

THE  
HOMILETIC REVIEW

VOL. XXVIII.  
*FROM JULY TO DECEMBER.*  
1894.

EDITORS:  
I. K. FUNK, D.D., AND REV. NEWELL WOOLSEY WELLS.

PUBLISHERS:  
FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY.  
NEW YORK.

LONDON.

1894.

TORONTO.

COPYRIGHT, 1894, BY THE  
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY.

# THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXVIII.—JULY, 1894.—No. 1.

## REVIEW SECTION.

### I.—THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF GERMANY.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

NUMERICALLY, and still more intellectually, the leadership of the Protestant Church of the world belongs to Germany. Of the nearly 50,000,000 inhabitants of the Fatherland reported by the latest census, fully two-thirds are credited to Protestantism. Deducting from these figures even a fair-sized percentage of merely nominal adherents, there yet remains for the land of Luther a larger contingent of Protestants than even England or the United States can claim. Yet this numerical superiority of Protestant Germany is but a comparatively unimportant ground for assigning to her the precedence in the family of the evangelical Churches of Christendom. Quantity, and number, and bulk are not the measure of influence and power. The leadership of Germany in the Protestant thought and theology of the age is undisputed. While in the sphere of practical Christian activity, such as missionary enterprises, the Anglo-Saxon Churches of England and America are more energetic and willing to labor and sacrifice, and are ordinarily more successful, too, in this sphere than the thoughtful and thinking Germans, it is nevertheless to the latter that the new movements in theological thought—which in these cosmopolitan days, when neither language nor nationality forms a boundary to the spread of new ideas and ideals, have become such powerful factors and forces in modern Church life—must be credited. The influence of German theological thought on that of Protestantism everywhere is simply marvelous, and is growing constantly. The fact that ordinarily several hundred of the brightest of graduates of American colleges and seminaries cross the waters and sit down at the feet of the savants of the famous German universities to learn the secrets of their methods and manners of research, as also the fact that the ups and downs of German theological discussions are eagerly watched by very many in the rank and file of the American ministry, is evidence enough that in

this country, too, German thought on matters pertaining to Scriptures and theology is fully recognized and accepted. Events in the last few years demonstrate sufficiently that this influence has taken such deep root in American ecclesiastical soil that the warnings uttered years ago by the late Howard Crosby as to the dangers of "Teutolatry" were the expression not of an empty fear of innovation, but the result of deliberate reflection by an exceptionally bright scholar. In view of facts and data like these, an analysis of the chief characteristics of German Protestantism and the German Protestant Church will be a timely task, and anything but a work of supererogation.

The extraordinary, almost international, power wielded by the scholarship of Protestant Germany is all the more remarkable because neither outwardly nor inwardly are the German Protestants one body. There is no such organization as the Protestant Church of Germany, or an Established Evangelical Church of Germany, as such institutions exist in England, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Although the historic battleground on which, under the fairest circumstances to both sides, the principles of Protestantism and of Roman Catholicism have contended for the mastery of the hearts and minds of men by an intellectual struggle of nearly four hundred years, yet in all this time Protestantism has never been able to present an undivided front and phalanx to the foe. The fact that in this great struggle, notwithstanding the lack of organic unity, Protestantism has since the dire Counter Reformation and the Thirty Years War steadily, even if slowly, gained the ascendancy numerically, and has done so intellectually and as an agent and power in the public life of the nation, its politics, literature, arts, etc., is evidence enough that she, and not her adversary, is in possession of the vitality and strength that portends victory. If, as Cardinal Wiseman has predicted, the great apocalyptic battle between the two great rival confessions is to be fought out on the sands of Berlin, the inner strength of Protestantism cannot but overcome the outward organization of Roman Catholicism. As at present constituted, there are no fewer than 46 different State Churches in the 26 States composing the German Empire. This excess of Churches is owing to the fact that in recent years, chiefly through the war of 1866, a consolidation of States has taken place, while a consolidation of State Churches has not. Of these 46 State Churches 24 are Lutheran, 10 are Reformed, 7 are United Lutheran and Reformed, and 4 are Confederate. As the State Church of the nine old provinces of Prussia is united, fully two-thirds of German Protestants are under this organization. No bond of union between these Churches exists, further than the Eisennach Conference, an unofficial assembly of representatives of the various State Churches, which meets for conference once every two years, but has no legal or executive powers. In more than one project the various State Churches, or a portion of them, co-operate at times. Such a project was the re-

vision of the Luther Bible, completed by the Halle Committee several years ago, as also the *Evangelischer-Bund*, an organization with a membership of nearly 100,000, composed largely of educated Protestants, and established only a few years ago for the purpose of battling against Rome "with tongue and pen"; and such a work is also the *Gustavus Adolphus* society, which has for more than 50 years been doing a magnificent work for the Protestant Diaspora, scattered in predominantly Roman Catholic countries. But further than such work no outward bond of union exists between the German Protestant Churches. This is the case, not because they do not appreciate the advantages of *unitis viribus*, but because, even if the difficulty of territorial lines could be removed, which would not be impossible since Germany is politically united, still the internal conditions for such a union of hearts and hands is wanting.

It is exceedingly difficult to make anything like a satisfactory classification of the schools of theological and religious thought flourishing in Protestant Germany. All shades and shapes of theological "isms," from the most pronounced advocacy of the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, both Lutheran and Reformed, to the most neological criticism of both Scriptures and positive theology are found, and the demarcation lines are frequently hard to follow. These as little coincide with the territorial lines of State Churches as the liberals and conservatives in American Christianity are divided along denominational lines. Possibly four general schools of theological thought can be distinguished in Germany—the conservative, confessional, or orthodox; the liberal and extreme latitudinarian; the mediating school; and, last and most, the new Ritschl school, which has succeeded in absorbing the most of the theological talent in the University circles and among the younger clergy of the land.

The confessional school finds its best representation at Rostock and Erlangen, and to a somewhat less extent at Leipzig. As taught at these centers of thought, the aim is not a reproduction pure and simple of the tenets and teachings of the great dogmaticians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although the agreement with these systems in the fundamentals and in the bulk of non-fundamentals, as also generally in spirit and in trend and tendency, is most hearty. But in not a few matters this orthodoxy has been modernized, especially under the influence of modern biblical criticism. With possibly the exception of Professor Nösgen, of Rostock, no German theological professor of the present day is known to accept the absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures in matters not pertaining to faith. Professor Frank, of Erlangen, the leading dogmatician of this school, regards the absence of an *ex professo* statement of the doctrine of the absolute inspiration of the Scriptures in the confessions of the Lutheran Church as an intentional omission in order not to fix this point confessionally. Luthardt, the great Leipzig champion of conservative and confessional

theology, makes concessions to the human element in Scriptures; and even Professor Diekhoff, of Rostock, has written two works to show that the best representatives in the past, notably Augustine and Luther, cannot be cited in favor of the strict views of later dogmatics. The teachings of all these men, however, as systems are distinctively and, in a most pronounced manner, positive, evangelical, and conservative. And in the matter of inspiration and other points in which they have made new departures voices of protest from the rank and file of the conservative Church are constantly heard. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the unity of Isaiah, the authenticity of Daniel, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, are all warmly defended by able men from the German Protestant ministry. In fact, the Church of Germany, in pew and pulpit, is much more conservative and evangelical than is the theological thought as represented at the universities. Here theology is merely treated as a science; in the Church it must be handled as a principle and power for Gospel work. It is, accordingly, quite common that young men fresh from the universities modify their views in favor of the old-fashioned Gospel as soon as they come into actual contact with congregations and are called upon to preach the salvation of souls. While, in a certain sense, it is true that the universities of Germany are the centers, seats, and sources of theological thought to a degree to which this is not at all the case in England, France, or America, or in fact any country, yet it is equally true that university thought in Germany is modified to a remarkable degree by the problems and perplexities of practical Church work. A point in this case is the exceedingly meager influence of the *Protestantischer-Bund*, an organization of men and congregations of many years' standing, seeking to reduce to practice the tenets of liberal theology. An acquaintance with university theology of Germany is not an acquaintance with the faith status of the Church as a whole. German Protestantism is in many respects a good deal better than German theology.

Next, toward the "left," *i.e.*, toward liberalism, to use the technical phraseology of European political and ecclesiastical terminology, is the mediating theology, represented mostly at the nine Prussian universities, in harmony with the union of the two great sections of the Protestant Church in Prussia. Among its best representatives were Schleiermacher, Neander, Tholuck, Dorner, and Julius Müller. Its aim is to mediate between moderate evangelical dogma and the tenets of the best philosophical thought. It is practically a compromise, in which at times positive Biblical teachings, and at times a more or less doubtful philosophy, gain the upper hand. As a factor in German theological thought this school has steadily declined in late years. Possibly its ablest exponent is Beschlag, of Halle, whose peculiar positions and teachings, especially his latest works, have elicited more contempt than favor. This school, like the liberal of Jena and Heidelberg, has

in the last decade been crowded to the wall by the resistless advances of the Ritschl school.

The old liberal school has lost its principal dogmatician in the death of Professor Lipsius, of Jena. In many respects this school is the modern representative of the spirit and method of Baur and the Tübingen school, as it is largely under the influence of the philosophy of Hegel. The appointment of a Ritschl man—Professor Wendt—as the successor of Lipsius has aroused the bitter opposition of the old liberal guard, and one of their number, Professor Nippold, also of Jena, has recently issued an entire volume against the principles, practice, and personal contingent of this school.

The liberals of the old type have in recent years made not only no progress, but have lost ground. This would be a matter of congratulation if something better had taken their place. However the victors have not been the orthodox or confessional school, but the Ritschl clans, the most aggressive school of theological thought that has appeared in Germany since the days of Schleiermacher, which has managed to place its men in nearly all the Protestant faculties of Germany, and is even credited with the plan of capturing those of Luthardt and Frank. The singular power of these men is attributable to their unique dogmatical position. Standing on the philosophical basis of Kant, the right of metaphysics in Christian theology is denied. This practically amounts to a denial of the objective reality or knowable objects of the fundamentals of Christian faith, such as the pre-existence of Christ, the atonement, and the like. Not what these truths and dogmas in themselves are (*Seinsurtheile*), but what they are worth to us for Christian faith (*Werturtheile*) is for them the contents of theology. By making Christian consciousness and conviction, as aroused through the Scriptures, the basis of Christian certitude, and not the Scriptures and their dogmatic contents as such, this school enables, or claims to enable, men to feel sure of their faith and at the same time hold the most destructive views of the Scriptures and their teachings. Practically and in accordance with its philosophical basis, Ritschlism is a system of morals without a basis of positive biblical teaching. Conservative theologians rightly charge the school with "emptying" the evangelical system by retaining the old technical terms, and at the same time depriving these of their positive contents, thus recognizing in the tenets of the school only a new but dishonest form of that rationalism which will ever reappear in the never-ending struggle between faith and unfaith, between conservative and positive theology and its neological counterpart. At the same time, the Ritschl school claims to be the correct interpreter of the principles of Luther and of the Reformation, at any rate of these before they came under the spell of "scholasticism," *i.e.*, positive confessionalism. Among the many able exponents of this modern type of theological thought are Harnack, Kaftan, Kaltenbusch, Achelis, Herrmann, and

many others. The Ritschl is decidedly the school of the aggressive young and talented men who, with some show of reason, can unfortunately make the boast that in their ranks are found nearly all the available ability and fine scholarship that Germany at present possesses. It is decidedly "the new theology" of the land of Luther, and present indications point to a determined struggle between it and the positive orthodox theology of the confessional school, in which the mediating and half-measure men of the other schools will have little to say. What the outcome may be, only a prophet or a prophet's son could foretell. The issues at stake are the very fundamentals and essentials of faith, the life principles of the Church of God.

From these data it appears that the debatable ground between the various theological clans of Germany is the foundation and basis of the Church. Such problems as the certainty and sources of religious knowledge, the basis of Christian faith, the character and reliability of Revelation, are the topics that divide the Protestant clans of the Fatherland. While a large number of the literary and educational representatives of the Church are pronounced advocates of positive Christian standpoints, a large number also have declared in favor of views which, in the convictions of the evangelical circles of America, are subversive of the very foundations of Christian theology and of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth.

The reasons why in Germany the divisions in the Protestant theological world are of such a serious character lie largely in the conceptions there entertained of theology as a science pure and simple, and of its relations to the practical needs of the Church, as also in separation between the theological teaching at the universities from the Church and her proper representatives. The "scientific" character of theology is the ideal and aim of the modern scholar of Germany, which, ideally, is a high and noble standard in so far as it seeks to develop truth absolutely and uninfluenced by a traditional or philosophical bias—in reality, however, it is little more than a phrase, as those claiming this prerogative most loudly are themselves the clearest demonstrations that this ideal has not been attained or maintained. The Ritschl reconstruction scheme is plainly controlled by the Kantian philosophy, as were the speculations of Baur by that of Hegel.

That Germany is the source and fountain of nearly all the new departures in the theological thought of the age is owing largely to the canons of scholarship there prevailing, according to which only he is a scholar who adds something new to science, either by new discoveries and results, or by the correction of old errors. Naturally, in not a few cases, a tendency toward the destructive and sensationalism will be developed by such a spirit, the advocacy of new views simply because of their novelty. The annals of modern biblical criticism abound with illustrations of this fact. The temptations in this direction are all the greater, because even the most silly proposal of a novel theory is

sure of the solemn examination of the scholars in their particular department. German scholarship does not understand how to ignore even the most senseless novelty advocated in the name of science, but, with the thoroughness characteristic of their scholarship as a whole, gravely analyze a still-born hypothesis to see how dead it really is.

German theological scholarship in the days of Luther regenerated Christianity, because it was the scholarship of Christian faith. Modern German scholarship can do a great work for the inner development of the Christian faith if it again is taken captive, not under philosophy and subjective speculations, but under faith. As it is, it is the greatest factor and power in the world of Christian thought today. Then it would be such a power entirely for good.

---

## II.—THE GHOST THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION.

BY REV. EDWARD M. DEEMS, PH.D., HORNELLVILLE, N. Y.

THE ghost theory of the origin of religion challenges the attention of all thoughtful people, not only because its author, Mr. Herbert Spencer, is one of the greatest thinkers of our age, but also because it is the account given of the origin and development of religion by the most popular school of evolutionists.

In order to obtain a comprehensive view of the theory, we must go back to Mr. Spencer's definition of evolution. He says that it is "an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."\* Undertaking to exhibit in his system of philosophy the phenomena of evolution in synthetic order, he has to provide for the facts of sociology, and accordingly says that there are three broadly distinguished kinds of evolution: the inorganic, the organic and the superorganic. In dealing with sociology we have to do with the third kind, which is distinguished from organic evolution by "including all those processes and products which imply the co-ordinated actions of many individuals." †

Mr. Spencer claims that only some of the *vertebrata* and sundry *primates* show true rudimentary forms of *superorganic evolution*, and in his *Principles of Sociology* restricts his attention to that form of *superorganic evolution* which "human societies exhibit in their growths, structures, functions, and products—that is, to the phenomena of sociology." † This is, by the way, as near as he comes to giving a definition of sociology.

Taking up the question of the original factors of human society

\* *First Principles*, Vol. I., Chap. XVII., §145.

† *Principles of Sociology*, Vol. I., Chap. I., §2.

‡ *Ibid.*, §5.

Mr. Spencer classifies them as external and internal: the former being the flora, fauna, climate, and other environments of primitive man, and the latter being primitive man's own physical emotional, and intellectual nature, experiences, and ideas. In dealing with this part of his subject Mr. Spencer lays down the principle that "the conception of primitive man and his history must be formed from those existing races of men which, as judged by their visible characters and their implements, approach most nearly to him."\* What then follows shows that he here refers to the living human beings who are in the most savage and least civilized condition. "Observe what such men and their ideas and habits are," says he, "and you see as nearly as possible what primitive men and their ideas and habits were."

Of course it was inevitable that in a professedly eminently scientific study of Sociology Mr. Spencer would come upon primitive man's religious ideas, institutions, and habits. Strangely enough, however, he nowhere defines religion, but appears to regard it as made up of men's ideas and sentiments relating to the supernatural, and resulting in certain ecclesiastical observances and institutions. He claims that there are some civilized and many savage men who have no religious ideas, sentiments, or institutions whatever! Hence he draws the remarkable conclusion that primitive man was entirely without religion. † But in the course of time it appeared, and has become all but universal. Whence did it come? His answer in brief is: "Comparative sociology discloses a common origin for each leading element of religious belief. The conception of the ghost, along with the multiplying and complicating ideas arising from it, we find everywhere. Thus we have abundant proofs of the natural genesis of religions." ‡

In this connection Mr. Spencer goes on to say: "Undeniably, a system of superstitions evolves after the same manner as all other things. By continuous integration and differentiation it is formed into an aggregate which, while increasing, passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity. This correspondence is indeed inevitable. The law which is conformed to by the evolving human being, and which is consequently conformed to by the evolving human intelligence, is of necessity conformed to by all products of that intelligence. Showing itself in structures, and by implication in the functions of those structures, this law cannot but show itself in the concrete manifestations of those functions. Just as language, considered as an objective product, bears the impress of the subjective process, so too does that system of ideas concerning the nature of things, which the mind gradually elaborates." §

In support of each of his points Mr. Spencer brings forward many statements of travelers among savages, which he alleges to be satisfactory evidence of the truth of his argument. Much of this evi-

\* Principles of Sociology, Chap. IV., §23.

† Ecclesiastical Institutions, Chap. I., §983.

‡ Principles of Sociology, Vol. I., Chap. XXVI., §307.

‡ *Ibid.*, §585.

dence, however, would seem to disprove rather than prove his position; but his ingenuity in trying to press them all into his service is exceedingly interesting. Moreover, Mr. Spencer is entitled to great credit for his industrious gathering together of interesting facts concerning the religions of the uncivilized portion of mankind; also for his strong testimony that the modern theory of evolution favors the belief of man in an "inscrutable existence everywhere manifested," even though he denies to this existence personality, and denies that it is knowable.

Notwithstanding, however, the ingenuity and interest of the ghost theory of the origin of religion, it is marked by so many fatal defects that it has to be abandoned as a scientific, a true explanation of the phenomena of religion as a whole, and as to its origin. Under and back of all its charm and plausibility we find in it the following defects:

First, the theory is not scientific in its method. To be such it should start with *all* that we have of religion at the present day, and by close and careful analysis, and painstaking historic investigation, following these facts as far back as they lead, and, standing on this *ultima thule* of facts, look still farther backward toward the primitive man, and thus get as distinct as possible a scientific view of his ideas and habits. This would be the inductive method of procedure in this matter, and not the deductive, the method of modern science and not of the middle ages. But so far from pursuing the scientific method, he assumes the point which he is to prove, namely, that primitive man had no religion at first. He *assumes* that the theory of evolution, which he says prevails in biology, prevails also in psychology and sociology, and then proceeds elaborately to bolster up his assumption by certain testimonies of travelers, archeologists, and ethnologists. To use his own language: "The doctrine of evolution will help us to delineate primitive ideas in some of their leading traits. Having inferred, *a priori*, the characters of these ideas, we shall be, as far as possible, prepared to realize them in imagination, and then to discern them as actually existing."\* In other words, his method is first to conceive what primitive man must have been according to Mr. Spencer's theory of evolution, and then seek for facts in nature and the history of savages confirmatory of that conception. This method, is, of course, best adapted to the support of the theory of evolution which Mr. Spencer has adopted. But it is a striking illustration of special pleading—a remarkable example of that philosophical bias which makes the construction of a science of sociology so exceedingly difficult.

Another glaring and unpardonable defect in the ghost theory is its practical ignoring of the highest and most ancient and widespread religions which have influenced and to-day are molding to such a great degree large masses of men. Where pages are given to some crude

\* Principles of Sociology, Vol. I., p. 97.

and obscure superstitions of small tribes of savages, only sentences are given to Buddhism, whose adherents are estimated at five millions, and whose authentic history goes back 2,500 years. The same is true with regard to Brahmanism, Confucianism, the religions of the Greeks and Romans, and that of the Egyptians and Hebrews. It is true that Mr. Spencer says that our present lowest savages are more like primitive men than these other higher peoples. But this saying of his is assumption pure and simple.

Again, Mr. Spencer complains that other treatises on religion do not go back far enough, since they go no further into the past than the classic ages of Greece and Rome, or the patriarchal period of the Jews. But the fact is that this very objection bears even more heavily on Mr. Spencer's ghost theory. It does not go back far enough and down deep enough. It tells us of matter, men's brains, and bodies; it tells us of force, the tool which touches matter and, in one sense, transforms the homogeneous into the heterogeneous; but it tells us not of the intelligence, consciousness, freedom, will—in a word, *personality*—which, using motion on matter, makes religion, as well as other similar things. It is as though he stood with us before Thorwaldsen's "Lion of Lucerne" and attempted to give a complete scientific and philosophic account of its origin and development by giving us an elaborate account of the chisels and mallets used in cutting it, and an interesting account of the rock out of which it was carved, and a few words of concession that there must have been some energy present when this impressive work of art was commenced and during the process of its carving. Such is really the so-called synthetic philosophy of the origin and growth of religion. But how lamentably inadequate is such a philosophy to account for the moral progress of mankind, or coherently to array the great facts of human life and human history, the great facts of the religion of our race! An account of the marble and the chisel, and even of muscular force, tells us not of the true origin of the statue; we must hear of the artist who conceived it. Even so must we hear, not only of matter and force, but of that personal Spirit back of them from which originally came the spirit of man with his religious ideas, if we would get at the origin and understand the development of that almost universal, that mighty influence among men which we know as religion.

The fact that the ghost theory claims precedence for polytheism as the first form of human conceptions of God, rather than monotheism, is another serious objection to it in the light of religion as it is and religion in its past history. But this is one of the strong pillars of support for the theory. Mr. Spencer says that from shadows arise belief in ghosts, from belief in ghosts arises belief in many gods, which ends in belief in one Supreme Spirit—the first, the greatest ancestor of the race. His own language is: "Originally, the only distinctions of good or bad among the doubles of the dead are such as were shown by the

living men, as are also the only unlikenesses of power. But there soon arise conceived contrasts in goodness between the ghosts of relatives and the ghosts of other persons, as well as stronger contrasts between friendly ghosts belonging to the tribe and malicious ghosts belonging to other tribes. When social ranks are established, there follow contrasts of rank and accompanying potency among supernatural beings which, as legends expand, grow more and more marked. Eventually there is formed in this way a hierarchy of partiality—deified ancestors, demi-gods, great gods, and among the great gods One Who is supreme.”\*

But I fail to find any such traceable connection between these different professed continuous stages of the evolution of the idea of God. On the contrary, all the great modern and ancient religions are monotheistic. The religion of the Hebrews, cherished by a godly portion of the race, and reaching back unquestionably over three thousand years, has for the opening sentence of its sacred writings, “In the beginning God” [not the gods] “created the heaven and the earth.” Again, their sacred writings say: “Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God” (Deut. vi. 4; Ps. lxxxvi. 10). Mohammedanism, with its two hundred millions of followers, and going back in history over a thousand years, ceases not day nor night from crying, “There is but one God, and Mohammed is His Prophet!”

Christianity, an older religion than Mohammedanism, going back nearly 2,000 years, and being the religion of over 400,000,000 of the most intelligent, prosperous, and civilized of our race, teaches and believes in one God, not many.†

Moreover, Buddhism, Brahmanism, Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, and the ancient religion of the East—the oldest and the greatest religions of the world were originally atheistic, or pantheistic, or monotheistic. They were certainly not polytheistic. Therefore, the ghost theory, that men worshiped first many gods and finally one God, while favored by some of the facts of the religion of some existing savage tribes, is discredited and exploded by the present ideas and past histories of all the great historic religions.

Most unsatisfactory is this theory for another reason, namely, it makes no provision for and takes little or no account of such almost universal facts of religion as man’s consciousnesses of sin, and man’s moral progress under the influence of religion. Even among the most degraded tribes, where the idea of God is so confused and obscure as to be almost, if not entirely, undiscoverable, a sense of imperfection—of being out of harmony with God or the gods, a sense of sin—is found. It is always found where religion exists. But so absorbed is Mr. Spencer in his preconceived scheme and ideas that he walks over it without seeing it. This defect is glaring in connection with his account of the origin of sacrifices. He uses, indeed, freely the words

\* Principles of Sociology, Vol. I., Chap. 26, §207.

† John i. 1, et al.

"propitiate" and "propitiation," but evidently merely in reference to pleasing spirits or gods, without reference to the wrongdoing of the one who offers the sacrifice. This oversight is unpardonable. It is exactly as though one should give an account of the material universe, and overlook and fail to give a due account of the attraction of gravitation.

Another phenomenon, almost as prominent in religion as man's consciousness of sin, is the moral progress of man under and on account of the influence of religion. Yet, according to the ghost theory, man's entire time, substantially, is devoted to pleasing certain spirits or gods whom he likes, and warding off dangers from ugly spirits or gods, in an attempt to secure finally a place with the good spirits after death. As to religion exerting any great influence on the character or practical daily conduct of men in their social and moral development, the theory either knows nothing—which is a shame; or, with prejudice, withholds the facts—which is a worse shame.

As a matter of history, religion has preceded and not followed as a result from practical moral progress. But Mr. Spencer's theory calls for the opposite state of the case. The fact stands fast that the religious ideas and principles which have swayed the great masses of men have not been mere dreams, and fancies, and hopes for the future, without power to mold character and shape conduct, but have been evidently mighty motives to right living and holy character. Did the limits of our paper allow, we could adduce a vast array of facts from the history of Zoroastrianism, Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and the religions of the Hebrews and the Christians to prove this. Suffice it, however, to cite the practical moral development caused by the religions of the Hebrews and the Christians, without whose religious atmosphere there would not have been produced two such men as Mr. Darwin and Mr. Spencer.

The religion of the Hebrews is not only utterly free from ancestor worship and polytheism, but also deals practically with morals—that is, the affairs of the present life. Astonishingly slight and few are the references to the future life, and comparatively slight are the references to the details of the nature and actions of God. The religion of the Hebrews is instinct with precepts and motives, leading men to keep the laws of God practically, and do their daily duties toward the members of society, and especially toward the poor, the sorrowful, and the guilty. The moral ceremonial and civil laws laid down in the Old Testament Scripture had a marked influence in saving the Hebrew people from the sensuousness, the cruelty, and the other moral evils which kept down and kept back the consciences and minds of the nations surrounding them. Those nations are extinct; the Hebrews are still with us. But one would imagine, from the narrow views of the ghost theory, that this important line of facts and phenomena had no existence.

The same is true regarding Christianity. While it claims as a re-

ligion to throw more light on the nature of God and the future life than is contained in the Old Testament Scripture, yet it deals chiefly with the practical morals of the present life and this world. It brings its whole power to bear on holiness, its keynote being "holiness, without which no man shall see God." This idea finds practical expression in the words of Christ: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." In his ethics Mr. Spencer voluminously dwells on "altruism" and "egoism." Christ, nearly 2,000 years ago, put all the truth that lies in "altruism" and "egoism" in this short phrase, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor" (altruism) "as thyself" (egoism). And most marvelous has been the intellectual and moral development of that portion of the race which has been influenced by the Christian religion. Our limits forbid our going into a history of the rise and progress of morals in Christendom. But a moment's glance down the Christian era reveals to the observant mind the practical moral progress of men caused by Christianity. Any one who will honestly compare the Europe and America of 2,000 years ago with the Europe and America of to-day must admit that the Christian religion is a present, practical, moral power. As a certain writer well says: "The more humane laws of war and treatment of captives, the abolition of slavery, the elevation of women, the prevalence of widespread education, the greater protection afforded to the poor, the efforts to reform the bad, the numerous institutions for the unfortunate and feeble—all testify to the presence and power of the spirit of benevolence and philanthropy. This moral growth has accompanied the preaching of the principles of Christianity and the practice of those principles." But, according to the ghost theory of religion, men make their gods like themselves. History, as we have seen, on the contrary, shows that men's conception of the gods comes first and molds their characters and practical lives. Hence the ghost theory is faulty in this important matter, and Mr. Carlyle is right when he remarks: "It is well said in every sense, that a man's religion is the chief thing with regard to him." Truly, the thing a man does practically lay to heart, and know for certain, concerning his vital relations to this mysterious universe and his duty and destiny here is, in all cases, the primary thing for him, and creatively determines all the rest.

There are other serious blemishes in the ghost theory—such as its ignoring and failing to account for man's sense of responsibility to God, and his ideas of the Deity as the self-existent first cause of things; and its unscientific dealing with the original names of God; and its lack of some eternal principle as the foundation of religion in man, and so on. But our limitations forbid our entering upon a consideration of these failings, which, with those mentioned, are so numerous and so serious that the good points of the theory are not sufficient to sustain it, and it must be regarded as inconsistent, illogical, unhistoric, and, in short, a failure.

## III.—THE TESTIMONY OF SCIENCE TO THE TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY MRS. AUBREY RICHARDSON, LONDON, ENGLAND.

SOME years since a well-known preacher on Christian evidences took for his text 1 Corinthians ii., and, after very cursorily reviewing St. Paul's subtle and elaborate exposition of the relationship of things spiritual and material, he laid it down as an axiom that "the road of observation and deduction is no thoroughfare to spiritual things." "You can't get at men's thoughts by anatomizing," said he, "and you can't get at God's thoughts by cutting or carving at Nature." This was "hard doctrine" indeed. If men's thoughts cannot be got at by anatomizing, the psychologists', phrenologists', and physiognomists' labors are vain. But, even if the as yet rather uncertain sciences of psychology, phrenology and physiognomy be set aside, the fact remains that men, by observance of each other's actions, deduce therefrom the knowledge of the characteristics, thoughts, and purposes of their fellows. Is it, then, altogether to be denied that the naturalist, the geologist, the chemist, and the astronomer, through their intimate knowledge of the processes and aims of creation, gain an insight into the nature and purposes of God? Can we not by study of the mechanism of a steam engine form an estimate of the quality of mind of its inventor? Do we not by contemplation of a work of art catch a glimpse of the inner workings of the soul of the artist? So it is with the discoveries of men of science.

One needs but a slight knowledge of the nature of the discoveries of the physiologist, the chemist, or the astronomer to see how, little by little, science is groping her way, examining, demonstrating, and building up a school of thought that will be a very counterpart of the School of Christ, and in this there is no cause for wonder. Truth is never in opposition to itself, nor can it be begotten of the father of lies. In studying the facts of the universe, men come nearer God whether they will or no. In all ages there have been men of science who have strenuously opposed the orthodox beliefs of their times and that, not because they loved darkness rather than light, but because the ways of approach to the temple of our most holy faith were shadowed by all manner of falsities—falsities that intercepted and obscured the Light streaming from within.

Students, thinkers, dreamers, and many an honest man and woman—marking the incrustation of bigotry, violence, and conceit that surrounded the inner truths of the Christian Faith—have, time and again in the world's history, dispensed with the guidance of the Church. They have cried, with Pilate, "What is truth?" and striven by searching to find it for themselves. Guided by the light they had, the light of reason—and God is light—they have sought

diligently and by laborious processes to gain an insight into the very Truth, and their patient efforts have reaped an exceeding great reward. As we read of their discoveries, we realize the universality of the law that truth must testify to truth. Olive Schreiner has beautifully expressed this thought: "Whosoever should portray truly the life and death of a little flower—its birth, sucking in of nourishment, reproduction of its kind, withering, and vanishing—would have shaped a symbol of all existence. All true facts of nature or the mind are related." The test, therefore, of any special truth is its relation to all other truths.

Though still incomplete, the history of the processes of creation, for which we are indebted to the men of science of all ages, is nowhere at variance with the grand old Bible teachings that God made the world, was incarnate to redeem the world, and has established a spiritual kingdom in the world. It matters not whether individual scientific discoverers believe these theories, the discoveries themselves are strong enough testimony to the eternal reality of the "things unseen," which are the objects of the Christian's belief. Man's opinion cannot stultify God's Truth. Out of the mass of controversy, false deductions, loud negations, and wild imaginations of half-diseased brains, God's Truth emerges purely. At times man's vain imaginings may veil the faces of the eternal Verities, but they cannot smirch their beauty nor destroy their power. Truth is a spiritual element which, like an atom of oxygen, undergoes no change. Says Professor Huxley:

"It matters not into how many myriad substances—animal, plant, or mineral—an atom of oxygen may have entered, nor what isolation it has undergone, bond or free, it retains its own qualities. It matters not how many millions of years have elapsed during these changes, age cannot wither or weaken it; amid the fierce play of the mighty agencies to which it has been subjected it remains unbroken and unworn; to it may apply the ancient words, 'the things which are not seen are eternal.'"

Thus is Truth: eternal in the heavens, though we discern it "through a glass darkly." Here and there—in all climes and ages, in many creeds, in lofty conceptions of duty, in science, art, and human love—flashes of the Eternal Radiance reach us, and each ray is found to be the complement of the other.

The Christ did not speak vainly when He said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth." The Spirit of Truth is surely guiding the human race, step by step, and one step at a time, along the path that leads into "all the truth." We have not reached that region yet. Science makes no claim to have discovered it. She puts forward no theories of creation and indulges in no speculative dreams. Only she declares to us that which she has heard, has seen with her eyes, and her hands have handled of the word of Life. Mr. Clodd explains the position she takes in the following words:

"Of the beginning, of what was before the present state of things, of what will follow the end of it, we know nothing, and speculation about it is futile. Thought and motion have their antecedents in molecular changes in the matter of the brain, and are as completely within the range of causation and as capable of mechanical explanation as material phenomena, but of them no material qualities, as weight and occupancy of space, can be predicted. Heat may be expressed in equivalent foot-pounds; light, and sound, and nervous transmission in measurable velocities; but these—never. We cannot make the passage from chemistry to consciousness, or transform motions of nerve-tissue into love, reverence, and hate."

And again:

"We know that the healthy working of the brain depends upon nourishment, upon abstinence from excess, upon freedom from injury. . . . And we know that the larger the proportion of brain to body, and especially the more numerous and intricate the furrows and creases in the gray matter of the brain, the higher in the life-scale are the mental powers. But the gulf between consciousness and the movement of the molecules of nerve-matter, measurable as these are, is impassable. We can follow the steps of the mechanical processes of nerve-changes till we reach the threshold that limits the known, and beyond that barrier we cannot go. We can neither affirm nor deny; we can only confess ignorance. If any one says that consciousness cannot exist except in the relation of cause and effect with certain organic molecules, I must ask how he knows that; and if he says that it can, I must put the same question. That is the impregnable position of physical science, as defined by its greatest living expositor (Huxley). Soul is only known to us in a brain, but the special note of a soul is that it is capable of existing without a brain, or after death (Tulloch). That is the unverifiable assumption of dogmatic theology."

Such are the simple assertions and just criticisms of men of science. Yet let them not condemn all the inspired convictions of mankind not yet physically demonstrated as false in essence. The poet Goethe's dream concerning the primary law of the vegetable kingdom became the established theory of the botanist. The astrologer surmised before the astronomer calculated. The alchemist sought, by the exercise of magic arts, to compound a life-elixir, anticipating fitfully and hysterically, in the dark ages, the discovery of that primal element which is a definite prospect with the chemist of to-day. For the possibility of the existence of a primary form of matter is now, according to Professor Huxley, "the burning question of physico-chemical science." And when that primary element of matter is discovered, shall we, who have the promise that the Comforter shall teach us all things, fear to know its nature? Must it not, of necessity, testify of God, the All-Father, and prove His existence as its Originator and Cause?

But leaving the discoveries which scientific men regard as the consummation of their labors "devoutly to be wished for," let us consider their more authoritative statements. These bear two distinct kinds of testimony—the positive and negative. Weak-minded men—mistaking the audacious theories propounded by certain sections of the scientific world for the unerring voice of true knowledge—denounce the scepticism of science. But an earnest student finds no

inherent scepticism in the chronicling of facts or the demonstrating of the actual character of truth. If they who think they can glibly refute the assertions of science with a passing sneer were to take the trouble to examine the nature of the affirmations and negations they affect to despise, they would find that they had criminally ignored a God-appointed witness to the Faith: "There be three that bear record on earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood." All truths, whether moral, physical, or physiological, must testify to Him in whose character and works the counsels and plans of God were manifested. Science neither furnishes us with our Faith nor deprives us of it. We believe in a God eternal, invisible, pre-existent before all worlds, from everlasting to everlasting; the All-Father, the Creator of all things, who made man out of the dust of the ground. What does Science, who has gone far with her task of resolving all things animate and inanimate to their primal elements, say of the beginnings of the universe? "The beginnings of the crystal are no less unknown and undiscoverable than the beginnings of the cell: the ultimate causes, which lock the atoms of the one in an angular embrace and quicken with pulsating life the corpuscles of the other, lie beyond our ken." And again, "Man is one, in his ultimate beginnings and in the stuff of which he is made, with the meanest flower that blows."

Have we here any refutation of our sacred beliefs?

Again, searching through the wide universe, weighing the distant stars, measuring the rate of progress of light and sound, noting planetary systems and the laws that govern the evolution of humanity, testing, analyzing, probing, reasoning—what is the logical deduction from all these things? That God is one and everlasting, or that He is many and subject to ceaseless change? That He is an almighty manufacturer, sitting apart from the mammoth toy He has created and watching, with perhaps some sense of the humor of the thing, its antics and gyrations as "the changes are rung on evolution and dissolution, on the birth and death of stellar systems—gas to solid, solid to gas, and yet never quite the same—mighty rhythmic beats, of which the earth's cycles and the cradles and graves of her children are minor rhythms"? Science has no such false vision of the Eternal Author of all things. Speaking again through Mr. Clodd, she says:

"Thus the keynotes of evolution are unity and continuity. Science tends to the conclusion that all kinds of matter are modifications of one primal element, and that all modes of motion are varied operations of one power; perchance these three—Matter, Force, and Energy—are one."

"Three in one and one in three"—do not those words strike on the ears of Christians with a familiar sound? Men have striven from a logical point of view to explain or laugh away the ridiculous myth of the triune Godhead—"The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost incomprehensible." They have abandoned the contemplation of the miraculous for the examination

of the actual and, by processes of scientific deduction, have, in their search for the ultimate cause, been confronted by these three—Matter, Force, and Energy. Is it not for them to cry, with the Psalmist, "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." Science has its threefold mystery, as great and unsearchable as the mystery of the Christian's faith, and Science can only show how such trinity in unity may be by examples as simple and natural as that used by St. Patrick when, in preaching to the half-savage Irish people, he picked a three-leaved shamrock and put it before them as an illustration of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Matter—what is Matter? Why and how was it formed? When did the first atom start into existence? Was it self-caused? These are questions for which the student of science has no answer. But, of the first person in the Trinity, the Christian says: "The worlds have been formed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear." And again, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." What is Matter? What the primal element? Science does not deny it to be the "breath of His mouth." Concerning the interrelation of Matter and Power, Mr. Clodd propounds a problem:

"Given Matter and Power as the raw materials of the universe, is the interaction of Power, under its two forms of a *combining Force separating* and an *Energy upon Matter*, sufficient to account for the totality of non-living and living contents of the universe?"

What are the teachings of Christianity? Of the Son, begotten of the Father, has it not been written, "All things have been created through Him and in Him all things *consist*"? A marginal note in the Revised Version gives us "hold together" as an alternative reading for the word "consist." In reference to the *combining Force* inherent in the Son, St. Paul speaks of Christ as "upholding all things by the word of His power." "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, *I say*, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens." Jesus Himself speaks of the irresistible magnetism of the Cross and the eternal law of gravitation through which it works. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself." Of the energizing power of the Spirit's work, the Master has also "somewhat to say:" "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear *that* shall He speak; and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine; therefore said I that He shall take of Mine

and shall show it unto you." Could the marvelous interrelation of Matter, Force, and Energy be more clearly set before us? "All things, whatsoever the Father hath"—all matter, whether inert or living, whether in the form of embryonic sea-urchin or highly specialized man—"are Mine; therefore said I that He"—the Divine Energy—"shall take of Mine and shall show it unto you." Energy is here asserted to be the Revealer of Force—"He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, *that shall He speak.*" Energy proceeds from God. Force abides in God. "The *ultimate transference of all energy to the ethereal medium* involves the end of the existing state of things." So says Mr. Clodd, to whom in this article it has been useful to defer as the mouthpiece of scientific thought. Yes; for when the Spirit of Truth shall have led mankind into all the Truth, the day of the Lord will have come.

Concerning the nature of the God we worship, we say that God is love, is all-merciful, all-just. Science, serene in her wide survey of the tasks and destinies of nations, beholds the evil and oppression. She discerns, with keenest vision, the barbarity, misery, and degradation existing in all ages. Yet through it all she sees the law of moral evolution making for a higher goal. She notes the relentless laws of nature insisting ever on the survival of the fittest—and the fittest alone. Yet, because her vision is unclouded and her mind unbiased, she marks the inestimable gain to the race that ensues from the cultivation of the Christian graces of love and pity—those twin jewels that shine the brightest in the diadem of the Son of Man. The following is the opinion of Science as formulated by Mr. Clodd:

"In a barbaric society, or among nations where infanticide was practiced, weaklings like Newton and hunchbacks like Pope would have been left to perish; modern civilization spares them and humanity is enriched by their genius. . . . Civilization, by preserving the weakly, offers slight check to natural selection, but that which the race would gain by the removal of this check is not to be compared to the *loss that would ensue from the repression of mercy and sympathy.*"

Science sees too—not because she looks for it, but because it is there distinctly traced on the record of human destiny—the mysterious law that "the many, through the sacrifice of the few," gain freedom, unity, and larger life, and that law Christ vindicated on Calvary.

For that truth of truths—dearer than life and all besides—that God is good or He is not God, science has no shadow of a denial. Firm is her conviction "that the slow-footed years are bringing us nearer to the goal, where might shall be subdued by right, and where injustice and selfishness shall be swallowed up by *goodness*, because *this shall have become spontaneous to man.*" And how can that become spontaneous to man or to any part of creation, the germ of which was not contained in the primal element? She herself teaches this principle with ceaseless reiteration. "If there be in man any faculty which is

no part of the contents of the universe, if there be anything done by him which lies outside the range of causation, then the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy falls to pieces, for man has the power to add to that which the physicist demonstrates can neither be increased nor lessened." Water cannot rise above its own level; neither can man attain to a higher state of righteousness than that in which the primordial element of soul substance once existed. Thus Science rises in her strength and purity and prophecies in these days as One prophesied of old, "They shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying know the Lord: for all shall know Me from the least to the greatest," and goodness "shall have become spontaneous to man!"

Churchmen and nonconformists, looking at the disproportion in the number of the male sex as compared to the female in our congregations, shake their heads and say, "It is the spread of scientific thought among our younger men that keeps them from the churches." They lament the spiritual pride of those who seek, as Eve did, to be as gods, knowing good and evil, and are not content to accept unquestionably the dogmas for which their forefathers fought and died. The spirit of scientific investigation—with its mixture of passionate curiosity and dispassionate inquiry—is abroad. The wide adoption of logical modes of reasoning, the increase of knowledge, and quickening of the general intellect have led our young men, and in many cases our "maidens, old men, and matrons," to demand as spiritual sustenance something more than pious rhetoric or timeworn platitudes. The more substantial diet needed is obtainable here and there in churches and chapels; but, on the whole, our weekly preachers meet but too inadequately the crying need of this generation.

It is an easy thing to cast blame on others, and I do not desire to perform so cheap a task. Yet I feel compelled to say something on this subject. I do not believe that those thirsting young souls who ask for bread and receive a stone are alone responsible for the growth in our midst of doubt and disbelief.

Men seek a God in harmony with His own creation, not one whose laws are in perpetual antagonism to His nature. Men look for preachers who can interpret God's messages as they are writ large to-day on earth and ocean, and not only as they were spoken by just and holy men of old. Preachers who are perversely blind to the revelations of God's will which reward the patient investigations of Science cannot be trusted to interpret aright the revelation of His will in Christ. Little by little, year by year, the Holy Spirit is lighting up the dark corners of the universe, blending the unseen with the seen, and making clearer the way of righteousness. And yet feeble-minded men—would that they were not duly appointed "ministers and stewards" of God's holy mysteries—cry out that Science is the Church's foe, that Science is the enemy of Faith, that Science is

the curse of this generation. And all the while Science, the much abused, unjustly persecuted servant of the Faith, serene in her own integrity, furnishes lavishly and uncomplainingly her countless testimonies to the truths of Christianity.

How often we fail to recognize our best friends! They come to us with smiling eyes and flattering lips, telling us we are so superior—we Christians—to the professors of any other religion. They praise us to our faces for our discretion in calling systematically on the name of the Lord, and thus insuring the salvation of our souls to all eternity, and we like them well enough. They come again, wearing the garb of truth, looking at us sadly—pityingly, perhaps—and we writhe beneath their glances. We call them fiends, and cry out that the evil one has sent them to tempt us and to be our ruin. They say to us, “Your righteousness and respectability are as filthy rags. You are building your hopes of immortality on a false conception of God’s universe and His salvation. You fancy that, because you have grasped the central truth that *He is* and *He is God*, you can afford to despise all other realities of which He is the author. You are as children clinging to the old myths of your childhood and shutting your eyes wilfully, scornfully, to the deep realities which those myths veil. You would rather believe in the good and bad fairies, whom you have never seen, than understand the mysteries of the good and evil influences that you meet with in the world around you. You cast up your eyes and say, often enough, that all are ‘born in sin’ and ‘the children of wrath,’ but you have not the courage to grapple, in God’s name, with those social evils which are the very fountain-heads of hereditary disease, insanity, and crime. He the Spirit of all Truth—who will guide you into all Truth—is pointing out to you the unmistakable way of righteousness, yet you would rather, with Peter, build a temple on the mount of transfiguration than follow Jesus through the sin-stained city, which is to you so commonplace, but on which the light of a deeper knowledge sheds a lurid glare.” The truths of Science are not so easily discovered or glibly guessed at that any who accept their doctrines cut and dried, from the lips of priest, parson, or time-honored commentator, can afford to despise them. How can we be satisfied with the ambiguity of old guesses at a truth when that truth stands plainly revealed to us to-day as a fact? Why should we cling to our childish interpretations of God’s messages to man, when the true meaning of them has been ascertained by scientific experiment and physical demonstration? Was the Holy Spirit sent in vain? Is the human mind, contrary to the law of all other organic things, to have no period of growth? Shall all creation climb nearer God on the steps of evolution, and man’s soul alone be stationary?

It is not that we must leave our first love to follow every vain breath of doctrine, but we must have open minds, be always inquir-

ing, always learning. We must examine and prove the spirits of science, philosophy, and art before we denounce them. We should apply to them the infallible test, contained in John iv. 1, 2: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God. . . . Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: *Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.*"

This theory of evolution from a primal form of matter, these alleged forces that propel mankind ever forward on the tide of human progress, do they testify to the truth of the Incarnation? These oncoming waves of physical, mental, and moral development, despite their fierce backward sweeps of reversion to lower types, are nearing by degrees, so Science tell us, their noble destiny of perfection. Do they bear witness to an incarnate God?

"The Incarnation," wrote the Bishop of Durham—then Canon Westcott—"includes the promise of the complete redemption and perfection of man, of the restoration of 'the body' to its proper place as the perfect organ of the spirit. The test of spirits is found in the confessing a fact which vindicates the fulness of life."

---

## THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

FROM "THE EPIC OF PAUL."

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM CLEAVER WILKINSON, CHICAGO, ILL.

[IN the following lines, which are a condensed extract from an extended poem well advanced toward completion, under the title, "The Epic of Paul" (sequel and companion to "The Epic of Saul," by the same author), the apostle Paul, rescued, through the intervention of his sister's son, from the plot of the forty Jewish conspirators to assassinate him, is on his way by night, under escort of Roman soldiery, horse and foot, from Jerusalem to Cæsarea. His nephew (named Stephen, in memory of the great protomartyr) is supposed to accompany him; and the two, riding side by side, somewhat apart from their escort, who partly precede, partly follow them, engage in conversation. The youth at length vents his indignation at his uncle's enemies, especially Shimei, the ringleader, by quoting in application to them a fierce psalm of imprecation (Ps. cix.). This leads to question and answer on the subject of the imprecatory psalms in general.]

"Thy patience and thy meekness make me fierce  
 With anger, with ungovernable wrath  
 Most righteous," Stephen cried, "against those men  
 Who, hating, hunt mine uncle to the death.  
 I hate them, and I wish them—what themselves  
 Wish thee—dogs of the devil that they are!  
 I know a psalm that I should like to sing—



That ponderable seemed to Stephen, so  
 Did his heart feel the pressure of that pause.  
 At length Paul said, with sweetest irony  
 That almost earnest seemed, it was so sweet :  
 "Yea, nephew, hast thou, then, already grown  
 Perfect in love, that thou dar'est hate like that?"

It was not asked for answer, Stephen knew,  
 And answer had he none he could have given,  
 No answer, save of silence, much-ashamed.  
 Paul let the searching of himself, begun  
 And busy in the spirit of the boy,  
 Go on in silence for a while ; and then,  
 In gravest sweet sincerity, he spoke :  
 "Hating is sweet and wholesome for the heart  
 That can hate purely, out of utter love.  
 But who for these things is sufficient—save  
 God only? God is love, and He can hate.  
 But for me, Stephen, in mine own proper self,  
 I dare not hate until I better love.  
 When, as I hope, hereafter I shall be  
 Perfect in love, then I may safely hate ;  
 Till then, I task myself to love alone."

There was such reverence in Paul's gravity,  
 Reverence implied toward him as toward a peer,  
 Not peer in age, but peer in human worth—  
 Toward *him*, so young, so heady, and so fond—  
 That Stephen, in the sting of the rebuke  
 Itself, shaming him, though so gracious, felt  
 A tonic touch that made him more a man.  
 Uplifted, while abashed, he dared to say :  
 "Perhaps I trespassed in my vehemence ;  
 But, uncle, did not God inspire the psalm?"

"Doubtless, my Stephen," Paul replied ; "but not,  
 Not therefore, thee inspire to use that psalm.  
 Sound thine own heart now, nephew, and tell me,  
 Which was it, in thy heart, that prayed the prayer—  
 True vehemence in sympathy with God,  
 Or vehemence against thy brother man?  
 A sentiment of sympathy with *me*  
 Thou canst not say, for I have no such wish  
 As that thou breathedst, touching any man."

Thereon, in silence, for a space they rode,  
 While their thoughts ranged diverse in worlds apart.  
 Then Stephen : "That distempering heat in me,  
 O uncle, is clean gone from out mine heart,  
 Slaked by the overshadowing of thy spirit,  
 Like the earth cooled with overshadowing night.  
 I am calm enough, I think, to learn, if not  
 Thy difficult high doctrine touching love,  
 Something at least about those psalms of hate.  
 Hate is the spirit of the psalm I said,  
 Is it not, uncle?"

“As thou saidst it, yea,  
Or I mistook the meaning of thy voice,”  
Said Paul; “whatever meant the holy words,  
The tones, I felt, meant that and nothing else.”

“Could then those words themselves mean something else?”  
Asked Stephen.

“Yea,” said Paul, “for words are naught  
But empty vessels that the utterer fills  
With his own spirit when he utters them;  
The spirit is the lord of utterance.”

“What was the spirit with which the Spirit of God  
Breathed these into the soul of him elect  
Among the sons of men to give them voice?  
Did not God hate whom He so heavily cursed?”  
Stephen inquired; and Paul at large replied:  
“God hates not any, as wicked men count hate—  
And men not wicked may, in wicked mood—  
Nor wills that of the souls whom He has made  
Any should perish; rather wills that all  
Come to the knowledge of the truth and live.

“But look abroad upon the world of men;  
What seest thou? Many souls resist the will,  
The blessed will to save, of God. Of these,  
Some will hereafter yield—thou knowest not who,  
But some—and let themselves be saved. Again,  
Some will to the end resist—thou knowest not who,  
But some—and obstinately choose to die;  
Choice is the fearful privilege of all.  
Now, toward the man incorrigibly bad,  
Who evil loves and evil makes his good  
Forever, without hope of other change  
Than change from worse to worse forevermore—  
Toward such a man, what *must* the aspect be  
Of the Supreme Eternal Holiness?  
What but of wrath, or as of wrath, and hate?  
Canst thou imagine other face of God  
Than frown and threat aflame implacable  
Against implacable rebellion set,  
And sin eternal, to eternal sin  
Doomed, for self-doomed, through free, unchanging choice?  
One flame burns love toward love, and hate toward hate—  
Toward hate that utmost love cannot subdue,  
The hate that, like the diamond-stone, amid  
The fiercest fires, rebellious and defiant, bides  
Still, in love's sevenfold-heated furnace, hate.  
That flame is the white flame of holiness—  
Which God is, and whose other name is love.”

“God is a dreadful thought,” said Stephen. “Yea,  
Said Paul; “so Jacob felt it when he cried,  
‘How dreadful is this place!’ and Bethel named  
The place where God was and he knew it not.  
God is a dreadful thought, dreadful as sweet—

The sweetness and the dreadfulness are one.  
 But never was the dreadfulness so sweet,  
 The sweetness never yet so dreadful shown,  
 As then when Jesus died on Calvary !  
 Shroud thyself, Stephen, from the dreadfulness,  
 Felt to be too intolerably bright,  
 In the cool, shadowing, sheltering thought, so nigh,  
 Of mercy, mercy, still in judgment sheathed. "

"I feel the buoyance of my spirit sink  
 Oppressed by the great weight of these thy thoughts,"  
 Said Stephen ; "and my heart is very still.  
 I wait to hear what God the Lord will speak. "

"Hearken," said Paul. "Those fearful words of curse  
 Which late thou nigh hadst turned to blasphemy,  
 Daring to lade them with thy personal spite  
 Against a neighbor man, whom we must love,  
 Until we know hereafter, which God fend !  
 That he bides reprobate, self-reprobate—  
 Those maledictions dire, through David breathed,  
 Express not human hate, but hate divine,  
 Revealed in forms of human speech, and, too,  
 Inspired in whoso can the height attain  
 To side with God, and passionlessly damn,  
 As if with highest passion, any found—  
 Whom, known not yet, even to himself not known,  
 Much less to thee or me, but known to God,  
 And to be known, in that great day, to all—  
 Fixed in his final choice of evil for good !  
 Henceforward, Stephen, when thou sayest that psalm,  
 Say it, and tremble, lest thyself be he,  
 The man thou cursest in its awful curse !"

"If it were right," said Stephen, after pause  
 Prolonged in solemn chiding of himself,  
 "If it were right and seemly things profane  
 To mingle with things sacred so—I think  
 Perforce now of a certain tragedy  
 I read once by that Grecian Sophocles,  
 Wherein a Theban king, one Ædipus,  
 Denounces on a murderer frightful doom,  
 Dreaming not he—though every reader knows—  
 The murderer he so curses is himself.  
 I shudder when I think, Were it to be  
 That the fierce blasting I invoked to fall  
 Upon another's head, I drew on mine !  
 'Cursing he loved, and cursing fell on him !'  
 Forefend it, God, and Christ with blessing fill  
 This heart of mine too hasting prone to hate !"

"Amen !" said Paul, "thou prayest for me and thee !"

---

NOTHING is more deadening than evenness and monotony. No one, indeed, can really live without emphasis.—*Trumbull.*

## V.—LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TEXTS FROM RECENT DISCOVERIES.

BY WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D., NEW YORK CITY.

## CHEDORLAOMER AND ABRAHAM.

WE know from Genesis that Abraham came out of Ur of the Chaldees, and by way of Haran finally reached Palestine, where he lived the life of a wandering sheik, caring for his flocks and herds, and where he recaptured the booty which had been taken from the cities of the Plain. We learn from Genesis that Chedorlaomer, who led the invaders, was king of Elam; that is all. Any further knowledge has to come from the recovered monuments of the East. What light does the new evidence cast upon this isolated incident? Are there historical relations into which it can be put? Special study has of late been given to the documents bearing upon this subject, and some of the probable conclusions can here be given.

We must think of Southern Babylonia at the time when Terah and his son Abraham left it as inhabited by various races. The original race was probably of the negrite type—very dark, small, and no match for the larger and stronger races that followed. They formed the original basis of the population of both Babylonia and Elam to the east. Perhaps they came from Africa, and at any rate they inhabited the low lands near the coasts, either having originally settled there and having spread northward and inland, or having been driven there by invaders. With them, and dominant over them, were two other rival and generally hostile races inhabiting Babylonia, one of which we may call Mongolian, which came from the east, or northeast, by way of Elam; while the other was Semitic and came from the west, from Arabia. Abraham belonged to the latter Semitic stock, which had succeeded the Mongol invasion and had conquered the country.

Somewhere about 2300 B. C. occurred one of the most important and revolutionary events in the history of the early world, one whose full extent only now begins to be understood. It was nothing less than the bursting out of a great flood of Mongol people, which overran all that was then known of the civilized East or West. There has been something remarkable about the periodical Mongolian invasions, as if a dam had broken and let a vast accumulated body of water flow out to desolate the long cultivated fields. We have already seen that such a horde of conquerors had subdued the negrite population of Babylonia and Elam before the beginning of history. Now came another such invasion. Yet another, nearly two thousand years later, reached the gates of Rome, and terrified all the old world. Yet another, some two thousand years later, still offers Milton a comparison to the multitudes of Satan's hosts.

"A multitude like which the populous North  
Poured never from her frozen loins, to pass  
Rhene or the Danube, when her barbarous sons  
Came like a deluge on the South, and spread  
Beneath Gibraltar to the Libyan sands."

This horde of about 2300 B. C., the first of which we have historical knowledge, divided, as it seems, into two streams. One of these crossed the upper Tigris and Euphrates, reached the Mediterranean coast, and proceeded southward until it at last reached Egypt, and leaving kindred people behind it, there founded the hated dynasty of shepherd or Hyksos kings, which overthrew the fourteenth dynasty. All this took time, and must be considered in relation to an already considerably Mongolianized Phenicia.

The other division of the Mongolian invasion passed down east of the Tigris over what was later Persia, into the southern Persian territory of Elam, where it found a kindred population in control, and then crossed the Tigris into Babylonia,

where the Semites were the ruling people. This great invasion, of which we have pretty definite knowledge, and which we call Elamite, was substantially concurrent with the conquest of Egypt by the invasion of the Canaanite, or Phœnician, old Mongolian nomads who founded Avaris and the Hyksos dynasty.

The most distinguished of these Mongolian or Elamite conquerors of Babylonia was Kudur-Nahunta, whose name means the servant of the god Nahunta. This Elamite conquest probably covered all Southern Babylonia, although the farthest extent of it known to us was the plunder in the year 2285 B.C. of the city of Erech, and the capture of the image of Nana, which was carried to Susa, and was recovered by Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, 1800 years later.

From Erech to Ur of the Chaldees was not a long distance. At this time there must have been a great emigration of the Semites who fled from this irresistible invasion. They went north and formed a homogeneous Semitic population farther up the valleys of the two rivers, the basis of the later Assyrian empire. About this time Terah and his family left their ancestral home for the North, and we may conjecture with great probability that the Elamite invasion explains in part their departure, and we may believe that they were representatives of the dispossessed aristocracy which went to the northern plain of Haran, carrying, as we know, with them the worship of Sin, the Moon-god of Ur.

In time Abraham, at the command of God, moved farther to the Mediterranean coast, and wandered over the land of Canaan. It was while there that the invasion of Palestine occurred, led by Chedorlaomer, or, as his Elamite name would be, Kudur-Lagamar, his name meaning the servant of the goddess Lagamar, who perhaps represented the Dawn, and a name perfectly parallel to that of his great predecessor, Kudur-Nahunta. Kudur-Nahunta's son was Simti-Shilhak, who was the father of Kudur-Mabug, who was the father of Eri-Aku (in Semitic, Rim-Sin), of Larsa, probably the Arioch, king of Ellasar, who was one of those who made the raid on Canaan with Chedorlaomer (Kudur-Lagamar), king of Elam.

We do not know just what was the extent and purpose of this invasion. Its real objective point may have been the mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula, or even Egypt, which was now ruled by a related dynasty, or it may have had no object beyond the spoil to be gathered from the rich Canaanite cities. We do not know that they went beyond El-Paran, in the Wilderness. Their success was made possible by the weakness of the intervening territory where the Hittites had not yet built up a strong empire. But we may be sure that the Semite Abraham, who had been driven by the Elamites out of his ancestral home, had no good will toward the house of Kudur-Nahunta, or any of his successors. He lived at some distance from the rich cities attacked, and was personally safe; but he was not only glad to rescue his nephew, Lot, but also to avenge as far as possible the injuries which he and his father had suffered, and which had made them wanderers from their early home. The opportunity offered on the retreat. We must not imagine Abraham with his 318 men as attacking the combined army of the invaders. What he probably did was to follow and surprise in a sort of Bedawy razzia a separate detachment which had lingered to attack and spoil Sodom, or had charge of the prisoners. These were suddenly overcome, and the prisoners and spoil retaken.

Kudur-Lagamar is the last one of this line of Elamite or Mongolian kings ruling over Babylonia that is known to us. It is supposed by some that Amraphel, king of Shinar, who was also in the invasion of Kudur-Lagamar, is the same as the Hammurabi who later drove out the Elamites and restored a Semitic line of rulers, who held sway until about 1600 B.C. Another Elamite or Kassite dynasty conquered Babylonia and held it for some 300 years.

Such a wide view of early Oriental history as we have taken explains not only the relation of Abraham to the politics of Ur of the Chaldees, and the reason for

his hostility to the Elamites, but it also explains that fact which has so surprised scholars of late, the wide use of the cuneiform writing in Palestine a few centuries later, as proved by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. The Elamites used the cuneiform script. This raid of Kudur-Lagamar was one of a large number which brought Canaan under the rule of Elam and Babylonia. Canaan had ties of blood and language and conquest with Babylonia, but not with the nearer Egypt. Its literature and writing were Babylonian, not Egyptian. We may not be surprised if we learn that its religion, and its notions of cosmogony, and all its faiths and legends were closely allied to those of Babylonia.

## SERMONIC SECTION.

### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHRIST'S DEATH.

BY JOSEPH RABINOWITZ, LEADER OF  
THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT  
IN KISHINEFF, SOUTH RUSSIA.\*

*Because for thy sake I have borne reproach; shame hath covered my face.*

—Ps. lxi. 7.

*And they kneeled down before him and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews!—Matt. xxvii. 29.*

DEARLY beloved children of Israel, let us join in giving glory to the eter-

\* The author of this sermon is one of the most remarkable men of our times, and the movement at the head of which he has stood for nearly ten years is one of the most significant phenomena in the modern religious world. It is a spontaneous Christward agitation among the old-fashioned orthodox Jews of the East, and Rabinowitz, who is a lawyer and literary man, aims at the organization of a national Jewish-Christian Church, in which, while fully accepting Christ as the promised Messiah of the Old Testament, the new congregation shall yet retain such national characteristics of the Jews that are not in conflict with the acceptance of Christianity. Among these Rabinowitz numbers circumcision and the observance of the seventh day of the week as the day of rest and worship. Rabinowitz was baptized in Berlin by Professor Mead, of Andover, and was one of the attractions at the World's Fair Congress of Religions in Chicago. His sermons and addresses, of which he has published a large number, are delivered generally in the Jewish jargon current among Eastern Israelites. His method is to select a text from both the Old and the New Testament as parallel bases for his discourse. The sermon here given, originally preached in Russian, is a representative discourse of the reformer.

nal God of Israel, who controls the courses of time, and let us render a prayer of thanks unto Him who in His mercy has ordained the changes of time. For many years the Jews have during the present holy Passah week lived in great concern and care, as they feared through word or deed to excite the Christians against them, who were, as a rule, easily offended during this period, because the ancestors of the Jews on the day before Passah, in the sacred city of Jerusalem, delivered our Jesus Christ to be scourged and crucified. The wrath of the Christians has caused much Jewish blood to flow, and it is not surprising that the Jews, too, at the approach of the present week should show their discontent at the slightest hint at the bloody narrative of Jesus of Nazareth, whom the entire Christian world worships as the Messiah, the Son of the living God. The Jews were vexed at the thought that this affair should have become the everlasting inheritance of the nations of the earth, and thus this important week becomes deeply significant for both Jews and Christians. But, thanks be unto God, through whose grace and goodness it has also been granted unto us also, the children of Israel, to meet together in our house of worship in this great week; and just as is the case with all true Christians, we too, through His holy name, can learn from the books of the Old and the New Covenant of this eternal divine drama, of this terrible and innocent death, which the Saviour of the world, in love and humility, took

upon Himself. Yea, in truth, our gratitude toward our Heavenly Father is endless, who has given to us all, Jews and all other nationalities, the possibility now, too, in the days of the rapid development of thought and the wonderful unfolding of science and learning, to recognize and appreciate in the despised and crucified Jesus, Him whom the pious and righteous Simeon recognized as the fulfilment of prophecy in the infant on the arms of His mother Mary, as the salvation which God has prepared for *all* nations, and a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of His people Israel (Luke ii.). That which the old eyes of the righteous Simeon, through the power of the Holy Spirit, saw, neither the proud Jews nor the ignorant but bold Romans were able to see. It was an easy matter for the Jewish leader, Caiaphas, to decide on the death of Jesus by saying, "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (John ii. 50). It could not occur to him that this Jesus would prove to be the *only* person in the world who should prove Himself to be the Saviour, not only for the sins of the Jewish people, but for those of *all* the world, in accordance with the prediction of the prophet, that He should bear the sins of many (Is. liii. 10). Again, it was not a hard thing for the leader of the heathens, the provincial Pontius Pilate, in Jerusalem, to deride Jesus and to hand Him over to the Jews with the words, "Behold the man" (John xix. 5). He could have no suspicion of the fact that human beings can become such, in the fullest and highest sense of the word, only when they keep constantly before their eyes as their highest ideal the God-man, Jesus Christ, and follow in His footprints. Only in later times the regenerated from among the Gentiles begin to understand the meaning of the words, "Behold the Man!" which were spoken by their leading representative; and, side by side with them, many of the Jews are beginning to appreciate the words: "It is expedi-

ent that one man should die for the people, and that the *whole* nation perish not."

When we this day remember the suffering and death which Jesus Christ took upon Himself, which, however, were merited by the sins of both Jew and Gentile, we must join in with all those among men who firmly believe that that precious and sacred blood of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, cleanses all of us who are sinners, Jews and Gentiles; and we should all from our heart of hearts pray unto God that He should open our eyes more and more, that we may see in Christ the salvation which has been prepared for all peoples who believe. May He give us His Holy Spirit, to enable us all, Jews and Gentiles, to understand that Jesus Christ did not come into this world as man in order to cause discord or strife among men, and enable us to understand the words of the holy apostle, St. Paul, when he says: "For He is our peace, who made both one, and broke down the middle wall of partition" (Eph. ii. 14). May He help us all to shake off the old man, with his sins and death, and put on the new and complete man through faith in Jesus Christ, of whom the Holy Ghost, through the lips of Pilate, said, "Behold the Man!"

With awe and reverence, we stand silent before this deep and unbounded mystery of the holy evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—the mystery concerning Jesus Christ as the Messiah, the son of David, the King of the Jews. We must remember that all the four gospels were written in the course of the first Christian century after the birth, life, death, and resurrection of the Saviour. Those were the times when men in the higher ranks of society treated with scorn little books of the kind of these four which spoke of a crucified Jew, Jesus. Those were the times in which every one who dared to confess his faith in Jesus as the Son of the living God, as the risen Lord, who had also ascended unto heaven, as the eternal King from the house of

David, was regarded as silly and the fit subject for ridicule and abuse. Under such circumstances it would have seemed more natural if the evangelists had confined themselves more to the parables and teachings which mark the life of Christ before he was condemned at the hands of the Jews. We see, however, that they devote more attention and space to His sufferings, and that they are careful to preserve for their descendants a comparatively complete account of the mockery which He was compelled to endure before His crucifixion and death.

If we for a moment would accept as correct the views of the Talmudists, that the evangelists were common deceivers, who tried by different kinds of fables to influence the common rabble and to gain them over for their cause, we naturally ask the question, Why did they, then, not keep silent on His disgraceful death; and why did they not prefer to boast of His courageous and heroic end? Manifestly the object of the evangelists was one of an entirely different kind. They did not exaggerate in describing the suffering of Jesus in order to cause tears to spring in the eyes of their readers and awaken sympathy in their hearts. Nor did they give expression to their sorrows and lamentations, as did Jeremiah after the destruction of the first temple. Neither groaning nor lamentations do we hear them utter at the death of the Redeemer, for they were well acquainted with His wish, that they should not weep over Him (Luke xxiii. 28). No, they wrote their gospels concerning the humiliation and sufferings of Christ with divine, heavenly smiles on their countenances—with those smiles of which the Psalmist speaks (Ps. ii. 4), "He that sitteth in the heavens laugheth;" to the end that the ignorance, the poverty, the blindness of men may become all the more apparent; that men may become convinced that their willing and doing signifies nothing; that without their consent the will of God will be accomplished; that they are only

instruments in His hands; that they only carry out His determinations, although they think they are doing their own desires.

In narrating to us in fulness of detail how Christ was mocked and scoffed, the evangelists at the same time give us a clear account of the deep significance of the great work which He has accomplished. As we now, after the course of 1800 years, read of this scoffing and scorn which was heaped upon the Saviour, we spontaneously turn to the children of the present nineteenth century with the question, Who understood more quickly the mission of Jesus of Nazareth, the thousands of Jews, the Pharisees and Scribes, Sadducees and Roman soldiery—who derided Him and cried out, "Crucify Him! crucify Him!" or those poor, insignificant fishermen, who truly believed in Jesus, that He, as the Son of the living God, the Redeemer of the world and the eternal Son of David, was also the king of the Jews? Did not the crown of thorns which was placed in mockery on His head become the most precious crown of the world? Has not the bending of the knees, done in derision by His abusers, become in truth a bending in deep devotion on the part of countless millions over the entire globe? It is now also time to recognize in its truth and significance the words, "Hail, king of the Jews!" and to hope that this, too, shall become a living truth and reality. For the Jews, too, can yet be raised, and, in accordance with the Divine will, like other people, can become a living nation by learning to believe, as do other people, in Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, as the king of the Jews.

What a warm and powerful faith, what a living and mighty confidence, fill the hearts of the evangelists, that they were able to pen all the sufferings and sorrows which were inflicted upon the Messiah by His contemporaries. Whence, we must ask, did the disciples get such a firm faith and such deep convictions that the despised and crucified Jesus was really the Lord and King of

the world? I do not speak of the manner in which the expectation of a few pious Jews were realized, but where they secured this firm conviction and certainty. It would be useless to look for the sources in historical or logical data. The riddle is solved by the evangelist himself in Luke xxiv. 25-30, where we are told that Jesus, having arisen from the dead, called two of His disciples "foolish men" because they did not understand from the Sacred Scriptures and from the prophets that it had been predicted concerning Him that He should suffer thus that He might enter upon His glory. The Scriptures, then, are the sources of faith. The constant reading of these writings, the divinely inspired, holy books, opened their eyes and enabled them to see in all the sufferings of Christ His eternal glory. These books, of which Christ says that not an iota or tittle shall be abrogated, gave them also the faith which convinced and still convinces the world.

Dearly beloved brethren, I believe that you, too, from Ps. lxix., read in your hearing, and which the Lord without doubt also frequently read to His disciples, can gain the conviction that the rejected and crucified Jesus is the Christ, the glorified King of the Jews, who sits at the right hand of God the Father until all things in heaven and on earth shall be subject to Him. Pray, therefore, to your Heavenly Father, that He may enable you to understand the words of the Psalmist and the prophets. Remember also this, that the Lord had promised that He will help Zion, and recognize the fact that all the sufferings of Christ have the one purpose, to give life to those who seek the Lord, so that the three ideas become inseparable—God, Help, and Zion.

Jesus shows us that, for the Father's sake, He endured disgrace; but the Heavenly Father has already shown that He has already fulfilled the prayer of His Son (Ps. lxix. 6), "Let not them that wait on Thee be ashamed through Me." Be not ashamed of the crucified Jesus.

Have the full assurance that God has given Him the power to establish the new Jerusalem, and that the prophecy shall be fulfilled: "And they that love His name shall dwell therein" (Ps. lxix. 36). Amen.

#### THE CONCERN FOR TEMPORAL GOODS.

BY PASTOR JOHN QUANDT [EVANGELICAL], THE HAGUE, HOLLAND.

*And he said unto his disciples, therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on.— Luke xii. 22.*

"AND he said unto his disciples." The man who speaks these words does so at all times from experience, never as a blind man would of colors, to use a popular saying. Since he here speaks of concern for earthly goods, he must by personal experience have thoroughly learned what it means to be in need of temporal things, certainly no less than the careworn men and women of the lowly classes of our own date. Jesus Christ was born in a stable; He grew up in a hut. The table of the carpenter Joseph in all probability did not groan with a wealth of good things. Mary, who soon become a widow, no doubt was compelled to practice the closest economy. When Jesus, as a young man of 30, entered upon his career and public ministry, his outward circumstances and surroundings were anything but brilliant. He was not in the possession of a fixed income, and the leading one among his disciples became embarrassed when he was called upon to pay tribute to the Master. Nor did the Saviour have a fixed place of residence—no place that he could call His own. He Himself tells us that while the foxes have holes and the birds have their nests, the Son of Man had not where He could lay His head. On the long journey from Jerusalem to Galilee He had taken no bite of bread with Him, nor a drop of water; only through the

*Christ was for*

kindness of the Samaritan women He manages to secure a cup of the longed-for beverage. For a journey of three days into the mountains, seven loaves of bread and a few fishes must suffice for the needs of Himself and His disciples, and in the case of a lengthy journey on the sea only a single loaf was at His disposal for the same number. What would you have done under similar circumstances? Would you have done as did the disciples on the sea, who were worried because they had no bread? Or what would you advise others to do under like circumstances? Would you advise them to free themselves of their worry by taking from those who have what you need? People who give this advice to the needy and hungry say they speak as the result of experience. However, Jesus also speaks from experience, and He gives you an entirely different advice. In the language of our own day, His words would read about as follows: "The concern for temporal goods is to be not a question of anxiety, but one of faith." On the presupposition that we still have faith in a personal God, we can do nothing more foolish than to worry and fret in reference to the needs of this life, and can do nothing wiser than to trust, with a joyful heart, for these things to the love of our Heavenly Father.

Yes, and do you yet believe in a personal God? Taking it for granted that we have no longer any such faith; that with the leaders of modern social democracy we protest against the "deception" and "illusion" that "a gracious power above the clouds turns all things to good ends, when we with our own hands and energy accomplish nothing"; even presupposing all this—and there are hundreds of thousands who no longer hold to this old positive faith—what becomes, then, of our worry and concern for temporal goods? Permit me to mention a case which actually occurred recently in my experience. A laboring man, who had been earning enough all along to supply his needs, became severely sick. For a time his

few savings sufficed to keep the wolf from his door. His sickly wife, who besides her husband had yet four children to provide for, worked hard until she too became too ill to keep it up. Most of their household goods gradually found their way to the pawnbroker's shop. The poor authorities in the city, who had already thousands of cases on hand, could indeed keep the family from absolute famine, but could not prevent their becoming beggars. Neither the husband nor the wife was a Christian. Can you understand how the wife conceived the idea of doing away with her children? Can you understand how the husband, on his bed of suffering, began to hate the landlord who asked for his rent, and began to think that the seventh [eighth] commandment was an invention of the rich, which the poor man in our day was no longer bound to observe? These are the results and consequences of not having faith in God when troubles and trials begin to press down upon men—either despair, or thoughts of self-destruction, or hate of one's neighbor, and a willingness to take not only the property of others, but even their lives. Indeed terrible alternatives, which find their expression in the old saying, "He who is without faith in a God and is worried with earthly concerns, he will by his concern gain nothing but sorrow and disappointment."

Do you believe in God? The great mass of our people, in spite of all the bad signs of the times, will nevertheless answer in the affirmative to this question. The number of those who are actually willing to murder their own souls is fortunately but small; and this is done by destroying their God-consciousness, the central nerve of life. But if you yet believe in God, then, O man, hear what he says through the mouth of His Son. The care and concern for the things of this earth is not a question of anxiety, but one of faith and trust.

Jesus knew very well that even the best of his disciples were yet far re-

moved from the high ideal involved in this standpoint of faith. Think of Peter and his experience on the Sea of Tiberias. What intense worry finds its expression in the words that he had labored all the night and yet had caught nothing. Think of the stormy passage on the same waters. Jesus is sleeping peacefully, but his companions are full of fear. "Lord, help us; we perish!" Think also of the widow of Zarpeth, to whom Elias went, and of the deep despair in her words that she would prepare the last food for herself and her son and then they would die. Jesus' disciples and this widow were no unbelievers, and yet the concern for the things of this life was for them purely a question of anxiety. And is not the same to a large degree true of Christians also? It is true that some of us know of care and concern for the things of this life only from hearsay, and not from actual experience. But yet there are many Christians who know by actual experience what want and need are. Are we, then, not in anxiety and trouble and concern? If, in spite of all work, all labors from morning to night, your income does not suffice for your needs, is not enough to secure what you and those dependent on you require, are we then not to be worried, not to be filled with anxiety?

By no means. For what is the outcome of worry and anxiety? Are our fears and needs in the least bettered thereby? Christ says that they are not, and as a proof adduces an example. Suppose that a man was anxious to add to his measure of life a short span—say a month, or even a day, or as little as an hour—would he be able to secure what he so ardently desires? By no means, saith the Lord; for in this very night he must depart. What good, then, does this worry accomplish? We smile at children who are afraid to remain in a dark room because they fear ghosts. But we grown people are not a bit wiser. The darkness of our worry is something terrible to us; we are afraid of ghosts. You do not know with

what to support yourself the next month, and, like a ghost, the concern for your future frightens your soul. You begin to fear that God will in your hour of need desert or forsake you. Or you do not know where you will secure the means for your family and dependents. In your heart of hearts you begin to fear that God's arm will prove to be too short and weak. In this way your anxiety really comes from a lack of faith. You no longer trust His mercy and fatherly care. Or do you think that your fretting will compel God to supply your need? In this you are mistaken. Remember the words of Paul Gerhardt's famous hymn:

"When sorrows here o'ertake thee,  
And self-inflicted care,  
Let not thy God forsake thee;  
He listens for thy prayer."

God wants us to have confidence in Him, the confidence which a child has in its father and mother; and it is inspired by this faith and confidence that we are to ask Him for His help and succor. The concern for the things of this life is not a question of anxiety, but one of faith.

Christ declares that the lack of trust in God is simply without any ground or justification. For this he furnishes clear proof. He says that we are anxious for our food and for what we are to eat and to drink. And what is the purpose of such food and drink? Certainly the purpose is to support and sustain life. And you are anxious about your raiment; and what is the object of clothing? Certainly to protect the body and keep it warm and healthy. And is not life more than food, and the body more than raiment? If, then, God provides for the life and the body of the birds and the flowers, should He not do this all the more for your life and your body? Are you not more than they, O ye of little faith? And in fact the raven, who neither sows nor reaps, has neither cellar nor barn and moreover is one of the most ravenous of birds, is yet not anxious about his life. And the beautiful flowers of the field have no

concern for their bodies, and yet these are more grand than was Solomon in all his glory. Unconcerned and without worry or anxiety, they bloom by the thousands in our fields. This argument of Christ no one who has faith in God can fail to acknowledge.

According to this the case is very simple for us. As soon as we from our heart of hearts believe in God, that He is our dear Father through Jesus Christ our Saviour, we must in all earthly concerns and things put our entire confidence and trust in Him, and, with the poet, Paul Fleming, be able to say: "Whatever our fate may be, God still reigns on high and will do all things well." Therefore we should cast aside our agonizing concern and worry for the things of this life. Our Heavenly Father knows that we stand in need of these things. And let nobody think that such adamant faith as that shown by Luther, August Herrmann, Francke, and others men of this type can be the possession only of the powerful heroes in the kingdom of God. On the contrary, you too, and I also, can secure such a faith by prayer through the grace of God. Pray, then, and diligently pray your worry away, and pray for a joyful trust in the promises of the Lord. Your experience shall be the same as that of thousands of others who, like Daniel, have been delivered. Him the messenger of God touched in the evening hour as he was speaking to his God in prayer, and told him that as he began to pray the command had gone forth that he should be heard. Think of it, dear hearer, when you are yet in the beginning of your prayer. God already begins to answer your petition! While you are writing the first letter of your telegram to be sent up to heaven God is already preparing the response.

Only our faith must not waver if God's answer should not come as quickly as we expect it. Often the messengers are quite distant whom the Lord would send to inform us of His answer. Many Christians forget that

the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer says: "Give us *this day* our daily bread"—not to-morrow or next year. As one of our famous hymns reads, if he does not help at the moment when asked, he certainly does so when we actually need the help.

In this way the soul is relieved and freed from earthly concerns, and can apply itself to that thing which ought to concern it most, the concern of the soul, the kingdom of God. Therefore we are told that we should *first seek* this kingdom, and then all these other things that we need for this life shall be added unto us. For the things of this world we are to labor, work, and pray, but we are not to worry or to fret about them. But our anxious concern should be directed to the heavenly as the greatest and most needful of possessions. If this is done, we will be in possession of heaven already here upon earth. Amen.

---

#### AN APPEAL FOR MERCY TO THE GOD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

BY REV. JAMES OWEN, SWANSEA,  
WALES.

*Hear me when I call, O God of my righteousness; thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress; have mercy upon me, and hear my prayer.*—Ps. iv. 1.

THE third and fourth Psalms may be called twin poems, composed on the same occasion, the revolt of Absalom. After David's great fall, there was great repentance and great forgiveness; but the fall left behind it evil consequences which could not be evaded. The forgiven king was like a wounded bird; he could not fly as he did before. He carried with him the penalty of an enfeebled will; the old courage that faced the lion, and the bear, and the giant of Gath was gone; the reins of government were hanging loosely in his hands; he shut himself up in his palace. This was the opportunity for the handsome, ambitious, misguided Prince Absalom. The flag of rebellion was

unfurled, and large numbers rallied around it. The king and his followers fled from Jerusalem; the evening closed on a day of weariness and sorrow; and David commended himself to God, and said, as in this Psalm, "I will both lay me down in peace and sleep; for thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety." And in the morning he sang the third Psalm, which ought to follow and not to precede the fourth, "I laid me down and slept; I awaked; for the Lord sustained me." The odds were terribly against him. Jerusalem was in the hands of his rebellious son, his enemies were many, his friends were comparatively few, and to some extent uncertain; yet he was not in despair; he knew one Friend who could not fail him. Foes were strong; but Jehovah was his shield. Shimei might curse him; but Jehovah was his glory. Slanderers might revile and degrade him; but Jehovah was the lifter-up of his head. He says, "*Hear me when I call.*"

Let us consider the Psalmist's appeal, and the grounds on which he makes it.

I. This book is full of these appeals. Without touching the question of inspiration, or submitting any theory of inspiration, losing sight of this, it is remarkable that there has come down to us a book full of the most confiding, reverent, pleading utterances, addressed to the Unseen and Eternal God. Without saying anything about the evidences and authority of the record, here is the fact that a book like this, full of addresses to God, has come down to us through the ages, that the voices of these suppliants have reached us across the gulf of the centuries, and that our devotional feelings and aspirations are often expressed in their words. There is no mist of doubt or cloud of formalism coming between them and God; He is present, close at hand, "nearer to them than breathing," and they talk to Him as a friend with a friend; or they cry to Him as a child in pain cries for his mother; or they sigh before Him, because their heart is breaking

beneath a load of sorrow for sin; or they lift up the voice of thanksgiving and joy because they have obtained the victory.

The story of the revolt of Absalom is the account of a passing occurrence; the need for God, and the soul trusting in Him—this is an eternal fact. Whatever may be the language of the lips, the language of the heart is the same in all ages. It is not the king, it is not the Jew, it is the *man* who speaks: "Hear me—have mercy upon me."

Picture David in that valley of the Jordan, withdrawing from his trusted friends, seeking some quiet spot, kneeling alone under the shadow of the rock, and saying, "Hear *me* when I call." Every one has his own prayer. We are thankful, as I have said, for words consecrated for us which express our needs; but there are seasons when the heart is not satisfied with these ancient expressions, indeed when it cannot find any expressions, when words fail, when the dictionary is too poor to supply what you feel you need to tell the tale that is in your heart. The trouble, the passion of confiding love, the yearnings—you want to tell all these; you try, and the broken heart has only broken speech, which is often the most perfect eloquence; and no one else can speak for you, no one can be your mouthpiece; the heart knoweth its own bitterness and its own joy, and when the joy is "unspeakable," and the groanings "cannot be uttered," God understands it all.

There are not many petitions in this Psalm. "Hear me when I call"—only "hear me," that is enough. A little boat, filled with a shipwrecked crew, is on a rough sea; they are in danger every moment, afraid of being swamped, shivering in their wet clothes; they spend the night in pulling at the oars, and in baling out the water; but through the pitchy gloom they see the lights of a passing ship; they have no lights of their own to show, but they cry, they unite in one long loud shout; only let them be heard, let them have a

sign that they are heard, then all is well; *humanity* lowers a boat to go in search of the distressed ones, finds them, saves them. We are out on a sea of care and toil and trouble, and often crying, "and with no language but a cry;" but when we know that the Father is *hearing* us, we also know that *Divinity* will rescue, will sympathize and succor. Oh, for the intense deep conviction that God is hearing us. Imprisoned in this world, remorseless Nature not heeding our cry, the waves battling against us, the tempest mocking our prayer, we ask in very agony, Is there no One to hear us? As blessings crowd around us, we feel thankful, and is there no Ear to receive our hallelujah? Is there no Heart to respond to us? Yes, He is hearing; that is enough. "Have mercy upon me." This is the only hope of guilt. The criminal cannot appeal to the law; he has broken and insulted it; he can only cry for mercy; and Mercy comes, and weeps, and keeps the door unlatched that the rebel may return; and says, Before the sword descends, I will take the olive-branch; before placing the prisoner in the dark, to receive the sentence, I will go to the Cross, and win the rebel-heart, the rebel-world back. "Have mercy upon me, and hear my prayer."

II. *The grounds of the appeal.* There are two considerations on which the appeal is founded.

1. *The character of God.* "Thou God of my righteousness." Not simply "my righteous God," but "God, the author of my righteousness, from whom all that is true and right in me has come." He knew that he had many defects; he had not yet attained to the mark; but he was in the right direction, and he was not a hypocrite; and whatever he had been or done, in this matter he was right, and Absalom was wrong. He was the rightful king, the king "by Divine right"; and Absalom, by meanness and treachery, had been plotting to take the crown. "God defend the right," we say; yes, "the right;" we cannot expect His defense of the wrong,

the false weights, the deceitful measure, the oppression of the weak. He denounces these; He is the God of righteousness.

You will observe that while the Psalmist was pleading for mercy, he was not asking for anything that was inconsistent with God's justice. "Grace reigns through righteousness." "A just God and a Saviour." Yes—"and;" it might have been "*not*"—but, "a just God *and* a Saviour." To beg mercy or help without a recognition of this golden link, "*and*," is little short of blasphemy. As if you would go to one side of God and coax a blessing that the other side did not know of, His left hand not knowing what His right hand did; as if He were on one side not a Father, but a weak doting grandfather, to be wheedled and won over; but He is a Father when He gives, and when He chastises, when He blesses, and when He judges. If you ask, and fail to say "*righteous* Father," instead of wishing God to act according to His nature, you are wishing Him to deny His nature, to deny Himself.

We rejoice that God is love; we also give thanks that justice is at the head of the universe. I have heard of a godly old Welsh minister in a railway carriage that happened to be nearly full of half-drunken men, and their oaths, their blasphemies, fell like drops of molten lead on his ear and heart; at length, after vain remonstrance, he stood up and said, and the words sobered the roisterers for awhile, "O God, if hell were not already prepared, it ought to be for such as these!" This was wrong, perhaps, as wrong as in the disciples wishing to call down fire from heaven on the Samaritans who did not welcome Jesus. But we are thankful that the God of love is the God of righteousness. "Ever the right comes uppermost, and justice shall be done."

2. The other ground on which he builds his plea is *the goodness already experienced.* "Thou hast enlarged me." It was not untried mercy. No one looks to history for a message of de-

spair—at any rate, no good man—for he always finds that the storm ends in calm, that the darkest hour precedes the dawn, that the struggles result in progress. Our days seem to be separated by the nights that come between; but they are united; the heart is beating, life is throbbing, God is caring, love is enriching, and yesterday helps to-day. We are often prying timidly into the Future, and one reason of the timidity is that we do not read the Past aright. We forget “the miracle of the loaves,” and how many baskets we took up. I am very uncertain about to-morrow. It is as much hidden from me as next year; there is a thick door, without a chink. I can see nothing. Behind it there may be sorrow, there may be a black-edged letter, there may be death. I know nothing about to-morrow; but I know a great deal about yesterday. Yesterday is not an uncertainty; it is a great fact; I can look upon it and study it; it is a cairn with “Ebenezer” written on it; it is a book with my name and God’s name in it; it is full of lessons of wisdom and goodness; and if I only read them carefully, I shall say, God who was near me yesterday will be near me to-morrow. “Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me?” “Thou hast been my help, therefore”—you have never known better logic than this—“therefore I trust under the shadow of Thy wings.” When Philip Henry, the father of the commentator, had been praying earnestly for two of his children, he said: “If the Lord will be blessed to grant me this my request concerning my children, I will not say, as the beggars at our door used to do, ‘I’ll never ask anything of Him again;’ but, on the contrary, He shall hear oftener from me than ever.”

“*Thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress.*” The word “distress” literally means pressure, straitness, a narrow place, and it is a figurative term for calamity and trouble. The word “enlarged” literally means to widen, or make room. The Psalmist says that he

had been enlarged *in his distress*; not merely that he had been rescued *from* his trouble, but that he had been rescued *through* his trouble. *In his distress*, he had been *enlarged*. This has been the experience of many. It is said of Joseph in his captivity that he was “laid in irons,” or as the Prayer-Book Version has it, “the iron entered into his soul.” He had been a favorite at home, treated indulgently; he needed the iron in his character to strengthen it, and to fit him for the position that awaited him. The sorrows of the dungeon, the confinement of the prison, made him a better man, enlarged his nature. How many have been raised to grand summits of spiritual excellence by means of their suffering! It made them bigger men, with bigger hearts, with loftier hopes, and larger ideas of God, and truth, and duty, and the Universe. There are some aspects of the Divine character of which we catch a glimpse only from some narrow rock-ledge of trouble; we do not see them when we are basking in the sunshine of the valley, or when we drink in health from the breeze on the table-land; but when we climb on hands and knees the steep path leading to the cleft in the rock, then we get the vision we cannot obtain elsewhere. *Many men have to stand on graves before they can see heaven.* There are truths we cannot see until our eyes have been washed with tears, until sorrow has brought us into “fellowship with His sufferings.”

A large heart, throbbing with human sympathy, is one that has suffered pain. “Thou hast enlarged me,” given me freedom of soul, “when I was in distress.” What a large-souled man the Apostle Paul was. He had grown *through* his afflictions. “When I am *weak*, then am I *strong*;” when I am in straits, in a narrow place, then I find room; “I glory in infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon me.”

Such were the grounds of the Psalmist’s plea. Let us also appeal for mercy to the God of righteousness, and take the past as an argument. There has

been care in the past; there has been goodness in the past; Gethsemane is in the past; Calvary is in the past. Plead the past. Take the name of Jesus who was yesterday; and, thank God, He is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."

### THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

By A. J. F. BEHREND, D.D. [CONGREGATIONAL], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

*And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.*—Matt. xxv. 46.

THESE are serious and solemn words from the lips of Him who came to seek and to save the lost and to give His life a ransom for many; of whom it is said—who has said it Himself—that He was not sent to condemn the world, but that the world, through Him, might be saved. They are words which may be made to mean too much, but they may also be made to mean too little—treated as rhetorical exaggerations, and so rejected with scorn. It certainly will not do wholly to ignore them, for the teachings of Christ are a seamless garment, the clipping of which involves wholesale ruin. The promises of the Gospel are robbed of their authority when its warnings are shorn of their truth.

This entire chapter is a chapter of judgment. The parables of the ten virgins and of the talents teach that there will be a separation among those who have heard the Gospel, among those who go forth to meet the expected Bridegroom. Among the servants was one who had a talent, but who hid it in the earth. The lesson is the same. A nominal possession of grace does not insure salvation. We must put it to use. Thus the discriminating lines are made to run through the ranks of nominal Christendom. That, I take it, is the lesson of the first two parables. The Church contains the wheat and the

chaff, to be separated by the winnowing fan of judgment.

Then comes the closing paragraph, in which Christ deals with all who have never heard of Him, and who are surprised to hear Him say that they have ministered unto Him or have failed to do so. They are not all wicked. There are many righteous among them; blessed of the Father, heirs of the kingdom. Christ does not sanction the notion that all the heathen are condemned to eternal perdition. In this very chapter he teaches the reverse, because the closing sentiments have to do with His treatment of nations which have never heard of Him. They are gathered before Him, and He divides them as a shepherd divides the sheep from the goats. Thus the balances are held with a steady and impartial hand. Men may die without any knowledge of Christ and yet be saved, and men may call Christ Lord and yet be rejected by Him; but there is a separation of the righteous and the wicked, and the separation is eternal.

The doctrine of eternal punishment rests upon biblical foundation. There has been a tendency, in former periods, to give it undue prominence and associate it with lurid pictures and hard outlines. It made God find a savage delight in damning men and making that damnation inevitable by deliberately withholding redeeming and pardoning grace. It reveled in vivid representations of physical torture, and made the canvas hideous with distorted forms and faces. Michael Angelo's fresco of the "Final Judgment" in the Sistine Chapel is enough to give one the nightmare for the rest of his life. When I saw it, I said to myself: "It is a hideous lie from beginning to end. God is not a Torquemada nor a Duke of Alva. He treats no creature of His in that way."

I do not wonder at the revulsion in our day; the repudiation of the doctrine in its old form is in every way healthy and wholesome, but the revulsion is in danger of going to extremes. It needs to be checked by rational re-

straint. We may repudiate the forms under which justice is made to appear, and label them cruelty; but we must not label justice as a delusion and a snare. Without it the whole universe would be in anarchy. It is the safeguard of glory. The miscarriage of justice is the greatest political calamity, and the elimination of judgment would plunge the moral universe into a helpless anarchy. There must be eternal order, and eternal order is only another name for eternal judgment.

Stated in this simple form, I cannot conceive how any man, duly estimating the importance of righteousness and the anarchy of wickedness, can rest in an eternal order which is not based upon an eternal judgment.

I have referred to the present revulsion against the old forms in which the doctrine of eternal punishment was stated. It is equally significant that the old Universalism has been quietly abandoned all along the line. That made men enter heaven at death—the best and the worst. Restoration to holiness is now the watchword, the discipline being continued until the penitence and reformation of all has been secured. If all men must be restored to holiness in order to be eternally blessed, that makes the condemnation of sin a part of salvation and gives justice its imperial rights. The only question here is whether the certainty of universal repentance, here or hereafter, can be positively affirmed. I do not think that it can be, without denying or abridging the freedom of will and without challenging the plain statement of Jesus Christ.

It is more important, however, in my judgment, to separate the doctrine of eternal punishment as taught by Christ from certain notions which have no warrant either in Scripture or in reason.

First.—The doctrine of eternal punishment must be separated from the notion of a Divine vindictiveness. I have seen the statement in cold type that, in order to reveal His glory, God must have subjects of grace and victims of wrath.

Nothing can be more false. The State does not need criminals to give expression to its righteousness. By its reformatory institutions it seeks to reduce the criminal class, and would be glad to eliminate it altogether. The glory of the State is not in its penitentiaries, and God does not need sinners for the display of His justice. He hates sin with an infinite hatred. He does not permit or use it as an occasion for the display of His justice. He would rather not use His justice at all, for judgment is His strange work, from which He shrinks. His rule is one in which all things are so ordered as to check sin and to save the sinner. The bolt leaps only when it must; when it can no longer be held back. He is long-suffering. He has no pleasure in any man's death. He wills every man's salvation. He does not only say, "You can, if you want to," but He is active in His disposition toward every soul in which He has stamped His image. He wills that every man be saved. God loves all; Christ died for all; truth and the Holy Spirit are for all. There is plenary ability and gracious opportunity for all. There is a book of life; but, it has well been added, there is no book of death. When a soul is saved, all heaven is glad and God records the name; but when a soul is lost, God has no heart to write the name in a book kept for that purpose. We do read of names which are blotted out of the book of life, a thing which implies record; but we read of no erasure in the book of death, because there is no such book. God has but one book, the book of life. In that book every name is written in lines of blood, and when any name is blotted out, it is because the grace that saves has been wilfully and wickedly rejected. God wants no victim of His wrath. He does not need a hell to magnify His justice, and its presence must be a perpetual sorrow to Him, as we deplore the necessity which, in the interests of justice and public security, compels us to send men to Sing Sing. God is not vindictive.

Second.—The doctrine of eternal punishment must be separated from the notion of external infliction.

When the Bible speaks of stripes, we are to remember that the language is figurative. We are not to think of a whipping-post, to which men are tied while so many lashes are laid upon their backs. When the Scriptures speak of a prison of outer darkness and a bottomless pit, we are not to materialize these phrases as if they were definite places fitted up with all the means of inflicting penalties. The soul holds all these. Heaven and hell, the glory and the shame, are in us.

Hundreds of men have been thrust into prisons who were not branded thereby. It was no disgrace to Paul and Bunyan that they were flung into dungeons. It was no shame that Christ died on the cross undeserved. Suffering which a man knows is undeserved, or suffering which goes beyond the reach of what he knows he has deserved, cannot break his spirit. The soul is its own and its only chamber of torture.

Third.—The doctrine of eternal punishment must be separated from the notion that physical suffering is the penalty of sin.

One needs only to turn to the earlier sermons of the late Charles H. Spurgeon to find that the idea of real fire as connected with the doom of the lost was not confined to the ignorant. It was long shared by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike, and it has doubtless been tolerated by the latter. It ought to be said, however, that it has never been definitely formulated into any Protestant creed as having been authoritatively indorsed. It has been the private opinion of a few ardent preachers more renowned for zeal than learning, and the Christian faith cannot be held responsible for the eccentricities and fancies of some of its teachers. But the notion that eternal punishment involves physical torment should be emphatically repudiated. It is an utterly horrible notion to a sane mind. One cannot possibly imagine what

moral end can be secured by such infliction. It can do no good to those who suffer, and it can only produce a shock to those who witnessed it or had knowledge of it. It would provoke the pity of Heaven. Sorrow would take the place of condemnation, and the song would die out in a wail on the glassy sea itself. There is a form of eternal punishment which commends itself to my rational judgment, but the infliction of physical torment is something which fills me with unqualified horror, and the God who could do such a thing would be an omnipotent and unmitigated devil. Righteousness is not cruel.

But do we not read of the fire that cannot be quenched and the worm which dieth not, wailing and gnashing of teeth, outer darkness, hell's fire, bottomless pit, and the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone? Yes; but if you will look, you will see that it does not suggest the idea of torture. The hell of our English speech is simply the Greek word Gehenna, and the Greek word Gehenna was simply the Hebrew word Ge Hinnom, the Valley of Hinnom. And what was this Ge Hinnom? It was a deep and narrow ravine to the south of Jerusalem, and outside the city walls, where Ahaz had located the fire-gods, and where living sacrifices had been offered to Moloch. Its associations became so abominable that it was made the dumping-ground of the bodies of criminals, and the carcasses of beasts, and of everything that was unclean; and, to prevent the place from becoming a breeding-ground of pestilence, the fires were kept perpetually burning. No living thing was tortured there; only the putrid and loathsome were deposited there; and the fire was a simple sanitary provision. The idea, therefore, in the terrible imagery is simply that of separation of the unclean from the clean, of the unholy from the holy—the separation completed by forever putting an end to the corrupting power of the unclean and of the unholy. The fires of judgment are a purifying

agency, making an end to the power of sin. They are not a means of torture. Gehenna stands for the destruction of sin—putting an eternal end to its power and misery.

We reach the same conclusion by another path of reason. The imagery of the final judgment is local. It is drawn from the judicial methods then in vogue. Now listen to what I am going to say. These methods of judicial procedure, both in the examination and in the execution of the sentence, included physical torture of the most barbaric kind. The prisons were made living and loathsome tombs. One cannot now inspect them without indescribable horror. I entered only two of them in Rome and I had enough for a lifetime. It makes one sick and faint at heart to look at the instruments of torture freely used to extract confession; and when death was inflicted, it was done with a fiendish glee. Men and women were flayed, and torn asunder, and disemboweled, and crucified. It is too horrible for description.

Now, the judicial procedure must be taken as a whole if we are to read aright. So much of it has been incorporated in the biblical description. The larger part of it finds no place in the Bible. Please remember that. It is a fact of great significance, which has not been sufficiently considered, that torture finds no place in the examination by which eternal destiny is determined. Souls are not starved into confession. The truth is not extracted by thumb-screw and rack. They are self-convicted when they appear before the Judge. They have not been brought out of dungeons. They are not scourged in His presence to confess their sins.

The first great reform in the judiciary was the elimination of torture from the trial of the accused. The court-room was purged of it, the bench would have none of it; that feature has dropped out of our modern procedure, and with it gradually disappeared the means once freely employed in prisons to make the life of its victims one of physical tor-

ment. They are punished, but they are not starved and they are not flogged. It is not upon the body that the sentence is executed. Physical torture could hold its place in prisons only so long as it was legitimate in the court where the criminal was tried. When the judge repudiated it, the warden could not retain it, and we have come to brand it as indefensible cruelty.

Now, this argument as applied to God's judgment of men is simply this: Physical suffering is not used to secure the confession of guilt and the conviction of the guilty. It cannot, therefore, enter into the penalty. The judgment itself is always represented as a free moral process without the use of physical force resulting in self-conviction, and that makes it impossible for physical torture to enter into the penalty. Torture is something which has no place in God's moral economy. He destroys the power of sin, but He does not put the sinner on the rack.

Fourth.—The doctrine of eternal punishment must be separated from the notion that the penalty is conscious and continuous mental agony and torment.

This more refined theory is as baseless as that of physical suffering. The penalty is declared to be what? Death. The wages of sin is death—a second death. The first death affects only the body. It does not affect the soul. The second death is represented as affecting soul and body alike, and death is not a conscious state of suffering of any kind. What is death? We define physical death as the separation of the soul from the body; but that is not death. That is only the immediate cause of death, that produces what we call death in the body. The first or physical death does not touch the soul at all. It only affects the body. The separation of the soul from the body produces death in the body, but the separation itself is not death. The separation produces death. And what is this death in the body? It is the stagnation of the bodily organs: the heart ceases to act, the muscles become rigid, the nerves lose their sensi-

tiveness. Eternal death, we say, is eternal separation of the soul from God. No, that is not it at all. That is only the immediate and the eternal cause of the soul's death. Death affects the soul; the separation of God from the soul or the soul from God is the immediate cause of what is called the second death. What is it, then? In its effects upon the soul it can only be the stagnation, the collapse, of its power; the darkening of the mind, the hardening of the sensibilities, the searing of the conscience, the weakening of the will—to become past feeling and past moral endeavor. That is the awful ruin of the soul. So far from being true that men become more sensitive as they become more wicked, the very reverse is the case. It is the youthful criminal who feels his disgrace most keenly. The old offender becomes hardened; his conscience does not trouble him. There is hope for a man so long as he is morally sensitive. His degradation is most complete and hopeless when he has become totally indifferent. Tell me, where is manhood or womanhood in ruin? Not among those who blush for their shame; not among those who are the victims of remorse. Such people are not utterly dead. The saddest spectacle on earth is a soul which is absolutely content with its degradation, which feels no shame and which has ceased to care for good. The absence of mental suffering in such cases is only an index of the darkness and death into which such a soul has fallen. We speak of such people as wrecks, in whom all that is noble has suffered collapse. They are stranded on the beach of life.

An eternal death can only mean one thing—the hopeless and eternal wreck of the soul, in whose awful crash reason, sensibility, conscience, and will go down together. It is moral annihilation. It is not ceasing to be; it is not endless physical torment; it is not conscious eternal shame and remorse. The soul is dead. If there be anything sadder than that, I cannot imagine what it is. The Lord preserve us all from that.

Once more. The doctrine of eternal punishment must be separated from the disputed question whether probation ends at the first death, or at the final judgment, or whether it is indefinite.

Some say that God never shuts the door; that pardon and salvation will forever remain possible. The debate at this point can never reach a settled conclusion, for the argument is conducted upon purely speculative grounds. If I were asked the hypothetical question, Suppose in the endless future, a number of lost souls should sincerely repent and plead for mercy, would Jesus Christ close his eyes and strike down those hands? I should answer promptly and emphatically, no; but I cannot see that there is any great relief in such a solution. It remains to be shown that impenitence gradually wears away; that hardness of heart disappears in time, instead of becoming more obdurate. The known facts are all in the other direction. The probabilities of reformation diminish as men grow older, and there is nothing to warrant the idea that in millions of years more there will be a mysterious grace which is less active in earthly life; and even the suggested possibility admitted, it would not follow that ultimately all souls would repent and be saved. The awful fact of the judgment, involving the possibility of the soul's eternal ruin, remains, however, far in the future. It cannot be eliminated from the New Testament; and so I say to you, with perfect frankness, that I could be a Universalist only by ceasing to be a Christian minister and by ceasing to bear the Christian name. I do not mean that a man must believe in eternal punishment in order to be a Christian; far from it. I know a great many whom I believe to be the very best of Christian men and women, who do not believe in eternal punishment at all; who believe absolutely in universal salvation. I am only speaking for myself. I do say that, so far as I can see, there is an eternal, illogical contradiction between the recognition of Christ

as an authoritative teacher and the positive affirmation that there is no such thing as hopeless and eternal ruin of the soul. Jesus Christ says there is. That, for me, ends the controversy. I find no pleasure in the thought. I would rather it were not so. Reduce the number as you will, bring it down to ten, or even to one, and my heart is oppressed. It is not the number which startles me, but the awful fact itself; the idea of an eternally ruined soul, an unfeeling wreck. In fact, I am not sure that a reduction in numbers does not aggravate the burden. It does to me at least. That one soul had a mother, and that mother's heart must forever carry the sorrow before the great white throne, for heaven cannot mean oblivion and the death of natural affection. I would rather that all men were saved, and I believe that God prefers that. He shrinks from blotting out any man's name from the book of life, and when it is blotted out, I believe there are tears all over the vacant space. It must fill His heart with deep and eternal grief. He is not anxious to condemn one man to eternal death, but sin remains sin, and God Himself cannot prevent the death of the soul which will not repent and abandon its wilful wickedness. I do not know any one who has placed the matter more aptly than Dean Alford, who holds a deservedly high place among modern New Testament scholars, when he says: "There is election to life; but there is no reprobation to death. A book of life, but no book of death; no hell for men, because the blood of Jesus hath purchased life for all, but they who will serve the devil must share with him in the end." God saves all whom He can save from sin, and redeems to holiness only such as hunger and thirst after righteousness. He can save only those who want to be saved. The eternal ruin of a soul, therefore, is something for which He is no way responsible, except so far as He is responsible for making us free and responsible agents; or, to quote again from Dean Alford, "All

man's salvation is of God, and all his condemnation from himself." God leaves nothing undone that can be done to save every man, and only deliberate and persistent wickedness can doom a soul to eternal death.

You see that this somewhat reverses the old doctrine. Instead of saying that all men are born under the curse of eternal perdition and are snatched from the awful death only by the grace of God, we say—and we say it by appeal to the apostolic teaching—we say that all men are born the natural heirs of eternal life by the grace of God in Jesus Christ, from which nothing can separate them except their own wilful and persistent impenitence. We do not drop into grace by the election of God; we are in it by His eternal election. We drop out of it by our wilful impenitence and disobedience. Let the old and the young hear to-day and respond to it with gladness. You have been born into the kingdom; holiness and heaven are your birthright. These are what God made you for. These are what He wants you to have. Do not wait until death comes; do not wait until age impairs your powers; do not wait until manhood and womanhood burden you with care; bring the dew of your youth to the Lord Jesus Christ; come while you are boys and girls. The way is harder the longer you wait. The very best and wisest thing which any one can do is, with the very first knowledge that we are sinners and that we are wicked, to come to our pardoning God and give Him our hearts, and he who comes will not be cast out.

The theme upon which I have spoken to you this morning is the saddest and the darkest upon which man can dwell. I have spoken with a painful reluctance. I cannot believe that all the longing of my heart for the salvation of all men is due to an unsanctified will or to a presumptuous reason. I know it is not. It is greatest when Jesus Christ lays the spell of His authority upon me, for His life and His tears have authority as well as His words; when

I think of Him as the Son of Man, I cannot think of Him as indifferent to any soul, or as passing any by. He came to seek and to save the lost. He died for all. I read of no election—others may, but I do not—I read of no election which draws its discriminating lines without pity for those whom it ignores, justifying its action on the ground of pure sovereignty. The sovereign, who is He? The Eternal Father. The honor of His fatherhood is involved, In the moral economy which He has established He has a great deal more to lose than I have if He does not deal fairly with every soul that He has created through fatherhood. I interpret His sovereignty through fatherhood. He needs no victims of His wrath. He wants not even one. He has no pleasure in the death of any. It is an economy of universal redemption over which He presides. It is a universal election unto eternal life, which is the place of His sovereign rule. It cannot be anything else, or He is not a father. All souls are made to be saved, and one soul just as much as another. I cannot believe anything else when I face the Father in the Son of Man, and yet the terrible shadow will not lift. Infinite love, dying on the cross that all might be redeemed, enduring and fulfilling the purpose of universal redemption, He declares that the soul may sink into the sepulcher of an eternal death.

Upon how many that doom may fall, I do not care to ask. Numbers do not enter into the perplexity and pain with which I confront the problem of man's eternal destiny. It is not a question of arithmetic. It is a question of morals. It is a question of parental treatment. If I were dealing with the apostles' testimony, and if I were dealing with what David, or Paul, or even John said—for they were men, after all—I might say to myself, the full counsel of God does not appear in what they have declared. There is but one witness whose words I cannot deal with as rhetorical and exaggerated. This is the testimony of Jesus Christ, which checks and curbs

my speculation, and He checks me because His love is so intense. My love for men cannot be compared to His; my dread of their possible ruin is as a point in an indefinite line, as a single drop in all the seas, when measured against His; and it is the authority of infinite and self-sacrificing love which makes His word final to me; and He tells me that there is an outer darkness from which the soul never returns, a second death from which there is no resurrection. The soul may fall into hopeless ruin; it may defy all that infinite mercy can do to win it to holiness, and even then I am sure that the doom is reluctantly permitted. It is not a positive infliction in the form of external penalty. It is not endless physical torture nor endless conscious mental suffering; it is death. It is the soul's collapse to its eternal wreck and ruin. The utmost that God and Christ can do is done to prevent it. It is the awful exception in the Divine economy; and however few the graves in which dead souls are buried, the Divine pity will never cease to sorrow.

---

### THE CITY OF GOD.

BY F. S. GUMBART, D. D. [BAPTIST],  
BOSTON, MASS.

Hebrews xi. and Revelation xxi.

OUR theme is the City of God, its future hope and immediate lesson.

Probably there is no doctrine in all the word of God, no doctrine that has ever found a place in our various systems of theology, concerning which there have been, and are at present, more differences of opinion than this, the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and the events associated with His second coming. Whereas the word of God is very emphatic so far as the actual fact of the second coming of our Lord is concerned and the establishment of His kingdom in its ultimate and eternal glory, yet, so far as the details of His coming are concerned, there is very much room for speculation, if we are

inclined to speculate, and wherever there is so much room for speculation, it is natural that various minds should have various opinions.

It is somewhat remarkable that among the people of God there are two classes that seem to be so widely apart, particularly concerning this coming of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. On the one hand there are those—and I say it with all Christian respect for their opinions—who seem, to my mind, to over-emphasize this doctrine. It is the one doctrine of all others which they preach and teach, and which they are glad to listen to. It is more important, evidently, than the doctrine of the atonement; more important among some, even, than the salvation of men.

On the other hand, there are those who, strangely enough, seem to regard this doctrine as of no practical and immediate importance. Again and again, men have said to me—I myself have argued the same way in years gone by—what difference does it make whether Christ will come in one way or another, at one time or another? What difference does it make whether I understand this doctrine or think about it or not? If I am saved, I am saved; and if I am lost, I am lost; if I am to go to heaven I will; and if not, I won't.

Well, my dear brethren, I want to say to you, if in your estimation you are saved only for the purpose of going to heaven, you have a very narrow and poor idea of what salvation really embraces. As well might the Jews of old have argued concerning the coming of the Messiah that it would make no difference as to when He would come; that it would make no difference as to what He would do when He would come, and that the Jew need not trouble his mind about something that, so far as he was concerned, might be far, far in the future. But one significant fact must not be overlooked; that in the Old Testament, on every occasion of backsliding, on every occasion of spiritual degeneration, God sought always to win the people back again to right-

eousness and piety by the emphasis and reiteration of the fact that a Redeemer would come, that the Messiah, the anointed of God, would surely, one day, make His appearance; although God Himself knew, when He inspired the prophet thus to speak, that many centuries would yet pass before the Messiah should come. And so for us to-day, it is very important that we should catch the spirit of this prophecy and that we should recognize the fact that no system of theology, no system of Bible interpretation, no creed, no system of religious belief, is perfect which ignores the glorious consummation of the work of the blessed Saviour as I have endeavored to read it to you from the word of God this morning.

We must remember that this thought of the second coming of Christ and the establishment of the City of God, as it is given to us in the New Testament, is not an appendix to the Bible. It is not an appendix to the thought of God. It is simply the normal development of the thought of God. And as a body is not complete without a head, so no system of religious belief that exalts the Lord Jesus Christ and claims Him as the Messiah, is complete which ignores these prophecies concerning the City of God. The Christology of the Bible is very clear, unless we are among those who have eyes and do not see, unless we belong to that class of men who have ears and do not hear, and whose understanding has been darkened. At first, to be sure, the Christology of the Bible appears but as a faint, glimmering light far, far away; very indefinite, but growing more and more clear and more specifically defined as it draws nearer to us, and as we ourselves grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Prophecy, like history, must oftentimes be read backward in order that we may understand its significance. For example, in the book of Genesis we have that very faint and indefinite prophecy which tells us that the seed of the woman shall bruise the

serpent's head; but, in bruising and destroying the serpent, he shall bruise his own heel. Now notice from this faint indication of the Christ who was to come, so faint indeed that we would scarcely recognize it if it were not for the light which the New Testament throws upon it, how gradually this thought develops in the word of God. First, as we come to the prophets, we find that the seed of the woman was to be a mighty conqueror; that is, that He was to be as wise and just as He was to be powerful; that He was to be a great King; that all other kings were to be subject to Him. We find, moreover, that He was to be peculiarly anointed of God, and that God had given to Him the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession. Later still we find that this seed of the woman was to be born of a virgin, and that He was to be called Emmanuel, God with us. Later we find that this seed of the woman was to be born of a virgin as no other man had ever been born of a woman, thus causing men to look upward for His origin as they never looked upward for the origin of any other man, linking His life with the life of God in a peculiar sense, and putting a special and unique significance upon the fact that He was the anointed of God. Then we see this Lord of life going forth into the world, and as we listen to His teaching we discover that the regeneration, the salvation of the world and the establishment of God's kingdom on the earth is not to be accomplished along secular, but along spiritual lines. By and by we see Christ suffering and dying upon the cross, we see Him carried to the tomb, we behold Him as He rises from the dead and then ascends into glory. Later we are taught that this Man, who died for the sins of men, who arose from the grave and ascended to the Father, was with God in the beginning, and that He was God. John tells us that He was the real Creator Himself, and that by Him all things were made, and for Him all things were made. Then we see Christ as the right

hand of God the Father, superintending all the affairs of the Church on earth, turning all the deeds of men into the channels which will bring the glorious consummation to pass for which all true children of God are earnestly and expectantly looking. What next? We see Him in the clouds, shining in the splendor of His glorified life, and suddenly the heavens rolling back and Jesus Christ coming again in the glory of the Father, with all the holy angels, to judge the quick and the dead.

So you see that the Christology of the Bible is distinctly revealed, if we shall search with spiritual understanding, and with the help of the Holy Spirit.

Now, I cannot tell how much this may mean for you, that Jesus Christ is coming again. It may mean very much; it may cause your heart to beat faster; it may flush the cheek with glorious expectation, or somehow it may cause you to shrink back and question whether there is any joy in that thought for you or not. It depends largely upon three things.

In the first place, it depends upon whether or not you have real knowledge of the fact that Jesus Christ is coming again. It is wonderful how much some people who have listened to the preaching of the Gospel for thirty or forty years can dodge. Not long ago I was called out to see a brother who was dying; a man who had been a member of a Methodist church for more than twenty years. I mention the denomination to which he belonged, because we all know that if there is any Church which emphasizes the work of the Holy Spirit, it is the Methodist Church, and yet this man did not know what the Holy Spirit was. It troubled and perplexed him to understand this matter; that there really was a Holy Spirit, and that it was something more than mere poetry, than a figure of speech. So there are scores of people who, while they know thoroughly that Jesus Christ is coming again, yet do not know it as a reality; it seems something poetic; it does not seem a reality. In the second

place, it depends upon whether you appreciate the fact of our Saviour's second coming or not; and in the third place, it depends upon your individual and conscious relation to the blessed Saviour.

I remember, when I was a boy, at the close of the war, one of my playmates announced one day, his eyes shining like two stars, his cheeks flushed with excitement, calling to us, "My father is coming home! My father is coming home!" For three long years that boy's father had been away from home. None of the boys had ever seen that boy's father. We were too young to remember it, even if we had; but day by day he emphasized and reiterated that thought with so much enthusiasm that there was kindled in every heart an expectation to see that father, and every time we saw the boy, the first question was, "Is your father home? Has your father come home?" And I remember how I took that boy and made him give a solemn promise to me that when his father came home he would bring him to my house; and one of the stipulations was that he should come in his soldier's clothes. So the contract was signed, sealed and delivered that he was to bring his father to my house. By and by the glad day came when I saw that soldier in my house, in his soldier's clothes. I brought him my drum and made him beat that drum over and over again until I was so fired with the martial spirit that I was really sorry the war was over. I wanted to be a soldier. My heart was thrilled to think that I was so highly honored. Here was a live soldier, dressed in soldier's clothes, in my house and beating my drum. But what was my joy and how little were my heart-beatings compared with the joy of that little fellow who sat on the floor at his father's feet, and with one arm around him, looking up into his face, saying, "My father, my father, my father."

And so I say, whether we shall be happy or not in the contemplation of

this glorious thought that Jesus Christ is coming again, depends upon the emphasis with which we are able to say, "My Jesus, my Jesus, my Jesus."

Now notice that in connection with the second coming of Christ is the thought of victory. When Jesus Christ comes again He will not leave behind Him a trail of blood, and darkness, and pestilence, and poverty, and weeping. He shall come in glorious majesty, and every tear shall be wiped away, and there shall be no more sighing. No one shall ever again say, I am hungry, or I am thirsty, or tired, or sick; there shall be a glorious victory.

The Church of Jesus Christ, or rather Christianity, is oftentimes criticized thus: Some one says, "I have read the glorious promises made by your Saviour. Christianity has been in the world nearly two thousand years, and yet, when I look over the world and see things as they are, and compare them with the promises made by your Saviour, I begin to question the trustworthiness of your religion, to question the reliability of that grand old Book that you talk so much about, and that I have been urged to believe since I was a little child. I do not see that the Kingdom of God is established on earth to-day any more than it was centuries ago, yet nearly two thousand years have passed."

My dear friends, note one thing in the Word of God. There is no promise anywhere between the two lids that the glorious consummation of the Kingdom of our Saviour will ever take place until Jesus Christ shall come again; I mean, in its absolute perfection. And notice this thought in connection with it. That when Jesus Christ shall come again there shall be established through Him—I cannot say how, I have not to do with the details this morning—the City of God, the New Jerusalem, the Heavenly Commonwealth, and all the nations of the earth shall walk in light, and righteousness shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

I want you to notice this thought as

it develops: the thought of the Heavenly City as it is revealed to us in the Word of God. Remember that when Abraham was called, he went to dwell in tabernacles, in tents; but, as we find in the New Testament, he looked for a city, he hoped for it—it was far off in the future—he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God. God was not only to be the architect in general, the One who should plan the city, but He Himself was to be the artificer of every detail that should enter into the glorious construction. Abraham dwelt in tents, but he looked for a city as our forefathers looked for a nation, glorious, triumphant, and powerful, and rich.

By and by we see the city of Jerusalem, a city having foundations; we see the Temple, and the worship of God therein; we behold Solomon the wise as king. Here we have, however, only the type, for, in a little while, this city is wiped away.

Then we hear Jesus Christ talking about the house of His Father, in which are many mansions; and later on, in the Epistles, we find that we are not citizens of this country, but that our citizenship is in heaven. We are citizens of another commonwealth, even the commonwealth of the eternal and majestic God.

By and by we get a view of that city, with its gates of pearl, with its streets of gold, with its river of crystal, with its ivory throne, with its heavenly and happy population, and once more we see the heavens open, and that city that hath foundations of all manner of precious stones, and whose light is God, the City of God, the New Jerusalem.

Now, mark you, that even as individual Christians, when they accept the Lord Jesus Christ, are a new creation, so this commonwealth of the Almighty God, in its perfect and glorious consummation, is to be a new creation, something absolutely new; not simply a development, although development has something to do with the fact. When in the Acts of the Apostles we

read of the final restitution of all things, we are not simply to think that God is going to put the world and to put men back to where Adam was before he sinned, but God is going to lift us up by His grace, and by the power of the anointed Christ. God is going to lift us up to that high plane of spiritual life and development and perfection to which Adam himself would have attained and the human race would have attained, provided Adam had never sinned.

Now this is, so far as the hope is concerned, a glorious hope indeed, but we must remember always that every prophecy, especially every prophecy of this kind, whereas it has a future hope, has also an immediate lesson. That is to say, by way of illustration—although this is not a thought I shall attempt to develop—when we have been born again through faith in Jesus Christ, by the Holy Spirit, when we have received the resurrection promise that we shall receive a body like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able to subordinate all things unto Himself, what follows? When we look up for the new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, what follows? Not simply the expectation of a future hope, but an immediate lesson; namely, that we who look for such things should be peculiar in our manner of life. In other words, we who have this hope in us should adjust ourselves by the grace of God to those principles by which that life, in its glorious consummation, shall be governed. In this day of nationalism and socialism, in this day of prophecies concerning new eras, in this day of Coxey's Army and a score of other things, it is imperative that we should recognize the fact that society can only be lifted up to the ideal, as by the grace of God, through Jesus Christ, we bring society in line with those principles which shall govern that glorious commonwealth of God in its perfection when the day of God shall shine upon this darkened world of ours. We must

not, in our plans and in our theories, forget to emphasize the fact that if the world is ever to be purified, and if social problems are ever to be solved, it must be through the reception of Jesus Christ. It can only be as Jesus Christ is recognized as King and Ruler, not merely of other nations, but of our own glorious nation.

The Church is oftentimes charged with being faithless to her trust so far as the working people are concerned. Only the other day, even in the city of Boston, it was boldly said, in a representative public gathering, that again and again the working people had stretched out their arms in appeal to the Church of Jesus Christ, and that the Church of Jesus Christ had turned her back upon the masses and particularly upon the working people, and had nothing but a deaf ear for their cry for help. I need not say that this is untrue. I need not emphasize in this presence the fact that only ignorance, or prejudice, or carelessness, or maliciousness could talk like that. The Church has no way by which she can compel men to adjust their lives in line with the beatitudes of Christ. The Church of Jesus Christ has no way by which, through the use of a hypodermic syringe, she can inject moral and spiritual vitality into society. This can only be done as society, through the individual and collectively, shall recognize the name and the power and the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

We hear much said about hard times, and slums, and tenement-houses, and dark alleys, and sweat-shops, and forty other evils. We hear much said about these things, as though the Church of Jesus Christ had only to wave her magic wand, and presto! all things would be changed, and dark alleys would develop of themselves into broad and flowery boulevards, and the slums into fountains of righteousness, and dark tenements into well-lighted palaces, and sweaters would develop into philanthropists and public benefactors on a large scale; but the trouble is, the

Church has no magic wand. But the Church has a magic Gospel, and as she faithfully proclaims that Gospel, and as men faithfully receive that Gospel, many of these problems which now so vex all will ultimately take care of themselves by the grace of God.

We may say nice things about Jesus, and our magazine writers may tell us how beautifully and lovingly some people talk about Jesus, but I want to say to you, in the name of God, be not deceived. Christ Jesus will not be flattered. The only way to honor Him is to take Him into our hearts, make room for the blessed Christ, make room for Him in our homes, make room for Him in our business, make room for Him at the ballot-box; make room for Christ, and these things shall all work out for the glory of God and for the perfection, and comfort, and happiness, and development of the human race.

If I want to raise a crop of corn, I plant such seed and I work along such lines as will be the most conducive toward giving me what I want; and if, in society, I want to see righteousness, and justice, and love, and brotherhood, and all these other things prevail, I must plant such seed and work along such lines as, according to the promises of God, will be sure to bring the results for which I am looking, and working, and praying, and sacrificing.

Men talk as if the Church of Jesus Christ could regenerate society by the enactment of certain laws. I believe in good laws in city life as well as in religious life, and I believe that the law is a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ; but it is one thing to have a schoolmaster and another thing to have a pupil who will take advantage of that schoolmaster's teaching and do as he is told. To talk as though the Church of Jesus Christ could, by her influence and power, enact laws by which these evils of society might be cured without getting at the heart of things, is like advising the skinning of a smallpox patient in order to get rid of the pustulous

eruption. What society needs is to recognize the fact that sin is in the world.

It makes me sick at heart when I read constantly in our magazines how the Church of Jesus Christ must do better, and live more righteously, and recognize its cross, and not a word about society doing the same thing; not a word. Sin is in the world, and it is only, as by the grace of God, through the might and power and wisdom of Jesus Christ, we crush the serpent's head and make away with sin and give place unto Jesus Christ—only then can society be permanently regenerated and developed.

Now, at last, just a word in view of all that has been said and suggested. What is the immediate and imperative duty of every individual in this house this morning if not that you, for yourself, man, woman and child, whoever you may be, recognize the Christ and take Him into your heart as your personal, individual Saviour?

The other day I received a typewritten communication from some national reform society, the name of which I forbear to mention at the present time, in which the writer, a professor of sociology, declared that for nearly two thousand years the Church had been making a mistake in striving to reach the individual. This man went on to say—and I am sorry to say he did not know as much about the Bible as he did of sociology—that men must be saved in groups, in communities. Blessed be God, there is a grain of truth in it all, but it has a mask over it. Whole nations shall be born in a day, praise God for that, but God never saves men in groups. God saves groups of men, but He saves them as individuals. Every man must come for himself; though he comes with a hundred thousand others, he must come for himself, saying, "Dear Jesus, I personally take Thee as my Saviour." Whole cities, whole nations may press into the Kingdom of God in a single day, but every man for himself must say, "Lord, I believe that

Thou art Jesus the Christ, the Son of God, my Saviour."

My brother, my sister, how much do you long for the coming of God's Kingdom, and for the establishment of the Heavenly Commonwealth? Let me say to you, vain, vain in the sight of God shall every endeavor be that fails to recognize Jesus as your personal, individual Saviour, for no man can honor God that honoreth not the Christ. What say you this morning?

The great question is not, "Shall the Congress of the United States recognize any Christian amendment that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of this people?" The great question that presses upon every soul here this morning is, Will you, individually, recognize Jesus Christ as your King, your Saviour? Thus shall your own soul be lifted out of darkness into the marvelous light of God's redeeming love, and in that proportion shall society be purified and the principles of Jesus Christ obtain among the sons of men.

---

### THE DIVINE FATHERHOOD.

BY REV. FRANK W. CROWDER [METHODIST EPISCOPAL], TÜBINGEN, GERMANY.

*Our Father, which art in heaven.*—  
Matt. vi. 9.

THE last four words of the text do not affect the doctrine of the omnipresence of God. Because our Saviour in this most beautiful of all forms directs men's prayers to God in heaven, it cannot be concluded that God is not elsewhere and everywhere present.

These words may show an accommodation on the part of Jesus to a disposition in man to locate all his conceptions. In the poverty of our thought and the feebleness of our imagination we attach our ideas to external things lest they elude and escape us. The painter strives to place his ideal upon canvas; the sculptor carves his in marble; the singer sends his out in sound-waves,

We must in a sense objectify our ideas in order to communicate them. The teacher uses the blackboard; the traveler from home, the wire of the telegraph. We are bound to matter. It is seldom that thought is communicated from mind to mind without the aid of eye, ear, or sense of touch. Our slavery is shown in our clinging to matter and material things as seen, heard and felt in the formation of all our conceptions. We think with imaginative eyes, ears, and hands. We locate and objectify our conceptions not merely because of habit, but because it is impossible for us to escape altogether in our highest thoughts and most lofty imaginings this physical environment, which is at the same time our limitation and our aid. When our minds, because of matter, grow tired, we fall back upon material things for rest, and around them group the thoughts which must have such an anchorage. So in our prayers to a God that is everywhere, we instinctively conceive of Him as in one place.

Why that place is heaven is easily explained on the ground that according to Scripture there the seat of God's power is, that there is the center of His glorious rule. Doubtless our looking above us for heaven simply shows our inclination to associate God with the greatest things in the physical universe, with those things which awe us into silence and wonder. We look from the ordinary around us to the extraordinary above us; we look from the known within our reach to the unknown beyond our reach; we look from the finite at our feet to the infinite above our heads, as well as above the comprehension of our intellect. Christ, feeling in His manhood all the limitations of our humanity, and looking up through that humanity, prayed, "Our Father, which art in heaven."

I. Truth of the Fatherhood of God.

Whence do we get this great truth? How may we be sure that it is no conjecture, no chimera? For centuries it was not known, and into millions of

minds searching for the highest truth it never found entrance.

1. It was not a truth of natural religion.

Before the revelation of the only true and living God came to men they read His revelation in the skies above them, and in the earth beneath them. To many the heavens declared the glory of God, and the firmament showed His handiwork. From the stars shone His glory; from the flowers was exhaled His goodness; the brook and the breeze sounded His praise; and the regularity and order of all forms of life showed forth His providence. Men looked through Nature up to Nature's God. But many and various as were the revelations of natural religion, it could not and did not make known to men this great truth of the Fatherhood of God. This is evident:

(1) From the reason of the case. Even should there have been among the truths taught by natural religion all of the elements of the doctrine of God's fatherhood, it would have been impossible for that idea to have been communicated to man without the aid of a further revelation. The principal elements that enter into our conception of fatherhood are love, goodness, truth, and providence. That is, our idea of an ordinary human father is, that he is a loving father, a good father, a true father, and a father that provides for his children. But these ideas combined together could never have placed before men's minds the conception of fatherhood. There are other relations of life to which all these elements are essential, but which by no means approximate that of the father in its uniqueness and preciousness. The chemist in his analysis of the seed disintegrates it into various elements, but in his synthesis of these elements he cannot produce the life of the seed though he avail himself of all the arts of his science. So the man who has never received the revelation of the Fatherhood of God may become cognizant of the most beautiful truths of natural religion concerning

God, but he cannot conceive of this greatest one save by a happy guess, which guess itself is beyond the reach of his imagination.

(2) From the fact of the case.

That the doctrine of God as a father is not a truth of natural religion is apparent from the fact of the case. Universal fatherhood implies universal brotherhood. If God is the father of men, then men are brethren. If men hold the idea of the Fatherhood of God, then they must of necessity hold the idea of the brotherhood of the race. But the testimony of history most emphatically denies the prevalence or even presence of this idea in the world before the coming of Christ. The Greeks believed in their common origin from Helen, but they looked upon men of other nations as inferior beings, giving them the name of "barbarians." The Romans called all other men by the name "hostes," "enemies." The Jewish race regarded the neighboring nations with a scorn and derision which in their days of affliction grew into an intense hatred of the Gentiles. Therefore it is impossible that the world had received the doctrine of God's fatherhood, because they had not the conception of the brotherhood of men.

2. This doctrine, however, is a truth of Scripture. In the Old Testament it is very faintly and scarcely more than prophetically revealed. In Ps. ciii. 13 we read: "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." But we read our New Testament idea of God as a father into this passage. Three of its parts fall away from our conception—the fact of mere similarity as against the actual relationship, the emotion of pity in God as contrasted with a helpful compassion, and the emotion of fear in men as against that of filial love. In Isaiah, the most evangelical of the prophets, we have a nearer approach to this wonderful truth. Chap. lxiii. 16 reads: "Doubtless Thou art our father;" but the very word "doubtless" seems to imply a doubt. Newman somewhere

in his "Grammar of Assent" has given expression to the thought that a man never says he is sure of a thing without implying his uncertainty of it. Then, further on (lxiv. 8) the prophet seems to come into the full assurance of the truth, when he bursts out with, "But now, O Lord, Thou art our father"; but he immediately falls back into the conception of God as simply his creator when he adds, "We are the clay and Thou our potter; and we all are the work of Thy hand."

In the New Testament, however, we find the full, clear, and explicit revelation of the Fatherhood of God. He is no longer simply the God of power, of awfulness, of majesty, and men His fearful and awestruck servants; but under the new dispensation God is the father of men, the loving and approachable one, and we are His children. "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, 'Abba, Father'" (Rom. viii. 15). "Our Father, which art in heaven." "The Spirit Itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. viii. 16). "Beloved, now are we the sons of God" (1 John iii. 1). In the breaking of a new day, the great and wonderful truth stands forth prominent among the most prominent. As the Sun of righteousness floods every relation of God to man with His light, this greatest of all stands before us like a glistening statue on the plain, for in Christ's assumption of human flesh the Fatherhood of God received its clearest exemplification.

## II. Ground of the doctrine.

What is the ground of this relationship which we sustain to God and which God sustains to us? Is there any reason for it? Why is it that God should recognize or should institute such relationship? There are three grounds that may be suggested.

1. In the relation between the natures of God and mankind. Gen. i. 27 reads, "So God created man in His own image,

in the image of God created He him." By this creation of man in the image of God is understood a resemblance in intellect, and a resemblance in righteousness and true holiness. Man inherited a Godlike nature. But the Fall blotted out the resemblance in righteousness and holiness. There still remained in him the intellectual image of God, born by no other creature on earth. In this he is related to God, and the relationship affords some foundation for the Fatherhood of God. Man is a great and noble being, with lofty reason, with soaring ambitions, and an imagination penetrating beyond the confines of his physical environment. "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him; and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?" Then follows close the answer to the question: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the gods, and hast crowned him with glory and honor" (Ps. viii. 4, 5). On this ground all men stand. Here all meet on a common level, no matter whether great or small, worthy or unworthy, righteous or sinful. In this relationship we all share, and God is the common father of the race.

### 2. In spiritual relationship.

We find a deeper ground for the Fatherhood of God in the spiritual relationship sustained to Him by all true believers. In them has been restored the image of righteousness and true holiness lost in the fall. Hence they are more truly the children of God, bearing, as they do, a closer resemblance to their Parent. Not only are they His natural children, but they are His spiritual sons, having been "born of God," possessing a new spiritual life, which is the direct offspring of the Divine Spirit. Adoption follows after, and is partly consequent upon regeneration. As extension diminishes with an increase of intension, so here, as the ground of the relationship deepens, the number of the related ones become fewer.

### 3. In God's infinite love.

The deepest, and in fact the only

sufficient ground of this relationship, is found in the infinite love of God for the human race. In spite of the resemblance, intellectual and spiritual, existing between God and the purest and holiest human being, the contrast between them is so overwhelmingly great that here we cannot find a sufficient ground. God is so great, man is so small; God is so holy, man is so vile; God is so wise, man is so foolish; that we must look elsewhere for the attitude He sustains toward us. And where can we find it save in His love? "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God" (1 John iii. 1.) Nothing but this can explain His condescension from loftiest heights to lowest depths; nothing but this could have induced Him to give His name to a race of sinful creatures and make them members of His royal family; nothing but love, infinite, wonderful love.

### III. Conceived of only in the light of the human.

The Fatherhood of God is conceived of only in the light of the human relationship. There is a probable explanation of "Which art in heaven," which was omitted from the introduction, that here it might have its greatest force. It is that the purpose of these words is to distinguish the Heavenly Father from the earthly parent. The relation came to men so suddenly as to be unperceived at once in its fulness—"Our Father." No doubt immediately the thought of each of those disciples reverted to that father upon whose knee he had played in early childhood, and who in his growing years was the synonym of all that was strong, loving, and protecting. The thought, there held in suspension, took a tremendous sweep upon the Saviour's uttering the next words, "Which art in heaven." It was a flight of the mind from earth to heaven, but a flight in which the mind took with it all the beautiful and tender conceptions that clustered around that word, "father." Those four

words, once realized, transferred every loving and tender quality of the father of their childhood to God, and, in doing so, opened up to the human vision a world of love and tenderness in the Divine character which must otherwise of necessity have been closed to them. The human relation was so unique, so precious, that only in its light could that powerful God, far off in the eyes of humanity, have been invested with an anxious and loving interest in the fallen human race. This side of God would be inconceivable to men were it not for the character He now bears in His relationship to them; and now His name appeals to every sentiment and emotion in them, though multiplied manifold in force, that the mention of their earthly parent awakens. Thus men looked up through this human relationship and saw God as He had never been revealed to them before. It was an opening in the skies of their ignorance and narrowness, through which a vision of God's love and beauty met their upturned eyes; and had there been no earthly fatherhood as a guide to their conceptions, this relation must forever have been closed to them.

But after all it was only an intimation, a foretaste, of a fuller love and goodness in the Divine nature than man, with all assistance from human relationship, can conceive of in this life. The vista reveals beauty in the distance—a sheen upon the strip of plain, a glory upon the edge of the lake, an ethereality in the patch of blue seen through it, and shows more of beauty and gives a larger scope of vision as we approach it; but how will it be, when we pass under the arch of the vista, and, standing on the border of the scene of beauty itself, survey with a range of sight unhindered the glories of God's nature? So now we are getting glimpses of God through this vista of human affection and relationship, but our reason tells us that there is more, far more, than we now see in Him—boundless stores of love, unlimited supplies of grace, and a wealth of

tenderness hitherto unrevealed. The reality goes beyond the symbol. There is no relation of life that can express its grandeur; else God would probably have chosen it instead of that of father. That which He did choose has been given a new meaning, deeper beyond all comparison than the first. This may throw some light upon Christ's words: "And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven."

Inferences.

If God is our father, and we are members of His great family, as we are members of our earthly father's family, it must follow:

1. That He will take care of us. That family is divinely instituted that the helpless children of the world might suffer no neglect. As helpless members of His family, God will take care of us. Here we have the great truth of His providence. "Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?" (Matt. vii. 9-11.)

2. If we are in God's family, we are under a government which demands implicit, unquestioning obedience. As the family demands a deeper obedience than the State, so does God's family demand a deeper obedience than the human family, an obedience that is concerned with the "thoughts and intents of the heart." As God's children—weak, ignorant, short-sighted, rash—we cannot choose our own way, and must by implicit acquiescence with His will let Him regulate the affairs of our lives. "Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and love?" (Heb. xii. 9.)

3. This government which we are under is for our highest good. The

father trains the children of his family for citizenship in the State; for positions of usefulness and honor, in the filling of which they will reflect credit upon himself. So God is training us for a higher sphere. All the discipline which we here receive, rough though it may be, is nevertheless a process of preparation for a nobler life. God is fitting us for a citizenship in the Heavenly Jerusalem. "In my Father's house are many mansions." Our inheritance is laid up for us—"if sons, then heirs." We shall some day become of age, and shall then receive our heritage—that "exceeding and eternal weight of glory" reserved in heaven for us.

### STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

TURN to the history of Christian art and literature as expressed in the conception of Jesus and see what it says. In earliest Christian art Jesus appears as a radiant youth; a kind of eternal youthfulness looks out from His placid and radiant brow. Something of the old Greek love of beauty still lived, and they made Jesus beautiful—beautiful as the dream of man could make Him. They represented Him in two forms: first, as a Teacher sitting in the midst of His disciples, creating life and making radiant, whose very person is a lesson in moral and physical beauty. The other form is the form of the Shepherd, coming home with lamb or the lost sheep, bearing the one in his arms and the other on his shoulder, bearing it by strength, which yet was love, home to safety and to God. When the world, which was the Church, grew further and further from His spirit and became possessed by the sadness of a disordered mind and threw back upon Him a misery and a pain unknown to the older Christ, then you see the medieval Master rise, the man who suffered pain; and they began to represent Him with a crown of thorns, to represent Him with the wounded hands and the wounded side. And you have it in His modern reproduction—the weariness of the Carpenter in His workshop, tired with anguish, raising Himself in His weariness and shaping Himself like a cross and casting its shadow upon His simple-minded mother. The art that sees in Christ only the Man of Sorrow, only the One who never had, as it were, the ever-radiant beauty save as a child in His mother's arms, is surely false to life. I would not speak one ungenerous word of that great devotional mood; its spirit of devotion is beautiful, needful, never more needful than now; it is the quality of its devotion that needs to be entirely and radically changed. It turns an ascetic face to Him. What underlies it is the complaint of the preacher, of the old sceptic that survives in Ecclesiastes, who preaches "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" and he turns from the world with that feeling, renouncing all and giving himself up to monastic seclusion and the misery that it brings. Never was this monastic self-torture in life native to Christ. He never said, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." A devotion based on the spirit of vanity as expressed here is not a devotion that expresses the soul and the inspiration of Christ. He

loved man; He was an enemy of disease as well as of sin; He was physician of the soul, but also of the body. He did not love to see the blind man sitting by the wayside begging; blindness He labored to remove, and begging He labored to end. As He loved life He loved joy. His first gracious appearance was at a wedding feast, making the joy of the wedding more abundant with His presence. He loved nature with a rich, great affection. Take the sermon on the lily, and see how He appreciated its pure and tender beauty! Look at the parables, and hear how he expresses His feelings with regard to the cultivation of the mustard seed, the sower going out to sow, the growth of the vine and the fig tree. Many a day He must have spent on the hills that clustered around Nazareth, many a time He must have walked out into the valleys with tender imagination and fancy free dwelling on the things they symbolized—the great Heaven above, and the silent yet everywhere present God.

So Jesus, drawing in upon Him all that was beautiful in nature, placing Himself against all that was evil in man, gave us His great example, an example that carried with it suffering. He who would cure ill must suffer from the ill he cures in doing it. He took upon Him our sin, for the man who never stooped to sin, to ignorance, never helped to do away with it; the man who never saw crime never ended it. The passion of Christ was a passion to save, that involved hatred of ill and sin, but love of life.—*Fairbairn*. (1 Pet. ii. 21.)

I do not want you to be eternally trying to save your own souls; your business is to try to save the souls of other people, and God will look after yours. If you are ever looking after your own souls, and forgetting the great misery of the world, you have not yet caught the Spirit of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Can any man tell me the ethical difference between a man pampering his body and another man pampering his soul? Mr. A. lives in a big mansion, and is merry all the day long and all the year through. From January to December he is pampering his own body, and he has no ear for the cry of poverty, no hand of help for the suffering, and never sends a loaf of bread or even a crust for the hungry ones around him to eat.

And Mr. B. shuts himself up in his cell, and feeds his own soul, or tries to. By prayers, litanies, and Pater Nosters he goes in for feeding his soul, and he never hears the cry of the perishing souls around him, nor the great roar of human suffering in the world. He is so intent on saving his own soul that he can think of nothing else. In the sight of heaven, is the one worse or better than the other?

I know that in the sight of the world there is supposed to be a good deal of difference. Of Mr. A. people say, "What a selfish glutton!" But Mr. B., who pampers his soul and thinks of nobody else, they call a pious saint, and erect a monument upon his grave after he has cheated the world out of years of service which he ought to have rendered to it.

For my own part, I can see no more piety in the man who pampers his soul to the neglect of everything else than in the man who does the same for his body. Both are fools, because no man has a right to neglect any one side of his nature, but to live as God meant him to live, giving of his best for the benefit of those around and about him. "I have declared Thy righteousness," said the Psalmist; "I have not hid it in my heart: I have spoken of Thy goodness; I have not concealed it from the congregation." Why? Because he could not help it. As sure as a man has caught the spirit of Jesus Christ in his heart, it must come out in some way or other.—*Hocking*. (Psalm xl. 10.)

### THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS:

1. The Prophecy of a Prayer. "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."—Matt. vi. 10. William T. Chase, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
2. The Economy of Giving. "To what purpose is this waste?"—Matt. xvi. 8. Kerr B. Tupper, D.D., Denver, Colo.
3. The Word of God Inspired. "Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God."—Acts xx. 26, 27. Willis G. Craig, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
4. Ancestry and Environment. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."—Matt. i. 1. S. A. Mutchmore, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
5. Christ as a Shepherd. "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want," etc.—Psalm xxiii. Pres. William C. Young, D.D., Danville, Ky.
6. Moral Panic. "Then they all forsook him and fled."—Mark xiv. 50. Howard Duffield, D.D., New York City.
7. The Presence and Power of the Holy Ghost. "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."—Acts xix. 2. Paul F. Sutphen, D.D., Newark, N. J.
8. The Peace of Trusting. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee; because he trusteth in Thee."—Isa. xxvi. 3. William J. Tremble, D.D., Chattanooga, Tenn.
9. The Life that Works through Death. "So then death worketh in us, but life in you."—2 Cor. iv. 12. J. W. Dinsmore, D.D., San Jose, Cal.
10. Lessons from the Life of Jonah. "Now the word of the Lord came unto Jonah, the son of Amittai."—Jonah i. 1. Arthur T. Brown, D.D., Portland, Ore.
11. The Greatest Need of the World Supplied in Christ. "Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."—Prov. iii. 17. Rev. Theodore Hand Allen, Mendota, Ill.
12. The Sign and Seal of Sonship. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God."—Rom. viii. 16. Rev. Thomas Douglass, New York City.
13. The Imitation of Christ. "For even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps."—1 Pet. ii. 21. Principal A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., London, England.
14. The Labor Movement and the Labor Rest. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."—Matt. xi. 28. Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell, Rochdale, England.
2. The Silence of Conviction. ("And Elijah came unto all the people and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word."—2 Kings xviii. 21.)
3. The Dependence of Jesus upon the Holy Ghost. ("He was received up after that He had given commandment through the Holy Ghost unto the apostles whom He had chosen."—Acts i. 2.)
4. A Divine Translation. ("Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who delivered us out of the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love."—Col. i. 12, 13.)
5. The Sum of All Things. ("His good pleasure which He purposed in Him unto a dispensation of the fulness of times, to sum up all things in Christ."—Eph. i. 11.)
6. The Attestation of Faith. ("The faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and which ye show toward all the saints."—Eph. i. 15.)
7. Office-Seeking. ("Absalom said moreover, O that I were made judge in the land, that any man which hath a suit or cause might come unto me, and I would do him justice."—2 Sam. xv. 4.)
8. Chronic Grumbling. ("And the men of Ephraim gathered themselves together and went northward, and said unto Jephthah, Wherefore passedst thou over to fight against the children of Ammon, and didst not call us to go with thee? We will burn thine house upon thee with fire."—Judges xii. 1.)
9. Protection to Enemies the Invitation of Disaster. ("But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you; then it shall come to pass, that those whom ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell."—Num. xxxiii. 55.)
10. Ethnic Knowledge of God. ("And Elisha came to Damascus; and Benhadad, the King of Syria, was sick; and it was told him saying, The man of God is come hither. And the King said unto Hazael, Take a present in thine hand and go, meet the man of God, and inquire of the Lord by him, saying, Shall I recover of my disease?"—2 Kings viii. 7, 8.)
11. The Secret of National Disaster. ("For Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen; because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his glory."—Isa. iii. 8.)
12. The Assimilative Power of Worship. ("They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them."—Psalm cxv. 8.)
13. Divine Humiliation for Human Exaltation. ("Who humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven, and in the earth! He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the needy out of the dunghill; that he may set him with princes."—Psalm cxlii. 6-8.)

### Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. Wearing out God. ("Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also?"—Isa. vii. 13.)

## LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TRUTHS FROM RECENT SCIENCE AND HISTORY.

BY REV. GEO. V. REICHEL, A. M., BROCKPORT, N. Y., MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

"I WILL GIVE YOU THE RAIN OF YOUR LAND IN DUE SEASON" (Deut. xi. 14).—These words are brought to mind by what has been so recently revived in the press regarding artificial rain.

With the last statement before us, that the Texas experiments have proved a failure, we would repeat what Chief Hazen, of Washington, D. C., said recently before the American Association for the Advancement of Science:

"Ever since Espy's day the subject of producing rain at will has had very great interest, and many studies of the problem have been presented. Of these studies, one of the most exhaustive has been the collecting of records of battles in the late war which were followed within 24 hours by rain. There were found to be 158 out of more than 2,000 which fulfilled this condition. In other words, the investigation of battle-accounts showed a little over 7 per cent., a fact not surprising when it is considered how many cases were examined. In the instance of the battle of Bull Run, which had a terrific rain after it, the rain was first felt very abundantly at Charleston. To extend the period for the rain to fall twenty-four hours is, virtually, to say that the concussions could not have produced the rain, for in twenty-four hours the point in the atmosphere where the explosions were made would have moved about 500 miles to the eastward.

"It also has been suggested that during the construction of the Central Pacific Railroad across the Sierra Nevada divide in California it was necessary to use vast quantities of gunpowder, and this blasting was accompanied by great downpours, unheard of before or since in that region. Just the dates of this phenomenon are not given, but

observations recently made have shown that in most of the months there are copious rains in this mountain country. It is not at all strange that the persons employed in the construction-work, and accustomed to the long periods of dry weather in the plains, should be struck by the greatly increased rainfall in the mountains."

It may easily be gathered from this calm, deliberate utterance of so high an authority, seconded by the failure to discover any law which produces rain at the will of man, that when the Creator declared ". . . I will give you the rain of your land in due season," He meant precisely what He said.

"ASK — SEEK — KNOCK — AND IT SHALL BE OPENED."—Commenting upon the recent notable failure of the rainmakers, a literary friend suggests that although in nature there are doors of inquiry, so to speak, at which we seem to knock in vain, our solicitations in the realm of grace for the Divine favor are bidden with the powerful assurance, "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you." "Bombard the heavenly doors," and the response sought will surely be given.

The experience of every earnest, struggling disciple avows the truth of this daily, with growing emphasis.

Keep us, Heavenly Father, faithful unto Thee, when Thou seemest to hide Thy face.

"UNTIL THE DAY BREAK, AND THE SHADOWS FLEE AWAY" (Song of Sol. ii. 17).—Prof. R. C. Kedzie, of Michigan, compares the unfolding and progressive development of knowledge to the breaking of the morning.

"The dawn reveals wild shapes and distorted forms; the shadows of sun-

rise stretch out limitless; but with the onward sweep toward full day, portentous forms and endless shadows settle down to the safe and quiet realities of everyday life."

Thus is it with the Christian watching for the morning which is to bring Divine grace to his fearful heart. In the first intermingling of his doubt and the approaching light, strange, distorted, portentous forms arise; but soon the ever-growing light of the Divine dispels them; there the "safe and quiet realities" stand forth, and the Christian pursues the life of everyday rejoicing.

"ALL THAT A MAN HATH WILL HE GIVE FOR HIS LIFE" (Job ii. 4).—We, of this century, often smile over the foolish alchemists of long ago, forgetting that such is man's love of existence that in all ages he has eagerly sought some true "elixir of life." And whether that supposed but ever elusive boon be pure gold, as with the early alchemists, or "extract of mutton," as Professor Kedzie calls the elixir of Dr. Brown-Séguard, the motive of search is the same. So, "though great the hope and slow to die," no ancient nor modern alchemy can prolong existence, which hath for each of us been set beyond the point divinely determined. How strange is it, then, that men are so slow to seek that One who is our life forevermore, who by His loving grace offereth life and immortality to all!

"I WILL OPEN MY DARK SAYING UPON THE HARP" (Ps. xlix. 4).—In making experiments with aluminum in constructing musical instruments, Dr. Alfred Springer, of Cincinnati, expresses the opinion that this metal yields qualities of tone superior to almost all other materials hitherto used.

Now, aluminum, as every one has been informed, is produced from common clay, and so points a lesson through the experiments of Dr. Springer, teaching that from the common things of every day may come

forth, if intelligently and appreciatively considered, those superior qualities in the music of life's joys which all hearts consciously or unconsciously long to hear.

A CAUSE FOR THE LACK OF THE SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY.—Prof. Thos. Gray, of Terre Haute, Ind., speaking of the advantage of systematic, thorough mechanical training for the scientific workman, says regarding the different persons being so trained, "It is a very different thing to give instruction to a man who wants to learn than to another man who has been forced to appear to learn."

The same difference holds good between the young Christian training for the Master's service, eager to learn whatever he may, and that other professed worker, who feels that duty of service is forcing him to the appearance of discipleship, which he abhors. Indeed, while we doubt the genuineness of the latter's profession under such circumstances, we are also led to believe that here lies a partial explanation, at least, for that lack of the sense of responsibility so to be deplored in much of the Church life to-day. Oh, for that disciple who proves his genuineness in service by his eagerness to learn!

OPPORTUNITY AVAILED OF.—William Kent, of New York, commented recently upon the unusual opportunities offered at the late fair in Chicago for thorough mechanical research—opportunities that may not be so easy of access very soon again. And while, doubtless, there were many who availed themselves of the opportunities so offered, their number was small compared with that which might reasonably have been expected. Let us, while asking, as we constantly do, for larger opportunity, see to it that when such is offered we avail ourselves of it—a matter in which some men by no means infrequently fail.

THE BEAUTY OF THE DIVINE DELIVERANCE.—Henry Lampard, Montreal,

Que., is of the opinion that the beautiful Mount Royal, at whose feet this famous Canadian city nestles, is without doubt an extinct volcano.

One who has visited this place is impressed with the skill of nature to completely hide from the untrained eye evidences of the early volcanic conditions, and thinks only of the singular beauties of the vast scene which a view-point upon the mountain-top affords to his delighted appreciation.

So, from the summit of a once fire-crowned height, standing solitary and alone amid life's vast scenes, the soul may look forth with gladness upon God's beauties of grace, no alarming thought of other days disturbing the reigning tranquillity. Memorable days of trial, whether made lurid by martyr-sufferings or gleaming with portentous flashes of mysterious soul-burnings, are hushed into peace by that master-touch of the Divine grace, which out of tribulation brings forth the perfect and the good!

#### THE MAJESTY OF GOD'S HANDIWORK.

—The majesty of the Creator is set forth anew in the recent classification of nature's vast work of what Warren Upham, of the United States Geological Survey, terms "mountain-building."

Mr. Upham says that he finds six modes of mountain construction throughout the western hemisphere; namely: folded, arched, domed, tilted, erupted, and eroded.

The Appalachian-Laurentian systems are specimens of the folded mountain range; parts of the Cordilleran belt in Western United States, of the arched construction; the Henry Mountains in southern Utah, of the domed; the Sierra Nevadas, of the tilted; the Andes range, of the erupted—as seen in the traces of grand volcanic-action throughout the entire extent; and lastly, the remnants of vast areas once uplifted, specimens of the eroded mode of mountain architecture.

THE WISDOM OF GOD'S CREATIVE POWER PAST FINDING OUT.—Among

other strange things in nature of which we occasionally hear, that show something of that Divine majesty the wisdom of which is past finding out, we learned recently that Dr. A. E. Foote, of Philadelphia, had discovered the presence of diamonds in a large meteoric-stone lately submitted to him for examination.

These diamonds were so hard that not only were several chisels destroyed in the attempt to release them from the stone, but also an emory-wheel, upon which an effort was made to polish one of the meteoric jewels.

There is only one other record of the finding of diamonds in meteors, and that so recent as 1887.

DEALING WITH THE FUTURE.—Among other peculiar objections to the exercise of that native impulse in every human breast to look forward to and speculate upon the future, is this one, recently uttered by a scientist of prominence:

"It is unscientific to deal with the future."

However this remark may have been intended, it goes almost without saying that no man, whether scientific or otherwise, but is ever and always compelled to count upon the future, and thus, at least, "deal" with it. Nothing in the past but links its inceptive thought to the present, and nothing in the presents exists but reaches out to and lays hold upon the future.

Hence man's hope of better things to come—of immortality itself, without which dealings with the present would be futile indeed. Our opinion, therefore, is that it is even more "unscientific" *not* to deal with the future than, as this scientist alleges, were one to "deal with it."

THE WEALTH OF POVERTY.—This paradoxical truth is taught in the Scriptures by the beauty and richness of our Lord's life and character, who, though He possessed little of this world's riches, has ever led His disciples to also see that "life consisteth

not in the abundance of the things which it possesseth."

The wealth of poverty, the richness of the destitute, the fruitfulness of the barren things in this world, may be illustrated by the experience of a well-known botanist on a visit to Carmen Island.

This island is in the Gulf of California, 120 miles south of Guaymas in Mexico, and has always been consid-

ered little more than a piece of marshland, rising amid little frequented waters. The soil was known to be poor, and few sought to make a visit to it. Not long ago, however, Dr. E. Palmer went to this island, and was gratified to find after his researches were completed that he had in his possession over seventy species of plants, of which seven were indigenous and six were entirely new!

## HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

### Marginal Commentary: Notes on Genesis.

GEN. ix. 27. *He shall dwell in the tents of Shem.* This is referred by some to *Jehovah*, as abiding in His tabernacle amid the tents of Shem. Others refer the prophecy to Japheth. Jonathan's Targum paraphrases it:

"The sons of Japheth shall be proselyted and dwell in the schools of Shem."

Read either way, the prediction is startlingly true. The Japhetic members of the human family owe to the Semitic their knowledge of the true God. Judaism in the ante-Christian ages conserved *monotheism*, and more important still, *Jehovahism*, the one primitive faith, amid all false religions. And Christ belonged to the race of Shem, and Christianity was first promulgated by Semites, and became the religion of Europe and America, and is now going back to redeem Asia's Aryan races.

This prophecy could be examined minutely and be found to contain occult hints of great value; but it can, on the surface, be easily read as foretelling or intimating:

1. The world-division into three great departments—Asia for Shem, Africa for Ham, Europe and America for Japheth.

2. Japheth was to have much the largest share.

3. Shem's descendants were to be dis-

tinguished as the nomadic and pastoral races, dwelling in tents.

4. Shem was to preserve the true faith and to be specially linked with Jehovah as his people and heritage. Note the phrase, "Jehovah, God of Shem."

5. Japheth was to be aggressive, and go to dwell in Shem's tents, learning from Shem the true religion. Possibly there is a hint there that while Japheth should move to the Semitic districts to colonize, Shem should not move toward Japheth in a similar way, Japheth being the aggressive party.

6. Canaan, if not other Hamitic tribes, were to be distinguished as servants—reduced to subjection and even slavery, and to be inferior socially to both Shem and Japheth.

This prophecy has so remarkably been fulfilled, and is still fulfilling, that this prediction alone suffices to stamp the Bible as inspired of God. Let any one read history—how Shem subdued Canaan, how Japheth did the same—in the contests of Rome with Carthage, etc. Japheth controls more than half the world, commercially and even religiously. In fact, every word of this prophecy so bears minute study, as to tempt to a fanciful interpretation.

GEN. x. 1. *Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah.* This is not only a genealogical table, but the earli-

est history of civilization. Ethnology, as it advances, confirms the Scriptural account of the descent of mankind from a single racial source; though the theories of diversity have run up to over fifty distinct human species, the highest authorities confess that all may be derivable from a *single* genus.

Anatomical structure, especially of skull and brain, similarity of intellectual life, average lifetime, exposure to similar diseases, physical temperature, frequency of pulse, fertility of inter-marriages (as against infertility of hybrids), general sympathetic likeness, and the argument from language all tend to confirm the biblical account.

William Humboldt said that man is "man not only by means of speech, but in order to invent speech must be already man." Comparative philology hints at a common origin in tracing languages to a common root.

It would not serve our present end to enter into minute examination of this genealogical and ethnological table. We note briefly:

1. The table mainly emphasizes families connected with *Hebrews*; hence more details are given as to nations having connection with God's chosen people, and in some cases racial ramifications are traced further than in others.

2. National or tribal names sometimes displace individual—*e. g.*, Jebusite, Hivite, etc., for the purpose is to trace nations, or at most families only. Changes of names are possibly accounted for by development of characteristic quality, as negro from niger.

3. The purpose of this table is not *scientific*, and it is not to be submitted to rigid scientific criteria, but judged by its purpose.

In these three great streams of civilization, *Shem* seems to stand for intellect and speculation, *Ham* for emotional warmth, and *Japheth* for will-power and aggressive action.

The general position of science as to races may thus be presented:

Mongol (olive)	Caucasian (white)	Ethiopian (black)
-------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Malay  
(tawny)

American  
(copper)

The most important verse in this chapter is the twenty-sixth, where the first mention is made of *Abram*. On this tenth chapter, we cannot forbear to quote the words of Dr. Adolph Saphir, whose last book on the "Divine Unity of Scripture" is probably the most thoughtful and suggestive book on the Bible ever yet published, and which has in itself a whole system of divinity and biblical theology.

He says: "The tenth chapter of Genesis is a very remarkable chapter. Before God leaves, as it were, the nations to themselves and begins to deal with Israel, His chosen people from Abraham downward, He takes a loving farewell of all the nations of the earth, as much as to say, 'I am going to leave you for a while, but I love you. I have created you: I have ordered all your future;' and their different genealogies are traced. Ranke says of this chapter: 'It is impossible to read it without seeing that there is something here different from all other history, and that the national pride and separation which we see everywhere else has here been entirely subjugated by the religious idea, that all the different tribes of the earth are related to one another by their common descent from Shem, Ham, and Japheth.'

"More than that," continues Dr. Saphir, "the end of history is given us in Scripture—and here it is; whereas the common view of history that is taken in the world, and taken also by many Christians, is the real reason why the Bible is not believed, and why many who profess to believe the Bible, if they knew what was in the Bible, would also reject it. But the history of the world is given to us in Scripture without entering into the history of the different nations. That was not necessary. For that we do not require a revelation—as to write a history of the Greeks, and of the French, and of the Russians. That we can do for ourselves. But to show us what is the

program, what is the divine idea, what is the real way and purpose of this history—for that we do require the teaching of the Most High.

“Before geography had made any great progress, the Bible anticipated that the whole earth would be inhabited, that the uttermost ends of the earth would be peopled, and that the whole earth would be united in the knowledge and worship of one God, and in righteousness and prosperity. Moses said that when the Most High divided to the sons of Adam their inheritance, He did it according to the number of the children of Israel (Deut. xxxii. 8). And this is the very thing that the Apostle Paul preached to the Athenians—the philosophy of history. He says: ‘God hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth,’ etc., not, as you imagine, that you Athenians are of a different blood from the barbarians. Not merely has He done this, but He fixed the bounds of their habitations, as well as regulated the different periods and epochs of their history. Here you have a chronology, and here you have a geography, and here you have a teleology, which is of that purpose or aim that alone gives eyes to history. . . . Ideas without facts make up a philosophy. Facts without ideas make up a history. . . . Only in Scripture facts are full of ideas. So to speak, they are all full of us and light shines to us in them” (pages 240, 246–247).

GEN. xi. 1. *And the whole earth was one language.* Probably Hebrew—some think Sanscrit.

2. *Shinar*, doubtless the region lying around Babylon, whose extensive valley was very fertile, and offered natural attractions for colonists.

3. *Let us make brick.* These rich alluvial soils, though deficient in stone for building, furnish ample supplies of clay for bricks. Nimrod and his followers found brick-material at hand for their buildings, and it required very little invention to utilize it. The hardness of the clay where exposed to sun-

light would naturally suggest the use of the material for such purpose. The Babylonian deposits of bitumen are well known to history. Semiramis built Babylon with brick and used the liquid bitumen as cement; and bitumen pits are still found on the west bank of the Euphrates. Layard refers to the bricks found at Birs Nimroud, cemented by bitumen so tenacious that it was well-nigh impossible to detach the bricks.

4. *A tower whose top may reach unto heaven.* There was no idea of thus escaping another flood, as even Josephus hints. If this had been in mind, they would have gone to the mountains, not to the valley. The phrase simply means a very high tower. Nor is it said that the tower was not completed when “they left off to build the city” (verse 8). This tower is generally supposed identical with the Temple of Belus, built in eight successive squares, the base square being a stadium in length and breadth, and the ruins of which are known as Birs Nimroud. This tower seems to have been completed, and its uppermost story contained a shrine, or fane, of Bel.

The purpose of building this city is the one thing that it is important to grasp, for it has a very important bearing on all subsequent Bible history. Many far-fetched and fanciful meanings have been imparted into the statement. Nimrod and his followers sought to found a city that should be the nucleus of an *empire* world-controlling. They saw that the simplicity of pastoral and nomadic life favored migration, and this meant dispersion and weakness. Hence came the first conception:

1. *Centralization*—a commonwealth, numerous, powerful, held together by a strong central government, and defended by an impregnable citadel. Diffusion was discouraged, and concentration and organization favored.

2. *Civilization*, in its normal sense, an ideal state or civil community, with commercial, military, social reputation; a far-spreading name and fame; all the fine arts as well as mechanic arts;

a standing attraction, drawing others into the community, and so making its renown ever-increasing.

3. *Idolatry.* If the testimony of history affirms anything, it is that ancient Babylon was the first great imperial stronghold of idolatrous polytheism. Herodotus affirms that this tower was not only finished but became the central temple of Chaldean idolatry; and even if the Temple of Belus be *not* this tower, there seems to be a consensus of opinion that the Tower of Babel

furnished the suggestion and pattern of those that followed it.

Various uses have been suggested for this tower at Babel, as astronomical observation, sleeping-chambers for chief priests, etc. But it is known that astrology and idolatry were from remote ages inseparably connected among the Chaldeans. The Magians naturally were a religious caste under Zoroaster, as the worship of the sun would of course connect the observation of the heavens with religious worship, etc.

## THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

JUNE 24-30.—THE WORK OF GOD.—  
John vi. 29.

A story has come down to us of Philip of Neri, a saint of the sixteenth century.

A young man, a student in a famous Italian university, came running to him one day with joyful face to tell him of his hope and aims for life. He had entered the law school because of its wide reputation; he would spare no pains to get through his studies as soon as possible.

"Well," answered the Saint, "and when you have got through your course of studies, what do you mean to do?"

"Then I shall take my doctor's degree," answered the young man.

"And then?" asked Philip.

"And then I shall have a number of difficult questions to manage. Shall catch people's notice by my eloquence, my zeal, my learning, my acuteness, and gain a great reputation."

"And then?" repeated Philip.

"And then, why—there cannot be a question—I shall be promoted to some high office. I shall make money and grow rich."

"And then?" reiterated Philip.

"And then—then I shall be comfortably and honorably situated in wealth and dignity."

"And then?" persisted Philip.

"And then—and then—and then—then I shall die."

Here Philip raised his voice. "And what then?"

Whereupon the young man made no answer, but cast down his head and went away.

Right enough, surely, are such high ambition and looking forward. Pity the young man before whose youthful vision there flames and flashes no high ideal even for this passing life. But, if it stop there, at that margin of this passing life rounded by its earthly end; if the ideal for this life be not of such sort that it can be the ideal for the other too; if to the inevitable question, "And what then?" for that other life, the majestic temple to which this life is but a meager vestibule, there be no other answer than that of a careless and abashed thoughtlessness; if all anxiety be given to this and none to that—can there be denser and starker folly? Can there be crazier craziness than, certainly confronted by the end of this life, to have no intelligible hope or purpose concerning the immeasurable life which is to come?

Multitudes of men to-day are like this young man of the sixteenth century, over whom Philip of Neri's questions threw the solemn shadows of an unescapable eternity. They are like these

Jews to whom the Lord Jesus made the answer of our Scripture—sedulously concerned about the present, making great plans for that, hoping great things for it; but, for the most part, untouched of any noble thoughtfulness concerning a questioning eternity.

Here in our Scripture, stated with the precision of the Ten Commandments, is *the* work of God we are to do; is the main duty for your life and mine. It is not that we labor simply for the meat which perisheth; it is not that we get on well in this world; it is not that we capture such or such a station in these passing days—but this is the overtopping, supreme, emphatic duty, which if it be not done, the whole life goes for nothing, just as if the keystone of the arch be not set in, the whole arch falls; this is the imperial thing to be accomplished in this passing life; this is *the* work of God—that ye put faith in Jesus Christ whom God hath sent, and so be ready for the “What then?” of the great eternal world.

For reasons like these:

First—Faith in Jesus Christ is *the* work of God for life, because we are thus enabled to make our own what God has done for us; for faith is the “appropriating faculty.” Christ has wrought out complete redemption for us. Faith is the hand by which we seize it and make it our own.

Second—Faith in Christ is *the* work of God for life, because faith in Christ is self-surrender to God. Take a page from a personal experience:

“That night he could not sleep. His mind was so exercised that he rose as soon as there was any light, left his house, and went off to a considerable distance, where there was then a grove, near a place where he had some water-works, which he called ‘the hydraulics.’ There in the grove he knelt down to pray. He said he had felt during the night as if he must get away by himself, so that he could *speak aloud and let out his voice and his heart*, as he was pressed beyond endurance with the

sense of his sins and with the necessity of immediately making his peace with God. But to his surprise and mortification, when he knelt down and attempted to pray he found that his heart would not pray. He had no words; he had no desires that he could express in words. He said that it appeared to him that his heart was as hard as marble, and that he had not the least feeling on the subject. He remained upon his knees disappointed and confounded, and found that if he opened his mouth to pray he had nothing in the form of prayer that he could sincerely utter.

“In this state it occurred to him that he could say the Lord’s Prayer. So he began, ‘Our Father which art in heaven.’ He said *as soon as he uttered the words*, he was convicted of his hypocrisy in calling God his father. When he added the petition, ‘Hallowed be thy name,’ he said it almost shocked him. He saw that he was not sincere, that his words did not at all express the state of his mind. He did not care to have God’s name hallowed. Then he uttered the next petition, ‘Thy kingdom come.’ Upon this he said he almost choked. He saw that he did not want the kingdom of God to come; that it was hypocritical in him to say so, and that he could not say it as really expressing the sincere desire of his heart. And then came the petition, ‘Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.’ He said his heart rose up against that, and he could not say it. Here he was brought face to face with the will of God. He had been told from day to day that he was opposed to this will; that he was not willing to accept it; that it was his voluntary opposition to God, to His law, and His will that was the obstacle in the way of his conversion. This consideration he had resisted and fought with desperation. But here on his knees, with the Lord’s Prayer in his mouth, he was brought face to face with that question; and he saw with perfect clearness that what he had been told was true, that he was

not willing that God's will should be done, and that he did not do it himself because he would not.

"Here the whole question of his rebellion, in its nature and its extent, was brought so strongly before him that he saw it would cost him a mighty struggle to give up that voluntary opposition to God. And then, he said, he gathered up all the strength of his will and *cried aloud*, 'Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.' He said he was perfectly conscious that his will went with his words; that he accepted the will of God and the whole will of God; that he made a full surrender to God, and accepted Christ just as He is offered in the Gospel. He gave up his sins, and embraced the will of God as his universal rule of life. The language of his heart was, 'Lord, do with me as seemeth to Thee good.' 'Let Thy will be done with me and with all creatures on earth as it is done in heaven.' He said he prayed freely, as soon as his will surrendered; and his heart poured itself out like a flood. His rebellion all passed away, his feelings subsided into a great calm, and a sweet peace seemed to fill his soul."

Third—Faith in Christ is the work of God for life, because out of faith in Him we begin to do works from right motive.

I think this confession from Mr. James Parton, the historian, who was himself no Christian, most noteworthy: "The old-fashioned theologians have often been taken to task for speaking of morality as 'filthy rags'—not that they denied the necessity of a strict observance of the moral rules. They only said: 'Woe be to those who rest in morality.' But, after all, I am not sure that they were so far out of the way, for an attentive study of history, or even an observation of the people about us, discloses the fact that a man may be even a model of what is commonly called virtue—frugal, temperate, chaste, incorruptible, even-tempered—and yet be a base, dastardly, and pernicious wretch."

But faith in Christ—for faith "is as-

sent of the intellect and consent of the heart" to Christ—puts right motive at the seat of action and prevents an inward baseness—because the spring of action becomes the desire and determination to please God as He has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ.

The work of God—how it sounds in our Scripture. And all life a maiming and a missing until that work be done!

JULY 1-7.—A FINDING SOUL.—Acts x. 1.

The Scriptural teaching of the relation of God to the world is that God is not distant from the world, that God has not flung the world from His creative hand to let it get on as it best can—that the chasm between this world and the throne of God is not so wide but that He who fills immensity with His presence can be both on the throne and in the world—that "there is a mystic implication of His nature with ours, and ours with His—His serenity amid our griefs—His sanctity amid our guilt—His watchfulness amid our sleep—His life through our death—His silence amid our stormy force." "Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid Thine hand upon me," exclaims the Psalmist.

Therefore, the soul may enter into personal relations with God, find God, know God, be conscious of God.

But the question is, Who may thus find and know God? Our Scripture answers the question by way of example. Cornelius is an example of such a finding soul.

First. This finding Cornelius was a *devout* soul; *i. e.*, open-minded toward the truth he already knew. "Cornelius was one of those men, so numerous in this effete age of idolatry, who were yearning for a better worship; and, under that impulse, had embraced the pure theism of the Old Testament, so much superior to every other form of religion known to them. They attended the synagogues, heard and read the Scriptures, practiced some of the Jewish rites, and were in a state of

mind predisposing them to welcome the Gospel of Christ when it was announced to them."—Professor Hackett on the Acts.

Thus Cornelius was a man whose soul was devoutly open to the best he knew. Such a soul is sure to be a finding soul. A sea-captain was telling me how, when his vessel was wrapped in mists, he yet kept his vessel's prow pointed toward the place where he believed the light was as the surest way of seeing the light when the mist lifted. And what is good for the navigation of a ship in this respect is good for the navigation of a soul.

Second. This finding Cornelius was a *reverently fearing soul*. He feared God. The Scripture fear of God is not the fear of terror, but the fear of a tender and holy awe, such fear as would prevent the soul from doing that which would displease God. Surely the soul holding itself in such careful mood toward God is a soul to which God will certainly more and more disclose Himself.

Third. This finding Cornelius was a soul *practicing* according to his light. And in two respects :

(a) As toward his home—he feared God with all his house. There is precisely where a genuinely religious earnestness will show itself. You say you enjoy religion ; but how does your wife enjoy your religion ?

(b) As toward his neighbor—he gave much alms to the poor. Cornelius recognized his stewardship toward God in his use of property. Homeward, pocketward, he practiced according to his light.

Fourth. This finding Cornelius was a *praying* soul, and prayed to God always. He held himself in constant devotional attitude toward God. And this attitude flowed out in set times for special prayer. He was in such set and stated prayer when the angel flashed before him. Ah ! to such a soul it was not so strange that "he saw in a vision evidently, about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming in to him,

and saying unto him, 'Cornelius, God hath heard.' "

Fifth. This finding Cornelius was an *obeying* soul. When he was directed to send men to Joppa after Peter, without questioning he sent them.

Sixth. This finding Cornelius was a *confessing* soul. When Peter came and preached the truth of Jesus to him, he at once confessed his acceptance of the truth in baptism.

God must cease to be Himself when such a devout, reverently fearing, outwardly practicing, praying, obeying, confessing soul shall not be a finding soul, shall not reach the light.

JULY 8-14.—THE DIVINE VICTORY.  
—Rom. xvi. 20.

Dangers were threatening the peace of this early Church at Rome ; bad doctrine was beginning to emerge, and perhaps the clash of contest for the truth must begin to sound. But they were not to purchase a poor and somnolent peace by yielding and letting error and evil teachers of it have their way. Satan was set against their peace, of course, and would be quite certain to more or less disturb it, and there was no way but to enter into battle with him. Writes the Apostle : "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned ; and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly ; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent."

"But do not be discouraged, O struggling Christians there in Rome," it is as though the Apostle went on to say ; "though Satan may disturb he cannot triumph ; here is strong consolation for you—'And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.' " And also for every resolute struggler toward the right, there is this strong promise and consolation.

Consider first : The Divine Triumph : God shall bruise Satan.

Satan is—It is a very real fact that the Bible is full of the revelation of a master evil spirit and of minor evil spirits. If the Bible tells us of God and His angels, it also tells us of the devil and his angels. There is an outlying realm infernal of evil, as there is an outlying realm celestial of good. There is a personal, masterful spirit of evil, who can influence the world, who does seduce men, who is the author of sin. See Mark i. 13; iv. 15; Luke iv. 8; x. 18; xxii. 3; Acts v. 3; xxvi. 18; 1 Thes. ii. 18; Rev. ii. 13; as to lesser evil spirits or demons, see Matt. ix. 33; xvii. 18; Luke iv. 41; viii. 2; Jas. ii. 19; Rev. ix. 20.

There certainly are evil spirits *embodied* in this world; may there not be also evil spirits *disembodied*? And, as in this world, you see evil men rising above their evil fellows through largeness of evil faculty and compelling their evil fellows under their evil domination, why may there not be some badly majestic, dominating evil spirit ranking the forces of evil under himself outside the world? God is not less at one time and more at another. God is not less benevolent and holy now, and more benevolent and holy then. God is not less benevolent and holy in this world and more benevolent and holy outside this world. If you believe, as you must, in a benevolent and holy God who consists with evil-embodied spirits in this world, what is there to prevent belief in a benevolent and holy God who consists with evil spirits *disembodied* and outside this world?

How does such a God consist with bad men here, with bad spirits in the spiritual realm? There is but one answer. Men become evil here by choosing against God. The Son of the Morning became Satan by choosing against God. Power of choice is necessary to moral beings. And in this world, and in all worlds, God respects power of choice, and consists with it. And when the Scriptures assert that, through choice of evil, Satan became Satan, and when the statement of the Scripture is

reinforced by all the analogy of life in this world here and now, it is certainly very foolish and foolhardy in me to refuse belief in such a badly powerful, tempting, personal evil spirit as the Scriptures assert Satan to be, and heedlessly live my life as though there were no such tempting and destroying spirit setting himself to trap me and to ruin me.

This is the dark side of it. Turn now to the brighter side. There shall be Divine Triumph. God shall bruise Satan. Once, in the theological seminary, Dr. Robinson burst out before the class and said: "Gentlemen, drive these four stakes down—sin is a tremendous evil; God is not the author of sin; God is not impotent before sin, but will control it; God gives to every man a power sufficient for his salvation." That is a good stake to drive down in this strange world—"God is not impotent before evil, but will control it!" Out of the clouds and darkness shall shine forth the righteousness and judgment which are the habitation of God's throne. He shall cause the wrath of man to praise Him; the remainder He shall restrain. Satan himself shall surely be seen to be but the hewer of wood and the drawer of water for the sublime temple of the Divine purpose. God shall bruise Satan. How evidently this shines forth in the cross and death of our Lord and Saviour! Satan's apparent triumph there was his worst defeat.

Second. Consider the *time* of the Divine Triumph. God shall bruise Satan *shortly*. Ah, but how long sometimes that "shortly" seems! Yes, but God has the spaces of eternity in which to work. Large purposes must consume large times. And how great and gracious the thought, God has time enough! But there is another measure. Dr. Payson, dying, thus exclaimed, "The battle's fought and the victory is won forever. I am going to bathe in an ocean of purity and benevolence and happiness to all eternity." Satan was *then* bruised for him.

Third. Consider the *method* of the Divine Triumph. God shall bruise Satan under *your feet* shortly.

"We rise by things that are under our feet,  
By what we have mastered of good and gain;  
By the pride deposed, and the passion slain,  
And the vanquished ills that we hourly  
meet."

Every struggle upward, every time our foot is placed upon some meanness, every victory we win for good, thus, *through us*, God bruises Satan. And we shall surely conquer, for we fight both for and with God.

JULY 15-21. — WOOD, HAY, STUBBLE.—Gen. xix. 30; 1 Cor. iii. 9-16.

It is quite possible for one to live long and yet have little strength or joy in the physical sense of living. Disease has fastened, rendered the wonderful functions of the wonderful body "like sweet bells jangled out of tune, and harsh."

Very different such life from the strong full life of health. What is true in the physical sense of life is also true in the spiritual sense of it. A man may be a diseased, dyspeptic, complaining, grumbling, almost useless Christian, or a man may be a healthful, growing, cheering Christian.

It is to this fact of the difference of spiritual life, and energy, and result, that the Apostle Paul, under another figure, refers in a very remarkable passage (1 Cor. iii. 9-16):

"For we are God's fellow-workers; ye are God's husbandry—God's building.

"According to the grace of God which was given unto me, as a wise master-builder I laid a foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall

prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire."

That is to say, a man may be a Christian and rear upon the foundation of his faith in Jesus the superstructure of a noble, beautiful Christian life and work, which shall be a blessing to others and a joy and infinite reward to himself, and which, asbestos-like, shall endure the fires of the judgment; or a man may be a Christian and rear upon the foundation of his faith in Jesus a superstructure of a life so worthless and so mean that, like wood, hay, or stubble in the flame, it shall be consumed, and the man himself escape but barely—saved, but so as by fire.

Consider now an Old Testament illustration of this principle. The illustration is Lot.

Lot was a man of faith. In obedience to the Divine command he set out with Abraham on his wanderings. It is as a man of real faith that the Apostle Peter speaks of him (2 Peter ii. 6-8). But the superstructure Lot built upon that faith was but wood, hay, stubble; it was not of gold, silver, precious stones. It could not endure. It could not afford protection to himself. It was the cause of ruin to those he loved the most.

First. Lot reared such a wood, hay, stubble superstructure of a life *by indulging in an evil choice*.

There come to every man days which stand, like mountains, out from the plain of usual life, days of decision, whence the path of life takes new direction, beyond the shadows of which decisions the life can never pass. See the Bible narrative (Gen. xiii. 1-13).

Standing there, on the mountain east of Bethel, Abram and Lot make their choices, and their diverse destinies, as to the sort of superstructure of life they are to go on to rear, begin. Lot looked down upon the valley of the Jordan,

fertile, luxuriant, beautiful as the lost Eden. Back toward the rugged hills, unto their desolations and their hardships, Abram went uncomplainingly.

In several particulars this choice of Lot's was evil.

(a) *It was a choice selfish.* In making it Lot thought only of himself, nothing of his uncle Abram, older, and, as the leader, the one to whom of right belonged the first choice. Lot seized all. He did not so much as suggest equitable division of the fertile country. Abram grandly takes the rugged hills and submits.

(b) *It was a dangerous choice.* The plains held something other than an Eden. Sodom and Gomorrah were in their embrace. Though Lot did not directly, and at first hand, choose these, they were in his choice, with all their depravities. Evil is a fearful magnetism and men are bits of steel. It is so everywhere you put wrong next you to become seduced, entangled, overcome.

Very significant is the Scriptural statement concerning the effect of this bad choice in Lot. First, Lot chose the plain with Sodom and Gomorrah in it: Second, he *pitched his tent toward Sodom*; got a little nearer; got within the hearing of its siren songs; became less strenuous in his determination of non-conformity with the world; was less in simple and earnest desire to please God; gave up daily worship in his family, perhaps; did not think quite so much of Abram back there on the barren heights—that is, lost his affection for the Church, was needlessly irregular in his attendance on the prayer-meeting; was not quite so distinct in his confession of godliness; pitched his tent *toward Sodom*.

And there, when afterward the angels came to warn him of the destruction impending the city, they found him *sitting in the gate of Sodom*; one of the magistrates of it possibly, at any rate in position and authority within it, *a resident of Sodom*.

Such was the way this evil choice acted upon Lot. And here in this

evil choice can be seen, I am sure, a large and prevailing reason for the wood, hay, and stubble superstructure of a life he built upon the foundation of his faith.

Second. Lot reared this wood, hay, and stubble superstructure of a life by *putting himself in unfavorable conditions for the growth and edification of the true life*. All true and normal growth is the result of the balance between the life in the growing thing and favorable surrounding conditions. Make the conditions hostile, and you hinder, if you do not destroy, the upbuilding of the life. These hindering and chilling conditions into which Lot thrust himself by becoming a resident of Sodom were mainly two—prayerlessness and evil influence.

Prayerlessness: "Then Abram removed his tent and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord" (Gen. xiii. 18). But Lot builds no altar. Suppose Lot had held himself in such personal connection with Abram that he could have caught a little of the stimulus of Abram's devotion!

Make application: You need the Church, its worship, communion, holy companionship, etc.

Evil influence.—Living there in Sodom, Lot could not help partaking of the evil influences of the place. And the better life in him lost health, tone, power. It was very miserable wood, hay, stubble, he began to build into the structure of his life. Living in the constant companionship of wrong, and bereft of companionship with God, though now and then his righteous soul was vexed at the surrounding sinfulness, he himself began to think and do very sinful things. See the infamous and Sodomite proposal Lot dared to think of making about his daughters (Gen. xix. 8). Ah! Sodom is no place for a Christian. Remember that when you choose your pleasures, or your business, or your companionship.

Third. Lot, upon the foundation of his faith, built the superstructure of a wood, hay, stubble life, because,

doing as he did, he *lost his chance of witnessing for God*. Lot, living there in Sodom, sought to do his duty of witnessing for God in Sodom. And what did he get for his pains? Ridicule and failure. He tried to make the Sodomites better, and they said, "Stand back"; they said again, "This fellow came in to sojourn, and he will needs be a judge." Lot was sure the Lord was about to send destruction upon the city. He was agitated for the safety of his family. "And Lot went out and spake unto his sons-in-law which married his daughters and said, 'Up, get you out of this place, for the Lord will destroy this city.' *But he seemed as one that mocked unto his sons-in-law.*" Ah!

"Thou must be true thyself  
If thou the truth wouldst teach;  
It needs the overflow of heart  
To give the lips full speech."

Lot living there in Sodom, himself at least a partial partaker in its wickedness—how could he seem otherwise to his sons-in-law than one who mocked?

Behold, now, the failure of Lot's life work, the consuming of the wood, hay, and stubble of it. With difficulty he persuaded his wife and daughters to flee with him. The angels force him out of the devoted city. The earth burns from beneath. The heavens flame from above. Part of his family falls in the destruction. Judgment overtakes his wife upon the way. He waits a little in the city of Zoar. He flees out of it into the mountains, stricken with fear. So, though he chose the plain, he gets only the rugged mountain at the last. And, cowering in the mountain with his two daughters, the influence of Sodom overcomes them, and they plunge into crime. Family ruined; possessions gone; wood, hay, stubble utterly consumed. Himself saved—but so as by fire.

You who have said you would live for Jesus—like Abram doing the right though the right be rough—upon that foundation of faith in Jesus take care how you build. Listen to the Apostle,

"But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon."

We are justified by faith; but we are rewarded according to our works.

JULY 22-28.—HOW TO GET LOVE.—  
Tim. i. 5.

Read the neighboring Scripture (vs. 3-7).

Attend to the meaning of some words:  
"End of the commandment."

"End," that means what is called final end, ultimate result, bloom.

"Commandment," that means precept, that which is laid down. And the Apostle is speaking here of what, in the 11th verse of this chapter, he calls the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God; so that the phrase, the end of the commandment, means the intended and triumphing result of the teaching of the Gospel.

"Charity," that means, not simply beneficence, alms-giving, as charity has come to signify to-day in our English speech, but that deeper, broader, nobler structure, something we call love, Godward, manward.

This, then, is the practical meaning and purpose of the Gospel for us—that we get love.

And how easy everything is for us if we only have love!

"Man soon wearies of living at his best." Not if he loves the best.

"To love Thee, Saviour, is to be  
Cheerful, and brave, and strong, and free;  
Calm as a rock 'mid striving seas,  
Certain 'mid all uncertainties."

Yes, everything is easy to love!

And when we think of our Christian living—its self-denials, its tasks, its easy yieldings to temptation, its sluggishness—how often we say to ourselves, "Oh, it would be all right, and delightful, and swiftly overcoming, if we were only conscious of a deeper, steadier, controlling love!"

And we sometimes strive and struggle for love. But we never get love in the way of a direct striving for it. Love never comes in such fashion. Love is

something which comes indirectly, as the result of adjustment to conditions.

Now our Scripture is very practical and important because, in the plainest way, it tells us how to get a noble, transforming, impelling, religious love.

First. We get such triumphing, religious love *out of a pure heart*. "For the end of the commandment is charity—love—*out of a pure heart*."

What does the Scripture mean by a man's heart? Heart, in the Scripture, means the center and seat of the spiritual life, the source and fountain of thoughts, desires, passions, endeavors, that in a man which is sensitive to and may respond to God. And a pure heart is a cleansed heart—one out of which evil thoughts, desires, passions, endeavors, have been cast; one which holds itself in such attitude as that it can respond to God. The pure in heart see God. And when such a heart beholds God in His beauty, loveliness, kindness, such heart cannot resist the springing of love toward Him.

Second. A further step on the path toward a great religious love is the having a *good conscience*. Now the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, and of a *good conscience*.

Conscience includes these three elements—discrimination, impulse, reaction. And a good conscience is where the discrimination between wrong and right motives is quick; where the impulse toward the right motive is yielded to; where there is the reaction of the unique peace of an obeyed conscience.

"I feel within me  
A peace above all earthly dignities,  
A still and quiet conscience."

Is it difficult to see that with a pure heart and a good conscience there would begin to well up in us a mighty and impelling religious love?

Third. But a third and most important step on the path toward a vanquishing religious love is *faith*. "Now, the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of *faith unfeigned*."

Unfeigned faith is sincere faith—ab-

solute assent of intellect, and consent of heart to Jesus Christ. Who has kept his heart pure? Who by undeviating choice of right has kept his conscience good? That is the trouble; we have not. And, to an impure heart and a twisted conscience, the thought of God is pain instead of peace. So love toward God is baffled. But now our Lord Jesus comes with His atonement, with cleansing for the heart and satisfaction for the conscience; and when we by faith accept it, heart and conscience are put toward God in right relation, and so trust is the way to love.

Dr. Shedd tells how, "in a beautiful New England village, a boy lay very sick, drawing near to death, and very sad. His heart longed for the treasure which was worth more to him now than all the gold of the Western mines. One day I sat down by him, took his hand, and looking into his troubled face asked him what made him so sad? 'Uncle,' said he, 'I want to love God; would you tell me how to love God?' I said to him, 'My boy, you must trust God first, and then you will love Him without trying to at all.' With a surprised look he exclaimed, 'What did you say?' I repeated the exact words, and I shall never forget his large, hazel eyes opened on me, and his cheek flushed, as he slowly said, 'Well, I never knew that before; I always thought that I must love God first before I had any right to trust Him.' 'No, my dear boy,' I answered, 'God wants us to trust Him; that is what Jesus always asks us to do first of all, and He knows that as soon as we trust Him we shall begin to love Him. This is the way to love God, put your trust in Him first of all.' Then I spoke to him of the Lord Jesus, and how God sent Him that we might believe in Him, and how all through His life He tried to win the trust of men, how grieved He was when men would not believe in Him, and every one who believed came to love without trying at all. He drank in the truth, and simply saying, 'I will trust Jesus now,' without an effort

put his young soul in Christ's hands that very hour; and so he came into the peace of God which passeth understanding, and lived in it calmly and sweetly to the end."

Yes, trust—faith unfeigned—is the path to love.

Learn:

(a) If you would have love do not go hunting after some other doctrine (v. 3).

(b) If you would have love do not think just talking about things will bring love. "Vain jangling" (v. 6).

(c) If you would have love do not be all the time probing your feelings.

(d) How practical is Christianity. Keep a pure heart, a good conscience, a steady trust, and an impelling and vanquishing love must be the natural bloom.

## EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

### An Exposition.

BY ROBERT PATERSON, D.D., BELMONT, BLANTYRE, SCOTLAND.

(Continued from vol. xxvii., page 561.)

*Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God (which he had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures) concerning his son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, etc.—Rom. i. 1-4.*

CONCERNING HIS SON.—The grand subject matter of the Gospel is God's Son, Jesus Christ, WHO SPRANG FROM DAVID'S SEED, OR WHO WAS DAVID'S OFFSPRING WITH RESPECT TO THE FLESH. In a word, Christ as regards his human nature was David's offspring. No one, according to Old Testament prophecy, could be the Messiah, the Christ, unless he sprang from David, "Israel's anointed and greatest king." Note particularly, the very expression, "made of David's seed according to the flesh," intimates that there is another and higher side to His complex personality. He was a real man, body, soul, and spirit; but He was more than man, more than David's Son. He was God's Son, God's Son emphatically, God's Son pre-eminently and peculiarly, and in a sense all His own. Hence the apostle adds:

WHO WAS MARKED OFF AS GOD'S SON IN (the possession of) POWER, AS REGARDS THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS, BY

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. It is a great utterance. Deep beneath deep is in it, and height above height. Its length and breadth reach far, very far. The phrase *the spirit of holiness* (πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης) cannot be rendered "the Holy Spirit." Thus the phrase itself determines that the reference is not to the Third Person of the Godhead. Besides the phrase "according to the spirit of holiness" (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης) stands in antithesis to the phrase "according to the flesh" (κατὰ σάρκα); and thus it is further determined that the reference must be to our Lord's divine nature. On the one side, the lower, He is David's son; on the other, the higher, He is God's Son. The one, in its outer, is characterized by "flesh;" the other is essentially distinguished by "holiness." Holiness, morally viewed, is of the very essence of divinity; or divinity, to change the aspect, morally considered, has for its very essence and quintessence *holiness*. Jesus on His higher and divine side is a "Spirit of Holiness"—a divine person, whose very essence morally is holiness.

Observe, with respect to His human nature, the apostle says He "was made" (τοῦ γενομένου). That nature was originated. It began to be. No such affirmation is made with respect to the other side of His complex being, "the spirit of holiness." It was not in any way originated or derived. Whatever is originated cannot be eternal. What-

ever is derived cannot be infinite. The ideas of divinity and of origination or derivation are mutually exclusive. The one of necessity annihilates the other. Thus what is divine cannot be originated or derived. What is derived or originated cannot be divine. Our Saviour, on the upper and eternal side, is divine equally as the Father and the Holy Spirit. True, He is designated "the only begotten Son," but so far as the idea of begetting goes, the reference is wholly and solely to His human nature. Thus the Scripture stands, "Thou art my Son, *this day* have I begotten Thee" (Ps. ii. 7; Heb. i. 5). "Therefore also *that holy thing* which shall be born of Thee *shall be called the Son of God*" (Luke i. 35).

Angels are God's sons. Men are God's sons. Angels and men are alike made in the image of God, and are for this reason His moral offspring. There is something in both divine-like. The essential nature of both is divine-like. But neither angels nor men are God's sons as Christ is His Son. The union of the human and the divine natures in Christ constitutes Him peculiarly, pre-eminently, peerlessly, the Son of God. He is absolutely of one nature with the Father.

The verb (*ἀρσθέντος*) translated in the Authorized Version "declared to be," and which we render "marked off," has close affinity with our word horizon. To speak to the merely English reader the word here used is the participial form of *horidso*, to bound or limit, from *horos*, a boundary. It is the origin of *horizon*, the limit or boundary of vision. Thus *marked off*, *bounded off*, is the apostle's idea. Our Lord Jesus Christ is marked off from every other being in the universe. He is from every other marked off as God's Son, and He is marked off as God's Son in the possession of power. His being is His twofold personality, is *sui generis*. There is none like it, absolutely none.

Literally it is said that He is "marked off" as God's Son *in power*. In the element of power is the idea, and that

comes to the expression we give, *in the possession of power*.

He is "marked off as God's Son in the possession of power *by the resurrection of the dead*." We should not say with the King James translators, "by the resurrection *from* the dead," but with the Revisionists, "by the resurrection of the dead." Paul is thinking of more than Christ's own resurrection. Of course our Lord's own resurrection is included, but is conceived as inclusive of all others. "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22). No matter what view one takes of the resurrection of the dead as to its nature, it is realized in and by Jesus Christ. His own resurrection is a fact the most indisputable. It stands unshaken and unshakable. Even our apostle had seen the risen Lord (1 Cor. xv. 8). No man who keeps company with Paul could possibly believe that he is either a deceiver or deceived. For Paul, then, Christ had risen from the dead. That resurrection marked Him off as God's Son in the possession of power. That resurrection moreover, taken in connection with the antecedent propitiatory life and death, was the meritorious cause or ground of the resurrection of all men. Installments of the general resurrection had been given even in Paul's time. In connection with the marvelous phenomena that occurred after the death of Jesus, "the graves," or "tombs," or "sepulchers" "were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised up" (Matt. xxvii. 52). The earthquake happened, it would appear, just immediately on the occurrence of the decease, and thus in the rending of the sepulchers preparation was made for the ensuing resurrection. But the reanimation of the bodies was fittingly postponed till after the resurrection of Him who is Himself at once "the Resurrection," and "the first-born from the dead" (Col. i. 18), "the first fruits of them who sleep" (1 Cor. xv. 20)—(Morison's Com. on Matthew *in loc.*). In these resurrec-

tions, in all resurrections that had taken place or that were to come, the apostle saw Christ distinctly marked off as the God-man Redeemer in the possession of power. His power it is, His unique and divine power, in which and by means of which the resurrection of the dead is realized.

When we postulate divinity, there is no difficulty with the resurrection of the dead. Absolutely none. He who is equal to creation is equal to annihilation. He who is equal to creation and annihilation is equal to resurrection.

Paul, however, is not thinking merely of omnipotence, or of the almightiness physically or metaphysically of Christ. His use of the term *power* is much more comprehensive. Omnipotence is involved, but is not exhaustive of the idea. Had not our Lord become incarnate; had He not lived, and suffered, and died, and risen from the dead in behalf of men, had He not made propitiation for their sins, and thus satisfied all the claims which were against them—resurrection, deliverance from death on every side, the lower as the higher, with respect to the body as to the soul, would have been forever a moral impossibility. "The wages of sin is death" as regards both body and soul; of the body in one way, of the soul and spirit in another. But for our Saviour and the atonement He made for us, we all should "have been holden of death" everlastingly. God, as the great moral Magistrate, the righteous Administrator of moral law, would have been destitute of the power to deliver from "the wages of sin" a single unit of the human family. It is Christ—Christ by means of His propitiatory life and death—Who puts God in the possession of power to save, and thus in the possession of power to raise from the dead. Such is undoubtedly Paul's magnificent and inspired conception.

**JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD.** The order of the words in the Revised Version is the true order. They are in the connection exceedingly solemn and grand. He who is the great subject-matter of

the Gospel; He who is the Alpha and the Omega of the Old Testament Scriptures in their entirety; He who is David's Son according to the flesh and God's Son according to the Spirit of Holiness, both God and man; He who is marked off from all the universe as God's Son in the possession of power by the resurrection of the dead—He is that very Jesus Christ, the divinely anointed and divinely appointed Saviour whom we Christians adore as Lord, our Lord, and Lord of all. If He be not Lord to others, He is at least Lord to us. We glory in Him. He exercises Lordship, as we believe, over the vastitudes of intelligences in the world of light. Wonderful that He became incarnate and died for our sins, according to the Scriptures. We seat Him on the throne of our affections and as Lord over the conscience.

#### **The Seven Beatitudes of the Apocalypse.**

BY REV. J. L. CAMPBELL, CHELTENHAM, ONT.

THE Book of the Revelation is highly symbolic, mysterious, and often difficult of interpretation. The number seven, the symbol of totality, universality, or thoroughness, occurs at least twenty times in this book. We read of the seven spirits of God, *i. e.*, the Holy Spirit in His one perfect seven-fold energy, the seven churches, the seven stars, the seven candlesticks, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the seven bowls, etc.; but it is not generally known, at least is not published in any book with which I am acquainted, that there are seven, and only seven, beatitudes in the book. This discovery gives a new interest to this portion of the Holy Scriptures, and affords a rich line of thought for meditation and instruction. It is pleasant, even joyous, to find that He who began His public teaching with the sweet word "blessed" seven times repeated in the well-known beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, ends the New Testament Revelation

with the same encouraging, assuring word repeated again seven times. He was then on earth and spoke on the mountain side, but now He is in heaven and speaks from the Holy of Holies. The risen, ascended, and glorified Redeemer still is interested in His followers, and pronounces blessings upon them. The beatitudes are:

1. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep the things that are written therein, for the time is at hand" (i. 3).

2. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, for their works follow with them" (xiv. 13).

3. "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments lest he walk naked and they see his shame" (xvi. 15).

4. "Blessed are they which are bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb" (xix. 9).

5. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years" (xx. 6).

6. "Blessed is he that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book" (xxii. 7).

7. "Blessed are they that wash their robes that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city" (xxii. 14).

In Matthew the beatitudes come one after the other without any intervening matter, but in the Revelation they are separated by longer or shorter portions of the book. In Matthew there is an evident logical connection between the beatitudes, and we may believe that by seeking we shall find a connection between these also, although they are written with interruptions. The book is one, and has a unity of author and purpose. As there is a connection between the several parts of the book, so we may look for such between the sep-

arated beatitudes. Professor Milligan, of Aberdeen, divides the book into seven parts, parallel to those which he finds in the Gospel by St. John. In that Gospel he finds the struggling and victorious Saviour; in the Revelation His struggling and triumphant Church. His divisions are: (1) The introduction (i). (2) The church on the field of history (ii., iii). (3) Anticipations of the Church's victory (iv., v). (4) The conflict between the Church and her enemies (vi.-xviii). (5) The pause of victory (xix., xx). (6) The New Jerusalem, the happy home of the victorious saints (xxi). (7) The conclusion (xxii). We find, accepting this analysis, the first beatitude is in the introduction, the second and third are in the main section of the book, in that describing the conflict, the fourth and fifth are in that concerning the pause of victory, and the sixth and seventh are in the conclusion.

The book as a whole is occupied with the struggle, the fight of the Church in the world against her enemies, the Beast, the False Prophet, and the Serpent—the threefold manifestation of evil. This, I think, gives us the key to these beatitudes. They are the beatitudes of *action*, of *deeds*, and so are a contrast to and an advance on the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, which are beatitudes of character, or of religious and moral condition or state. As the fourth beatitude in Matthew is the climax of the whole—the first three preparing for and culminating in it, and the other three originating in and growing out of it—so also in the Apocalypse the fourth, viz., that concerning the blessedness of those (effectually) bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb is the climax of the new seven. The first three run up to and centralize in it, and the other three are similar to the first, and may be considered as further stages of development in the same.

He who is effectually called to the marriage supper of the Lamb lives a life of active preparation for that great

and glorious event. The rule of his conversation or manner of life is the Word of God, the lamp that shineth in a dark place, to which he gives heed until the day-dawn and the day-star arise in his heart. Here we have the first and sixth beatitudes. He patiently continues in well-doing even unto death, and his works follow with him into the marriage hall as evidence and reward of his faith. This gives the second beatitude.

In the gospel by John there are only two beatitudes: (1) The blessedness of *faith* in Christ without having seen Him (xx., 29), and (2) the blessedness of *doing* the known commandments of Him who is at once teacher and exemplar (xii. 17). These are echoed in the Apocalypse.

He keeps Himself unspotted from the world and is not found naked, but clothed with the robe pure and white when his Master comes. That day does not overtake him as a thief. He has on the wedding garment, the righteous acts of a righteous man justified by faith. Hence we find the third and seventh beatitudes. He is regenerated and united to the living and great High Priest within the veil; he has heard the voice of the Son of God and lives; he has part in the first

resurrection, and is in consequence a priest of God and of Christ and partakes in the glory of the ascended and reigning Priest-King. He, with his Redeemer, lives and reigns in perfected bliss for a thousand years, even forever and ever. This is the sixth beatitude.

In each he is a man of deeds and is blessed in his doing (James i. 25).

His works are the consequence and proof of his sure calling and election. His faith is seen to be living by his acts.

He is blessed with the blessing of Abraham, his father, who believed and obeyed.

The writer hopes that this brief study may direct attention to this last book of the Bible and lead to its being read, preached, and heard, and that thus a great blessing may come to the Church. Its first beatitude has in view a congregation having a minister who reads and an audience who hears. It is the only book of the Scriptures which declares the reader and hearers of it blessed. Its beatitudes invite and encourage study of its contents. It is pre-eminently the book for these last days and should not be unfamiliar, a *terra incognita*, to our preachers and their congregations.

## SOCIOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

### Papers in Social Science and Comparative Religion.

By REV. B. F. KIDDER, PH.D.

#### I.—SOME OF THE LOWER SUPERSTITIONS AND CUSTOMS OF NORTHERN AFRICA AND EGYPT.

SUPERSTITIONS have always had a vigorous growth in the soil of Egypt. In the museum at Cairo, and still more among the ruins of Thebes, one wanders, as it were, through vast petrified forests, where may be seen in enduring stone, the form and character

of that religious life which flourished in Egypt for thousands of years. These trees no longer spread their branches and bear their fruit; yet, in the same general soil in which they grew, there is found an inferior undergrowth which evidently springs from the same root.

Although practically all of Egypt and Northern Africa is nominally Mohammedan, there nevertheless appear, in different forms, many superstitions that more properly belong to the Shamanism of the ancients. One of the characteristics of Mohammed's conquest was to form an easy alliance with

whatever could not be expelled. It was so in Mecca, when veneration of the Kaaba, formerly an object of idolatrous worship, was ingrafted upon Islam. It has been so everywhere.

Without attempting in every instance to trace them to their source, I purpose to point out in this paper some of those superstitions which exert the most baleful influence upon the people of Egypt and Barbary.

By grouping Egypt with the North African States, it is not claimed that conditions throughout this territory are everywhere the same. The Arabs of Egypt are, as a rule, superior both in intelligence and moral character to the natives of Barbary, while the natives of Tunis and Algeria are in advance of the Moors of Morocco. Again, the English and the French in Egypt and the French in Algeria and Tunis have exerted a powerful influence, which has not been felt at all as yet in Morocco, at least outside of Tangier. But the general character of the superstitions and customs throughout all of this territory is the same.

Belief in demons everywhere prevails. The chief of the demons is "Iblis," or "Shaitan," the devil. But he is not the enticer to evil; he is rather an indescribable monster, who changes his shape at will, prowls in the dark, juggles with the light, and lays tribute upon whomsoever he will. Sometimes he may be avoided by charms. Sometimes he must be propitiated, and votive offerings to him are hung in the branches of the trees.

Associated with belief in "Iblis" and the demons is belief in innumerable djins or genii, supposed to be a kind of spirit, pre-Adamite in origin and intermediate between angels and men. These djins haunt the caves and the lonely places by the sea and among the mountains. They are supposed to take part daily in the affairs of men. So great is the fear of them that before a bucket is lowered into a well or a burden cast upon the ground permission is usually asked of the djin that may be

near. The aid of djins is invoked by the magicians for the performance of marvels, after the manner of ancient necromancy and modern spiritualism. Some of these spirits are evil, others good. Not far below the mission-house in Tangier is a lonely nook in the sea, supposed to be the haunt of a good djin. Moorish women may often be seen going to this rock when the tide is out, to carry offerings and seek the aid of the spirit.

It not infrequently happens that a man or a woman becomes possessed by an evil djin, or demon. Then the hakem, or doctor, is usually summoned, and, by charms and incantations or frequently by beating, the intruder is expelled. When a woman of the lower classes is afflicted with epilepsy or some other disease the nature of which is not understood, the sheikh and several women of the village are called in. She is declared by the sheikh to be possessed by a djin. The women beat the tom-toms and scream and yell for most of the night. Then the sheikh informs the woman that it will be necessary for them to return the next night, and that a sheep must be provided. The next night the program of tom-toms and howling is repeated. Finally the sheep is dressed up as a bride, and the woman is placed upon its back and compelled to ride about for a while, when the sheikh pronounces her cured. The sheep is then killed and dressed, and the company indulges in a great feast.

The people of Egypt and Barbary firmly believe that the spirits of the dead return. By many the prophet is supposed to make nightly visits, and a kind of aloes, known as "suburra" (literal meaning, "make to continue") is hung over the outer doors, that the prophet, seeing it, will grant his blessing to the house and cause it to continue. During at least two of their great feasts (one of them being Bairam, which follows the fast of Ramadan) the women, and many of the men as well, carry offerings of cakes, etc., for

the dead to the cemeteries. This is done in order to prevent the spirits of the dead from returning to their houses. But these offerings are not laid upon the graves, as among many savage tribes, but given to the beggars who frequent the cemeteries in anticipation of these gifts. Similar to this is a custom prevalent among the Copts, of burning incense after a funeral to drive the spirit from the house.

The superstition which, perhaps, exerts the greatest influence is that of the "Evil Eye." Certain persons are supposed to possess the power of producing all manner of physical injury, even to the causing of death, by a mere glance of the eye. A mother is in terror if you compliment her child, for fear it will attract the Evil Eye. To lessen the peril, children of respectable and well-to-do parents are often allowed to go in filth and rags. To save themselves from the Evil Eye, the people resort to various charms. A little silver hand is laid upon the foreheads of the boy babies at birth (the girls are not considered as worth saving). Boys are often seen with little charms tied to their hair or fastened to their caps. Women attach charms for the same purpose to different objects in the house. The little donkey that I rode in Luxor had three charms attached to a string about his neck. When we asked Ahmed, the guide and owner of the donkey, what they were, he replied promptly: "Texts from the Koran, to keep away the Evil Eye." We asked him if he wore any such protection himself, and he answered, "No, God is best. I do not need to wear anything against the Evil Eye. People like you do not need anything to save them from the Evil Eye. God will take care of us." Ahmed is far above his fellows both in intelligence and character. He has attended the American Mission school at Luxor for three summers, and seems to have an earnest ambition to know and to practice that which is true. But the traditions of his fathers are strong.

Not only the Evil Eye, but other ills of life are to be warded off by charms. On the fronts of many houses, particularly in Alexandria, we have seen wooden hands projecting as a protection against the Evil Eye, and also as a kind of general guaranty of good fortune. On the inner blinds and doors of a native house in Tunis we found many Arabic texts and prayers, one of which I subjoin: "*Silam a la Nuah fil a la min on a la Mohammed fil morceliu famin. Allah alma ou a oukarua adab essimoum*"—which means: "Peace be on Noah in both worlds, and on Mohammed among the sent ones. The blessing of God be on us, and may God preserve us from venomous reptiles."

There is another class of superstitions which exerts a very great influence upon the general character of the people. I refer to religious frenzies. Some of these are practiced by the Marabouts, a sect of religious teachers, who claim for themselves special sanctity, inspiration, the power of handling deadly serpents without injury, and the power of working miracles. On Fridays they gather in their mosques, eat snakes and scorpions, and receive special divine impulses. Once every year they have a great celebration. At their mosques the tom-toms are beaten, while the devotees sway to and fro and whirl round and round, working themselves into a state of the highest mental excitement. Until restrained by British and French influence, the Marabouts were accustomed on these occasions to parade the streets and commit many extravagances.

Of the same general character with the Marabouts are the Dervishes, of which many sects are found in Egypt. The most fanatical of these are of the order known as "Rifaceyeh." They perform, or claim to perform, many wonderful feats. One sect, for example, claims the power of thrusting iron spikes into their eyes and bodies without sustaining injury, and also the power of breaking great stones upon their chests. Another sect claims to

handle deadly serpents without injury, and they frequently devour these reptiles. The sheikh of this sect, the "Saadceyeh," was formerly accustomed on special occasions to ride on horseback over the prostrate forms of the devotees, who threw themselves on the ground for this purpose. But the British Government has put a stop to these barbarities. One evening we witnessed one of the zikrs, or fetes, of the Howling Dervishes at Cairo. There was nothing remarkable about the performance, except a gradual increase of swayings and contortions of the body, accompanied by an almost constant repetition of the name of Allah and the most guttural, gasping, and ghastly groans that probably ever proceeded from human lips, until the performers, 25 in number, including one boy, were in a state of general delirium and mental and physical exhaustion. Enough members of the order took good care to remain sufficiently *compos mentis* to look well after the "backsheesh," which those who had witnessed this highly religious service were expected to leave behind them "for the good of the order."

The most fanatical sects to be found in Egypt or Northern Africa (perhaps because they are under less restraint) are the Assoni and the Hamdouchi of Morocco.

The Assoni claim that their patron saint, Sidi Bon Aissa, gave them power over all venomous reptiles. In their most devout religious exercises they wind serpents around their necks and arms. Once every year, usually about our Christmas time, they have a great feast. Devotees from the country districts gather in the cities and larger villages. They form in groups of 30 or 40, beat the tom-tom, whirl round and round, and work themselves into the extremest frenzy. Sometimes a live sheep is thrown in among the worshipers who immediately tear it limb from limb and devour it, entrails and all. When one falls, purple in the face and foaming at the mouth, he is believed

to be specially inspired, and the others leap in wild ecstasy about him. Live snakes and scorpions are frequently eaten during these celebrations, and the more furious bite at everything animate or inanimate. Jews and Christians have not infrequently lost their lives by venturing too near on these occasions.

The Hamdouchi resemble in many particulars the Assoni. Instead, however, of handling deadly serpents and scorpions, they inflict upon themselves bodily injury. They claim to have received power to do this without suffering from their patron saint, Sidi Ali Ben Hamdouch. In their extreme frenzies they gash themselves with knives and hatchets, and frequently thrust nails and daggers through their cheeks.

When we ask, whence arose these superstitions? it is not difficult to answer that many of them at least are older than the Hegira. Although Mohammed incorporated the doctrine of the djins, or genii, in the Koran, the propitiation of Iblis is not unlike that which existed in Egypt from very early times. The same is true of making offerings to the dead, and of many other superstitions referred to in this paper. The question as to the origin of the Assoni is of more than ordinary interest. Although the remains of Sidi Ben Aissa, as also those of Sidi Ali Ben Hamdouch, are said to rest at Maquisez, the words Sidna Aissa mean literally, "Our Lord Jesus," and some have conjectured that the sect which bears this name were originally a remnant of the Ophites, who were once scattered through Barbary. It is well known that the serpent worship of the ancient Egyptians reappeared in the tenets and practices of this heretical sect, as well as among the Nicolaitans and the Gnostics, soon after the opening of the Christian era. Tertullian said of the Ophites that they even went to the extent of preferring the serpent to Christ, as the former brought the knowledge of good and evil into the world. And Epiphanius,

in describing the Ophite ceremonies, said that they kept a living serpent in a chest and at the time of the mysteries would entice him forth by a piece of bread. The door being opened, he would come forth and coil himself around the bread. This they called the perfect sacrifice. Then they would break and distribute the bread among the worshipers, and whoever desired it might kiss the serpent. The service was concluded by singing a hymn through him to the Supreme Father. Whether the present Assoni of Morocco have any connection with the Ophites, it is evident that they have through some channel received some of the tenets and adopted some of the practices of the ancient serpent worshipers of Egypt.

A more important question is, What is the influence of these superstitions upon the people who hold them? It is safe to say, on general principles, that the man who attempts to propitiate the devil is paying too dearly for favors received; that the man who walks in fear of the spirits of the dead is a slave to a morbid and misguided imagination; that whoever trusts in charms is a simpleton, and that those who need to work themselves into a frenzy in order to be religious are destitute alike of the spirit of true religion and of common-sense. This may seem like a sweeping and severe characterization, but concrete illustration is everywhere apparent. These simple people live in an unreal world. They are constantly combating shadows, and looking for help to forces which have no existence outside of their own imagination. They rely on dreams rather than upon carefully laid plans. They trust to the caprice of lucky and unlucky days rather than to forces and laws which are unchangeable. In sickness they are at the mercy of pious mummary, and, in consequence, few of them ever live to grow old. In health they seek to avoid sickness by remedies that are worse than the disease. Until European influence began to be felt they made

practically no advancement in the sciences. Alchemy was their only chemistry and astrology their only astronomy. And few of the common people as yet have any conception of natural law as it is understood by enlightened races.

Is it not fair to ask, In what respect do these lower superstitions of nominally Mohammedan countries differ from the lower superstitions of nominally Christian countries? The answer may be more embarrassing than difficult. It will not readily appear to most minds why juggling with the dead, either trying to call them up or to keep them down, is any more stupid or degrading in the East than in the West. Most of us might consider the Eastern custom of occasionally taking a few cakes and sweetmeats to the cemeteries to distribute among the beggars as even less objectionable than the modern seance, with its dark room and still darker practices. The Christian who regards Friday as an unlucky day will do well to see that he has good reason before ridiculing his Mohammedan neighbor for regarding Friday as a very lucky day. And with the records of witchcraft so fresh upon our pages, it might be well at least to be a little modest in characterizing the intelligence of those who believe in the "Evil Eye."

There are some points, however, at which the comparison between the lower superstitions of Mohammedan countries and corresponding superstitions in Christian countries yields important results. (And I refer, of course, not to Roman Catholic, but to Protestant countries. Romanism has its authorized and orthodox absurdities that are fully equal, so far as I am informed, to anything that Mohammedanism ever dreamed of.)

(1) These lower superstitions of northern Africa and Egypt are fully believed in by the great generality of the people, while the corresponding superstitions of Christian countries are believed in by but few.

(2) A devout Mohammedan may

subscribe to all of the superstitions which I have named, and to a hundred others which I have not named, and be considered all the more devout for so doing, while belief in corresponding superstitions in Christian lands raises a question as to a man's mental balance and leaves him outside the pale of Christian fellowship. The Ophites were regarded as heretics by the early Church and cut off from Church fellowship, but the Assoni, the Dervishes, and the Marabouts are looked up to as saints and religious leaders among Mohammedans. The present Khedive of Egypt is a young man of recognized intelligence, the patron of education, progressive in his spirit; yet he attends regularly upon the zikrs of the Dervishes, and contributes to their support as one of the religious institutions of his country. In short, these superstitions have a natural affinity for Mohammedanism, but are contrary to the spirit and the teachings of Christianity.

A final question must be asked: How can these degrading superstitions be so

far dislodged from the minds of the people that progress will be possible and practicable? The best way to dislodge them is not by attempting to substitute others equally absurd. Either Romanism will not succeed in these countries, or these countries will not be saved. But the same force that drove witchcraft from New England will some time drive the "Evil Eye" from Egypt and her sister countries. Progress in scientific knowledge, progress in the intelligent conception of God and the laws of his kingdom, these are the great civilizing factors. Few Mohammedans have been converted as yet to Christianity. It may be long before large numbers will be thus converted. But the currents of a new atmosphere set in motion by Christian forces are beginning to circulate upon these shores, and already there are not a few indications of awakening thought and life.

A consideration of Egypt's new departure in education, together with other matters of similar interest, must be deferred to a future paper.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

### *Lessons from Two Biographies.*

BY REV. D. SUTHERLAND, CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I.

Two notable additions have been made recently to the clerical biographies of our generation. One deals with the personality and activity of Westminster's greatest dean, Arthur Stanley, and the other shows us the character and work of Andrew Bonar, one of Scotland's most useful and saintly preachers. Both books are vivid in their portraiture, instinct with a vitality that for the time summons the dead back from the grave and makes them live again, and full of inspiration to all seekers after the white flower of holiness. Arthur Stanley and Andrew Bonar differed widely in their conceptions of doctrine and service, but they

agreed in resolute fidelity to what they believed to be the truth and in a following of the common Master which, in the case of one at least, was intense enough to be a passion. Both were conspicuous for a purity of character, on which no shadow rested during long years of public life, and both did work for the Church of their choice large enough to rank them among the ecclesiastical celebrities of their time. Thus they deserved the reward of remembrance, and call for the respectful regard of laborers whose day of toil may be brightened by the recollection of how more eminent laborers bore the burden and stood the strain of the common service.

It is now twelve years since Dean Stanley died, but his name and work are as fragrant as if he had died but yesterday. Proof of this is manifest in

the widespread interest excited by his biography. On both sides of the Atlantic and among adherents of various denominations it is being eagerly read; and, so far as we have seen the critical notices of the religious press, the consensus of opinion is unanimous in pronouncing it most helpful and stimulating. The man now rises before us in all the massive majesty of high-souled endeavor, and with the winsome catholicity which drew to him the hearts of opponents even when they used their pens in attacking the beliefs he advocated. Opponents he had many, but enemies he had none; for his was a charity that thought no evil and spoke no words of bitterness. Now that clearer light has come, it will be seen that strife rose more out of misconception than out of radical departures from the truth on the part of Dean Stanley. He ever had the courage of his convictions, and often he was a pioneer in the theological thought of his day, so he had more than his share of controversy and strife; but the reader who can turn away from his biography doubting his deep piety and intense devotion to Christianity must be prejudiced indeed. It was the very sincerity of his own religion that made Stanley so tolerant and just to religious men of all sorts and conditions, from Cardinal Newman to Bishop Colenso.

Veracity was the passion of Stanley's life. He scorned "to traffic in the false commerce of a truth unfelt." From Arnold, his great master at Rugby, he learned the lesson which he afterwards learned more fully in the companionship of a greater Master, to seek above all things else the single eye and pure conscience, which are the doors opening communication "between us and the supreme and eternal fountain of all purity and of all goodness." Certain limitations in the range of his spiritual sensibilities infused a coldness into his expressions of religious feeling which was misinterpreted as apathy verging on indifference by some of his critics. He lacked in body and spirit qualities

which most people have in some degree. He had no sense of smell and scarcely any sense of taste, and he suffered from a corresponding dulness of spiritual sensibilities, which told in a curious manner on the fervor of his religious life. The intellectual was far more largely developed in him than the emotional, and so the elements of warmth and coloring were to a large degree absent from his deliverances upon personal Christianity, but their absence was atoned for by the presence of other qualities, which gave force and emphasis to Stanley's message for his generation.

The things that abide with us when we turn away from the study of Stanley's personality and activity are the winsomeness, sweet charity, and purity of his character, and the value of his toleration, breadth, and catholicity of culture to the Church of Christ. To know him was to love him. As Dean of Westminster, he came into contact with all classes of society, from the queen on the throne down to the humble mechanic who spent a holiday afternoon in looking at the sights of Westminster Abbey. To all alike he was gentle, courteous, and considerate. The wail of sorrow that broke from the heart of London when he died amply testified to the depth of affection he inspired. His charity was large enough to embrace men of all creeds. He softened the asperities of denominational strife, and often smoothed troubled waters with the oil of Christian charity by means of his famous gatherings in the Deanery—gatherings the charm of which was rivaled only by their catholicity. By pen and voice he pleaded for the recognition of the brotherhood in Christ that could forget sectarian barriers and the discord of differing opinions. It was singularly appropriate that he should go from the Abbey pulpit to his deathbed after preaching on the blessedness of the pure in heart who see God; for purity of mind and heart distinguished Arthur Stanley from schooldays until he lay down to die,

The ardor with which he concentrated all his culture, piety, and pictorial power on the elucidation of Scripture history and topography teaches its own lesson of the power of "this one thing I do" just as surely as it succeeded in enriching the literature of our generation with books which ripened knowledge, fed thought, and quickened imagination to realize incidents and scenes unrealized before.

Andrew Bonar did not move in the high places of this world, nor was he a leader in any of the intellectual movements of his time. Society had no charm for him, and scholarship was only a means to an end. Had he so chosen, he could have rivaled Stanley himself in breadth of culture, for at school and college he carried all the honors. But he early gave himself to the preaching of the Word and to prayer, deliberately magnifying the work of a pastor above that of a scholar or writer. In the beautiful retirement of a Perthshire parish at first, and for many years in the din of busy Glasgow, he fulfilled the functions of a model minister. We question if a better pastor ever lived. Day and night he was visiting his people. Although he had a membership of over a thousand and many adherents, he could call each one by name, and knew the joys and sorrows of every family. And yet the taunt could not be flung at him that he cultivated his heels at the expense of his brains. As a preacher, he fed his people with the finest wheat. He knew his Bible in the original tongues as few of his contemporaries knew it. The

books he wrote reveal his insight into and grasp of the deep things of revelation. His biography shows us a modern Samuel Rutherford, of whom it could be justly said that he was always praying, always preaching, always visiting his people, and always at his desk. But the praying always came first, and so made what followed possible. No recent book has more abundantly demonstrated the truth that to pray well is to labor well. Andrew Bonar's rich and abiding contribution to the religious forces of our generation was fed by unceasing prayer. For more than 50 years he was signally owned in the saving and upbuilding of souls, because he was always waiting on God for the message he should deliver and the manner in which it should be delivered. The earnestness of his spirit breaks out into such passionate counsel to other ministers as "O brother, pray; in spite of Satan, pray; spend hours in prayer; rather neglect friends than not pray; rather fast and lose breakfast, dinner, tea, and supper—and sleep too—than not pray." Because he practiced what he preached about prayer, Andrew Bonar became a source of untold blessings to thousands of souls as a preacher, pastor, and writer.

Ministers should seek the largest possible culture and manifest the broadest charity, in all of which they would do well to take Arthur Penrhyn Stanley for their model; but their hearts will be heavy and their service will be barren if they do not pray much and often in the spirit of Andrew Bonar.

#### PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

##### "The Sinless Man."

IN the April HOMILETIC is an exegetical article on "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not." The writer gives the proper view of the origin of the spiritual life and the immediate effect

of its presence in the soul—the enmity or antagonism between the new and the old; but he is unfortunate in seeming to leave these forces in about equal vigor until death destroys the lower and sets the higher free.

The chapter which furnishes his text

makes a distinct declaration of the *supremacy* of the new force, "Whatever is born of God overcometh the world."

And the epistle which furnishes the most vivid picture of this same moral conflict—the seventh and eighth chapters of Romans—states most clearly the triumph of the Divine principle over the carnal nature in this life; and though the evil power is not destroyed, it is subdued.

It is not correct to say: "The conclusion the apostle renders is, 'So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.'" His *conclusion* is in the first and second verses of the eighth chapter: "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; for the law [or force] of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free [given me power over] the law of sin and death." This supremacy of the spiritual over the carnal is anticipated in the last verse of the seventh chapter, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Dr. James Macknight gives the following translation of this verse, which connects the cry for deliverance in the twenty-fourth verse with the glorious freedom described in the second verse of the eighth chapter, quoted above: "I thank God, who delivers me through Jesus Christ our Lord. Do I myself, then, as a slave serve with the mind the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin? By no means."—"A new literal translation from the original Greek of all the apostolical epistles, with a commentary and notes. By James Macknight, D.D." O. S. CHAMBERLAYNE.

#### An Experience.

It was Sunday morning. I was to preach on Christ's message to the Church at Sardis. It lacked nearly an hour of the time for service. I had prayed, somewhat formally I confess, and had gone through my sermon once more, but I lacked something. I

wanted a spiritual impulse and inspiration. I keep my study-table Bible indexed so that I can tell when I look at a passage whether there is a sermon or exposition on that passage in any of my books or reviews. I turned to my Bible, but there was no reference. On the opposite page, however, I saw that Spurgeon had a sermon—two of them, in fact (vols. v. and xvii. of the Funk & Wagnalls edition)—on the words, "I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love." I read the one in vol. v., and it gave me just the spiritual uplifting that I needed. I fell on my knees and confessed that my prayer that morning had been very formal. I went to my pulpit much better prepared to preach, spiritually, than I would have been if I had not read that sermon. It gave me no new idea for my own sermon, though it was on the same subject in part, but it gave me an uplift of soul, a tenderness of heart, a spiritual inspiration. After the minister has his own sermon-outline all prepared, before he writes out the sermon—or, at any rate, before he preaches it—it is a good plan to read a sermon on the same subject by some master mind. And if one has a sermon in his library on that text or subject, how is he to know it unless he indexes his Bible? It takes a little time to do it, but it saves time in the end. When the writer received, a few weeks ago, the twenty volumes of Spurgeon's sermons, he turned to the index of texts by books of the Bible found at the end of vol. xix. and marked in his Bible a reference to every sermon. "Sp. 5-164 and 17-320" marked opposite Rev. ii. 4, means that Spurgeon has sermons on that verse, and that they are found in vols. v. and xvii. on the pages indicated. The same thing is done with each number of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW*. On one of the blank pages of the Bible there is a list of abbreviations, *e.g.*, "Rb. Robertson; Ch. Chalmers; B. S., Pentecost's Bible Studies; H. R., *HOMILETIC REVIEW*," etc. Try it, brother minister, if on nothing else than this magazine.

R. T. CROSS.

YORK, NEBR.

"Plagiarism."

I HAVE been interested, amused, puzzled, wearied, and disgusted as, from time to time, I have carefully followed the efforts of your different writers to relieve their minds on this subject. It looks to me that many of these efforts are in themselves guilty of the very thing they are condemning—for their very words and thoughts are but the reiteration of hundreds before them. And they stand self-condemned.

But a question, if you please, which to my mind will bear examination in a few elements, at least, of its analogies.

Am I a thief for using the pen and ink with which I give you my thoughts? This pen and ink is not my production; the thoughts of my mind are the suggestions of others; the ideas are the inspiration of others. To how many am I responsible?

Am I to be arrested, condemned, imprisoned for wearing the fine overcoat presented me by my friends or procured from my tailor? The original animal who wore it, with all workmen and merchants preceding me, received their satisfaction out of its elements. I have it now—mine by virtue of the gift or purchase, and for which purpose it was sheared, woven, dyed, and made.

Am I to be fined and denounced for using the fine plane or tack-drawer for whose excellence I paid the price, and now enjoy the ingenuity of thought as well as mechanical arrangement of that thought? Was it not put on the market for service, for circulation? I bought it. It belongs to me by every right of ownership.

I submit, is not a book, a pamphlet, a thought in the same category of finished product for distribution? It is put on the market to be circulated. Is it not, then, the property of him or her who chooses to pay its price. Can he not do what he pleases with its parts, whether it be of the hand, or mind, or mouth of any one related to its production?

What is a library but the student's work-chest. Must he publish to the

world every time he takes up a tool which is his possession, or which he has even borrowed, its first conceiver, its designer, or its maker, that he shall be safe from accusation as a thief? It is mine, is it not, by virtue of the willingness of all antecedents? If I pay the price, is not the whole thing mine—wood, metal, shellac, varnish, glue and whatever is used in its making? If not, then are all men plagiarists, from the bottom to the top, in physical as well as in all spirit forces which have given the world any completed product for its aid. That tool I use—be it a corkscrew, a book, a sentence of words, or a thought—is the product of some precedent, and I am using that identical thing for which I paid the price. Who is not doing this every hour? And I have also paid in the price proportionately the cost of invention or copyright.

There is too much straining at gnats and gulping of sawmills. I have kept quiet many a time, and have waited and listened, and have not failed to find in many cases the guilt at the very doors of the most pronounced iconoclasts of plagiarism. Franklin said: "It is not an uncommon thing for ingenious men in different ages, as well as different countries, to hit upon the same contrivances without knowing or having heard what has been done by others."

I have listened to Moody, Gladstone, Spurgeon, Hugh Price Hughes, Beecher, Talmage, B. Fay Mills, bishops, college presidents, judges, and talented lecturers of this land and in other lands, and have heard identical thoughts, thoughts clothed in almost identical verbiage, yet the charge of plagiarism would be repudiated at once with justly outraged feelings. All nature follows in the line of preceding seasons and agencies in appropriating—or "stealing," if you please—powers already set in circulation for immediate use. Trees, flowers, and vines make use of the identical influences without the charge of theft being hurled at them from preceding seasons.

F. D. T. BICKLEY, D.D.  
WHEELING, W. VA.

### Present Aspect of the Church of England.

UNDER the above title, Mr. Scoon has used the hospitality of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW* (March) for a purely partisan jeremiad on the Church of England. In the cause of fairness, I beg a little space in behalf of the great majority of that Church.

The class of evangelicals that Mr. Scoon champions are, as he shows, greatly in the minority. But so are the extreme Ritualists. Many Protestants of various names are becoming ritualistic in a liturgic and esthetic way. But that is no indication of a general Papal tendency.

Shrill partisan warnings serve a purpose; and in most large bodies there are extreme parties trying to drive out the opposite extreme. It is hard for fanaticism to philosophize, but equally so for dispassionate minds to overlook the immense advantage of a comprehensive tolerance, like that of the Church of England, both for practical work and for protection against partisan persecution; and such organization has proved the home of original and fruitful scholarship. Experience shows that organisms on narrow doctrinal lines split and split again and again, and the fringe of the fragments tends to vague, impractical, anarchistic individualism. The wisest are waking up as never before to the curse of denominationalism. As a first practical step toward real union, federation in work is advocated; that is, just the education partisans have in the Anglican Communion. With all their differences, Churchmen work together with wonderful unanimity; and, with that constant contact, most are sure to be enriched and enlarged in charity and knowledge. Differentiation is a necessary step in true growth, but integration is the higher and ultimate stage. Wide culture and deep religion tend to the union that Jesus prayed for—"Nearer to God, nearer to one another." There must be the family contact for

this education. As love is the ultimate term in religion (which word means reunion), almost every sin (which word means separation) can be classed as a form or result of selfishness. Disintegration means the corruption of death to the material body—the body politic and ecclesiastic.

I wonder how Mr. Scoon knows that there are in the Church of England "widely diverse *views*" and "extreme differences of *opinion*" (italics mine) on ritual more than "in all the religious denominations of the world combined." In any case it shows the liberty of opinion in the Church, and that the mass of the clergy and people have not lost mental perspective, submit their private preferences in ritual as a non-essential, and follow the Prayer-Book word for word. Among so many thousands there would naturally be a few eccentric clergy in the matter of attitude, vestment, etc. But they have to submit to the decision whenever any point is brought to legal test. That this sense of proportion (which does not hold ritual as among things of first essential importance) is the Church attitude in the main, is borne out by the fact that the bishops omitted it from the "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral." Union can only exist with some sense of symmetry. That "quadrilateral" proposal incidentally swept away ritualistic air castles and sectarian bugaboos about the main "drift" of the Anglican Communion.

Mr. Scoon speaks of the Church as "racked and rent by an endless series of internal dissensions." But in the next paragraph he bemoans the "apathetic indifference." The truth is, as everybody knows, the controversies over the "Oxford Movement" have pretty well died out of late years. And so far from the dire calamities predicted, there has been an immense revival of Church life.

Partisanship plays havoc with logic. But let us try to see what data there are for predictions. What keeps organic bodies from dissolution but life?

And what better test of Church life is there than that of Our Lord, "By their fruits ye shall know them"?

The output of Anglican theology and sermonic literature speaks for itself. Mr. Scoon's party should allow some weight to the opinion of the most popular dissenting evangelical preacher in the world. During his last years, Mr. Spurgeon said that though he had said some hard things about the Church of England, he was constrained to commend the superior soundness of her preachers as compared with the dissenting pulpit.

Is increased membership a proof of vitality? Then compare the increase of the Anglican Communion with the increase of population in general and other Protestants in particular. As to Romanists, it is a mere matter of Irish immigrants; and their prelates complain of large losses to Protestantism. Their number and power there are in striking contrast to what they are in America and the Continent of Europe.

Again, as a test of vitality, examine the Church missionary work abroad and at home (much of the latter in poor urban and rural districts deserted by the Dissenters).

Again, consider the scores of millions of voluntary contributions for church restorations and buildings in the last decade. These are endowments. But many Americans are surprised to learn that the English clergy get not a penny from "state pay," or taxation, and that the Established Church is the largest voluntary contributor to clerical support in England. Besides, it is estimated that the aggregate contributions from the private means of the clergy for Church work is more than comes from endowments. Again, by means of immense voluntary contributions for primary education, the Church parochial schools (called "national"—under Government inspection and examination) still keep pace with the "Government Board" schools (purely secular).

Does all this, and the immensely pre-

ponderating part she takes in all kinds of philanthropic work, indicate a Church about to go into dissolution? As for "disruption," there are ample safety-valves toward Rome on the one hand and all kinds of dissent on the other. But it is noticeable that the stream sets inward rather than outward.

To understand Anglican conservatism one needs to study the persistent and triumphant struggle the Church has made to prevent being made either Papal or narrowly and exclusively sectarian. She is far more homogeneously anti-Papal now than she was when England was the bulwark that saved Continental Protestantism. And she is equally less liable now than then to imitate the example of those who allowed themselves to be narrowed and split up into endless sectarianism.

While the Church of Rome has offered to recognize the validity of her orders if she would submit to the Pope, and while she is in recognized communion with the great Eastern Churches and the Reformed Catholics of Germany, Switzerland, France and Holland, the Anglican is at the same time the most powerful Protestant evangelical communion in the world. It is the evangelical but orderly conservatism and comprehensive tolerance that gains for the Anglican Communion such large accessions from the clergy and cultured of all other denominations. And this is why learned men of the most widely separated Churches in the world have pointed beyond their own communions to the Anglican as occupying the position nearest the probable center of the future reunited Christendom.

S. C. THOMPSON.

RENSSELAERVILLE, N. Y.

WILL some one kindly explain how the "Naphtali" of 1 Kings vii. 14, can be reconciled with the "Dan" of 2 Chron. ii. 14?

T. A. BROWN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL SECTION.

## LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

## The Relation of the Church to Political Morality.

BY REV. BERNARD PAINE, SAYBROOK,  
CONN.

THIS question, which demands a practical solution in the States and in the nation, suggests a larger one, viz. : the relation of Christianity to the moral condition and the moral improvement of society. In this discussion, therefore, we consider the Church as synonymous with Christianity. When the Christian Church is true to its mission, and just so far as it is true to the teachings and to the example of Christ, it is the salt of the earth. It saves it from utter corruption and purifies it with a new life and a new morality. The truth is, if we examine closely into Christ's work, we learn that immediately, constantly, and by indirect methods as well, He was correcting the relations of people in society. His words let the light in, and smote the sources of wrong moral conduct. One thing which he was ever enforcing was the proper estimate of man apart from his condition. Every man is a child of God. This is his great revelation as to man. Christ has given to every man on earth the charter of his liberty, the right to a filial and equal relation in God's family, and so the moral and inalienable right to be, as a man, on a fundamental equality with every other man. Boundaries of nations cannot fence off and cast out any men regardless of their rights as men. The color of the skin cannot obliterate the man, or make him anything else than a man. Education, culture, refinements of society, occupation—especially the luxurious living of the wealthy—may make a striking difference in the external appearance of those who are so favored from those of the large majority whose hands are bony and calloused with daily toil, and whose dress is plain and worn.

The innocent and amiable will carry a sweet face, while the ugly and vicious will betray their vices to the world in the countenances that they wear. But notwithstanding these wide diversities, there is the human soul under all beating with common impulses, feelings, and desires; and Christ opened the door of hope and life to each and to all. In close connection with this, Jesus taught the duty and Christian privilege of self-sacrifice in place of selfishness. In this he showed the only practicable way of exercising love for our neighbor. If a Christian loves his neighbor as himself, there will be no end of opportunities to assist him out of trouble and help to better things; and in doing these things, he will be denying himself and making personal sacrifices in order to attain his end, and bringing to his brother man everywhere the help that he needs. And it is in relation to this wide opportunity afforded in this free land of ours—a nation so open to all kinds of effort and influence for the uplifting of great masses of human brothers—it is at this point of view that we should cultivate our Christian patriotism, and learn to honor and love our native land. We need not condone her faults; but with all the faults and imperfections of our country, for this liberty in Christ's work we love her still.

The relation of the Church to the moral condition of society in our land and to its improvement is one of responsibility as well as privilege. Take one instance—the family. Upon its sacredness and peace, its unity and virtue, the whole structure of society rests. Whatever touches its integrity or weakens its life tends to destroy the home and spread the virus of unfaithfulness and libertinism through the land. Now, Christianity has lifted marriage to the level of a sacrament. It elevates the relation between hus-

band and wife to a holy unity, symbolizing the relation between Christ and his Church. It holds up before us the relative duties and affections of parents and children as an affecting mirror in which we behold the face of our Heavenly Father, and the filial piety that is due to Him from all his earthly children. Every Christian family is a pivot on which the Church moves the lever of personal life to herald forth and carry Christ to the people. The families of a Church are like planetary stars, of varying brightness, sending light into the intervening spaces from Christ, the central luminary. This light is their good works, which men see and for which they bless God, because they come from God. This testimony is not weak, but purifying and aggressive. The Church never will rest or be silent so long as the laws of the State make it easy for the marriage covenant to be annulled. It cannot cease to cry aloud until the laws of the State are made parallel to the law of Christ. We see in this one instance how closely the Church is related to the moral condition of society, and how it constantly and powerfully works for the improvement of that condition. We also may see how this aggressive power for good may be increased through the enactment of laws which favor the virtue and sanctity of the family. Every Christian man is a citizen of a free, self-governed nation. He need not go out of the kingdom of heaven to become a citizen, but remains in it, a Christian man. The Church has a mighty, aggressive power to exert through her citizen membership.

And now we approach another phase of our subject. We speak of the suffrages of the people, and of the ballot in the hands of a freeman. Let us not be ashamed to ask, What is a ballot? A ballot is a vote upon some question, or measure, or law, as a constitutional law, brought before the citizen voters to decide. More commonly, it is a vote by which each citizen makes his choice of the men that he prefers should hold

certain offices of trust, especially for men, whether in the State or the nation, who are to enact and to execute laws. The ballot is a piece of paper. It means nothing except in the hands of a citizen who is privileged to show by his use of it what kind of a man he is. By a figure of speech, the term "ballot" is used to cover the power, use, and privilege of the voting citizen in the making of laws, and in the governing of the nation. When we speak of the purification of the ballot, we mean the purification of the men and their acts in the use or misuse of the ballot. We have been taught from the early days of the Republic that a free nation depends for its stability and prosperity upon the virtue and intelligence of her citizens. It is a maxim of freedom's defenders. The ballot is the true measure of the virtue and intelligence of a citizen. Upon the sacredness of the ballot rests the future of the nation. Whatever corrupts it strikes a blow at the life of the Republic. Is such corruption at all prevalent in our State and nation? Professor McCook, of Trinity College, Hartford, has made a careful inquiry. Having been chosen chairman of a committee to examine into the expenditures for alms and charity in the city of Hartford, his report of the facts was given to the world, and made the basis of a reformation in that city. He then extended his investigations to the State, more especially to learn the facts concerning the amount of venality at the polls. These facts have been given out through various periodicals. He discusses the subject in *THE HOMILETIC REVIEW* for June, 1893. Speaking of the manner in which the practical politician gets into office, he says: "It has come to pass that 20,000 votes of Connecticut's 166,000 votes are liable to be cast for money or some other valuable consideration. The gauge has been thrust into the barrel at haphazard in three places—two country towns and one city ward—bringing up 11.3 per cent. of venal. Again, it has gone

down into 17 towns and one large city and brought up 15.9 per cent. As a result, the mean number of voters for sale in the open market is 22,576, and the sums paid have found to range from \$1.50 to \$50.

This information comes from the practical politician "unembarrassed," as the writer says, "by the consciousness of moral guilt or civic delinquency." Professor McCook further testifies that "The practical politician effects bribery of this kind through money, flour, cows; through shooting parties, with free conveyance and free refreshment, both solid and liquid, attached, and like gross rewards." Let us smother our moral feelings and coolly look these facts in the face. More than one-eighth of the citizen voters of this State, this famed "land of steady habits," can be purchased for such various mercenary rewards. Moreover they are being purchased. What does this mean? It means, for one thing, that this venal vote rules the election in every doubtful State, and probably in every doubtful town and city. What, now, becomes of the ballot, the power and glory of the Republic? Where are the virtuous and intelligent American citizens, who, whether in one party or the other, may be outvoted by a band of lawless tramps and drunkards, who are bought by money, cows, or beer? What kind of men will get into office while such voting prevails? Will not the practical politician get to the State Capitol? "One has only to follow the proceedings of a State legislature day by day," says Professor McCook, "to find the evidence of bribery no less real, though perhaps less gross." Then, besides, there is the venal influence and work of the third house. Only a few years since, the lobby of the Massachusetts Legislature underwent an investigation. It was found that hundreds of thousands of dollars were in the hands of this lobby, and operated with the connivance of prominent politicians. An article in the *March Forum* shows how

municipal corruption is reduced to a science. The writer says: "Municipal government is corrupt simply because corrupt and corruptible men are elected to office. Corrupt men are elected to office because office 'pays,' and corruptible men yield because they make money by yielding. If municipal governments had no profitable contracts to award, if school boards had no textbooks to select, we should have no 'municipal problem.'" In this way the writer opens up a vast but well-defined system of bribery on the part of business firms, operating upon city councils, the selectmen of towns, and the school boards of town and city to introduce water-works, school-books, heating apparatus, etc. These things are being practiced widely all over the country. But the spirit of righteous reform is not dead. It was such righteous reform that abolished the Tweed ring in New York City. It was such a national spirit of protest and revolt that withered the reputation of every man whose name was in any way connected with the "Credit Mobilier" scandal in Congress. This righteous spirit of reform has its source in the Christian Church. One of the most iniquitous forms of taking from an American citizen his right to a free ballot is through intimidation. This is not bribery: it is oppression. It is oppression in a free land. It is practiced by both parties, sometimes through corporations and capitalists, and sometimes by threats of violence at the polls. The evidence is spread before the nation that it is practiced at elections in various States at the South for the suppression of the colored voters. I do not know what legislation is wise in such a crisis; but one thing the Church knows, and that is that the Ethiopian as well as the Caucasian is a man in Christ's view, and as an American citizen he has the right to a free ballot; and whenever force or intimidation drives him from the polls, the nation has the duty and the power to protect him. Is anything being done to correct these

evils that surround the elections? Yes; and the current of reform is in this case started from across the water. Fortunately, we have a very encouraging example in the very thorough legislation upon the corrupt practices at elections which was effected in the Parliament of Great Britain in 1883. This was one of the great achievements of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, and the man who had special charge of the work was Sir Henry James, the attorney-general at that time. The author of the act gives a very interesting account of it in the April number of the *Forum*. The evil had become gigantic, spreading and taking deeper root for many generations. It seemed to defy reform. Many attempts had been made and laws passed, but they had little effect. Says Sir Henry: "A most unsatisfactory aspect of the matter was that in many localities bribery and treating were resorted to by men in responsible positions, who seemed to be blind to any moral evil in the corrupt practices they had almost openly resorted to. From the reports it was found that justices of the peace, members of the governing local bodies, and professional men were conspicuous offenders." But as these corrupt practices were investigated and exposed, the public demanded reform and the press of the whole realm did valiant service. A striking feature of this law is its thoroughness. The courts and mode of conviction were clearly marked and the penalties severe. For example, "If upon the trial of an election petition, the Election Court reports that the offenses of bribery and personation have been committed by or with the knowledge and consent of a candidate, or that the offenses of treating or undue influence have been committed by a candidate, such candidate shall not be capable of ever being elected to a sitting in the House of Commons for the county or borough to which the report refers, and if elected, his election is void." The same result follows if a candidate is guilty "by his agents." The act has been in existence ten years.

The author says: "Corrupt practices have in most localities ceased, to exist. No member since the passing of the act has been unseated for bribery." The act passed by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1892 for a similar purpose is also set forth in the same number of the *Forum* by its author, Hon. Josiah Quincy. He says: "While it defines and forbids certain acts as constituting 'corrupt practices,' its main provisions are directed merely to securing a full and public account of all political expenditures; but no limitation is imposed upon their amount, and they are not confined to certain specified objects, as they are in the English act." These expenditures must be made through a political committee. Each such committee must have a treasurer, and this treasurer is obliged to keep a record of all moneys received and paid out, with names of each person contributing, and the amount given. He is not allowed to solicit or make any assessment upon any candidate. Within 30 days after election this treasurer must make a sworn statement of all the receipts and disbursements. Mr. Quincy says: "The Massachusetts act has worked so well at its first trial as to afford decided encouragement for the introduction of similar legislation elsewhere." Mr. Bishop, of New York, criticizes the Massachusetts law, as well as those in New York and Michigan, in not making sufficiently definite the courts before which the offenses are to be tried and the manner of bringing them to trial. The proposed Connecticut act, which goes to the next General Assembly, seems to me to remedy this defect. This proposed act "to suppress corrupt practices at elections" is published, together with an improved ballot law, with the acts of the last Assembly, a copy of which ought to be in the hands of every citizen of the State and read. This law ought to be enacted. It should be so well understood by the public as to call forth a strong public sentiment in its support, so that it shall not be weakened by the

amendments of practical politicians, but, if necessary, made stronger by the corrections and additions of the framers and friends of the bill. This reform has come; it is a pressing need, and it hastens to its goal. What is the sphere of the Church in such a reform? A brief outline must suffice in my closing words:

1. It must recognize and hold up before men the moral character of this corruption of the ballot. Bribery is a sin. It is condemned in the laws of Moses: "And thou shalt take no gift; for a gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous." These words are as true to-day as when they were written. The warning is repeated in Deuteronomy and other parts of the Bible: "Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons; neither take a gift; for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous." If it will blind the eyes of the wise, what effect must it have upon the common people, upon the foolish? Will it not destroy the moral sense? When Simon the Sorcerer tried to bribe Peter with money, he said to him: "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." Even our Lord was made subject to the temptation of bribery by the arch-deceiver. He showed him all the kingdoms of this world, their riches, and the glory of them, and said, "All these will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." But this was most abhorrent to the holy nature of Christ. His reply was quick, with disgust and sharp rebuke: "Get thee behind me, Satan." Bribery under all circumstances is wicked; but in the political life of a people, it is most degrading. Corruption is the proper word.

2. The Church furnishes a standard for political morality. Outside of Christianity, there is no one standard of morality for all people and times. Governments are of various forms. Circumstances and customs call forth

divers ideals and tests of what is justifiable and right. But God does not change. Jesus Christ "is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever." In setting up His kingdom, there is to be—there is only one standard: it is the will of God. How repugnant to bribery is the thought of God! God's love does not trifle with the rights and privileges of the weak. It does not permit a stumbling-block to rest before the feet of our brother.

3. Once more, for the elevation of political morality the Church is to furnish motives. The motives furnished by the State in its regulation of conduct are limited in their range. They appeal to fears, chiefly in the restraints put upon personal liberty and the disgrace of convict life. The State does well to call in the Church and her ministers to help reform the character of the convicts. But what can the State do toward changing the moral character of the people in the community at large? How rid them of a wrong bias? How straighten the crooked places in man's fallen nature? How restore the lost balance? She knows nothing of these things. Dr. Parker says concerning Christ's work of adjusting human relations: "A very subtle thing is the equipoise. An extra handful of dust on the side of a planet might endanger the universe." There is something in human nature that the State cannot reach. A writer in *Lux Mundi* says: "If states and societies are as the individuals who compose them, then any theory of society must rest upon the theory of man; and the theory of man is imperfect unless it recognizes the fact of sin. This fact of sin, of course, is broader and deeper than any acts, whether moral or immoral. The State, therefore, needs the Church to furnish the motives for the elevation of political morality. Her resources for this are quite inadequate, and need to be supplemented by those of Christianity. The State fails to give principles and motives which apply to all moral conduct." And again we

quote these conclusive words: "The State can only secure a minimum of morality, shifting with the general morality of the community. It is in its appeal to the higher motives that the State is weak; it is in its appeal to the higher motives that the Church is strong." Brethren, we believe in the coming of a better future to the world. We have not lost the vision of the seers. We are now living in the bright tomorrow of ancient days; and every tomorrow will be brighter than the one before it. But how is this hope of the ages to be realized? The prophets, with one voice, say, by the increase of righteousness. "Righteousness exalteth a nation," and nothing else can. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." Sodom found it so; Nineveh had experience of the truth; so did Babylon, Rome; and the nations of heathenism in every age affirm the truth. The kingdom of God is not to be a kingdom of saloons. It is said the brewers of New York City rule the entire municipality. How? By mortgaging 6,000 saloons, and holding the keepers in political subjection. Does not the city need Dr. Parkhurst and the Churches behind him to smite

the vampire of debauchery and corruption? "And a highway shall be there, and the unclean shall not walk therein." The better to-morrow will see a great diminution of almshouses and miseries of poverty. Professor McCook says more than 56 per cent. of the expense of almshouses and charity in Hartford is due to intemperance. In 1890 intemperance cost the city the sum of \$68,432 in alms and charity. The kingdom of God that we are praying for is not a far-away kingdom, somewhere in the outside universe. It is coming on the earth. The inhabitants shall not want. Poverty and sickness will be swept away. The strife of tongues shall cease. Peace shall reign on earth as in heaven. The New Jerusalem comes down to earth. It is "four-square." It hath foundations. The measuring line in its erection is the plummet of righteousness. Its cornerstone is Christ. Through his reign righteousness and peace are promised throughout the world.

In every movement that Christianity makes to eradicate the corrupt practices of men in political and in social life Christ is setting up His kingdom on the earth.

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

##### Sermonettes and Exposition.

DR. JAMES MOORHOUSE has had a long and varied experience as a preacher. As Hulsean lecturer at Cambridge, chaplain in ordinary to the Queen of England, vicar of the populous parish of Paddington, London, bishop of Melbourne, Australia, and now as bishop of the great manufacturing diocese of Manchester, England, Bishop Moorhouse has arrived at the conviction that the length of a sermon should be 20 minutes, and that a sermonette of seven minutes is the best kind of address for a week-day service, and that an expository discourse should be delivered on Sunday even-

ings. The Bishop was and still is one of the most popular preachers in England, and he supports his advice to his clergy by giving incidents from his own ministry, a ministry exercised under the most eventful and varied conditions. Crowned heads, university students, fashionable Londoners, sturdy colonists, and hard-headed Lancashire artisans all like short sermons. The Bishop admits the great difficulty of being brief, but brief you must be if you want people to listen to you.

The expository discourse on a Sunday evening is a good and wise suggestion. Let the short expository sermon on Sunday evening become a recognized institution, and gradually our people

will look forward to the evening sermon for instruction rather than for entertainment. It may not "attract" quite as much as an expensive musical service, but it will be more profitable. For the week-day exhortation we must ask of the Bishop to let us have 15 minutes, although he says that when he was Vicar of Paddington he found his seven-minute sermonette a great attraction and his audience increased as the sermon shortened. When a preacher of Dr. Moorhouse's popularity asserts this, it is, to say the very least, worthy of consideration. For the last 30 years he has been a preacher of whom people never wearied.

#### Expression in Reading.

THE late Rev. Dr. Morley Punshon, the Methodist preacher, was beyond question one of the most gifted speakers of modern times, and it is interesting to find a critic of the eminence and culture of the Rev. Canon Fleming quoting the Methodist preacher as a great example of one who possessed the art of expression. Canon Fleming says (in his *Religious Review of Reviews*): "Who that ever heard Morley Punshon recite Macaulay's 'Lay of Horatius' is likely to forget his 'word-painting?' As, for instance, in that stanza in which the bridge falls:



"But with a crash | like thunder—  
Fell every loosened beam;  
And, like a dam, the mighty wreck  
Lay right athwart the stream:  
And a long shout of triumph  
Rose from the walls of Rome,  
As, to the highest turret-tops,



Was splashed | the yellow foam.'

"It is not too much to say that, as Morley Punshon recited that stanza, you (mentally) *saw* the bridge fall, you (mentally) *heard* the 'CRASH,' and you (mentally) *beheld* the 'yellow foam' 'SPLASHED' to the 'highest turret-tops.' This is only another way of saying that it was REALISTIC in a high

degree. He threw the very *sound* into a word.

But how came he to possess this coveted power of 'word-painting?' Some one may answer, 'By genius.' I prefer to answer, 'By study.' He had studied this scene till it became a picture in his own mind. He *saw* it in the way in which the great chessplayer Morphy—when he played 12 games *simultaneously*, without seeing the board—peopled each board with all its pieces, and *saw each piece* as if he was looking at the board. But can we ordinary readers and speakers attain to this? Yes, in our measure, by the same process—'by study.' In the first place, learn by heart what you wish to express; learn it *perfectly*, so that you are quite independent of your book, and are left free to the guidance and promptings of your own mind. Then, when you have *memorized* the words, close your eyes, and *infit* the thoughts and feelings of the author in the mind in such a way that there shall be an entire *re-production* of them. This will not make you *artificial*, but *natural*. The effort will become almost *involuntary*, as was the case when little Jim whistled in a ragged school. His teacher corrected him, but the lad exclaimed, 'Please, sir, it was not me as whistled; *it whistled itself.*' "

#### Services for Cyclists.

THERE has been a commendable difference of opinion among clergy as to whether it is compatible with clerical dignity to ride a bicycle, and whether cycling is not a desecration of the Lord's day. But there is abundant testimony that some very hard-worked pastors in London and other places have found "wheeling" a most valuable auxiliary in the visitation of the sick and dying.

But now another question arises, namely, what can be done for the spiritual benefit of those thousands of young men who cycle on Sundays?

The parish church of Woodford is situated near Epping Forest, in the

suburbs of London, and the vicar has determined to "catch men" as they come out of the city on a Sunday afternoon on their bicycles, and during the summer months there are special services for them. A cyclist reads the lessons, a cyclist clergyman preaches the sermon, and cyclists form the choir.

Last summer there was a great cycling service in the nave of Winchester Cathedral. More than a thousand wheelmen were assembled. Many of them had traveled a long distance and were doubtless glad to enjoy the cool, refreshing shade of the great cathedral on a sunny Sunday afternoon. Their machines were stacked in the cathedral cloisters.

It is beyond question a most difficult thing to restrain the sons of a family from riding a bicycle on a Sunday; it therefore becomes a matter for serious consideration whether these young men cannot be gathered for worship in country churches for a single hour on the Sunday afternoon. The churches of our large cities are not as well attended by young men as they ought to be, and it would seem very probable that if at certain distances from the city services were held on Sunday afternoon for the special benefit of "wheelmen," much spiritual good might be effected.

---

#### The Parson and the Choirmaster.

A WELL-KNOWN pastor in one of our large cities in America has a stated weekly consultation with his choirmaster for the express purpose of harmonizing the musical part of the service with his pulpit ministrations. There would seem to be no question as to the desirability of this practice, and yet in a great many churches the choirmaster exercises complete control over the musical portion of the service, leaving the pastor only the selection of the hymn before the sermon. In fact the choirmaster too often resents any interference on the part of the pastor, and

regards himself as responsible only to the music committee, which engages and pays him for what he calls his "part of the service." In the Episcopal Church the legal right of the rector to the sole control of the choir is guarded by canon, but such is not the case with a large number of pastors. They find themselves almost helpless in controlling the music in the congregation of which they are the acknowledged leaders, and many an organist or choirmaster resigns because he is "interfered with" by the pastor. Hence the strange orchestral displays which violate all good taste and feeling, and which the pastor often apologizes for by saying he cannot help it, as his choirmaster will not be interfered with. A large proportion of the modern anthems are singularly faulty from a Scriptural view, and words are sung which if they were carefully scrutinized by the pastor of the church would not be sanctioned. It is often quite true that the pastor has "no ear for music," but he is usually far better able to judge of the spiritual fitness of things than either a choirmaster or a music committee. We know of a large church where the minister has absolutely no control over the singing, the whole matter being left to the music committee. No clergyman should accept a rectorship or pastorate under such conditions. The choir should be absolutely under the control of the minister of Christ, to whom the spiritual instruction of the people is entrusted. When this position is established, then a weekly consultation between the parson and his choir master can be arranged, with manifest advantage to the spiritual good of the people.

---

I AM not entirely without hope that the time may come when. . . . churches will cease (as Swift says) to be public dormitories; and sleep be no longer looked upon as the most convenient vehicle of good sense.—*Sydney Smith.*