffering and atoning work, if He be the Christ. It is not our purpose to undervalue any of the forms of the "judicial" or "commercial" theories of the atonement; they have done and will continue to do good work; they are needed yet. But some minds are compelled to ask for something other than these. They love not, and cannot think of the all-loving Father claiming the bloody sacrifice of an innocent victim, as necessary or just, to procure man's salvation. They think that the epistle to the Hebrews continues to refer to the *mere facts* of the old sacrifices, not the perpetual need, when it says: "Without shedding of blood there is no remission;" that Christ's death was rather the accident, than the essence of soteriology — something attendant, rather than supreme — necessary, indeed, on man's side, but not on the divine side. To give a satisfactory answer to these assertions is not easy. One of the strange things of our Christian history is, that whilst we go right up to the cross with our faith in Him as the Christ, the confused issue, raised by the Chief Priest and rulers of the Jews, has blinded many eyes, so that they have failed to see how the Lamb of God bore our sin, or the sin of the world; the real value of Christ's death for us was supposed to be a hidden transaction. Many of us have been content to say, "It is a mystery;" and to use other terms of wonder, which have, perchance, as much expressed disappointment at not finding the *how*, as awe at its sublime reality. The simple fact is: He died because He was denied. He bore that which in the abstract, and absolutely *is*, the world's sin—denial of God. Just in the same way Galileo bore the world's denial of the earth's movement, though it was only uttered by local foes. If any one should be disposed to aver that this is a mere trick of language, or treat the thought with the condemnation of faint praise "ingenious;" let him consider whether the demands of an atonement are met by this explanation. Every imaginable bitterness of sin is concentrated in the cup, the bitter cup of His repudiation by man. The clearest possible manifestation of the Deity, and the clearest possible denial, are brought into sharpest contrast, and most distinct expression. The formula cannot be escaped: Jesus bore "the sin of the world."

But it is time to ask still further: How did He bear it *away*? Scriptural answer: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God," "hath the witness in himself," "is passed from death unto life," "is saved," etc., etc. Faith reverses the world's sin, and looking to Calvary, says: "It is the Lord;" and sees that sin of denial borne away, for Jesus could only have escaped that death by denying His Messiahship. His death, therefore, became, *even is*, proof of His Messiahship, and proves that He bore our sin; it is the extinguishing of doubts, and yet, to give every objective proof which it is possible to give, His *resurrection* throws vividest light of divine confirmation upon it; "*this is indeed the Christ*," confirmed is my fullest faith, Jesus has borne away, for all believers, the world's sin.

But yet again, as we rise to claim our privileges of sonship, the terrible question takes us in its merciless grip, how are the consequences of *past* sin destroyed? It is true that it is said, He is the propitiation for sins that are past, but *how*? God's laws must have this operation at the least, *penalty* for *violation*. Righteousness cannot dispense with this principle. In such realistic explanation as we desire, reason objects to the commercial idea of Christ's suffering being equal to the sum of the sufferings which all sinners should endure. How can a sinner, then, be saved from sin's consequences. The element of difficulty lies in the grim array of past transgressions. Can the Imperial power which established universal law change its action here, and say consequences shall not be? Nay! The maintenance of the majesty of perfect law is as necessary to God's throne as breath to human life; and we *must*, therefore, reach the conclusion *somehow* or *somewhere*, that Christ suffered the consequences of all sin, or find an answer in annihilation or purgatorial fires. But where is the difficulty in receiving the teaching that Christ bore the consequences, the result, the penalty of all sin. Death is the consequence of sin. "Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death (sin's consequences) for every man." But how? many ask. Is there no answer but one, "Believe it" and "live?" Can we not also *understand* it and live? Let us try. At the point where penalty for sin

is, and must be righteously exacted, another law comes into operation—the vicarious law—God's vicar of mercy. This law asserts that the penalty of broken law having been once endured, even by the innocent, it cannot be exacted again. "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." It was a sacrifice "once offered." Human reason looks sceptically upon such assertions, it is true, and yet, strange to say, the existence of a *vicarious law* is never doubted, nor its operations questioned, in *social life*, nor in *art*, nor *science*, neither is the justice of its operation in these spheres doubted. The formula by which it is known is something like this—all operations have their cause and equal result, *i.e.*, a result equal to the cause, no more nor less. The latter clause opens the door for vicarious action. For instance, the pendulum which swings from a sustained horizontal position south, say, of its pivotal point, will, upon release, swing to a like position on the north—no more, no less. In the same way the exact value of the destructive power of every explosive agent is calculated, and the results (circumstances being equal) are always the same, neither more nor less; but the objects upon which the force of an explosion was expended, in any particular instance, may not be those intended; that which may be called the subjective effect is the same, though the objective may vary. Again: a parent, though suffering the direst pangs of outraged love, or the friend whose confidence was abused, will receive back the *repentant* one. They say in effect, "I bore the pain, the equivalent of your wrongdoing; there has been suffering enough; I do not want you to suffer again; any new suffering which I might force you to endure would be only the result of my desire to punish, not the direct result of your wrong."

Our law courts, so often resorted to for illustrations, do not give us any true presentations of vicarious law. Human nature is imperfect. Perfect justice, which is, indeed, the true name for vicarious law, cannot be administered, hence inequalities. The action of vicarious law in the instances given are illustrations of God's law; but only in the sphere of God's kingdom of grace has it free and full action. Could perfect justice be administered by us that is justice which goes upon the prin-

ciple laid down, viz., the exact equivalent of result for every operation, then every wrong-doer would suffer the recoil of his own transgression, the murderer's blow would destroy himself, the liar expose his own mendacity, and so on; but human imperfection cannot act in such a manner, therefore, in our moral relations we suffer for each other, and on repentance forgive each other; while in criminal law, for the defence of society, and in deference to educational principles, our laws must be punitive. We hang the murderer; we dare not forgive, because we cannot operate a perfect law of abstract justice. With God this is not so. The spiritual sphere, the kingdom of God, which links us with immortality, has, therefore, its perfect law of justice, which we call *mercy*. The apostle boldly calls it justice. "He is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Mankind has, if human predicates may describe the awful mystery, torn the heart of Deity with ingratitude and rebellion. Abstractedly we cannot say that God suffered the anguish of a broken heart; but relatively to humanity, it is exhibited in Christ. The "rebuke," the penalty of sin, hath "broken His heart." He came, was denied, suffered, died—a tragedy in human sphere, but a revelation of the heavenly photosphere, which we dimly see. It was of a broken heart that Jesus died. The "rebuke" had to fall as the consequence of sin. The swing of the pendulum cannot be staid, nor its momentum fall short of its equipotent force, nor pass beyond it. The blow which must break His heart or destroy the offender should fall upon man, for he was the traitor, the false-hearted denier of his Benefactor. But it was precisely that pain for treason, falsehood and ingratitude which Christ bore. He suffered the pangs of outraged love; they were His to the full; the King was dethroned, the Friend spit upon, the Brother disowned, the Father denied, the purest and best manifestation of God subjected to vilest outrage and contumelious rejection. There cannot be a question that Christ bore the precise equivalent of broken law—the penalty of denial. So, then, as we were just about to be crushed with fear of past transgression, the divine vicarious law brings relief. "He suffered, the just for the unjust." Nothing can now separate us from the love of God-

This is the Christ. All we can give for past and shameful sin is sorrow. Lo! we repent. Strict justice did demand our death, but instantly on our faith the vicarious law became operative. Christ has died. This is enough, says the law of Heaven's perfect justice, which in human nomenclature we call mercy. Christ has borne the penalty. The consequences (the chastisement) of sin fell upon Him. "He hath borne the iniquity of us all." To him that believeth, the Lamb of God taketh away the sin of the world. Rather than sing "The Lord in the day of His *anger* did lay our sins on the Lamb," we would sing, "The Lord in the day of His *mercy* did lay our sins on the Lamb, and He bore them away."

JAMES WATSON, F.T.L.

A PLEA FOR CREMATION.

WE have few more striking examples of the strength of custom than in the opposition to cremation wherever in Christian countries it is introduced. The dislike to this new practice is, partly, because it would tear us from a venerable institution; partly, because the very thought of consigning our friends to the flames is, to those not familiar with the practice, repulsive in the extreme; but it is chiefly because many fear it is a degrading of the body, and may be a jeopardizing of our resurrection.

These objections are not easily disposed of; but yet in England, to say nothing of continental European countries, this new method of disposing of the dead is making rapid progress. I say new method, because it is new with us, though, of course, it has been practised by the heathen in all ages; and probably the only reason why, in the past, it has been so exclusively practised by them, is to be found in our respect for the sanctity of the body and our belief in the doctrine of the resurrection.

This question of the adoption of this ancient mode of sepulture in Christian countries will soon be discussed, especially, in

all large cities. It will find favor, no doubt, with a few; but the majority will bitterly oppose it. Many will look to the ministry, anxious to hear their opinion upon what some call a heathenish practice.

The difficulty of finding room for the burial of the dead is already in many places, very great. The expense of funerals, too, is enormous. Moreover, where so many thousand dead bodies are accumulated the infected air and drainage become a source of pestilence and present a serious problem in sanitation. The running of daily burial trains from great cities, too, has not given satisfaction to the bereaved, especially among the poor. It is well that the objectionable practice of burying the dead in the churches, and in the churchyards, has been almost universally abolished. Doubtless this objectionable practice originated in the desire on the part of friends to be near the graves of the departed when prayers were being offered for the repose of their souls.

It is foolish to think, but yet how often do people imagine, that these God's acres will never be disturbed, and that the remains of the departed will there peacefully rest till the resurrection morning. Alas! this hope is vain. In a few generations, as the cities enlarge, and the dead are forgotten, graveyards are invariably destroyed. The avaricious city authorities need the land, and the sacred remains are ruthlessly cast up and flung to the winds of heaven, and if a few survive this wreck their fate is sure. No spot on earth is safe against the ravages of men and of time. The fashion of having large vaults and catacombs, as in cities, is too expensive to be general, and they, too, will fall into decay.

There is a growing feeling that some new method of disposing of the dead must be discovered. The reformers have three prominent ideas—cheapness and quickness in the disposal of the dead, and the conservation of the health of the living. Cremation seems to meet the case. I doubt not, when prejudice has passed away, that it will be generally adopted in large cities, especially in the case of those who have died of infectious diseases.

In India and other countries where they have always lighted

their funereal pile, it would be equally difficult to persuade them to bury their dead, and thus permit them to become a prey to corruption and worms, as it is to reconcile us to committing our dead to the flames. In England cremation is advancing, though the progress of the reform is slow, and in the nature of things will be gradual. This year a large crematorium will be opened at Manchester, similar to the one at Zurich, and will cost £6,000; and several buildings have been erected, in the same country, by philanthropists for the benefit of the people. As I stood by one of these heathen establishments, as they are called, and saw all that it was possible to witness while the mortal remains of a fellow-creature were being reduced to ashes, I was hardly prepared to say, "Let my last end be like his;" but, on second thoughts, the cold grave and its horrible associations seemed equally repulsive.

But we may expect the stoutest opposition to this new practice, because it is thought to be contrary to Scriptural usage and doctrine. We are so accustomed to read of burials in the Bible, that many think it is the only lawful way for disposing of the dead. God buried Moses, but He took Elijah to heaven in fire. It is true, burial was the Bible custom; but we believe it is optional, and we need not copy the ancients in this respect, any more than we need to imitate them in their marriage ceremonies. The Bible gives no law on this subject that must be obeyed. Again, whatever may be our ideas or feelings in respect to the sacredness of the human body, we cannot, dispose of it as we may, prevent it from being reduced to dust, whether by the ministry of worms or of flame—both being alike repulsive to our feelings. If buried, they are almost sure to be cast up in ages to come to be trodden under foot of men. In cremation we are saved from this possibility at least, and we also have a better opportunity of saving the dust, which may be more securely kept in an urn, or it may be, if you prefer it, deposited in a grave. What, however, is the advantage of this dust? The remains of the greater portion of the human family have been burned. Great is the number of the drowned. But if we believe in a general resurrection, we have no ground for anxiety, whatever disposition may be made of the body, for

nature holds every particle of their former constituents in some form or other, either in earth, or air, or sea. There can be no advantage in trying to save the remains of the dead. A blindly superstitious and ultra-literal view of the resurrection, which supposes a special providence is placed over every grave, so that the bodies will remain undisturbed till the trumpet sounds, when each person will come up from their respective graves, bearing exactly the same body that was entombed, has often given a needless occasion for ridicule to the enemies of Christianity.

The resurrection, as we all must admit, is a great mystery. Let us not add to the difficulties with which it is confessedly beset by associating it with our own crude and unauthorized notions and conceptions. Much of the teaching of Scripture about this subject is designed to assure us of a personal corporeal existence in the future life; a bodily form and personal identity, in opposition to the pantheistic doctrine of absorption into the absolute. Many dreaded the union of spirit and matter again, thinking matter must ever be connected with evil; these were assured that, although there would be a union, their fear was vain. Hence, we read of "a spiritual body," "immortal," "incorruptible," and void of much that is now necessary to our lowly state. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."

Since we do not believe in the germ theory, we do not see the need of carefully preserving the remains. Neither can we think "that our future bodies will consist of the same material particles as those we now wear;" or, "that the resurrection body will be exactly the same as that laid in the grave," as Agar Beet remarks. Hence, what need, if it were possible, to preserve the remains. One cannot read Dr. Pope without feeling that he often verges, in his treatment of this subject, on the edges of self-contradiction. He remarks: "The identity of the body is not the identity of the man; nor is the identity of the body dependent upon the continuation of the particles, in their union, which were deposited in the grave." "In the resurrection the spirit will have a spiritual psychical organism given to it, which, in the wonder of divine power, will be to it the same

organ it had in time." "*The literal return of the dissolved body St. Paul never affirms.*" "The new creation at the end will, after all, have some analogy with that at the first, when God created the body. *Behold, I make all things new; a second time, Let us make man.*"

Ulrici's view of the spiritual body, adopted by Joseph Cook, seems almost to do away with the resurrection. Yet it is difficult to think of a conscious spirit without some ensawathe-ment or body.

Again, great is the mystery of the resurrection. I think Dr. Dorner's view is most reasonable and probatly most correct. He states that the resurrection will be in association with vast cosmical processes, and as relates to matter, "the elements, in which everything of earthly corporeity is again dissolved, are an essential, uniform mass, like an ocean, of which it is indifferent what parts are assigned to each individual man. The entire world of matter, which makes a constant interchange possible, is made over to humanity as a *common good*. Thus, it may be said, not indeed of the individual, but of humanity, that it will appropriate, or put on, that which corresponds to its resurrection—life in glorified form of the same world of elements which served it in the present life, because the perishableness of matter will be abolished by its glorification."

As we are asked now, chiefly by the evolutionists, to give a wider meaning to "the dust" out of which our first parents were taken, so let us give equal breadth to "the dust of the earth" out of which we shall rise, even the elements in which all earthly corporeity has been dissolved. It will still be a resurrection, and not purely a new creation. Thus we may be greatly relieved of useless anxiety. God will give us a body as it pleaseth Him, and herein let us rest; for what is exactly implied in the resurrection none can tell.

Since the Scriptures are silent in respect to the disposition of the body when life has become extinct, and believing the resurrection to not be in the least dependent on the preservation of our remains, seeing that we cannot preserve them, do what we may, and that there is nothing degrading to the body in its being burned, any more than it is to say to "corruption,

Thou art my father; to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister;" and seeing that it is a cheaper, quicker and more convenient method—one, moreover, more consistent with the health of the living—I see no reason why we should oppose, much less denounce, cremation. Let each choose for himself.

Some have thought that this plan of disposing of the dead may prevent the discovery of persons who poisoned their friends, as when the facts are discovered it may be too late to have a *post mortem* examination. To guard against this, before the body is cremated a doctor's certificate, stating the cause of death, has to be presented.

Let us remember Abraham, who believed that, although after death his son would be consumed by flames, yet "God was able to raise him up even from the dead." Meanwhile, we leave this gloomy subject, feeling sure that if we are buried like Moses in some lonely grave, or carried aloft like Elijah in flaming fire, we shall, like them, most certainly appear on the glorious mount talking with Jesus.

HENRY ABRAHAM.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

II.

THE second group of passages describes a still more terrible aspect of "sheol," as in Job xxvi. 5, 6; a lowest Sheol or Abaddon for the wicked dead. Then there is one grand passage in which Job, with his strong faith in his Redeemer, casts a flood of light upon the condition of the good. "But I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand up at the last upon the earth: and after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from (or "without" as in the margin) my flesh shall I see God," etc. (xix. 25, 26, R. V.) Job expected after his body was laid in the grave, and had decayed, to see God in his disembodied condition, consequent upon death.

The future state is referred to undoubtedly in that famous Davidic Psalm (xvi. 10, 11), which is quoted in Acts ii. 27, to show its final Messianic application: "For Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol: neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in Thy presence is fulness of joy; in Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." (R. V.) The idea of this passage is more clearly brought out by the Revised Version. So far as David is concerned, it seems to teach that there are two conditions of life in "sheol"—the realm of the dead—one in which the soul is abandoned by God to the corrupting results and tendencies of its own sin, and the other in which the trustful soul is shown by God the path of life, and enjoys the stimulus and pleasure of communion with Him.

In Psalm cxxxix. 8, we find a beautiful poetical description of the omnipresence of God, that is based on the idea of a free disembodied spirit roaming through the universe: "If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell (sheol), behold, Thou art there" etc. The reference here cannot be to "hell," as ordinarily understood, for David did not expect to make his "bed," *i. e.*, remain there, and he immediately adds: "Behold, Thou art there." The chief terror of "hell" is the utter banishment of the soul from the immediate presence of God and all the good.

From the Book of Proverbs we learn a little more about the intermediate state. "Sheol" is the state to which men descend at death (v. 5; vii. 27; ix. 18; xv. 1). It is insatiable, and swallows up all mankind (xxvii. 20; xxx. 16; l. 12).

Interesting as it might be to follow this detailed method of textual study throughout the rest of the Bible, and thus see what is said about Sheol in the lesser and greater apocalypse of Isaiah, in the prophets of the exile, and in the minor prophets, we shall have to forego the pleasure and profit, as space will not permit. Sufficient passages have been studied in the Old Testament from which to draw our inferences.

The natural conclusion from the teachings of all these passages is that the departed spirits of all men pass into a state described by the term "sheol," or hollow place, where

there is conscious existence, and a definite experience of happiness or misery.

In the New Testament we find a gradual development of the idea of an intermediate state, as described by the word *ᾅδης* (hades), which, literally translated, means the invisible place, and answers to the German *hölle*, or the English word "hell," in its original meaning of covered or hidden depth, but not in its commonly received meaning at present. The word *ᾅδης* (hades) is used eleven times in the New Testament. The other words used with reference to the spirit world are : *παράδεισος* (paradeisos), *Γέεννα* (gehenna), *ταρταρος* (tartaros), *φυλακή* (phulaké) and *αβυσσος* (abussos). *ᾅδης* (hades), as the general term for the spirit world, corresponds with the Latin *Orcus* or *Inferni* ; *παράδεισος* corresponds with *Elysium*, and *γέεννα* with *Tartarus*.

1. In the Gospels we find by studying different passages that *ᾅδης* (hades) as a general state is subdivided into *παράδεισος* (paradeisos), and *γέεννα* (gehenna), the natures of which are conditioned on difference in character, rather than upon separateness of location and external conditions.

(a) *Παράδεισος* (Paradeisos) is a Persian word, meaning a park or garden, which the Hebrews borrowed during their captivity ; the Greeks learned it a little later during the campaigns of Alexander. It was used by the translators of the Septuagint to describe the garden of Eden. From this use of the word the Jews came to apply it to the condition of the righteous after death. While our Lord used the term thus derived, we are not to suppose that He endorsed all the absurd notions about the intermediate state which had been taught by the Jewish Rabbis.

(b) *Γέεννα* (Gehenna) is a term that was originally applied to the valley of Hinnom, on the southern side of Jerusalem, which had been desecrated during the reigns of idolatrous kings by the horrid rites of Moloch, and had been called Tophet, as an expression of Jewish detestation. There fires were kept constantly burning to consume the refuse of the temple and city. With such terrible associations our Lord used the word, to represent the unquenchable fires that will torment all incorrigible evil doers.

Some have said we ought to interpret this word in an extremely literal way, and always translate it as referring to the actual valley of Hinnom. The only passage where it would be possible to rationally use it in that sense is in Matt. v. 22, which is a quotation from the old Jewish laws, and might refer to the literal valley of Hinnom.

On the other hand, there are some passages where it could not rationally be used in this coldly literal way, for instance, Matt. xxiii. 33, where the Pharisees are asked how they can "escape the damnation of hell" (*τῆς γέεννης*); Matt. x. 28, where the soul as well as the body is spoken of as being cast into hell (*ἐν γέεννῃ*), showing that the reference is not to the literal valley of Hinnom, for the soul could not be burned there. See also Luke xii. 5.

In all the places where *γέεννα* (gehenna) is used, after examining the context and the rational interpretation of the word itself, we are compelled to conclude that it refers to the punishment of the wicked in the spirit world, or in the final hell.

Endless confusion has arisen from using the same English word "hell" to translate two such entirely different words as *ἄδης* (hades) and *γέεννα* (gehenna), the latter word only being properly translated by the word "hell" in its present accepted meaning.

Ἄδης (Hades), as we have stated, means literally the unseen, and is only properly used when used to describe the place or state of departed spirits, both righteous and wicked.

To show that this meaning and usage of *ἄδης* is generally recognized by the most eminent Biblical students, I pause here to make mention of some of their opinions.

Dr. Robinson, in his "Greek and English Lexicon," says: "According to the notions of the Hebrews, Hades was a vast subterranean receptacle where the souls of the dead existed in a separate state until the resurrection of their bodies. The region of the blessed during this interval, or the inferior paradise, they supposed to be in the uttermost part of this receptacle, while beneath was the abyss or Gehenna, Tartarus, in which the souls of the wicked were subjected to punishment."

Dr. Meyer, in his "Commentary on Luke," says: "Hades corresponds to the Hebrew sheol, which, in the LXX., is translated by Hades, and hence denotes the whole subterranean place of abode of departed souls, divided into Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43) for the pious, and Gehenna for the godless."

Dr. P. J. Gloag, in his "Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles," says: "The souls both of the righteous and the wicked are in Hades; the former inhabiting the region of the blessed, or Paradise; the latter being confined in the dungeon of Tartarus."

Dr. Samuel T. Spear, in an article in the *New York Independent*, after a careful examination of all the passages of Scripture bearing on the point, arrives at this conclusion: "Hades, or the invisible world, considered as the abode or place to which departed human spirits go at death, and in which they exist as conscious beings in the condition of happiness or misery, according to their conduct and character when in the body, prior to the resurrection and final judgment of the race, and separately from the bodies which they had on earth, is by no means merely a heathen or Jewish fancy, but a Biblical reality; as much so as is the earth, or the planet Jupiter, or the solar system an astronomical reality. Man, when he dies, goes as to his spiritual nature into Hades, and there consciously exists, as truly as he ever removed from one place to another, and as truly as he ever consciously existed in this world. This Hades is not only a condition, but a place of abode, and in both respects rests as to its reality upon the teaching of the Bible."

Having thus determined the proper meanings and uses of the general term ᾅδης (hades), and its two subdivisions *παραδείσος* (paradeisos) and *γεέννα* (gehenna), let us agree upon a set of terms which shall be accurately used in describing both the intermediate state, with its two opposite conditions, and the final places for the good and bad.

We shall thus avoid the trouble that might arise from using a confused terminology. We will use the following terms: *Paradise-Hades*, to describe the state of the righteous in Hades, from death to the resurrection; *Gehenna-Hades*, to

describe the state of the wicked from death to the resurrection; "*Heaven*," to describe the final abode of the good from the judgment on through eternity; and "*Hell*," to describe the final abode of the bad after judgment for ever and ever.

The first two states are incomplete and temporary; the last two are complete and eternal.

We shall gather the teaching of the Gospels on this question from two notable passages—that which is commonly called the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and the words of Christ to the penitent thief on the cross.

Luke xvi. 19-31, contains the teaching of Christ concerning the contrasted condition of Dives and Lazarus, both in this life and in the state after death. Our Lord does not call this memorable passage a parable. It seems realistic enough for a historical picture. But whether it be a parable or not, its general teaching remains the same.

After describing the earthly experiences of the two men, Jesus tells us that after death the rich man lifted up his eyes in torment, in Hades (*ἐν τῷ ᾄδῃ*), probably in the Gehenna part, although our Lord does not say so. The tormenting flame could not have been physical, for his body had just been laid in the earth, but the material figure represented his terrible remorse of conscience, and fearful anticipations of judgment and eternal punishment. We learn, too, that Lazarus at death entered the same Hades, and was in such a position that the rich man could see him and learn of the just reversal of their contrasted conditions. It seems to have been possible for the rich man to hold communication with the righteous in Hades, or rather in Abraham's bosom, which is the Paradise part of Hades, but he was separated from them by the impassable gulf of fixed moral character.

The condition of Lazarus in Hades was Paradise to him because of the consciousness of God's favor and presence, and the joyous hope of a blessed resurrection.

The teachings of this passage may be summarized as follows: Both good and bad spirits exist in a definite state or place after death; that existence is thoroughly conscious; there is an unscalable gulf separating the good from the bad; this gulf

does not preclude the possible nearness or juxtaposition of the good and bad, so that the bad may feel their badness and its proper punishment all the more deeply because of its black contrast with purified goodness and its rewards; and finally the happiness and misery of the dwellers in Hades is not caused so much by material surroundings as by the relation of the soul to God and the good, which is either one of fellowship or banishment.

In support of these interpretations, I will quote the comments of some eminent exegetes.

In commenting on the expression, "Abraham's bosom" verse 22, Trench says: "The happy side of hades where the fathers rest in bliss. Hades is not a place of festival, but of quietness and fellowship." Bishop Lightfoot calls it "The perfect felicities of Paradise."

In contrasting the word $\alpha\delta\eta\varsigma$ in verse 23 with $\gamma\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\alpha$, the general criticism of commentators is that $\gamma\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\alpha$ denotes a place or state of punishment, and that $\alpha\delta\eta\varsigma$ denotes the state of the righteous and unrighteous alike.

Meyer, Bengel and others agree in concluding that $\alpha\delta\eta\varsigma$ means, "The intermediate state of the soul."

Wetstein and Rosenmuller both say, "That the good and bad both go thither."

Alford, in speaking of $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\delta\eta$, says it is "The abode of all disembodied spirits till the resurrection; not the place of torment, much less hell, as commonly understood in the Authorized Version. Lazarus was also in Hades, but separate from Dives—one on the blissful side, the other on the baleful side."

Bengel, on the same words, says: "Hades differs from gehenna as a *whole* differs from a *part*, for while Jacob says, 'I will go down to hades to my son mourning,' Jacob did not despair of salvation."

Trench again says: "As Abraham's bosom is not heaven, though it will issue in it; so Hades is not hell, though it will issue in it."

Godet, one of the best exegetes, comments thus upon this passage: "The idea of suffering does not lie in the words

ἐν τῷ ᾄδῃ, which our version renders by 'in hell.' Sheol (Heb.), hades (Gr.), inferni (Lat.), or the infernal regions simply denote the abode of the dead, without distinguishing the different conditions which it may include, in opposition to the land of the living. Paradise (see Luke xxiii. 43), as well as Gehenna (see Luke xii. 5) forms a part of Hades. Hence also, from the midst of his punishment, the rich man can behold Abraham and Lazarus."

We will now consider the answer of our Lord to the prayer of the penitent thief on the cross, as recorded in Luke xxiii. 43: "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise." This is the only recorded use by Christ of this word *παράδεισος*; in fact, the word is only used in two other places in the New Testament.

We have already learned that, according to the usage of ancient Greek writers, such as Herodotus and Xenophon, the word *παράδεισος*, means literally a park or garden, and that it was used in the Talmud, and other Jewish writings, to describe that portion of Hades into which the righteous enter at death.

Meyer calls it "The abode of joy in hades."

Osterzee expresses his opinion thus: "It is not the heavenly Paradise referred to in 2 Cor. xii. 4, or Rev. ii. 7, but a part of 'sheol,' as opposed to 'gehenna.'"

Tertullian and Origen both make the statement: "The regions of paradise are not heaven."

Irenæus, another of the early Fathers, says: "It is not heaven proper, for David himself had not reached it." (Acts ii. 34.)

Godet remarks on this passage: "The earthly Eden once lost, the word Paradise is applied to that part of Hades where the faithful are assembled, and even in the last writings of the New Testament, the epistles and apocalypse, to a yet higher abode, that of the Lord and glorified believers, the third heaven. (2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7.) It is Paradise as a part of Hades which is spoken of here."

Therefore, we conclude that Christ, in using the word *παράδεισος*, made reference to the abode of the blessed in

the spirit world into which both He and the pardoned thief entered. Knowing that before sunset they would be both dead as to their bodies, He encouragingly told the prayerful thief that on that very day their spirits would be together in the same Paradise.

This comforting message was not merely for the dying thief, but may properly be received by all dying believers as an assurance that their spirits, at death, will go at once into the Paradise which Jesus entered with His forgiven companion.

2. In the Epistles and Apocalypse, we find that *ᾅδης* (hades) is generally used with the meaning of grave or realm of the dead. See Rev. xx. 13: "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell (hades) delivered up the dead which were in them," etc. 1 Cor. xv. 55: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave (hades or hell in the margin), where is thy victory?"

The descent of Christ into Hades, as described in the Epistles, furnishes their most important teaching on this question.

In Acts ii. 31, Peter refers to the fact that the soul of Christ, *i.e.*, Christ Himself was in Hades, but was not allowed to remain there, because of His resurrection.

In Eph. iv. 9, we find this descent spoken of as going down "into the lower parts of the earth," a figure which undoubtedly applies to the realm of the dead.

When Christ is spoken of in the Bible or creeds as "descending into hell or Hades," it is not supposed by any one that He entered the place of torment or final hell, but the natural meaning of the words in the original is simply this: that the disembodied spirit of Christ went directly at death to the spirit world into which the spirits of all the dead have entered.

Rom. xiv. 9, declares the purpose of this death and descent into Hades: "To this end Christ both *died* and rose and revived, that *He might be Lord both of the dead and living.*"

The purpose of Christ's descent into hades, therefore, seems to have been not only to complete man's atonement by dying and passing through death into eternal life and sovereignty, but also by triumphantly descending into the under world to take possession of the kingdom of the dead, and to proclaim, even

to the imprisoned spirits, the glorious completion of redemption as the justification of all God's providential dealings with them, and the logical complement of all His preparatory plans. This purpose of Christ's visit to Hades throws some light on that much criticised and much mysticised passage, which speaks of His preaching "to the spirits in prison."

Now, if it be true, and it is so stated in the Scriptures, that Christ died and descended into Hades, and if it be true also that Christ, at the very same time, entered and remained in Paradise—and it must be so, for He assured the penitent thief that on the very day of His death he would be with Him in Paradise ("being with Christ," and having communion with Him mainly constitutes Paradise)—then from these simple and truthful premises we must conclude that Hades is simply the *intermediate state* of all disembodied spirits, and that *Paradise* describes the happy condition of those who have intercourse with God, while *Gehenna* describes the unhappy condition of those whose badness and unbelief has separated them from God and all the good.

After Christ's descent into Hades, there seems to be quite a change in the terms used to describe the condition of the righteous in it.

The apparently darkest hour of earthly history was the brightest hour to the disembodied spirits of the redeemed in Hades, for on that memorable Friday evening, when Christ "bowed His head and gave up the ghost," or "dismissed His spirit," as it should be more accurately translated, that disembodied spirit entered Paradise or "Abraham's bosom," and irradiated it with the light of His presence. He came forth out of Hades holding in His conquering grasp the keys of death and Hades (Rev. i. 18), so that while He holds these symbols of lordship over death and the spirit world, His trusting followers need not fear death or the entering of the spirit world any more.

The Apostles in writing to their Churches caught up this idea, and so the current language of the Epistles refers to the death of believers in more joyous terms, such as: a departure "to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23); entering "an house not made

with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. v. 1); the attainment of a companionship with "the general assembly and Church of the firstborn which are written in heaven," where are "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23); to "sleep in Jesus," "to be absent from the body," and in the beautiful words of the Revised Version, "to be at home with God."

The fuller revelation of God's holy and loving nature shown by Christ's life and death, the certainty and glorified nature of the resurrection of all believers' bodies pledged in the resurrection of Christ, and the presence of Christ after His resurrection and ascension, with His glorified human form and remembered earthly experience, may in some measure account for these brighter views of Paradise.

Dr. Herman Cremer, known to the world by his standard work on New Testament Greek, in his recent interesting and ably written book, "Beyond the Grave," has placed entirely too much emphasis on this difference in the expressions used about Hades in the Gospels and the Epistles. He has deduced from it the conclusion that, so far as the condition of the good in Hades is concerned, there is a past, present and future. Regarding the past, he holds that until Christ's work of redemption was actually accomplished there was only *one place* for *all* the dead, Hades or Sheol, but the state of all the dead was not the same.

Hades was then to the righteous dead the vestibule of heaven, where they tarried in hope and rest for their promised redemption; and to the wicked dead it was the porch of hell, a place of suffering and despair.

He claims that the reference of good and bad alike in the Old Testament to sheol denotes an actual historical fact, and is not to be explained away by speaking of it merely as a mark of the imperfect knowledge of the Old Testament saints.

As to the *present*, he holds that when the redemption of Christ was historically accomplished, the gates of Hades were thrown open by Him to the waiting believers, and they followed their Lord into Paradise. Those who had no share in His redemption remained behind in Hades.

But the consummation has not yet been reached, for the righteous and wicked both await the full rewards and punishment consequent on the resurrection and judgment. The righteous meantime in happiness and the wicked in suffering.

As to the *future*, he claims that at the resurrection the righteous will pass out of the intermediate into the full blessedness and rewards of heaven, and the wicked who have rejected Christ will fall hopelessly into the condition of that second death, from which there is no deliverance.

While the main conclusions of Prof. Cremer are in harmony with Scripture and reason, yet a cautious student of the Old and New Testaments will see that he has exaggerated the differences between the conditions of the Old and New Testament saints immediately after death.

On this point, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, has very wisely said: "In the actual personal realization of salvation in Christ, and all that it involves in its fulness, believers resting in 'Abraham's bosom' must have come short in much of the measure of blessedness realized by Christians in what we call the intermediate state" now, but he strongly denies that death and Hades had special power over the Old Testament saints during the period before Christ's actual crucifixion.

The Old Testament saints in Hades were holy and happy with God, and derived great joy from looking forward to the coming of the Messiah, just as the saints still alive did, and especially to His entrance into the spirit world and brightening of it with His human presence.

While Dr. H. Cremer, Prof. C. N. Briggs, and a few others are right in calling attention, as we have done, to the brighter views of Paradise-Hades, given in the Epistles after the descent of Christ, I believe they are wrong in placing too much emphasis upon that fact, and supposing from it that there was, besides the difference in added blessedness, a great difference in place and surroundings made by Christ at His death.

All thought about the spirit world as a place, and all attempts to locate and describe it, must be purely imaginative, and seem to me to be unscriptural and unreasonable.

Following the language of Scripture and the promptings

of reason about unclothed and unlocalized spirits, I have throughout this essay, spoken of the spirit world as a state rather than a place. One interesting line of proof of the existence of an intermediate state is that furnished by the teaching of Scripture about death and resurrection. It teaches that death is a going out of the spirit from the body into a disembodied condition, and that the separated spirit does not inhabit another body till the resurrection, when it again becomes the eternal tenant of its glorified body.

Now, it is self-evident that if the soul exists in a disembodied condition from death to resurrection, there must be some kind of a transitional or middle state—call it by what name you please.

Because of the limitation of space, I have not pursued this line of evidence, but have chosen to dwell upon the meanings of the words used in the Scripture to describe the state after death, and the statements of those passages which teach us anything about the existence and nature of this state.

As to the general nature of Hades, I have only time and inclination to say a few words by way of caution. It is a thoroughly conscious existence, as distinguished from the dreamless sleep advocated by some writers. We have abundant evidence in dreams, and in some cases of suspended animation, etc., that the mind can act consciously when independent of matter, and the material brain is not the physical side of mind, but merely the keyboard of the soul. If the mind can act independently of matter, it will exist as a definite something after death, and that something must be somewhere, and will know it is something and somewhere, *i.e.*, it will be conscious.

Some Christian writers have expressed the sentiment that it would be a pleasant prospect after the wearying toils of an earthly life, to think of the soul taking a long rest in sleep till the judgment. This notion is, of course, derived from our weak bodily condition; and no active, useful, Christ-like soul could think of entering upon a lethargic sleep for a long period of time with any feelings of pleasure. Besides this healthy shrinking from sleepy inaction, there creeps over the

soul the terrible suspicion that perhaps after slumbering so long, the soul might sleep on forever and have no joyous awakening.

Let me express one more caution as to the nature of this middle state. It is a *fixed moral state*. It is not *final* as an abode for the righteous and wicked, but it is *fixed* so far as the *moral* character of its inhabitants. Probation closes at death, and there is no more hope of a radical transition from Gehenna-Hades to Paradise-Hades than there will be from the final hell to heaven.

The faintest hope of a moral change in Hades destroys the sincerity of God's warnings concerning the dangers of earthly rejections of salvation. The enjoyments and sufferings of Hades are consequential rather than judicial, and internal rather than external.

R. N. BURNS.

THE "PENSÉES" OF PASCAL, AND THEIR
THEOLOGY.

II.

THE lapse of centuries has proved how thoroughly divine and human this theory of Pascal's is—a bulwark against which the foam-crested billows of scepticism and dogmatism have harmlessly broken. It is a sanctuary for the soul midway between the dry, sapless dogmas of a scholastic theology and the reckless license of modern rationalism. It is an aspect of truth to which the Church of to-day would do well to give emphasis. "It is specially important for our age to hold it firmly, when, on the one hand, the pure province of religion is like to be sacrificed to a one-sided Intellectualism, which would swallow up everything; and, on the other, the distinction between a mere creed, however systematic and clearly expressed; and the essence of religious faith and life, threatens to be always placed more in the background."*

If Pascal's method had been followed by all modern

* Neander's Lectures on Pascal's "Thoughts."

defenders of Christianity, we should have been spared not a little poor logic, and it had not been so often stabbed in the house of its friends. The writer does not wish it to be understood that Pascal ignored the External Evidences; that would be to close our eyes to one-half of his book. What he really does is to emphasize the fact that the self-evidencing power of Christianity is to the soul that receives it its highest and best authentication—an authentication amounting, indeed, to a demonstration. Coleridge has precisely and pertinently put Pascal's position when he says: "If you wish to be assured of the truth of Christianity, try it." That is the only way in which it can be satisfactorily demonstrated. The most elaborate arguments, sustained by the most faultless logic, fail to do what this trust of the heart does for the man who rests his soul on Christ. Christianity is not a mere system of doctrine, but a life; and, therefore, it cannot be measured by logic. Its truths are apprehensible only to a soul that is anxious to live by them. Is it not declared in the infallible Record, and in various forms, that "the carnal mind cannot discern spiritual things?" The desire of its friends to prove Christianity to godless men is at once a blunder and an impossibility. "This is to put the main point, the attractive action of God Himself, out of the question. If the end of God be what we hold it to be, to bring human souls to Himself, then the means He actually employs must be living and spiritual. They are likely to be infinitely various and subtle, but they will deal principally with the conscience and the affections. God is likely—nay, is certain—to manifest Himself more and more in proportion to faith and love. Christian appeals belong naturally to a region that may be called mystical, or may be otherwise described as personal and spiritual. The experience of the inner life, rightly understood and tested, is the best evidence that can be adduced. Words which one man can say out of his own heart may strongly move another man. If we will not acknowledge evidence of this kind, the evidence does not perish or lose its power, but we are simply remaining on the outside of the question."*

* Preface to Sermons on "The Gospel and Modern Life," by J. L. Davies.

In maintaining his position, Pascal may have spoken somewhat contemptuously of logic and of reason; but the writer is persuaded that this is more in appearance than in reality. However this may be, the influence of his "Thoughts" has been to show that a man may know a great many things which he cannot prove by logic; or, in the more accurate words of Dr. W. L. Alexander, "The sphere of knowledge is wider than that of conception or reasoning; and that consequently to receive truths which faith embraces, though they transcend reason, is not, as some have insinuated, to abrogate the dignity of our intellectual nature, but rather to rise to its highest and serenest sphere."* Principal Shairp has also well said that, "When once awakened, the spiritual faculty far outgoes all systems, scientific, philosophic and theological, and lives by truths which these cannot reduce to system." †

It is not the human heart, as it is independently of divine grace, however, of which Pascal speaks, but of the heart humbled and made docile; and this not of itself, but by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as the Administrator of redemption. He says: "There are three means of believing—reason, custom and inspiration. The Christian religion, which alone has reason, does not admit as its true children those who believe without inspiration; not that it excludes reason and custom; on the contrary, it is necessary to open the mind to proofs, and confirm ourselves therein by custom; but offer ourselves by humiliations to inspirations which alone can give the true and salutary effect." ‡ "Be not astonished to see simple persons believe without reasoning. . . . One will never believe with a useful belief and faith, if God does not incline the heart; and one will believe as soon as He shall incline it." § These words are pregnant, indeed, for they "announce the advent, proclaim the authority, and measure the empire of the Holy Ghost. Christianity considered as existing in man is the testimony, the reign of the Holy Spirit. The divine and the human meet here in a glorious and ineffable unity." ||

* Papers on "Pascal and the Influence of his Writings." † "Culture and Religion," p. 54. ‡ "Thoughts," p. 368. § *Ibid.*, p. 279. || "Studies on Pascal," by Vinet, p. 161.

This keen spiritual insight, this mighty mastery of the human heart, is to us the chief merit of Pascal's work. The profundity of the "Thoughts" is great, but their practical value is immeasurable. No truth of religion is of any practical advantage to the soul until the heart has grasped it; in other words, until it has become a personal experience. Intellectually apprehended religious truth is only another burden laid on the memory; to be of advantage it must be transmitted into the life. To become real it must live in us, or rather, we must live by it. The vital distinction between a religious truth to which the reason assents and one upon which the heart reposes, lies just here; the former is a theory, the latter is a fact. To illustrate, take the divinity of Christ: "If we are content to believe that Christ is God, without possessing Him as such, we have only the one formula more in the mind, without our moral being having gained anything thereby. The truth remains external to us; and in the matters of religion no external truths are possessed, or really known. In order that we may possess, or even know a truth, it must be one with us; without this we may have the name to know it, but yet we know it not."*

It is only when thus received that the divine truths of Christianity substantiate and expound themselves. Unless the human soul comes to this, there will come times in its history when doubt will feed and fatten on its very life. A soul with a mere intellectual faith in the Gospel is like a vessel at sea without a rudder or chart; it is completely at the mercy of the winds and waves; it may, at any moment, be dashed on the jagged rocks of scepticism, or whelmed in the depths of superstition.

It is just here that the tendency of modern culture comes into conflict with the genius of Christianity. Its ideal is, in many respects, admirable, but one-sided. It is mainly a culture of the intellect, ignoring or neglecting the heart; and this is only what might be expected, when we remember that in many quarters culture prides itself on being superior to Christianity, and aims to supplant it. Not until culture and religion are

* "Outlines of Theology," Vinet, p. 53.

united, and the former draws its inspiration from the latter, can it do ought else but develop one side of human nature, and that by no means the highest. The heart, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, discovers a whole universe of truth, over which the mere reason has never been permitted to range; yea, to which of itself it were impossible for it to rise; a universe of truth as far removed from the cold speculations of philosophy or the rigid formulas of our theological system builders, as it is from the poisonous miasma which reeks in the hot-beds of superstition; a universe of truth which is of supremest importance to the soul, the breath of its life, and certified to it as it never could be by the reason. "The inward witness to the truth lodged in our hearts is a match for the most learned infidel or sceptic that ever lived. In spiritual things, the most acute of reasoners and most profound of thinkers, the most instructed in earthly knowledge, is nothing unless he has also within him the presence of the Spirit of truth. Human knowledge, though of great power when joined to a pure and humble faith, is of no power when opposed to it."*

It is this faith of the heart which brings the Gospel, as a practical and saving power, into the possession of all who exercise it. If salvation depended upon accurate logical processes, or upon clear-cut definitions, its conditions would exclude the majority of mankind from a share in its benedictions. Most men have neither the intellectual training, nor the leisure needful to grasp Christianity as a system, even if it can be so grasped at all; and if the accidents of their earthly circumstances shut out the greater portion of mankind from the advantages Christianity affords, this, of itself, would invalidate its claim to be of God. Infinite love has not made salvation a matter of syllogisms, but of the heart. The disciples of modern Phenomenalism, with Auguste Comte for their high-priest, may pity the ignorance or smile at the credulity that can write thus; but as we sit at the foot of the cross, and gaze with the eye of the heart at Him who was crucified thereon, we feel in our own consciousness that Christ is at once the wisdom of

* Newman's "Grammar of Assent."

God, and the power of God. Doubtless this may be all foolishness in the world's estimate; but, then, the wisdom of God is broader than that of men, and infinitely more kind; and nowhere does that wisdom shine more brightly or beneficently than when it declares that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness."* Principal Shairp was right when he said, "It is not the critic's eye but the child's heart that most truly discerns the countenance which looks out from the pages of the Gospel."†

In the light of what has been written above, some of our readers may ask: "Was not Pascal a Roman Catholic? and if so, how can his position be reconciled with the fundamental teachings of Rome on the authority of the Church?" Though a devout member of the Church of Rome, and in some respects a Roman of the Romanists, Pascal was at the core a Protestant. Rome starts out from the authority of the Church, Pascal from the authority of the Holy Ghost; two lines which point in opposite directions, and which can never join. What Protestant ever wrote anything more thoroughly Protestant than this: "So far from the having heard a thing said being the rule of your belief, you ought to believe nothing without putting yourself in the condition as if you had never heard it. It is the consent of yourself to yourself, and the constant voice of your reason, and not of others, that ought to make you believe."‡ However Pascal may have submitted to the superstitious injunctions of the Church in his own life, they exerted but little influence upon the higher realm of his thought. No man who submitted to the absolute authority of the Church could have written the celebrated "Provincial Letters." No man whose soul had not drunk deeply, immediately and independently at the fountain of truth contained in the Holy Scriptures, could have penned the "Thoughts." Pascal's pivot thought pushed to its legitimate logical consequences would annihilate Romanism. A truth once authenticated to the heart by the Holy Ghost neither needs, nor will it tolerate, the interference of an external authority. To humble the worship-

* Romans x. 10. † "Culture and Religion," p. 64. ‡ "Thoughts," p. 397.

per of reason Pascal shows that the heart is the faculty by which man perceives spiritual truth; to check the advocates of superstition from blinding the eye of reason and annihilating the will by setting up the authority of the Church, he puts forward the authority of the Holy Ghost. The "Provincial Letters" had, by decree of Rome, been burned on the 23rd of September, 1660. Pascal's allusion to this event in his "Thoughts," places his position before us clearly: "If my letters are condemned at Rome, what I condemn in them is condemned in heaven; *Ad tuum, Domine Jesu, tribunal appello*—To Thy tribunal, Lord Jesus, I make my appeal. . . It is better to obey God than man. I fear nothing, I hope for nothing."* Dreydorff states the whole truth when he says: "Pascal saw and lamented that he was in a strait between God and the Pope; he never appears to have felt himself in a strait between God and the Church."† If then, as has been said, in the eyes of Rome, "Submission to authority becomes the whole of religion, the necessity of authority all its philosophy; the demonstration of authority all its theology;"‡ then assuredly Pascal was no Romanist. The writer is aware that it is just here that the Romanist bases what seems to be his strongest argument against Protestantism. Pointing to the diversities among Protestants, he triumphantly exclaims: "All these men cannot be guided by the Holy Ghost." To which we reply, these diversities have to do with the accidents and external manifestations of Christianity rather than with the essentials of its life. Pointing the spent arrow back, we in our turn inquire: Has the system of authority in the Church of Rome begotten uniformity? The history of Pascal and of Port Royal is an answer sufficient to that. Such an authority as that taught by Rome is necessarily the enemy of freedom. Such a uniformity as that at which she aims is always purchased by the stagnation of the soul. The unity inculcated in Scripture is attainable only where diversity is possible. In our revolt from Rome, however, this question has sometimes been pushed to such an extent that it has become a

*"Thoughts," p. 379. †Review Article on Pascal. ‡"Outlines of Theology," Vinet, p. 194.

dangerous error. Even in Christianity there are facts to be believed on the testimony of competent witnesses. Satisfied of the competency of the witnesses, the individual has no choice in regard to the testimony but at his own peril. Beyond this, however, faith on authority is slavery to the soul, a sacrifice of individuality as well as of will. We imagine Pascal reached higher ground than the sect to which he belonged by his adoption of the introversive method of dealing with the truths of the Christian religion. As already intimated, his system was dug out of his own human heart enlightened by the word of God, and human nature is wider than any sect, Christianity than any church or creed. Indeed, Pascal was a fine illustration of Luther's favorite maxim, "*Pectus, theologum facit*"—"It is the bosom that makes the theologian." In a sense broader and higher than that of the great German Reformer, Pascal's was a theology of the heart. His genius perceived the congruity of Christianity to the needs of the human soul; he had tried it on his own life, and found it adequate to touch his inmost nature at every point, adequate to satisfy his profoundest needs and longings. This explains the bold earnestness, and the warm life of his "Thoughts," as well as the freedom with which he leaps over the doctrinal restraints of the Church of which he was a member.

It is worthy of remark that notwithstanding Pascal's Jansenism, and all the influence it exerted upon him, he has done equal honor to the Divine Sovereignty and to the freedom of the human will. His ardent admiration of the Augustinian theory of predestination and grace betrayed him into the utterance of many things we can but regard as essentially erroneous; but even these are not the necessary conclusions of his theory, only the accidents of his associations. "The fundamental principle of the "Thoughts" . . . when freed from the accidental combination in which they have been thus placed by Pascal, only present themselves more pure, clear and fruitful."* Here is what he says: "Religion is a thing so great that it is just that those who would not take the pains to seek it, if it is obscure, should be deprived of it. What do they

* Neander's "Lectures on Pascal."

complain of, then, if it is such that they could find it by seeking it?"* "There is light enough for those who desire only to see God, and obscurity enough for those who have a contrary disposition. There is sufficient light to enlighten the elect, and sufficient obscurity to humiliate them. There is sufficient obscurity to blind the reprobate, and sufficient light to condemn them, and render them inexcusable."† From these quotations, it is evident that Pascal regarded the will as the instrument by which the soul comes to know and enjoy God; and that it is, in a very important sense, the arbiter of human destiny. The only objection we would make is to the introduction of the terms "elect," and "reprobate" in their Augustinian import. Make his statement universal instead of particular, and it would satisfy the stoutest defender of Arminius. Pascal's thought is essentially Arminian; his mode of expressing it, Calvinistic.

One of the chief objections to the theology of the "Thoughts" is its sadness. Voltaire said: "This sublime misanthrope writes against human nature almost as he writes against the Jesuits."‡ The tastes of a poor fallen human heart, still in rebellion against God, are poor criteria by which to judge what theology is to be; and it is from this source that this objection comes. Pascal did speak strongly of the weakness and misery of human nature, and why should he not? Is man not equally helpless and sad? "In view of eternity and of the awful issues involved in religion, the common life and pursuits of man seemed to Pascal not only frivolous, but criminal. . . . But this is only the temporary mood of the profound moralist touched to his heart by the pangs that he cannot resist. His true view of life is never cynical, but always grave, if bitter, and hopeful, if stern."§ When a man understands himself, or the statements of Scripture in reference to his condition, he will not be likely to find fault with Pascal's perspective or coloring of that condition in his "Thoughts." He has expressed himself according to the habits of his own mind, but his thought runs parallel with that of the apostles and of Christ.

* "Thoughts," pp. 355, 356. † *Ibid.*, p. 328. ‡ See Tulloch's "Pascal." § Tulloch's "Pascal," p. 191.

It is, however, hardly fair to lay emphasis on this aspect of the "Thoughts," for assuredly they have another and a brighter. Whatever else he was, Pascal was not a misanthrope. True, he wrote from "the edge of an abyss," as Voltaire says; but it was "the abyss of life and pain and death, the abyss of sin and ignorance and error, the abyss of redemption and God's love;"* and it was not less the latter than the former. From all that pained, perplexed or saddened him in the contemplation of life, Pascal found refuge in Christianity. Christ was to Pascal at once a solution of all the enigmas of life, and a reconcement of its "contrarities," both of which had rent his soul with anguish. "Thus I extend my arms to my Liberator, who, having been foretold for four thousand years, came to suffer and die for me on the earth, at the time and with all the circumstances which had been predicted; and by His grace I await death in peace, in the hope of being externally united to Him; and I live, nevertheless, with joy, either in the blessings which it may please Him to give me, or in the ills which He may send me for my good, and that He has taught me to endure by His example."† Mark these words as the expression of Pascal's own experience of life and of Christianity, and say whether he was indeed a hater of mankind.

Further, they understand little of the methods of Christianity who have not learned that the way to a pure spiritual joy is by the way of a corresponding grief. Vinet, in one of those dashes of light and warmth for which his writings are so remarkable, grandly says that "Christian happiness, taken in its essence, is not without melancholy; and that, born in a sublime sadness, it loves to return to its origin."‡ The Redeemer's pathway to the throne was through the agony of the garden and the tortures of the cross; and the pathway of His followers to the sublime heights of satisfaction and bliss lies through the deep vales of humiliation and sorrow. Pascal had travelled this way until he had reached the rest and joy of a soul in daily fellowship with God. This age loves a Christianity

* Dean Church's "Companions for the Devout Life." Lecture II., "The Perils of Blaise Pascal."

† "Thoughts," p. 296. ‡ "Studies on Pascal," p. 174.

made easy, and is content with the superficiality which grows out of it. This sort of thing makes babies, not men like Pascal. His excessive and mistaken asceticism, no doubt, robbed his life of some of the sunshine which Christ brings into every soul that receives Him; but, after all, Pascal was at heart a contented and happy man. Cousin charges Pascal with not being at rest with Christianity; calls his faith "unquiet and unhappy;"* but the assertion of one even so great a man as Victor Cousin, is not proof; and we hesitate not to affirm that the penetrating mind of the great eclectic philosopher could not substantiate his assertion from either the life or writings of Pascal. If his faith was "almost as lamentable as the evil which it professes to cure,"† it is certain he neither found it to be an evil nor found anything in it to lament, and of this he alone was the competent and final judge.

We have thus rapidly scanned some points in the theology of this unique and wonderful production. No book has ever fallen into our hands that has been so suggestive and helpful. We most earnestly commend it to the rising ministry^c and careful study. They will find much in it from which they will and ought to dissent; but there are also mines of wealth, such as we have found in no other uninspired book—mines that only need to be worked to enrich the toiler therein with priceless treasure for his own heart, and the souls to whom he ministers.

WILLIAM JACKSON.

* Essay on "The Thoughts of Pascal." † Cousin's Essay on "The Thoughts of Pascal."

MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

III.

DAVID commences the Psalm by devoutly entreating God that He might preserve him, as his entire trust is in Him alone. The natural result of his love to God is, that he finds also a delight in the communion with His saints, while he utterly abhors the apostates and their idolatrous practices (verse 1-4). The Psalmist then thankfully acknowledges the manifold mercies the Lord has bestowed on him, "The * lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage" (verse 6). These mercies, however, were not confined to the giving of earthly possessions, but also having counselled him in the way he should walk. For this he offers his heartfelt thanks, "I will bless the Lord who hath given me counsel" (verse 7). The Psalmist then declares that he has always put his entire trust in the Lord, "I have set the Lord always before me" (verse 8), as much as to say, I have the Lord continually before my eyes, and look upon Him as my protector. This implied confidence in the Lord affords him unbounded joy, "Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory † rejoiceth: my flesh also shall dwell in safety" (v. 9).

But it is not merely the worldly prosperity that engrosses the Psalmist's mind, but by faith that God would fulfil His promises "that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne," he is led to employ language prophetic of the resurrection of Christ, "Neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One

* "The lines," it is *the measuring lines* here metaphorically used for *the parts measured by lines*. So again Josh. xviii. 5, "and there fell ten lines (*i.e.*, parts) to Manasseh."

† My glory, *i.e.*, my soul, man's spiritual nature, which is his true glory. The Hebrew word *cabhd*, *i.e.*, glory, is often used in the poetical writings of the Old Testament, in parallelism with *lebh*, *i.e.*, heart, it then denotes the noblest part of man, *the soul*. Compare also Gen. xlix. 6; Psalm vii. 6. We have thus in the verse the three principal constituent parts of the body, the flesh, standing for the whole external part of the body, and three together represent the whole man. In this sense it seems to be used sometimes also, when not standing in parallel with *lebh*, heart; as Psalm lvii. 8, "Awake, my glory," *i.e.*, Awake, or rouse up my soul.

to see corruption." We say language prophetic of the resurrection of Christ, for if the Hebrew word *shachath* is correctly rendered by "corruption"—and it is so rendered in all the ancient versions, except perhaps in the Targum (Chaldee Version), where the rendering is somewhat doubtful—then the Psalmist could not possibly have spoken of himself in the passage, and any attempt on the part of commentators to apply it to him must absolutely prove abortive. This our adverse critics are fully aware of, and there remains, therefore, no other way for them to strip the passage of its Messianic character, than by denying the correctness of the rendering "corruption," and accordingly force the meaning "pit" upon the Hebrew word, which makes the passage read, "Thou wilt not suffer Thine Holy One to see the pit." This rendering is adopted by Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld, and others of the same school, and even by Delitzsch. But as the rendering "pit" would, after all, not make the passage applicable to David, for surely it cannot be said that David did not go down to the grave, our critics are obliged to explain the word "pit" to be here metaphorically employed to denote *great danger*, that is, "*Thou wilt not suffer thy godly One to experience great or mortal danger.*" Delitzsch renders the passage: "Nor give up Thy godly one to see the pit," and then explains, "It is, therefore, the hope of not dying, or even if dying, still not really to die, that David expresses in v. 10. For by *chasidecha* (i.e. Thy holy one), David means himself." ("Com. on the Psalms," p. 205.) We confess our inability to reconcile Delitzsch's explanation with his rendering of the passage. Perhaps the reader may be more successful.

The strained interpretations that must be resorted to by those who render the Hebrew word *shachath* by "pit," shows in itself how unsuitable that rendering is.

Besides this, in order to obtain the meaning "pit," the noun *shachath*, "corruption," must be derived from the imperfect verb *shuach*, to sink or go down, for which there is no authority, since it can be more directly derived from the verb *shuchath*,* to

* Although both the noun and verb in the two Hebrew words, in expressing them in English, appear to have the same form, in the original, however, the noun slightly differs in the vowel points from the verb for distinction sake.

corrupt. All the translators of the Ancient Versions have so derived it, and so have the translators of the Authorized Version; Luther; Rabbi Solomon Hakkohen, who translated in his German Jewish Version; the noun *shachath*, by Verwesung, *i.e.*, corruption. It is also so derived by a host of well-known interpreters, and among them, Dr. Kay, Klaus, Moll, Briggs, Bonar, Orelli, and Dr. Pusey, who remarks: "The xvi. Psalm speaks yet more of the body, since it is a prophecy of the resurrection of the undecayed body of Jesus. It expresses a certain future, which every child of Adam knows, could not be directly fulfilled in himself. He of whom he speaks was to see the grave, but He was not to abide in it." ("Com. on Daniel," pp. 504, 505.) Even Gesenius admits the meaning "destruction" of the noun *shachath* in Job. xxxiii. 18, 20, 30, as derived from the verb *shachath*, to destroy, to corrupt. (See his "Thesaurus," p. 1378.) Winer also admits that there is a noun *shachath*, denoting "corruption," derived from the verb *shachath* to corrupt, besides the one derived from *shuach*, to sink down.

But besides what we have already advanced in support of the Messianic application of our passage, we have further, the direct authority of the Apostles Peter and Paul for such an application. In Acts ii. 25-31, St. Peter, in his first sermon after the out-pouring of the spirit on the day of Pentecost, quotes verses 8-11 of the Psalm, and then goes on to show that the Psalmist could not have spoken of himself, but that his language was prophetic of the resurrection of the promised Messiah, and had his fulfilment in the resurrection of Christ. "Brethren, I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God hath sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins He would set *one* upon His throne: he, foreseeing *this*, spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was He left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption. This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses." Surely this language of the apostle cannot be construed to be merely a "quotation," it is a plain and distinct application.

And it must be borne in mind, also, that this address of Peter

was not delivered in an obscure place of the country, and to an assembly of ignorant people, but in Jerusalem, the seat of the most famous schools of learning, at the head of which stood the school of Gamaliel. In the teaching of all the schools, the Hebrew Scriptures were made the basis of their instruction, as the fountain of all wisdom, special attention being paid to the elucidation of passages referring to the coming of the promised Messiah. The ancient Hebrews were, therefore, well versed in Old Testament interpretation, yet, in that vast assembly who heard St. Peter's address, not a single person stood up to dispute the apostle's interpretation and application of the Psalmist's language, but on the contrary, as the sacred record informs us, there were converted that day "about three thousand souls." Surely, the conversion of such a large number in one day clearly indicates that the minds of these Hebrews were in perfect accord with the apostle, as regards the meaning of the Psalmist's prophecy, and that it required only that they should become convinced that it had its fulfilment in the resurrection of Christ.

St. Paul, too, in his discourse in the synagogue at Antioch, quotes the Psalm to prove the resurrection of Christ. (Acts xiii. 34-37.) Now, St. Paul, in using the Hebrew word *shachath*, in the sense of "corruption" in the presence of a Jewish congregation, must have known that that was the accepted meaning of the word among the ancient Hebrews, otherwise he would never have attempted to use it in that sense. He would only have laid himself open to the charge of ignorance, as not knowing his vernacular language. But Paul, apart from being inspired, was highly educated. From his earliest youth he was instructed in Biblical learning, being probably destined to become a Rabbi. At the age of fourteen he was sent to Jerusalem, where he entered the famous school of Gamaliel, and highly distinguished himself in Biblical and Rabbinical lore.

Some of the later Jewish Rabbis have founded the belief that David's body was not permitted to decay, upon the words, "Neither wilt Thou permit Thine Holy One to see corruption." (See Rab. Isaac, in "Midrash Tehillim," i.e., "Com. on the Psalms.") As extravagant as this belief is, it nevertheless shows that they considered "corruption" the proper rendering.

It is indeed surprising that, in the face of such authorities as those we have adduced, we should yet find so many of our modern interpreters persisting in rendering "pit" instead of corruption. If, indeed, there existed any philological difficulty in adopting the latter rendering, some allowance might be made, but there exists no such difficulty. Every Hebrew scholar will admit that the verb *shachath*, to destroy, to corrupt, is of common use in the language, and that from it, the noun *shachath* corruption, may readily be derived. But, says Gesenius, in his abridged Hebrew Lexicon, p. 1053: "It would be difficult to show that *shachath* has this sense (corruption) in any single passage, as derived from the root *shachath*" (*i.e.*, to destroy, to corrupt). But Gesenius had evidently forgotten that he himself had admitted in his larger "Lexicon" Thesaurus, p. 1378, that in Job xxxiii. 18, 22, 30, it has the meaning "destruction." We shall hereafter have occasion to show that his memory failed him in other instances of a similar kind. Then there is the passage in Job. xvii. 14.

"I have said to (*shachath*) corruption, Thou art my father,
To the worm, *Thou art* my mother, and sister."

Here we have "corruption" and "the worm" as parallel terms, and to substitute "pit" or any other word, would completely destroy the parallelism.

But even supposing that the word were nowhere else used in the Hebrew Scriptures in the sense of "corruption," would any Hebrew scholar tell us that it is a substantial argument against it being so used in the Psalm? Certainly not. There are quite a number of words which occur only once in the Old Testament, and no one disputes their meaning on that account.

We have dwelt on this subject at some length, both on account of its importance in the chain of Messianic prophecy, and the determined adverse interpretations it has been subjected to by so many of our modern expositors. We feel that in a discussion involving the momentous question as to the correctness of an inspired writer's teaching, too much cannot be said in its defence, even at the risk of tiring the reader's patience.

J. M. HIRSCHFELDER.

Editors' Council Table.

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

BY CHRISTIAN Socialism I understand any social system connected with Christianity. It may mean, (1) The social laws and usages which prevailed in Christ's day, so far as He recognized or countenanced them; or, (2) The system that has existed where Christianity has prevailed in past ages; or, (3) The particular doctrines concerning the social fabric which are at the present time most generally recognized in Christian lands. This is, no doubt, the meaning attached to the words Christian Socialism by those who think that the best way to right wrongs is to abuse the Church, as if it were wholly responsible for every evil that exists, and as though it could bring immediate relief if it would, but it won't. Or, (4) Christian Socialism may mean the socialism which the principles of Christianity are capable of developing in the future, when, in obedience to ethical science, things shall have become in all respects what they ought to be.

Now any one of these lines would afford abundant ground for discussion in a single paper, and yet something from each will necessarily crowd upon our thought. And even more, for, though nothing can be clearer than that Christian Socialism does not mean the Socialism of the Mosaic Law, yet it is difficult to discuss any social problem without some reference to that law.

Especially, when any question affecting the tenure of land comes up, Moses is quoted as conclusive authority. It is probable that less weight would be attached to the land regulations of Moses in their bearing upon social questions to-day, if

men would remember that Moses actually adopted, for the distribution of the land among the chosen people, the only system of land distribution then practised in the world. Briefly stated, it was this. A conquering people were recognized as the rightful owners of all conquered lands (the same principle which governed William the Conqueror), these lands were then divided up among the tribes, and the tribal authorities distributed them among the families. Under this system the allotments to the families were frequently changed. In Germany, at a later day, and among many other nations of an earlier period, the change was as frequent as once a year. Warlike peoples did not desire the individual to form any strong attachments to a particular locality, or the family to be too comfortably housed, which would have proved unfavorable to instant readiness for the field of battle, hence constant change in the family allotments. The tribal possession of the land yet survives in the village communities of India and some of the less civilized parts of Russia, where we may still study the primitive, patriarchal system of land tenure pretty nearly as it existed thousands of years before Christ's time. The law of Moses moved forward toward a more peaceful condition of the people, and in doing so it approached more nearly to a permanent possession of the soil by individuals, than the general practice of mankind at the time had gone. He gave the family a rightful claim to its allotment of land forever, with power of sale for only fifty years—say the life of one man.

The system adopted by Moses was the same as that now known as entail, and largely practised in Europe, under which the heir secures only the use of the land during his natural life, but cannot alienate it from his descendants. In modern times this system has been favorable to the accumulation of vast estates in one family, but this was guarded against in the law of Moses by the provisions of the jubilee year, when all the land reverted to the original owner. In this way small estates were forever secured to the family originally holding them.

That men should turn to the system adopted by Moses to prove that private ownership of the soil, with power to transmit it forever, is a crying wrong, is one of the curious things in

literature. Why, the fact is that his legislation led the world in recognizing private claims to the land. But not only in the field immediately under the operation of the Mosaic law, but far beyond it, the primitive ideas of mankind on the subject of land tenure had undergone a great change before the birth of Christ. This was inevitable with the growth of the human race.

When a tribe had become so numerous that the tribal possessions would admit of no further divisions, one of two courses was open. Either the tribe could divide, and a swarm of its younger people go out and find, or conquer, a new territory for their habitations; or, a part of the people of the tribe could cease to derive their living from the soil, and devote themselves to mechanical pursuits. Both of these methods of relieving the soil of the burden of the congested population were followed at different times and places. Until quite recently the Russian communities relieved themselves when too numerous by the swarming out of a portion of the tribe. But the latter mode of relief—that is, the devotion of a part of the tribe to mechanical pursuits—was the more general, and we perceive at a glance that this would introduce the idea of private, instead of public, ownership of the soil, for those who no longer derived their support from the soil would soon cease to be regarded as having any claim upon it, and the agricultural portion of the tribe would be the recognized owners of the land. And when once this idea was admitted its influence grew rapidly, so that when Christianity inherited the earth the Roman Empire was largely owned by a few, whose vast estates made them lords of the land, and capable instruments of tyranny, and of the worst abuses, in which Pliny found a potent cause hastening the downfall of the Empire. It seems to be, therefore, clear that private ownership of land was the dominant idea of mankind on this subject in Christ's day.

I do not know just how generally the system of the jubilee year was ever observed among the Jews, but it is as good as certain that it had not in any degree survived the captivity of the two kingdoms, and the importation of foreign peoples to occupy their lands, so that where Christ was born and lived, as

well as in Rome, men recognized the rights of individuals to the soil, and the power to sell it in perpetuity.

The case of Ananias indicates private possession of land. Jesus, a Levite—and it is the more noticeable because he was a Levite—also had land over which he had a recognized right to sell, and enjoy the proceeds of the sale, and, therefore, another could buy his title, and hold the land, as a righteous possession. I do not remember that Jesus ever denounced this state of things; but He did not, like Confucius, constitute Himself a social and political reformer, except so far as the leaven of true moral sentiments must work reform in every particular. Not assuming the role of a reformer of social abuses, it is not remarkable that He made it no part of His work to commend this system of land tenure, if right, nor to denounce it, if wrong. When the young man complained to Him that his brother would not divide the inheritance, which may, or may not, have consisted partly or wholly in land, He taught an impressive spiritual truth, but He said nothing for or against the recognized laws of inheritance, because that lay outside His chosen path.

The tribute to Rome was an oppressive burden. Organized opposition to it was not uncommon. Judas, the Gaulonite, organized and led a party whose avowed object was to refuse the payment of this tribute. Every Jew hated it, but Jesus said, pay it. I cannot think He taught thus because He meant men to believe that it was in harmony with the eternal principles of righteousness. I think the common sense of mankind would at once reject any such notion, because the human soul thunders its applause of the great Pitt's memorable words, "Millions for defence, but not one cent for tribute." The truth which Jesus taught made a Pitt possible, and advanced him to better social ideas than some which Jesus must have seen in operation in His day, and did not condemn, but which His soul must have loathed; but He found them living, and He said in substance, let them live for the present, I will take the longer, but, at the same time, the surer way for their destruction. And all this because He was not acting the part of a social reformer. His mission was not to give a text-book on a higher socialism. Hence I think the social system which Jesus lived with and

recognized was simply that which had been growing up with the ages.

After His ascension, we find for a time that the Church practised a community of goods. It was not compulsory upon any, but, by common consent, it was adopted for the relief of the present necessities. It is doubtful if it extended with the growth of Christianity, because we find Paul taking collections for the relief of the poor saints, and urging, not as a universally recognized practice that every convert surrender all, but simply what we urge now, that every one give as God had prospered him. I think it safe to assume that he saw then what we find to-day, that different Christians in giving to the common cause, estimated the degree of their prosperity by very different standards. The record seems to me to indicate that this community of goods was only a very temporary provision, expressing rather the love and confidence of a few, situated conveniently near to each other, than being the practice of an extended community, or a law for all mankind; but I do not pause for any contention on this point with those who think that it was a typical state of society to which we are to expect that the whole world will come, when, in due time, as we all confidently believe, the principles taught by Christ will, in all things, prevail without contradiction over all the broad earth.

The socialism of subsequent ages is pretty well indicated in the two words status and wages. Woman's relation to the social fabric has always been controlled by her status. It has uniformly pleased her brothers to believe her essentially inferior to themselves. There has been improvement in her outward circumstances. Once she did the slavery of the household, and even of the field, as among savages to-day. She prepared the food, and then, after her lords had gorged themselves with the flesh, she, for her portion, scraped the bones. Then she was further advanced to serve at the table, standing meekly behind her lordly masters; and the movement upward has continued, until now at table she is served first and with the best. But here gallantry stops, for Christianity has not yet lifted her above an inferior status. Neither in Church nor State is she freed from the disabilities thereof. It is undeniable

that some women have great strength of body and great organizing abilities, and are capable of being efficient leaders and legislators. Such women have led armies, founded religions, and manipulated, with commanding success, the most gigantic humbugs and frauds; as for example, the founder and high-priestess of Christian Science, and she also who led the Theosophical Society. It is nothing that comparatively few men have equal capacity for labor and leadership with these women, it still remains to most Christians of both sexes a satisfactory answer to any plea for woman's complete emancipation, that women are weak, as, in truth, most men are; that very few have the originating faculty essential to legislation and leadership; and, therefore, the few women whom nature has made great, may not use their wisdom in the slightest degree in ruling the earth, because her status does not admit of any such thing. That is a dignity reserved exclusively for the very few men whose strength and capacity qualify them for such duties. Status in womanhood yet lingers also in the fact that she is not allowed the same consideration in market and fame as man, for the same work, when done as well as a man does it, for she is only a woman. That is her status.

But, through most of the Christian centuries, man's, as well as woman's, relation to society was regulated by status. He was a noble, or a freeman, or a slave, or a serf. The serf was sold with the soil, like the trees and ditches, the slave was sold off the land like a mere chattel to be carried in a carpet-bag, or tied up in a bundle and removed in a cart, like lambs and calves carried to the butcher's place of slaughter, or driven away in droves like unconscious cattle. These must do all the toil, create all the wealth, and sleep in the cold, and live on insufficient food, because it belonged to their status. God made them so. So the holy bishops believed, and taught them to be content in that condition of life in which Providence had placed them. And contentment meant that they were never to think of rising out of their miserable condition. To try to do so would be discontent and rebellion against the order of Divine Providence. This state of things has only just now gone out of the door. So near are they to us that at our very feet fall the

retreating shadows of the men who, with voice and pen, and even the sword, broke the enslaving bonds of status and taught the human soul the meaning of individual liberty and equality before the law. The long ages of feudal bondage, in one form or another, are the book of the history of status as the sole regulator of social rights.

When once the idea that men were equal to each other, in respect to all natural rights, found access to the human mind, so that one human being could not constrain another to serve him because God made him inferior, then the relations between the receiver and the giver of service could be regulated only by wages, actual payment, not in part and in kind, as formerly, but in whole and in cash.

But the nature of men remains the same, and employers are willing to take advantage of their superior position, and to grow rich by withholding for themselves a part of what each man working for wages has earned, so that the laborer has the status of a free man, equal to every other, yet the competition for wages is so great that oftentimes his condition is little better than slavery. The accepted business maxim that men increase wealth by the employment of other men, reveals that the habit and expectation of the employer of labor is to take for himself toll from what each man has earned. This is no better than fraud, unless the employer has created the labor.

But a fact altogether in favor of the laborer is that with competition has come in discussion, and the boundless field of political economy has been opened. When status regulated everything no discussion was admissible, even if there had been any available methods of carrying it on. But the competition of individuals, all civilly equal to each other, has set the commonest kind of mortals to thinking upon their own condition and their rights in relation to others, and the last half century has sent up against the echoing sky more strong and confident language on the rights of womanhood, and of the working-men, and on the proper distribution of earth's bounty, and has evolved more of the principles of natural justice than all the preceding ages put together, if we except the actual teaching of our Lord and His apostles. I do not think that there can be

any doubt that the result is a wonderful improvement in the condition of every child born on the face of the earth to-day ; and a better result, one full of infinite promise, is that individuals advanced to great wealth and great power have discovered that they must think upon the condition of their brothers in every state of life, and all old notions must come out into the light, and either be dethroned in the presence of the witnessing stars, or prove their power to endure and their right to live in the fierce furnace-heat of thought and action among men who feel as well as toil.

What, as a result of all this thinking and heated discussion, Christian Socialism will become is not so easy to determine positively, as it is to write a book like "Looking Backward," of materials drawn wholly from the imagination. Many social theories show a reaction in favor of methods which the human family supposed that it had outgrown as evil, or at least as inadequate to the changed conditions of things. Of this kind is the disposition to look to the government as the depository and distributor of whatever value inheres in the soil. Ground rents belong to the public, it is said, and the government should receive them. This seems to point toward the old time despotism. While the nature of the creature known as man remains what it is now, the only safety lies in limiting, not in extending, the powers and resources of governments. Multiply them, and you must multiply departments sufficiently to cover all the avenues of distribution, and every department must have its head ; but men are so constituted that if a man, who to-day is driving a cart or wheelbarrow, should next week find himself at the head of some department under government, arranged for the equalization of the comforts of all the people—and I would gladly aid in putting the working-man there—yet, like the cock that alarmed Peter, he would be on the top rail of the highest fence before five o'clock the next morning, crowing over his wonderful success in life, and would spend half his time cutting out newspaper notices of his great rise in the world, to be preserved for the inspiration of his children ; and in six months' time every one of his family would be taught to inquire, whenever they should see a cart or wheelbarrow in the street,

"What is that there thing? I never saw such an affair before, I am sure.

With bureaucracy to begin with, the inevitable intermarriage among the families of the bureaucrats would soon develop a proud aristocracy, and then you await only the coming of some Napoleon, educated in a democratic Sunday-school, and the leader in all revolutionary proposals of the most radical debating society, who, posing as a tribune of the people, shall buy up all these aristocratic families by the offer of good positions under his government, and so pave his easy way to a crown and a despotism.

That this would follow the enlargement of the powers of governments is only a legitimate inference from every page of human history in the past. That the past would repeat itself should be no more difficult to believe than that woman, if enfranchised and freed from all disabilities, would sometimes, and as often perhaps as men, be selfish and tyrannical, and as capable of receiving bribes, and of selling truth and honor for gain and place and power, and yet am I in favor of the enfranchisement of women.

Before any very radical changes can come it seems to me that all proposals and plans must be fused in the crucible of clearer reasoning, and be whipped into shape by the lash of a greater accumulation of facts coherently braided together than have yet subjected themselves to our command.

A few axiomatic truths do stand out in bold relief from the mass of conflicting views as clear as the Great Bear among the constellations. For example:

Never were the means of happiness as evenly distributed among men and families as they are now.

A perfectly even distribution would not be justice, because both willingly and unwillingly men are not equal contributors to the common store.

Men are not equal in the endowments of nature, as bodily strength, mental brightness, beauty, etc.

They are not equal in education, allowing education to include scholastic training, mechanical skill, and knowledge of business, conferring the ability to manage. They are not

equal in industry. They are not equal in thrift. They are not equal in respect to what they waste by intemperance, gambling, etc.

Now simple justice will indicate that in the distribution of earth's gifts the shares allotted to different persons will differ from one or more of these causes.

So much, I am confident, Christian Socialism will ever recognize, and that it will reach the goal of an ideal condition of society by the perfecting of the individual. Our present methods are bad only because the individual man, on both sides of the bargain, is coarse, and gross, and selfish, and brutal. Let the individual become true, and righteous, and generous, and any method will work well. Meanwhile the worst element in Christian Socialism is the selfishness of human nature.

It is customary to abuse the Churches and the clergy as if they alone are to blame for the evils that exist, but because of their rich pew-holders they dare not say anything. Now what is the fact? The Church has come into an inheritance of notions and practices for which the Church and clergy of to-day are no more responsible than for the tides of the sea. It would be more than angelic if the preachers of the Gospel could at a glance detect every defect in the application society has made for generations of the principles of Christianity, and at once set them right. Yet every leader of a new project, fancying that he has the sovereign remedy for all human ills, at once begins to labor with the pulpit for not taking up his peculiar views, and, not merely discussing them on their merits, but he must give them the right of way at all times, if he would not be denounced as in alliance with the powers of darkness. Meanwhile the Church is steadily devoted to its appointed work of regenerating men—making them better, under the persuasion that if the man who works systems were not so imperfect, the systems themselves would show better results.

E. A. STAFFORD.

EDITORIAL REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Canada and the Canadian Question. By GOLDWIN SMITH, D. J. L. William-son & Co., Toronto. 1891. Price \$2.

The Canadian Question, as defined by this author, is simply whether the four blocks of territory constituting the Dominion, can forever be kept by political ager united among themselves, and separated from their continent, of which geographically, economically, and with the exception of Quebec ethnologically, they are parts.

It has been no secret that for years Dr. Smith has regarded political union with the United States as the manifest destiny of Canada, and this because of a strong conviction that such a union would be decidedly to the advantage of the Canadian people. He has not been obtrusive in his advocacy of these views, nor offensive in his manner of presenting them, as the present work is really the only elaborate attempt he has made to give currency to them, and there is internal evidence that this volume is designed for the information of the British public on the position of Canada, her needs and future relations, as much as, if not more than, to win converts among the Canadian people.

There can be no manner of doubt that he brings to his work as full a command of the history of peoples and governments in all ages and lands of the past and present as any man living to-day could do, and his more than twenty years' residence in Canada, not as in any sense an active politician, but as a philosophical observer of events, fully justifies him in stating his judgment as to what may be the best for this land; but at the same time, it is inevitable that the prejudices of education, and of local and personal interests, prevent the audience he addresses from being either deeply sympathetic or highly susceptible.

Another difficulty facing such a work is the fact that any discussion of current events necessarily involves the dealing with the policies of the political parties, as they are constituted at the present moment; and, though the leading members of them could easily point out their own mistakes and faults, yet they are not likely to accept with very good grace the work of a critic who dilates upon the same errors, however candid and fair he may think himself. The reader of this work will find, in a fair examination of it, that the defects of both parties are held up to the light, but as the party now in power in the Dominion has directed the affairs of the nation, with the exception of five years, ever since Confederation, and long before, it could not but be that this party would be subject to more criticism than the

others; but the shortcomings of the other party, as well when in opposition as when directing the government, are dwelt upon in such terms as show that no feeling of mere partisan friendship directs the critic's pen.

As to the contents of the work, a considerable portion is devoted to an examination of the past history of the several provinces, as preparing the way for the movement which culminated in Confederation, and due prominence is given to the presence of the French element. The Federal Constitution is critically examined, and the various parts of its legislative machinery are compared with whatever in the United States and Great Britain furnishes any parallel, the result of which is that Canada is declared to be in reality a Federal Republic, and practically independent of the mother-country. From this conclusion, as a matter of fact, we think there can be no reasonable dissent.

On "The Fruits of Confederation," we have a chapter in the author's most brilliant style. Both parties are measured up, we believe, with discrimination; but, of course, it will be natural for each to approve of the thrusts dealt out to the other, but to deny the justness of what is said of itself. There is also a pretty strong suggestion that the administration of the Earl of Dufferin, while constitutional to an extreme, was not in all particulars a model for the imitation of Colonial Governors. It is at least new to find any one who dares to place a minus sign, however light, before the name of one of Canada's popular idols. The chapter on the results of Confederation leads up to the main point in the discussion. Twenty-four years' experience in the present relations of the provinces to each other have not brought about an ideal condition of happiness so perfect that the Canadian mind is incapable of entertaining any thought of change. On the contrary, many unsatisfactory developments awaken grave questionings as to the future. What shall it be?

The author carefully examines in order, the question of Dependence on Great Britain, Independence, Imperial Federation, Political Union with the United States, and Commercial Union with the Continent.

Though his judgment approves of Political Union with the United States, he neither accepts of the idea of annexation—that is, the swallowing up of Canada by the United States just as it is, nor of any violent separation from our British connection. His plan would be first a peaceable dissolution of our present tie, with the continued good-will of both parties, so that in new relations Canada might be of even greater service to the parent land than now; and then such a political connection with the United States as would follow the most careful consideration of every institution, and method of government, and the casting out of elements that work evil on both sides, and the preservation for all the states involved of what has proven itself of the highest utility in both modes of government. Canada might contribute as much as she would receive. It is well known that not a few thoughtful men are seriously considering whether they might not escape from some of the evils in their system by the adoption of some things in the well-tried British Constitution.

During the last election, and since, we have heard a great deal about treason, and it is, therefore, worth while to ask, is there anything treasonable in writing such a book as this under review? If it was treason to write it, it was also to publish it, and we suppose it would be equally culpable to notice it here, or even to read it. But our readers may dismiss all anxiety on this subject. Treason, like other crimes, is definitely fixed by statute, and the particular statute which defines treason was passed in the reign of Edward III. It has been added to and subtracted from at various times, especially in the reign of Henry VIII., but it is to-day the law of Great Britain on the subject of treason. It includes six separate Acts, the chief of which are an attempt on the life of the sovereign or heir to the throne, and the levying war against the realm, or aiding his enemies when in the realm. It is plain, therefore, that the free discussion of any question which may be considered as for the welfare of the people, though often difficult from various causes, is not treasonable. In the best of election contests many things are said, many charges made which will not bear the light of calm reflection afterward. The boast of loyalty to the Queen, made in behalf of the Canadian people, undoubtedly rests upon a better foundation than any general accusations against individuals or numbers, of treasonable designs.

The Mission of Methodism. Being the Twentieth Fernley Lecture. By Rev. RICHARD GREEN. Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, London. William Briggs, Toronto. Cloth, 16mo, pp. 230. Price \$1.

Such is the title of a publication which comes very appropriately at this season, when the minds of men are turned towards Methodism on account of its Centenary celebrations, in the form of a review and defence of Methodism from such a competent authority as the Governor of the Didsbury Wesleyan Theological College. Taking the life of its founder as his standpoint, the writer declares "the essential characteristics of Methodism to be conversion, Scriptural holiness, evangelism and fellowship."

The first of these the writer declares to be "the germ, the nucleus, the true starting-point of Methodism." Upon this she still insists, and it would be hard, indeed, to imagine a Methodism from which this was absent or expunged. The spread of Scriptural holiness throughout the land was declared by Wesley to be "the mission of Methodism," and its active propagation was the outcome of a living actual experience, and has ever been looked upon as the distinctive doctrine of Methodism. So far, we are in hearty accord with all the writer has to say; but in the next division of his subject we feel that we are approaching one of moment and interest. "Methodism becomes, by the force of overwhelming circumstances, *an evangelism.*" "Methodism was made by preaching," as it is "the greatest work of Methodism." The galaxy of names enrolled upon the Methodist records of the past, from Wesley to Punshon, or later, are a standing witness that these statements are no mere idle boast; and from these we turn

towards the future, and ask what of it? In the discussion of this question, which is very bald and meagre, altogether unworthy of the importance of it, the writer declares it as his opinion that the itinerant system is, upon the whole, the best, though he is perfectly willing to admit that there are grave disadvantages in connection with it; and "the day is probably at hand when some change in its severely marked lines may be made." Whether with a view of avoiding the rocks, or not, there is a marked absence of any adequate discussion of the relations between church and pastor. In passing, a reference is made that "in 1746 a decision was arrived at that a congregation has power to choose its own pastor," and that "the relation between pastor and flock is one of mutual consent." Here a query arises, whence the change of position? Why should not the same decision apply in this day? It would obviate much difficulty, even though to some it may seem that only evil could come out of it; practically the principle is tacitly acknowledged, then why not openly? If the relation between pastor and people be one of mutual consent, why may it not be mutually extended without the intervention of an authority which says that such mutual relationship must be terminated at the end of three years and shall not be renewed without an interval of six years?

One argument used by the writer in favor of the itinerant system may find some supporters amongst his ministerial brethren, but as a practice, or the sanctioning of such a practice, is not likely to find much favor amongst the congregations, or, if carried out to the fullest extent allowable, to conduce much to the benefit of Methodism, notwithstanding the writer's assertion. The practice is that of using old sermons. "There can be no sufficient reason why a prudent use may not be made of previous preparation for the pulpit." If by such preparation the writer means study, we agree with him that it might be used, but only by way of foundation for something better; but if he means preach old sermons, we must take issue with him, and ask him what limit shall be placed upon such prudent use of previous preparation for the pulpit? whether it shall extend, as it might, over three years upon every circuit the minister might have? And further, who shall be the judges of such prudent use? I think if it is to be the voice of the people, as it ought, they would protest against any such sanction of a practice which might result in the wholesale infliction of sermons which ought to have had a decent burial long ago. Surely Mr. Green would not recommend the adoption of such a pernicious practice to the young men under his tuition; a practice which must be hurtful at least to their own mental development, as well as detrimental to their usefulness. We are sorry that such an authority should sanction, if only by implication, such an undesirable practice.

Under the head of the fourth essential, Mr. Green has much to say with regard to the class-meeting, and with evident love for that institution. A very clear distinction is made between Church membership and class membership. "Unquestionably with him (Wesley), attendance upon

the Lord's Supper implied Church membership in the visible Church of Christ." Membership in the society was a different thing, the only condition for entrance being "a desire to flee from the wrath to come," and one of the conditions of continuance was a continuance of implied Church membership by an attendance at the Lord's Supper. If this position be a true one, and we have no reason to doubt its truthfulness, a change has taken place since the early days, for clearly the evidence is against the class membership being a test of Church membership. In Wesley's mind the two were evidently distinct, and if the evidence is worth anything at all, it surely means that every person who has been converted is willing to conform to Methodist discipline, and partakes of the Lord's Supper, has a perfect right to be considered a member of the Methodist Church, irrespective of membership of the society. Why the writer has not carried out to its conclusion the principle laid down it is hard to say, unless it be unwillingness to accept the logical outcome of his principles. The class-meeting has been honored and blessed by God, and it can stand upon either its record or its merits as a means of grace, and will not suffer if it be freed from the incubus of a test of membership. An appeal is made for the improvement of our public service, which we heartily endorse, as also the appeal on behalf of Foreign Missions.

The gem of the whole book, and we can forgive many faults for the sake of this, is the eloquent and impressive appeal on behalf of Methodist reunion. This is made to every section of the Church called Methodist, "to take every opportunity of making known their essential unity and of encouraging a well-devised and prudent effort to promote actual unity," and hopes "that the approaching Ecumenical Conference in America will do something toward that end." The spirit of Christ demands it, the spirit of reviling without demands it, the necessities of the age demand it, and the writer trusts he may live to see it. Condensation upon some points, and enlargement upon others, would have increased the usefulness of the work; but as a whole it is a worthy contribution to the literature of Methodism and to the series of which it forms a part.

Ten Years of Upper Canada, in Peace and War, 1805-1816; being the Ridout Letters with Annotations. By MATILDA EDGAR. Also an appendix of the narrative of the Captivity among the Shawanese Indians in 1878, of Thomas Ridout, afterwards Surveyor-General of Upper Canada; and a vocabulary compiled by him of the Shawanese Language. 8vo, pp. 396. William Briggs, Toronto. Price \$2.00.

It is not easy to recall any more interesting or valuable addition that has been made to the historical literature of this country in recent years than that which has been made by Mrs. Edgar in this goodly volume. The period covered by it is one of the most interesting in the history of Upper Canada, including the entire period of the War of 1812, and probably nothing that has been published sheds upon it so quiet and steady a light

as this series of letters. And no one who desires to acquire a complete understanding of the state of things existing in those early times, and of the forces, both social and political that were at work forming the character and shaping the destiny of this young nation, can afford to be without Mrs. Edgar's book. It is not too much to say that it deserves to be in every family, and to be read by every young person in Ontario, if not in the Dominion. It is, indeed, in its contents of the nature of original chronicles; but it is, on that account, all the more valuable, as very little of the information that it contains is second-hand. Besides, being composed almost exclusively of family letters, never intended by their writers for the eyes of any but the members of the family between whom they passed, they have none of the stiffness and artificiality of the state papers and political memoranda of which such chronicles are generally composed.

The Ridout letters, regarded merely as specimens of epistolary composition, are of considerable interest, and might be studied with advantage by the youth of this generation. While they are models of gravity, dignity and propriety, they are throbbing full of life, with scarcely a dull sentence in them. And it is a happy circumstance that several of these letters were written by school-boys, chiefly to their parents, while pursuing their education abroad. And as these lads did not complete their literary training in this country, but for the accomplishment of this, one of them at least had to spend some years in England, from the letters written at that critical period, we get glimpses of English, especially London society, and of some of the prominent characters in it, "in the days of the Regency, when Napoleon ruled Europe, when Wellington was earning his first laurels, when Siddons still reigned at Drury Lane, and Scott and Byron walked through London streets, which are full of interest." We have now the impression made upon the mind of a Canadian youth, by the royal fêtes and and civic displays witnessed in the British metropolis, including the celebration of the Duke of Clarence's birthday, and an afternoon drive of the little Princess Charlotte in Regent's Park, a Lord Mayor's show, and a Mansion House ball; and then the scene changes, and we have letters written on this side of the Atlantic full of the details of battles, and describing scenes of hardships and suffering, when Canada was a battle-field, and the country from Quebec to the St. Clair was in peril.

No one can read these letters, we think, without feeling, with Mrs. Edgar, that "there is much to be proud of in the War of 1812, and that its events cannot be too strongly dwelt upon; not in order to stir up old animosities, nor to revive a spirit of antagonism toward our kin beyond the border, but to inspire every Canadian with a feeling of pride in his country, and grateful admiration for those who saved the land in its hour of need."

Divine Providence has given us a grand country, and set before us a future full of glorious possibilities; and we have, by the blessing of God, been enabled to reach a state of development and of prosperity of which

the most sanguine among us could not have dreamed, even thirty years ago; but it is well for us to remember that this heritage has not been secured to us without the sacrifice and suffering of those who have gone before us. No country can afford to forget its past. Nations are not made, but grow; and that nation which has ceased to be influenced by the memories and traditions of its past, like the vine that has become separated from its root, is virtually dead. Fondly may we hope that the baptism of blood that our country received, nearly nine decades ago, may prove to be the last, at least, for many generations; but it should not be forgotten that the evil elements, from whence come wars and fightings, have not yet become extinct in human nature. Cupidity and greed are just as potent forces in human society as they ever were. And though the sentiment of honor and the desire for martial glory are less active, perhaps, than formerly, baser and more sordid motives have taken their place, which are quite as likely to disturb the peace of nations; and to illustrate, even in our day, the maxim that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. In a word, the nation that would preserve its soil inviolate, that would hand down to unborn generations the heritage received from its fathers unimpaired and improved; and that, in order to this, would jealously guard its honor and its rights, must not only be firm in the assertion of them, but, as a *dernier ressort*, be prepared to do battle for them to the death. The Scottish motto emblematically represented by the thistle, *nemo me impune lacessit*, may, indeed, seem to some to smack too much of "jingoism" to suit these piping times of peace; but while there is a bullying and irritating self-assertion which is discreditable to a nation as to an individual, there is a pusillanimity which is no less inimical to the interests of peace, the effect of which is to invite rather than to prevent invasion.

Mrs. Edgar's book, as it appears to us, ought to act as a tonic to the patriotic feeling of the young men of Canada. And we cannot, perhaps, better close this notice than in her own words. "As we have reached the last decade of our century," she says, "it is well to look back on those foot-prints stained with blood, that marked its beginning. The shores of Lake Erie, of Huron, and of Ontario, the banks of the Niagara and the St. Lawrence, are all full of associations for those who have followed the fortunes of the little band of heroes that for three years held the frontier against enormous odds. Every home in the land gave its husband, or brother, or son, to the country's service; and had it not been for the martial spirit aroused in the people, the efforts of the small body of regular soldiers then in Canada would have been useless." It is only needful to add, that the safety of the country lay then, as it does now, in the loyalty of the Canadian people; and should occasion arise in the future for the illustration of the potency of this force—as we most earnestly pray there may not—we have no doubt that history will repeat itself, and that too in a way that will elicit the admiration of mankind.

The Anatomy of Atheism, as demonstrated in the Light of the Constitution and Laws of Nature. By Rev. H. H. MOORE, D.D. Pp. 365. Cloth. Cranston and Stowe, Cincinnati. William Briggs, Toronto. \$1.50.

The author states that this treatise owes its existence to the fact that no answer has been made to Col. R. Ingersoll's challenge to give an interpretation to nature, which would be consistent with its phenomena and the existence of a God of infinite perfections. The purpose of the book, therefore, is to prove that nature, properly interpreted, is a revelation of God; and it furnishes at once an effective reply to Ingersoll's atheistic assertions, and a strong argument for the existence of God. Dr. Moore claims that his argument, "in its main features, has not been worked out before," and that "it gives a breadth and conclusiveness to the proofs of Christianity that cannot be reached by any other course." His claim seems to be just. We do not know any other work that gives the same presentation of the argument. The author may be thought to be a little late in the field, because Ingersoll's star is waning, if, indeed, it has not already set; but the argument applies to all forms of anti-theism, and consequently has permanent value.

The origin and ground of Ingersoll's atheism is first examined. A keen analysis of the character of the man shows his infidelity to be the offspring of feeling and not of earnest thought. It was rendered possible only by silencing the "voice of humanity"—the religious instincts—within him. It has no foundation in any fact, or philosophy, or truth. Several chapters are devoted to the proof of these statements. "Ingersoll's attack is not upon Christianity only; he is the opponent of all religion. His conceptions of God are paganish, they are of an anthropomorphic being—a very bad man, with his powers enlarged to infinity." Because he cannot believe in the God he describes, he cannot believe in any. His conceptions of the facts of nature and Providence are false also, and tend to atheism. He makes God the author of all evil, physical, social, and moral; and because he cannot believe in such a God, who would be an "infinite fiend," he rushes into atheism. He lays down the premise that no pain, loss, or inconvenience should exist in a properly regulated world. That these exist in this world, is indisputable, and he concludes, therefore, that there is no moral governor of infinite power, wisdom and goodness. The foundation of his position is that evil as well as virtue must have a divine origin, if a God exist. He is a necessitarian, and since he denies a personal governor, all must be under the control of irresistible fate. Our author shows that his atheism is the outcome of a narrow and imperfect reading of nature, and is rooted in a *misinterpretation* of the phenomena of nature, and it must disappear before a correct interpretation. In its constitution, nature is perfect. The reign of law and the miseries that flow as consequences from the transgression of law, proclaim a moral governor. Physical evils are only incidents in the progression toward ultimate good. Moral evil originates in moral freedom. The moral character of man is a

revelation of God, and temporal evils serve to develop this character. That the virtuous suffer with the vicious in physical catastrophes is incidental; and the evil to the individual is counterbalanced by the incalculable benefits arising from the invariability of the laws under which the universe is placed. When man's moral character and the future destiny of the virtuous are considered, these "light afflictions" become insignificant and form a part of useful discipline. Dealing with the Fatalism of the Atheist, Dr. Moore takes strong exception to the doctrine of necessity, whether held by the theologian or the infidel. He shows that Ingersoll's doctrine of physical necessity is the result of his early teaching, which made God the immediate cause of all things, including the thoughts and desires of the heart, both good and bad. The moral freedom of man is necessary to the existence of virtue and vice, and the doctrines of freedom and necessity cannot be harmonized. A chapter is devoted to the perversions of Scripture by the atheists, and the discussion is closed by showing the agreement of nature and revelation as witnesses to the same truths, and the attitude that the Church and theologians should assume in dealing with infidelity.

This is a scant and imperfect outline of the argument. Many, possibly some of the most important, links in the chain have been omitted. The chapters dealing with the constitution of matter and the reign of law will attract special attention. Some may take exception to the fundamental assumption of the author that "atoms are entities, individuals, self-centred, self contained, and sources of energy—in the aggregate the energy of the physical universe;" but this seems to be the only way in which one can avoid the pantheism that makes God the force and energy immediately behind all physical occurrences. The difference between the position of the author and that of the materialist seems to be, that the latter makes the inherent energy of the atoms eternal, while the former makes it a part of the endowment the Creator gave to matter when He called it into existence. "The physical energy of the universe, as now displayed, originates in the atoms. That God created things so to be, does not change existing facts." [This might be supposed to involve the "mechanical theory" and eliminate all divine control, thus rendering a divine Providence impossible. To meet this the author says:

"In holding God as a divine Personality, and denying that He is any part of the universe He created, either its substance or laws, we do not by any means isolate Him from it and abandon it to its fate. If asked minutely to define the relation the Creator sustains to the things created, we can only answer, He is Governor. If asked, How can He be said to govern that which is, in some way, subject to laws of its own—laws which are inherent in its own nature? we answer, 'By searching we cannot find out the Almighty to perfection;' for 'His wisdom is unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.' The intelligence who has a clear and perfect conception of God as the Creator on the one hand, and of the universe He created on the other, might be able, with an eternity of time before

him, to formulate the relation they sustain to each other. The man who undertakes the task, gives fullest proofs that he has but a very limited conception of either God or nature. We hold, at the same moment, to the existence of God as Governor, and to the reign of the laws He has established; and if critics stagger at the mysteries involved, we confess we cannot help them. We will, however, engage to attack the proposition, if any one will explain to us the relation oxygen and hydrogen sustain to each other so as to form a molecule of water. In the main we must be content with facts. The *why* and the *how* of things are a great way off." The style of the author is clear, and the established facts of the sciences are used in a masterly way to sustain and illustrate the argument.

Evidences of Christianity: The Supernatural Book. By the Rev. R. S. FOSTER, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

This is the third volume of Bishop Foster's Studies in Theology, and differs from its predecessors in being a more systematic survey of the entire field indicated. As might be expected from Dr. Foster's general position, he approaches the subject with full acknowledgment of the rights and claims of reason in the great subject of religious truth. In his preface he takes direct issue with those who distrust reason in matters of faith, or who hold that Christianity needs no proof, or that resort to proof is disloyal to faith, and that the evidence of experience is final. He, therefore, accepts in full the responsibility of making our faith answer at the bar of reason as to the grounds of its confidence.

Such a task in the present day is no easy one, and the man who undertakes it requires to use the most rigidly scientific method. That method must govern him in the unmistakable definition of that which he attempts to prove, clearly distinguishing the great essential positions from all subordinate and accessory matters. It must also govern him in his choice of premises. His proofs must rest not upon dogmatic assumptions, but either upon universally admitted axioms, or upon facts well ascertained by a careful induction. While these essential principles are not altogether ignored in the work before us, we cannot say that they have been thoroughly and, at all times, satisfactorily applied. The scope of the work embraces and largely intermingles two great questions—the Divine authority of the Christian religion as a revelation from God, and the inspiration of the book as a written record.

While it may not always be possible to separate these two questions, it is of advantage in the battle with the sceptic, to keep them generally distinct. The consideration of the human element which enters into Scripture has become so important that a vastly more extended discussion is necessary when the question of inspiration is introduced into the field of the evidences. It becomes necessary clearly to define in what inspiration consists, as well as to prove that inspiration exists, if we would arrive at anything like a satisfactory conclusion. Both these things can be done only by careful adherence

to the inductive method. No man has a right to say *a priori*, nor even as a supposed deduction from any dogmatic position, what kind of revelation God shall make to men, nor yet by what process He should put that revelation into the forms of human thought and language. The only safe method is to permit God's work to speak simply and solely for itself. If we do that, the old mechanical theory of inspiration certainly cannot be sustained, and any line of argument built upon it is not adequate to the wants of to-day.

Another difficulty which arises from the commingling of the two questions is the vexed question of date and authorship. It is exceedingly unwise to make the acceptance or rejection of Christianity depend upon the truth of the Jewish traditions which have been handed down to us regarding the authorship and date of the Old Testament. Here again, we should let the book speak for itself, and not read into it our own traditional preconceptions, nor force it to carry the weight of assertions which it has never made. Many of these points Dr. Foster recognizes, and he goes even beyond what we would consider necessary at times in his limitation of claims. For instance as he says on page 3: "It is not in the claim that every word or statement in the sacred books of either Testament is divinely inspired, or even divinely authorized, or even true." In one sense, this is undoubtedly true; in another sense, it may yield too much. On the other hand, the caveat on page 16 is a very wise and necessary one: "If we have outgrown the fables of the Middle Ages—and who doubts it?—without impairing the value of the holy text-book, why shall not unborn scholars outgrow ours in the same manner, not simply without impairing the holy teaching, but also enriching and aggrandizing its claim?" This limitation is entirely in harmony with the observations made above, but not always in harmony with the author's own method of argument. The limitations defined on page 39, as to the sphere and function of revelation, are also very wise, though again there are points of the argument not altogether in accord with this position. We may feel the utmost confidence in the final harmony of all truth without assuming that we have arrived at ultimate conclusions in regard either to the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, or of the facts of geology.

Our author adopts the usual classification of evidences, beginning with the argument from probability, and putting in a very neat form what he calls "the law of need and supply." The second class of argument from the character of the book is one which requires to be carefully guarded. The author says: "A book which God would make ought to differ from any book which man could make." There is serious danger of dogmatism here. God may condescend to man in revealing Himself to us much more fully than our theories would suppose. The dogmatist would have been very far from ordering for our Lord Himself, the lowly, perfectly human life recorded in the Gospels. But notwithstanding some tendency to the mechanical view of Scripture, our author has fairly guarded this branch of his argument on pages 39 and 40.

Under his third head, our author touches the great question of the supernatural. He holds "that no deliverance, however derived, can support its claim to be a direct revelation without supernatural proof; and, also, certain things cannot be known without supernatural help." He defines the supernatural as *to being and power*, as God Himself, and, as *to action or effect*, "an action or effect not possible to nature under the fixed and permanent order which has been imposed upon it. An action or effect brought about on nature or in nature, or through nature in a way not provided for in the system itself under its permanent and established order. We doubt whether this definition takes sufficient account of the higher and lower laws and order in nature, and their relation to each other. That which may be supernatural to-day in our sphere, may be the common law and order of a higher sphere to which God is leading us. The supernatural thus is not the unnatural; and it is one of the noblest results of this branch of apologetics to point out the harmony and analogy of the supernatural and natural, and their ultimate unity under a higher order or law. It is certainly a fact that the supernatural is of the very essence of the Christian revelation. It is also certain that the supernatural in the revelation itself has further projected its influence into the subordinate material sphere in physical miracles. But it does not follow that this is, as our author seems to assume, always a necessity to the revelation. Paul evidently does not so regard it. (See 1 Cor. xiv.) It would remove many serious difficulties if, by careful induction from the Scriptural facts, we clearly defined the limits which God has prescribed to this lower projection. Dr. Pope has already done something of this in his *Christian Theology*."

After discussing the question of the supernatural generally, our author takes up the two specific heads of prophecy and miracle. On his treatment of miracle we have already remarked. His discussion of the old question of evidence, as raised by Hume, is very good, but should be supplemented by those views which a more careful study of miracles in themselves will bring into prominence, and which strike at the very foundation of Hume's objections to evidence by showing that miracles are not out of harmony with the reign of law.

But the lack of adequate exegetical and inductive study is still more manifest in the author's treatment of prophecy. The laws under which God has seen fit to reveal Himself in this part of the supernatural order have been made the subject of careful, devout and reverent study by such men as Delitzsch, Orelli and Rhiem, to say nothing of those who in England have followed up their lines of investigation; and no treatment of prophecy as an evidence is at all adequate which falls back upon the crude exegesis of Keith on Prophecy.

Our author's words, already quoted, as to the growth of scholarship "without impairing the holy teaching, but also enriching and aggrandizing its claim," are especially applicable here.

The other general heads embraced in the work are: Internal Evidence;

Evidence from the Character of the Writers ; Argument from Successful Propagation, and Argument from Experience. In these chapters will be found many passages of rare beauty and felicity of expression, to the spirit and truth of which every Christian heart will respond. We give this one : " Christian consciousness flowering and fruiting in the Christian life is a monumental proof of the divinity of Christianity which no sophistry can evade, and which no logic can refute."

N. BURWASH.

A full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium., 604. By HERMAN C. HOSKIERS. David Nutt, London, 1890.

The object of this admirably printed volume is apparently two-fold. In the first place, it makes a very considerable contribution to our very precious materials for New Testament criticism. In the second place, it presents arguments founded upon these and other recent materials looking to the establishment of the superior authority as a text of the *Textus Receptus*.

The field of investigation from which this book gathers its treasures is so difficult in itself, and the means of reaching it are so limited to the few select scholars, that all students will hail with gratitude a new contribution, and will bid God-speed most heartily to a new worker. The MS. collated is a copy of the Gospels with the Eusebian tables, for use in public worship. An inscription by a later hand gives a date 1335 or 1338. The MS. gives nearly 250 unique readings, but our author especially rejoices in the attestation of this copy to the doxology, Matt. vi. 13, to Mark xvi. 9-20, and to John vii. 53-viii. 13, and other passages questioned by modern criticism. The MS. he believes to have been copied from an Uncial, and he traces a remarkable accord between it and several of the most ancient authorities ; while he believes that its independence of these at the important points where it favors the *Textus Receptus*, proves it to be of great value as a witness for what he, following the late Dean Bourgon, regards as the traditional text of the Church.

To the student of the sacred text who will patiently follow the author through his careful and learned investigations, and especially his tabulated summaries of comparative results, the work will give not a little light upon the methods of that devout toil which seeks to perfect for our age the text of the Word of God.

N. BURWASH.

The Pastor Amidst his Flock. By Rev. G. B. WILCOX, D.D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Cloth. 8vo, pp. 186. American Tract Society, New York. Upper Canada Tract Society, Toronto. Price \$1.

This work is a most practical contribution to the literature on pastoral theology, by one who is in thorough touch with the broadening sphere of

the pastor's work. The line of thought may be gathered from the following epitome. The pew is levelling up to the pulpit, and in some instances surpassing it, in general education, Biblical knowledge and Christian work. The work of the preacher is becoming more varied, general and important than ever before. The pastor must be a practical man, not only a preacher, but a worker. He must have definite plans for every department of work, and recognize such a division of labor as will enable him to give "to every man his work." He must not be a mere "parson," nor a "sky-pilot" only, but a well-rounded, large-hearted, many-sided Christian man, rightly apprehending Christianity as universal goodness, not simply "religious" good. He should not be selfishly absorbed in building up his own church rather than in doing the Lord's work. He should beware of the meanness that uses success in a personal and professional way for the purpose of increasing his own reputation and securing a larger salary or getting a better church. He should become thoroughly one of the people, taking them all into his confidence in connection with the work of the church, and regarding all who are not members of some other congregation as belonging to his. His spirit should not be fault-finding or self-seeking—never using his pulpit as a stepping-stone to another. The pastor must go to the people; he must, in the pulpit, accommodate himself to their range of thought, preaching on such duties and sins as are somewhat peculiar to his own people. Sermons should have the flavor of the present, not of a past circuit, illustrated by the events of the day and surroundings of the people. The pastor must show a warm interest in everything that concerns the church, cultivate a confidential familiarity with the families and individuals of the congregation, and labor *alone* with persons to bring them to Christ, recognizing the individuality of each. Do not wait for a mighty revival, but select one after another of the congregation to be led to Christ by prayer, personal conversation and other means. The pastor should take care of his health by being cheerful and happy, taking recreation and cultivating humor, keeping the skin in a wholesome condition, taking care of the throat, teeth and eyes, having good ventilation, regular exercise and a day of rest. Have a light, cheerful study, with some sort of gymnastic apparatus at hand, and a library of a few hundred well selected and carefully studied volumes. He must study the Bible and all that bears upon his work, examine every text he preaches on in the original, and read choice fiction and standard poetry. Follow the Great Teacher's example in using illustrations in preaching, gathering them from the street, shop, etc., and cultivate a habit of regular work. Conduct business affairs with integrity, keep out of debt, save something and always know where he exactly stands financially. In the preparation for the pulpit always have the object of the sermon before the mind, what is to be accomplished, in thought; have individuals in view, but avoid personalities. Keep abreast of the times, arrest attention by the recital of actual cases; not only write sermons, but preach extempore; use old sermons, but always make

them new. Do not carry a crushing sense of responsibility into the pulpit, be buoyant without being trivial ; avoid making the service a drudgery or matter of course, but be fresh, wide-awake and sincere as having something to say, in the service of God, for the welfare of men. The preacher should be earnest, but not solemn, forceful but not vehement ; always looking the audience in the face.

This gives an idea of the author's treatment after the Socratic method, of "The Outset in the Work," "The Pastor Personally," and "The Pulpit." In like manner he treats of "Organizing and Administering," "Social life of the Church," "Among the Children," "Church Financial Affairs," "In the Homes of the People," and "Miscellaneous Matters." This is a book for preachers who wish to be organizers and leaders of the people for intelligent and efficient work in the Master's service. It will prove eminently helpful to all, but especially young pastors, who are not fixed in any conventional methods, it will be eminently suggestive.

The Two-Fold Gift of the Holy Ghost. By THOS. K. DORR, Editor of the *Christian Harvester*, Cleveland, Ohio. Cloth. 6mo, pp. 240. Wm. Briggs, Toronto. Price 65 cents.

The design of this book is, in as plain language as possible, to designate the place of the Holy Ghost in both the Godhead and the work of salvation. Especially, an effort is put forth to show that Entire Sanctification is wrought in the heart by the Baptism of the Holy Ghost ; and that the Epoch of the Baptism is identical with that of His Advent in His Indwelling Personality. The agency of the Holy Ghost in the Life, and in carrying on the Work of the Gospel, is given particular attention.

Some idea of the scope and plan of "The Two-Fold Gift" may be further gleaned from the titles to the chapters, as follows :

1. A Summary.
2. The Holy Ghost a Person.
3. The New Testament Designating Terms.
4. The Scriptural View.
5. The Holy Ghost is God.
6. Blasphemy Against the Holy Ghost.
7. The Triunity of God.
8. The Apostolic Benediction.
9. The Worship of the Holy Ghost.
10. The Dispensations.
11. The First Dispensation.
12. The Second Dispensation.
13. Holiness—Sinning.
14. "The Sin of the World."
15. Final Deliverance from Sin.
16. The Day of the Holy Ghost.
17. Jesus and the Holy Ghost.
- 18 and 19. The Epoch of the Holy Ghost.
20. The Anointing.
21. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost.
22. The Baptism of Fire.
23. The Two-Fold Experiences of the Holy Ghost.
24. Fellowship of the Holy Ghost.
25. "In the Spirit."
26. Several Scriptural Terms Considered.
27. Pentecost.
28. Inspiration—Prophecy.
29. Spiritual Leading and Teaching.
30. The Gifts of the Spirit.
31. "Praying in the Holy Ghost."
- 32 and 33. Power.

The treatment may be considered extreme by some, but it is not anatical.

The Amazons, a Lyrical Drama. By VIRNA WOODS. Cloth. 16mo. Flood & Vincent, Meadville, Penna. Price 75 cents.

It must be owned that the muses receive scant courtesy in these latter days. Yet now and then publishers recognize them. This little volume is not the usual collection of verses, but a dramatic narrative, cast in the Greek manner, reciting the episode of Achilles and Penthesilea, queen of the Amazons, whose duel before the walls of Troy is mentioned in the Iliad. The blank verse of this poem is smooth and regular, and free from all extravagance. The rhymed choral passages possess beauties of no common order. All who admire classic models and well wrought verses will find pleasure in this book.

Philosophy of Christian Experience. By RANDOLPH S. FOSTER. Cloth. Hunt & Eaton, New York. Price \$1.

This work consists of eight lectures delivered before the Ohio Wesleyan University, on Experimental and Practical Religion. These lectures indicate the process through which the soul passes in becoming Christian, and indicates the grounds and significance of each successive stage of the process. They treat of definitions, grounds of experience, probation, the fact of sin and its consequences. They further show how man became involved in sin, and then unfold the method by which Infinite Love seeks to deliver him from sin, by a continued probation under redemptive influences and agencies. The author is emphatic in his statement that the facts of experience which, in their wholeness, constitute Christian experience, are facts which do not emerge in the soul by its own agency alone, nor by the agency of God alone; but by the concurrence and co-action of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost—the Trinity in the Godhead—with the soul. The facts of Christian experience he claims are, Divine Illumination, Conviction and the Universal Call of the Holy Spirit to all men to repent and turn to God. Following Penitence, the next step in logical order for the experience of Pardon is Faith. These preliminary facts being thoroughly dealt with, he follows with a clear and exhaustive lecture on Pardon, Forgiveness and Regeneration. These three facts he holds are concurrent, and unitedly constitute what is Scripturally and theologically known as justification. The subject of the last lecture is the "Possibilities of Grace." He deals with the defects of experience after Regeneration, and asks, can these defects be removed? He then proceeds to discuss the possibility of enlargement and development. This higher experience he terms "The Perfection of the Soul in Love." To attain such an experience he indicates three steps. 1. A direct aim and a definite ideal. 2. A resolute determination to measure up to the divine standard—the ideal. 3. The Prayer of Faith. By such a course he claims the seeker will win the evermore increasing consciousness of completeness in Christ.

After such clear and scholarly dissertations on Repentance, Faith and

Regeneration, we approached with eagerness this closing lecture of the author, but confess to some disappointment, and wish the lecturer had shown the same care, clearness and thoroughness in dealing with this fact and possibility of experience which is just now attracting such universal attention.

The True and the False. By Rev. A. C. DIXON, Pastor of Immanuel Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md. Pp. 173. Wharton, Barron & Co., Baltimore.

Scriptural Christianity is the true ; Roman Catholicism is the false. The first nine chapters are a popular statement of some of the evidences of Christianity. There is nothing new ; but the familiar facts and arguments are skillfully employed. Beginning at the centre of the system, the author presents the unanswerable argument from the claims and character of Christ. Moving from the centre outwards, we have a statement of the testimony borne to the truth of Christianity by history, experience, its enemies, and reason. The argument from experience is well put ; and under the heading, "The Enemy as a Witness," the author has collated a large number of striking testimonies to the character of the Bible, from those who are the reputed enemies of Christianity. Short chapters are given on Christ as the Life, the Light, and the Way. The last ten chapters are devoted to a discussion of Romanism in the light of Scripture. The principal questions in dispute between Protestantism and Romanism are pretty thoroughly discussed, and the errors of the Roman Church are fully exposed. There is not a little that will be fresh to one who is familiar with the subjects discussed ; but it is a little book that will be interesting and profitable to the ordinary reader. It furnishes satisfactory answers to the sophisms of current infidelity, and it will be likely to settle the convictions of those whose faith has been disturbed by the arrogant but baseless assertions so freely made by sceptics of all classes.

God's Jewels: Their Dignity and Destiny. By W. G. FULLERTON. 16mo, pp. 125. Cloth. Many cuts. American Tract Society, New York. Upper Canada Tract Society, Toronto. Price 60 cents.

In this little book the author gives us the result of eight years' research. He has acquired a wide technical knowledge of the various jewels, and gathered a large number of interesting facts and incidents connected with the discovery, possession, and commerce of precious stones. Believers are God's jewels, and the Christian life is beautifully illustrated by the facts connected with the principal gems. While some of the similes may seem a little strained, taken altogether the book itself is a gem. Almost every page furnishes one or more fresh and striking illustrations by which some precious truth or important Christian duty is enforced. It is a book that will be enjoyed by any Christian, and will be gladly read by many who are not yet among "God's Jewels." The preacher will find here a store

of effective incidents and similes with which to enrich his discourses. It should find a place in Sunday-school libraries. The publishers have given it a beautiful dress. In printing and binding it is a model.

The Light of the World; or, the Great Consummation. By SIR EDWIN ARNOLD, K.C.I.E.C.S.I., author of the "Light of Asia," etc. Funk & Wagnalls, 18 and 20 Astor Place, New York, 1891. Price, cloth cover, \$1.75; paper cover, 50 cents.

Some years ago the world was surprised by the appearance of the poem "The Light of Asia," from the hand of this author. Therein he sketched the great work in India attributed to Gautama. He took the traditions which exalted this hero into one of the great teachers of the human race and presented them in garments which reflected all the hues of excellent poetry. This poem was much misunderstood. It was thought to exalt Buddhism as a religion into a place superior to Christianity; but, in fact, the author meant simply to place his hero before mankind in his true light. He strove to relate the story of a wonderful life, and to set up a picture of a noble character. It cannot be said that he overdrew the character, why then should he have been required to embody a profession of his faith in his poem? Poetry should not be judged by what it does not contain, but by its actual contents.

That Sir Edwin did not intend to disparage Christ and Christianity is now evident from the contents of this recent and greater poem, "The Light of the World." It is the record of the great life, and the tragedy of the death, of Christ. It is worthy of rank among the great poems of the human race, and does not fail to exalt the Saviour of mankind to His place of infinite supremacy above all teachers, reformers and saviours.

It is the theme of many great poems, but none of them approach the subject from the same point of view as this one. No person who will give himself the delight of reading this great work will ever again for a moment suspect that the author's long residence in India, as Principal of the Government College, has prejudiced him in favor of Buddhism to such a degree that he could possibly place it in a position of superiority to Christianity.

God Incarnate. By the Right Rev. HOLLINGWORTH TULLY KINGDON, D.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada. Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York, 1890. Price \$1.75.

Some ten years since, a Brooklyn gentleman founded and endowed the "Bishop Paddock Lectureship," with the design of defending the religion of Jesus Christ as revealed in the *Holy Bible* and illustrated in the *Book of Common Prayer*. The present volume contains seven lectures delivered under the provisions of this lectureship, the subjects of which are, "The Creator," "The Creature," "The Incarnation," "Perfection of Sympathy,"

“The Atonement,” “The Sacraments,” and “The Gift of the Holy Ghost,” to which is added a copious appendix of forty-six pages, containing chiefly quotations from authorities referred to and a lengthy historical sketch of the views entertained on the subject of confirmation through the early Christian centuries.

The author lays no claim to originality, and particularly disclaims the introduction of anything new. “Old truths sometimes in modern words, rarely in new language.”

The reader will soon be convinced that this claim is correct. He will find his face turned squarely toward the past. He will be impressed with the learning in the ecclesiastical literature of remote ages which is brought to the service of the Church of to-day. In this work *the Church* is strictly equivalent to the Church of England and its co-ordinate branches, except that there is constantly implied the continuity of this Church with the Church of the Apostolic age, and the Catholic Church of Rome in succeeding ages. This is the assumption, although the deed of trust founding the lectureship, under whose auspices these lectures were given, speaks definitely of the “historical reformation” out of which the Church of England in its present form began to be. The spirit in which the authority of this Church is constantly recognized ought to satisfy the most exacting demand for allegiance which even Rome could make. This Church is also represented as the only regular channel through which the grace of God is communicated to men. There is no promise of the indwelling power of the Holy Ghost outside the Church, but it is not denied that in His boundless mercy God may visit those who are outside; but this is exceeding love, and is beyond all the promises, and so it is the imperative duty, as well as gracious consideration, on the part of those in that Church to try to win the erring sheep of other denominations back into the true fold.

Members of the Church of England, who are so inclined, will find here quite a repository of quotations, derived, doubtless, from original sources, which, if they wish, they can use at second-hand in upholding their exclusive claims against all other Christians; but to others, the book will not be of very great value, except as exhibiting the style of thought yet possible among so many, which, if correct, would make God's ways as narrow as those of some of the most narrow men. Considering what the history of the Christian Church has actually been, it is impossible for a broad thinker to understand how learned and intelligent people can entertain the exclusive views met with in this volume. It indicates how wide the divisions yet are which separate different parts of the Christian Church. The history of the Church of England is grand enough, its work and influence noble enough to be the pride of Protestantism, and the promise of its future sufficiently high to justify it in dismissing narrow pretensions to the almost exclusive favor of God, which can scarcely be more pleasing to Him than they are helpful to mankind; and, as to the latter, they can contain nothing but offence, except to those who are willing to put the lingo of a party in the place of their divine right to think and to investigate.

Socialism of Christ; or, Attitude of Early Christians Toward Modern Problems. By AUSTIN BIERBOWER, author of "The Morals of Christ," "The Virtues and their Reasons," etc. Chicago: Charles H. Sergel & Co.

The author of this work is a lawyer, and from his pen came the best short reply to Ingersoll which we have read. We were so charmed with that particular piece of work that we are compelled to confess our disappointment in the work now before us.

The table of contents promises as much as could reasonably be expected from any work of the size, but all the way through the author's studies are purused from the Unitarian point of view, if not, indeed, from a very much lower level. The reader's impression of Christ, as derived from these pages, is not only that He was a mere man, but, at that, a very commonplace and inferior type of man, for He was not only animated by all the selfish and ambitious motives common to men, but He was capable of scheming with His followers, in order to realize His ambitious aims. He had one face for the public and another for those whom He admitted into His confidence. The mode of interpretation adopted here does not admit of the plans of Jesus reaching farther than the present world. For example, the kingdom of God means only an earthly kingdom, which Jesus was ambitious to set up, but very uncertain whether He would succeed in doing so or not. By this mode of reading the Gospels the author has succeeded in making it appear that the chief work of Jesus was to reform social abuses, and it is very easy, therefore, to give to all His teaching, some bearing upon the social questions of to-day. But we suspect the most of our readers will find the book so at variance with their sentiments of the high character of our Lord, that they will not derive much advantage from this application of His teaching to social problems.

Social Aspects of Christianity, and other Essays. By RICHARD T. ELI, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Political Economy in the Johns Hopkins University. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 13 Astor Place.

This work deals with the same subject as the foregoing, but in an entirely different spirit. The author admits that social principles are more or less a development upon the general teachings of Christ, and he thinks that in the present day the pulpit is not accomplishing all it ought to do by espousing the cause of the masses and the poor as against wealthy church-members and pew-holders who accumulate riches by levying toll upon the wages of the toiler.

This is only one of the works on some phases of this subject by the same author. He seems to be in perfect sympathy with the principles of truth and righteousness as applied in the dealings of all men with each other, and that the poor and the weak should be shielded by these principles against the hand of the rich and the strong. This is a good and wholesome book, though, in the light of many practices which to-day are recognized

as legitimate in business, it will seem to many to be extremely radical and bold in its claims.

How to be a Pastor. By THEODORE S. CUYLER, D.D. 32mo., pp. 157.

The Baker & Taylor Co., New York. William Briggs, Methodist Book Room, Toronto. Price 60 cents.

The style and general character of the writings of Dr. Cuyler, are too well known to need any particular commendation. In this little volume, which is appropriately dedicated to the young ministers of all denominations, we have the results of the experience of a long and successful ministry. We know of no work that in such narrow limits contains so many valuable hints and suggestions for such as are entering upon the Christian pastorate, and who desire to make the best of their pastoral life. It must carry a blessing with it, and its circulation cannot fail to do good.

The Evidence of Christian Experience. Being the Ely Lectures for 1890.

By LEWIS FRENCH STEARNS, Professor of Christian Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary. Chas. Scribners & Sons, New York. Wm. Briggs, Methodist Book and Publishing House, Toronto. Price \$2.

This is one of the noblest contributions to the department of apologetics. Apologetics is the defence of Christianity. The battle with unbelief is a never-ending one, for as the foe is dislodged from one place, he takes up his position in another part of the field. Every change of front requires a corresponding change of defence. Paley's "Evidences" and Butler's "Analogy" have never been surpassed. They met and routed the rampant deism of the day; but they do not serve for the attacks of our time. The infidelity of Tom Paine, David Hume and Voltaire is now old and worn out. "Distinguished Paine, rebellious stay-maker, rebellious needle-man," as Carlyle calls him, is no longer influential. If Voltaire were now living he would feel ashamed of his coarse jokes on the Scriptures and his haggling over the discrepancies of the Bible. And David Hume would find himself such an anachronism, so far out of date, that he would be searching for new arguments. The power of the more recent attack has lain in its great historical criticism. "Biblical criticism," says Delitzsch, "took its rise at the Reformation, when the Church began to examine and sift the possessions that had been handed down to it by tradition." The destructive criticism of the New Testament is not half a century old, yet it has had its day. Strauss, Bauer, Renan and Volkmar have been fully met and answered. One of the latest and best works, giving the conclusions of the whole matter, is the Bampton Lecture for 1890, on "Modern Criticism Considered in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel," by Dr. Watkins, Archdeacon of Durham. The keen-eyed critics have been discomfited; but the influence of their assaults persists in literature, in such books as Robert Elsmere, and also among the scientists, who, making their assaults upon the Supernatural Religion, and not being up in the latest criticism, continue to reiterate their declarations as to the historical untrust-

worthiness of the New Testament writings. The Elias P. Ely Lectureship on the Evidences of Christianity has already rendered signal service to the Christian cause. Dr. Storrs' lectures on the "Divine Origin of Christianity, indicated by its Historical Effects," were prepared and delivered on this foundation. Admitting the possibility of a supernatural religion, the eminent Brooklyn divine takes the new conception introduced by Christianity concerning God, man, man's duty towards God in worship, man's duty to man in politics and society, and the effects of the Gospel on the mental culture, the moral life of mankind, and on the world's hope of progress; and from these constructs an overwhelming argument in favor of the divineness and supernatural authority of our holy religion. Professor Stearns' lectures are also a monumental work. They consist of ten discourses to the students of Union Theological Seminary, New York, on the Ely Foundation; and they not only bring fresh honor to American scholarship, but they open up a new and most important department of Christian apologetics. The argument from experience is not only a valid argument, but an unanswerable one. There is a confidence in religion, born of inward experience, which it is impossible to overthrow. One may have his doubts concerning the practical proofs for the authority and veracity of the sacred records, but the sweet peace of pardoned sin, the thrilling sense of spiritual health appeases all doubt and enables the sunlit soul to say, "One thing I do know, that whereas once I was blind, now I see." This is the very core and centre of Christianity, and no one that has ever tasted its power has doubted its divinity. Here is a settled faith that rests on foundations which lie far beyond the reach of scientific and historical criticisms.

Prof. Stearns has shown himself eminently fitted for his task; and the discussion is thorough, scientific, and on entirely new lines. After having traced the attack of physical science and the philosophical accompaniment of the great scientific movement, he notes the distinction between the redemptive revelation and the Bible. The Bible is not the same as the revelation, for the revelation existed in part before the record of it was made. The redemptive revelation was God's means of introducing into the world redemptive agencies which were brought in to stay, and they are now at work in the world, in the Church, and in the heart and life of every believer. With great clearness and power the accomplished Professor maintains that the kingly office of Christ, and the work of the Holy Spirit everywhere active, make Christianity a living reality to-day.

The lecturer next defines his philosophical position. There is a definite philosophy underlying the proof of Christian experience. It has to do with matters of universal validity, which can be verified by all men, for it deals with the universal religious experience. This he designates as the theistic philosophy. In the Genesis of Evidence, he looks at the preliminary experience by which a soul makes its entrance into the Christian life; the outward Word, the witnessing Church, the divine call, the personal acceptance. The first effect of the great act of will, involved in repentance and

faith, is the revelation of a new life. The change is a "new creation," a passing from death unto life. This is the forgiveness of sins, and the witness of acceptance. All this is not second-hand, but first-hand knowledge.

Then, with rare spiritual insight and critical skill is traced the growth of evidence in sanctification as Christian experience deepens and enlarges. There is an increasing holiness of character, and an increased evidence of the reality of the divine causes that are at work. Christ has an actual personal existence. He is no longer a mere historical personage, an abstract and unreal being, but a present Saviour, with whom there is the converse of friendship and love.

The sixth lecture is a verification of the evidence. The way to turn probable knowledge into real knowledge is the scientific way of experiment. Any one who puts the Gospel to the test acts scientifically and learns for himself whether it is true or false. There is an agreement among those who have access to the facts. The individual Christian finds the reality of his own experience verified by the testimony of all who, like him, have put the Gospel to the test.

Philosophical objections are next answered; the Agnostic, the Positivist and the Materialist, as well as the more plausible objections that the evidence is based on private and particular experience and is unintelligible to the uninitiated. The theological objections are then dealt with. The Rationalist, who denies the doctrine of a supernatural regeneration, as well as the objections of the Kantian, the Pantheistic and the mystic theology. The argument concludes with the position occupied by this evidence in the system of Christian evidences. The lecturer makes it the key-stone of the arch of evidences. It is a product of the Scriptures, and leads to a fuller appreciation of the value of the evidence for the authority, credibility and inspiration of the Word of God. This experience makes the miracles credible and strengthens the evidence of prophecy, for his own spiritual life is a progressive fulfilment of a prophecy. The evidence derived from the person and work of Christ is strengthened, for the Jesus of history is the Christ of his faith; while the evidence from the comparison of Christianity with other religions has its crown and consummation in the fruits of holy living. The whole subject is treated in a practical, scientific and comprehensive manner, with abundant learning and admirable candor. There is earnestness of purpose and spiritual depth; the thoughts are fresh and suggestive, and find an energetic and attractive expression. The book should be read by every minister, and will be found of interest to the ordinary Christian reader. It will strengthen faith, overthrow doubt, and lead the perplexed and wandering into the truth. The whole argument is one of important and pervasive force. The only work of a similar character, and to be placed by the side of it, is Dr. Dale's latest work, "The Living Christ and the Four Gospels." All who read these replete and instructive lectures will be deeply interested, greatly delighted, and highly profited.

HUGH JOHNSTON.

Jesus the Messiah in Prophecy and Fulfilment. By EDWARD HARTLEY DEWART, D.D. Cloth, 8vo., pp. 256; price \$1. Methodist Book Rooms, Toronto, Montreal, and Halifax.

This volume, written in the well-known vigorous style of the editor of the *Christian Guardian*, was called forth by Prof. Workman's lecture on Messianic Prophecy, and is intended as "a review and refutation of the negative theory of Messianic Prophecy." The subject is treated under the following heads: (1) "Prophecies and Prophets of the Old Testament;" showing the relation of the Old Testament to the New, the origin of prophecy, character and mission of the prophets, origin and development of Messianic Prophecy. (2) "The Predictive and Ethical Elements in Prophecy;" calling attention to the unjustifiable disparagement of prediction by a certain class of Biblical expositors, to the place of prediction in Scripture teaching, that prediction is an essential part of prophecy, that the prediction is not opposed to the ethical, and to the evidential value of fulfilled prophecy. (3) "Messianic Prophecy Elucidated by Fulfilment;" giving the methods which exclude the light of fulfilment, and the true method of interpretation, based upon the fact that God's thoughts are revealed in prophecy, sustaining the position of eminent expositors. (4) "The Negative Theory of Messianic Prophecy;" which denies all predictive reference to Jesus Christ, stated as an unavailing appeal to ambiguous phrases, against which eminent Hebrew scholars are shown to be. (5) "Messianic Prophecies which Predictively Refer to Jesus Christ;" examining Genesis iii. 15; Genesis xlix. 10; Deuteronomy xviii. 15; Psalms cx. 4; Psalms ii. 6-8; Isaiah vii. 14, ix. 6; Isaiah xi. 1-10; Isaiah lii. 13-15, liii.; Micah v. 2; Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6; Daniel ix. 24-26; Zechariah ix. 9; Malach' iii. 1, iv. 5. (6) "General and Typical Messianic Prophecies," are fully considered. (7) "The Theory of Accommodated Application" is refuted, which assumes that "fulfil" in the New Testament has only an accommodation to unpredicted events. (8) "New Testament Fulfilment of Messianic Prophecies;" in which is cited a limited number of the remarkable correspondences between Old Testament predictions and the events of Christ's life, the Apostolic appeals to the evidence of fulfilled Messianic predictions, and the testimony of Christ to the fulfilment of Old Testament predictions by Himself. (9) "The Negative Theory of Messianic Prophecy Essentially Rationalistic;" in which are shown the distinguishing features of rationalism. While Dr. Dewart has written this book as an orthodox defence of the historic Christian faith, against a certain tendency of the higher criticism, he justly disclaims any illiberal spirit that would antagonize independent investigation, or free criticism. Of course, all who have read Dr. Workman's article in our *QUARTERLY*, for October, 1890, will desire to read this book. Dr. Workman claims to be misunderstood, but we think that Dr. Dewart has candidly sought to give what he believes to be the true meaning, and in this book has given us an able apologetic on a most vital theme.

The Virgin Mary, and Other Sermons. By Rev. J. E. LANCELEY. Methodist Book Rooms, Toronto, Montreal, and Halifax. Price \$1.

Why should not our own ministers give us volumes of sermons, when, as in this case, they have something good, original, suggestive, and practical? One may not always agree with the exegesis, but that self-assertive dogmatism is so wanting in the style, that you cannot help but pay respect to the opinions of the preacher, though you do not admit his conclusions. An excellent feature of these sermons is, that they send you away thinking along higher and truer spiritual lines. The "New Richmond" Congregation, McCaul Street, Toronto, before whom they were preached, must have been greatly benefited, as will all be who read them. The first section of seven sermons is made up of studies in the opening of Christ's life and work. In the second section we have the following subjects treated: "The Bible and Prohibition," "Perfect," "The Pulpit and Social Questions," "The True Soldier" (military), "A Greek Proverb," "The Lord's Battle," and "The Apocalyptic Appearance." We commend these sermons to preachers as thought-provoking material, to Christian homes as profitable reading, and to all devout readers as helpful to a comprehension of the truth.

An Introduction to Social Philosophy. By JOHN S. MACKENZIE, M.A. Glasgow, B.A. Cantab, Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, etc., etc. New York: Macmillan & Co.

This is a series of lectures delivered under the Shaw Fellowship at the University of Edinburgh two years ago.

It is an able discussion of some of the most living topics connected with political economy at the present time. It does not claim to have opened up originally any new mine of wealth in the discussion of these important themes, but it certainly is a clear and forcible treatise in which most readers will find abundant food for thought, and helpful suggestions of a very practical nature, as well as epigrammatical passages worthy to be remembered. For example, the following, "Whole truths are seldom so good to fight with as half truths; because the latter can oppose themselves more sharply to the half lies against which we have most often to contend."

The American Sabbath for June is the second number of this valuable journal. Its twenty-four pages are filled with matter of rare interest on the Sabbath question in its different phases. This organ of the American Sabbath Union, the only national society for the Protection of the Sabbath, has secured the very best talent in its list of writers, and is printed in the very best style. Rev. Drs. Butler, of Washington, D. C., Burrell, of New York; Scovil, of Ohio; Warren, of Syracuse, N. Y., contribute, among other well known writers, to this number. Published March, June, September, and December, 1891, under the auspices of the Union, at 23 Park Row, New York, at 50 cents a year.

THE SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS.

The Reformed Quarterly Review (Reformed Church Publication House, 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia) is one of the ablest of the publications of the kind that reach us. It has an able corps of contributors, and the editorial work is well done. The following is the table of contents for April: I. "Heinrich Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli, and Second Antistes of Zurich," by Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D.; II. "The Church Review, Symposium on Christian Reunion," by William Frederick Faber; III. "The Music of the Old Testament and the Religion of Israel," by Rev. J. B. Rust, M.A.; IV. "C. E. Smith, on the Apocalypse," by Rev. W. M. Reilly, Ph.D.; V. "Why am I Reformed?" by Rev. C. Chever, D.D.; VI. "The Practical Side of Culture," by Charles H. Lerch; VII. "Infant Consecration to the Lord," by Rev. George B. Resser; VIII. "Simon Bar-Jonah: The Stone and the Rock," by Mrs. T. C. Porter; IX. Notices of New Books. \$3 per annum in advance.

The Unitarian Review (monthly), so far as its general character is concerned, is too well known by our readers to require particular characterization at present. The last four numbers, now on our table, are fully up to the standard of excellence attained to in previous issues. The article in the June number, by the Editor, is particularly noteworthy. \$2 per annum.

The April number of *The Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church South*, is chiefly remarkable for its contribution to the discussion of the doctrine of the Atonement. Among the contributed articles is one from the pen of Dr. J. G. Burney on this subject, which is made the subject of critical examination by the Editor. The space at our disposal will not allow us to even attempt to intelligibly characterize either of these papers. Those who read only to find the echo of their own opinions will probably be disappointed; but those who are mainly anxious to see how a great and difficult subject, which is only imperfectly understood after all the thought that has been bestowed upon it in the progress of the ages, strikes the minds of differently constituted original and independent thinkers, and who are prepared to be grateful, for even the side-lights that may be shed upon it, even by theories with which they cannot agree, will find a good deal here to interest them.

The Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ, for April, discusses "The So-Called Proofs of the Existence of God," "The Poet, the Priest of Nature," "The Historical Development of Church Music," "The

Church Recreant," and "Eloquence." It has also a series of short articles on "Sunday Opening of the World's Fair," "The use of the Scriptures in Public Worship," and "A School-day Reminiscence." The Editor deals in a trenchant style with Posthumous Probation, under the heading of "A Blunder in Eschatology," "Ecclesiastical Rights of Women," and Dr. Briggs as "A Modern Iconoclast." The usual space to "Book Reviews" concludes a very valuable number. Dayton, Ohio: United Brethren Publishing House. Pp. 96. \$1.50 per annum.

The Atlantic Monthly, for April and May, contains the usual collection of first-class articles—historical, scientific, artistic and political. Of especial interest to Canadians is Parkman's account of "The Capture of Louisbourg by the New England Militia." It is a fascinating story, as full of adventure and excitement as any novel. The minute details of this piece of history, not found in any great record of the events of the time, lend a charm to the account which makes it impossible to forget it. It has appeared here in three parts, the last being in the May number. But there is little room to specialize, in this able work, all of its articles are of such high excellence, and there are few which are not of general interest.

The American Catholic Quarterly Review, for April, contains, in addition to its notices of books, twelve able articles from contributors, most of whom are men distinguished in their Church, and some of them with a world-wide fame. Nearly every page is devoted to the defence or exposition of some usage, institution, or exposition, peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church. The Review seems to take no knowledge of anything lying outside of that Church. But it must be admitted that it commands the very best ability, and a high literary style in the presentation of its subjects to the public. It requires more than bold and strong assertion, and violent denunciation to displace the convictions maintained by the writers here engaged.

The Universalist Quarterly is a striking contrast with the foregoing in its method. It certainly teaches unequivocally that the work of redemption will ultimately secure for every child of man an entrance into the full blessedness of salvation, but that teaching does not appear to be the sole end for which the Review exists. The impression left upon us by the reading of many numbers, is that liberal Christianity, as represented here, differs from orthodoxy chiefly in its readiness to present doubts and questionings as well as certitudes. Probably most men feel that the calm flow of life is disturbed by grave doubts and deep questions on many points of their faith, but they are admonished to preach their certainties, and not their doubts, as a foundation of Godly living; to doubt if they must, but keep their doubts, like their noses, for their own special use, and not trouble other people with them. But liberal Christianity, as we find it here, proceeds on the understanding that Christ's teaching is strong enough

to live in the face of all questionings, to answer them, if possible, if not to live with them, and by faith to triumph over them. All this is especially noticeable in an article with the simple and indefinite title "Brain," which deals with some of the gravest questions which can enter the domain of religion and morals, the very mention of which would be regarded by many earnest Christians as dangerous to the faith, and calculated to subvert the true basis of morality. And the writer proves by his treatment that he is not an enemy of the faith, even though he does not dispose satisfactorily, even to himself, of all the difficulties he quickens into life. Whether the method of the *Catholic Quarterly*, looking obediently and reverently only toward the past, in full satisfaction with the light received therefrom, or that of the *Universalist Quarterly*, knocking importunately at every door of the future for more light, is the better way, is a question which each person will probably answer according to his intellectual and religious temperament.

The Missionary Review. Funk & Wagnalls, New York. This Review is becoming almost an indispensable requisite to every one who wishes to keep pace with modern missionary enterprise. It has a staff of able and experienced editors, and its articles are ever fresh and interesting. The whole field of foreign missions passes under review, while home missions are not overlooked, as is seen in the excellent articles in the April number on the immense work carried on in London and Edinburgh. In the July number we note stirring articles on "Missionary Money—Quality and Quantity," by Dr. Gordon, and "The Present Crisis of Missions," by Dr. Pierson.

The African Methodist Episcopal Church Review for April. The list of contents shows a wide range of thought on the part of contributors, dealing with such subjects as "The Education of Literary Taste," "Which is the Greater Christian Poet, Wesley or Watts?" "Biographical Sketch of Condorcet," "General Booth's Darkest England," "Philosophy Religiously Valued," "Relation of Baptized Children to the Church," etc. There are some very good articles on "The Relation of the Negro to Education and the State." The address on "Popular Discontent," by Mr. Stewart, is exceptionally good.

The Lutheran Quarterly for April. In addition to the articles specially interesting to Lutherans are those on "The Theology of Zwingli," "The Abyssinians and their Church," "The Final Philosophy," "Massillon," and "The Influence of the Church in the organization of Modern Europe." These are ably written, and contain much mental stimulus.

The New Englander for April, May and June. The chief value of this periodical is in what it deals with present-day topics. All that is dreary and antiquated is banished from its pages, and its articles are, as a rule,

written with great clearness and vigor. We have room only to denote those that more immediately concern the student of theology and social themes: "The Indian Problem;" "Present Tendencies in German Philosophy;" "Divorce Socially Considered;" "Was Christ a Buddhist?" "Evolution of the Realistic Philosophy;" "The Inductive Method and Religious Truth;" "Labor's War on Labor." The article on "Canadian Reciprocity within the Union," in the June number, is strongly antagonistic to any concession to Canada except upon condition of annexation. The writer seems to work upon the principle that patriotism ought to be the slave of mere material considerations. When he refers to our "cities inland, and on the sea-coast heavy with earthworks and bristling with guns pointed south," we fear that his imagination has run away with his judgment.

The Methodist Review, New York, for May-June, continues the series of articles on the New Testament books. In this number "The Epistle to the Philippians" is treated by Rev. Jesse Bowman Young, D.D., which is not only critical, but is very helpful as to method of study. The biographical sketch is on the active and useful life of "Major-General Clinton B. Fisk," by Rev. A. B. Leonard, D.D. The Symposium is on "Life," most interestingly and ably treated by R. H. Howard, D.D., on "Its Nature and Phenomena;" by H. H. Moore, D.D., on "A Substantive Part of Creation," and by Prof. Lummis, on "Matter-Mind; Which Is Primal?" "Bristol in Relation to American Methodism," by Rev. W. H. Meredith, D.D., is of historical interest. The opening paragraph forms the basis of the article, and will give an idea of its scope. Bristol is the Mecca of organized Methodism; it is the scene of its earliest conflicts and its greatest triumphs; here was built its first church; here was formed its first class-meeting; here its then peculiar type of theology was settled; here the battle waged the hottest whether Methodism should be merely an annex to the Church of England, or a separate Church, with its ordained ministry and its sacraments. Here the victory of independence from Church of England control was gained. A very interesting article is "Newfoundland," by Richard Wheatley, D.D., which discusses fully the piscatorial and diplomatic struggle of the Newfoundlanders, the political history of the country, and the position of insular Methodism, which the writer declares vindicates the claim of being "Christianity in earnest." "The Southern Problem," by Rev. L. M. Hagood, M.D., is a review of a letter on the same subject in the *Arena* department of the January-February number. It is a sharp reply by a Northern Republican favorable to the negro. The subjects of *Current Discussions* in this number are: "The Theology of the New Testament," "Sociological Christianity a Necessity," and "The Ground of Women's Eligibility," all of which we heartily endorse.

The Andover Review for February contains among the leading articles, "Papal Infallibility in the Light of History," "The Ideal College Educa-

tion," "The Malthusian Idea," with a *fac-simile* letter from Mr. Gladstone; "The Theology of a Sacred Day." "What Shall We Do With the Old Testament?" is a helpful editorial which sums up the answer in "it must become to us a living word." The March number has "The Proximate Causes of the Crucifixion," "University Extension In England," "Some Philosophical Aspects of the School of 1830," and editorials on Canon Lucock, Canon Liddon, and Dr. Delitzsch on "The Preaching of the Gospel to the Dead," and on Prof. Brigg's "Inaugural." In the April number are "The Life and Times of Plato," "The Poetry of Alfred Austin," "Bazan's Russia," "Mr. Bellamy and Christianity," which should be read by all who have read "Looking Backward;" "The Function of Public Prayer," which is a plea for a common form of prayer by all Churches as a means of securing Christian unity, and makes a right conception of God, and of our attitude before Him necessary to true prayer. The writer makes the essential to be "prayer *with* a present eternal Spirit, who is the very life of the world," and from which "*self* in all forms is banished." The article that is sure to attract attention is "Revelation, Inspiration and Authority," by Alfred G. Langley. The genius of the article may be gathered from "We live in a transition age. Old methods of thought are passing away, new methods of thought are taking their place. The change is natural. It has been going on in all past history, it will go on in all future history. The new does not cut loose from the old, the present roots itself deeply in the past. The whole is organic, and continuity is a prime law of the organism." The author claims that "Jesus Christ is the supreme and final revelation of God to men—the personal embodiment of absolute truth," and that "the attainment of the absolute ideal in his own personal experience by Christ, is proof that it may at length be attained by us." He says, and so do we, that "We are not half awake as yet to our exalted privilege." The view maintained throughout the article, the writer admits, "is radically and fundamentally different from that which is ordinarily current," and he says, "If the new here set forth is erroneous, let the error be exposed; if it be true, let us accept it and act accordingly." The editorials are on "The Spirit of Expectancy," which is hopeful and inspiring as to the future, and "Our preaching Christianity as a gospel." An article in the *Biblical and Historical Criticism* department on "Immanuel—Prophecy and Fulfilment," by H. G. Mitchell, of Boston University, will be read with interest by Canadian Methodists. It is an exposition of Isaiah vii. 14-17, the conclusion of which is "that Isaiah's prophecy refers to the immediate future; that, therefore, if it was fulfilled in any proper sense, it must have been fulfilled toward the beginning of the reign of Ahaz, and that the birth of Jesus fulfilled it only in the *Jewish* sense." In the May number is discussed "Ethical Christianity and Biblical Criticism," by Prof. Harris. This is an article to be read with great profit, and makes one feel that so long as the realized ethics of Christ's life are lived and preached, no Biblical criticism can take away our Lord. He makes the heart of the Gospel to be "The sacrifice of Jesus

Christ (both by life and death) revealing through suffering the holiness and love of God." The breadth and liberality of his views will be seen in the following: "Let us remember, in general, that our conviction of the truth of Christianity does not rest on the authority and inspiration of the book which contains it, but that our exalted opinion of the book is in consequence of the value of its truth; and that while we of these later generations depend on the book for our knowledge of the facts, that knowledge is given to spiritual insight on almost any theory of the origin of the writings. Our Bible will not suffer if it rests on the solid base of Christianity itself, but our faith in Christianity may suffer if we insert the pyramid and rest our belief in the gospel on the absolute accuracy, in every part of the Bible, which is merely given to record it. We have, perhaps, been loading our faith down with non-essential beliefs, which are superfluous in any case, and which may become a serious embarrassment to us in the defence of the truth, or which may thrust the opacity of human traditions into the place of the simplicity that is in Christ. There are some things, the loss of which is a gain." The article on "Chinese Ideas of Inspiration," by Prof. Martin, of the Imperial College, Peking, is full of information, and shows that Confucius bore a relation to the Chinese similar to that of Moses to the Jews, so that the conversion of the Chinaman is not by presenting as an alternative Christ or Confucius, but Confucius as a special teacher, and Christ as the Light of the world. "The Greater Miracle," by E. C. Moore, which takes us beyond the antiquated arguments of Butler and Paley to the true logic: "He is the great miracle." "The True Use of the World: Three Types of Christian Life," by Prof. Egbert C. Smyth. The types are Greek Christianity: "This world is illusory and vain; rise above it to the real and eternal." Roman: "The world is a place of discipline; use it for self-conquest." "Christianity to the Greek means truth; to the Latin righteousness; to both Christianity said: 'Renounce the world.'" The true type is "use the world aright." "The aim of life is not simply a good beyond life. The true use of the world is, not merely to rise above it, not chiefly to gain its discipline, but to save it." The editorial on "The Moral Undertone," is an encouraging outlook upon social and public life, caused by the protests and responses against immoralities, both among the high and low in society. In the June number we have "Christianity a Religion of Hope," by Philip S. Moxom, D.D. Of the Christian religion, he says: "Its chief message to the world is the declaration of God's good intention toward men, and its chief representation is the person of Jesus of Nazareth." He distinguishes between the religion of Christianity and the religion of Christ, and says: "In forming our judgment of Christianity, we must discriminate between what is accidental and transient on the one hand, and what is essential and permanent on the other." "The fundamental element in the Christianity of Jesus is the love of God for humanity. Jesus was and is essential Christianity; in His person, and teaching, and deeds, He is the Gospel." Without doubt, the Gospel of the Son of God is a Gospel of sovereign love as well as of

sovereign law, and is optimistic, not pessimistic. "Christianity as a revelation of divine Fatherhood, and human sonship, and of divine love seeking the full realization of truth and love in human experience, and character, and destiny, is pre-eminently a religion of hope." "The Significance of Modern Criticism" discusses the effect of the inductive method upon literature and art. "The Present Religious Crisis in Japan," by Noluta Kishimoto, is a very valuable article, fully comprehensive of the subject. A concluding thought is applicable in other countries than Japan. "What we want is the *essence* of Christianity, Christianity in its lowest terms. As to the minute sectarian differences in doctrine and ceremony, the best way is *not to emphasize* them as essential, but leave them to our own choice. The clear distinction between the essentials and non-essentials of Christianity must be always kept in view." "The Gospel of Wealth," by Prof. Tucker, is a very able criticism of the articles by Andrew Carnegie on this subject in the *North American Review*, and the discussion that followed in that periodical, and in the *Nineteenth Century*. The Professor states Mr. Carnegie's position thus: "His 'Gospel' rested upon the clear and bold assumption that wealth was best placed in the hands of the few; the gospel part of his message being the duty of the few to redistribute their wealth in the interest of the many." He accepts neither the theory nor the premises upon which it rests, and shows that it is not the method to afford social relief. He calls attention to the moral significance of great fortunes, and shows the ethical bearing of the amassing of private wealth without offering a social remedy. The editorials are "Christianity in its Lowest Terms," suggested by Kishimoto's plea for a Japanese Christianity; "The Significance of the recent Episcopal Election," referring to Dr. Phillips Brooks, as Bishop of Massachusetts; "An Inconsistent and Useless Procedure—the Trial of Prof. Briggs," which regards the Presbyterian Church as on trial; and "Christian Nationalism," which refutes the idea that it is opposed to Christianity, and defines it as "the Christian protest against industrial slavery." Under *Biblical and Historical Criticism* we have "Can there be no Davidic Psalms in the Psalter?" which meets the affirmative answer of this proposition.

The Memory, for March and April, "Treats of the development of the power to retain and recall such sensations and perceptions as reach the mind through the two senses of seeing and hearing." Under "Eye Memory," the subdivisions are "The Windows of the Soul," "Training the Eyes to See," "Using the Trained Eye," and under "Ear Memory," "What it Is, and What it has Done," "The Method of Training," "How to Use Ear Memory." In addition to these there are practical articles on "Hints on Memory Practice," by Rev. Jesse L. Hurlburt, D.D., and on "Memorizing Music," by Joseph Singer." This is the third of the "Memory and Thought" series. \$5 per annum; to our subscribers \$4. The first of the series, "The Mastery of Memorizing," is reduced in price from \$1 to 60 cents to subscribers to *The Canadian Methodist Quarterly*.

The Primitive Methodist Quarterly, for April, contains sketches of "Mackay of Uganda," and "Vinet, the Chalmers of Switzerland." An able article on "The Origin and Relations of the First Three Gospels," criticises in a liberal manner the various theories, urging an open mind, and not too great haste to believe the assumption of theorists. The author's conclusion as to origin is, "A combination of the oral theory with subjective tendencies of the writers, and a borrowing between Matthew and Mark, and that all were written before A. D. 70." In the purely literary there are "Gareth and Lyneth," the most suggestive story of the "Idylls of the King," "Amiel's Journal," and "A Study of Shakespeare's 'King Lear.'" "Apparitions: The Aims and Achievements of the Physical Society," is full of interest. "Shall there be a Forward Movement in Primitive Methouism?" is inspiring, and should be read by every Methodist. "Modern Hinduism," is a plea for missions in India. Under the head of "Practical Homiletics," the parable of the virgins is considered.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Review, for April, is filled with interesting articles on "How to Study the Gospels," "The Holy Ghost," "The Family of God," "What Shall we Believe," "History of the Doctrine of Free-will," and "Free Schools in the South." The article of articles to our mind is, "The Family of God," which is an outline sketch of systematic theology, based on the Divine Fatherhood as the constructive factor, by Prof. W. H. Black, D.D., of the Missouri Valley College.

The Homiletic Review, for April, contains in its review section "The Present Relations of the False Religions to Christianity," "Applied Christianity the True Socialism," "Liturgical Tendencies and the Service of the Reformation," "Bibliolatry and Monumentimania," and "The Gospel to them that are Dead." In "Applied Christianity," Right Rev. F. D. Huntingdon, D.D., puts in a strong plea for "the true socialism," which "would be a brotherhood of men beneath the fatherhood of God; a human and divine commonwealth." In May, we have "Federation of the Churches," by James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., in which he advocates a combination of the parochial and congregational method in a systematic plan for pastoral visitation by all denominations acting in unity. "An Ancient Egyptian Bible Commentary," which is Egypt itself in "fulfilled prophecies." "The Present Problem of Inspiration," by Prof. Warfield, which is written against the negative school of critics upon the question. "What does an exact and scientific exegesis determine to be the Biblical doctrine of Inspiration. In the June number, "The Power of the Pastor's Hand-grasp," by Dr. Cuyler, should be read by every preacher. "Constructive Conduct," by President Andrews, is a sociological article dealing with hedonism, or personal utilitarianism, as against the true touchstone of conduct, which is the individuality of the race, and the collective responsibility of the individual to the whole. An interesting symposium on "Women in the Church," contributed to by Mrs. Bottome, Mrs. Brown, Mrs. Terhume, and Miss Greenwood. The "Sermonic Section" is

as usual well sustained. In the "Exegetical and Expository Section," studies in the Psalter are continued, and all the other departments go to make the *Homiletic* a most helpful review. With July it starts on its twenty-second volume.

Our Day. The April number contains "The Student Volunteer Movement," "The Political Value of the Independent Voter," "The Jewish Christian Conference at Chicago," and "The Hutchinson Family as Reformers." We would call special attention to "The Value of the Independent Voter," which is written in the interests of prohibition and other moral reforms. The author starts out by announcing the conventional political creed: "Politics resemble war. Morals, and questions of right and wrong are considered mainly as matters of expediency. If they will make votes on the stump, put them into the platform. If they lose votes, if they interfere with the interests of officials, or workers, let them be left out, evaded by glittering generalities, or ignored." He states another sad truth: "The fact is evident that ethics have no power in politics, except as they make votes. Public morals have no sanctions, except as they defeat enemies and elect friends." In view of this fact, the custodians of morals "must make moral convictions incarnate at the ballot-box, or fail with ignominy." The independent voter puts principle above party, right above a calculating expediency, and morals above spoils or power. He holds the balance of power, and gives the sceptre now to one and then to another, until both are lifted to higher planes, and one accepts his platform." In May are discussed, "Sunday Newspapers," "Popular Reforms in India," "A New Government for Indians," and "Dr. Starr on the Prospects of Missions." In June, "Anti-American Canadian Catholic Convention," "Unmixed Self-rule for Cities," "American Municipal Reform," and "Are Americans Becoming Ambitious?" The Boston Monday lectures in these numbers are "Self-surrender to the Self-evident in Science and Scripture," "Rights and Wrongs of the Red Men," and "Fruitful Faith as held by Our Lord and Saviour." The departments of "Vital Points of Expert Opinion," and of "Questions to Specialists" cover a wide range of interesting practical questions very ably treated by different writers.

The Preachers' Magazine has, under "Present-Day Reading," in the April and May numbers, an exhaustive sermon by Rev. T. G. Selby, on "Man and His Divine Prototype," from Genesis i. 7, and in June, by Rev. Wm. Cuff, on "Church Prosperity: or, A Needful Prayer for Ministers and Churches," an anniversary sermon from Psalm cxxvii. 25. Rev. Mark Guy Pearse has a homily in each number, on "The Gospel for the Day," which are intensely practical and eminently spiritual. Prof. Findlay continues his sketches of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul, and Rev. J. R. Gregory his "Papers on Christian Doctrine," the subjects being "Sanctification," "Entire Sanctification," "The Witness of the Spirit," in which a

distinction is made between the "faith of adherence" and the "faith of assurance," and the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments. In the April number, Rev. John Edwards tells us "How Men Get Their Sermons," using Rev. C. H. Spurgeon as an example. It is full of good hints. Mr. Spurgeon believes in hard study, wide reading, and long-continued meditation. He is a firm believer in pouring a stream of new ideas through the mind constantly, to preserve its freshness and prevent stagnation. When asked "Wherever he got all the knowledge from that he put into his sermons?" his reply was, "Oh, I take a book, and I pull the good things out of it by the hair of their heads." He believes that every sermon should be full of really important teaching, well illustrated, but not to be overloaded with too much matter. His motto is "Christ crucified," with an intense and vigorous faith. The May number contains a critique of Prof. Davison's article on "Inspiration and Biblical Criticism," and in June we have a new department, called "Homiletic Assistance." This is a good magazine for either minister or layman.

The Epository Times for April, May and June, contains the usual variety of suggestive thoughts and helps for Bible students. There are also a series of contributed papers by distinguished scholars on the present position of the Higher Criticism, such as "The Early Narratives of Genesis," by Prof. Ryle, and "Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel," by Canon Cheyne. Special texts in 1 Corinthians are still being treated in "The Great Text Commentary" department, and the "Expository Papers" are of well-sustained interest. This magazine is certainly *multum in parvo*.

The Treasury for Pastor and People for May, June and July, are as usual freighted with good things. The frontispieces and biographical sketches are of Myron W. Haynes, Edward M. Deems, and J. Wesley Hill, also a sermon of each. The living issues discussed by eminent college professors, and a view of the church in which they preach, are on "The Indian Question—The Friendlies;" "Notes on the Negative Criticism;" "Temperance in All Things—Biblical Teachings and Modern Methods." The "Pen Pictures of Eminent Preachers," by Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D., are of Chas. H. Spurgeon, Newman Hall, LL.B., and Albert Barnes. The "Questions of the Day" discussed are "The Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions;" "Arrogance of Romanism;" "The World's Fair on Sunday." In the July number, Prof. Schodde sketches "Theological Thought in Germany;" Rev. H. A. Delano points out the uses of the "Imagination in Preaching;" Dr. J. Hall gives his views on the "Second Coming of Christ;" Rev. J. H. Jenyanan writes of the wonderful revival in Asia Minor; Rev. W. W. Willard shows what the lever is in preaching; Dr. Moment, as usual, throws clear light on Sunday-school Lessons. Leading thoughts of six capital sermons are given, and significant editorials on "Systems of Theology," "The Theology of Christ," and "Nebulous Language," with other important matter.

Christian Thought for April contains "Scientific Conceptions of a Spiritual World," in which Prof. Martin ably maintains that "Science is not materialistic and earthly, save by mere perversion of its methods and scope." Mrs. Mary S. Robinson in "The Conflict of Sixteen Centuries," clearly shows "That no article upon the will, accepted as part of any creed, should be forced upon us as absolute truth." She makes some fine distinctions between Calvinism and Arminianism, to the great advantage of the latter. "The Religious Future of the Nation," from a United States standpoint, is very suggestive, and measurably applicable to Canada. The author sees the advantage of the situation to be in the "Independence of the Church from the civil power; the voluntary principle applied to the support of religious institutions; the increase of the Church's forces by revivals of religion rather than by natural growth of children; that the whole system of American Christianity is developing in its practical and moral aspect, rather than in its theological and speculative." "Evolution and Morality," by Chas. F. Deems, is a reply to "Herbert Spencer's Theory of Religion and Morality." In "The Believer's Sanctification," some erroneous conceptions are pointed out, and attention called to the fact that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has not yet been so clearly formulated as to bring it out for practical use in the Christian life; also, that the doctrine of sanctification can only be studied when studied practically. In June there is a sermon on "Visions," by President Reed, of Dickinson College; an article by Thos. Scott Bacon, D.D., on "Primitive Men," in which the first human pair are set forth as made in the image and destined to have the likeness of God as finally manifested in the actual character and life of the man Christ Jesus; an able defence of the Christian Faith against "Prof. Huxley's Latest Polemic," by Rev. Geo. W. King, and a speech on "A Few of the Chief Contrasts Between the Essential Doctrines of Buddhism and of Christianity," by Prof. Sir M. Monier Williams, K. C. I. E. This number completes the eighth volume of this very valuable periodical.

The Magazine of Christian Literature, with the April number, begins its fourth volume with undiminished interest. Among other articles we would mention "Is it Worth While to go on Preaching?" "The Early Religious Life of Charles Bradlaugh;" "John Wesley;" "The Influence of Wesleyanism on Calvinism;" "The Denominational College." In May, "Moral Education in the Public Schools;" "The Relation of Church and State;" "Mission Chapels;" "The Type of Personal Piety for To-day." In June, "Theodore Parker's Early Sermons;" "Wit in the Pulpit;" "The Swing of the Orthodox Pendulum;" "One by One."

The English Pulpit of To-day for March, April and May, sustains its character as exclusively a clergyman's magazine. The preachers selected are representative of the different leading denominations. The treatment of the themes is of the characteristic biblical expository style, as in contrast with the topical manner of the American pulpit.

The Scientific American, published by Munn & Co., New York, presents weekly to its readers the best and most reliable record of various improvements in machinery, while the scientific progress of the country can in no way be gleaned so well as by the regular perusal of its pages.

The Popular Science Monthly begins its 39th volume with the May number, which contains, among other interesting articles, "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science;" "Miracles and Medicine," which is concluded in June; "Fortifying Against Disease," suggesting preventive, protective, and curative methods; "An Experiment in Moral Training," as applied to school work, with satisfactory results. The Duke of Argyll concludes his able article on "Prof. Huxley on the War-path." "The Education of Children" is a study of the plans of Friedrich Froebel. "The Mexican Messiah," gives the plausible inferences, from facts and circumstances, of the visit to Mexico by a Christian missionary from Ireland in the sixth century, and the establishment of Christianity among the Toltecs. In the June number we would mention "Our Grandfathers Died too Young;" "The Development of American Industries Since Columbus," a continued illustrated series; and "Questions Concerning the Minor Planets." In July, "Man and the Glacial Period;" "Sanitary Improvement in New York;" "Our Agricultural Experiment Stations;" "A Coming Solution of the Currency Question;" and "Höfding's Outlines of Psychology."

The Chautauquan for April, May and June, has the usual interesting table of contents in each number. J. Rankin Towse on "Life in Modern England," says of the *influence of Victoria's reign*: "It would be difficult to exaggerate the reformation wrought in the general tone of English society by Queen Victoria, in the fifty years of her reign. The fierce light that beats about a throne has never been able to reveal a flaw in the purity of her personal character. All her life she has striven to promote public and private morality and decency, and the official example of the Court which has been, openly at least, in the interests of cleanliness and decorum, has set a high standard for society in general, and has not been without its effect even upon the lower and more ignorant orders. Coarseness and profligacy are no longer regarded with admiration, and the clergymen may again enjoy the respect due to religion, and the professed union of Church and State. There can be no doubt that there are forces at work in England, as in Europe generally, that threaten the foundations of society as now constituted, but the consolidation of the educated and prosperous classes, and the growth of what may be termed a conservative liberalism, afford a promise of security, and although it is difficult to foretell the result of the fermentation of discontent in the proletariat, it is always permissible to hope and believe that a danger which is recognized, may be avoided."

TOPICS FOR WEEKLY PRAYER MEETINGS.

SEPTEMBER.

- 2.—Song Service.—Ps. LVII. 7, 8.
 9.—For more spiritual working power in the Church.—ACTS I. 4, 8, 14; II. 1.
 16.—For Missions—that the Annual Anniversaries be seasons of spiritual awakening.—ACTS IX. 18.
 23.—For all supporters of the Liquor Traffic, that they may see their error.—HAB II. 15.
 30.—For personal self-surrender to the will of God.—ROM. VI. 13.

OCTOBER.

- 7.—For individual heart purity.—Ps. LI. 10; MK, VII. 20, 23.
 14.—For Missions—that the grace of liberality may be exercised by the people.—2 COR. VIII. 7.
 21.—Promise Meeting—Select some from the 31,000 “exceeding great and precious promises” in the Bible.—HEB. X. 23; NUM. XXIII. 19.
 28.—For our Sunday-school Work and Workers.—ACTS XVII. 11.

NOVEMBER.

- 4.—For the Unsaved in our Homes.—NUM. XII. 13; 2 SAM. XVIII. 33.
 11.—For the Unconverted in our Congregations.—ROM. X. 1.
 18.—For Missions—The heathen at home.—ROM. I. 23-32.
 25.—A Consecration Meeting.—ROM. XII. 1, 2.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

Consider Wednesday evening engaged to attend Prayer Meetings—plan accordingly. Let nothing keep you away that would not keep you from a business engagement, social party, club room or lodge. Invite your visitors and friends to come with you. Bring the children. Come from your closet; give attention to the subject; study the corresponding passages of Scripture. Be short and to the point when you speak or pray. Allow no long pauses. Cultivate a friendly spirit in the meeting. Speak to strangers. Shake hands. Take an interest in others.

PRACTICAL REQUESTS.

Do you know any member of the Church that is sick, or that needs pastoral attention? Do you know any stranger in the vicinity that is or has been a Methodist? Do you know of any family that attends no Church, or of any adults or children that attend no Sunday-school? Do you know of any person under conviction, or members that are backslidden in life? If so pray for them and visit them if you can, also write their name and street address, with any further helpful information, on a slip of paper or a card, sign your own name and drop on the collection plate.

“Ye are workers together with God,” and I am your fellow-helper.

YOUR PASTOR.

ALWAYS READ THE MANAGER'S NOTES.

YOU may think that the Editors place a very high estimate upon "Our Review," but read what *The Theological Monthly* of London, Eng., an eminent periodical and leading review, says: "THE CANADIAN METHODIST QUARTERLY for January is considerably taken up with an examination of Prof. Workman's Teaching and Methods by Dr. Dewart, and by a very notable article by J. M. Hirschfelder, supporting the orthodox view of Messianic Prophecy, in opposition to the opinions of Prof. Workman. This article should be read widely; it is a masterly defence of the position taken up in it, and is in many ways a model of what a controversial article should be. Mr. Burton's article 'Mosaic and Mosaic,' is worth thinking about; and Dr. Thomas writes very sensibly on the "Power of the Pulpit." Altogether this number is a very good specimen of a magazine which is well edited and capably supported by writers of more than average ability." We could furnish plenty of such testimonials.

How it would help us if each subscriber would send us another. Just try it, you can get one.

Geo. P. Rowell & Co., of New York, publishers of the American Newspaper Directory, and of *Printers' Ink*, a journal for advertisers—the oldest and best known of all the advertising agencies—conduct their business in such a way as to make it a material benefit to both advertiser and newspaper publisher.

They furnish plans for an advertiser and prepare his advertisement. For their services—designing his advertisement and preparing his estimate—they make a sufficient charge to pay for the required service of persons competent to do the work well. They tell the advertiser what papers he should use and what the price will be. If the advertiser wishes them to place the advertisement in the papers, they do as he directs, and for that service the newspapers pay them. If the advertiser wishes to place his advertising through some other advertising agency, or to contract with the publishers, he is at liberty to do so, and the estimate furnished by Messrs. Rowell & Co. serves as a guide. It tells him where he is securing a bargain and where he is paying more than he ought.

Every one who is in need of information on the subject of advertising will do well to obtain a copy of Geo. P. Rowell & Co.'s "Book for Advertisers," 368 pages, price \$1. It is mailed postage paid, on receipt of price, and contains a careful compilation from the American Newspaper Directory of all the best papers in the United States and Canada. It gives the circulation rating of every one and a good deal of information about rates and other matters pertaining to the business of advertising.

Among the papers named in it the CANADIAN METHODIST QUARTERLY occupies the position to which its merits entitle it.

☞ If those who are in arrears for 1890 or 1891 would remit at once, it would save us the trouble and expense of sending out a postal notice.

The tract on "Organizing the Church for Work," may be had for \$1.00 per hundred, and the Consecration Pledge Cards for 50 cents per hundred, also the Prayer Meeting Topic Card which appears on page 404 of this number, 50 cents per hundred. Send to the Business Manager for any of these, cash to accompany order. Order at once if you want the Prayer Cards.

Always mention the CANADIAN METHODIST QUARTERLY when writing to any of our advertisers. You might assist us to secure advertisements. Think of it.

You can at any time begin a Correspondence Course in New Testament Greek, Old Testament Hebrew, or the English Bible, with *The American Institute of Sacred Literature*, through the Theological Union. Now is the time to form a Bible Club for the study of John's Gospel, preparatory to Sunday-school teaching during the last half of 1891, or to arrange for the Examination to be held during the second week in January, 1892. Send to A. M. PHILLIPS, Toronto, Ont., for circulars and other information.

Could you not sell some bound volumes of the QUARTERLY for 1889, or 1890? Try it. \$1.40 per volume; \$2.50 for both. To new subscribers, either bound volume and subscription for 1891, \$2.25; or the two bound volumes and 1891 for \$3.00.

DR. B. E. MCKENZIE, B.A., Specialist—Disease of the Joints and Deformities. Consultation 10-3. 44 North St., Toronto.