

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.
- Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- 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

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 Review.

[NEW SERIES.]

---

---

VOL. VI.]

MAY-JUNE, 1894.

[No. 3.

---

---

## “THE IDEA OF GOD IN THE WORLD’S RELIGIONS.”

THE idea of God is co-extensive with human life. The origin of the idea it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss. Nor will it concern itself with extinct religions and the religions of savage. Rather will it take a survey of the present great non-Christian religions of the world, and note the conception of Deity contained in each.

The God of a religion determines a religion. Religions is an old subject of discussion. Six centuries before Christ there were writers on this theme. The science of religion antedates the history of philosophy.

India and Pantheism are conjoined in thought. We view India as the world-centre if not the world-source of Pantheism. Yet India was far on in her history before she reached this form of belief. Four centuries before Christ, the Upanishads mark the beginnings of her Pantheism; while eight centuries before that, the Vedas describe the existence and unfoldings of her ideas of God. The question of the religion of the primeval Aryans has been long to the front, but it is far from settled. Yet it has come to be generally believed that with the early Indians objects of nature were revered as supernatural powers. These in time were raised to divinities and worshipped as such. Simple appears that worship to have been—prayer, praise and offering. No temple, no public assembly, no idol. In a room

set apart in each dwelling, the family's devotions were led by an humble itinerant order of priests. Their conception of Deity was heno-theistic—a plurality of gods, but each the equal of the other, and of all in dignity and power. Neither limited the other, each and all supreme. Max Müller, Rawlinson and others give copious translations from the earlier Vedas, in which their gods, Indra and Veruna, are in turn addressed as the Supreme God, while Indra, Dyans, Agni, and Vishnu, severally and independently conduct the whole world's administration. In this ancient rule of faith, Agni, the God of Fire, is represented as all the gods.

India moved on towards an attempt at God-supremacy, and farther on to a compounding of Divinities, and still farther on to One God Supreme, with all others as subordinate. Her period of Atheism came, short and unsatisfying, for any gods are better than none, and she pushed on to Pantheism. One god is named with his triple impersonation of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. He is the "Objective Self," "The Incomprehensible, Eternal Soul," "The Only Reality," of whom the physical universe is but the emanation, expression, manifestation. "Before there was any thing, before there was death or immortality, before there was any distinction between night and day, there was that one. It breathed breathlessly by itself. Other than it there nothing since hath been."

Yet in the India of to-day, contemporaneous with this Pantheistic conception of the philosophers and priests, which means more than "the universe is God," the masses grovel in the most inclusive and degraded of idolatries. The world-centre of Pantheistic philosophy is the world-centre of Polytheistic degeneracy. The boundary-line of Hinduism, past and present, is the rise and fall of Buddhism. The Hinduism of to-day is the joint product of Brahminism, Buddhism, and other elements.

Twenty-four hundred years ago, a young and gifted Indian prince of the name, or clan, Gautama and family Sakya, was met by the question, "Is life worth living?" He became deeply impressed with the all-prevailing vanity and misery. "Desire," whose form is legion, was thought to be their cause. He resolved

to know and subdue himself. He forsook friends and wife and children, and retired from the world. The most rigid discipline and profoundest study of his country's philosophy and religion proved ineffectual. He abandoned such study and decided to seek independently a way of deliverance, if such could be. By deep and protracted meditation, he happened on the Truth, became the "Enlightened" (Budda), gathered disciples, and started a philosophy, a religion, and a social reform. "Myth," "legend," says the Western, modern higher critic. But the Buddhist world is as firm in its faith that the Buddha was an historical person as the Christian is that Christ was, or the Chinese, Confucius. Having displaced the national faith, this misionary religion swept over Asia, threatened Europe, and became the only moral stay of a fifth of the human race.

Yet Buddhism started with no soul and no god. It denied the existence of a creator and of an absolute being. A system which saw man a part of an universe, and specially emphasized "cause and effect," declared for an uncaused universe and an uncaused law. To the Veda, held by every Brahmin to be a Divine revelation, the Buddha accorded no superior authority. Brahminism made the Absolute the only reality; with Buddhism even this was not real. No Absolute, no ultimate absorption. The secret which the Buddha found was to end suffering; and this could be done only by ending existence.

But Buddhism has been as flexible, as aggressive and as elective as widespread. In its progress through the years it has taken on nearly a god. Metaphysics never satisfies the masses. Neither does the doctrine of mere self-help. Believe what men may, there is a felt need of assistance from something outside and higher than self. After Buddha's death, his followers, blinking annihilation, looked to him still to help them somehow. About the dawn of Christianity, he was raised to the rank of a deity. Chinese sages regarded the Buddha of the West as a Divine person before the advent of Buddhism to their country in the first century A.D. Present Chinese Buddhism is well known to be polytheistic—permitted, say some few of the philosophers, to satisfy the lower orders of the people. Nevertheless, it is an integral part and conspicuous feature of Chinese

Buddhism. Many think that Buddhism could have got no foothold in Japan without having first recognized the gods of the existing Shinto. Of the dozen sects of Buddhists at present in Japan, some are almost, if not altogether, theistic. Much is written and spoken by Japanese Buddhists of cause and effect, and "universal law;" but allusions are increasingly frequent to the "Absolute," "The Absolute Truth," "The Universal Mind," "The Pre-existent Sentient Mind," and the "worship of Buddha." Japanese Buddhism, in competition with Christianity, has already adopted the latter's methods. Will it simulate its God and future state? A recent writer in the leading Buddhist periodical in Japan affirms Buddhism and Christianity to be the only two forms of religion which can hope for universal dominion.

The religion indigenous to Japan is Shintoism. The cult under a variety of forms and names prevailed widely in Asia before the rise of Confucianism and Buddhism. In its primitiveness it was a compound of nature and ancestor worship. The forefathers of the Japanese people, when they "came from heaven in a boat," edged out its devotees and appropriated their faith. Time bent it and fashioned it to meet growing national requirements. What seems everywhere else to have been a passing phase was perpetuated in Japan, and wrought into a system of loyalty, obedience, respect and politeness, and more—a political engine. Shinto has a god. Its name signifies, "way to God." Before a beginning or a creation, there existed the one absolute, self-originated being. Assuming the male and female natures, he generated a host of lesser divinities. This done, the natures returned into absolute oneness again. The inferior gods created the heavens and the earth, and are the progenitors of the Japanese people. They possess men at call. Men at death become gods, good or bad; so that the worship of ancestors *a la* Japanese Shintoism is the worship of gods. In Yesso, the northernmost island of Japan, is found the fast-fading remnant of the country's aborigines, the Ainu. Their number does not exceed sixteen thousand. The Ainu are not Shinto in the Japanese sense; but they likely possess its primitive substance. They do not worship their ancestors, but their Ancestor, the

Father of their race. They have no public places of worship. At the east end of each hut a few poles indicate the family's place of offering to the gods. The Ainu believe in one supreme being, who governs the world through a host of lesser deities.

China, of all lands, is the most "untouched by time." It is the "Celestial Empire," the kingdom of God completed upon earth. Its national faith is Confucianism, while Taoism and Buddhism have prominence and state aid. Confucianism stands to China as Shintoism does to Japan. Buddhism was imported from India in the first century A.D. Confucianism and Taoism, native products, sprung up together six centuries earlier. But this does not reach the source of religion in China. Traces of a much more ancient faith are clearly discernable. Some taking Confucius to be not merely a civic moralist, but an exponent and transmitter of the old religion, extend the name Confucianism to include the same.

Dr. Legge, the eminent authority on things Chinese, having, with his master mind, given them a lifetime of study, declares that the primitive characters of China, made five thousand years ago, show unmistakably the Chinese to have been monotheists—that the believing in one God was the faith of the fathers and founders of the nation. A recent pantheistic writer or two object that Dr. Legge's characters might mean one god without necessarily implying distinct personality. The writers do not show that it is excluded.

The religion of China became a huge state institution, and took on a worship of inferior spirits and ancestors. The oldest Chinese book, the *Shu-King*, describing the inauguration of rulers from twenty-three to twenty hundred years before Christ, says it took place in a temple, and was signalized by the usual worship of sacrifice to the Supreme God, with subsequent offerings to the inferior spirits. The ruler himself did the sacrificing.

Confucius, while professing to expound the ancient faith did not emphasize God as the faith had done. He did not deny; neither did he plainly affirm. He thought the people could spend their time better in practising morality than working at supernatural problems deemed too much for human intelligence. He

gave them an empirical system of political ethics. Duty, civic, social, family, ancestral, was its substance. He spelled humanity with capitals. He was semi-positivistic, semi-agnostic. Yet the system with the rule, "Do not to others what you do not wish them to do to you," was no bald one. The rapid moral decline of the nation after the death of the great teacher is sadly depicted by Mencius. Yet the vacant religiousness and idolatry of China to-day is a conglomerate of Taoist and Buddhist rather than Confucian principles.

Taoism is the second great religion of China. Although it takes its name from the "Tao" of Lao-tsze, a mystic and recluse of the sixth century B.C., it made no pretensions to a religion till after the time of Christ. The full signification of "Tao," it seems impossible to get at. It has been translated variously, "way," "reason," "word," "nature." A "way" or method is possibly the best, as a way of salvation, a way of philosophy, a way of nature. It seems to be this "way," as applied in the personal, social, governmental. It is the secret of the universe in its origin, government and progression.

Lao-tsze taught a morality which rose as high as "return good for evil." He was in the field before Confucius, while some years his contemporary. His followers formed a school distinct from Confucianism and in a measure opposed to it. But it soon degenerated; the philosophical and moral elements vanishing, and the superstitions, patterned after some of the worst features of the later ancient faith of China, taking their place. During the reaction against Confucianism in the first and second century B.C., Taoism made its headway. Confucianism reasserting itself, Taoism lapsed into grosser superstitions. Buddhism stimulated Taoism, compelling it in competition, to systematize itself. Before the advent of Buddhism in the first century, A.D., Taoism had neither public services, temples nor priests. After, it got these, plus images, popes, penances, purgatories and hells. It has made frequent radical changes in faith and practice to cope with Buddhism. Lao-tsze does not positively assert belief in a personal god. His "tao" logically reached back of the origin of the universe, but whether this "way" or "secret" of the universe has included in it per-

sonal attributes or not, there seems to be as yet no sure means of deciding. But present Taoism is better off for gods than most religions. It has four supreme gods (deified men). The first is the first created man. The second and third are Lao-tsze in two persons, who certainly would object to being deified or related at all to the present system; and the fourth is a deified magician. Besides these there are innumerable subordinate deities, benevolent and malevolent.

Possibly the best of the non-Christian religions is that of the Parsees (Fars, Pars, Persia). Its adherents now in the world total not over one hundred thousand. With the exception of a small fraction still in Persia, they have their home in India. They stand for all that is left of the once powerful Zoroastrianism, which fell at the Mohammedan conquest of Persia. The Parsees are the Persian Pilgrim Fathers.

Zoroaster has been represented as a Median king, an humble philosopher, a "gold-bright reformer," a god. The best modern opinion, contrary to the later Avesta, lifts him out of the catalogue of divinities and makes him a truly historical personage, the founder or reformer of the religion which bears his name. His date and the rise of the religion may be placed somewhere between a thousand and fourteen hundred years before Christ. Some, finding the elements of the religion in the older Aryan beliefs, regard it as a development therefrom. Others see it as broken off from these, a reaction against the Vedic religion, and a setting up of itself upon an entirely different and superior footing. Its bible is the "Zend Avesta." With the religion of the Hebrews it had common ground as opposing idolatry. That which is determinative of this Zend religion is its dualistic God-conception. Its dualism has been variously conceived of by students of religions. With some it has consisted of two, distinct spirits, one good and the other evil, subordinate to the one eternal supreme God. Others have regarded it as one God eternal, having as an opponent and the creator of evil, the one subordinate spirit akin to the Bible doctrine. The Supreme God is the stronger, and will ultimately vanquish the evil spirit and exterminate evil. Again, two spirits have existed equally from eternity, one good, one evil, the respective creators thereof;

and thus good and evil have eternally existed. That the doctrine among the Persians has more than once shifted ground is inferable from the history of their religion. That which has come to be among the Indian remnant is not that which formerly had always been among their Persian forefathers.

Keary, in "The Dawn of History," says: "The evil principle opposed to Ormuzd is Angra-Mainus; but in the true doctrine he is by no means the equal of God, no more so than Satan."

West writes: "There are not wanting those who consider that Zoroastrianism is not more dualistic than Christianity, and point to the fact that no attempt is made to account for the origin of either spirit, while the temporary character of the power of evil is distinctly asserted."

Haug says: "Zoroaster held the grand idea of the unity and indivisibility of the Supreme Being, and sought to reconcile the existence of imperfections and evils with the goodness and justice of God by supposing two primeval causes which, though different, were united."

Bettany: "If one reads the Gathas naturally, without prepossessions, it will appear that Ahriman (evil god) existed from the beginning."

Prof. Geldner represents Ormuzd and Ahriman (the good and evil gods) as existing from the beginning. "The existence of evil is thus presupposed from eternity. When two gods are spoken of as Yêma (a pair), this is not to be interpreted as meaning that they are twins; it simply denotes duality—an opposed couple." The belief of the present Parsees in India inclines to a pure monotheism. The dualistic feature is subordinate, if not altogether suppressed. The Parsee Catechism, as construed in the "Great Indian Religions," accords to them one god, Ormuzd, and Zoroaster as his true prophet. "That the religion of the Avesta was communicated to him by God; that God is good and good deeds are enjoined." The doctrines of the resurrection, a future state of rewards and punishments, prayer and angels, is set forth therein. Mohammedianism, which arose in the beginning of the seventh century, is, at least, an international religion. One hundred millions will scarce include its adherents. Charles Martel and John Sobieski

checked its making of millions and diverted its history. Its "call" has been heard in the New-World; What occasioned this religion and what has it to say of God?

The original religion of Arabia was Sabeanism, say Mamoides, Wright, and Lees. Others make it a Sexual Dualism. Men like Marcus Dods see in it a simple Abrahamic monotheism. The later pre-Mohammed Arabians had adopted a polytheism of a most varied and complex character. Yet before Mohammed's time, some Arabs acknowledged a Supreme God and regarded the multitudinous deities as greatly inferior. "Allah" was above the gods, the "Supreme-One" afar off. The great temple (Kaaba) in Mecca, the Jerusalem of Arabia, contained idols of all the tribal gods, but there was one representing "God Most High." At the bottom of Arabian idolatry there was a hazy notion of a Supreme Being.

Moreover, there are always reformers before the reformation. Prior to the appearance of Mohammed, not a few thoughtful persons had become dissatisfied with the gods of Arabia. They rejected polytheism and confessed Allah. Historians differ mainly as to the extent of the dissatisfaction. The young, religious, nervous, quick-witted Mohammed could not have failed to observe the disaffection. From other sources, too, flowed opportunities for learning better than Arabianism. Mohammed's tribe, the Koraish, were the foreign traders and the knowing ones as to things and thoughts outside. Young Mohammed himself was actively and prominently engaged in trade with Palestine and Syria, and naturally met with floating Jewish and Christian ideas of God. Jews were numerous in the vicinity in which he spent his early life, and had the freest intercourse with the Arabs. Christian communities of a sort were contiguous. Both Pocock and Dozy assert that two tribes had an organized Christianity. Evidence is not wanting that Mohammed was acquainted with the contents of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. He saw that the earlier Arian controversy had left the scattered Christians throughout the East unsettled and disagreed as to the Godhead. He claimed that the God of the surrounding Jews was not the God of Abraham, and that the Christian's God was by them misapprehended. But whether

the environment and force of outward circumstances or other cause, there was a something which impelled him to rise above his fellow-thinkers, to break with his national faith and protest against it; to risk life, to suffer banishment, the loss of friends—all for the sake of his new faith. It was the immortal and irresistible conviction of a truth burnt into his soul, producing an irrepressible impulse to proclaim and maintain it.

The God of Mohammed is described in the Koran: "God—there is no God but He, the living and self-consistent. Slumber takes Him not nor sleep. He is what is in the heavens and what is in the earth. Who is it that intercedes with Him save by His permission. He knows what is before them and what behind them; and they comprehend not aught of His knowledge but what He pleases. His throne extends over the heavens and the earth, and it tires Him not to guard them both, for He is high and grand. Those who are in the heaven and earth adore Him voluntarily or involuntarily—Allah the Eternal, the Living One, who never dieth, the first and the last."

Yet the God of the Koran is but a part of the Hebrew's God and a part of the Christian's—a being of power and will afar off, without the righteousness and fatherhood of the God of the Bible.

Arabian philosophy, if importations can thus be called, distorted the God of Mohammed, Neoplatonized Him. Practical politico-ecclesiasticism makes Him the supreme despot over worlds of slaves. With a comparatively exalted notion of Deity, the rapid degeneration of Mohammedanism and its blighting effects morally and religiously wherever it goes, have been variously accounted for. Mohammed's idea of God, though imperfect, was sufficient for a higher civilization than Mohammedanism has ever shown. The fault was not entirely with the idea. Is it not rather in this! Mohammed's creed had two propositions, "There is no God but God; and Mohammed is His Prophet"? It was from the contents and results of the second proposition that the trouble has come. It stamped with the authority of the one God, absurdities, human weaknesses, human passions and human pride, "The lust of the flesh, the desire of the eye and the pride of life."

*Tokyo Anglo-Japanese College, Japan.*

JOHN WIER.

## THE HOLY SPIRIT OUTSIDE THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

No Scripture doctrine is of more importance than that of the Holy Spirit. Yet, relatively to its importance, no doctrine has been so much neglected. There are aspects of the subject that are a *terra incognita* at the end of the nineteenth century of the Christian era. What Athanasius did for the doctrine of the Son, and Augustine for the doctrine of the Church, and Anselm for the doctrine of the Atonement, and Martin Luther for the doctrine of Justification, still waits to be done for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. A really great and complete statement of the doctrine in all its aspects, harmonized with related doctrines, particularly with the Scripture teaching concerning the Father and the Son, is, to-day, the desideratum of theological science.

That modest task is only suggested here, not undertaken. It is as far beyond the aim of this paper as Hare's "Mission of the Comforter" is beyond one of Finney's tracts, or Moule's "Veni, Creator" beyond a Sunday morning sermon. Yet a tract may suggest and stimulate thought upon a subject when a magnificent monograph would not exhaust it, and a simple sermon may introduce the hearer to a study that will be the joy of years. May He of whom this subject treats make this paper to perform the office of such a tract or sermon!

1. The Holy Spirit in nature is one important aspect of the doctrine of the Spirit. We are taught in the Bible that the Spirit is the cause, the immediate cause, of all things, animate and inanimate. *Of the Father, through the Son, by the Spirit,* is the Divine method in Creation; as it is also in Redemption. Let me quote you three passages. The first consists of the opening verses of the book of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void: and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." There, the

orderly arrangement of the earth, and all that creative process related in Genesis, is attributed to God the Spirit. In the book of Job (xxvi. 13) we read: "By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens," a declaration that the stellar worlds are the creation of the Spirit, just as is the earth. The third passage is (Job xxxiii. 4): "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." That statement brings the creation of man, and the continuous procession of the generations of men, into the same list. Of the Father, through the Son, by the Spirit, is the Divine order in creation throughout all the universe.

All this is equally true of the preservation of nature. Listen to this significant verse from the 104th Psalm: "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the ground." I call that verse significant, and its significance is at once perceived when its connections are considered. The Psalmist has been giving an elaborate description of the energy and wisdom of God working in both animate and inanimate things, impressing on them the law of their action, sustaining them in being, allowing them, when He so wills it, to drop into formless dust again, and then comes the verse I have quoted as the explanation of this working, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit," and so thou doest it.

In one of our Lord's well-remembered parables He speaks of the earth as bringing forth fruit of itself. The Greek of that expression, "of itself," is *αυτοματή*: automatically. And what is the secret of this automatic action but the ever-present and everywhere-present Spirit of God? The law of crystallization in the unorganized stone, the law of growth in the organized plant, the law of instinct in animated nature, and the law of reason in the human mind;—what are they but modes of the Divine working, expressions of the life and energy of God the Spirit? Scientists fall back on Evolution as the explanation of all these things; yet, what is Evolution but the working of the evolving Spirit, and all the forms that nature wears but the vesture in which He at once conceals and yet reveals himself? There is that in nature which appeals with almost the power of a human love to spiritually sensitive minds, just as the lilies

and the birds did to our Lord Jesus Christ. Men often talk of communing with nature, as though it could speak to them with thought and sympathy, like a personal friend. And you have heard people speak of an experience in conversion which seemed to bring them face to face with a new world. What is the explanation of these sentiments and experiences? I answer, the explanation is God. The Spirit of God in nature responds, to the Spirit of God in man, until, like Jacob at Bethel, we exclaim, "Surely God is in this place, and I knew it not." "Thou coverest thyself with light as with a garment." "O Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of thy glory."

2. The Holy Spirit in the natural endowments of men, particularly in their loftier ranges, deserves more attention than has usually been accorded to the subject. The great physical strength of Samson, the valor of Gideon, the mechanical and artistic skill of Bezaleel and Aholiab, the mental acuteness and vast wisdom of Joseph and Daniel, are all attributed to the Spirit of God. These are not things usually attributed to Divine inspiration. They whose interpretation of the gifts of the Spirit admits most have seldom thought of including the endowment of the athlete, the mechanic, the inventor, the artist, the architect, the soldier or the statesman. Gifts of eloquence or government in the Church may occasionally be attributed to the Holy One, but the rest of life is largely atheistic—without God. Yet in these practical negations we have not outgrown the Bible, but have come short of its insight. Its spiritual explanation of human talent and genius is far more tenable, because far more scientific than any of our mechanical theories. It is the inspiration of the ever-present Spirit, which still enables men to conceive, to plan and to execute in all departments of practical thought and active life. Hence, a great German metaphysician, Schwab, giving philosophical form to this conception, declares: "Nothing calls us more powerfully to adore the living God than the appearance and embodiment of genius on the earth. Whatever, in the ordinary course of things, we may choose to attribute to the mechanical process of cause and effect, the highest manifestations of intellect can be called forth only by the express will of the original Mind, *independent of second-*

*ary causes.* Genius descends among us from the clouds precisely when we least look for it. Events may be calculated, predicted—spirits, never. No earthly oracle announces the appearance of genius; the unfathomable will of the Creator suddenly calls to it, "Be!"

3. The Holy Spirit's presence and work in men dwelling outside of Bible lands and beyond the horizon of Biblical illumination, is another important aspect of this subject. Who that has any knowledge of general history and literature, can deny the fact of a real Divine teaching among the nations of the earth? Real, I say! Divine, I say! Not full, not constant, not unmingled; quite intermittent and confused rather, because of the very imperfect medium through which it found utterance—but still real.

There are gems among the moral aphorisms of Confucius of the first water. There are conceptions of Buddha that are essentially Christian. Take the three words of Zoroastrianism, as held by the Parsees of India—"Good thoughts, good words, good deeds"—the Parsee Triologue. As principles of morality, could anything be more manifestly of God? The Bible gives us glimpses of the world outside the bounds of Israel, which do not permit us to doubt that while God was subjecting Israel to a special and peculiar training, and through Israel had great purposes in view for the world, He was not leaving himself, meanwhile, without a witness among the nations beyond. Job in the Auranitic desert; Balaam in far-off Mesopotamia; the Queen of Sheba in Arabia, and the wise men who came to Jerusalem seeking the infant Messiah, are not only great historical characters, but also sublimely suggestive characters. May we not say of them that they are object lessons which God has brought within the range of, and displayed to, His Church, testifying to a loving care and a gracious teaching, which the Church herself could no more exhaust than one nation could exhaust the atmosphere of the world.

St. John speaks of the true Light enlightening every man who cometh into the world. Jesus speaks of the Father as drawing men unto the Son—drawing, of course, by the Spirit. And is it not because of this omnipresent Spirit drawing men

toward God, even when the Son has not yet been historically lifted up before them, that there is so much hope in missions to the heathen? Men led of the Spirit into love of the light already possessed, perceive at once that the Christ is the Light of the world when He is shown to them, and their response is sometimes so prompt as to put many Christians to shame. The late Dr. W. O. Simpson relates a story of preaching many years ago in a town of India to a congregation of Brahmins who had never before heard the Gospel. When he ceased, there were those who perceived a new doctrine had been advanced which ought to be combated, on the principle that what is new in doctrine is not true. They pushed forward a very old man, who began to speak with reluctance. Finally, he said: "You see, sir, I am pushed forward to contradict you. I don't know why I should be, but—" and as he spoke he took a lock of his long, white hair in his hand. "You see this, sir! It is very white now. It was as black as a crow's wing once, and it has grown white while I have waited to hear words like those you have spoken to-day."

The light of the Holy Spirit does shine even on heathen lands. Long continued resistance on the part of the fathers has led to much perversion of original truth, so that the rays of the Spirit are reflected on the children through a sadly distorted medium of doctrine. So much refracted and coloured, indeed, are the Spirit's rays, that we are often ready to deny any heavenly origin to them. Nevertheless, the Spirit shines, and in that fact there exists a mighty motive to the Christian Church to preach the Gospel to every creature. It should be an inspiration of hope to every Christian soul in disseminating the truth as it is in Jesus—the Word of God—which is the Spirit's special and most eminently preferred instrument and medium.

4. The Holy Spirit in the Jewish Church is another most important branch of this subject. The teaching of the Old Testament tends steadily to the impression that the entire covenant people were subjects of the influence of the Spirit of God. He was not the exclusive possession of prophet and psalmist, of judge and priest, of statesman and warrior, but was an inheritance in which all the people shared, so far as they

were willing and obedient. God's covenant to them is expressed in these words (Isa. lix. 21): "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever." And because the Spirit was given thus, their sins are spoken of as sins against the Holy Spirit. Stephen charges, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did, so do ye." Isaiah says (lxiii. 9, 10): "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them." Moreover, there are moments of inspiration when the Spirit is realized by the Old Testament saints to be everywhere present. "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there. If I make my bed in Sheol, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, surely the darkness shall overwhelm me, and the light about me shall be night; even the darkness hideth not from thee, but the night shineth as the day. The darkness and the light are both alike to thee." All this is spoken of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament. And beyond all this, those Old Testament saints were not ignorant of the experience of special seasons of religious revival, when the Spirit was poured out in unusual measure. Where do we get our figure of "Showers of blessing," but from Ezekiel? And our conception of the Spirit "coming down like rain upon the mown grass," where does that come from but from the Psalms? And listen to this from Isaiah (xxxii. 13-15): "Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers; yea, upon all the houses of joy in the joyous city: For the palaces shall be forsaken; the populous city shall be deserted; the hill and the watch tower shall be for dens for ever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks;

Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and (then) the wilderness (shall) become a fruitful field, and the fruitful field (shall be so luxuriant as to) be accounted for a forest." What a picture of revival and of the effects of revival! Yet, primarily, it is testified of the Jewish Church.

One marked result of this rich and richly diffused gift of the Spirit to the Jewish Church, was a lofty and intense type of spiritual experience, among those who were faithful. The more I read the experimental portions of the Old Testament, the more I am surprised at the richness and fulness of their tone. No study is more interesting to me than Christian biography, yet the best Christian biography seldom rises higher than the best Old Testament biography. Christian men who are led of the Spirit come to have a deep repugnance to sin and a profound penitence on account of their own sin. Yet for hatred to sin, I have never seen a Christian writing expressed more vigorously than the 101st Psalm, and for penitence how steadily we quote the 51st Psalm. Christian men who are led of the Spirit have an intense passion for righteousness, yet the 119th Psalm breathes a fervor which the most consecrated Christian may receive stimulus from. "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day." "Rivers of water run down mine eyes, because they keep not thy law." "My zeal hath consumed me, because mine enemies have forgotten thy words." "Seven times a day do I praise thee because of thy righteous judgments." How many in zeal for righteousness and truth have gone beyond that? And consider that most choice and rare attainment of the Christian life, the power to walk with God calmly, trustfully, lovingly, conscious of His presence and delighting in His guidance. Yet where can you find a better expression of it than in the 23rd Psalm? "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. . . . Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." How often we quote that by the side of Christian death-beds? Yet it was written a thousand years before the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is an inspired record of the experience of a saint in that far-off time. Who is there among us that has

not had the experience of being urged by the Spirit to reach up to some new attainment, to put his foot on some new promise; who, when he has finally consented, has been startled to find that many an Old Testament saint had been before him.

Now, out of the midst of a people thus taught and led by the Holy Spirit, it became possible that the great, the solemn, the sublime fact of an inspired literature should spring. The prophets of Israel were rendered possible because Israel as a people was so divinely led. The loftiest mountains of the world are not isolated pyramids springing abruptly from the level of the sea. Everest, and Aconcagua, and Mont Blanc, and St. Elias are only loftier peaks of lofty systems—special elevations of elevated mountain chains. The whole system of the Himalayas lies beneath Mount Everest. The entire bulk and altitude of the European Alps support Mont Blanc. And so the inspiration of Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, is based on the elevated spiritual attainment and endowment of all Israel. They are elevated peaks of an elevated spiritual range. The Spirit which was in the prophets, we are expressly told, was “the Spirit of Christ,” but it was not their exclusive possession. It was only a fuller measure of that Spirit in which all the people had inheritance. It was only a specialized manifestation of the Holy Ghost, whose ordinary working was a common experience. The prophets were the ministers of a holy nation; the specially endowed spokesmen of a remarkably endowed people. And so richly were the people endowed that they were made the judges of the prophets. Theirs was the duty of deciding between false prophets and true. (Deut. xiii. 1-5, xviii. 1-22.) By the response of the Spirit in themselves, they were to discern whether their teachers spake by the Spirit, or whether they spake falsely. Just as Paul, writing to the Christian Church, says, “I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say!” so the prophets of the Old Testament came to the Jewish Church. To me it is the easiest thing in the world to believe in the inspiration of the prophets, because I believe in the inspiration of the people. It seems to me a most natural thing that the prophets should have been specially inspired of God, when I see all the preparation God had been making to that end. When a man

has seen the St. Elias Range, he can believe in the peaks of Fair-weather, Crillon and St. Elias. And so, when my mind grasps the fact of Israel's inheritance in the Holy Spirit, I can believe in the special Divine inspiration of Isaiah and Ezekiel; of Hosea and Malachi; of Samuel and Ezra. I can believe in the miracles of the Old Testament. I can believe that the Old Testament is the Word of God, because I believe in the gift of the Holy Ghost to Israel.

But some, probably, will be disposed to interject a question here. In the light of these facts, why do we call the Christian dispensation the dispensation of the Spirit? Why do we consider our privileges in relation to the Spirit to be so much superior to those enjoyed in Old Testament times? And why is it said by our Lord, "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you, but if I go away, I will send him unto you?" Why, also is it said, "The Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified?" All these questions are one in principle, and may all be answered in one general statement. The Holy Spirit's work in redemption has always been to testify of Christ. The efficiency of His work is dependent on clear views of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. His work is limited accordingly as the knowledge of Christ is limited.

In heathen lands the knowledge of Christly truth is exceedingly defective. It lies among a mass of falsehood, in the proportion of a grain of wheat to a barn full of chaff. And there the efficiency of the Spirit is the lowest and least of all. Among God's ancient people, when Christ was the subject of clear and graphic prophecy; when all rites and ceremonies pointed to Christ; when the very prophets themselves were types of Christ, the work of the Spirit was highly efficient. His rays could shine on human hearts through a tolerably clear medium. And when the work of redemption was historically completed, in the glorification of the Redeemer, then there was given to the Church a body of truth which the Spirit could freely use and fully honor. Taking of the things of Christ and showing them to the world, he could convince of sin, of righteousness and of judgment in a measure that rendered his

work a new departure. The directness, the clearness, the vigor of His work became such as to inaugurate a new dispensation. And not only could he so honor the Gospel of Jesus Christ as to accompany it with marvellous power, but also the inspiration to propagate it was full of promise for the world. By reason of a Gospel to be preached to every creature, it became possible that the Holy Spirit should operate efficiently more and more widely, until He should be the Spirit poured out on all flesh, and all the ends of the earth should see the salvation of our God. The work of the Holy Spirit which commenced at Pentecost was new, not in the sense of a new Spirit making his advent into the world, and beginning for the first time to operate on men's hearts, but it was new in its quality and intensity by reason of the completed Gospel of Jesus Christ, which the Spirit could freely use and fully honor, and steadily bless with signs following. The sword of the Spirit is the Word of God, and in the completed Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Spirit is supplied with a sword, on whose bright blade there is no spot, and in whose double edge there is no dull notch, from hilt to point.

*Toronto, Ont.*

THOMAS SIMS.

---

### "CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM."\*

It is refreshing to have before us utterances on this subject from the Church which rose from the working classes of a century ago, and through whose instrumentality much has been done to elevate the classes amongst whom her lot was cast. No previous statement has been made upon her behalf of such weight as this one, on the vital topic of Socialism in its relation to Christianity, or *vice versa*. It is, therefore, with great interest we take up the book to find out what is the position of the Fernley lecturer, speaking to the Wesleyan Methodist Church on these questions. From the constituent elements of her organization, no Church has a greater right to speak, and to

\* "Christianity and Socialism," by Rev. Wm. Nicholas, M.A., D.D. Being the 23rd Fernley Lecture, delivered before the Wesleyan Conference at Cardiff, July 28th, 1893. Octavo, pp. 220, paper, 70c. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room. Toronto: William Briggs.

speak plainly; and some such production as the one before us has long been looked for by her followers from some one of her leaders of thought. That such an utterance should have been brought before the public under the auspices of the Fernley Trust, which has for its charge the providing of a yearly lecture on the Defence of Christianity, or some kindred subject, and that it should have fallen from the lips of one evidently well prepared and courageous enough to deal with the subject, is certainly a happy combination, and an equally happy result is looked for. It is an undoubtedly fair attempt to deal honestly with a great subject, but either the lecturer has failed to grasp the whole genius of Socialism, or his spectacles have been red, and he could only see harmonious colors. To many this lecture will be a great disappointment. To many a working man, dependent on his labor for his support, and with a sincere love for the Church which brought to him the knowledge and need of a Saviour, it will be like the death-knell to his hopes of the coming time when the Church shall take a more than passing interest in his temporal welfare and the remuneration he shall receive for his toil—whether it be sufficient or not for the needs of himself and family. And to many others who, from other standpoints, have looked for some note of endorsement of the efforts put forth for social amelioration, it will be like the proverbial pouring of cold water upon their efforts. One thing, however, must be said: the lecturer's ideal of ethical Christianity is a high one, and we say most heartily, amen. Would to God the practice were equally high.

He starts out with the axiom that "God has made man a social being," therefore "society is not to be regarded as a mere accumulation of separate and distinct individuals coming into contact with each other, as grains of sand on the ocean shore, without having any vital bond of union between them. It is rather to be regarded as an organism, past, present and future, vitally connected together, all influencing each, and each influencing all." (Page 2.) Speaking of Christianity, he says: "Jesus of Nazareth is the greatest of social reformers, and the system He taught, if cast into the bitter well of our humanity, will make the waters sweet." (Pages 5 and 6.) Of Socialism,

he says: "Now, there is another system which claims to have a deep sympathy with the poor and suffering, and declares itself able to remove all social evils, and to solve all social problems, and to so reconstruct society that men shall lead lives free from the cares and troubles of the present, and with full satisfaction to themselves. This system is Socialism." (Page 6.) "These two systems are gravely dissimilar *in origin, in principles, in aims, in methods and in motives*. It is true that there is some ground common to both. Yet, because of this common ground, to represent the two systems *as similar, or as allied, or as closely related to each other, is a mistake*." (Page 6.)

This is Dr. Nicholas' starting point; and his evident intent is to show Socialism in its blackest form. He can see no possibility of an alliance between the two. In some respects, undoubtedly, his arguments are correct from his point of view, but there are other points of view worthy of more consideration than he gives them.

Let us look at the foundations first. There is no quarrel as to the possibility of Christianity to accomplish all that the lecturer claims for it—if, as he himself suggests, it be applied to the social system as at present constituted. If! Why not? The objection of Socialism, as I understand it, is not with the teachings of Christ as such, but with the Christianity of to-day as practised. He admits that dire social evils do exist, and that there is certainly a need for something to be done. Since the days when humanity shook itself free from the shackles laid upon freedom of thought by the Church, the work of the latter has followed a somewhat different course. The effort has been for the salvation of men's souls, to the neglect of their temporal condition. Except under exceptional circumstances, such as sickness, etc., no provision was made for any enquiry as to how far a man's income, as the product of his labor, sufficed for his reasonable needs. In the meantime, the evils of the social system have grown and men have thought, with the result that Socialism is suggested as a means of accomplishing what modern Christianity in its practice has failed to do. Is it not possible that the union between the two systems may be as close as the

union of soul and body. If the Church, as representative of Christianity, has elected to look after the souls of men, ignoring the means by which the body is to be sustained, provided no legal or moral (Sinaitic) law be flagrantly violated, and if Socialism has elected to perform the work that Christianity, through apathy or misapprehension, has neglected, then the two may, after all, be the complements of each other; or, rather, Socialism is the complement of Christianity, as at present practised in looking after man's rights as a human being, while the former is chiefly interested in promoting his spiritual welfare, and leaving the temporal to take care of itself. Granted that Socialism is materialistic, and may be anti-Christian in its extremes, it is not to blame for that, if it be the product of the spirit of the age. What has been the moulding influence of the world's thought for the last eighteen hundred years—Christianity or Materialism? It is the misfortune of Socialism that it is materialistic, but the sheltering arms of Christianity has never been open to it, and so long as men have bodies they must be cared for; and if men, thinking men, see in Christianity no relief or sympathy, what wonder if they turn to something else. And after all, these two systems may not be so gravely dissimilar, in at least some of their features.

On the historical portion of the work much care and research has been bestowed, though the conclusions of the writer cannot always be accepted without some slight reservation; as not only Socialism, but every other "ism" is brought under the one common head.

"We shall now deal with their assertion that Christianity sanctions some of the leading economic ideas of Socialism. It is necessary to do so. There are many besides those who regard themselves as Christian Socialists who have a vague impression that Christianity teaches *equality of condition, is opposed to the holding of private property, and in favor of a community of goods.*" (Page 111.) The common fund of our Lord and the apostles is then used as an instance from which the inference is drawn, "that this having a common fund" was not "designed as an example for us, and that their having a common fund did not prevent the apostles from holding private property."

(Page 112.) Whilst these inferences may be strictly correct, yet it is equally true that the principles of Socialism are not incompatible with Christianity, as the instance quoted shows.

"The story of Dives and Lazarus is also instanced as showing that in the view of the great Teacher it is wrong to be rich," and the following inference is drawn: "Then it follows that the richer a man is, the less chance he has of salvation, and the poorer he is, the more certain of it." (Page 115.) But the lecturer does not believe that himself, or his labored defence of the rights of private property which follows is altogether at a discount, as also his use of Christ's "sanction of the rightfulness of holding of private property." (Page 118.) His great fear is expropriation of private property, and it is rather unfortunate for his argument that whilst one of its strongest props "is a tacit sanction" of this practice, there is a very distinct and unequivocal command to "lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth" (Matt. vi. 20), and his attempt to do what he himself condemns, "the drawing of a general conclusion from a particular premise" (page 114), is more than overcome by the general command against the accumulation of such property. Granted that such sanction was given to the holding of property already accumulated, what about all the vast accumulations that have taken place since both by Christians and Methodists, even contrary to Wesley as well as Christ? Surely the Socialist has some slight ground for holding that if Christianity is consistent with itself, such accumulations are contrary to its teachings, and, as restitution is one of the fruits of repentance, the best thing to be done is to expropriate such accumulations.

A parallel is drawn between the teaching on the subject of the rightfulness of holding private property and slavery. But it proves too much, if "whilst our Lord and His apostles did not definitely attack slavery, *they do not express approval of it, and they lay down principles which are absolutely incompatible with it.* It is otherwise with private property. The moral right to hold it is admitted, and no principle or precept of Christianity is violated by its possession." (Page 121.)

But slaves were private property, and what applies to one kind of private property applies to another. It is no worse to

keep a slave and appropriate the products of his labor than it is to do the latter without keeping him, thus throwing upon himself the onus of providing for himself out of the miserable pittance selfishness may see fit to dole out to him. It is on moral grounds alone that you give him his freedom, but the moral standard has not yet reached the height of his recognition as a brother, although you liberate him as a man; the demand for the emancipation of at least a fair share of the products of his labor is as yet unheard. Again, the part emphasized applies equally well to the holding of other private property. If the principles are not incompatible with the holding of it, they most certainly are with the accumulation of it, and as it cannot well be accumulated without being held, the inference is that after all one of the principles of Christianity may possibly be violated by its possession.

The finest chapter in the whole book is that which is devoted to the examination of the Socialist condemnation of Christianity, and he frankly admits that current Christianity is not without blame for the present state of affairs. "We have Christianity as it was presented and taught by Christ and the apostles, and Christianity as it was presented in the lives and professions of His followers in different lands and ages. In this latter sense Christianity has been often to blame for taking but little interest and making but slight efforts to secure the progress of society." "Again, we contend that the charge is true only in so far as Christianity has been misrepresented by Christians." (Page 128.) He, however, fails to do justice to the Socialist objection. How is Christianity to be measured? By its glorious dead past, or by its present misrepresentation? If the past is Christianity, which no one denies, what is the current representation which is claimed to be the same thing? If the one is right, the other surely cannot be, and those who criticise it may surely be allowed to judge of it as they find it without being blamed because it is no better. If the Christianity of the present day were up to the standard our author raises, we could safely predict that Socialism would soon die a natural death, because there would be nothing for it to do. "No matter how exalted may be the teaching, or how spiritual

the exercises in the house of God, the Gospel of Christ is not fully preached if the duty of loving and serving man is not made as prominent as the great Master made it." (Page 131.)

The text of the next chapter is here: "The right to hold private property and individual liberty stand or fall together." (Page 141.) "Now, Christianity secures our individual liberty by insisting on two fundamental principles. One principle is, that every man is responsible to God, and should obey God rather than man. Another principle that Christianity teaches is that every man has the right of private judgment." (Page 133, *et seq.*) "Liberty is essential to the progress and development of the human race." (Page 137.) "Men have felt liberty so important that they have sacrificed everything for its sake." (Page 143.) These are noble and inspiring sentiments, and their very nobility may mislead us as to what they really mean. But he further says: "Majorities may be wrong. History shows us that in no one period has the majority of the race been on the side of right and truth. Minorities have rights with which majorities have no right to intermeddle." (Page 143.) He thus supplies the argument which best answers himself. As Socialists are as yet in the minority, perhaps he will not object to allowing them the benefit of his logic. We find that it makes all the world of difference as to who the subject of liberty may be. If it be the individual or class who hold private property, the argument applies; but if it be the class struggling and dependent upon their labor for an existence, the liberty allowed is of a totally different character. He may join a trades union if he sees fit, provided such combination does not involve harm to others, *i.e.*, the accumulators of private property from the results of his labor. When choice is a matter of necessity, it makes just all the difference how much liberty, and of what kind, the individual shall enjoy. Under such circumstances, what becomes of the second fundamental principle of Christianity—the right of private judgment? In spite of his private judgment that he has a right to hold private property, the laborer must, in many cases, conflict with those who by combination have decided that his right to hold private property shall not be interfered with, but that *his right to acquire pri-*

vate property through his labor is contrary to their right to accumulate and hold private property; and it is just possible that the combination, even if they be in a minority in point of numbers, are the majority in point of power, and such a majority might possibly be wrong. As might be expected, the lecturer sees in Socialism the germ of every evil. "Under Socialism, we should soon find ourselves in the dark night of unmitigated slavery." (Page 133.) "Socialism is destructive of individual liberty. Anarchism would not be so destructive of liberty as international Socialism." (Page 138.) But everyone is not so alarmed for the consequences of Socialism in practice. He seems to have allowed his fears to warp his judgment, and to forget that the very principles he condemns so vigorously obtain in the realms of commerce and trade. He does not give his fellows credit for even common-sense when he says: "The necessary tendency of organized labor is to create a large class who would devote themselves to work at minute portions of manufacturing, and a small class who would control and organize. Few are possessed of the faculties requisite for organization on a large scale; and those who devote their powers, say, to making pin-heads and filing the points of needles, or some other department of the almost infinite division of labor, would be incapable of organization." (Page 139, *et seq.*) If it were not for its terrible earnestness, such puerile reasoning would be unworthy of notice. His fear really is that the pin-head maker or needle-point filer might become an organizer, and some holder of private property relegated to a subordinate position. It might be news to him to learn that if he adds a class who do not work, his division is actually in existence at the present time, and that the greater part of the duties (see page 140) he lays down for the organizers, are actually performed by employers and managers in a much more arbitrary manner than any such organizer would dare to do, and that such minute divisions of labor as he deprecates are an actual fact. His fears for such corrupt, tyrannical oppression as he foresees, "a more odious form of government than that of the 'wicked ten' in Venice, or of the worst oligarchies of the ancient states of Greece," shows but little faith in the possibility of improvement in the human race—and

why his preaching?—and also in the ability of any future generation to learn the lessons of history and apply them—then, why his preaching? The question of equality is another upon which he has got wide of the mark. His contention is that Socialism seeks for a uniform equality, social, moral, intellectual, physical, political, etc., and quotes as his authority the following passage from one of the Fabian essays: “Inequality is hateful to all but the Highest” (page 145), and says: “If God had intended equality to prevail in human society, He would have made human beings equal in the cradle.” (Page 146.) God has not made men equal by nature, and any artificial attempt to do so must end in disappointment and failure.” (Page 151.) Such is the conclusion at which he arrives, but gives us no other authority than one short sentence from an anonymous writer, a very slight foundation surely on which to build such an elaborate superstructure as he by labored argument has raised upon it. The “picturesqueness of inequality” may be very pretty, but it does not point out the way to obtain the necessities of humanity, nor do the “advantages of inequality” feed starving women and children, while “the moral purpose of inequality” sounds well when read. “The inequality existing in society has a moral purpose. It is a means for the moral training of the human race.” (Page 155.) When it comes down to the stern realities of life, the philosopher is very apt to give way to the man, and the benefits to be derived in “moral training” are very apt to sink into utter insignificance before the thought that such inequality is man-made.

“Man’s inhumanity to man  
Makes countless thousands mourn.”

It were surely as sound an argument to say that if God had intended men to be perfect, in the sense of His own perfection, He would have created them so, and equally as honoring to the Divine name as to ascribe inherited vice and infirmity to God’s intention, which scarcely squares either with God’s goodness or Methodist theology. If this were the worst it were bad enough, but to say “the idea of equality appeals to envy,” “this evil passion is the moral

basis of Socialism," "to soothe envy there must be equality" (page 155), is surely the language of a prejudiced critic, and is sufficient to put the lecture out of the realm of serious discussion, and to stamp the lecturer as a rabid partisan with a determination not to see any good in the theory he is examining, and put him on a level with the most fanatical and extreme of his opponents. Moderation is the most desirable feature in such a discussion, but such statements as those of the writer will tend only to bring ridicule and contempt of the cause he represents from those whom he thus attacks, and the latter evil is worse than the former. But is his statement of the case a correct one? One of the authors he himself quotes in another connection as an authority, says: "The question is undoubtedly one of economics. The Socialistic movement, as is admitted on all sides, is primarily directed towards a fundamental transformation of the existing industrial system." ("Schaffle's Quintessence of Socialism," page 8.) In the programme of the Fabian Society, which is too long to quote here, there is no mention of any other equality than that of a political or economical character. The evidences are against the lecturer so far as authorities go. It must be the red flag of Republicanism that has crossed his vision, for its watchwords are ringing in his ears, and he has mistaken them for something else. But says he: "The equality that Socialism loves if once secured would rob life of all its interest. The dead level would soon become absolutely repulsive." (Page 157.) So it would from his point of view, where there is nothing to be hoped for or gained better than already exists; but from the other side it would not be quite so repulsive to feel that the incidence of taxation was a little more equitably distributed than at present—that the struggle with poverty and want was no longer hand-to-hand, or at the farthest, a few weeks removed, as witness the late coal strike in England—that the remuneration for labor was not dictated by the whim and caprice of non-workers—that the hours of labor were so regulated that they afforded opportunities for recreation and mental improvement—that the prospect of ending one's days in the poor-house when past work was a little more remote than at present—that brains counted for

something in the world as well as money—that a man was honored because he was a man, and was not regarded as a piece of human machinery to be used as long as he served the purpose and then cast aside—that toil was no disgrace, and poverty no crime. These things would at least promote self-respect, and self-respect wins respect from others, and even the lowest can be elevated in this way, for they thirst for respect. The aspirations and instincts of humanity are as strong in the toiler as in the employer, and were an honest attempt made on the part of Capital to approach Labor as reasonable beings, such an offer would be met in the spirit it was tendered. But so long as Capital, by combination, crushes out of existence the small producer seeking to rise, so long will workmen combine—and rightly so, as the lecturer allows—to demand their rights. But as we shall meet with this again at a later stage under another aspect, we will leave it for the present. Such reasoning, however, as the lecturer's scarcely conforms to the teaching of the greatest social Reformer, whose object was to bring peace and good-will toward men, *and before whom all men are equal*—whose great teaching was the brotherhood of man by the bond of love through the fatherhood of God.

No one for a moment doubts or denies the truth of the statement "that Christianity has done more for the benefit of the human race than any other system," or that compared with the "fraternity of Christianity," the "fraternity of Socialism is a poor, partial and class affection." "It does teach fraternity amongst the proletariat, but it does not extend it to the *bourgeoisie*. Of the rich and powerful it speaks in terms of indifference and hatred." (Pages 161 and 160.) There is no doubt but this is the blot of Socialism, but a word in palliation may be allowed. The proletariat have received so little encouragement or sympathy from the *bourgeoisie* that they look upon those who treat them with contempt as their enemies. That is no excuse for the sweet unreasonableness of either party. A little more brotherly love on the one hand and a little more grace on the other might work wonders. As we have before remarked, the lecturer's ideal is high, and we

feel bound to endorse such passages as this: "We want our laws so improved, that not only shall the man who, by the simple and comparatively straightforward method of picking his neighbor's pocket, or of breaking into his neighbor's house, has violated the law, be visited with condign punishment, but that the more skilful and less straightforward thief who can evade the law, yet on the Stock Exchange, or in the directors' board room, in the high places of the commercial world, takes from others thousands and hundreds of thousands of pounds, shall be punished also. If our laws were made as stringent as they ought to be, many in high positions then would be found not as local magnates, or as legislators, or as leaders of fashion, but serving their term in the humble but healthy occupation of convicts in the prisons of our land." (Page 170, *et seq.*) To such manly sentiments we gladly say "hear, hear," and heartily rejoice in some common ground upon which we are one.

We do not propose to follow Dr. Nicholas through all the minutiae of his reasoning on the economic aspect of Socialism, but simply to take up one or two chief points: "The land, mines, etc., are God's direct gift to the race, and should be no man's private property." (P. 195.) This is met by him on the principle that possession is nine points of the law, and because the possessors are in possession they ought to remain so to the end of the chapter. Perhaps a little close examination might prove that the right of ownership rests upon a very shady foundation, viz., that of appropriation. But such small matters of detail are of no moment to him so long as it is now private property, nor is the fact that there is in some countries a distinction made between land and articles of produce. The whole question of the state ownership of products is one of expediency, and in spite of his argument it is yet an open question whether that would not be a preferable method to that of the private ownership of land. If it turns on a question of right, and these are the gift of God, as surely they are, why should one of God's creatures appropriate these things to the exclusion of his fellows? If all are children of God and brethren, surely all are entitled to a share in the Father's bounty, and no argument of possession can atone for the wrong done, or affect the validity of the other's claim.

We fail to see that he establishes his right to call such a scheme "immoral." Before any man is confirmed in ownership, let his title be absolutely above suspicion. A wrong done five centuries ago is none the less a wrong, and a sin of that age is still a sin in the sight of God. "On Christian principles the worker ought to get what will enable him to obtain sufficient nourishment to keep him in good health, suitable clothing and a wholesome and comfortable home. He ought not to be compelled to work so long as to prevent him from having time for recreation, for worship and for mental and social enjoyment. *If at all possible these things should be secured to him.* What may be called the Christian law of wages demands this." (Page 198, *et seq.*) That, as affecting the question of wages, is what I would call Christian Socialism. The difficulty is that the facts are opposite to this; and while this may be the Christian law, the machinery for making the law an operating force has not been put into motion, and the law is, like others that are inoperative, dead. Under such circumstances, something must needs be done. If this law do not work, and cannot be made to do so, then some expedient must be sought to attain the same ends; and here the whole difficulty arises. The theory may be all right, but that the practice is far from being so, even Dr. Nicholas admits. "That gross injustice has been inflicted on workers cannot be denied." (Page 202.) That gross injustice still exists is a palpable fact, and so long as it does exist with no effort on the part of Christianity to remove such injustice, men will be driven to the adoption of the expedient, Socialism. Why did not the Methodist Church of England seize the opportunity offered to it a short time ago in the coal strike, and invite both parties to a conference for conciliation, if it be so interested in the working man? Surely his own Church is a Christian institution. To raise relief funds is very nice and charitable, but Christ said, "Blessed are the peace-makers," and to have made peace would have prevented more distress than relief ameliorated. But to resume: The lecturer has, in his antipathy to Marx, failed to see his point. The question at issue is, whether the workman who does the work which renders material valuable shall receive the value of such results of his labor,

or shall he receive only a portion of such value, leaving the balance to increase the capital of his employer? The question needs to be approached from a moral as well as an economical standpoint. And the question turns upon what constitutes a fair return for capital invested, and the right of capital in combination to tyrannize over small capitalists in driving them out of the field, so preventing the use of the workman, in increasing the price of the article produced to the consumer, and by such combination practically compelling workmen to accept such remuneration as they may choose to offer to perform such portions of work and during such hours as may be assigned to them, so unfitting them for employment elsewhere, and the right to discharge them without provision for the future when they are past work. These are the questions as they affect the workman. With these Dr. Nicholas does not deal. He is too full of "the principle of private property." He tells us that "idleness is one reason why many are in a state of destitution." (Page 167.) That is a truism, but he forgets to tell us that many who are not in a state of destitution are equally idle and vicious." "Taking human nature as we know it to be, the majority of men sure of their daily bread would do as little work as possible." (Page 208.) And is it not equally human nature to suppose that the man who, from necessity has to provide by his labor, not only the daily bread for himself, but also for the other man who, by reason of the accident of birth, wants not only bread but butter as well, should feel that the burdens of life need to be equalized a little more, and either a little more of the benefits put upon his shoulders, or a little more of the burdens upon the other man's. Idleness may be twofold, but according to the lecturer's way of looking at it, it is only a crime in those who have no private property.

"Some were made to starve and toil,  
Some to share the wine and oil."

If Socialism did nothing else but turn a few of the so-called "ornaments of society" into workers, it would have helped more toward an improved social condition than all his arguments in favor of private property. What advan-

tage is it to a man to know that property is "a sacred thing," if the stronger force refuse to him the right to use what little he may be possessed of in the way he sees fit because it might affect their interests? "If the powerful motives presented by Christianity in so many cases fail to prevent men acting thus, what will?" We use his own words and trust he may not object to the application. There is a very essential part of some men's salvation, and that is to place them out of the reach of temptation, and if the appeals and precepts of Christianity have failed to overcome selfishness, might it not be possible to do so by removing the temptation. Once money ceases to have a value beyond the procuring of necessities, it would also cease to be a temptation; and if "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat" came to be universally applied, instead of "If some men will not work, neither shall they eat," as at present—if such a result could be brought about by Socialism or any other agency, it certainly would be a most desirable improvement of the social system.

It is not the wisest thing in the world to press texts of Scripture further than they are intended to go, and to insist upon Paul's injunction that every man should provide for those of his own house, etc., will certainly not bear the stretch given it when he uses it as a defence of the law of inheritance. We have already spoken upon the subject of the accumulation of private property, and do not propose to take it up again, except to say that providing for the necessities of a family after a man's decease may be done in other ways than by leaving them wealthy, and that your workingman often falls under censure, not from lack of disposition so much as from lack of opportunity and through no fault of his own.

The lecturer comes back to his old love, the right of private property, and there we will leave him. His concluding propositions are laid down in lawyer-like style. We do not propose to go over them. The pith of his argument is directed against the practical difficulties of the system. The principle still remains untouched by him. The world is becoming more and more collectivist every day. It may be that in the coming time, whether by Socialism imbued with the Spirit of Christ,

or in a Christianity such as that for which he pleads, we may see the ideal of the Sermon on the Mount reached: Capital and Labor united in one common cause, and peace and good-will prevailing among men.

Meadow Lea, Man.

J. W. DICKINSON.

---

WERE THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST PENAL?

III.

VIII. REPLIES TO OBJECTIONS.

It is objected, first, that transfer of guilt or punishment, from one person to another is *impossible*. This is affirmed by Limborch and his school, with an emphasis and reiteration which would be apposite to a mathematical or intuitive axiom. The assertion seems to be dogmatic in proportion as proof is wanting. The conclusion, again, is assumed in the definition, *e.g.*, "In the strict sense of the word, it is not only unjust, but impossible, for God to punish the innocent. The very idea of punishment according to the strict sense of the word, implies the notion of guilt or ill-desert in the person on whom it is inflicted." If this were "the strict sense," it would not affect our contention for punishment in another sense. But we deny that this is the only "strict sense of the word." (Bledsoe, quoted by Dr. Jackson, p. 237.) The statement that the "ill-desert" must be "in the person upon whom it is inflicted," so far from deciding the matter, is the question in dispute. Again, "If there be anything valid in the imputation of another's sin, it must transfer the demerit before the guilt can arise, or the punishment be just." (Dr. Miley, quoted by Dr. Jackson, p. 237.) I deny that transfer of demerit or culpability is necessary to transfer of guilt (*reatus pœnæ*) or of punishment.

If Dr. Miley's assertion were undisputed, the alleged impossibility, of course, would follow; but it is only the proposition to be proved or disproved; not an axiom from which to argue. Rightly he says, "Personal demerit is the only source of guilt, and the only ground of just punishment." (*Ibid.*) But it does

not thence follow that it is impossible for anyone to bear the punishment of another's personal demerit. The following is another instance of attempting to secure the desired conclusion in the definition of terms :

"In the nature of things (whatever that may mean), it (punishment) can fall upon no other but the transgressor. If the blow falls upon another, it ceases to be punishment." (Rev. A. H. Bradford, p. 243.) An attempt at proof is made by Dr. Jackson, thus: "Now, we hold that demerit is the very thing that exposes the wrongdoer to penalty, and as this cannot be transferred, atonement by punishment becomes impossible." (P. 250.) The *non sequitur* is palpable. Because demerit cannot be transferred, it is concluded that punishment cannot, which by no means follows. The argument is as inconsequential as to argue that, because the state of having contracted a debt cannot be transferred from one person to another, the obligation to pay it cannot. There is good reason for saying culpability cannot be transferred, for that is the state of having done the wrong, which cannot pass to another. But there is no such impossibility in a different person from the perpetrator coming under obligation to bear the penalty of the wrong act. The blameworthiness of an action morally evil, must cling to the actor ; but its effect, in natural evil, may fall on another (as Dr. Jackson allows), and the natural possibility of such transfer is not in the least destroyed if the effect be *judicial* and *penal*. For however just or unjust the transfer might be, the natural possibility would remain the same, and bare possibility is the question here. Thus, the argument that punishment is impossible of transfer, because demerit or culpability is so, breaks down.

The attempt to confine the word *guilt* to blameworthiness or culpability, and to refuse it to liability to punishment, is an arbitrary way of seeking to gain a position by monopolizing the use of a word for one idea, as if that could alter the thing. The fallacious result is, that men employ a word in one sense in their premises, and another in their conclusions. Like many others, when speaking of the guilt which is transferable, I intend, not culpability, but liability to punishment. The dis-

inction between *reatus culpæ* and *reatus poenæ* is well known.\* What else but such liability is meant in "a manslayer which is guilty of death"? (Num. xxxv. 31; cf. Deut. xxi. 22; xxii. 26; Matt. xxvi. 66.) This being the only sense in which we hold guilt to be transferable, why is our view so often denounced, as if we held culpability to be transferable? Dr. Jackson is conscious, at least at times, that we do not believe "the personal demerit of the wrongdoer" is transferred (p. 240), yet at other times he argues as if unconscious of it. (P. 365.)

As to punishment, Dr. Jackson defines it as "suffering inflicted on an individual on account of personal guilt." Very well; but that does not say the sufferer's *own* guilt. All guilt is "personal," as all demerit is; but this definition does not state whether the person guilty is the actual offender, or his substitute. It was certainly "on account of personal guilt" that Christ bore the punishment of Adam's sin, and it was "an expression of God's displeasure at the sinner's wrongdoing." (Pp. 236-243.) The context shows that, to get a definition sufficient for his argument, Dr. Jackson has to add, "It can fall upon no other but the transgressor." (Bradford, quoted p. 243.) The additional clause takes for granted a matter on which we are at issue. I accept the definition, but reject the added clause as neither proper to the definition, nor true. It simply begs the whole question.

Where is the "impossibility"? That an innocent person should willingly accept and endure the natural evil justly due to the moral evil committed by another, is neither inconceivable nor self-contradictory. Whether it be desirable or wise, is quite another question. The question here is, whether in the nature of the case it is *possible*.

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. xviii. 2; iii. 20) is relied on to prove the impossibility. But that is to overlook the fact that the threatening was not intended for all cases

\* "The term *guilty*, I am aware, is often used by theological writers for an *obligation to punishment*, and so applies to that voluntary obligation which Christ came under to sustain the punishment of our sins." (A. Fuller, quoted by Dr. Jackson, p. 243.)

and conditions, but for the particular case in the prophet's mind, in contrast with other cases in which the punishment fell on some who had not done the evil deed which called for punishment. "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," signifying that it shall not be so in the case contemplated. "Every man shall be put to death for his own sin" (Deut. xxiv. 16) was a law for particular conditions, and only proves that punishment of the innocent for the guilty is not universal, and was not to obtain in the case mentioned. The Son of Man will "render unto every man according to his deeds." (Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10.) That is, according to his deeds he shall stand or fall, which is quite consistent with the transferability we contend for. His deeds may have been to accept or reject the benefits of our Lord's penal sufferings. Everything will come into the final reckoning. Divine government deals with men on the two principles of individuality of the man and solidarity of the race. Each one has an interest and responsibility peculiarly his own, and also an interest and responsibility shared with other men.

We are told "pain is transferred, not penalty." (Dr. Whedon, quoted by Dr. Jackson.) How is this possible? Punishment is only transferable in the sense that obligation to suffer it is transferred from one to another, not necessarily that it is first actually on the one and then formally transferred to the other. The guilt, that is, the liability, being transferred, the punishment follows. But how can merely non-judicial pain be transferred? If it be answered, by first transferring the obligation to suffer pain due to another, that would be about the same thing as transferring guilt, though not called by that name. But in that case, what can be the meaning of an *obligation* to suffer pain which is not penal? How can the obligation arise, except from some claim of justice? If that be the import of Dr. Whedon's words, he would be more consistent if he called the transferred pain penal. Refusing, he would find it much harder to explain transfer of pain, minus penalty, than we to explain transfer of guilt. By the statement, "pain is transferred, not penalty," Drs. Whedon and Jackson deny a transfer which is both possible

and actual, while they commit themselves to one that is as impossible as it is inexplicable.

The alleged impossibility of transferring guilt and punishment is refuted by the known transfer from Adam to his posterity, without which we have no satisfactory theodicy in view of the misery and death to which humanity is subject. Limborch (Vol. I. page 197) seeks to meet the difficulty of his position by suggesting that God will, in the future world, make it up to the sufferers of so much undeserved pain and trouble in this world. But, if it were even so, that would not render the present infliction just. Nay, without the justification which comes by regarding the infliction as penal retribution, it would be a difficult task to rebut the charge of cruelty. We have seen that the Scriptures consider the death of all men as in the penalty of Adam's sin. The *fact* that others besides Adam came under the guilt and punishment of his sin is conclusive proof of its possibility.

This agrees with the close relation of suffering to sin, in the view of our Lord. (Matt. ix. 5; Mark ii. 9; Luke v. 23.) To forgive sins was to remove the judicial and moral cause of physical suffering. Hence, to forgive sins prepared the way for healing. (Matt. ix. 1-6.) When he cast out devils and healed the sick (Matt. viii. 17), it was a fulfilment of Isaiah liii. 4: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases." I know not how, except that as He bare man's sins, *i.e.*, their punishment, He made atonement, in virtue of which He could remove the mental and bodily sufferings which formed part of the penalty devolved on all men through sin. Is it not time the assertion that transfer of guilt and punishment is impossible were abandoned as a mischievous error?

With equal positiveness it is affirmed that transfer of guilt or punishment would be *unjust*. (Jackson, page 237.) If unjust, it must be so to some *person* or combination of persons. Then to whom? Not to Christ, for He bore our curse as voluntarily as successfully. Dr. Jackson thinks the objections to the penal theory are "unanswerable, and none the less so because of the fact that Christ was a voluntary victim." (Page 244.) Surely he will admit that the voluntariness, at

least, obviates all such objections as are based on the assumption of His unwillingness. Had He been unwilling, the infliction of our punishment on Him would have been unjust, because it would have violated his rights. That objection, therefore, has no force, since He suffered voluntarily.

The objection, truculently expressed by Dr. Martineau, and apparently approved by Dr. Jackson (p. 244), "How is the alleged immorality of the sinner mended by the added crime of penally crushing the sinless?" is in a great measure met by the ignored fact that Christ bore the deserved penalty of His own free will. It shows that in that respect it was not unjust to Christ. Had the transfer made Christ chargeable with the evil deed and its blameworthiness, it would have been unjust. But as such transfer has no place in the doctrine defended by myself and many others, the objection is, for us, altogether irrelevant. I can imagine no other respect in which transfer of guilt and punishment can be supposed unjust towards Christ. Nor can the transfer be any injustice to the Father who made it, nor to those men who, by it, obtain salvation.

It is, however, alleged sometimes in indignant, if not denunciatory terms, that it would be unjust to those of the human race who, persisting in sin, are finally lost, after Christ has endured the penalty of their sin. We are told, in that case, the penalty is unjustly inflicted twice over, first on Christ, and again on those who perish. (Jackson, p. 242.) This objection is pointless against the evangelical Arminianism we hold. Levelled against us, it ignores the *conditionality* of the forgiveness obtained by Christ, in its personal application to each individual. The objection might have force if we held that Christ bore the penalty of every sinner, stipulating that it should take effect, in his eternal life, *absolutely*; whereas, on the contrary, we hold that, in the terms of our Lord's substitution, that effect was to be conditional on the sinner's individual, voluntary submission and acceptance. Somewhat as one might pay the debt of another, at the same time stipulating with the creditor that the debtor should be free only on condition of his making a suitable acknowledgment; or as a prince might pay the ransom price of a captive, on the distinct understanding that he was not to

be set free except on some certain condition, say, a promise of life-long allegiance to the prince.

The atonement brought in a constitution or economy of grace, in which Christ bore the guilt and punishment of all men, with the *proviso* that it should take full effect only in those who complied with the appointed conditions; while those who refused compliance should still be answerable for their own sins, Christ having borne their penalty notwithstanding. All are atoned for by ample satisfaction to justice; not one is coerced into the experience of the chief benefits accruing thereby.

Dr. Jackson declares: "It is contrary to the soul's intuitive sense of justice for Christ to bear the penalty of a man's transgressions, and then for the man to bear the penalty a second time himself." (P. 361.) Intuitive truth is self-evident, necessary, and universal. Is this dictum so? How many millions are not only unconscious of any such intuition, but would be amazed to hear that anyone claimed to have it, while vast numbers, like myself, search in vain for the intuition in their own consciousness? Has my careful friend, in making this statement, sufficiently weighed his words?

This contingent element of the mediatorial constitution is manifest in the Scripture doctrine of redemption. He is the "Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." God gave His son "that whosoever believeth should not perish but have everlasting life." Men may perish for whom Christ died. He was a propitiation in His blood, that God might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Seeing Christ endured the penalty of the race, in order that every individual might be delivered conditionally, and not absolutely, it follows that no injustice is done to those who voluntarily refuse the boon. If the sinner will thus drag down on himself the penalty which Christ once endured for him, he may in some sense be said to suffer it after his substitute suffered it; but there is no injustice done him. He never had a right to escape the punishment apart from compliance with the appointed condition; therefore it cannot be said he receives less than justice. He perishes for no one's sins but his own, and deserves to perish. In the light of this conditionality, the dilemma that, on the

penal theory, we are bound to choose between universal restoration and an atonement made only for those who actually receive eternal life (pp. 239, 242, 336, 238), is seen to be imaginary. We are not obliged to accept either universalism or a limited atonement. Our position is that Christ took the guilt of the whole race; but in such wise that the final salvation of each man should depend on his own free choice. Seeing, then, there is no person or party wronged on supposition that our Lord's sufferings were penal, the charge of injustice is utterly baseless.

And yet Dr. Jackson writes concerning separation of liability to penal suffering, on account of sin, from personal blameworthiness, *i.e.*, making the former transferable. "Were such a course attempted in any civilized community it would be greeted with universal execration. Shall we think of God as less just than men?" (P. 246.) Observe in reply:

1. Underlying the supposition is a *petitio principii* of grave import, namely, the assumption that for the innocent to bear the punishment of the wrongdoer, under any conditions whatever, would be unjust.

2. Were this speculation, on the kind of "greeting" that would be given, correct, it would still be needful to recollect that what may be proper and just in God may not be so in men. If men decreed eternal punishment for any crime, it might be so "greeted." Yet God decrees it. Is He therefore "less just than men"? Suppose that in any "civil community" men were to inflict extreme non-penal suffering on the innocent, instead of inflicting penal suffering on its many criminals, as the Limborchians hold God did on Christ for the wicked human race, would it not be "greeted with universal execration"? Then, on Dr. Jackson's theory, the question becomes more pertinent, is God "less just than men"? Or, again, suppose men having the power inflicted on millions of innocent persons, not the penalty, but the deadly "effect" of one man's wrongdoing, as Dr. Jackson thinks the effect of Adam's sin falls on his posterity, might it not be equally greeted with execration? But does it thence follow that God is less just than men? If it does, Dr. Jackson's theory is condemned.

3. Transfer of punishment might be unjust in human, yet just in Divine government. (a) Because in human government no good end is likely to be answered by it. (b) Because human rulers have not charge, as God has, of the administration of justice in supreme and universal government. Their jurisdiction is limited, subordinate, delegated subject to revision. His is supreme, universal, final, all-comprehensive. It belongs to Him, and not to them, to avenge, to adjudge and execute ultimate awards. (Deut. xxxii. 35; Rom. xii. 19; Heb. x. 30.) To enter into war with a foreign nation may be legally and constitutionally wrong in a single confederated state, yet right in the supreme government of all the states which compose the nation. So may an act be right in the Divine and wrong in a human government.

4. Now that God has done the very thing which it is said would be execrated if done in a civil government, that is, laid the iniquity of us all on His innocent, but willing and powerful Son, the deed, as matter of fact, is not so "greeted." Millions admire and adore its display of wisdom, righteousness, and love, none the less because human governments afforded no precedent of such procedure, nor human thought previously conceived it.

5. How is the case made more just by saying that in Christ's sufferings, "pain is transferred, but not penalty"? Punishment transferred to Christ, an innocent, willing, and able substitute, has the vindication of being the fulfilment of justice as expressed in God's law; but to transfer the pain, not as punishment, divests the act of that necessary defence. Comparing His pain, viewed as penal, with the same pain viewed as non-penal, how does the former differ from the latter? In the former, God and good angels think no worse of Christ. No one thinks Him individually blameworthy. He does not blame himself. He knows He is effecting immense benefit. The difference is that in the former case His suffering is regarded as fulfilling the sanction of the broken law. He suffers natural evil for a moral reason, and for a moral purpose. What is there revolting to a healthy moral sense in so regarding it? The difference is not in the nature of the pain, but in its significance and relation.

6. But is it certain men would so "greet" the case supposed? Imagine a chief convicted of rebellion, and sentenced to pay a heavy fine, or to forfeit most of his land. If in view of his condition, another paid the fine or forfeited his own equally valuable land that the impoverished delinquent might be spared, the innocent would bear the punishment of the guilty, or suppose the sentence should be twenty lashes, and in pity to his emaciated condition, another man, strong, hardy and generous, with the consent of the sovereign judge, freely endured the strokes, would the transaction evoke the "horror," and execration of the entire community? In merely human transactions such vicarious suffering may be unwise, and seldom, if ever, resorted to; but it does not appear impossible or necessarily unjust. I am compelled to differ from the view of my friend on the case of Zaleuchus, the Locrian king, who, when his own son was convicted of a crime, the penalty of which was to lose both eyes, decided that his son should lose one eye, and instead of his losing the other, he, the king himself, would lose one eye. Dr. Jackson asks, "Who will pretend that he suffered half of his son's penalty?" (P. 245.) Whether half or not, he certainly suffered something of the penalty. Dr. Jackson has no warrant for saying, in the words of the Rev. A. H. Bradford, his non-penal suffering "would . . . vindicate the law as much as if his son had suffered it all." One would think in that case, the deliberate omission of part of the law's penalty was a doubtful way of vindicating it. From the infliction by the king on himself, of suffering precisely of the nature prescribed by the law as its penalty, and due for breach of the law, but not inflicted on the offender, it is reasonable to think Zaleuchus intended his own suffering to be the remainder of punishment incurred by his son. Mr. Bradford's words are not made good in the least degree by adding, "No person can be punished for another." That is again only attempting to support one baseless assumption, by asserting a still wider assumption equally baseless. Zaleuchus gave one of his eyes in order that the penalty of the law might be carried out, or else it was not carried out, and the son escaped part of the punishment due; in which case it would have been equally just, had no eye been

lost but one of the son's. The loss of the king's eye was clearly meant to meet the law's requirement of two eyes; and thus to complete the punishment. But it does not appear that the act was "greeted with universal execration."

While we are on the question of a limited atonement, it is opportune to ask, what else is the Limborchian atonement as advocated by Dr. Jackson? He writes: "We regard the sufferings and death of Christ as a substitute for penalty *in the case of all who accept of Him by faith.*" (Italics mine, page 250.) I presume this is the explanation of the statement that "what Christ suffered was for all men." (Page 243.) Then, what of all who do not so accept of Him? It appears He is not their substitute, nor an atonement for their sins. I understand Dr. Jackson to mean that the sufferings of Christ are never in effective, concrete relation with the individual who persists in not accepting Christ; and that Christ never actually satisfies justice for his sins. The full penalty of his sins remains on him; though I see not how this agrees with the free gift which "came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 18), or, with the prevenient grace given to all, and despite which some men perish. But, on this view, the atonement of Christ was a limited one. This involves a further difficulty. If the acceptance by faith in each individual is contingent on his own choice, how could Christ beforehand substitute himself exactly for those who would choose Him and for none besides? Was foreknowledge brought into play, and the vicarious sufferings laid on Him for those particular persons only, who, it was foreseen, would accept Him, and not for the rest of mankind? If so, the atonement was made only for the former; and we have a limited atonement very much like that of Baxterian Calvinism. It is the theory of non-penal suffering, not ours, which makes Christ die for only part of mankind, namely, those "who accept of Him by faith." This cannot be squared with the fact that "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 2; John iii. 16; i. 29.) Should the advocates of the non-penal theory withdraw from this untenable position, and say the sufferings of Christ were borne for all men alike—those who refuse, and

those who accept the boon—they will then have to face their own objection, that in respect to those who refuse and perish, suffering for their sins comes twice over—first, in the non-penal sufferings of Christ in their stead, and again in their personal punishment. And further, as to those who accept Christ's salvation for a time, and then fall and perish, Dr. Jackson (*ex hypothesi*) must admit that Christ suffered for their sins, and yet afterwards they suffer themselves for them, *i.e.*, the suffering for their sins is their full punishment in the persons of the offenders, plus all that Christ suffered for them. The upholders of the non-penal theory are in the dilemma; not we. They have to choose whether they will reduce the sufferings and death of Christ to a limited atonement, or devolve the suffering for sin first on Christ, and again on those who continue in sin. Choosing the latter alternative, they must drop their objection to the penal theory, that punishment comes twice over.

3. It is objected that to regard the sufferings as penal leaves no room for the exercise of the Divine *prerogative of mercy*. (Pages 59, 60, 238, 369.) Here, again, the objection may have force against Calvinism, which presses the idea of debt-paying too far; it has none against the Scriptural view, which regards the great penal sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the whole world, as the *ground* on which God freely and mercifully forgives every sinner who believes. The death of Christ by satisfying Divine justice, opened the way for love to come to man, laden with pardons, without stultifying or relaxing the law. Forgiveness is not less merciful because it is just. God's prerogative of mercy is manifest in His freely providing the just ground of pardon, and in its actual bestowment. Pardon is not the sinner's due, except as God of His free mercy provided it by the vicarious punishment of His Son, and confers it on terms appointed according to His own prerogative. On the basis of atonement, He has ample scope for the constant, world-wide exercise of mercy, in innumerable benefactions, both natural and spiritual. To that ground may be ascribed all the blessings He pours upon the human race, as all the ills endured by men may be ascribed to the inroad of "death by sin." The media-

torial work placed the moral government of all men under an economy of grace,

“ While Jesus’ blood through earth and skies  
Mercy, free, boundless mercy cries.”

Dr. Jackson admits “ that ‘penalty is an essential element of law’ ” (233), and “ the inviolability of Divine law.” (Page 238.) But how is it inviolable if its sanctions may remain forever unenforced? How is the penalty “ essential ” if it may be omitted? That is surely the defeat of law. To fulfil the penalty by the vicarious punishment of Christ, enables mercy to dispense forgiveness and all other blessings freely and graciously.

The penal theory presents a more adequate ground for the exercise of mercy than the non-penal; pardon was a better justification, and all other blessings a freer flow from God to man. That forgiveness must have a justification is implied in Dr. Miley’s words: “ There is never any remission, except on such ground and conditions as fully justify it.” “ The sufferings and death of Christ are the ground on which the Scriptures justify the forgiveness of sin.” (Jackson, page 238.) Precisely so; but that is because therein the justice of the law was met by our Lord’s undertaking to bear its ordained penalty. Minus that relation to the law, the sufferings are an incongruous and inadequate ground; the inviolable law still calling for execution, without which forgiveness would lack justification. Divine prerogative never seeks to exercise mercy in defiance of, or in opposition to, justice, but in harmony with it. Justice satisfied, sin can be justly and mercifully forgiven, to be succeeded by all “ the fruit of the Spirit ” as the work of grace.

It is objected further, that, on the penal theory, the sufferings of Christ ought to have been *identical* with the penalty of man’s sin, and yet that, as matter of fact, they were not. (Jackson, pp. 59, 240, 241; Limborch, Vol. I., pp. 292-294.) I reply, that though the suffering was not, and was never intended to be, the very same in every point of form and quantity, it was of the same nature, and substantially identical. He “ bore *our* sins.” The penalty of sin was death, involving mental and physical pain

(Gen. iii.; Rom. v.; 2 Cor. v. 15.) And these were the elements most prominent in the sufferings of Christ, who was "exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." And to these our deliverance from the penalty of sin is attributed.\*

Between the penalty due to man's sin, and what our substitute endured, there was manifest sameness. All that can be said on the opposite side is, that they were not absolutely the same in every respect. In point of quantity or duration, it is not contended that Christ endured exactly all that the offender would have endured had there been no redemption. Nor was it necessary that He should. It is conceivable that the sense of being "forsaken" of God, was not precisely the same in the Saviour as it would have been in the sinner, and yet it might be as truly penal as other parts of His suffering which were identical in kind with the suffering prescribed for the offender. The appointed penalty of a crime might be loss of a sum of money, and, for good reason, loss of goods of equal value might be enforced instead. Difference in the kind of loss would not make the suffering less penal. So, if the sense of desolateness experienced on the cross were not precisely of the same kind as the sinner would have endured, yet, being offered and accepted as part of the law's requirement for sin, it would be quite as penal as the other, and, considering the dignity of the person who endured it, and how much deeper was the humiliation of the eternal Son in meeting the penalty of law than man could have experienced, His suffering would be equally adapted to meet the claims of justice.

In the satisfaction offered, penal suffering was a large and essential element. But as the bearer of the curse was the Son

\* Matt. xx. 28; Rom. v. 10-15; iii. 18; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20-22; John iii. 14, 15; xii. 24; Luke xxiv. 46; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 21, 22, 25, 26; 1 Pet. i. 19; ii. 24; Heb. ii. 9, 14, 15; 1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5. I cannot agree with Dr. Jackson that "the punishment of sinners consists chiefly in the sense of their ill-desert, because of having broken the law of love, in bitter remorse, and the horrid darkness of despair." (P. 240.) Much of that is proper rather to the state of probationers, influenced by prevenient grace than the state of unmixed punishment. Some of these feelings, no doubt, are involved, and penal depravity might be mentioned as in the sinner's experience of the penalty, and not that of Christ. But the sense of ill-desert having "broken the law of love," or even the law of justice, is not of the essence of punitive death; and penal depravity was rather involved in the loss of Divine communion than necessary to the idea of death. It could be penal death if penal depravity were not present. Of the appointed penalty, natural evil, rather than moral, was the chief element, *e.g.*, pain, sorrow, the sense of being outcast, and dissolution.

of God, as well as the Son of man, His suffering was, not quantitatively, but qualitatively, as full an enactment of the law's penalty as if its whole weight had fallen on the actual transgressor. It was an enactment of the law's just demand, equal in point of inherent fitness and value, as homage rendered to the justice which called for punishment. This is *not* saying Christ's sufferings and the penalty of sin were "the same and not the same." (Jackson, p. 241.) But it says that, while not the same in every particular, the one was sufficiently the same in nature, quality and worth to stand instead of the other, in order to meet the inexorable demands of violated law, and to afford a broad, immovable basis of gracious government.

"Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." (Gal. iii. 13.) I am unable to appreciate Dr. Jackson's exposition of this text. (P. 240.) In order to show that the curse which Christ endured was not identical with that from which He delivers us, Dr. Jackson says: "The Son of God was accounted accursed because He submitted to the ignominy and shame of the cross, a form of death reserved for the lowest class of criminals." But why were the sufferers accounted accursed? The writing referred to (Deut. xxi. 23) shows it was because they were executed as "worthy of death," and, *as such*, "accursed of God." The humiliation ascribed to Christ did not consist so much in the social disgrace as in His dying as one worthy or liable to death, and, therefore, accursed of God. He was not himself criminal; but He took the place of criminals under the curse of God and men. That was the very curse which had been brought upon man, and from which Christ, by His curse-bearing, redeemed him. The difference was not in the nature of the curse, but in that man deserved it, and Christ did not. The identity is apparent, inasmuch as in each case the curse was the punishment of wrongdoing. Accordingly the sinner is freed from the curse, because Christ bore it in his stead.

Dr. Jackson seeks to differentiate the two by saying, Christ's curse was in that He "submitted to the ignominy and shame of the cross," while "sinners are said to be accursed because

they have not continued 'in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them.' That, however, is a comparison, not between the two curses, but between the curse, in the one case, and the *cause* of the curse, in the other. Their curse consisted not in disobedience to the precept of the law, but in the consequent guilt and punishment. This latter, and not the disobedience, is the proper term of comparison with the curse on Christ. Interpreting the curse on Christ by the place in Deuteronomy, it is clear that, whatever the cause, in either case the curse was punishment due to sin.

Dr. Jackson objects to this interpretation "because it destroys the conditionality of forgiveness as taught in Scripture." I answer (1) were it so, that would not be a sufficient reason for rejecting the plain meaning of the text. Theology must not dominate exegesis. (2) It is not so. I entirely dissent from the idea that Christ's penal suffering would make the salvation of all for whom He died absolute. It rather provided the only ground on which forgiveness could be bestowed on condition of the sinner's voluntary repentance and faith. The conditionality was an essential element in the scheme of vicarious punishment. To make the apostle say Christ redeemed us from the great curse of sin by enduring social disgrace, or some curse of insignificant nature and degree, is to make him speak with less than ordinary, to say nothing of apostolic, intelligence.

Dr. Jackson (p. 362) considers that those who hold the penal theory are, and must be, unable to answer Socinian and Unitarian objections to vicarious atonement. As the matter appears to me, the Calvinist, with his rigid theory of debt absolutely paid, has no satisfactory answer; advocates of the non-penal theory answer by capitulating to the enemy, and are in danger of being compelled, by logical consistency, to go still further in the rationalistic direction, while the advocates of the penal theory, as held by Wesley, Watson, John Goodwin, James Harmens, and many others, occupy the impregnable stronghold of Scripture doctrine. The position they maintain is, that the Divine-human Christ offered himself a sacrifice, in which He bore the punishment of man's sin, thereby satisfying the justice of the Supreme Lawgiver, the saving benefit to take full effect

in each man on his voluntary compliance with certain conditions. Thus was founded a grand economy of grace, under which the just and loving God offers eternal life to all men. Against this view the said objections have no real force. In it is found the most self-consistent and satisfactory explanation of the Redeemer's stupendous work.

*Didsbury, Eng.*

M. RANGLES.

---

ERRATA.

ARTICLE I. JANUARY—FEBRUARY.

- Page 23—bottom line, after "*reatus culpæ*" add a note of interrogation, "1".  
" 25—"an" *vice* "a" before "expiatory."  
" 28—"land of the living" *vice* "or the living."  
" 29—line 1, "the sin" *vice* "their sin."  
" "—line 27, "suffering inflicted" *vice* "sufferings inflicted."  
" 31—line 27, "offering for" *vice* "offering of."  
" 32—line 2, "Isa. liii." *vice* "Isa. lvi."  
" "—line 6, "sin of the whole" *vice* "sins of the whole."  
" "—line 24, "same nature as that which was due to" *vice* "same nature due to."

ARTICLE II. MARCH—APRIL.

- Page 111—bottom line note, "Works" *vice* "Watts."  
" 114—line 13, "their receiving" *vice* "them receiving."  
" 123—line 18, "Still less does it" *vice* "still, does it."

---

PSYCHIC PHENOMENA AND PHYSICAL LAWS.

It is our boast in this enlightened era that the superstition and mysticism of the dark ages have been swept away by the great floods of light poured from our laboratories, observatories and centres of learning, giving place to exact science founded on absolute truths. What little there was of good in the schools of the mystics we have retained; the dross holds place merely in a list of the curiosities of the past. If we examine with unprejudiced minds the myths of the ancients, we shall find that what were most probably the origin of fanciful stories and beliefs were truths—fables were built up around them. There can be but little doubt that the whole system of astrology was built upon the fact that the Creator had decreed that the sun shall be the source of animal and vegetable life on this globe. This truth would lead primitive man to deify the sun, and students of mythology know the rest.

And there linger yet, here and there, remnants of these beliefs, which appear resolved to die hard. The very last to go will probably be the superstitions connected with the unoffending moon.

Then, just as that strange science gave rise to exact astronomy, so the weird alchemy was the origin of our chemistry. This, probably, originated in the hour when some observing philosopher first noted some simple chemical change; the idea would flash into his mind that he might separate substances into their constituents; then the idea of atoms would follow; and, finally, the myths of the elixir of life and the philosopher's stone. The atomic theory survives yet. He is a bold chemist who will dispute it. And the fabled stone that would turn all things into gold, was probably built up around the idea that all the elements were compounds of one, a theory which holds yet among many of our brilliant experimentalists.

But if these sciences have been winnowed of their chaff as the world has progressed, there is one that has come down to us entire; nay, we have extended it in directions of which the ancients never dreamed. This science never had a name. It did not readily yield to classification. It meandered through the other sciences so as to lose itself. One branch was detested, another cultivated. The student on one line was a magician to be stoned to death, on another a philosopher of the noblest character. But modern scientific method has gathered it in; forced it into classification; given it a high place in the college curriculum, and bestowed upon it the lofty and comprehensive name, Psychology.

The goal of chemistry is the constitution of matter; of astronomy, the structure of the universe; but psychology aims at the instrument of investigation itself, at the solution of the mystery of the human mind.

It considers every emotion conceivable; the influence of one mind upon another; the cause of phenomena, which physical science has confessed its inability to explain; seeks to lay hold of forces "transcending physics and chemistry," and has already found names for some of these, which it claims are as real as any which are known only by their effects.

Particularly does it investigate all those occurrences which the quiet wit of the Scot describes as "uncanny," apparitions, unearthly sounds, magic transformations, remarkable coincidences, mysterious communications by slate writing, spirit rapping, and the like, vivid dreams, second sight, all under the head of "psychic research." Mysterious intercourse between mind, thought transference, violent but inexplicable emotions—these come under the general head of hypnotism, while, we presume, the real scientific study of the mind is "metaphysics." But the term psychology takes everything in, the student may classify for himself.

Now, we are long past the age when anything even fairly well attested can be ridiculed. Every lover of nature aims at truth, and if we are assured by persons in whose veracity we have perfect faith that phenomena have occurred in their experience, pointing to "things which we do not dream of in our (natural) philosophy," we are bound to investigate the records, no matter how prosaic and every-day like we may be ourselves.

It is only fair, however, that we be allowed to use the instruments with which we are best acquainted, and it is our object here to examine psychic phenomena by the aid of physical laws.

It has been said that there is yet a law to be discovered that will at once let in such a flood of light upon our minds that all these mysteries will be clear, just as Newton's law of gravitation showed how the physical universe was held together. Without disputing this, we assert, with the utmost confidence, that there are two physical laws which such a discovery will never transcend. These are, first, the conservation of energy, with its corollaries, the non-annihilation and non-creation of matter, and the non-wastefulness of natural processes; secondly, the law that there is "no action at a distance," forces can only act by or through some medium.

Should the metaphysician, skilled in the intricacies of his own science, venture to dispute, we have but to remind him that the most sublime conception of the human mind—the immortality of the soul—rests for the proof of its reality, apart from faith, upon the law of the conservation of energy. The study of centuries

failed; volumes were written, only to close with the unsatisfactory statement that this was a matter "beyond pure reason." This law, the triumph of modern physics, binds the seen and the unseen together from eternity unto eternity; transformations every moment; but annihilation, never!

We have no fear, however, that these laws will be attacked, nor any other fundamental laws of physics we may refer to, and we proceed to investigate.

The very numerous recitals of incidents in which "apparitions" play an important part are generally prefaced by candid admissions that the cause of the phenomena is quite inexplicable, and any theory will be welcomed that may even help to a solution. It is useless to deny that in many cases the recitals are true—that is to say, according to facts as far as the observer's consciousness is concerned; we cannot make the sweeping assertion that all who relate these stories are only anxious to deceive.

Nor do we deny the extreme difficulty in explaining just how and why these apparitions were presented; but we do hope to show, from a physical standpoint, that there is one element to be left out in any and every attempt at explanation, that is to say, no apparition, however well attested, ever did or can have any objective reality at all.

There is but one witness to be examined, the human eye, and that must be and can only be tried by the laws of light. The eye receives the vibrations of the luminiferous ether, the optic nerve is excited, and in its own mysterious way carries a message to the brain. The source of the light waves are primarily some luminous body, then some body from which the waves are reflected. The retina receives the image of the body; by certain optical arrangements the spectral image may be seen, but it is the spectral image of—still a body, a material body, though it be as rarified as the lightest gas. Upon matter only can the wave of the light-bearing ether act; it forms no images by itself.

The "apparition" then must be that of *some thing*, composed of atoms of matter. If so, then what force built it up in a moment and what force destroys it? We are answered, it is not composed of matter, but the "cold calculating" physicist

calmly asks: "Is there something else then that will reflect light?" And the sum of the argument is this, we must either reject the possibility of objective reality, or reject our results in experimental philosophy regarding the nature of light.

This is severe; but indeed no such alternative need be for a moment considered if we regard every apparition as a purely subjective phenomenon—no exceptions at all—no attention to repeated assertions of "wakefulness," "real as life," etc.

That there are presented, to what we call the "mental eye," images as real as any objective vision, is well known to anyone who has ever suffered from the delirium of fever. The most remarkable instances, however, are those which have been occasioned by the action of drugs. He who has seen an unfortunate creature in the horrors of *delirium tremens* knows that the frightful pictures in the mind of the sufferer must be as real to him as the actual objective appearance of surrounding objects. The eyes are wide open, everything that others see is seen, and the visions are side by side, as it were, with the realities. And while alcohol acts in this way, there are other poisons which, while causing delirium, seem to have the effect of presenting beautiful instead of horrible visions to the mind.

A complete explanation of this is at present beyond us, but this much may be safely said: there are certain combinations of the chemical elements which, taken into the system, are absorbed, and so act upon the molecular structure of the nerves that the brain is abnormally excited.

When a person in an apparently normal condition sees an apparition, he has simply become conscious of it. The peculiar excitation of the brain which produces the vision has been set up in some mysterious manner. How, is a question for the student of psychology proper, and he may borrow from physical science his first postulate, that however the image was formed on the retina, it was not formed by the waves of ether reflected from a material body, and nothing else to reflect them can be conceived of. What has been said of apparitions applies to a host of other psychical phenomena; it is only necessary to read them by the light of the physical sciences.

But the greatest demand upon our credulity is made

by the records of mysterious writing, and the appearance and disappearance of material bodies. Psychic writing is said to be done in some supernatural manner, even without the aid of a pencil, and there is abundant testimony by reliable witnesses of the reality of the phenomenon. The utmost care has been taken to exclude the possibility, so we are told, of human interference. But we have never heard of a rigorous investigation of the writing. Marks have been made, let us say, on a paper perfectly clean before being folded up. Now, the ordinary observer might regard these marks as marks made with something or other. Not so the physicist. Are they lead-pencil marks? If so, whence they?

This is not to be lightly passed over, for if they are pencil marks, then each particle of the substance composing them is composed of millions of atoms of carbon, these atoms possessing definite and most wonderful properties, each precisely alike in weight and density, and power of combining with other elements, soft when built up in one form, while in another they adhere so as to form the hardest of substances, each a centre of tremendous energy and possessing a particular form.

These, we are asked to believe, are suddenly and for some trivial purpose called into existence by psychic power, and strewn upon paper so as to form characters.

If the particles that make the marks are of some substance which seems to have been put through some chemical processes, as, indeed, all our silicate or graphite pencils are, then we are to suppose that a blast furnace, laboratory, etc., have been erected somewhere in the realm of the unseen.

No student will for a moment admit the objective reality of any phenomenon of this kind. He cannot conceive of even so simple a thing as dust being called suddenly into existence, and before anyone can consider such a thing, he must first declare that there are exceptions to so fundamental a law as the conservation of energy.

But if we reject the idea of pure carbon being by some psychic force created, what are we to say to the phenomena of fresh flowers being showered down from nowhere? Flowers in all their beauty of structure and color, built up of myriads

of atoms of several elements; flowers, too, that are not in a wild, uncultivated state, but giving evidence of having been carefully attended by the gardener. Scientific men have even stooped to consider such records as these, that they might not be accused of a lack of desire for the truth, but surely none ever remained long in doubt.

It has been pointed out again and again that psychic forces are always engaged in some very trivial work. It would be easier, surely, to produce gold ingots (we would not insist upon the stamp of the mint) which contain but one element, than organic bodies of highly complex structure, yet we have no records of increase in the base lucre through psychic forces.

These phenomena, then, are to be explained only by one or other of two methods; they are presented to the consciousness in some mysterious manner, and are therefore worthy of deep study by the student of the human mind, or they are clever conjuring tricks. In this connection, the late W. Mathieu Williams said that it was not enough that well-known scientific men should see and report upon psychic phenomena. He suggested that such men as Houdin, the wizard of the north, or other world-renowned conjurers, should be asked what they thought about them after investigation. Men of purely scientific training are not so ready to perceive all the intricacies of legerdemain as those who have made this peculiar art a study.

But if we reject as in some manner illusory, all the so-called psychic phenomena dealing with appearances and transformations of material bodies, we are still required to answer why it is that the mind becomes conscious even of the illusion, and if it is possible for one mind to so act upon another as to impart to it any required impression, we are asked to name the medium through which it acts. The answers to these questions involve a very complete description of the functions of the brain, such, indeed, as we do not possess.

There is, however, a great deal of mystery removed when we consider the brain as a storehouse of past impressions; the so-called bending of the will, the superiority of one will over

another are made tolerably clear when we take into consideration the power of memory.

The most abject slave does not obey his master because of difference of will power (it is doubtful, indeed, whether there is any difference of this kind existing at all), but because the consequences of disobedience are presented to the mind simultaneously with the thought of refusal, and it is evident that it is the function of memory to continually reproduce the painful consequences in a case of this kind. It is the emotion of fear that is played upon, and under different conditions it might be the emotion of love that would impel obedience, but in either case memory is the connecting link.

There are no instances on record of complete loss of memory—that would probably mean death to the whole organism—but partial loss of memory is frequent enough, and many a poor creature has been reduced by accident, or illness, or hereditary taint to a state of partial idiocy when those who had been loved were now completely unknown, the bridge connecting the minds, as it were, removed.

There are numerous examples, however, of the apparent power of one mind to make impressions on another when no previous knowledge existed on the part of either, of the other. That is the way it is usually put, but close investigation will invariably discover that the weaker had been at least told of the generally recognized superiority of the other. Now, memory is the connecting link here as before, for it is rare, indeed, to find one who has not heard records of occult influences, etc. The very least intimation is enough to arouse curiosity, and the rest follows readily.

Surroundings, again, have much to do with these matters. The weaker mind may feel a peculiar influence stealing over the seance room, but if the house suddenly became enveloped in a blaze of fire, or if a dynamite bomb were thrown amongst the company, there would be a scramble for escape. He would be a clever psychic, indeed, who could prevail upon his disciples that no danger existed, and a still cleverer who could so influence anyone as to persuade him to take second chance for safety. There would be a struggle for first place all round.

Familiar illustrations are found everywhere. Policeman X. in civilian's dress may quell a small riot by the strength of his arm alone, but Policeman X. in his gorgeous uniform has only to show himself and the rioters disappear. Why is this?

Soldiers say they do not salute their officers, they salute the uniforms in which they are clothed. Again, why is this?

It is said of the old Emperor William of Prussia, that he never allowed his soldiers to see him with his coat unbuttoned.

We all understand these things, and the whole psychology of the subject was summed up by one who knew human nature well, in

“One touch of nature makes the whole world kin.”

We have, however, merely touched upon the subject of mind influence under apparently normal conditions.

There is a feature of the problem not so readily explained.

The mind of one has been brought completely under subjection to that of another when memory could not act at all, nor the “sense of mystery” be aroused in the least.

This state, which resembles catalepsy, is induced by purely physical means, as was shown by Braid more than forty years ago, after it had been set down to peculiar magnetic influence on the part of some specialist in occultism.

The optic nerve, but sometimes the auditory, is acted upon abnormally, and becomes practically paralyzed; the brain then acts at the suggestion of another.

Experimentation on this line has been vigorously denounced by many physicians, but still there are probably as many who hold it as a proper field for study, discrediting the idea that any harm ensues to the subject.

A wide field for study is here opened up for the student of psychology, and, as in other branches, he will find it best to read up his physics before formulating any theories, wrapped in mystery as they usually are.

It may seem too ruthlessly exact to say that the human brain is but an aggregation of molecules, yet it is so. There is something additional. This we are ever seeking.

Every emotion, pleasant or painful, means a particular action of the molecules.

In a paper read before the Royal Society, in March, 1892, Professor Mosso, of the University of Turin, discusses certain experiments, made with specially constructed instruments, on the temperature of the brain. We know heat as molecular motion, therefore increased heat means increased activity.

One of the experimentalist's results was that he found intense psychical processes caused heat to be set free in the brain. He says, also, "the mere maintenance of consciousness belonging to the wakeful state involves very considerable chemical action," and concludes by expressing the hope that investigations of this kind will enable us to push forward our knowledge of the phenomena of life.

It would follow that an impression made upon the brain is in part explained mechanically, and if a person in the hypnotic or cataleptic state obeys a command given by another (and we have no reason to doubt this), then the sounds conveyed to the brain have formed the same mind pictures as they would in the walking state, and the brain of necessity sends the order to the muscles of the body to execute.

To the writer this phenomenon serves simply to prove that the images are latent, as it were, in the brain, ready to arouse whenever the corresponding sounds are heard, the whole process merely a mechanical one. We will credit it to the occult influence of the other mind when we hear of an illiterate person's being hypnotized and made to demonstrate two or three propositions in Euclid.

The connection is most assuredly not between the minds of the subject and the experimenter, but between the sounds of the words and their corresponding images.

We would suggest this simple experiment: let a hypnotized person be placed with his ear to a phonograph, see whether he will not obey commands received through that instrument as readily as before.

We have thus far not seen the necessity of admitting that any real influence or force can be exerted by one mind upon another, as we understand the word "force" in the physical sciences.

But we are not allowed to withdraw so easily; there remains

records of communications between persons far apart, of mysterious desires on the part of one only to be explained on the assumption that the mind was under the control of some other, and of obedience in the hypnotic state to commands expressed mentally, not verbally or by signs.

One does not care to assert that the proofs are not sufficient when these things are given as in the experience of our own friends in whose word we trust. We can only accept them as true and then show what they compel us to believe, if they are true.

They prove primarily that consciousness is radiated; the molecular motion in a red-hot bar of metal communicates heat, which is energy, to the surrounding ether. If Prof. Mosso's instruments were not at fault, then psychical activity imparted energy to his delicate thermometer. But if consciousness be radiated, then this energy must have an undulatory motion similar to what we conceive of in the ether-transmitting light and electricity, and must be propagated with about the same velocity, practically instantaneously, for distances such as we are accustomed to.

One difficulty in accepting this lies in the fact that consciousness is everywhere the same, and the testimonies, however strong they may be, are very rare. It is certainly strange that the most gifted minds find it quite impossible to "precipitate their thoughts," while the feat is accomplished by others who are certainly not above the ordinary in mental calibre.

The evidence proves, secondly, that radiations of consciousness act only upon certain other minds, not upon all; it is apparently akin to magnetism which only affects some substances, at least sensibly. Or we might say, it is akin to light to which some substances are transparent, while others reflect it in a greater or less degree.

Now, while we are not prepared to discredit entirely the theory that the vibrations of the molecules of the brain impart energy of some kind to the surrounding ether, it is extremely difficult to conceive of another brain's selecting the particular currents of energy which it is desired it should select. This certainly transcends all that the physical sciences have taught of "selection" and "absorption."

Yet, if "mental suggestion," as it is known in the phenomena of hypnotism, is really an accomplished fact, then we have nothing but to accept it. The testimonies, reliable as they are, are yet not reliable enough, but carry sufficient weight to entitle to investigation, and in their favor it may be said that they do not ask us to actually set aside the known laws of physics, but merely to extend them into an unknown region.

But admitting this much, we are not called upon to admit the reality of the wondrous tales of telepathy, astral communication, etc., which are told us. So long as we have a physical force, let it be ever so ethereal, and a medium through which it may act, we may consider it; but when we find a record of a force which goes hither and thither and around corners at the sweet will of the sender, then we stand amazed indeed. A medium we must have, and a force that will obey the known physical laws; we have allowed the transference of thought a very short distance, and have allowed that a brain in a particular physical state may possibly be susceptible to waves of ether bearing the imprint of molecular motion in the brain of another; but that the ordinary mind, for we have records only from the most ordinary people, can impart its activity to the surrounding ether and impel it in any direction at will, this we really cannot consider at all.

It is quite possible, however, in this connection, subjective phenomena are mistaken for real, and we are brought back to the first study of the student in psychology—the various states and emotions of the mind. This is a fair field, mayhap a field of mighty promise; but it must be investigated in the light of known physical laws, the laws which the Creator has made for this real world. When we find a direct variance, we may reject any and all testimony to the phenomena, set it down as unreal, and then study why it is so.

And once again, it may be said that the extreme triviality of all the phenomena, even suppose them for other reasons worthy of consideration, bears terribly against them. No astral communication is ever received about the price of stocks, for instance; we have to trust to the sluggish electric current for these things.

We have not touched upon the theory of direct aid in these matters from the realm of the unseen ; this is too sacred a subject. Yet to their shame be it said there are those who would tell us that the spirits of the dead are interested in us in regard to matters ridiculously insignificant, while not able to tell us what an hour may bring forth.

The Creator has left us to work out our ends, endowed us with intellects that enable us to grasp the laws He has imparted to matter, but has hidden from us the events of the morrow, and has withheld the power to add one atom to the universe or to take one atom away.

*Toronto.*

THOMAS LINDSAY.

---

#### ANNUAL CONFERENCE BOUNDARIES.

THE regulating force and controlling power in the Methodist itinerant system is the Annual Conference, yet neither its functions nor its authority should be so circumscribed as to interfere with the freest movement of the "itinerant wheel." There should be such an easy interchange of ministers, especially among contiguous Conferences, as would result in their highest development, and produce the greatest good to our work. It is felt that by present Conference boundaries both the men and the work are confined, and that the number who are transferred beyond an Annual Conference limit is comparatively few. The well-being of the ministry and the good of the work demand a larger field for the former, and a greater number of men and more variety of talent for the latter. Some equitable system should be devised that would more efficiently supply the work, increase the effectiveness of the pastorate, and at the same time intensify the loyalty and devotion of both ministers and people to our itinerancy.

It has been proposed that, in order to overcome the limited area of present Conferential territory, the boundaries be changed so as to have fewer Conferences, with more men and circuits. While this would partially, but very imperfectly, meet the difficulty, it would give rise to many objections. For all the purposes of Annual Conference work, the present area

of each is none too small. The number of delegates, ministerial and lay, which is always increasing, is quite large enough for a deliberative executive body, and for billeting and other purposes. Ten Conferences, as now constituted in Canada, will better supervise Methodism in the Dominion, develop her ministers and laity in the business and work of the Church, and reach a greater number of centres of influence by annual gatherings than would be done by a smaller number.

The following plan is submitted for thoughtful consideration and such correction as will make it serviceable :

1. Let there be a grouping of certain contiguous Conferences for stationing purposes, viz., Niagara, London and Guelph ; Toronto and Bay of Quinte ; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia—Montreal being already numerically and territorially large, would stand as at present, as also Manitoba and the North-West, and British Columbia, because of their situation.

2. Let the Stationing Committee be composed either of the Chairmen of Districts alone, or the President of Conference and one minister from each District to be elected by the ministers and laymen by ballot at the Financial District Meeting, from among those who are not completing the last year of the pastoral term.

3. Let the members of the Committee in the Conferences of a group meet as a joint Stationing Board, prior to the annual session of the Conferences concerned, with full power to station the ministers within the group without regard to boundaries.

4. The joint Committee should consider all invitations and propositions, and receive representations, in person or by letter, from the ministry or laity; and submit a complete and final draft of stations for all the Conferences in the group, to each Conference concerned.

5. The draft thus submitted might not be absolutely final, but subject to revision by the Stationing Committee of each Annual Conference, so far as its own circuits or missions are concerned; provided, however, that no change shall be made without sufficient cause decided by a two-thirds majority vote of the Conference Stationing Committee. In case such change should

affect another Conference, then the President of the Conference and representative of the District interested must consent.

The above plan would permit a properly regulated "invitation system," do away with many abuses of our present *custom*, and meet some objections to the plan submitted in a previous article on "The Invitation System." It would provide an easy and more equitable means of transfer than now prevails, and give a larger sphere of usefulness to men and churches. It would largely eliminate the element of personal interest from the Stationing Committee, leave that body more untrammelled in the proper exercise of its functions, and secure a wider sphere for its action.

But a still greater benefit arising from the proposed change would be the effect upon the sessions of Conference. Who has not felt that the mind of our Annual Conference was overburdened with the stationing business? Laymen are watching the interests of circuits, and ministers are anxious about their stations. It is all but impossible to get the undivided and unselfish interest of the entire body concentrated upon the real work of the session. Is there not far too little time and attention given to the discussion of the reports of the different committees? Is not the whole work of Conference made too much a matter of mere routine business? Are reports and discussions of that spiritual and practical character that are calculated to rouse enthusiasm and send all away stimulated and helped for the work of another year? Do Annual Conferences interest, edify and assist as they should our churches and people in the towns and cities where held? As in comparison with other denominations whose Synods, Conventions or Unions are not charged with the stationing of ministers, are our sessions as promotive of the highest and best interests of the kingdom of God? As a great Christian body, would we not accomplish more good in the world if the work of the Stationing Committee were entirely separated from the Annual Conference, thus leaving its sessions wholly free for the consideration of not merely the schedule topics of the Discipline, but of such other questions as the interests of Christ's work demands? Would not the introduction of more of the convention idea enable us

to keep closer to the new and growing needs of the age, and adapt our methods to the changing circumstances of the times? Have we not drifted far from the original purpose of Wesley, as set forth in his call for the first Conference, to obtain "advice respecting the best method of carrying on the work of God"? Have we not fallen into stereotyped ways as to the business of Conference, and made the main thought and laid the chief stress on the stationing of the ministers? Did not the discussion of ecclesiastical and theological questions occupy a prominent place in the Conferences of early Methodism, and was not the subject of personal religion the predominant thought? Would not the Methodist Church enjoy more spiritual prosperity and become a greater power for the promotion of Christ's Kingdom among men, if, under a properly regulated invitation system, both the ministry and the laity would leave the appointments absolutely in the hands of the Stationing Committee, independent of and not connected with Conference sessions at all, except as to report of the final draft?

Our whole plea in this matter is that a change of Conference boundaries is not the best remedy for the present condition of things. Conferences as now constituted are well organized, and any other re-arrangement than that of adjusting some Districts or portions thereof would cause an unsettling of relations that would take years to harmonize. The grouping idea for stationing purposes and the entire separation of the Stationing Committee from Annual Conference business would give us not only what is sought by having larger Conference area, but would concentrate the thought and effort of members upon the real work of the session. Another plea is that we ought to give more time and attention at our annual gatherings to that which will better qualify our ministers for their work, and more thoroughly train our people in ways and means of prosecuting the Master's commission. The Conference sessions should be the instrument of arousing a holy enthusiasm for, and inspiring an unselfish devotion to, Christ and His cause.

"For the advancement of theological learning among ministers and preachers of the Gospel in connection with the Methodist Church," Theological Unions have been brought into existence.

and the CANADIAN METHODIST REVIEW established. But the whole matter is treated extra-conferential, and although much has been accomplished, yet the interest in the lectures and discussions is not so general as it should be. The Presbyterian Church is giving attention to practical questions outside of Synod business at the annual meetings, as do also the Baptists, Congregationalists and Episcopalians. Besides this, at their theological colleges they are having post-graduate sessions "for the study of new problems, critical, theological, social, which are continually presenting themselves to the minister in his active work, as well as for fuller and deeper understanding of the sacred Scriptures, and the prosecution of such other studies as will the more fully prepare and furnish the mind and heart for the great work of preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ." In the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, similar work is done by "The Itinerants' Club," an institution first organized by Bishop Vincent to assist probationers for the ministry in prosecuting their studies, but since enlarged to help all who have a "true desire to gain knowledge and power." Its object is thus set forth: "This is a meeting chiefly for ministers. Its first aim is to hold up very high ideals of ministerial character and qualifications. It seeks to bring into helpful fellowship the members of a holy profession; to outline plans of study and work; to guide students of theology in the mastery of the books and subjects on which they are expected to pass a satisfactory examination; to exalt the sacred office, and to encourage a renewed consecration of every minister, present at the session, to the God of all grace and to the service of Christ and His Church."

The beneficial effect of such movements must be apparent to all, as also the comparative result to a ministry where such helps are neglected. In order to secure truly effective preaching and the best pastoral work, the mind and heart of the preacher should be kept fresh and vigorous by the inspiration of new truth, the stimulus from discussion of current thought, and the quickening and deepening of spiritual life by sympathetic fellowship with those having a common interest.

Shall we of the Methodist Church fall behind? Why should

we not at all our theological colleges have a week or ten days' "course" every year, and at each Annual Conference have at least two or three days for the introduction of a previously prepared programme of topics and "conversations" thereon? Why should not the principle of "University Extension" be applied by our college professors to Biblical, theological, and sociological subjects at such Conference gatherings, and thus carry the college to the people?

We need a "forward movement" along this line, and in order to its most effectual working, should not enlarge Annual Conference territory by breaking up or materially changing present boundaries, but inspire the entire Church with new life and vigor by more practically utilizing and spiritually vitalizing our present system of organization.

*Toronto, Ont.*

A. M. PHILLIPS.

THE UNITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.—These two dispensations have, indeed, a wonderful unity. They come from the same *source*. The first word of inspiration and revelation, whether old or new, is God. It was He who spoke unto the fathers; whose message Abraham obeyed; with whom Moses communed; whose warnings and blessings the prophets faithfully delivered—down to the hour when Malachi closed the prophetic roll. It was the Same, who, opening anew the page of divine self-communication, wrote himself down for mankind in the person of His Son.

These covenants have also a unity of *purpose*. The one does not overthrow what the other has built up. God, who speaks in both, speaks to the same purport and with the same object—the revelation of himself and the salvation of the race. The methods are varied: warning, promise, law, parable, poem, type, ritual, harsh and cruel barbarity, loving and gentle self-sacrifice—yet, running through all, is the ultimate object of grace. The light is dim in the Temple compared with the brightness of the Risen One, but it is the same light, and both in their degree illumine the way to heaven and reveal Him whose throne is there.—*Biblical World*.

## EDITORIAL REVIEWS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS.

---

*How God Inspired the Bible: Thoughts for the Present Disquiet.* By J. PATERSON SMYTH, Rector of Christ Church, Kingstown, and author of "How we Got our Bible." New York: James Pott & Company, 14 and 16 Astor Place. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. 12mo, pp. 209.

This little book is intended to meet a want of the time, and it seems to us to be well calculated to accomplish that purpose. It recognizes the fact that a large number of intelligent and thoughtful Christians are passing through a season of doubt and disquiet concerning the inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures; and it deals with the cause and cure of this state of things. As to the former of these, though it is partly the result of the spread of rationalistic speculation, Mr. Smyth holds it to be chiefly due to the progress of knowledge. "For centuries past men have been forcing the Bible into a false position, a position perilous to its authority, unwarranted by its own statements, and, worst of all, in a great measure obscuring the real power and beauty of its teaching. In the fierce light of modern inquiry, it is becoming more and more evident that this position cannot be maintained, and simple men are growing disquieted, thinking the Bible itself to be in danger, while those who know better are looking forward hopefully, even though in some measure anxiously, too." Their anxiety, however, is not about the fate of the Bible; they who best understand the influences which are at work and the work which is being done, have no doubt that, if the Bible is the Word of God, as we fully believe it to be, it will fully vindicate its claim to be recognized as such, and though some of the theories which have been held concerning it will be swept away as so many cobwebs, the book itself will be helped, not harmed.

The real danger to the perplexed and disquieted arises from the attitude taken up by the injudicious friends of the Bible, who, unconsciously, it may be, to themselves, identify the book with their own theories concerning it, and make its inspiration and authority depend upon their validity. "Inspiration, in its Divine largeness and freedom and grandeur, is an idea quite beyond them. Their notion is of a sort of rigid superintendence to guarantee that each little detail of the Bible history shall be absolutely correct; that its science shall be unassailable in the light of the nineteenth century; that its moral teaching in every period shall be perfect. To attempt to question this is, in their opinion, to endanger the whole foundations of religion. Such men as these are the chief causes of disquiet, and the chief cause of the discredit of the Bible. They pledge God's inspiration, they pledge Christianity itself, to their own mechanical theories. They give to the infidel his chief victories over religion. They make sad the seeking souls whom God has not made sad; they unconsciously make void the Word of God by their traditions, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Under the head of "Re-assurance," Mr. Smyth discusses the question, "Is the Bible safe?" and in so doing gives an interesting and impressive summary of the internal evidence of their Divine inspiration and authority

which the books of the Bible carry with them, by which they vindicated their claim to be recognized as containing a Divine message when they were first written, by which they won their way into the Canon; and which places them forever in a position of independence of those traditional props which seem to be in danger of being swept away by the destructive criticism of these latter times. He then deals with "Popular Notions of Inspiration," in which he points out, *en passant*, that the difficulties which are troubling the souls of honest inquirers, and frightening so many who regard themselves as being set for the defence of the truth, are not in the Bible so much as in the misconceptions of men concerning it. If there are difficulties in the Bible, they have put them into it. "*They have put in the place of inspiration itself certain popular notions of what inspiration should be.*" They have assumed without the slightest warrant that if God inspired the Bible, He must have done it in the particular way which appears to them the most fitting. It must be verbally inspired, it must be absolutely infallible, or its style and language must be faultless, or its religious teaching must be perfect from the beginning. At any rate, it must be something which is necessary for a book inspired of God."

But all this is superstitious and wrong. Nay, it is founded in presumption. It assumes that men are capable of deciding how God should proceed in giving a revelation of himself and His will to mankind, and, *a priori*, what attributes a revelation given by Him ought to possess. But the only means we have of knowing what sort of a revelation God would have given, is by the study of that which He has given. This book is a human as well as a Divine production. It did not fall down from Heaven. "It was not, as the old illuminations picture it, copied from golden books held open by the angels in the sky. It was written by men—men inspired by God, it is true, but yet men with human hearts, and human frailties, and human feelings. It was written in the most natural way, with exertion of hand, and heart, and brain, as we ourselves would write. We know that it came from God in the sense that God inspired it for the spiritual guidance of the world; that a noble influence and a Divine teaching emanated from it. But the fact that it was thus inspired of God did not change this living, throbbing human book into a dead, gilded idol. That is what we have done. We have bound together in one volume, and tried to level into dead uniformity a number of separate writings, history, poetry, drama, epistle, prophecy, parable, written by different writers, of different temperaments, at different times, for different purposes, and, for aught we know, with different degrees of Divine illumination. This collection of living utterances given for our use we have almost treated as a fetish for our worship. We have attributed to it every quality that seemed to us an excellence, without asking whether we had reason for doing so. We have made God responsible for its every passing reference to history or science—nay, for even the author's name at the head of every writing. Thus the intelligent veneration for a nobly inspired book degenerated into a foolish reverence for an idol; the faith that should have assimilated the *spirit* of the Bible has become a superstitious worship of letters and words."

The popular notions respecting inspiration which our author sets in the fore-front as chief among the causes of doubt and disquiet, he groups under five heads: "1. The theory of verbal inspiration, that asserts that God is the author of Scripture in the same sense as Milton is of 'Paradise Lost,' every chapter, verse, word and letter being directly dictated by Him. 2. The ignoring of the large human element in inspiration. 3. The belief that the inspired Bible must be absolutely infallible in every detail, even in secular subjects. 4. That the moral and spiritual teaching in an inspired book

can never at any period be crude and imperfect. 5. That editing or revising, or mistaking the author's name goes far to destroy the inspiration of a book." These he challenges and does battle with in the after part of this work.

The next chapter, which deals with the question, "How to Form a True Notion of Inspiration," has been anticipated in part already. "*The right way is to question the Bible itself—to accept finally no beliefs or strongly maintained assumptions until you have 'searched the Scriptures whether these things are so.'*" Following this is a chapter in which the "History of Notions of Inspiration" is discussed. The opinions held concerning it by the Jews, by the Early Church, by the Church in the Middle Ages, by the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, and those which are prevalent in our day, are all passed under review. But all this is merely intended to prepare the way for the discussion indicated by the title of the work. It is in the Second Book, which constitutes the latter half of the volume that the questions, "*How did God inspire the Bible? What is implied in the fact of its inspiration? Admitting that the writers of the Holy Scriptures were inspired, what does that bind us to believe concerning their writings?*" are treated.

The negative side of this discussion, or how God did not inspire the Bible, according to the view entertained by the author of this book, has been sufficiently indicated already. Respecting the nature of inspiration, Mr. Smyth does not attempt any definition of it, and he refuses to become responsible for any theory. It is remarkable, as he points out, that the classical authors had evidently the same idea of it that we have, and often used the same expressions concerning it that are employed in the Bible. They speak of a "Divine frenzy" or "afflatus," of "being borne along by God," and of being "God-inspired." But neither these expressions, nor those employed by the sacred writers, afford us any information beyond the fact that it is a Divine influence "inbreathed" into the human soul, by which men are "moved" or "borne along," to speak or do something that they could have done, or done as well without it. "Though mainly a moral or spiritual endowment, it seems also to have elevated and enlightened the mind. Its manifestations were manifold and differed in different men. It gave a deep insight into moral and spiritual truth, a perception of God, an elevation of soul, an enthusiasm for righteousness, a glowing warmth of devotion. It gave, too, a spirit of wisdom and judgment, a quickening and enlarging of the mental faculties. . . . It helped one man to be a historian, another to be an editor of old documents, another to be an architect and designer, another to sing noble soul-stirring hymns. It helped an apostle to write letters of wise counsel to the Church, and touched a prophet's 'hallowed lips with fire,' to rouse a nation from its evil life."

Inspiration must be distinguished from *revelation*. "Inspiration is a breath which fills the sails of the inner being. Revelation is a telescope bringing into range objects which the eye could not discern. . . . Inspiration may exist without revelation. Thus, for example, if criticism should prove that no single item in a book was supernaturally revealed, that the facts were all learned in the ordinary way from observation, or from old documents, or from the testimony of others, this would not in the least disprove that the writer was inspired with a clearness of memory and an insight into the Divine signification of facts, and with more than natural discretion to determine what he should say or how he should say it."

The two extremes against which the student of this subject must guard, according to Mr. Smyth, are what, for want of a better term, he calls *natural* inspiration, on one hand, and verbal inspiration on the other.

The former involves the virtual denial of the Divine element in the Bible, while the latter is the virtual denial of the human. Both are false. It is true, indeed, that the natural and the supernatural are so blended in the Bible that it is not possible to always say where the one ends and the other begins. In this, as in all other things that He does, God hides himself under second cause. It is evident that the sacred writers, especially the prophets, believed themselves to be not only divinely but supernaturally inspired. Thus the marvellous insight of these Bible authors distinguishes them from all others. Take, for example, the Divine prophecies which caused the widespread expectation of the Messiah; the miraculous knowledge which Paul evinces in his testimony respecting the resurrection. "Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and we shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." While rejecting the verbal and the mechanical, we must be careful to not let go the supernatural. In other words, while fully recognizing the human element in the Holy Scriptures, we must be careful to not lose sight of the Divine. A rational interpretation of the Bible is not necessarily rationalistic. For the former Mr. Smyth contends strongly, but against the latter he raises a no less emphatic voice. He holds the doctrine of the infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible; but he holds that this can only be rationally maintained when it is read in the light of the Divine purpose which it was intended to serve, and the progressiveness of God's teaching as unfolded in its pages. But this is too large a question to be dealt with in a paragraph. The reader must therefore be referred to the book itself for what he says upon this branch of the subject, with the assurance that he will find it well worth a candid perusal, and if he cannot accept in all respects the author's conclusions, he will at least admire his spirit.

*Darwin and After Darwin.* An Exposition of the Darwinian Theory and a Discussion of Post-Darwinian Questions. By GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. Price \$2.

This volume is the outcome of a course of lectures delivered before the University of Edinburgh in connection with a lectureship founded by Lord Rosebery. They were afterwards extended and delivered before the Royal Institution in a course covering three years—1888-90. The first year's course dealt with the history of biology from the earliest times to 1859. The second took up the theory of organic evolution, commencing with the issue of Darwin's "Origin of Species," and extending to 1882, the year in which Darwin died; while the third year's course traced the development of the theory from that date onward to 1890. This is the first published instalment of the above lectures, the first and third series of which will appear in due time. The lecture form has disappeared, and we have an interesting volume of ten chapters and several appendices in which we are treated to the best thought that the Darwinian theory can rally for its exposition and defence. The author is thoroughly at home in this, his chosen field, and writes with the enthusiasm and earnestness that accompany ardent conviction.

The introductory chapter fully sets forth the Darwinian method as compared with that which obtained when Darwin began his investigations. We have here no longer, on the one hand, a mere web-spinning of theories from the ever-fertile source of man's own inner consciousness; nor on the other, a mere tabulation of facts and phenomena, with no attempt at theorizing upon their scientific import. The accumulation of facts

is necessary, but their value lies "in their power of guiding the mind to a further discovery of principles." A theory must pre-suppose facts and deal with them as matters calling for explanation. "Not facts, then, or phenomena, but causes or principles, are the ultimate objects of scientific quest." Such a statement should offend the positivist of the School of Comte rather than those who are disposed to dissent from his extreme materialism. Darwin is not afraid of the "bug-bear of speculation. The spirit of speculation is the same as the spirit of science, a desire to know the causes of things." But speculation is valueless without verification. Every theory must consequently submit to this testing process. Facts must first demand a theory, and then the theory must stand the test of the facts. "It is just because Darwin did both these things with so admirable a judgment that he gave the world of natural history so good a lesson as to the most effectual way of driving the chariot of science." Observation, deduction, or theory, and verification have, in some form or other, come to be, in general, the recognized steps in every department of research.

It must be noted that these steps or processes necessarily limit the field both of fact and theory as well as that of verification. The super-sensible is a *terra incognita*. The very term itself closes the door to facts, and consequently theory and verification are alike impossible. We can work only with what we have. "We are concerned only with the origin of particular forms of life, that is to say, with the origin of species. The theory of descent starts from life as a *datum* already granted. How life itself came to be the theory of descent, as such, is not concerned to show." Interesting as is the question as to its origin, "at present, it must be confessed science is not in a position to furnish so much as any suggestion upon the subject." Not life, then, as such, but life in its specialized forms, is the object of the biological evolutionist.

While, however, the supernatural is beyond the reach of observation and experiment, yet the gradual unfolding of intelligence is doing much to assist in the solution of these mysterious problems. No greater obstacle has stood in the way of their proper conception and meaning than the persistent disposition to remain in the uncriticized superstitions of our first unreflective thought. "Thus it is only by degrees that fetishism is superseded by what now appears a common-sense interpretation of physical phenomena. Everywhere the miraculous is progressively banished from the field of explanation by the advance of scientific discovery. . . . In our own day there are but very few of these strongholds of the miraculous left. . . . One of these cases is the origin of life; and, until quite recently, another of these cases was the origin of species."

In common with Herbert Spencer, the author holds that the origin of species must be referred to one or other of two hypotheses. "Either all the species of plants and animals must have been supernaturally created, or else they must have been naturally evolved. There is no third hypothesis possible, for no one can rationally suggest that species have been eternal."

Accepting evolution as the correct theory, what can be said in its defence? In support of the theory, the reader is taken through five chapters, extending over 230 pages. Each chapter is devoted to a special line of evidence. The first treats of Classification, and undertakes to show that the unity observable in the different forms of plants and animals, rendering classification possible, can be most satisfactorily explained on the evolution hypothesis. The next chapter deals with Morphology. A striking instance is found in the paddle of the whale, the wing of a bird, and the hand of a man; and the supposition is that

these differences and divergences from an original type correspond in a general way with the length of time during which the divergence has been going on, together with the environment and other empirical conditions.

Perhaps the strongest and most startling evidence is found in the following chapter, "The Newest of the Sciences, the Science of Embryology." The fetal stages and transformations are so numerous and so similar, even in the most widely divergent species, that it is thought no explanation of this can be given except on the supposition that all are to be viewed as related to a common parent stem.

In the two remaining chapters on Palæontology and Geographical Distribution, we have an accumulation of evidence bearing on the forms, the order, and the distribution of ancient and modern life. It is endeavored to show that gaps now evidently existing can be accounted for; gradual divergences may be traced in the one direction and assimilations in the other; the whole furnishing a mass of evidence that practically closes the argument against the rival theory of the formation of species by special creation. The "time" distribution in geology and the "space" distribution in geography show—on the one hand, the remarkable similarities between animal and plant life during the same periods; and on the other, the corresponding resemblances over the same areas.

The argument so far presented is fuller and more satisfactory than in Spencer's "Principles of Biology." Spencer concludes his examination in rebuttal of the special creation hypothesis in the following words: "Thus, however regarded, the hypothesis of special creations turns out to be worthless—worthless by its derivation, worthless in its intrinsic incoherence, worthless as absolutely without evidence, worthless as not supplying an intellectual need, worthless as not satisfying a moral want." As the evolution hypothesis is open to none of these objections, it is accordingly accepted.

The second part of the volume consists of four chapters devoted to "The Theory of Natural Selection." Part First treated of "the main evidences of organic evolution considered as a fact." In Part Second, "we enter a new field, namely, the evidences which thus far have been brought to light, touching the causes of organic evolution considered as a process." It explains and defends the theory in the operation and process of realization.

What is the outcome, in the opinion of the author, in relation to the personality and spirituality of man and the existence of God? "Design," "adaptation," "contrivance," "beneficence," these are the terms in which the Divine nature and activity were wont to be set forth in the not distant past. Darwinism has changed all this. Whatever may be left of the substance, the reading of the record and the method of presenting the subject have undergone complete transformation. The direction is one of *tendency* rather than dogmatic utterance. We must bear in mind that science can only speak oracularly of what it knows. This statement is necessary to guard the reader from pronouncing too severely upon the following quotations. Detached from the context, they are more than likely to be unduly misleading:

"Innumerable adaptations of structures to functions appeared to yield convincing evidence in favor of design; the beauty so profusely shed by living forms appeared to yield evidence, no less convincing, of that design as beneficent. But both these sources of evidence have now, as it were, been tapped at their fountain head; the adaptation and the beauty are alike receiving their explanation at the hands of a purely mechanical philosophy. Nay, even the personality of man himself is assailed, and this not only in the features which he shares with the lower animals, but also in his god-like attributes of reason, thought and conscience."

The theory of evolution has brought about "a fundamental, a cosmical, a world-transforming change. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it is a change of a non-theistic, as distinguished from an a-theistic kind. It has rendered impossible the appearance in literature of any future Paley, Bell or Chalmers, but it has done nothing in the way of negating that belief in a Supreme Being which it was the object of these authors to substantiate. If it has demonstrated the futility of their proof, it has furnished nothing in the way of disproof."

The irreconcilable antagonisms revealed between the painful struggle for existence on the one hand, and of the moral sense on the other, have come to the religious mind "with a shock of terrified surprise." "The religious thought of our generation has been more than ever staggered by the question—Where is now thy God? But I have endeavored to show that the logical standing of the case has not been materially changed; and when this cry of Reason pierces the heart of Faith, it remains for Faith to answer now, as she has always answered before—and answered with that trust which is at once her beauty and her life—Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself."

*Pauperism, a Picture; and the Endowment of Old Age: an Argument.*  
By CHARLES BOOTH. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.  
12mo, pp. 355.

It cannot be said that this is the best, though it is the latest, of the books written by Mr. Booth on the condition of the poor in London, but anything from his pen on this subject is well worth reading. A person listening to a debate in the English House of Commons, was surprised at the attention which was given to a speaker who hesitated and stammered, and seemed to have extreme difficulty in getting out what he had to say. He asked a person who happened to be present, and who knew all about the House, how it was that this gentleman was heard so attentively. The secret, he said, is, that that gentleman knows more about the subject than any other man in England. They care nothing about his style, but they are intensely interested in his matter, because he happens to be the very highest authority on the subject that he is discussing. And this applies to Mr. Booth's books, to this extent, that if they were not nearly as well written as they really are, they would be worth reading, simply because this author knows more about the subject to which they refer than anybody else; and no one who desires to understand it can afford to be ignorant of what he has written.

The first part of the book, as indicated by the title, consists of a picture of pauperism, but we shall be disappointed if we look for some fine descriptive writing setting forth the picturesque or pathetic aspects of the subject. It is, in fact, made up of a series of hard facts extracted in the main from written records of parochial relief. The grouping of these facts may be inferred from the headings of the chapters: "Pauperism at Stephney," "Stories of Stephney Pauperism," "Charity at Stephney," "St. Pancras," "Pauperism at Asby-de-la-Zouch," "On the Enumeration of Paupers," "The Causes of Pauperism." While the facts grouped under each and all of these headings are of great scientific value to those who know how to use them, the last of these chapters, that on the causes of pauperism, possesses considerable popular interest.

The second part of the work, that which deals with the endowment of old age, is the most interesting and the most important. The first thing that is likely to impress the mind of the reader in the perusal of the several chapters into which this part of the book is divided, is the extreme difficulty

with which this question is beset. Of course, it is impossible to indicate in a sentence or two the line of the argument. But whoever may be interested in the question—one which is forcing itself upon public attention in the Old World as it never did before, and which is pretty sure to be one of the burning questions of the near future—will find it very fully and fairly stated in this book, and that, too, without any waste of words.

*The United States: An Outline of Political History.* 1492-1871. By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. Toronto: The Copp, Clark Company. Crown, octavo, pp. 312.

*Essays on Questions of the Day, Political and Social.* By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. Toronto: The Copp, Clark Company. Octavo, pp. 300.

The former of these volumes has had a large sale, and has met with much favor both in this country and in the United States. The name of the accomplished author is a sufficient guarantee for its literary excellence. It is only necessary to say that it is written in his very best vein. It is a marvel of historical condensation, as may be inferred from the fact that it covers a period, including the continental period, of three hundred and seventy-nine years. But, though it is an "outline," it is an illuminated outline in which there is not a dull or uninteresting page. The spirit of impartiality and fidelity to the truth of history which characterizes it throughout, however, constitutes its chief charm. Dr. Smith had a delicate work to perform and he has done it in a manner which has already met with the approval of fair-minded men everywhere, and that is pretty sure to meet with even more hearty appreciation in the future. To those who are not familiar with the sources from whence Dr. Smith's materials are drawn, this work will be invaluable; and even to such as have access to those histories, this work will be found a valuable aid in directing them in the study of the several epochs and the principal events embraced in the period with which it deals.

By many who are familiar with the best periodical literature of the time, many, if not all, of the "Essays on Questions of the Day" will be recognized as old acquaintances, they having already appeared in such publications as the *Nineteenth Century*, the *Forum*, and the *North American Review*. Readers of these periodicals will be glad to find them in a permanent form in which they can be conveniently preserved. Those who have not had the privilege of reading them when they first appeared, have an intellectual treat in store for them. Viewed merely as literary performances, they deserve to be not only read but studied by all who would use the English language with purity and force, and who are desirous of cultivating the graces of literary style. And whatever may be the reader's opinion on the questions discussed, whether he may be able to accept the conclusions at which the author has arrived, he can scarcely fail to have his horizon enlarged and his knowledge of the subjects treated increased by the perusal of those admirable papers. Dr. Smith, it is true, has his fads. He is what the French call a *doctrinaire* rather than a practical statesman. His politics are speculative rather than practical. But there are spots on the sun; and though we are not prepared to stand sponsor for every opinion expressed in these able and admirable essays, we are none the less sincere and hearty on that account in recommending them to the perusal of our readers.

The questions treated are: "Social and Industrial Revolution," "The Question of Disestablishment," "The Political Crisis in England," "The

Empire," "Woman's Suffrage," "The Jewish Question," "The Irish Question," "Prohibition in Canada and the United States," and "The Oneida Community and American Socialism."

*The Prince of India; or, Why Constantinople Fell.* By LEW WALLACE, author of "Ben Hur," etc. Cloth, 2 vols., 16 mo. Price \$2.50 the set in library box. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Montreal: C. W. Coates. Halifax: S. F. Huestis. Second edition.

The closing decade of the nineteenth century is witnessing a revival of the old "Historic Novel," and if one may judge anything from the eagerness of the reading public to have these novels, an increasing demand for a healthier style of fiction than that of which George Moore, Ibsen and Zola are the chief exponents. Conan Doyle in the Old World and General Wallace in the New have recently given us vivid pictures of the dead past, causing the old characters of history to move before our gaze, describing with detailed accuracy the circumstances and the customs of their day, teaching us by example the old lesson of our prophetic poet, that

. . . through the ages one increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns.

The Methodist Book Room has issued a second edition of the novel upon which General Wallace had been at work for the last two years, entitled "The Prince of India; or, Why Constantinople Fell." The fact that over 100,000 copies were ordered before it was taken off the press is a proof of the abundant financial success; but the question we wish to consider just now is, What about the book as a book?

It is a work which would establish firmly a reputation for any unknown author, but General Wallace has to compete with himself, and "Ben Hur" is the standard by which he must be judged.

Unquestionably this is a greater book than "Ben Hur," greater in its historical accuracy, in its attention to details, in its absence of anachronisms, greater, also, in its main conception faithfully brought out through plot and incident, as the events sweep on in ordered sequence to their tragic close.

Unquestionably it has been a greater task to write this than to write "Ben Hur," because the latter, from the comparative scarcity of the details known about the period of which it treats, allowed greater freedom to the imagination, while in the present case the reins of the fancy would have to be checked by the actual happenings.

The Prince of India is the Wandering Jew, who a traveller through all the known lands of the earth, has sat at the feet of all the great philosophers and teachers of religion, seeking even the rest of a trustful peace for his soul but finding it not. He is introduced to be as learned in all the knowledge of the world as skilled in the mastery of men, and yet longing for some higher ideal, he determines to found a universal brotherhood of all who believe in God.

Being persuaded that the Islam is too firmly attached to Mohammed, he establishes himself at Constantinople, and proclaims his idea to the Christians there. We will not here unravel the plot; but circumstances force the Prince to seek help from Mohammed, and as a messenger from Heaven he leads on that ambitious prophet and ruler to undertake the conquest of Constantinople.

This book is indeed a monumental work. While the style is crisp and nervous, there is no superficial lightness about it. The spark and savour of those old Byzantine times are tersely reproduced. There are some remarkably vivid and dramatic descriptions, such as the "Story of the

Hidden Treasure," in the prologue, "The Passing of the Caravan," "The Diadem of Epicurest," "A Fisherman's Fate," "The Prince of India Preaching God to the Greeks," "The Bloody Harvest," etc., etc.

One chapter in the book, entitled "Racing with a Storm" is even a better piece of description than "The Chariot Race" in "Ben Hur," and will without doubt become a favorite piece with our leading elocutionists.

This is essentially a book, not only to be read, but to be kept and treasured on the shelf with our favorite volumes that we read and re-read so often. Dramatic in conception, vigorous in execution and terse in dialogue, these books will be appreciated by all who love a good story of plot and incident free from vulgarity, and written in the "Queen's English."

*Bible Studies: I. Studies in the Pentateuch. II. Studies in the Life of Christ. The International Sunday School Lessons for 1894.* By GEO. F. PENTECOST, author of "In the Volume of the Book," "Out of Egypt," etc. New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 12mo, pp. 413.

To those who have read Dr. Pentecost's other books, the fact that he is its author will be a sufficient recommendation to this volume. Though he is better known, perhaps, as an earnest and successful evangelist than as an author, it is due to him to say that he is, so far as he is known, no less popular as a writer than he is as a preacher. This book is probably the best that he has produced so far. The spirit in which it is written, like all his other works, is admirable; and though the esteemed author has peculiarities of opinion with which some of our readers might not be able always to agree, there is very little in this book, we are persuaded, with which evangelical Christians generally will not be able to cordially accept. Sabbath School superintendents and teachers will find it very helpful in teaching the prescribed lessons for the next year; and, if we are not mistaken, preachers will find in it a homiletical commentary on the passages included in the lessons, of permanent value.

*The Way into the Holiest. Expositions of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* By F. B. MEYER, B.A., author of "Tried by Fire," "The Life and Lights of Men," "The Psalms: Notes and Readings." New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 12mo, pp. 277.

These expositions are not critical, but devotional and practical. The author shows no disposition to meddle with anything that cannot be made to minister to the edification of his readers. Even the vexed question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews is a matter of too little importance for him to spend time over. In every sentence he detects the authorship of the Holy Spirit; and he believes that it contains a message, not to any one age merely, but to all ages; not to one community—though addressed to the Hebrews—but to the universal Church. The evidences of this stalwart faith are to be found everywhere throughout his pages. He is not troubled about the authority of the book but about its meaning; his ambition is, not to play the part of a critic, but that of an expositor. So far as the processes or the results of Biblical criticism can aid him in this it is welcomed, but no farther.

These expositions are not sermons, and there is nothing sermonic or homiletical in their form; and yet it is probable that in their original form they were sermon notes, composed in the regular course of the author's ministry. They are all the better on this account. There is nothing into which the faithful minister puts so much of his own soul, or in which he displays so much desire to know the whole mind of God, as in preparing

to instruct and edify the flock over which he watches as one who shall give account. Spots are seen upon the sun; infirmity cleaves to all human performances; and persons in pursuit of blemishes and defects will probably find them in this little book; but on the other hand, the reader who is animated with a desire to understand an interesting and important part of the Holy Scriptures, as a means of personal edification, and as the instrument for doing good, will find much that is valuable in its pages.

*The Stickit Minister, and Some Common Men.* By R. S. CROCKETT.  
London: T. Fisher Unwin. Toronto: William Briggs. Octavo, pp. 283. Price \$1.25.

This book is alike creditable to the author and to the publisher. The sketches of Scottish character and life which it contains bear the stamp of genius upon every one of them. Indeed they are so admirable that we are disposed to say little about them beyond heartily commending them to the readers of the REVIEW, believing them to be quite capable of telling their own story. They are short and, on this account, will commend themselves to the busy people of this bustling age; but no one who has read one of them is likely to willingly leave any of them unread. The Book Steward has done his part well, giving to the book a body in some sense worthy of its soul. It is to be hoped that "The Stickit Minister," and his friends, to whom we are introduced in this delicious volume, will become widely known, for they only need to be known to be loved.

*Holy Men of God from St. Augustine to Yesterday.* By the REV. JAMES ELDER CUMMING, D.D., author of "Through the Eternal Spirit," "The Blessed Life," "Scripture Photography," etc. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Toronto: Upper Canada Tract Society. Octavo, pp. 314. Price \$1.75.

This belongs to a class of books which cannot be too widely circulated, or be too generally read by people who desire to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth. It can scarcely fail to carry a blessing with it wherever it goes. It is, as its title indicates, made up of a series of sketches of eminent saints who have lived at various periods from the days of Augustine down to the present. The selection of the subjects has been made with judgment, and the treatment of them is admirable. The fact that the author has allowed these good people, as far as possible, to tell their own story, adds materially both to the interest and value of the work. We are thankful for the specimens of mediæval saintship which our author has given us, and the list might have been profitably extended. Whatever may have been the faults of the saints who lived in what we are wont to call "the dark ages," and which our Catholic friends call "the ages of faith," their characters will amply repay devout and careful study. They were lights in dark places, and in a dark age they kept alive the spirit of Christianity when it cost much to do so, and by their godly lives and self-denying labors made the Reformation possible which has brought to us many blessings.

*Paul's Ideal Church and People.* By ALFRED ROWLAND, LL.B., B.A.  
Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 8vo, pp. 287. Price \$1.00.

This is a popular commentary on the first Epistle of Timothy, made on the Revised Version. The author claims that "the authenticity of this Epistle was never questioned by anyone holding a recognized position in

the Christian Church. From the earliest times it was universally accepted as the writings of St. Paul, except by the Gnostics and Marcionites." Not until the present century, in the year 1807, were objections raised by Schleiermacher. The first part of the commentary discusses the Epistle in the form of "Expository Notes," while the main part of the work deals with the leading thoughts of the Epistle in a homiletical way, in forty "Sermonettes."

*The Duties of Man*, addressed to workingmen. By JOSEPH MAZZINI. Reprinted. 12mo, paper, 146 pp., 15 cents. New York, London and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

With the advance of democratic thought the name of Joseph Mazzini, the Italian patriot and revolutionist, grows brighter and larger. His was one of the strongest and sweetest spirits that have blessed our century by their presence and counsel. While Mazzini was an ardent patriot and advocate of struggling nationalities, he also believed most emphatically in the unity of mankind, and hence he is a moral teacher for all men. All his writings are permeated by an unwavering faith in the people and a profound religious spirit. The most characteristic and important of his utterances are to be found in his essay, "The Duties of Man," now reprinted by the Funk & Wagnalls Company, and from which hundreds of valuable quotations may be culled and used to advantage by the writer, speaker, student, and all others interested in that vital topic of the times, the ethics of labor.

*Genesis I. and Modern Science*. By CHARLES B. WARRING, PH.D. 12mo, pp. 245. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price \$1.00.

The author is a member of the New York Academy of Science, and has published several other works on Natural Science and its relation to religion. He takes issue with those scientists who think it no longer "good form" to regard the first chapter of Genesis as anything more than a poem—the work of a wise but uninspired man. He proposes, as Prof. Huxley suggests, "to test this view in the light of facts." The questions he discusses are these two: "Are the physical statements in the first twenty-seven verses true, and is their order correct?" The subject matter is in the form of a discussion between the writer and one whom he styles "The Professor." The latter brings forward all the objections set forth by modern scientists against the Mosaic account of the creation: and the former compares them with the statements in Gen. I. and shows how all such objections must disappear before what is really set forth in that chapter. The book is popular, is exceedingly interesting, and is well calculated to set at rest any doubts which the rash statements of modern scepticism may have originated. It is a good book to put into the hands of young students.

*Doctrine of the Trinity: The Biblical Evidence*. By RICHARD N. DAVIES. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price 90 cents.

The author presents clearly and quite exhaustively the Scriptural argument in support of a trinity in unity in the Godhead, including the Deity of Jesus Christ, and the Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit. The book is intended especially for persons who are beginning their Biblical studies, but may be consulted with advantage by all. It will be found very useful to candidates for our ministry in preparing for our district examinations.

*The Redemption of the Brahman.* A novel. By RICHARD GARBE. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. Price 75 cts.;

This is the history of a Brahman of high caste who was led by various instrumentalities, and especially by his love for a beautiful girl of a lower caste, to see the errors of Brahmanism and renounced them. But the author does not make his hero to go far enough. Every man must believe something in the line of religious truth. If this man had embraced Christianity and become an earnest Christian, the story would have had a consistent ending.

*The Prayer that Teaches to Pray.* By REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Price 60 cts.

A very valuable exposition of the Lord's Prayer, of which petitions the author remarks, "it takes a life-time to fill them with their meaning, and eternity to give them all their answer."

*The Prophetic Attestation.* A Proof that Christianity is attested by Prophecy. By JOSEPH S. COOK, B.D., Ph.D. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Price 25 cts.

A concise statement of fulfilled prophecy, "specially adapted to young Bible-readers desirous of studying Christian evidences."

*The New Era.* By REV. JOSIAH STRONG, D.D., author of "Our Country." New York: The Baker & Taylor Company. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. 350 pp. Library Edition, cloth, gilt top, \$1.75; plain cloth, 90 cents; paper, 35 cents.

This second work, by the author of "Our Country," which is now in its 160th thousand, is an application of fundamental principles to the solution of some of the greatest problems of the times. The writer finds in history two governing principles which are its key—two lines of progress along which the race has moved. As these lines spring from man's constitution, they are permanent and indicate the direction of the world's future progress. Christ recognized man's constitution and based on it two fundamental laws which correspond precisely to these two fundamental principles. The Church has accepted and taught but one of these two laws, and has, therefore, only half comprehended, and only half accomplished, her mission. In the light of these facts the writer interprets the great movements of the times, and points out what he believes history, reason and revelation alike show to be the solution of the great problems of the age. The writer believes that the Church will accept her heretofore neglected social mission, that the world's rate of progress is to be vastly accelerated, that the race is to be perfected, which will be the kingdom of heaven fully come in the earth, and that the Anglo-Saxons are to develop the ultimate civilization.

*Accidents and Emergencies: What Should, and What Should not, be Done before the Doctor Comes.* By THOMAS BLACKSTONE, M.D. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Square 16mo. Cloth. 122 pp. Illustrated and with complete index. Post-paid, 60 cents.

In this little volume we have a thoroughly rational and practical, and therefore valuable, home medical adviser. Not after the "every-man-his-own-physician" order. It does not propose to substitute ignorance and inexperience for the skill of the regular physician. It simply tells us what to do in that interval of time which "always elapses between the receipt of an injury, or the arising of an emergency, and the moment when a physician

can be called and take actual charge of the case." Hence the book treats only of those accidents and emergencies liable to occur in any family following the ordinary avocations of life, and suggests those simple, common-sense appliances and remedies always available, and whose intelligent use may sometimes save a life. Its brevity and directness and simplicity make it all the more valuable.

*The Gospel According to St. Paul.* Studies in the first eight chapters of his Epistle to the Romans. By REV. J. OSWALD DYKES, M.A., D.D. Second edition. Cloth, 8vo. 280 pp. Price, \$2.10.

*In Christo;* or, The Monogram of St. Paul. By REV. J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. Cloth, 8vo. 280 pp. \$1.75.

*Footsteps of St. Paul.* Being a life of the Apostle designed for youth, by REV. J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. 39th thousand. Cloth, 8vo. 416 pp. \$1.75.

*St. Paul in Rome;* or, The Teachings, Fellowships and dying Testimony of the Great Apostle in the City of the Cæsars. By REV. J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. Seventh thousand. Cloth, 8vo. 340 pp. \$1.60.

*St. Paul's Song of Songs.* A practical exposition of the eighth chapter of Romans. By REV. J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. Second edition. 8vo, 222 pp. 90 cents. All published by James Nisbet & Co., London, Eng. Toronto: Wm. Briggs.

Here is a library on the life and teachings of the great apostle that will furnish an excellent supply of mental and spiritual food for the Christian, as well as suggestive to the preacher. *The Gospel According to St. Paul* is not a commentary nor a treatise in theology, but "an attempt to restate in plain language the course of the argument and the development of thought through these famous eight chapters." In this the author has been eminently successful, and will be greatly appreciated by intelligent seekers after evangelical truth. *In Christo* is a collection of thirty-one meditations founded on the phrase "in Christ" and its equivalents. The author finds this monogram to be the *cor cordium* of Paul's writings, the key-note of the whole divine symphony. The treatment is practical, personal and lofty. An ideal is lifted up that must bring the reader into a consciousness of how far he falls short of his possibilities "in Christ," and at the same time lead him to aspire to the full attainment of his covenant privileges. *The Footsteps of St. Paul* is what it claims to be, an effort "to interest and instruct younger students" in the life of the Apostle to the Gentiles, in which the author has succeeded. It is not a mere compilation of culled facts, but the combination of historical and biographical interest with religious instruction, "to attract to a more careful and devout study of the Word of God." The pictorial and descriptive character of the narrative is sustained throughout, which will make it as interesting to a youthful reader as a romance. *St. Paul in Rome* is a series of sermons preached by the author in Rome in 1871, based upon such selections from the epistles as vividly portrays the Apostle's life in the Eternal City. To these is prefixed an "introductory chapter," explanatory of persons, places and circumstances in such a way as to make the memories of the Apostle to live, though his true portrait is in his character, which is brought out in his sermons. *St. Paul's Song of Songs* is an expository, unfolding and illustrative explanation of this well-known and precious chapter. The author finds "the love of God and the security of the believer" to be the dual strain intoned in this New Testament canticle. In a prologue to the discourses proper, the

author treats the first seven chapters as a prelude to the eighth, in which two themes are prominent, "the righteousness of Christ" and "the inadequacy of the law." This is a rich little volume that will repay careful perusal.

*How to Bring Men to Christ.* By R. A. TORREY, Superintendent Chicago Bible Institute. Toronto, Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Cloth, 8mo, 121 pp. 75 cents.

This is a timely and much needed book in view of the multiplied personal workers for Christ in the world. Hundreds of soul-winners are being raised up through the instrumentality of young people's societies and other agencies, who are willing and anxious to work, but do not know just how. Perhaps no one is better able to impart this knowledge than Mr. Torrey, because of his long and varied experience. It is not like some books designed to help workers—a mere manual of texts, but shows how to use them. This book will be a help to any earnest Christian, and should be in the hands of everyone who desires to win souls.

*The Unequal Four.* A story for young ladies. By SAMUEL W. ODELL, LL.B. Cincinnati: Cranston and Curts. Toronto: William Briggs. Cloth, 8vo. 442 pp. \$1.20.

*How I Became a Preacher.* A sequel to "How I Became a Sailor." By OWEN T. GILLET, A.M., M.D., author of "Save Your Minutes." Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Cloth, 8vo. 436 pp. \$1.00.

Two excellent books for either a private or Sunday School library. There is a high moral and truly spiritual tone running through them.

*The Call of the Cross*—four College Sermons by PROF. GEO. D. HERRON, D.D., with an introduction by PRESIDENT GATES, of Iowa College. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. Cloth, 8vo, 111 pp. 75 cents.

*The Bible in Private and Public.* By ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D. Toronto, Chicago, New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Paper, 12mo, 50 pp., 25 cents.

Prof. Herron is a man of power in moral things. He is a man of great enthusiasm, and aims at producing impressions by earnest, emphatic statements and direct appeals and commands to the moral nature. He is a seer whose vision realizes the perfecting of the kingdom of God *on earth*, by the process of the complete redemption of humanity. He is not a mere dreamer, but a practical teacher whose idea is that the salvation of the world is not by an ark theory of separation from the world, but by a pouring of the Church into the world. His ideal is Christ, whom he lifts up as the divine magnet to draw men and women to a life of heroic sacrifice for Christ. He reverses the old Roman poet's song, and makes it sweeter and more glorious to live than to die for one's country. This little book is an appeal based on the call of God for help to help men. It is the living Christ he sees, hears, and is working for and with. These sermons are not the utterances of a theologian, but of an optimistic evangelizer with a soul set on fire by the Christ spirit and purpose. No one can read them without having a truer outlook and more hopeful love for humanity.

Dr. Pierson starts out with his little work on *The Bible* with this axiomatic sentence: "As the lawyer is expected to be the master of books on

legal cases, and the physician of the literature of medicine, so the preacher and teacher of the Bible should thoroughly know the divine Book." Would that this statement were more thoroughly realized by our Methodist Church and her ministry. He then suggestively discourses on "Bible Study and Bible Teaching," in which, in order to effectiveness, he says, endeavor first "to think the thoughts of God," and, second, "to express the thoughts of God."—sound advice, as also is the statement, "The Word of God is the one Book, which it pays most richly to make the almost exclusive subject and object of searching study."

The other topics treated are, "Public Reading of the Word of God," and "Laws of Expression," in which are some most excellent hints on that important yet much neglected duty. This pamphlet will well repay a careful study upon the part of preachers and teachers.

*The Design and Use of Holy Scripture*, being the twenty-second Fernley Lecture, delivered in Bradford, 1892, by REV. MARSHALL RANGLES, D.D. London, Eng.: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room. Toronto: William Briggs. Paper, 8vo, 251 pp., 70 cents.

*Revised Normal Lessons*. By REV. JESSE LYMAN HURLBUT, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. Toronto: William Briggs. Paper, 8vo, 111 pp. Cloth, 60 cents, paper 35 cents.

With Prof. Randles the readers of the REVIEW are already acquainted through his articles on "Were the Sufferings of Christ Penal?" The same careful, thorough, conservative treatment characterizes this valuable lecture that does his articles. He shows the Scriptures to be a divine medium of revelation, and that they are the end and sufficiency of that revelation. Next he discusses the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures and their practical use, giving his statement and estimate of the "Higher Criticism" in relation thereto. Then follows chapters on the office of reason, of the Holy Spirit, and of the Church in the use of the Scriptures. The treatment of the subject throughout is soundly orthodox, and in the appendix he meets the objections of some critics. The lecture is a very valuable contribution to the literature of the day that is being produced through the Biblical controversy. The value of the book is enhanced by a very complete indices on "Subjects and Persons," and "Texts of Scripture."

Dr. Hurlbut's *Normal Lessons* has been before the public since 1885. In this revised edition the lessons on the Canon, Versions, and Evidences have been omitted, but others added, and all carefully re-written. The aim is to awaken an interest in the study of the Bible, and aid those who are preparing to teach it.

*Exodus*. With Introduction, Commentary and Special Notes, etc. By REV. JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. Two volumes, 8vo. Price 70 cents each.

This work belongs to the "Hand-Book Series for Bible Classes," and sustains the reputation of that admirable set of helps. Part I. is "The Redemption: Egypt," chaps. i. to xiv.; and Part II., "The Consecration," chap. xv. to the end. Besides providing a concise commentary, in which the author aims at giving the simple exposition and meaning of the text, he adds special notes on important topics that throw much light upon a proper understanding of Exodus. Not the least important part of this set is the Introduction in which is discussed: Description of the Book, Character of the Exodus Movement, Egypt-Sinai theatre of events—in

place and time ; Revelation, as a fact in the history ; the Revelation, specifically of Redemption ; the Evidence of the Revelation ; the Monuments of the Revelation. This discussion is a most excellent preparation for the study of Exodus, and teachers in our Sunday Schools, as well as preachers, would do well to possess themselves of these volumes, especially the first, which covers the lessons of this quarter.

*Gist.* A hand-book of missionary information, pre-eminently for use in young women's circles. Compiled by LILY RYDER GRACEY. Cincinnati : Cranston & Curts. Toronto : William Briggs. Price 70 cents.

This is a very valuable volume of much information in small compass. It contains two hundred pages, and every page is consecrated to the compiler's purpose to give just such facts as might be most helpful to the missionary student and worker. The topics treated are : Missions, Women and Missions, Mission Fields—China, India, Africa, South America, Mexico, Turkey, Syria, Persia, Burmah, Siam and Laos, Corea, Japan, the Island World, and North American Indians—Gifts, Jim and the Missionary Meeting, and the Giving Alphabet. The book is worthy of a place on the desk of every worker for the Master.

*Job.* Exposition by REV. G. RAWLINSON, M.A. ; Homiletics, by Rev. T. Whitelaw, D.D. ; Homilies, by various authors. Price \$2.25.

*Proverbs.* Exposition by REV. W. J. DEANE, M.A., and S. T. TAYLOR-TASWELL, M.A. ; Homiletics, by PROF. W. F. ADENEY, M.A. ; Homilies, by various authors. Price \$2.25.

*Ecclesiastes.* Exposition by REV. W. J. DEANE, M.A. ; Homiletics by REV. T. WHITELOW, D.D. ; Homilies by various authors. New York : Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., Toronto : Wm. Briggs. Price \$2.25.

These works on the wisdom books belong to the "Pulpit Commentary" series, and will form a most valuable addition to any minister's library. The introduction to each volume is an important contribution to the understanding of the subject, dealing with the title, author, date, analysis, integrity, character, object, plan, literature, etc., of the book. *Job* is not regarded as actual history, but as "a work of creative genius," based "on a solid substratum of fact," written for a moral and religious purpose, with a view of solving the complicated problem of human life. *Proverbs* is treated as a collection of sayings, our duty to God, ourselves and our neighbors ; domestic duties and maxims relating to civil life and political economy by various authors. *Ecclesiastes* is not attributed to Solomon as the author, but *Koheleth*, "the debater," who is said to have flourished about B.C. 300, and was "more concerned with the life and circumstances of man generally than with man, as a member of the commonwealth of Israel, and speaks as man to man, as one of the great human family, and not as an item in a narrow fraternity." The two concluding verses of the book are made "the clue to the interpretation of the whole," the writer's method being to "put forth his views under the mask of Solomon the King, whose name had become proverbial for wisdom." Aside from the homiletical worth this series is of great value as commentaries to which there are few superiors.

*The Standard Dictionary of the English Language.* Funk & Wagnalls, Toronto, New York, London. Vol. I. Single-vol. edition : half-Russia \$12.00, full Russia \$14.00, full Morocco \$18.00. Two-vol. edition : \$15.00, \$17.00 and \$22.00 respectively, according to binding.

Four years have been spent by 247 office editors and specialists, and over five hundred readers for quotations and definitions of words, in the

production of this most complete and authoritative dictionary. It contains nearly 300,000 terms, or 75,000 more words and phrases than any other, not excepting the great six-volume *Century Dictionary*. The Standard is really a new work, so complete in its character, careful in its work and accurate in its results that it is sure to become a standard of the English-speaking peoples. It is so comprehensive in plan, method and device that the information of an encyclopædia is brought within its small space. Thousands of words and phrases are admitted for the first time into a dictionary, and their derivation and definition given. One peculiar feature is the grouping of derivative words around their primitive stem. The spelling reform movement has been recognized in the direction of greater simplicity, the definitions are not mere synonyms, but simple explanations, and the pronunciations are the consensus of opinion of a committee of fifty scholars. It is illustrated with practical wood-cuts and ornamented with full-page lithographs in colors. It is without doubt a dictionary up to date, the very best of its kind, and will take a front and permanent rank. For practical work one scarcely expected anything superior to Webster's International, but the many excellencies of the Standard certainly gives it an advantage over its predecessors, and will make it the standard for students and literary men generally.

*Christian Literature and Review of the Churches*, New York. The May number begins Vol. XI., and is true to its name, giving the contents and index of religious periodicals and a synopsis of all important articles, besides a careful review of books. It keeps in close touch with "the progress of the Churches," missionary problems, and the "Reunion Movement." "Women with World-wide Aims" is an interesting interview with Lady Henry Somerset and Miss Frances Willard (illustrated). The most significant article is Prof. Lindsay's sketch of the late Prof. Wm. Robertson Smith, under the title of "Pioneer and Martyr of the Higher Criticism" (illustrated).

*The Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature*, edited by Prof. S. D. F. Salmond, D.D., published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. This is not a magazine of articles, but what its name implies, an able critical review of select works continually issuing from the press in the theological and philosophical field of literature. The man who reads this periodical will keep himself abreast with the best thought in these lines. The April number has an excellent table of contents.

*Christian Thought* for April contains: "The Bible and Science," by Prof. Wright, of Oberlin; "The Quality of Immortality," by Prof. Herron, of Iowa College, and other articles and addresses which show that the drift of thought is turning from "What do you think about God?" to "What do you think about man?" and this "newer religious thinking" is influencing our theological thought. Theodore F. Seward, founder of the Brotherhood of Christian Unity, writes on "The year 1893 and the Federation of the World," as seen in the Parliament of Religions.

*The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Philadelphia, for April, has articles on "The Sabbath School Movement of To-day," "The Ecclesiastical Situation in Scotland," "The Witness of the Reformed Church of Germany against Rationalism," "Klosterman on the Pentateuch," "Christian Beneficence and Some New Theories Affecting Property," and two able discussions of Christian Missions, besides the reviews of recent theological literature.

*The Thinker*, London, for April, has under Biblical Thought, "The Westcott and Hort Text of the Greek Testament Tested by its Results;" "One God, one Sanctuary: Is Wellhausen right?" "The Book of Jonah: Its Authorship and date of Composition," and "The Synoptic Problem, III., The Theory of Oral Tradition." In Expository Thought are "Some Prominent Difficulties in the Gospels, III., The Sin against the Holy Ghost;" "New Heavens and a New Earth," and "The Demoniacs." In Theological Thought are "Prof. Pfeleiderer's Gifford Lectures," and "Thoughts on the Doctrine of Sanctification." And Scientific Thought has "Evolution and Creation, No. II." To these are added a survey of British, American, German and Scandinavian Current Thought.

*The Methodist Review* for May-June has a varied table of contents. First place is given to a philosophical article on "Conscience;" next an ethical one, entitled "Twice on Mars' Hill,"—first with Cleanthes, second with Paul; then a historical paper on "Dante Alighieri and the New Life;" a Biblical one on "The Recent Critical Attack on Galatians," and a theological essay on "The Pre-eminence of Faith." The practical subjects treated are "The Opportunities and Perils of the Epworth League;" "Subjective Conditions Essential to the Highest Power in Preaching," and "The Removal of the Time Limit." The Epworth League, if rightly guided, may be made one of the mightiest powers of modern Methodism. The extension of the pastoral term in the Methodist Episcopal Church has been so satisfactory that there is a movement to remove it altogether. Under our present system, the best is not done for our ministers or people.

We have received Vol. 1, No. 1, of the *Temple Builder* for April. This is a new bi-monthly magazine published in the interests of the "forward movement" by the Bureau of Supplies, International Christian Workers' Association, New Haven, Conn., and edited by Rev. John C. Collins, Secretary of the Association. This number gives the history of Grace Baptist Church, Philadelphia, detailing the methods by which it has, under the ministry of Rev. Russell H. Conwell, grown from a membership of forty-nine to over 2,000. It has other suggestive and helpful articles about Church work.

*The Charities Review*, published for the Charity Organization Society, New York. The numbers of this interesting monthly for February and March are before us. The subject is one of increasing importance and its discussion in an able "Journal of Practical Sociology" must do good. The articles, entitled "A Day's Work at the Organized Charities of New Haven," "The Austrian Poor Law System," "Provision for or Treatment of the Unemployed," are specially important and well treated.

*The Preacher's Magazine* for April, edited by the Revs. Mark Guy Pearse and Arthur E. Gregory, is to hand. The leading sermon is entitled, "Guidance and Glory," and is by President H. C. G. Moule. Dr. George G. Findlay writes on "Faith and Duty," and the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse on "The Vision of God," being one of the chapters of his excellent series of Articles, entitled "Moses: His Life and Its Lessons." The Rev. W. Hay Aitken contributes an able paper on Mission or Revival Preaching. The Homiletical Department is, as usual, complete.

*The Yale Review*. February, 1894. Tuttle, Moorehouse and Taylor, New Haven. This is one of the ablest of our journals of political science. The present number contains an article on "European Bureaus of Labor Statistics," by Dr. E. R. L. Gould. Dr. Gould is a Canadian and a gradu-

ate of Victoria University who has already won for himself a world-wide reputation in the Department of Political and Social Science, and everything from his pen is marked by ability and thorough scholarship. "The Law and Policy for Hawaii," by Dr. Woolsey, is a discussion of an important international question, worthy of the ability and eminent status of its author.

The leading feature of *The Century* for May is the first of a series of papers by Thomas G. Allen, Jr., and Wm. L. Sachtleben, recounting their adventures in a journey "Across Asia on a Bicycle." The ground covered in the first paper is from the Bosphorus to Mt. Ararat. The objective point of the journey was Peking, and for the greater portion of the way the route was parallel and occasionally identical with that of Marco Polo. The account will be illustrated by a large number of unique photographs taken by the writers during the adventurous trip in the region almost unknown to the western world. Among the articles on public questions are discussions in the editorial department of "What is Political Economy?" "The Foreign Element in Trade Unions," and "Popular Education in Citizenship." Theodore Roosevelt contributes an "Open Letter" on "The Common Sense of Civil Service Reform," and attention is again called to "The Depletion of American Forests."

*The London Quarterly Review*, January, 1894. This number opens with an exceedingly able and interesting review of the "Life and Life-work of Dr. Pusey." Though he himself did not seem to see the logical result of his teaching, many of his disciples saw it and stepped over into Romanism. Other articles are "Lowell's Letters," "John Ruskin: A Story in Development," "Mashonaland," "People's Banks," "Captain Lugard in East Africa," "Modern Apologetics." These, with Short Reviews and Book Notices, make up an admirable number.

*The Quarterly Review of the M. E. Church South* discusses ably and interestingly the following topics: "The Field for a Southern Literature," "The Governing Body in Methodism," "The Spiritual Teaching of the Book of Job," "Morals and Manners of the Eighteenth Century," "Philip P. Neely and Alabama Five and Forty Years Ago," "James Jenkins: A Pioneer of Southern Methodism," "A Blue Stocking of the Eighteenth Century," "The Codex Vaticanus," "Henry T. Lewis, Humorist, Poet, Preacher and Reformer," and "The Editor's Table," which occupies about fifty pages, dealing with important questions in the vigorous and able style of the accomplished Editor, who, in addition to this department, contributes the article on "The Codex Vaticanus."

*The Atlantic Monthly* seems to us to grow better and better. "Philip and His Wife," a specially well-written story by Margaret Deland, which began with the year, the special attraction of the last three numbers, grows in interest as it proceeds. Other light articles of scarcely less interest appear; but critical articles, and others dealing with practical questions are worth all that the magazine costs.

*The Expository Times* for May has, in addition to notes of recent exposition, "Hebrew Prophecy and Modern Criticism," "The Hebrew Legend of Civilization in the Light of Recent Discovery," "The Paraclete," "The Theology of Isaiah," and "Keswick at Home." Under this latter will appear a series of papers on the Keswick teaching, the first of which is, "The Denial and Crucifixion of Self."

*The Preacher's Assistant.* As usual, we have looked through the numbers with great interest. They contain many valuable suggestions.