

12827

THE
HOMILETIC REVIEW

VOL. XXIII.

FROM JANUARY TO JUNE,

1892.

EDITORS:

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

PUBLISHERS:

FUNK & WAGNALLS CO.,

NEW YORK:

18 AND 20 ASTOR PLACE.

LONDON:

41 FLEET STREET.

TORONTO, CANADA: 11 RICHMOND STREET, W.

Copyright, 1892, by the
FUNK & WAGNALLS CO.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—JANUARY, 1892.—NO. I.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—PRESENT ASPECTS OF NATURE AND REVELATION AS RELATED TO EACH OTHER.

BY SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S., MONTREAL, CANADA.

MUCH is said and written at present of the origin of religion and of the distinction between that which is natural and that which is revealed ; though it would seem that the latter has few charms for most of those who discuss these questions. They at least attach no great importance to it. As to natural religion, we are told that it may be of three kinds : First, that which attributes the phenomena of the outward world—its winds, its sunshine, the movements of its heavenly bodies—to the action of intelligent agents or an intelligent agent ; second, that which deifies the spirits of the dead and supposes them to exercise superhuman power ; third, that which recognizes man as an embodiment and image of God, either in the person of the worshipper himself and his works, or in those of the rulers and magnates of the world. Each of these has its advocates, hostile to each other, while some have the good sense to combine them all. The publication, by Professor Max Müller, of his Gifford Lectures last year, added new interest to the first,* which he advocates ; though we cannot read his book without perceiving that in the ancient idolatries, at least as presented to the common people, all were inextricably interwoven.

It is the object of the present paper to show that all these forms of natural religion are not only reconcilable with, but cognate to and in some degree contained in the religion of Jesus Christ ; and that nature is not only in harmony with revelation, but cannot be fully understood without its aid. It will also appear that the various forms of nature-worship found where revelation is unknown or has been lost, are all more or less rational, and are based on a felt want of humanity, which makes religion of some kind as necessary to man as his daily food, and renders questions as to a supposed origin of religion among peoples destitute of the religious

* "Physical Religion," Longmans, London, 1891.

instinct as useless and frivolous as it would be to search for a tribe of men who had not learned to eat and drink.

The Old Testament knows nothing of a spontaneous development of man from lower animals, nor of a gradual development of religious ideas through various stages of fetichism and polytheism. On the contrary, it assumes man from the first as a being capable of religion and of intercourse with his Maker.

This appears in the first sentence of the Book of Genesis, whose words are absolutely unique in their grandeur and far-reaching significance—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." No evidence of the truth of this initial statement is given. The writer was aware that it required none, because the fact is one which admits of no alternative. The universe must have had a beginning somewhere in past time. We cannot conceive of it as eternal. It cannot have been causeless or self-produced. There must have been a first cause, and in that First Cause must have been potentially all that has been produced. The reason of the most primitive or of the most modern men cannot, without contradicting itself, reach any other conclusion than that Power and Divinity lie behind nature. What name shall we give to this omnipotent, eternal First Cause? He is Elohim—a name implying might and awe, power and divinity; and its plural form indicates a plurality of persons in the unity of the Godhead, so that all that are called gods might be included under this one great name.

In harmony with this are the succeeding statements that God revealed Himself to primitive man, gave him a law to observe, was known to him in the evening breeze that murmured through the leaves.* Let it be observed here that, according to Genesis, natural religion and revealed religion coexist from the first. Man—untutored, primitive man—can perceive behind the machinery of nature the power and divinity of its Author, and this intuitive and natural religion is supplemented by a direct revelation, placing the mind of the Creator in relation to that of His creature. Theism is thus "a fundamental truth, . . . because it is founded on the very nature of our mind, our reason, and our language, in a simple and ineradicable conviction that where there are acts there must be agents, and in the end one prime agent, whom man may know, not, indeed, in his own inscrutable essence, but in his acts as revealed in nature."† This is natural religion as indicated in the first verse of Genesis, and in many succeeding passages of the Bible; but to this it adds that revealed religion which presents to us the Creator as a personal being, in whose likeness our own rational and moral nature is made, with whom we may hold intercourse, and who cares for and loves us.

Let us now consider the relation of the earlier chapters of the Bible to the three kinds of natural religion above referred to, and to their distorted and diseased development into polytheism and idolatry. All three of the forms

* Gen. ii. 16; iii. 8.

† Max Müller, "Physical Religion."

of natural religion—that which recognizes God in physical nature, that which believes in the continued and glorified existence of the holy dead, that which recognizes our own kinship to God and capacities of intercourse with Him, revelation recognizes, but at the same time opposes that superstitious degeneracy of these ideas which leads to actual deification of natural objects, of ancestry and heroes, or of ourselves and our works.

How wonderfully does the first chapter of Genesis dispose of all the raw material of ancient idolatry! The heavenly bodies are pointed out as the work of God, and their obedience to definite law is indicated in connection with that important purpose which they serve to us as the great clock of nature. They are “for signs and for seasons and for days and for years,” servants of ours, like our household timekeeper, not gods to be worshipped. The capricious atmosphere and its waters, its storms and its thunders, fall into the same categories of creation and fixed law. The dry land and the sea, with all the living things, plant or animal, on or in them take their places in the same great procession. So it is with early human history. We now know that Eden, the tree of life, those mysterious cherubim, whether natural or spiritual, that guarded the paradise of God, formed part of the materials of the myths and worships of the heathen world. In Genesis they appear as included in God’s dealings with men. Learned archaeologists may vehemently dispute as to whether natural objects or deceased heroes and ancestors furnished the early material of religion. Genesis quietly includes both, and ranges as ordinary men in primitive human history all ancestral gods and demi-gods of the old mythologies, from Eve to Nimrod; for Eve was evidently the original of Ishtar and all the other mother-goddesses of antiquity; while Nimrod is now known to be Merodach, the great tutelar divinity of ancient Babylon. Thus the Bible, if we only will receive its simple statements of positive fact, has already settled all these vexed cosmological and mythological questions, and this in a way which seems consonant with common sense and with all that we can glean from the relics of primeval man. The deification of humanity itself, whether in the general or the individual, and that of man’s works, seems to have been of later growth, but on this the Bible everywhere pours contempt, reminding man of his inferiority, imperfection, and mortality, and ridiculing the attempt on his part to make a portion of a log of wood into a god, while he burns the remainder.

If now we turn from the Bible to consider those views of nature and religion which have arisen independently in the minds of men destitute of direct revelation from God, or who have rejected that revelation, we shall find that whether in ancient myths or modern science they have some features in common, and are characterized by conclusions and results of the most partial and imperfect kinds. In both the creature is regarded to the exclusion of the Creator. Both consequently fall short of a first cause, and whether a man worships the sun or fire or a deceased hero, or limits his view to physical energies and to the dicta of great authorities,

the ultimate character and results of his religion or want of it become nearly the same.

The steps by which men came to worship fire, the great god Agni of the Hindoo mythology, are well explained by Max Müller in his Gifford Lectures, though the view which he presents is necessarily one-sided and imperfect, regarding, as it does, man as a being working his way to religious ideas from a state of destitution of religion, and supposing that the habit of speaking of his own actions was transferred to what seemed to be the actions of fire and other agents, as when we now speak of fire as raging, roaring, devouring; natural, even necessary modes of speech, which might, perhaps, lead simple minds to fancy the fire a living agent. So we may think or speak of the sun as "like a bridegroom coming out of his chamber" to run his daily race, or of the moon as "walking in brightness;" but there is no necessary connection between these forms of speech and idolatrous worship.

The magic influence of fire is indeed one which many may have felt. Its spontaneous action, its devouring energy, require but little imagination to convert it into a living, active agent. I remember an incident of my own youth which strongly impressed this upon me. I used to take long rambles through the woods in search of rare birds or other animals to add to my collections. On one occasion, on a hot, still summer day, I suddenly came on a tall, dead tree on fire from top to bottom. There was no other fire near, and there it stood blazing quietly in the still air. How it was set on fire I do not know, probably not by human hands, and it may have been by lightning. The strange, causeless, spontaneous burning struck me forcibly. I could sympathize with Moses when he saw the bush that burned without being consumed, and could easily imagine some primitive savage unacquainted with fire, in presence of such a sight, imagining that he saw a god or at least something supernatural. This might be superstitious, but when we see any strange natural phenomenon, or even the ordinary rising and setting of the sun, and are ignorant of the causes, it is surely natural and not irrational to refer the effect directly to a divine first cause, and it requires but a small stretch of imagination to deify the seen agent. When, however, we find that neither the sun nor fire are voluntary agents, but obey unchanging laws which we can understand, and in the case of fire, can regulate to our own advantage, we learn that these are not gods, but only manifestations of a higher power. It will be a curious failure of sound reason if, when disenchanting as to the divinity of natural objects, we fail to recognize their Maker. There is good reason to believe that in ancient times the priests and the initiated did not make this mistake, but continued to regard natural objects as emblems of God. But whatever may have been the case among the heathen, this was certainly the attitude of the Hebrew writers, to whom nature was not itself divine, but the manifestation of the unseen Elohim.

On the other hand, it is to be observed that hero-worship, regarded in

the light of revelation, connects itself with the idea of a promised redeemer or deliverer. In most religions we find some deity or hero who fills the place of a saviour and intercessor. Bel, Osiris, and Vishnu have this function, and this element enters largely into most systems of heathenism, in which it allies itself with sacrifice, a priesthood, and too often with base and venal priestly absolution. Let us not wonder that this was the case of old, when we see what has happened to Christianity in modern times. Jesus of Nazareth, who represented Himself as the fulfilment of all the ancient prophecies of a coming redeemer, and who stigmatizes all previous pretenders to that title as "thieves and robbers," instituted no priesthood, founded no temples or altars, required no special emblems, whether sculptured or pictorial, and no special vestments or ceremonies. Yet how soon there grew up among His professed followers all these things in as full development as in the more ancient systems! We may, therefore, ask, if Christianity now appears in this guise, can we detect any similar outgrowths in the ancient heathen religions? With this clew in our hands we can thread the labyrinth of primitive mythology, and shall find that the old idea of a coming hero and deliverer to remedy all human evils—that seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head—is the root from which sprung many of the most perplexing features of the ancient cults. It would require too much space to follow this into details; but I may refer to a few leading points now coming out from the mass of recent discoveries and discussions.

Nothing is more certain than that throughout heathen antiquity a mother goddess—mother of men and also mother of a god, hero or deliverer—formed a central point of worship, and whatever adoration might be given to any other or higher god or gods, she was the favorite intercessor of the people, just as the Blessed Virgin now is in the Catholic and Greek churches. Sometimes she is absolutely a goddess, sometimes has very human attributes; sometimes she is identified with the moon or the evening star. Sometimes she has a pure and holy character, sometimes her worship is licentious and unchaste. Under all these forms, however, her main attributes are the same, and it is now generally admitted that Ishtar of Chaldea, Astarte or Ashtaroth of Syria, Athor and possibly Isis of Egypt, Artemis of Greece and Asia Minor, and some forms of Aphrodite, are modifications of the same original idea. Endless hypothetical solutions may be given of this ancient worship, but we have lately had an authoritative explanation in those interesting deluge tablets of ancient Chaldea first introduced to English readers by the late George Smith, and which, though known to us only in Assyrian copies of the time of the Hebrew kings, were probably taken from very ancient Chaldean originals. In these Ishtar appears in the character of the mother of men, and as mourning the death of her children devoured by the flood, and beseeching the gods to deliver them. This is the most ancient document in which the goddess appears, and we see at once that as the mother of men she

represents the biblical Isha or Eve ; but we know more of her than this. She has a favorite son, Tammuz or Adonis, who is murdered by his brother Adar ;* she mourns his death and teaches her daughters annually to weep for Tammuz, and she even descends into Hades to rescue him from the under world. This is the ancient Chaldean and Syrian version of the pitiful story of Cain and Abel, though, in the legend as we have it, there seems to be a confusion between the murdered Abel and the surviving Seth of the Bible. In any case, Ishtar is the mother of a deity or redeemer, and as such she is worshipped, and is regarded as having a control over the destinies of her children in the spirit-world.

Thus we learn that a story of sin and suffering, which in Genesis is merely a family tragedy, becomes the source of an infinity of brilliant and poetical myths ; that the promise of a redeemer for fallen man leads to the apotheosis of the first mother ; that under these myths and allegories was originally hidden that promise of a Saviour whose future coming was announced and celebrated by Jewish prophets ; that this blessed revelation became by gradual corruption and embellishment the nucleus of complex systems of idolatry ; that under it were hidden nature-worship, ancestor-worship, and the worship of humanity, the dealings of God with fallen man and the promise of a Redeemer. This may appear fanciful to some, but I think that an unbiassed study of the most recent results of investigation into ancient mythology will indicate its correctness. Let me now turn back to our original subject, and point out how remarkably such discoveries show the relation of the Bible to ancient history and archæology, as well as to the interpretation of physical nature.

The Bible, we are often told, was not intended to teach science. Certainly not ; revealed science would be an impossibility, and it is of the very nature of science to work out its own results from its own data ; but the fact that we have seen the human mind necessarily elaborating for itself a religion of nature and developing this into systems of idolatry, subversive of the true ends of religion, rendered it necessary that a revelation from God should take definite ground on this question. Hence we find at the outset that great fundamental doctrine of a beginning and a Creator, to which we have already referred.

But, starting from this doctrine, it follows that nature must be an ordered system or cosmos, not such a mere mixture and struggle of forces as might result from blind chance, or from the conflict of antagonistic demigods or spirits of good and evil ; hence we have an order of the construction of the universe, given most naturally in the similitude of working days, with a rest at the end, a great Sabbath which furnishes the precedent for the weekly rest of man. This order of creation further gives a good opportunity for showing the higher and lower planes on which natural things exist, and that while merely natural and all lower than man they have their relative ranks in the works of God, and this not at all in

* This, according to Sayce (Hibbert Lectures), is the oldest form of the legend

the order of those myths which would place atmospheric phenomena and heavenly bodies in the front rank of gods. In like manner opportunity is taken of this orderly narration to group and include under the idea of monotheism the sea, the mountains, the groves, the powerful and ferocious wild beasts, and every other object that might give rise to the idea of local gods or of warring and discordant spirits of good or evil. Such thoughts constitute a full justification of the cosmogony and early history of the first book of the Bible.

Let it be noted here that such doctrine of creation, to be of value, must be not science but revelation, communicated, it may be, in vision to some primitive seer, and enlightening him as to the creative work sufficiently to serve the uses of primitive religion. What its relation might be to any scientific knowledge of nature subsequently worked out by man did not concern the early believers in one God the Creator; yet it is remarkable how nearly the short sketch in Genesis coincides with the results of the science of the earth as in more recent times it has grown up.

I have already referred to the orderly development first of physical and then of organic nature and of man, as remarkably in accordance with the testimony of the earth itself. Geology, properly so called, though the time it demands is long, goes back but a part of the way to the origin of the world, but physical astronomy carries us farther, and we may now with some certainty correlate the records of science and revelation from the condition of a mere dark formless mass of matter or form, an incandescent nebula to a finished world.

The following short statement, taken with a few verbal emendations from a recent paper by the writer,* may serve to show the general accordance as at present understood.

“1. In both we are struck by the evidence of an orderly process in which inorganic arrangements are first perfected, and then the organic world of plants and animals, culminating in man himself. In both we read the unity of nature and a grand uniformity of development and progression from the beginning onward.

“2. Though geology carries us only a part of the way to the genesis of the earth itself, yet when it joins its facts and conclusions to those of physical astronomy we reach a formless and void condition, a nebulous mixture of all materials, chaotic and undifferentiated, as the beginning of our planet and our system. Physical astronomy is also making plain to us the fact that the first stage in the conversion of dead and cold matter into worlds consists in the development of those vibrations which cause light, heat, and electricity. The only physical idea of a nascent planetary system is that of a self-luminous and condensing nebula. Light is the first demand of science, but such light can at first only be diffused. The next stage is its concentration around a central luminary, and then comes the distinction between light and darkness, day and night. This is clearly

* Prepared for the Convention of the Evangelical Alliance at Florence, 1891.

the conception of the writer of Genesis i. as much as of modern physicists.

“ 3. After the first formation of a crust on our nascent earth, the geologist postulates an ocean, and he finds that all the stratified rocks composing our continents bear evidence of having been deposited in the waters and elevated therefrom to constitute land. This also is the conception of Genesis. The fiat, “ Let the dry land appear,” implies its emergence from the ocean.

“ 4. Now, however, we find two apparent points of difference between Genesis and modern science. In Genesis the introduction of vegetation immediately follows the production of the continents, and precedes the creation of animals. In Genesis also the perfection of the arrangements of the solar system follows this early vegetation, constituting the work of the fourth creative day. Of all this geology professes to know nothing ; yet it has some dim perception that the old historian must, after all, be right. Why should land have existed a long time without any vegetable clothing? Would it not be natural and even necessary that the plant should precede the animal? May not the great beds of carbon and iron-ore in the oldest rocks of the earth’s crust be the residua of an exuberant vegetation otherwise unknown to us? Again, may not the final gathering of the luminous atmosphere around the sun, and the final regulation of the distance of our satellite—the moon—have been of later date than the origin of the first dry land? There is nothing to contradict this, and some things to make it probable. We know that in all the millions of years since the first crust formed on the earth the sun must have undergone great contraction, and reasons of at least a very plausible character have been assigned for the belief that in those early ages the moon may have been greatly nearer the earth than at present. Thus, while as astronomers and geologists we may consider these statements as yet unproven by science, we cannot condemn them as untrue or even improbable.

“ 5. When we come to the introduction of animal life, the parallelism becomes obvious. The great incoming of the *sherez* or swarmer in the seas corresponds with those early palæozoic ages which have been emphatically called the ages of marine invertebrates. Not that land animals had not appeared, but they were altogether insignificant in numbers and importance. In no respect has the author of Genesis been more unfairly treated than in his reference to the *Tanninim* of the fifth day. The word has been translated ‘ whales,’ and still more absurdly ‘ monsters.’ As used elsewhere in the Bible, the word *Tannin* seems invariably to denote a reptile, either serpent or crocodile. It first occurs as the name of Moses’ rod when turned into a serpent. It is used afterward for a large predaceous animal inhabiting large rivers, armed with scales, and used as an emblem of Egypt and Babylon.* Evidently it is a generic name applied

* See the author’s “ Origin of the World,” p. 405.

by the Hebrews to the larger serpents and to the crocodile. If, then, great Tanninim and flying creatures are represented as immediately succeeding the marine invertebrates, the writer means to picture an age in which reptiles and flyers, which may be either birds or flying reptiles, were dominant. He has before his eyes a picture exactly similar to that represented in the sketches of the 'Age of Reptiles,' by the late Mr. Waterhouse Hawkins. The quadrupeds of the land obviously come into their proper place on the sixth day as immediate predecessors and contemporaries of man.

"6. The comparative recency of man is one of the best-established geological facts, and while, as in the second chapter of Genesis, man may be said to have made his appearance in the latest tertiary or quaternary period along with a group of land animals suited to him and to the condition of the earth when he appeared, on the other hand, his place in the general chronology of the animal kingdom is that of its latest member. Farther, even since the appearance and wide diffusion of man there has been a great continental depression, which is connected with the extinction of certain early tribes of men, and also of a great number of the quadrupeds of the land. It is, therefore, undeniable that we have in the geological history an equivalent of the biblical deluge."

When we are confronted with the current forms of agnostic and materialistic infidelity, we should bear in mind that these are not direct results of science, but rather of certain current forms of philosophical dogma which have been so presented as to be captivating to scientific men. We should also bear in mind that the scientific specialist is too apt to bury himself so deeply in his own researches that he can see little else, and that few theologians will take pains to make themselves familiar either with nature or with the interpretations of it given by modern science.

Still in the last resort men must have some religion, and we find even positivists and agnostics, though falling back on mere atoms and forces which are their substitute for God, desiring some ennobling influence for their own lives, and seeking for it either in the vastness of the universe, like some of the old physical religions, or in humanity itself, like those which were euhemeristic. Thus we find that man must have a religion, and that there can be no form of infidelity without some substitute for God, though this is necessarily less high and perfect than the Creator Himself, while destitute of His fatherly attributes. Further, our agnostic and positivist friends even admit their need of a Saviour, since they hold that there must be some elevating influence to raise us from our present evils and failures. Lastly, when we find the ablest advocates of such philosophy differing hopelessly among themselves, we may well see in this an evidence of the need of a divine revelation. Revelation informs us of the true end and significance of all that is to be found in the living God, while it has compassion on those who without its light "seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after and find Him, though He be not far from

every one of us." If we look up with adoring wonder to the material universe, the Bible leads us to see in this the power and Godhead of the Creator, and the Creator as the living God, our Heavenly Father. If we seek for an ideal humanity to worship, the Bible points us to Jesus Christ, the perfect Man, and at the same time the manifestation of God, the Good Shepherd, giving His life for the sheep, God manifest in the flesh and bringing life and immortality to light. Thus the Bible gives us all that these modern ideas desiderate, and infinitely more. Nor should we think little of the older part of revelation, as presented in the Hebrew Scriptures, for it gives the historical development of God's plan, and is eminently valuable for its testimony to the unity of nature and of God. It is in religion what the older formations are in geology. Their conditions and their life may have been replaced by newer conditions and living beings, but they form the stable base of the newer formations, which not only rest upon them, but which without them would be incomplete and unintelligible.

While like Elijah we may perceive God in the "great wind and in the earthquake and the fire" of His natural manifestations, and while in His providential guidance "His way" may be to us, as to Israel of old, "in the sea, His path in the great waters, and His footsteps not known," He comes more closely to us and speaks more to our hearts in the "still small voice" of His revealed Word.

The lesson of these facts is to hold to the old faith, to fear no discussion, and to stand fast for this world and the future on the grand declaration of Jesus—"God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

II.—THE METHODOLOGY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND ITS ALLIES DEMONSTRABLY UNSCIENTIFIC.

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT WATTS, D.D., LL.D., BELFAST, IRELAND.

It is a hopeful sign of the revival of a truly scientific method of treating the subjects which are occupying human thought in our time, that so much attention is given to methodology. It is not too much to say that the chief mistakes and positive errors in the different departments of science, whether within the sphere of matter or of mind, have arisen very largely from a violation of the laws laid down by Bacon in his "Novum Organum." Many investigators in one or other or both of these branches of study have fallen into error through acting upon *à priori* assumptions, instead of collecting and comparing the phenomena into whose nature and relations they had undertaken to conduct their inquiries, or through an inadequate induction of facts, or through the restriction of the investigation to one class of the facts collected.

With this violation of the Baconian fundamental, not only the higher criticism, but all modern criticism which denies the plenary, verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is unquestionably chargeable. It is true that all classes of antiverbalists profess to eschew all *à priori* assumptions in their investigations of the phenomena of the Bible, and claim to base their conclusions solely upon a complete induction of all the facts of the case; but their practice is not in keeping with their profession. They tell us that they deal with the Bible as they would with any other book; that they take into account all its phenomena, and that, from a careful study of these phenomena, they deduce their estimate of it as a professed Divine revelation. Such is the claim advanced; but the claim and the facts revealed in the actual procedure and its results are very different. Let us examine the actual facts and see whether there are any grounds warranting this high claim to a scientific method of investigating the phenomena of the Book of books.

I. Let us consider, first, the claim of the higher criticism to eschew all *à priori* assumptions. Of course, there is a wide difference between a baseless *à priori* assumption and an *à priori* principle having its root in the very constitution of man, and revealing itself in a primary belief common to man as man. Apart from and independent of such an *à priori* no process of human thought were possible. All valid processes of human thinking assume and are based upon such *à priori* principles. If the higher criticism simply assumed and acted upon one or other of these primary beliefs, and carried out its reasoning thereon consistently with the law that governs the deductive method, so far as its methodology is concerned, there could be no ground of complaint. This, however, is not the rule of its procedure in dealing with the claims of the Bible to be the Word of God. Its chief, its fundamental *à priori* principle is that miracle, in any shape or form, is impossible. This baseless *à priori* assumption is remorselessly applied to the sacred volume from the cosmogony of Genesis to the revelation of Patmos. Every passage in which the exercise of supernatural power or the possession of supernatural knowledge is expressly affirmed or simply implied is rejected as unworthy of human credence, and as discrediting the record in which it has been assigned a place.

Now here, at the very outset, issue is joined with the higher criticism. It is chargeable with basing itself upon an *à priori* assumption, and this, too, an assumption which is not only not a genuine *à priori* principle, or primary belief, having its foundation in the mental and moral constitution of man, but an assumption which is gainsaid by the deepest convictions of our intellectual and moral nature. An *à priori* principle needs no argument to secure its acceptance. It shines by its own light, and no amount of argument can induce the human mind to challenge or repudiate it once its terms are understood. Can this *à priori* of the higher criticism bear this test? Is it among the primary beliefs of mankind, that the Author of

man's being, who gifted him with intellectual and moral powers, cannot communicate to him directly knowledge not attainable by the exercise of his own natural faculties, or make him the medium of a manifestation of power transcending any power possessed by man? It is replied that there is no warrant for representing such manifestations as supernatural, as we do not know what power may be embraced within the sphere of the natural. The answer to this is obvious. The agents through whom or in connection with whom such forthputtings of power or such manifestations of knowledge have occurred always claimed for them a supernatural source. Are we to assume that these men, presenting such credentials as are exhibited in their incomparable writings, were mistaken regarding the source of their knowledge, or their power, or that they were the victims of a delusion which, under the circumstances, was absolutely incredible? Are we to set up our ignorance regarding the contents of the domain of the natural against the testimony of prophets and apostles, and of Christ Himself? If these witnesses are to be credited, however, this primary, anti-supernatural postulate of the higher criticism must be discredited.

But apart from the evidence of the supernatural furnished by such testimony, we have scientific *data* which must be very embarrassing to the higher critics. The position of Bacon is truly scientific and impregnable, that it is only when the mind contemplates second causes scattered that it runs into atheism, but that when it views them as concatenated and linked together it flies to Providence and Deity. The human mind cannot rest in second causes scattered, for the obvious reason that, however scattered, they exhibit marks of mutual correlation as parts of one whole. This correlation of parts is a distinct phenomenon, and constrains the investigator of nature to seek for it an adequate cause. This cause is not to be found in the domain of second causes, and must, obviously, be sought for outside. This is all one with saying that it is to be sought outside the sphere of the natural, for nature is but the sum total of the phenomena presented by second causes, and the object of the investigator is to find a cause for the manifest and demonstrable unity, or unification, of this marvellous whole. It is surely not too much to claim that a cause sufficient to account for all that is natural must be supernatural.

The higher criticism may reply that, in denying the possibility of the miraculous it is not intended to deny the existence of the supernatural. Its existence is admitted, but what is denied is its intervention among second causes, superseding their action or imparting to them a measure of causal efficiency beyond what they are capable of exerting in virtue of their own constitutional attributes. This is manifestly an important concession. It saves the higher critics from being charged with atheism, but, at the same time, the concession subverts the position that the miraculous is impossible. By admitting the existence of the supernatural, they admit not only the possibility, but the actuality of the miraculous. The admission of the existence of the supernatural is all one with the admission of

an original creation, and to this admission they must have been brought by the evidence of the action of the supernatural presented in the domain of the natural. This is simply saying that they have found out the existence of the supernatural through the manifestation of activities which they hold and teach are impossible. Surely the power exerted in creation was a miraculous power, and he who admits such an exercise of power is precluded from denying the possibility of miracles.

But the alternative plea suggested above is still open for consideration. May not one who admits the existence and actual exercise of supernatural, or, which is the same thing, miraculous power in the creation of all things at first, not consistently deny the exercise of such power after the institution of the order of nature? Does it not give us a higher conception of the wisdom and power of the Creator to be told that the whole creation, in all its parts, was so perfectly balanced and adjusted for the attainment of the ends contemplated in the Divine purpose, that subsequent interference with its operations was thereby rendered unnecessary? Does such interference as is implied in the doctrine of miracles not involve the very irreverent conclusion that there have arisen contingencies in the actual working out of the Creator's plan requiring an intervention on the part of the original creative power and a readjustment of the original scheme, for which provision had not been made at the outset? These questions suggest about all that can be urged against the doctrine of miracles by those who admit the doctrine of creation, and it is manifest that the argument they suggest will not bear examination. The argument assumes several things which are not admitted.

(1) It assumes that there were no junctures, predetermined and foreseen, in the actual progress of the affairs of the universe, for the very purpose of furnishing an opportunity for the manifestation of the presence and power of the Creator to the moral agents, who might be forgetful of both. We know that such conjuncture has occurred, and the Scriptures not only inform us of it, but, at the same time, announce the marvellous miraculous intervention to meet the emergency displayed in the inauguration of the economy of grace.

(2) This leads us to point out a second most unwarrantable assumption—viz., that the economy of grace is built upon natural law. This is the fundamental *à priori* of Professor Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and it is the logical outcome of the doctrine that the intervention of the first cause in the operation of second causes is an impossibility. On this assumption an economy of grace is necessarily excluded. As that economy professes to involve the incarnation of the second person of the adorable Trinity, and as that incarnation professes to have been effected not by natural law, but by the Holy Ghost coming upon the Virgin Mary and the power of the Highest overshadowing her, it is clear that the actual inauguration of our redemption was effected by the forth-putting of a power unknown to natural law—a power which, if we are to

credit the higher critics, cannot be exercised without an unwarrantable interference with the operation of second causes, or a grave reflection upon the wisdom of the Creator.

(3) The principle underlying this critical theory is not only irreconcilable with the historical facts of the incarnation of the Son of God, but contravenes the whole administration of the Covenant of Grace. That Covenant is in the hands of the Mediator, and, in order to its effectual administration, He occupies the throne of God, not only *de jure*, but *de facto*, a king. The New Testament details the history of His administrative acts, even to the time in which, His commission having been executed, He shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father, that God may be all in all. These acts are certainly acts of omnipotent, supernatural power. The Book of the Revelation, with which the Canon closes, is a graphic portrayal of the warfare waged by Him as the enthroned Lamb; and certainly that warfare is not waged under the limitations of natural law. From beginning to end the power put forth in the defeat and final overthrow of the antagonistic powers of darkness is miraculous, and is therefore of the very class which the higher criticism would have us believe is inadmissible in the sphere of second causes, as disturbing the order of nature and involving a reflection upon the wisdom of the Creator. The conjuncture arising from the temptation and fall of man required an interposition not provided for under the reign of natural law, and those who object to the display of miraculous power in the Divine administration will find themselves compassed about with insuperable difficulties at every stage in the historic development of the economy of grace. In a word, the economy which is designed to make known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places *the manifold wisdom of God*, makes that wisdom known through transcendently glorious supernatural interventions.

It were, of course, very easy to point out what must be the effect of the application of this principle of the higher criticism upon the Mosaic account of creation and upon the history of Israel. As these portions of the Old Testament abound with instances of the manifestation of supernatural power, all such passages as bear testimony to the fact of their occurrence are either put under ban altogether or explained in a way that eviscerates them of their natural and manifestly intended import. Forecasts of events, afterward verified as tallying with their actual eventuation, are either referred to a statesmanlike sagacity and insight into the characters of men and the set and tendency of human affairs, or they are represented as *ex post facto* narratives, which have been cast in the mould of prophecy to enhance the glory of Israel and her prophets, as the peculiar objects of Jehovah's care. Instead of pursuing this course in examining the claims of the higher criticism, the writer has considered it quite sufficient to point out the bearing of its primary postulate, which ignores the miraculous, upon the whole economy of redemption. It is almost unnecessary to add, after what has been already said, that it is impossible to entertain and endorse

the above fundamental principle—on which the whole theory turns—and at the same time to hold what the Scriptures teach regarding the origin, constitution, and administration of the way of life.

II. But there is still room for an additional word on the claims of the higher criticism to take rank as a science. As already stated, the higher critics claim to base all their conclusions upon a fair and full induction of all the phenomena of the Bible. How does their practice tally with this profession?

The phenomena presented in the Bible may be divided into two classes—the explicit, didactic statements it makes regarding the question of its inspiration and consequent infallibility and inerrancy—statements in reference not only to particular portions of its contents, but statements of unlimited reference, embracing its entire contents. Besides this class there is another, consisting of apparent discrepancies, some passages appearing to contradict others in regard to matters of fact, and passages which, it is alleged, commend or command the perpetration of immoralities. Now the question is, How do the higher critics deal with these two classes of passages? Do they proceed to an examination of them in accordance with the recognized principles of scientific criticism? It is a notorious fact that they do not. It is true of these critics and of all antiverbalists, that instead of giving a fair and full exhibition of those passages in which a full plenary, verbal inspiration is claimed, they minimize the instances, reducing them to the smallest possible dimensions, while, on the other hand, they are sure to seize upon, and hold up to the disparagement of the sacred text, every passage which has even the semblance of an incongruity with any other. Their motto seems to be, Minimize the positive evidence of verbal inspiration and magnify the counter testimony. A writer in the *Theological Monthly* for May, 1891, reduces the former list to very small dimensions. The Bible, he tells us, says very little about its own inspiration, and he mentions only three or four allusions to the subject of the inspiration of the Old Testament by Christ, and one by the Apostle Peter, adding that “the New Testament nowhere asserts its own inspiration!” Prebendary Row, in his book on the Evidences (pp. 454–55), reduces the number of proof texts to four or five, found in three chapters of the gospel by John (the xiv. 26, xv. 26, 27, and xvi. 13, 14), and evacuates these of their testamentary force.

Within the limits of this article there is not room to depict in its true colors such treatment of the testimony borne by the Scriptures themselves to their relation to the inspiring Spirit. This the writer has done in his book on “The Rule of Faith and the Doctrine of Inspiration.” All that he wishes to point out at present is the utterly unscientific character of such procedure. Having reduced the positive evidence to a minimum, and after rifling that minimum of its point and force, they proceed to construct their theory upon the basis of alleged discrepancies, and whatever else may be construed as inconsistent with a genuine plenary, verbal, inspiration

of the sacred text. Is this a scientific procedure? Genuine critical science pursues a very different course. It begins with the positive evidence, and is anxiously careful to note and record and take into account every particle of that evidence. Having done so, it is then prepared to take up and deal with objections. And, as Archbishop Whately counsels, it will not surrender a position established by adequate evidence because there may be objections urged against it which we may not be able to meet, especially when there are stronger objections against the opposing theory. We do not get rid of difficulties by denying the full plenary, verbal inspiration of the Bible. On the contrary, we involve ourselves in difficulties absolutely insurmountable—difficulties involving issues contravening the right of the sacred Scriptures to be regarded as a Divine revelation at all. If the testimony borne by the Bible to its own inspiration be rejected, there is no reason why we should accept its testimony upon any subject of which it treats. We do not get over the difficulty by admitting a partial inspiration, or a full inspiration of some of its parts, for the claim it advances is the full inspiration of all its parts—a claim, in all its comprehension, not only countenanced, but endorsed and confirmed by the testimony of Christ Himself and by His holy apostles and prophets.

III. There is only room to notice another unscientific *à priori* postulate, common to almost all antiverbalists. It is assumed that such intervention of the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit as the verbal theory demands would be destructive of the freedom of the sacred writers, and would transform them into mere "automaton compositors." Coleridge in his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit" urges this *à priori* with all the enthusiasm of his poetic imagination. "All the miracles," he says, "which the legends of monk or rabbi contain can scarcely be put in competition, on the score of complication, inexplicableness, the absence of all intelligible use or purpose, and of circuitous self-frustration, with those that must be assumed by the maintainers of this doctrine, in order to give effect to the series of miracles by which all the nominal composers of the Hebrew nation before the time of Ezra of whom there are any remains were successively transformed into *automaton* compositors." This impassioned denunciation of the doctrine of verbal inspiration merits a prominent place in text-books on logic, and might be introduced as an instructive example of the *ignoratio elenchi*. Its author assumes that such agency of the inspiring spirit as the verbal theory hypothesizes must ignore the prerogatives of the human spirit and supersede the exercise of its faculties in order that He Himself may be the sole agent in the resultant utterance or record. The theory thus denounced, however, assumes no such thing. It assumes nothing inconsistent with the freedom or the conscious activity of the inspired agent. It assumes nothing which Coleridge himself, it is to be believed, would have questioned regarding the action of the Spirit in the creation of man in the image and likeness of God. If—as all who accept the Scripture account of the creation of man hold—the Spirit breathed into the lifeless form of

Adam an energy that imparted to it all the attributes and faculties of an intellectual and moral nature, what ground is there for the assumption of Coleridge, that the same omnipotent Spirit cannot enter into the very pénétralia of man's spirit—that same spirit which is His own workmanship—and control its thoughts and determine its volitions? The account of man's creation and the agency of the Spirit therein forbid any such *à priori* assumption. The assumption proceeds upon an utterly inadequate conception of the relation of the Creator to the workmanship of His own hands. He who gave us all our intellectual and moral powers, and in whom we live and move and have our being, without the exercise of whose sustaining power we could neither think, nor will, nor act, nor exist at all, has constant access to the citadel of our souls, and can bend them to His will and determine them to the execution of His infinitely wise and inscrutable purposes. Granting these clearly revealed truths, what becomes of this Coleridgean assumption? It stands out in its native nakedness as an irreverent invasion of the Divine prerogatives, as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. Coleridge is in his native, appropriate element, on board the ill-fated craft of the ill-starred Ancient Mariner, but he is utterly out of place on board the bark of critical speculation.

But this is not all. Like the *à priori* of the higher criticism, which excludes all miracles, it is in direct conflict with the doctrines of grace. If the Holy Spirit cannot enter into such intimate relationship with the spirit of man as to determine his thoughts and volitions, it must be manifest that there is no room for His agency in the regeneration of the souls or in the origination of faith or repentance. In a word, this Coleridgean objection to the doctrine of verbal inspiration, is founded on a principle which is subversive of the office-work of the Holy Spirit in applying the redemption purchased by Christ. Besides, it is at open war with the Scripture account of the estate in which the Spirit finds the soul when He proceeds to impart to it the benefits of redemption. According to what the Scriptures teach on this point, the soul is dead in trespasses and sins and is at enmity against God. Such is the condition of all men prior to the action of the Spirit in their recovery. The account given of the Divine agency in effecting this recovery sets the stamp of the most unequivocal condemnation on the forefront of all such *à priori* assumptions. The agency is likened to that brought into action in the resurrection of the dead, and even in the resurrection and enthronement of Christ Himself.

One almost owes an apology to the Christian reader for dwelling at any length in exposing the anti-evangelical character of an assumption which would preclude all possibility of the Holy Spirit entering the domain of spiritual death and quickening the soul dead in sin into spiritual life. It is hoped that what has been said may serve to awaken the minds of the readers of *THE HOMILETIC REVIEW* to a still higher estimate of the great question which is now agitating the churches on both sides of the Atlantic.

III.—WHAT AILS BUDDHISM?

By J. T. GRACEY, D.D., ROCHESTER, N. Y.

"BUDDHISM," says Latham, "has created a literature for half the human race, and modified the beliefs of the other half." Landresse speaks of the Buddhists as "those Hindus without caste expelled from their native country, dispersed in all directions, carrying their contemplative idolatry among twenty nations, civilizing some, rendering others anti-warlike, altering the manners, institutions, languages of all, and arresting in some the full development of the human faculties."

What is this great Oriental movement, then, which we call Buddhism? What cheer will it bring to us if we study it? What hopes will it enkindle if we accept it? What is its worth to those who have adopted it? Who was its founder? What did he originate? What was the residuum to those overburdened people of the Oriental world who turned to it for comfort from the already dreary faiths which had their allegiance? A few points only can come hastily under review, and these not in an exhaustive, scarcely a thorough way. Let us ask just two or three questions, to hint, at least, at the answers to them.

WHO WAS GAUTAMA BUDDHA?

Dr. Edkins, who has devoted a quarter of a century to the study of Buddhism, says: "The best key to the understanding of Buddhism is to be found in the study of the life of its founder." That may be called in question; but who is this Gautama Buddha, the alleged founder of this widely extended cult? Who is this man, and what, that at his birth ten thousand world-systems trembled at once, while those born blind received sight; the deaf heard the joyful news; the dumb burst forth in song; the lame danced; the crooked became straight; those in confinement were loosed from bonds; the fires of hell were extinguished; the diseases of the sick were cured; bulls and buffaloes roared in triumph; horses, asses, and elephants joined in the acclaim; lions sent forth the thunder of their voices; instruments of music spontaneously uttered sound; the winds were loaded with perfume; the flight of birds was arrested, as if to look at the infant, the waves of the sea became placid, and its water sweet; the whole surface of the ocean was covered with a floral canopy, and flowers fell in showers from heaven.

Who is this, that flowers sprang where he trod, whom the dwellers in ten thousand worlds shield from the torrid sun with umbrellas twelve miles high, and whose praises they sound with conch-shells one hundred and twenty cubits long, whose long blast rolls for four months without intermission, while others celebrate his praises on harps twelve miles long, and deluge him with golden caskets, tiarras, perfumes, and red sandal-wood, and burden him with gifts?

WAS GAUTAMA BUDDHA AN HISTORIC PERSON ?

Professor Wilson, in his essay on Buddhism, considers it doubtful whether any such person as Gautama Buddha ever actually existed. He notes the fact that there are at least twenty different dates assigned to his birth, varying from 2420 B.C. to 453 B.C. He says the very names of persons connected with Buddha are allegorical. His father's name means "pure food," his mother's name is "illusion," his own name means "enlightened one." The birthplace named for him (Kapilavastu) has no geographical place that can be reasonably suggested. It may mean only the substance of Kapila or the substance of the Sakhya philosophy, called Kapila Muni. It seems not impossible that Sakhya Muni is an unreal being, and all that is related of him is as much a fiction as is that of his preceding migrations and the miracles that attended his birth, his life, and his departure. Senart's "La Légende du Buddha" thinks it legend and only a reproduction or migration of the mythical being, the *sun hero*, presented in semi-human shape, "No more one of ourselves than the Greek Heracles, for instance;" and Kern, in his recent work, "History of Buddhism in India," emphasizes this view on a broader scale. He says Sakhya Muni is a creation of European scholars, and Kuenen himself cites quotations from Buddhist literature asserting that what the sun does Buddha does, and without committing himself wholly to the myth theory, says it is not possible now to say if any part of it is historical. We are not now free to explain Buddhism by its founder. Oldenberg says that "a biography of Buddha out of antiquity—that is, from out of the sacred Pali texts—has not reached us, and we may say with confidence has never existed." It is almost impossible to find a manuscript of Buddhism written five hundred years ago. Monier Williams says no authoritative scripture gives any trustworthy clew to the exact year of Buddha's birth. No reliable information exists of the extent and character of the Buddhist scriptures, said to have been finally settled by the Council of Kanishka in the first century, which were handed down orally from generation to generation. The Buddhist historian Māhānāmā (A.D. 459) affirms that the doctrines were first committed to writing in the reign of Vatagamini, B.C. 86 and 87, and Max Müller seems disposed to accept this. Thus touching the Man and the Book the testimony is equally defective.

Max Müller, however, reviews Wilson item by item, and says we may be sure Buddhism has a real founder, and that he was not a Brahman by birth, but belongs to the second or royal caste. Kuenen thinks Gautama is essential to Buddhism. The legend must be accounted for, and the most natural way to account for it is this supposition of the pre-eminent incorporation of the philosophical thought in the character and career of Gautama Buddha.

But the legends of Buddhism are the wildest extravaganza. They are divided into three periods: First, of his pre-existent states through several

hundred transmigrations; second, of his earthly life before attaining Buddhahood; third, of his ministry after he had become "enlightened." It is the legend that represents him as a saviour incarnated to bring blessings to men. It is the legend that describes his miraculous birth, entering his mother's side as a white elephant. It is the legend that tells us of his child miracles. It is the legend that says, when seated under the Bo-tree, Satan tempted him, surrounded with a phalanx eleven miles deep. It is the legend which says Satan's ashes and fire and smoke and rocks and mountains became but zephyrs and fragrant flowers on his neck. It is the legends which contain those myths which present correspondencies with the events in the life of Christ, like the angelic hosts as heralds; Simeon the aged blessing his birth and Herod seeking to destroy the young child; the presentation at the temple; the dispute with the doctors; his baptism, transfiguration, temptation and translation. But it is incomplete and unsatisfactory logic to conclude that necessarily there must have been some special personification which these legends represent. It may be true that the legends must be accounted for, but it is not necessarily true and certainly not proven that they imply an historic personage. It would be a troublesome, if not severe logic, that would make us conclude that every famous legend of the Asiatic world must necessarily have had a personification in history. Dr. Ellinwood, who, we take it, is the author of the article in the new "Cyclopædia of Missions," of Funk & Wagnalls, on Buddhism, sums up the matter perhaps as nearly as can be done, when he says: "It has virtually been settled by the consensus of the best scholars that those accounts which are the oldest, which are authorized by the earliest councils, which have the concurrent testimony of both the Northern and the Southern literatures, and which are credible in themselves, shall be accepted as the probable history of Gautama."

This, then, is the nearest liberal conclusion that we can reach of the value of the history, and this is admitted to be only "probable." Nobody will claim that we have here exact history. If, however, we give the historic side the benefit of the doubt, as to the personality of Gautama Buddha, what then? Still another question arises, What do we owe to him? How far is he to be credited with being the author of the system or rather the unsystematic teaching which is known as Buddhism? In other words,

IS GAUTAMA BUDDHA THE ORIGINATOR OF BUDDHISM?

Dr. Oldenberg says: "If it was usual formerly to describe Buddha as the religious re-creator of India, as the one great champion in the struggle for his time; henceforth as research advances we shall find ourselves more and more distinctly compelled to regard him as simply one of the many contemporary heads of ascetic unions—one concerning whom it is not and cannot be in any way shown that he exceeded his rivals in profundity of

thought or force of will, even in any approach to the same proportion in which, perhaps by nothing but a change of purely accidental circumstances, he has come to transcend them in actual renown. From the multitudinous saviours of the world who were traversing India in every direction about the year 500 B.C., a second figure has already issued into distinct recognition." He refers to the founder of the Jain sect of Buddhists.

It must be always borne in mind that Gautama was not the only Buddha. Other beings will also become Buddhas. These possible Buddhas, called Bodisat, are numberless. Buddhas appear after regularly recurring intervals in a series that has no beginning or end. The Singhalese suppose all trace of the preceding Buddhas has been lost, except as presented in Gautama Buddha's teachings.

It is thought by many Orientalists that Gautama was not the originator of Buddhism, that he only revived the system of the more ancient sages. On the great bell in Rangoun the inscription says there are three divine relics of three deities enshrined there, who were the immediate predecessors of Gautama Buddha. The dates of these three predecessors of Gautama have been celebrated as 3101 B.C., 2099 B.C., and 1014 B.C. respectively. It is difficult, therefore, supposing Gautama Buddha to be an historic person, to determine how much of what is peculiarly Buddhistic is to be attributed to him.

WHAT GAVE GAUTAMA POPULARITY?

It is not so difficult to see what it is, in the whole concept of Gautama Buddha's story as popularly related, that gave him pre-eminence, or that gave, if you please, to the myth its popularity.

Kuenen says that it was his masterly attempt to bring within the reach of those who have not bid farewell to social life, who cannot in the nature of the case become ascetics, such measure of salvation as is possible for them—*it is this* which is distinctly the work of Gautama.

Spence Hardy very aptly puts the most distinctive things about Gautama when he writes: "A great part of the respect paid to Gautama Buddha arises from the supposition that he voluntarily endured throughout myriads of ages, and in numberless births, the most severe deprivations and afflictions, that he might thereby gain the power to free sentient beings from the misery to which they were exposed under every possible form of existence.

"It is thought that myriads of ages previous to the reception of the Buddhahip, he might have become a Rahat (entered into Nirvana), and therefore ceased to exist; but that of his own free will he forewent the privilege and threw himself into the stream of successive existence for the benefit of the three worlds."

This is what is meant by Gautama becoming the saviour of men.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE TO BUDDHISTS OF GAUTAMA'S ACT.

Another question then presses on our thought—What, from the standpoint of the Buddhists themselves, is the practical output of this noble and self-sacrificing act of Gautama? It would seem that from the veneration accorded him, from the great value attributed to his renunciation of his hard-won privilege to enter Nirvana, that there ought to be some corresponding result to the masses of men for whom he made the sacrifice; but we are at a loss to locate it. The hope of Nirvana is not, after all, the hope of Buddhist communities. Only a few of the holiest and most austere after uncounted centuries of uncounted forms of existence have ever attained to it. Less than a dozen followers of Gautama have in twenty-five centuries ever reached Nirvana. Rhys Davids says: "Though laymen could attain Nirvana, we are told of only one or two instances of their having done so, and though it was more possible for members of the Buddhist Order of Mendicants to do so, we hear after the time of Gautama of only one or two who did so." Oldenberg says that Gautama himself grew very reticent in later life about Nirvana, and that he became himself an agnostic. Thus practically the entrance into Nirvana is something the ordinary Buddhist never concerns himself about. It is out of his range, and he takes no interest in the question whether Nirvana is absorption, extinction, or mere existence, without any qualities whatever. It is not for him, why should he bother himself about it? The more devout may hope to ascend to some one of the Buddhist heavens. Others may aspire to positions of influence after this life; but Nirvana is something they never trouble themselves about. We are told the Siamese rarely if ever mention it. Virtue will be rewarded by going to *Savan* (heaven), till his stock of merit is exhausted, and then he must, like everybody and everything else, take his chances as to what will follow in the endless series of being, dependent on merit and demerit again. He does, in localities, endeavor to find relief from the theory of absolute and unalterable consequence, as in China, where he has invented a Chinese Goddess of Mercy, a Chinese Virgin Mary, whose highest merit is that, like Buddha, she turned back from the door of Nirvana to hear the cries, and succor from conditions of misery, the human family. It is this idea which made the historical or mythical Gautama the reputed founder of Buddhism. It is this that made Buddhism, as contrasted with Brahmanism, a missionary religion, a thing Brahmanism could never become; but, after all, how has it helped the Buddhist to get quit of the, to him, bane of all creation, the ceaseless round of existence, *The Wheel?* Gautama eliminates the idea of a personal God. There is simply no room for a Supreme Deity. Self-acting, immutable, eternal Law is made to account for the origin and continuance of all things. There is no personality to the human being. Soul is a metaphysical fiction in the Buddhist faith. Gautama Buddha did not mend the matter. He was no saviour from Buddhist metaphysics.

The same dread of all Buddhist being remains. Man is bound in the endless chain of ceaseless and relentless being. Transmigration according to merit antedates Gautama Buddha, and remains unmodified by him.

There is here no Supreme Being weighing deserts, dispensing, directing with reference to either justice or mercy. It is simply the eternal wheel of change, the unchecked flow of action and irresistible result. No power in the sky, no power in the sea, no power on the earth, no power under the earth, may ungear an atom of consequence from an atom of action. The action itself is resistless, the result is resistless; and everything revolves and ensues and ensues and revolves in an endless, irreversible, irresistible chain of consequence. This blind, unfeeling, unthinking, eternal Law, or Order, or Wheel, of revolving change grinds and crashes right on, now gentle as zephyrs, now terrific as collision of spheres; now delicate as a bird's eye, now cyclonic and all-enveloping as cosmic periods are, and flame of demi-gods. Law, Eternal Law, Change that dates no beginning hour in the enveloping eternities of the Past, and knows no parenthesis in the on-sweep of the infinitely little or the infinitely lofty—a mighty swinging course of eternal consequences that cannot be lifted off their hinges through unending and uncounted and inconceivable periods of existence. That is all that is left to contemplate, if courage can be found equal to contemplate it.

There is no Law-Maker, hence no one to control law, no one to intercept, interrupt, check or sustain law. Hence there is no Creator, no Almighty One to condemn or to forgive, and hence no benign Providence to save from the effect of one's folly or mistakes; and hence no great Benefactor to whom to render thanksgiving, nor to repose in, nor to pray to, nor to praise, nor to worship. Here is no explanation of the beginning of things, no dealing with the riddle of creation. Buddha himself made no attempt to say how existence began. Buddhism can as a consequence know no prayer. "Pray not, the darkness will not brighten. Ask naught, for the silence it cannot speak. Vex not your mournful minds with pious pains. Ah! brothers, sisters, seek naught from the helpless gods by gift or hymn, nor bribe with blood, nor feed with fruit. Within yourselves deliverance must be sought; hence there is no sacrifice."

Arnold well renders the thought .

" Each man's life
The outcome of his former living is.
The angels in the heaven's gladness reap
Fruits of the holy past.

" Devils in the under world wear out
Deeds that were wicked in an age gone by.
It knows not wrath nor pardon, after truth
Its measure makes, its faultless balance weighs."

From all this dire, dread fate, Gautama did not save his people. They are bound down with it so far as they accept Buddhism as it is presented

in the literature, whether of philosophy or legend. It is one long, helpless, hopeless bondage, driving men to despondency or paralyzing all moral purpose, save as they rise above it or are indifferent to it. *That is what ails Buddhism!*

IV.—HAVE THE MONUMENTS AND PAPYRI ANYTHING TO SAY OF THE HEBREWS AND THE EXODUS?

EGYPTOLOGY, No. IX.

BY REV. CAMDEN M. COBERN, PH.D., ANN ARBOR, MICH.

“A foolish atheist, whom I lately found,
Alleged philosophy in his defence.
Said he, ‘The arguments I use are sound.’
‘Just so,’ said I; ‘all sound, and little sense.’”

—*Beha-ed-din, Zoheir of Egypt.*

I. *No biography of Moses or history of the Exodus can be gathered from the Egyptian records.*

It is not surprising that in the early, uncritical days of hieroglyphic knowledge, after Champollion had recognized the Sallier and Anastasi papyri as being of the times of Moses, that a few hasty and ardent spirits should have “taken by assault the Egyptian language,” and by an imaginative and arbitrary process of interpretation have translated these records to suit themselves. In 1855 the most important of these attempts was made, and its author congratulated his readers upon this rare find of “Egyptian newspapers” of the Mosaic age, which gave “a true, original and vivid picture of many of the actors of the Exodus.” “After three thousand years we have fallen upon an Egyptian song alluding concisely but accurately to the slavery, rebellion, and exodus of the Jews, and to the ascent of Mount Sinai by Moses.” In one papyrus he read the names of many Bible characters. There was Moses and Phineas; there was Balaam and Balak; and there was Jannes, followed by a blank which, of course, contained Jambres, the gap being just about long enough for that!*

For three years not a word repudiating this discovery seems to have been uttered by the few *savants* capable of testing a hieroglyphic translation, but about that time appeared a noisy article in a French journal, which ventured a new translation of these papyri, in which appeared prominently the plagues of Egypt and the destruction of Pharaoh in the Red Sea; and all this was presented as the result of the lessons of M. Ch. Lenormant, of the College of France. Owing to the prominent position and acknowledged learning of M. Lenormant this called forth an immediate answer from M. Chabas, who declared the “total inanity” of the system of interpretation to which was due these startling discoveries. Notwithstanding this exposure from one fully qualified to speak, some scholars

* “The Exodus Papyri,” Rev. D. I. Heath, London, 1855.

were too much fascinated by this theory to heed his warning, and the "Exodus papyri" began to have more honor in certain quarters than the Bible account itself, when the craze was checked by the publication of a careful, scientific rendering of these documents by Mr. C. W. Goodwin.* This was translated into French almost immediately by M. Chabas, who added to it a brilliant preface, in which he declared that in the papyri could be found "no more 'Jannes' than 'Moses,' no more 'Jew' than 'people of Sem,' no more 'circumcision' than 'hyssop,' no more 'magician' than 'sleeping in the waters.'" †

The only other memorable attempt to read the history of the Israelites from contemporaneous Egyptian records, which has been made since the above critical annihilation of the "Exodus papyri," occurred ten years later, when Dr. Franz Joseph Lauth discovered, in a papyrus of Leyden, the name Mesu, and for various reasons—such as that this Mesu was a "scribe," "author of writings," had studied at On, had travelled in Palestine, had made religious researches, was a leader of armies, possessed the Semitic title of "champion," and was called "Marina of the Aperiu"—he leaped to the conclusion that this hero was the Moses of the Hebrews. ‡ The argument was interesting but by no means conclusive, and found few adherents. Thus has ended in failure the effort to read the annals of the Hebrews from the Egyptian records.

II. *There is no hope that any such history of Israel will ever be discovered in Egypt.*

1. No such record can be expected from the Hebrew sepulchres, for, in the first place, very few of the Hebrews in Egypt could have afforded themselves this luxury; and, in the second place, the Hebrews were never given to cutting inscriptions upon their sepulchres, even in Palestine, no single instance of this occurring earlier than the Babylonian captivity; and finally, if Joseph or some other high official had built a tomb and covered it with an account of the Oppression or of the events preceding the Exodus, and even if the government had not interfered in the matter, such a tomb immediately after the Exodus would have been unquestionably occupied by some Egyptian dignitary, and the inscription would have been erased to give place to his own, as can be paralleled in many instances.

2. But it is no less unlikely that an account of the entrance, oppression, or exodus of Israel should be preserved in the native Egyptian papyri. Few Egyptians were interested in their arrival or concerned about their servitude, and as for the Exodus, the only possible place where this might be mentioned would be in some private diary or letter of that epoch; but unfortunately private note-books and letters are scarce. Neither the Ancients nor the Moderns have been accustomed to preserve these treasures in their coffins. People may prize a Greek classic, but seldom a private letter relating to the affairs of state sufficiently to have it buried with

* "Hieratic Papyri," Cambridge Essays, 1858.

† "Sur Les Papyrus Hieratiques,"

‡ "Moses der Ebraer." München, 1868.

them. The large majority of the papyri discovered have been books of magic and devotion. Some scientific and literary works have been found and many legal documents, but scarcely any private correspondence worth mentioning.

3. Some have seemed to think that something might be discovered in the temple deposits, but who can really believe that the Israelites were ever invited to take part in these dedications? Others have had hope in the native Egyptian tombs, but these are universally tombs of government officials and priests, and the inscribed texts consist of prayers, lists of sacrifices, family genealogies, a report of the offices held by the deceased and of the property left by him, accompanied in the Mosaic period almost invariably by a funeral eulogy of the deceased and also of the reigning king. That a surveillance was exercised even over private monuments cannot be doubted. In a private tomb recently examined by Mr. Griffith near Siut, the inscription, which had incidentally mentioned a civil war then in progress, was found to have been stopped abruptly and to have been partly erased.

4. It is an absurd imagination that any narrative of the events connected with the Exodus could ever be gathered from the national annals of Egypt. Even though these national records had been like ours and had been preserved intact, yet we could hardly have hoped to find an account of the plagues of Egypt. Greece alone of all ancient nations has recorded her defeats; but the Egyptians never wrote history nor even biography, properly so called. Their writings were not elaborate and systematic, but wholly eulogistic and intended for public inscription upon temple walls and royal tombs.

Even our art galleries and churches and cemeteries, if examined never so carefully, would hardly throw a brilliant light upon our defeats in the War of 1776; while it would be equally difficult for the most expert archæologist, even in our era, to discover the chief causes and results of that great Revolution, from various ancient copies of the Book of Common Prayer, the art galleries of Windsor, the monuments of Bunhill Cemetery, or even from the sepulchral tablets of Westminster Abbey. True, a little tablet might be found in the Abbey, sacred to the memory of "William Wragg, Esq., of South Carolina, who, when the American colonies revolted from Great Britain, inflexibly maintained his loyalty to the person and government of his sovereign;" and another little monument erected in honor of Major André, "who fell a sacrifice to his zeal for his king and country," and is represented in the sculpture as being *shot*; but in neither case is there a hint that the Revolutionary war was a success and that the "revolt" was not crushed at its birth.

It is noticeable in this connection that, in the National Art Gallery at Versailles, hundreds of battles are pictured, from that of Clovis, 496 A.D., down to the latest time—and every battle is a victory for the French! There is Napoleon entering Berlin in 1806, while the German women are

holding up hands of supplication to the conqueror; but one searches in vain for a picture of the German army marching through the Porte St. Martin in 1814, or the crowning of William I. in that very palace in 1871. Among the battles whose names are recorded in the magnificent tomb of Napoleon, no one can help remarking that there appears no Waterloo.

We conclude, therefore, that sovereigns, and their subjects high in office, are not accustomed to commemorate the deeds of their opponents by cherishing their portraits and memorial tablets in their palaces or tombs. No portrait of Washington is likely to be found in the ruins of the palace of George III.; no picture of Moses among the shattered memorials of Ramses or Menephtah.

III. *That the Israelites should not be mentioned at all on the monuments or in the papyri would by no means indicate that they had never been in Egypt.*

It is far more probable that an incidental reference to the Hebrews should be found than a detailed account of their sojourn and departure; yet even if not one such explicit reference could ever be proved, it ought not to be thought surprising. Only a few scraps of the writings of those times have been preserved, and those scraps are chiefly found in temples and cemeteries. The antiquary who, three thousand years from now, will search in the Louvre, the Nôtre Dame, and the Pantheon for news of the Franco-Prussian War, will probably declare that war to be a myth if the canon holds then as now that silence proves non-existence.

Arguments against the Bible narrative, drawn from the silence of the monuments, reminds one of the confidence with which Baron Cuvier, a little over half a century ago, declared, "This much is certain, that they [the Pyramids] did not exist at the time of the Jewish migration, for the Scriptures make no mention of them"!

If it is accounted a proof of the Pyramids' non-existence that the Bible does not mention them, what shall we say of the fact that the monuments themselves convey to us not one solitary whisper concerning the existence of the Labyrinth, which Herodotus thought more wonderful than the Great Pyramid?

The silence of the Scriptures proves no more than the silence of the monuments.

One might argue quite as convincingly that sandals were never worn in the Old and Middle Empires, because even the Pharaohs, clear down to the New Empire, are represented with bare feet, were it not that in one single instance a man of the fifth dynasty is seen holding his sandals in his hand. So far as the pictures and statues are concerned, I know of no other evidence for more than two thousand years that sandals were worn by the ancient Egyptians.

Equally unaccountable is the fact that not a camel is seen represented upon the monuments down to the Roman epoch, and it is even doubtful whether it is mentioned in the hieroglyphic texts; yet the records of

Greece and Assyria, as well as Judea, prove that the Ship of the Desert was known and used in Egypt centuries before.*

Additional force is given to these suggestions when it is remembered that some blanks occur even in this fragmentary monumental testimony. There are entire dynasties which have wholly disappeared.

It unfortunately happens that several of these blanks occur at the very epochs in which the Bible student is most interested. Scarcely a trace remains of the Hyksos dynasties, during which, according to the best chronologists, Abraham and Joseph flourished.

Another blank occurs at the period immediately following the Exodus; for the end of the nineteenth dynasty and the beginning of the twentieth are practically non-existent so far as memorials are concerned. If ever the Exodus would have been mentioned in the Egyptian records it would have been then; but of that era no record on any subject is obtainable. We only know that in the reign of Menephtah or his successor some terrible catastrophe happened, followed by anarchy, and then that Night settled upon Egypt.

If it is accounted surprising that the monuments do not mention the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, it is equally noteworthy that the Bible itself compresses the entire history into one verse (Ex. i. 7).

The silence of the monuments proves no more than the silence of the Scriptures.

SERMONIC SECTION.

"THE TILLAGE OF THE POOR."

BY ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D.
[BAPTIST], MANCHESTER, ENG.

Much food is in the tillage of the poor.—
Prov. xiii. 23.

PALESTINE was a land of small peasant proprietors, and the institution of the *Jubilee* was intended to prevent the acquisition of large estates by any Israelite. The consequence, as intended, was a level of modest prosperity. It was "the tillage of the poor," the careful, diligent husbandry of the man who had only a little patch of land to look after, that filled the storehouses of the Holy Land. Hence the proverb of our text arose. It preserves the picture of the economical conditions in which it originated, and it is capable of, and is intended to have, an application to all forms and fields of work. In all it is

true that the bulk of the harvested results are due, not to the large labors of the few, but to the minute, unnoticed toils of the many. Small service is true service, and the aggregate of such produces large crops. Spade husbandry gets most out of the ground. The laborer's allotment of half an acre is generally more prolific than the average of the squire's estate. Much may be made of slender gifts, small resources, and limited opportunities if carefully cultivated, as they should be, and as their very slenderness should stimulate their being.

One of the psalms accuses "the children of Ephraim" because, "being armed and carrying bows, they turned back in the day of battle." That saying deduces obligation from equipment, and preaches a stringent code of duty to those who are in any direction largely gifted. Power to its last particle is

* Soc. Bib. Arch., vols. XII, XIII.

duty, and not small is the crime of those who, with great capacities, have small desire to use them, and leave the brunt of the battle to half-trained soldiers, badly armed.

But the imagery of the fight is not sufficient to include all aspects of Christian effort. The peaceful toil of the "husbandman that labors" stands, in one of Paul's letters, side by side with the heroism of the "man that warreth." Our text gives us the former image, and so supplements that other.

It completes the lesson of the psalm in another respect, as insisting on the importance, not of the well endowed, but of the slenderly furnished, who are immensely in the majority. This text is a message to ordinary, mediocre people, without much ability or influence.

I. It teaches, first, the responsibility of small gifts.

It is no mere accident that in our Lord's great parable He represents the man with the *one* talent as the holder of his gift. There is a certain pleasure in doing what we can do, or fancy we can do, well. There is a certain pleasure in the exercise of any kind of gift, be it of body or mind; but when we know that we are but very slightly gifted by Him, there is a temptation to say, "Oh, it does not matter much whether I contribute my share to this, that, or the other work or no. I am but a poor man. My half-crown will make but a small difference in the total. I am possessed of very little leisure. The few minutes that I can spare for individual cultivation, or for benevolent work, will not matter at all. I am only an insignificant unit; nobody pays any attention to my opinion. It does not in the least signify whether I make my influence felt in regard of social, religious, or political questions, and the like. I can leave all that to the more influential men. My littleness at least has the prerogative of immunity. My little finger would produce such a slight impact on the scale that it is indifferent whether I apply it or not. It is a good deal easier for me to wrap up this talent—which,

after all, is only a threepenny bit, and not a talent—and put it away and do nothing."

Yes, but then you forget, dear friend, that responsibility does not diminish with the size of the gifts, and that there is as great responsibility for the use of the smallest as there is for the use of the largest, and that although it did not matter very much what you do to anybody but yourself, it matters all the world to you.

But then, besides that, my text tells you that it does matter whether the poor man sets himself to make the most of his little patch of ground or not. "There is much food in the tillage of the poor." The slenderly endowed are the immense majority. There is a genius or two here and there, dotted along the line of the world's and the Church's history. The great men and wise men and mighty men and wealthy men may be counted by units, but the men that are not very much of anything are to be counted by millions. And unless we can find some stringent law of responsibility that applies to them, the bulk of the human race will be under no obligation to do anything either for God or for their fellows, or for themselves. If I am absolved from the task of bringing my weight to bear on the side of right because my weight is infinitesimal, and I am only one in a million, suppose all the million were to plead the same excuse; what then? Then there would not be any weight on the side of the right at all. The barns in Palestine were not filled by farming on a great scale like that pursued away out on the Western prairies, where one man will own, and his servants will plough, a furrow for miles long, but they were filled by the small industries of the owners of tiny patches.

The "tillage of the poor," meaning thereby, not the mendicant, but the peasant-owner of a little plot, yielded the bulk of the "food." The wholesome old proverb, "many littles make a mickle," is as true about the influence brought to bear in the world to arrest

evil and to sweeten corruption as it is about anything besides. Christ has a great deal more need of the cultivation of the small patches that He gives to the most of us than He has even in the cultivation of the large estates that He bestows on a few. Responsibility is not to be measured by amount of gift, but is equally stringent, entire, and absolute, whatsoever be the magnitude of the endowments from which it arises.

Let me remind you, too, how the same virtues and excellencies can be practised in the administering of the smallest as in that of the greatest gifts. Men say—I dare say some of you have said—"Oh! if I were eloquent like So-and-So; rich like somebody else; a man of weight and importance like some other, how I would consecrate my powers to the Master! But I am slow of speech, or nobody minds me, or I have but very little that I can give." Yes! "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much." If you do not utilize the capacity possessed to increase the estate would only be to increase the crop of weeds from its uncultivated clods. We never palm off a greater deception on ourselves than when we try to hoodwink conscience by pleading narrow gifts as an excuse for boundless indolence, and to persuade ourselves that if we could do more we should be less inclined to do nothing. The most largely endowed has no more obligation and no fairer field than the most slenderly gifted lies under and possesses.

All service coming from the same motive and tending to the same end is the same with God.

Not the magnitude of the act, but the motive thereof, determines the whole character of the life of which it is a part. The same graces of obedience, consecration, quick sympathy, self-denying effort may be cultivated and manifested in the dealing out of a half-penny as in the administration of millions. The smallest rainbow in the finest drop that hangs from some sooty eave and catches the sunlight has pre-

cisely the same lines, in the same order, as the great arch that strides across half the sky. If you go to the Giant's Causeway, or to the other end of it among the Scotch Hebrides, you will find the hexagonal basaltic pillars all of identically the same pattern and shape, whether their height be measured by feet or by tenths of an inch. Big or little, they obey exactly the same law. There is "much food in the tillage of the poor."

II. But now, note, again, how there must be a diligent cultivation of the small gifts.

The inventor of this proverb had looked carefully and sympathetically at the way in which the little peasant proprietors worked; and he saw in that a pattern for all life. It is not always the case, of course, that a little holding means good husbandry, but it is generally so; and you will find few waste corners and few unweeded patches on the ground of a man whose whole ground is measured by rods instead of by miles. There will usually be little waste time, and few neglected opportunities of working in the case of the peasant whose subsistence, with that of his family, depends on the diligent and wise cropping of the little patch that does belong to him.

And so, dear brethren, if you and I have to take our place in the ranks of the two-talented men, the commonplace run of ordinary people, the more reason for us to enlarge our gifts by a sedulous diligence, by an unwearied perseverance, by a keen look-out for all opportunities of service, and above all by a prayerful dependence upon Him from whom alone comes the power to toil, and who alone gives the increase. The less we are conscious of large gifts the more we should be bowed in dependence on Him from whom cometh every good and perfect gift; and who gives according to His wisdom; and the more earnestly should we use that slender possession which God may have given us. Industry applied to small natural capacity will do far more than larger power

rusted away by sloth. You all know that it is so in regard of daily life, and common business, and the acquisition of mundane sciences and arts. It is just as true in regard of the Christian race, and of the Christian Church's work of witness.

Who are they who have done the most in this world for God and for men? The largely endowed men? "Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble are called." The coral insect is microscopic, but it will build up from the profoundest depth of the ocean a reef against which the whole Pacific may dash in vain. It is the small gifts that, after all, are the important ones. So let us cultivate them the more earnestly, the more humbly we think of our own capacity. Play well thy part; there all the honor lies. God, who has builded up some of the towering Alps out of mica flakes, builds up His Church out of infinitesimally small particles—slenderly endowed men touched by the consecration of His love.

III. Lastly, let me remind you of the harvest reaped from these slender gifts when sedulously tilled.

Two great results of such conscientious cultivation and use of small resources and opportunities may be suggested as included in that abundant "food" of which the text speaks.

The faithfully used faculty increases. To him that "hath shall be given." "Oh, if I had a wider sphere, how I would flame in it, and fill it!" Then twinkle your best in your little sphere, and that will bring a wider one some time or other. For, as a rule, and in the general, though with exceptions, opportunities come to the man that can use them; and roughly, but yet substantially, men are set in this world where they can shine to the most advantage to God. Fill your place; and if you, like Paul, have borne witness for the Master in little Jerusalem, He will not keep you there, but carry you to bear witness for Him in imperial Rome itself.

The old fable of the man who told his children to dig all over the field and they would find treasure, has its true application in regard of Christian effort and faithful stewardship of the gifts bestowed upon us. The sons found no gold, but they improved the field, and secured its bearing golden harvests, and they strengthened their own muscles, which was better than gold. So, if we want larger endowments, let us honestly use what we possess, and use will make growth.

The other issue, about which I need not say more than a word, is that the final reward of all faithful service—"Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord"—is said, not to the brilliant, but to the "faithful," servant. In that great parable, which is the very text-book of this whole subject of gifts and responsibilities and recompense, the men who were entrusted with unequal sums used these unequal sums with equal diligence, as is manifest by the fact that they realized an equal rate of increase. He that got two talents made two more out of them, and he that had five did no more; for he, too, but doubled his capital. So, because the poorer servant with his two, and the richer with his ten, had equally cultivated their diversely measured estates, they were identical in reward, and to each of them the same thing is said: "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." It matters little whether we copy some great picture upon a canvas as big as the side of a house, or upon a thumbnail: the main thing is that we copy it. If we truly employ whatsoever gifts God has given to us, then we shall be accepted according to that we have, and not according to that we have not.

SOMETIMES a man gets a thought, develops it, works it over, and fathoms its secret meaning; and sometimes a thought gets the man, elaborates him and works him over, and becomes the leaven of the personality. — *Stucken-berg.*

THE CAPACITIES OF THE SOUL.

By REV. DWIGHT M. PRATT, M.A.
[CONGREGATIONAL], PORTLAND, ME.

And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness. So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him.—
Gen. i. 26, 27.

THIS is what inspired Scripture says of man. The average person has no adequate conception of the profound significance of this statement. Consequently he is ignorant of the glories and possibilities of his own nature. If he is debased it is because he has never learned God's estimate of his endowments; and thus has debased views of himself. When David discovered the mysteries and inherent grandeur of his own being, he exclaimed, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made." Looking up with devout adoration to Jehovah, he said, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou visitest him?" Thou art mindful of him only because thou hast made him but a little lower than God. The fulness of this truth is brought to light in the person of Jesus. The glory of God and the dignity of man both have intimate and unceasing fellowship in his incarnate life. And man is exalted in proportion as he takes God's estimate of his being and endowments.

I. I have been thinking of late of the capacities of the human soul. What infinite possibilities are wrapped up in every human being! What mighty achievements have been wrought by the intellect in the various realms of investigation and discovery! How the soul of man has winged its flight to the infinite in every department of thought—in science and art, in music, poetry and philosophy, in the study of man, and in visions of God.

1. In the realm of mathematics, for example, look at Newton, the discoverer of the Calculus and the author of the Principia, which the great La Place regarded as pre-eminent above all the productions of the human intellect. His

keen eye penetrated the secrets of nature. Back of the visible manifestation he saw invisible law. He stood intellectually on so lofty an eminence that the whole universe seemed open to his piercing gaze. He tracked the planets through the labyrinth of space. By one flash of thought he saw that the force that determined the fall of the apple was the very force which curved the cannon ball in its flight, the moon in its orbit, and the sun in its majestic circuit through the skies. Thus he discovered the law of gravitation. Thus his penetrating mind fathomed the distances of space, and invented methods of investigation and analysis so intricate and so profound that only a few of the world's brightest intellects have been able to follow him. And yet from this lofty eminence of vision and knowledge, even while his sovereign mind was taking unfettered excursions into the realms of infinity, he said, "I know not what I may appear to the world, but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing with pebbles on the sea-shore, while the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me."

2. Every great intellect demonstrates the marvellous capacities of the human soul. And their diversity of endowment gives additional suggestion of the soul's infinite possibilities for expansion and achievement. Newton embodied one phase of power, Shakespeare another. As the one saw into the profound depths of the material universe, so the other saw into the profound depths and mysteries of human nature. Shakespeare's mind was cosmopolitan. He was the greatest uninspired student of man. He seemed to have an intuitive knowledge of the human soul. He fathomed its secrets. He understood its moral and spiritual laws. He had the power to place himself in intelligent and vital connection with men of every age, race, and condition; with infancy and maturity; with peasant and king; with devil and saint. Hypocrisy could not deceive him, nor virtue outstrip his vision of purity. With equal accuracy he

measured the shallowness of folly and the profundity of wisdom. The mental condition and moral character of mankind at large seemed to be open to his searching eye. He spanned the distance between heaven and hell. He demonstrated in the infinite sweep of his own vision the capacity of every soul to take in, understand, and consciously reproduce the satanic or angelic. What possibilities of fancy, of knowledge, of moral diversity, of spiritual attainment his thought reveals! The soul of man is bounded only by the eternity and infinity of God.

3. Consider another illustration of its marvellous and diverse capacity. Perhaps no musical composer has ever surpassed Handel in majesty and sublimity of conception. His "Messiah" is the prince of oratorios. The average mortal, in the discord and ignorance of his being, is hardly able to conceive of the workings of such a musical soul. He thinks in music as we think in language. Indeed, to him the highest language is the harmony of sound; the highest thought the revelations and possibilities of such harmony. Words fail in such composition; words are no longer needed, as the soul voices its discoveries in the articulate language of the celestial world. I know nothing more suggestive of heaven and of the infinite capacity of the soul for endless attainment and felicity than the divine oratorios born in the mind of mortal man. What capacity for invention, what wide excursions of creative thought, what visions of glory in giving birth to the "Fidelio" of Beethoven, the "Requiem" of Mozart, or the "Messiah" of Handel! Yet the capacity for music and harmony is a universal endowment. In every human soul there are possibilities for beauty, harmony, joy, glory, of which the world has not so much as even dreamed. Man was made in the image of God. "In the image of God created He him."

4. Consider once more the capacity of the soul for art. Raphael and Angelo caught the spirit of their age. In

their inmost being they felt the impulse of coming reformation and progress. The Christ of history had given them their ideal of man and their vision of spiritual beauty. In sculpture and painting they reproduced and embodied their thought. The mediæval world had never witnessed such an exaltation of Christ as in the painting of Michael Angelo in the Sistine Chapel of Rome. In that picture Christ "stands before us as the head of all humanity, as the goal of all progress, as the consummation of all earthly glory." The ceiling of the Sistine Chapel has been called the most eloquent of all sermons on the immediate communion of Christ with the whole united world.

Raphael did for the infant Christ what Angelo did for the mature Christ. He gave to the infancy of the Redeemer the first full tribute of beauty which art could lend. His paintings of the Divine Child have ennobled and purified the thought of mankind for four centuries. Their conception of the perfect humanity, of the perfect beauty and sinlessness of Jesus, reveal in the artist, and consequently in all men, a like capacity for divine loveliness and symmetry of character. In the lofty flights of his sanctified imagination and in his subtle discernment of spiritual beauty, no subject was worthy of Raphael's skill but the Holy Child Jesus. His paintings are the crown of art. What elegance and refinement of thought! What delicacy of execution! What marvellous capacity to enter into the inner sanctuary of the human soul and portray on canvas the revelations of that most holy place!

The soul of a Raphael or an Angelo suggests unlimited power, boundless vision, and possibilities of eternal development. Infinite stretches of thought are wrapped up in every soul, for he who can delight in the works of Raphael shows within himself degrees of the same power, which are capable of the same eternal expansion.

5. Take one other illustration of the soul's inherent grandeur and power—the capacity for spiritual vision. The Apos-

the John is the highest example of communion with God. Independent of revelation, he demonstrates as a man among men the capacity of the human soul for insight into the profound realities of spiritual truth and for intimate fellowship with his Maker. He leaned upon the bosom of Jesus. This has its spiritual application as well as physical. In his innermost nature he communed with Christ. No other companionship so feasted his soul. The beloved John wrote his gospel to demonstrate to the Church universal that Jesus was the Son of God. But in order to do this, he must first know the proofs of His divinity in his own soul. Every word of the fourth gospel is written out of the deep knowledge of experience.

We stand and look upon the snow-capped mountain glistening in the perpetual glory of the sun's radiance. It is miles above us. Yet we can see its majestic beauty, can catch inspiration from its grandeur, can understand its revelations of God; we can even scale its summit, until, by means of its lofty altitude, our faces touch the sky. So in the realm of character. The Holy Christ towers far above the world of poor sinful humanity, yet by the inherent endowments of the soul we can see and know His divinity, and by means of His own spirit rise into the high altitudes of the Christlike life. In no other realm of thought and experience does man so demonstrate his original likeness to God. The seer of Patmos saw beyond the horizons of earth to the full glory of the celestial world; yet by means of his writings we can see the same visions and rise to the same saintly life. The capacity for spiritual vision and attainment is a universal endowment, and the divinest gift of God to the race.

II. What range of power and what sweep of thought we have just considered: power to penetrate the remote regions of space and bring back the secrets of the material universe; power to fathom the deepest mysteries of the

human soul and reveal the inner life of man; power to know celestial harmonies and bring the music of heaven to earth; power to catch the glories of Divine character and reproduce them in marble and flash them forth on canvas; power to see into the holy depths of Christ's nature and enter into eternal and intimate fellowship with Him.

Newton, Shakespeare, Handel, Raphael, and the saintly John, each represents a distinct capacity of the human soul. In them we see the grandeur and the glory of man's original endowment. Yet these capacities in these men of genius were not isolated gifts. Newton was not exclusively a scientist and Shakespeare solely a poet. In some degree the capacity for poetry resided in the former, and the capacity for science in the latter; for Newton could interpret Shakespeare and Shakespeare understand Newton. So of each and of all; there is a community of endowment among all men, and in some degree, latent or expressed, there are music and poetry, science and art in every human soul, and the capacity also to know and commune with God.

What does this teach us of man's inherent glory and of the possibilities of a glorified eternity? What does this reveal of the exaltation and supremacy of Christ? He is the ideal and representative man. He is the type of what is possible in some degree to all men. He is greater than Newton, for He is the Creator of the universe which Newton explored; greater than Shakespeare, for He made man, whose inner life Shakespeare sought to know; He is the Author of all harmony, the Source of all beauty, the Giver of spiritual sight, and combines in His soul the music of Handel, the art of Raphael, the vision of John.

Now every man made in the image of God has, in his original endowment, likeness to Christ, for Christ is simply the revelation and restoration of man as God created him. Do you not see, dear hearer, ground for the Psalmist's surprising utterance regarding man:

"For Thou hast made him a little lower than God"? Do you not see glories and possibilities in your own life of which you never dreamed?

III. We are not apt to take in the profound significance of Christ's incarnation. The union of God and man in His Divine Person was meant to teach our nearness to God, both by creation and redemption. His actual humanity demonstrates the possibility of such union and the exalted sphere in which man should live, move, and have his being. A sinless man cannot be otherwise than in fellowship with God. Jehovah does not mock us by the exalted standard of perfect holiness. He simply pays a tribute to our capacity and inherent moral grandeur. The redemption of man is simply a reincarnation. The glory of humanity is that God does actually reside in His people. They become transformed into His likeness. They become glorified by His life.

To even conceive of these mental and moral conditions is to demonstrate the possibility of their being realized in our own lives. That which the mind can know and the heart desire is by that very fact within the reach of actual experience.

IV. Such are the possibilities of the human soul. And with such capacities of mind and heart, what manner of persons ought we then to be? By creation God made us kings, for He placed man at the head of the created universe and put all things in subjection under his feet. By redemption He made us both kings and priests, restoring our sovereignty, and introducing us to the intimate communion and privileges of His inner sanctuary. He has opened to us all realms of His universe for discovery and knowledge. The soul of a Mozart or a Beethoven may roam at pleasure through all the harmonious aisles of nature's majestic cathedral, and never reach its limit of rapture and achievement. Earth and heaven are open to all searchers for truth, to all who respond to the infinite possibilities of their own being. The doors of God's

temples are ever wide open to those who aspire to the cultivation and enrichment of their own immortal natures.

What are the thoughts that occupy us? Are we using the muck rake, when we should be reaching up for the proffered crown? Are we feeding our souls with the vanishing husks of worldly enjoyment, when the substantial realities of intellectual and spiritual wealth promise the soul eternal felicity and growth?

"Look how we grovel here below,
Fond of the earthly toys;
Our souls can neither fly nor go
To reach immortal joys."

The good things of earth are simply ministers to our higher need. Have you ever understood the profound philosophy of Christ's words: "Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment"? Even the lily in its loveliness and the bird in its ecstatic freedom ought to teach you of higher things. Life is character. Life is enrichment of soul. Life is the unlimited expansion of the immortal capacities of mind and heart. Life is the substantial attainment of knowledge and holiness. Life is the free, unfettered exercise of all the faculties of the soul in the pursuit of the beautiful, the true, and the good. Life is fellowship with God.

Is this what life is to you, dear hearer? We never can rest in the enjoyments and wealth of earth. "Our souls are restless, oh God, until they rest in thee," said the great Augustine. His great heart soon sickened of the cheap pleasures of a day. And any soul conscious of its own dignity and worth will transfer its affections from the fleeting to the substantial, from earth to heaven.

V. I love to dwell upon the possibilities of eternity. We are bounded here on every hand. The body hampers the soul. Sinful environment hinders development. We all feel in the quiet moments of serious reflection that we are not what we ought to be or what

we might be. We feel as though the wings of aspiration were clipped. We are conscious of unrealized possibilities in the soul. When we hear the oratorio of the "Messiah," we are confident that there is capacity in us for coming closer and closer to the mysteries and delights of Handel's inner life. We feel that there are latent possibilities in our natures which God intended for development and exercise. Every great life touches us in the same way. We would like to follow the footsteps of Newton as he explores the wonders and mysteries of the universe at large. We covet opportunity to develop the mind until we can have fellowship with such men as Shakespeare, such artists as Raphael, such refined characters as the saintly John.

Now, beloved, these longings are yet to be realized.

The strings of the soul are to be unloosed in heaven. Its capacities will have the freest scope for exercise and expansion. Your love for music, for art, for science; your desire for growth, for holiness, for God, will be met and satisfied. The only true employment of life here is in preparation for such a life hereafter. God made us in His own image. We shall never be full-grown men until that image is restored, until all the capacities of the soul revel in the sunlight of His love and roam at pleasure over all realms of knowledge and enter into all the joys and secrets of holy life.

PLANTS AND CORNER-STONES.

By J. E. RANKIN, D.D., LL.D., PRESIDENT OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace.—Psalms cxliv. 12.

THIS psalm might be called a war-psalm. You can almost hear in it the din of the conflict and the shoutings of

the captains. Its author is the same boy David that kept sheep against the lions and the bears on the plains of Bethlehem, and put to flight the armies of the aliens under Goliath of Gath, the king, the captain, the poet; a man that could do things and sing them. He rejoices in God as the Lord of Hosts; the God of battles; the Being who constituted him for service; who taught his hands to war and his fingers to fight; who covered his kingly crest, nay, earlier his naked head, in the day of battle; who sent His messenger from above, and took him and delivered him out of the great waters, and from the hand of strange children. But the war he celebrates is a war that ends in peace. The Philistines go down before the Lord's Anointed, as they always must. The mailed hand of the God-guided warrior is only to pluck for the people the nettle-bloom of safety, so that industry and integrity may dwell together undisturbed; for the psalm closes with pictures of serenity and beauty almost unequalled. "That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace; that our garner may be full, affording all manner of store; that our sheep may bring forth thousands and tens of thousands in our streets; that our oxen may be strong to labor; that there be no breaking in nor going out; that there be no complaining in the streets. Happy is that people that is in such a case; yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord."

The subject which I want to discuss this morning is Plants and Corner-Stones; or, Youth-Element in Family Life. "That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace."

Ah, the havoc that war makes with youth! It is the youth of a land, the first-fruits of home-life, that go with their fresh lips and brave hearts into the imminent deadly breach when war comes. It is the youth of the land that

come trooping in their unstained manhood from the embrace of mothers and sisters; that lay down the implements of labor on the farm and in the workshop; that fling away all the dreams of their book-life in schools and colleges, the glowing perspective of manhood; that trample on the aspirations of their dearest ones even, and, girt with the nation's uniform, and marching under the nation's hallowed emblems, go forth for God, for home, for native land. "That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth." Ah, how touchingly in his poem on Waterloo does the poet Byron speak of the unreturning brave! They go forth, and disappear from life forever. For four hours I once stood in the shadow of Willard's Hotel, in Washington, while President Lincoln reviewed the troops of General Burnside, as they filed past on their way to the battles of the wilderness—a large number of them never to come back. The unreturning brave! What a history beneath every one of those uniforms; what ties going back to thousands of homes—ties to be sundered forever!

The Psalmist David was a warrior-king. He knew what war costs in young life. He knew what all that meant which was predicted by Samuel, when the Israelites wanted a king to reign over them; wanted to set up a family establishment of royalty among the nations. "He will take your sons and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots." The fathers and the mothers want the sons in their homes. They are the beautiful staffs on which their parents would lean when sorrow comes, when old age comes. There is nothing more attractive or holy out of heaven than the reverence of a true son for his father—is not God our Father?—than the love of a pure boy for his mother. The boy to whom his father is a kind of elder brother—how holy is the epithet, since Jesus has hallowed it, by becoming ours; the boy to whom his mother is

the ideal of all excellence. Yes, the boy that is in love with his mother is the boy that can be poorly spared from the scene of existence. I never see a boy with his mother leaning on his arm but my heart is touched to tears. The coarse-textured, blustering braggadocios, who are afraid of the rude boy-opinion, the bully-opinion that is among boys, that makes a good think of his being in his mother's society as being tied to his mother's apron-strings, and of his father's kind counsels as the fault-finding of the governor; ah, how cheap is the stuff he is made of compared with that which goes into the constitution of such a boy as honors his father and his mother, and thus purchases of God exchange on the future: "That thy days may be long in the land which the Lord, thy God, giveth thee."

"That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth." Youth is for growth; growth is the business of youth. It is sad to see youth put prematurely to work; to severe study, even; stunted by pressure of business anxieties and cares, so that growth is impossible. Humanity needs time for unfolding, as a tree does. The psalmist sees a period in the national history of his people when young men shall have a youth in their own homes, under the eyes of their father and near the heart of their mother. It is home training, home memories, home inspirations that are the hope of our youth. They are the qualities that go into their manhood. Better one ounce of mother than ten ounces of boarding-school; better one pound of father than ten pounds of college. I do not mean that boarding-school and college are not right and needful for some boys—perhaps for many boys; but happy are those children whose very homes furnish them with school training that is near by. The physical, intellectual, and moral growth, the religious growth, are thus all, in a certain sense, under the parental eye—as parent-birds watch their young ones in their nest.

I do not think any young man has

the foundation for true greatness who does not foster reverence for home life, who has not instinctive and holy reverence for his mother. I remember going as a pilgrim, one day, to the former residence, in Marshfield, of Daniel Webster, perhaps the greatest statesman America ever produced. There, in the library, among the elegant oil paintings of great English and American statesmen—Lord Ashburton and others—was hanging a little old-fashioned silhouette profile, inscribed, in Mr. Webster's handwriting, "My honored mother.—D. W." Here was a man who had stood before kings; nay, who was himself a king among men; the most noticeable man of his generation, who would gladly have lavished uncounted treasures upon the skill of the artist for a true picture of the woman who, in that old Franklin inn, kept by his father, had, in some inscrutable way, set his eye upon the true goal of life, and helped him reach it—"My honored mother.—D. W."

I recall a passage from Mr. Webster's own lips—those lips which always grew eloquent when he thought of the manner in which the inmates of that home had spent and been spent for those that were rearing there: "It did not happen to me to be born in a log cabin; but my elder brothers and sisters were born in a log cabin; raised amid the snow-drifts of New Hampshire at a period so early that, when the smoke first rose from its rude chimney and curled over the frozen hills, there was no similar evidence of a white man's habitation between it and the settlements on the rivers of Canada. Its remains still exist. I make to it an annual visit. I carry my children to it to teach them the hardships endured by the generations gone before them. I love to dwell on the tender recollections, the kindred ties, the early affections, and the touching narratives and incidents which mingle with all I know of this primitive family abode. I weep to think that none of those who inhabited it are now among the living; and if ever I am

ashamed of it, or if ever I fail in affectionate veneration for him who reared and defended it against savage violence and destruction, cherished all the domestic virtues beneath its roof; and through the fire and blood of seven years' Revolutionary War shrunk from no danger, no toil, no sacrifice to serve his country, and to raise his children to a condition better than his own, may my name and the name of my posterity be blotted forever from the memory of mankind."

Of Mr. Webster's mother it was true, as has usually been true of the mothers of eminent men, not only that he resembled her, that he was the seed of the woman, but that she had in her sons a maternal pride, and an aspiration that they should excel not in any narrow and limited sphere, but in one as large and wide as it is possible for human ambition to fill. This gave them elevation and direction. Edward Everett—Mr. Webster's biographer—says, "That the distinction attained by them, and especially by Mr. Webster himself, may be well traced to her early promptings and judicious guidance." Ah, did she not hide all his promise in her heart?

"That our daughters may be as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace." Sons are out-door plants; daughters are in-door adornments. Sons grow up in out-door strength; daughters clothe a home with attractiveness and grace. Our translation of this passage does not seem to be quite perfect. The picture it suggests to us of a palace, with its pillars, polished and graceful, is rather masculine, and does not seem to have been in the mind of the psalmist. This seems to be his thought. He passes from the growth of the out-door plant to the corner-carvings with which it was customary to decorate the inside of palaces. It is said that to this day, in Damascus, many a reception-room is thus decorated. "This decoration," says Wetystein, "has a great advantage in saloons from two to three stories high, and is evidently designed to get rid of the darker corners above the ceiling;

comes down from the ceiling in the corners of the room for the length of six to nine feet, gradually becoming narrower as it descends."

I do not believe in woman as a mere ornament, as we use the word. She is God's masterpiece. He finished with her. Man needs something more for a helpmeet to complete his outfit for life than a woman who would be described in any such effeminate manner. The word ornament is largely used in the Bible to describe qualities that are moral and spiritual. In Proverbs we read, "My son, hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother, for they shall be an ornament of grace to thy head, and chains about thy neck." Again, "As an ornament of fine gold, so is a wise reprove." And St. Peter speaks of woman in this manner: "Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair and of wearing of gold and putting on of apparel, but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible; even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." Where, therefore, in the text the Holy Spirit speaks of female adornment in our times, He means chiefly, I think, those graces of manner and of character which cannot be taught in any earthly school, but which fit one to walk with God here, and for the society of God and of heaven hereafter. And here, lest I may be misunderstood, in quoting the above passages from St. Peter, I want to say that I do not think the Holy Spirit intended to forbid the wearing of gold or the brodering of the hair. Of course my exegesis may be defective. But this is my idea: that He intended merely to contrast two kinds of adornment, and to show the one which was especially pleasing to the Being who looks not on the outward appearance, but upon the heart. I do not think the Creator would have made it natural for woman's hair—her glory, as the Bible terms it—to fall into waves, or would have given to man, whether father,

brother, or husband, a sense of what is graceful and beautiful in woman, were it not proper to afford it healthful and legitimate gratification. No man wants to be mortified by the disregard paid by his sister, his wife, his daughter to legitimate graces of form. But, for all that, I think the Bible intended to magnify that which may belong to the most unattractive in person, to the least adorned in exterior—namely, the hidden being of the heart; that in us which only God can see, and in which God alone can take the greatest delight. I think the Bible intended to teach that God has put this crowning womanly grace within the reach of the humblest, just as He has put His kingdom there; that the mother, or the sister, or the wife in the lowliest cottage may be just as beautiful in the eyes of the angels as though her outward graces and adornings were queenly; as, perhaps, her inward adornings are. You and I have seen a woman with all the outward adornment that wealth could procure; with a grace of manner as bewitching as though she had caught it from the courts of queens; with a personal beauty that defied painting or poetic description; with an intellectual culture which gave her mastery of all languages and all literature, and brought men of genius to sit at her feet; who, to speak in the mildest terms possible, could not lay claim to any of that inward adorning which in the sight of God is of great price; could not compete in the judgment of God with some humblest mother in Israel; who did her own work, as perhaps your mother did, and my mother did, and yet found time to be at the bedside of the sick, and made her personal ministrations of love exhale from her as an atmosphere.

I have known more than one woman who began life in her father's humble home, the oldest sister, like a family heroine, taking the brunt of all the battles with hardship and poverty which the family waged; standing as her mother's chief counsellor and comforter, the pride of her father and her

brothers ; going out to service, teaching day-school, or music, or painting ; laying her hand to anything, to everything which was becoming, that she might add to the family income ; hovering over the home as a kind of guardian spirit ; caring for the young children till they were educated and grown, and then passing into the same kind of ministry in the home of some humble minister or missionary—for such men, I think, have an eye for such attractions ; or, going off singly and alone to some unknown and unnoticed toil, which only God could recognize, or even know ; and such, I think, are the King's daughters. There is a beauty of inward character, a beauty of outward life which originates in that character, which even God desires. "So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty," which, in God's sight, is of great price. And I think that when the sacred writer in the text speaks of the daughters in our homes, he means this beauty. "That our daughters may be as corner-stones, polished after the similitude of a palace." Other accomplishments, of course I would not depreciate ; the more of them the better.

The ambition to give Christian adornment to a home, to make it more attractive to a father, whose head has caught now and then a snowflake from the clouds of age, floating over from eternity's mountains, where dwells the "Ancient of Days : " to brothers whose strong drawings are to an outward life, and perhaps to indulgences which alienate them from the kingdom of God within them ; the ambition to be graceful and attractive in the interest of keeping-at-home and building-up home for one's husband's sake, and one's children's sake, instead of making home the stopping-place of a night ; the value set upon home and home influences, which comes from regarding it next to God and the Church of God as that which man most needs to fit him for heaven's joys—this, I think, is the holiest of all woman's instincts. The function of youth in a family is to keep alive the

love of life there. We hold on to little hands that hold on to time, and thus are kept young. We are all compelled to draw the elasticity of life from the future. There is nothing more selfish than the man who makes all things minister to his present ; who makes the present the aim and end of all living. I know the beauty of what is done to minister to the wants and infirmities of old age, to minister to the past. Ah, that young life, that maturer life which yields itself up to the care of those out of whose life youth and strength have forever gone ; that sacrifices itself for those who have cared for it in infancy ; have given it a chance to be and to do in its generation ; that young life is very holy ! The picture of Ruth, as she is true to Naomi, and who found that her fidelity brought her into the lineage through which all nations should be blessed ; the inquiry of Joseph, "Is thy father, the old man of whom ye spake, is he yet alive ? " these show us what the Bible means when it says, "Thou shalt reverence the aged ; thou shalt stand up before the face of the old man."

But only youth and associations with youth can keep us young. This youth in our family life is vital to the family. The Persians say that "Heaven is at the feet of mothers," meaning to indicate the sacredness of the maternal relation to children. But there is another meaning to the proverb. The little child keeps the mother-heart open to the kingdom of God, so that heaven is at the feet of mothers in the person of the little ones who nestle around her ; she clings to life for their sakes ; she becomes to them father as well as mother ; she who has never thought herself competent to take business cares, sits down with calculating business men to arrange matters left unsettled at her husband's death ; project plans for her children ; becomes to them masculine in the strength as she is feminine in the warmth of her love for them. And a corresponding change occurs in the fatherhood of a man for his motherless

children. The coarse voice and the rough hands become tender ; the father shows that he has the qualities that usually belong to the mother ; and it is the care of children which develops them.

I have seen people who lived only to themselves, and have therefore died. Instead of having children about them, pulsating with the life of the future, preparing for the work of the future, to build up homes, and to grace homes in the future, they have had no home at all. Every time the swallows return to the barns of New England they build up the waste places under the eaves ; they rehabilitate their homes. But these people, with their summer flittings to Europe, and their winter flittings to the city, or to the Indies, take only their trunks and their pet dogs and parrots to round out and complete their domestic circle. They are nomadic in their very constitution ; and you can no more locate them than you can locate the birds of the air. What can such unfortunate people know of the text "That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth, and our daughters as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace" ? Of course this is sometimes providential, and is to be accepted as a dispensation from God. It is not always given to God's creatures to know what actual fatherhood means, nor what actual motherhood means ; to come into fellowship with God when He says, "Like as a father pitieth his children." And there are in the hearts of some of these homeless ones great spaces, great territories which God has filled ; there are kindled within them fires on the hearth, so that they are neither cold nor inhospitable ; and many a weary and forsaken one knows what it is to sit there and be warm. There are crusty old bachelors—though I am not sure the name is properly applied to them, except as it applies to good pastry—whose benefactions go silently and unexpectedly to enrich the boys and girls of other households where they are working their way upward ; and so by the

second remove the meaning of the text can be understood, even by those who have neither home nor child.

There are elements of material prosperity in this psalm which are very beautiful. Peace brings rest to material things—to the valleys which are clothed with verdure or grain ; to the hills which are covered over with flocks ; fills the garner to overflowing ; makes traffic in towns and commerce on the seas ; puts an end to all disturbances. But the most beautiful and touching element in it is this allusion to home-life, in which young men and maidens have an opportunity to develop in all the symmetry and beauty characteristic of each in its best estate. "That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth ; and that our daughters may be as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace ;" as though the sons graced the exterior of a home, as the plant does, and the daughters the interior.

We sometimes get impatient with our children ; it is so hard to get them to conform to the regulation standard. A father said to me the other day that his son had come to a period when it was hard to get along with him. Let us guide and control them, but let us also cherish them as God's most precious gifts, His richest endowments ; for after all, God intended home-life for them, and them for home-life. They are beautiful in it, because God has made them so. Let it be our aim to make home so much more to them than any external attraction, that when we sleep in silence it shall be among their sweetest recollections ; it shall be among their highest aspirations for themselves to repeat it in their own lives.

Ah, could I in any way give utterance to what is in some of your hearts respecting sons and daughters who have passed from dwellings where their voices once made melody into the silences of the great future ; the very places that are vacant, in which speak day after day, and year after year, and are never without a voice ; the thought

of whom makes your heart tender, as when they died, it would only add emphasis to this discourse. You often say, with the patriarch, "If I be bereaved of my children I am bereaved;" as though this bereavement can never be healed. May I remind you that the only refuge from God is in God; from sorrow is in the words of the Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with grief! And that God has made your homes so sweet that you may know what His home is, where they never lose an inmate; and where what you have done to make your sons and daughters Christians will be your great and everlasting joy.

SILENCE.

BY G. M. MEACHAM, D.D. [METHODIST], YOKOHAMA, JAPAN.

A time to keep silence.—Eccl. iii. 7.

MAX MÜLLER says of speech: "To whatever sphere it belongs, it would seem to stand unsurpassed—nay, unequalled in it—by anything else. If it be a production of nature, it is her last and crowning production, which she reserved for man alone. If it be a work of human art, it would seem to lift the human artist to the level of a Divine Creator. If it is the gift of God, it is God's greatest gift; for through it God spake to man, and man speaks to God in worship, prayer, and meditation." Silence and speech are the rest and motion of a little but mighty member, which needs to be wisely controlled. The bit in the mouth of a fiery steed and a helm to guide the ship are no more needful than safe guidance for the tongue. Back of the tongue are certain dispositions which must be repressed, and others which should have their appropriate expression. An Eastern proverb runs, "Speech is silver, silence is gold; speech is human, silence is Divine." In Elia we find an old poem:

"Still-born Silence! thou that art
Flooder of the deeper heart!
Offspring of a heavenly kind!
Frost o' the mouth, and thaw o' the mind!"

And speaking of silence in "A Quaker's Meeting," Elia says: "Here is something which throws Antiquity herself into the foreground—silence—eldest of things, language of old night, primitive discourser." "Silence," says Addison, in the *Tattler*, "is sometimes more significant and sublime than the most noble and expressive eloquence, and is on many occasions the indication of a great mind."

That silence is golden, who can deny? Yet undoubtedly it is often of a baser metal; not silvery, but leaden or something worse. Who has not been tried by the silence of reticence when a few words would have cleared away the darkness and indicated the true path of duty? Who would call that silence golden which was ashamed or afraid to champion the weak or defend the absent? Or that which buries one's sorrows deep down in one's own bosom, when relief could be had by confiding them to a loyal friend?

No; silence is not always golden. Certainly not when it falls like a deep shadow upon the home, taking all the brightness out of the lives of the children, who are happy only when father and mother are glad. Nor when one has found his religion to be full of consolation and support, and yet refuses to confess his Lord before men. Silence ought then to be as impossible as for flowers to close themselves against the tender wooings of the warm sunshine and the gentle breath of spring.

There is a silence which is golden. We do not refer to the silence to which woman is condemned, of which Priscilla complained to John Alden—a great wrong, which, according to Edward Bellamy, will be righted in the next century—nor to that discreet concealment for awhile of some great truth, which sometimes is necessary till a moral preparation has paved the way for its publication. We do refer to the prudent silence of folly. The wise man has said that "even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise." For so long as he holds his tongue, who

can know his folly? "Silence," said Confucius, "is a friend that will never betray." Certainly it was not because he was a fool that Pitt, when on his legs before Parliament, with no power of reserve, poured out all that was in him—State secrets and intrigues blurted out incontinently with all the rest. But with equal certainty, we may say that it was not because he was wise that he placed no embargo on his lips. If the fool would but hold his tongue, how could you distinguish him from the philosopher?

Golden, too, is the silence of *sympathy*. Pleasant to be on such terms with one's friends that long silence may take place without any risk of misapprehension. Such were the hermits of whom Elia writes, "Who retired into Egyptian solitudes to enjoy one another's want of conversation." To the sorrowing, more precious still is silent sympathy. Those friends of Job who sat down, and for seven days and seven nights never spoke a word, showed profoundest sympathy, and only when they began to talk did they cease to comfort.

"Job felt it when he groaned beneath the rod
And the barbed arrows of a frowning God;
And such emollients as his friends could spare,
Friends such as his for modern Jobs prepare."

The value of true sympathy, who can describe? From the bare presence and the kindly look of our friend in time of grief we catch comfort and inspiration. Condolence cannot bring back our lost ones, but a gentle sigh and the pressure of a warm hand have brought more comfort to us than thousands of gold and silver.

There is also the golden silence of *self-effacement*. Who cannot recall the memory of a friend who, rich in good deeds, did them in secret, like some summer rill refreshing the withered grass and drooping flowers, itself unheard, unseen. It is the hypocrite who sounds the trumpet before him. To trumpet one's own virtues is not wise. Better to be of them who

"Do good by stealth, and blush to find it fame."

Well says our Shakespeare, "We wound our modesty and make foul our deservings when of ourselves we publish them." To speak evil of others is not far removed from self-praise. When in the company of those who are indulging in malicious or vulgar gossip, we can at least show our disapproval by saying nothing. A friend once accompanied Mrs. Fry on her round as she was visiting the worst female prisoners in Newgate. On leaving she asked Mrs. Fry of what crimes they had been guilty. How suggestive her reply, "I never asked them; we have all come short." The fumes of praise are frankincense in the nostrils of many.

If there are those who love the incense of flattery, there are always some who, for dishonorable ends, keep the perfumed censer burning brightly. Alas! how many can be flattered to their own undoing. When you have counted up the flatterers and those who love flattery, how many are left? Timon of Athens cries:

"Who dares, who dares
In purity of manhood stand upright,
And say, 'This man's a flatterer'?"

Once in a while we are refreshed by one who dares, as when Hannah More praised Dr. Johnson so inordinately that he turned upon her sternly with, "Madam, before you flatter a man grossly to his face, you should consider whether or not your flattery is worth having." No wonder he was angry if he believed, with Coleridge, that at heart we despise the man whom we flatter. Swiftly hastens the day when the Scripture will be fulfilled. "The Lord shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things: who have said, 'With our tongues will we prevail; our lips are our own; who is Lord over us'?"

Once more, when we know we are not in a heavenly temper, and are in danger of saying unkind things, or are the victims of detraction and obloquy, much is gained by keeping close the door of our lips. General Grant lay under a cloud cast over him at Pitts-

burg Landing and elsewhere. The people and the press, impatient for results, were not sparing of cruel censure. But with amazing self-control he held his peace. He would not hazard the cause of the Union by revealing his plans. And to-day his memory is green in the hearts of a grateful people. "Seest thou a man hasty in his words? There is more hope of a fool than of him." Plutarch has weightily observed, "Plato says that for a word, which is the lightest of all things, both gods and men inflict the heaviest penalties. But silence, which can never be called to account, doth not only, as Hippocrates hath observed, extinguish thirst, but it bears up against all manners of slanders with the constancy of Socrates and the courage of Hercules, who were no more concerned than a fly at what others said or did."

Golden, too, is the silence of *meditation*. Frederick W. Robertson said of a great preacher, "He has lost his power, which was once the greatest I ever knew. I heard four sermons from him with scarcely four thoughts and much absolutely false logic. But how can a man preach for ten years without exhausting himself? Talk, talk, talk forever, and no retreat to fructifying silence!" But silence will not be fructifying if occupied with trivialities; it will be as self-injurious as constant babbling. We learn more by listening than by talking, yet it is not good to be eternally pumped into as if we were cisterns. The mind is rather a mill to grind up the grain that is poured into the hopper, a stomach to digest the food that it receives. By meditation are slowly fashioned strength of purpose and lofty character. Carlyle remarks, in "Sartor Resartus," "Silence is the element in which great things fashion themselves together, so that at length they may emerge, full formed and majestic, into the daylight of life, which they are thenceforth to rule."

"How grand is silence! In her tranquil deeps
What mighty things are born!"

It is in the silence of meditation that the

mighty structure of character grows like Solomon's temple, wherein no sound of hammer or of saw was heard.

Silence is comparative. A day in the early spring, when the sap rises in trees and plants out in the woods, is silent; albeit, as Humboldt conjectured, there it makes a continuous melody in the ears of our tiniest fellow-creatures. The silence of the night in Yokohama is often broken by the yells of coolies; but silence comes again "like a poultice to heal the blows of sound." Visitors to the Mammoth Cave of Kentucky tell us that the darkness and silence surpass all former experience. Besides, there are the Three Silences of Speech, Desire, and Thought, which make up the Perfect Silence, wherein mysterious sounds from higher worlds are heard. "The Lord is in His holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before Him." Ye dissonant voices of a rude contending mob of vain thoughts and foolish desires, hush! He speaks, "Be still, and know that I am God."

"I lose
Myself in Him, in light ineffable!
Come, then, expressive Silence, muse
His praise."

What better preparation than this silence of self-effacement, of meditation, and of worship can there be for the approaching silence of death! Pain, ache, weakness, dimness of vision, gray hairs—what are they but

"The little rift within the lute
That by and by will make the music mute,
And ever-widening slowly silence all."

HAMAN.

BY O. T. LANPHEAR, D.D. [CONGREGATIONAL], BEVERLY, MASS.

*So they hanged Haman on the gallows he
had prepared for Mordecai.—Esther
vii. 10.*

This event occurred under the reign of Ahasuerus, one of the most powerful of the Persian kings, whose reign was one of peculiar splendor, and among whose ministers none, perhaps, were

more remarkable than Haman. He seems to have risen suddenly from obscurity to the highest office of trust under the crown, the king having made him chief over all the deputies of the realm.

In the character of Haman there is a singular exhibition of ambition and envy. He cannot be satisfied with the king's favor and the applause of thousands, so long as one poor captive, Mordecai, rises not up to do him honor. Though the worship offered to Haman was such as the captive could not offer, because contrary to his religion, yet to the mind of Haman no excuse can be given for such neglect. That Haman was destitute of benevolence appears in the fact that for the offence, as he conceived it, of one man, there could be no atonement except by the blood of all this man's kindred and people. Nor does there appear in Haman any sentiment of justice, for having this sentiment he would have given Mordecai an opportunity to justify himself, whereas now he has recourse to a plot unsurpassed for cruelty of intention. Haman is devoid of mercy as well as of justice, else he might have had some pity for the captive Jews; but instead of that, he shows none of those tender feelings which give beauty to the character of a Darius or a Cyrus. Here is a man without benevolence, justice, or mercy but who has, instead, ambition, envy, and that "mad revenge" that kindles without insult.

From this one external act of Haman, in respect to Mordecai, we infer the fearful depth of depravity within. It does not appear but that his character might have been without reproach previous to his promotion. Exemplary conduct, however, previous to an open act of sin must not be taken as proof of purity of character at any time, for the external acts of sin may be compared to the eruptions of a volcano which sometimes occur only after intervals embracing centuries, while the internal depravity is like those pent fires which lie couched beneath the base of the moun-

tain, where in secret the lava wave is in perpetual motion. The cloud may cease for awhile at the crater, but those secret fires never cease from the heart of the mountain. So Haman may appear in the execution of but one wicked design, but from this one we know all. In this we read his capacity for intrigue and base design, from the inception to the conclusion of his plot, as he gloats over its promise of success in the privacy of his family; as he goes to that last banquet of the king and queen, so assured of success, where, as he is about to make that final petition which rises to the climax of his baseness, the queen has also a petition, disclosing Haman's perfidy, in consequence of which Haman passes from the banquet, not to carry out his base plot, but to disappear from the gallows which he had built with so much care for Mordecai.

From the life and death of Haman, among the lessons to be noticed there is:

First, this: that the wicked man cannot go unpunished. It is a fundamental principle in the Divine government that it shall be well with the righteous and ill with the wicked. To the realization of this principle all events are made to transpire, so that all things have reference to it, so that there is nothing casual in the universe. This is because there is an unseen Hand moving beneath the surface of daily and seemingly casual affairs, holding constant control. That Hand from the depth of eternity planned the order of the universe, fixing immutably the bounds of right and wrong, so that the right can never be made wrong by any change of circumstance, or the wrong be made right by any seeming utility or delay of the visitation of justice. While this apprehension of justice is clear and convincing as an idea entertained by the mind, it stands out in the greater clearness of comprehension when illustrated by a practical example. Such an example is given in the life and death of Haman. Wickedness appears not as an abstraction, but as the rule of a life, as a living personification of selfishness, as a

force of evil in the human will which dares to leave no means untried in the way to secure selfish aims in the face of whatever warnings or threatened penalty; as wickedness before which the question thrills every conscience not dead, whether its deeds can be done with impunity. There is no relief to this question until that punishment, seemingly delayed for a space, comes swiftly at last with convincing proof that the wicked man cannot go unpunished. Haman may fortify himself by all the power of subtlety; his name may startle the multitude as he passes along the galleries of the Persian court; his word may be the king's counsel, his nod an oracle; but by so much as he excels in crime and power, so much the more glowing the illustration he must furnish of the higher might of justice and of God.

Another lesson is that the wicked man will be punished when he least expects it. All that occurred previous to the second banquet, so far as Haman could discern, was in his favor. At first he dared not petition for the death of Mordecai alone, and so masked his hatred of the individual under the petition for the destruction of all the Jewish people. Gaining the ready assent of the king encourages him to ask at the next banquet for the peculiarly ignominious death of Mordecai. He is so sure of success that he builds the gallows for Mordecai beforehand. He knows that he is the king's favorite, and feels quite sure of being a favorite of the queen, else why should she invite him to the banquet with Ahasuerus? He is so sure of success that he rejoices over the prospect in the privacy of his family. But when the wicked man feels most secure, then is the hour of his peril. That state of fearlessness shows his ripeness for destruction, indicates that the measure of his iniquity is full. Hence it is written that "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall;" so that the day of judgment cometh "unawares."

Another lesson is that the wicked man

will be punished by means of his own devising. There is an old Roman proverb that "there is no law more just than that the devisers of death should perish by their own art." The saying is peculiarly applicable to Haman, when it appears that however elated he might be in telling to his family the story of his successes, there is no particular that gives him so much satisfaction as the prospect of his personal revenge upon one man, though procured at the cost of thousands of lives. And so, when the gallows for the destruction of Mordecai was suggested, "the thing pleased Haman," pleased to think a plan of so easy device had been suggested, pleased to think how the object of his envy should give his last struggle on that ignominious device, pleased as he hears the ring of the saw and the rattling of the timbers as each tenon meets its mortice in the construction of the device. Since to him sin is such a sweet morsel, how can he help being pleased with the device by which he hopes to enjoy it. There is here no extenuating circumstance to show that he ought not to perish by that very device which he had designed for the innocent.

It must be remarked that in the life of Haman there is nothing peculiarly his own, except the time and manner of manifesting his wicked designs. The depravity in which these originated is universal. It operates in and gives character to every man not regenerated by the Holy Ghost. As the law of gravitation is the same in essence, whether it bind together the smallest particles of matter or the masses of matter which compose a planet, so the "law of sin" is the same in essence, however varied may be the actions that flow from it. In this sense the character of Haman is repeated in every impenitent person. Haman is a mirror in which every impenitent character, as to quality, is reflected. This is not saying that every impenitent person is guilty of murder, or is the prime minister of a powerful king, or has ever wished for a nation's ruin; but that every such per-

son has the elements of character from whence such deeds proceed. There is in the heart a perverse self-love which labors for the accomplishment of selfish aims, to the exclusion of the love of God. There is the fear lest some one may be thought more deserving than self, while the object of such suspicion becomes the object of envy and hate. Then, how much stratagem is resorted to in order to eclipse the supposed rival, and clothe self in a shining garment. But this was just what Haman did.

Thus sin is a law working with as much certainty in man's moral nature as any material laws work in the physical world. The law of sin is so connected with the universe that it must and will work the death of all who make it their rule of life. It blinds the reason, shuts out from the soul the Spirit of God, and causes men to blindly plot their own ruin for eternity. Hence the glory of Christ as the Saviour of sinners, as in Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life for all who will believe in Him.

TREASURED TEARS.

By REV. J. F. ELDER, D.D. [BAPTIST],
ALBANY, N. Y.

Put thou my tears into thy bottle.—Psalm
lvi. 8.

THE so-called lachrymatories, or tear-bottles, found in museums of art, were applied to no such use as their name implies. They probably contained unguents that were used in preparing the dead for burial; which accounts for their presence in tombs. However poetic in the abstract, the idea of gathering the tears of the mourner or the dying, it becomes supremely ridiculous when reduced to practice by means of these "tear-bottles."

The Psalmist rather had in mind the skin bottle of his day, in which, by a bold figure of speech, he conceives of God as treasuring our tears with that same divine carefulness which numbers the hairs of our head or notes the falling sparrow.

We live in a vale of tears. Indignation forces them to our eyes; anger makes them leap from their hiding places; grief opens the floodgates; even pity will moisten the cheek, and joy make our tears distil as the dew. Pain often wrings them from us in full measure. That was a quaint conceit of Dickens where he says, "A kind word fell into the well of Little Dorrit's heart, and splashed the water up into her eyes." Indeed, it seems as if Jeremiah's prayer were almost superfluous: "Oh, that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears."

Tears are sometimes called womanish. But the Bible does not repress the tears of its strong men. Jacob wept and made supplication to the divine athlete that found him at the brook Jabbok. Joseph wept till the house of Pharaoh heard. David wept for Absalom as one might mourn for an only son. Hezekiah's tears and prayer turned back the shadow on his life's dial. Peter wept bitterly over his woeful fall. Paul was a copious weeper, serving the Lord with tears. Jesus wept. Nor should we be ashamed of this "honorable dew." A tearless life is apt to be a selfish or a shallow and frivolous life.

"Prithee, weep, May Lillian,
Gaiety without eclipse
Wearieth me, May Lillian."

But why should God treasure our tears in His bottle?

1. As a token of prayers to be answered.

Tears and prayers are closely connected. "Strong crying and tears" accompanied the "prayers and supplications" of Christ in the days of His flesh. The woman that was a sinner said nothing as she bathed the travel-stained feet of her Lord with her tears. But her sins, her many sins, became as snow. Such tears are the guarantee of sincerity, the evidence of moral earnestness, and the token of prevailing prayer. The tears in God's bottle represent petitions filed away for answer in His own good time. Tears of godly parents and of faithful Sunday-school teachers who have wres-

tled with God for the conversion of children may thus be preserved to plead before the throne long after the suppliant's voice has been hushed in death.

2. In token of wrongs to be avenged.

The tears of martyrs thus treasured up plead like the blood of Abel. With the tears of the oppressed, which He has in His bottle, God fills the vials of His wrath, and pours them out in turn upon the air and upon the throne of the oppressor; and the inhuman tyrants gnaw their tongues for pain. It is a perilous thing to make a little child to weep by our cruelty or by injustice to smite the fountain of tears in the widow's heart. Every such tear of the poor and needy is gathered into God's bottle, and will be a swift witness against us, till the wrong is atoned for or avenged.

But the Christian's tears are transient. Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. In the Father's house there will be no sorrow nor crying. God's own hand will wipe away all tears, and we shall so completely forget our earthly sorrows, perchance, that angels will need to bring forth in crystal vases some of these treasured tears to assure us that we ever wept. And this may be another reason for putting them into God's bottle

THE INCRECULITY OF THOMAS.

By REV. JOHN McNEILL [PRESBYTERIAN], LONDON, ENG.

But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came, etc.—John xx. 24-29.

HERE is a man in difficulty about the subject of the resurrection. It is a great subject. Thomas could not take it all in at once. Paul quotes an objection: "How will the dead be raised, and with what body will they come?" Thomas was just such a man. He appears characteristically, ever like himself whenever referred to in the gospels. No disciple or apostle is seen in clearer delineation. At one time, weary and

puzzled, he says, "We know not whither thou goest; how can we know the way?" Again, he exclaims, "Let us go with Him and die with Him;" and here, when the others rejoice, his face lengthens and he seems even to get petulant and angry as he speaks, "Except I see," etc. But let us come to some practical points which may be of personal benefit.

1. How did Thomas get into this condition? Great doors may swing on small hinges. This eclipse of his faith, which threatened to be permanent, was occasioned, was it not, by his absence from that meeting? I think that Thomas might have been there if he had desired. Many of us are slow to believe, but quick to doubt. The vision of Thomas to me is that of a slow man, thick set, beetle-browed, solid and stolid, a splendid man, indeed, if you can only get him to move "unanimously," for large bodies move slowly. Had he lived now, this nineteenth century would have spoiled him, so rich is it in opportunities to doubt. Thomas breaks away from the disciples and segregates himself. He says, "I've got a big *think* on hand, and I want to get away from John and from Peter—they tire me; and from those women—they are too rapturous, and have their ups and downs too easily. Great things have happened, and more wonderful may be at hand. I want to be alone and think this matter all out." Ah, Thomas, dear, I want you to try a simple cure for your doubts. You may have a great power of intellect, but we simple folks advise you to come to the prayer-meeting, or just take a look into the Salvation Army! I'm glad to see you smile. Anything to rouse you, for you have no heat, no celerity, no momentum. Nothing pleases you, for you think nobody can hit the angle of your doubt. For your soul's sake, Thomas, come in here! I haven't a great intellect I know—my critics say so, and we both agree—but if I chose, I could utter some brand-new, patent doubts as good as yours. Thomas, remember your name

—"one of the twelve"—come back to us. Remember the exhortation not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is. Exhort one another. Keep warm by physical contact and by hearty fellowship.

A lady of education and social standing—an author—wrote to me a sad but honest letter, and said in substance, "Every word you spoke about Thomas went home to my poor, proud, silly heart. I was a follower of Christ, but ashamed of my fellow-Christians in the country village where I was, and so went into the society of those who had more culture, though without grace. I left the sheep and went to the goats. They are more clever, you know; but when I showed any of my sheep traits, any respect for the old faiths, the goats butted me with their horns." Dear friend, bewildered like Thomas, come to us. You may say, "Small pots are soon hot;" never mind, come with us, and we will do you good. Be present at the meeting. Yes, Thomas, dear, you just find Didymus and give him a good talking to.

2. How was this incredulity overcome? I've said some hard things about Thomas; but, really, I'm not sorry that he got into these tantrums, played the fool for us, and spoke unadvisedly with his tongue. We have in him an instructive lesson, for he was a *rara avis*; an honest doubter. He wanted to believe. It made him nearly mad to think that he doubted. He fought against his doubt. We are proud and conceited, and display our doubt as a white cockade is made to be displayed upon the hat. We like to show our unbelief to all about us. Thomas was unwilling to take the testimony of others as to the resurrection of the Lord. Nothing second-hand would suit him. "Except I shall see in His hand the print of the nails, I will not believe." He may have been vexed that the Master had appeared to others and not to him, for He knew that he loved Him. Coleridge says that to be wroth with one you love "brings madness to the

brain." Now, this hesitancy of faith on the part of Thomas gives evidential value to the story. It stamps it with naturalness and sincerity. Supposing that you had heard that a child, brother, wife, or parent had risen from the grave—were it possible—and appeared to another far away, would you not ask with acute sensibilities, "Why not to me?" Is there a continent too broad, a sea too stormy for you to cross to reach the risen one

"Loved long since, and lost awhile?"

Nay, if he be not far off, but near at hand! Verily the word is nigh thee if thou wilt believe. How indifferent we are to our best Friend, and how slow to follow Him! He has promised to meet even with the few; but if the night be wet or cold we stay away. He has promised to be with us "all days" to the end. If the per cents go up we are glad, if they go down we are sad. We have capacious beliefs intellectually, wide throats, and bolt them down whole, and have spiritual dyspepsia. That's what is killing us. This is practical infidelity, blighting, sickening, more harmful than the infidelity outside the Church. To be a Thomas at his worst would be the beginning of hope to some of us. Thomas comes back. Absence and presence are the two points of the story. I can see the blush on the face of Thomas. He "wilted," as you Americans say, when he first saw the Lord. Christ is a very human Saviour in His ways. He takes us down and half laughs at us even when He helps. He shows us what fools we are, and how unreasonable all our doubts have been by which we have limited God's grace. It is said that all tears shall be wiped away when we get home; but really, I think there'll be some red faces in heaven for the first five minutes when we see the Lord and think how we have treated Him. Unbelief is shameful, and your doubt is the same old stupid thing that as of old seemed to sit with its thumb in mouth with ignorant self-content.

We can hear some critical doubting one saying, "It isn't scientific to say that we have actually seen the Master. I will show the disciples what they have not thought of, and how to reason out the matter." Ah, critics will dwindle in that day! Some of them will be ashamed of what they wrote as well as spoke. Faith is not in the fingers. It is not found by analysis, by knife and dissection. Scientific methods don't help. Faith is an open eye and heart, an inward throb, a vision, a personal experience. I do not read that Thomas did as Jesus suggested. I think that the disciples would have hissed him out of the room had he been so coarse, rude, and vulgar as to prod those wounded hands and pierced side with his exploring fingers. We, too, are to gain a spiritual apprehension of divine truth. "Except ye are converted and become like little children, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven."

Remember, friends, that Christ is always here. Livingstone, writing home from Africa, adopted the words of the "May Queen," and said:

"I shall look upon your face;
Tho' I cannot speak a word, I shall harken what
you say,
And be often, often with you when you think
I'm far away."

In a fuller sense the ever-present Master looks into our hearts and homes today. He sees our hopes and doubts. He is ready to relieve. Give not away to despondency. Doubting does not make you a Thomas. Lying under the juniper-tree does not make you an Elijah. Cursing and swearing does not make one a Peter. This is not the way to reason, though some commentators seem to think so. Elijah had his triumph, and Peter lifted up his voice, and three thousand were converted. Thomas was not all the time in an eclipse. There was light on the far side. He rose from his despondency. I come home weary and stretch out upon the lounge. My little four-year-old comes and stands by me. She looks down on me and says, "I'm bigger than

papa!" But if he pulls himself up again and stands erect, she is not much above his knee. Thomas leaps from his supine posture. His faith conquers, and there rings out from his lips, as bells peal forth from a lofty steeple, the glad yet reverent exclamation, "My Lord and my God!" Gabriel, before the throne could have given no better testimony. This is a rock on which Unitarianism splits to shivers. Had Christ been simply an honest man, He would have objected to such adoration. He received Thomas's uttered recognition of His divinity, for it was the intelligent and triumphant declaration of an enlightened soul that rose serenely above all doubt into the clear light of knowledge and of love,

"As some tall cliff, that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale and midway leaves the
storm.
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are
spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

Oh, for such a victorious faith! The Lord's Supper, to which some of you are now looking forward, is one of the helps to secure it. There at the feast it is your privilege to see the face, and grasp, as it were, the very hand of Jesus. There you may take a firmer hold on eternal verities and rest upon Him, whom having not seen, ye love, and in whom believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. I close this talk with His own words to Thomas, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." He meant to be even with Thomas, as if He had said, "You have seen Me, looked upon and handled the Word of Life, but that will not last long, and I am to be off soon. But I'm coming back for good and all. We shall never part. Meantime, within the veil I'll be very busy; therefore, trust me, let not your heart be troubled. You shall soon see me again, and your joy shall be full." He looked down the ages and saw you and me in this century. Yes, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." Endeavor to be worthy of

that benediction. Be not faithless. Sit back in your seats, look up with an eye of faith and a heart of love to Him who is your Life. As oft as ye eat this bread, "ye do show the Lord's death TILL HE COME."

A GREAT QUESTION ANSWERED.

By C. V. ANTHONY D.D. [METHODIST],
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?—Micah vi. 8.

THE prophet wrote as though uttering the last words in a great controversy, as if settling a great question that would never be raised again. We shall see that that question—no doubt great in his day—is the question in ours. We shall see that this answer—the only one then—is the only satisfactory one we now have, or ever can have. We shall best see what that question is by a few plain statements.

1. Without controversy the highest, noblest element in man is his moral nature, with all that the word involves. It is this that most distinguishes him from the brute. It is this that leads him to look upward toward his God and cherish immortal hopes.

2. It ought to be conceded that a man's highest destiny, either as an individual or in society, can never be achieved if this element of his nature be neglected.

3. To gain this end of conformity to our highest nature in moral and spiritual matters, we need to know the law of our being on this subject, no less than on those interests pertaining to our lower nature.

4. No one can question but that man's greatest deficiency is and ever has been in this department of being. Here, then, he needs most instruction and help.

It follows that the greatest practical question man can ask is: "How shall

I live? What shall I do to meet the highest destiny of which I am capable, both for time and eternity?" And somehow we feel instinctively that the answer to that question is bound up in another: "What is right and what is wrong? What is the true standard of virtue?" This question the prophet answers. A few considerations will convince us that it can be answered in no other way.

1. No man can answer it out of the depth of his own judgment. His reasoning faculties are especially at fault when he decides duty in the face of prejudices and inclinations. He is ever engaged in bringing down his ideas of ethics to the standard of his conduct, instead of bringing up his conduct to a fixed rule of right.

2. It cannot be answered by conscience. It is not the province of conscience to tell what is right or wrong in law. This seems to be the error of Pope when he says:

"What conscience dictates to be done,
Or warns me not to do,
This teach me more than hell to shun,
That more than heaven pursue."

The truth is, conscience never decides anything except to condemn us when we do what we think is wrong, and approve us when we do what we think is right. If we are mistaken about the question of right and wrong, our consciences will condemn for doing right, and approve for doing wrong. This is actually true to-day of millions of human beings in this world. Conscience needs an infallible law, and needs to be educated in it, and needs to know the authority that is back of it.

3. It cannot be answered by expediency. This is the great mistake of Herbert Spencer. He supposes the necessities of animal life, to secure the conditions of existence and the perpetuation of the species, led to the settlement of ethics in the brute world, and that ours is only a more complicated system growing out of our more complicated environment. As though our highest nature was from beneath rather than

above, of earth rather than heaven ; from the beast that perishes rather than from the Lord of Light and Glory ! But no community can settle the eternal principles of moral conduct any more than the laws of physics can be settled by popular suffrage ! He who planned the lowest did not forget the highest. He who "made us of clay" also "formed us men !" He only can determine what is good. He only can settle the question of His own requirements. And when so fixed, His moral laws are as universal as His natural laws. The laws of light that control the taper in your hand control the radiations of the mighty sun, whose light has been hundreds of years reaching the instrument by which only you can know that it exists. God's moral law is *His* law, and is law wherever a moral being lives. What is right on earth is right in heaven. What is wrong on earth is wrong in hell !

4. Finally, the Church cannot answer it. This is the most serious error of the Roman Catholic Church ; one that has its effect in producing nearly all other errors of that great Church. They suppose a council or a pope can determine what is right and wrong. Not only so, but they pretend to discriminate between mortal and venial sins. They further claim that they can measure the exact degree of an offence, and so prescribe the exact penalty in the shape of penance that will atone for it. The Church can no more be trusted than the community. The streams of Divine grace must flow abundantly and constantly through the Church, or it becomes corrupt as any political party. It would not be difficult to show by the history of the Church that its accredited authorities at some time or another have declared every right thing wrong, and every wrong thing right.

We see, then, that upon any human foundation we can build nothing solid in ethics. Our conceptions of right and wrong will change like the shifting sands on the sea-shore, where the winds break and the tides beat against them.

What a flood of light pours in upon this great darkness when we read again the words of the prophet : "He," God, "hath shewed thee, O man, what is good ;" He has not left us in doubt and uncertainty in so great a matter. He has given us His Holy Word to teach us. Then, as though it were a small thing to tell us where to *find* the answer, He answers it in the most beautiful and comprehensive manner : "And what doth the Lord"—in the original, Jehovah—"require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Let us now see the completeness of this answer.

1. The answer is *practical*. A great deal is said about truth, meaning thereby what is to be received intellectually. God don't put that in the foreground when He speaks to us. It may be that we magnify that subject too much. The man who asked in the New Testament, "What is truth?" did not care enough for the answer to wait for it, but hurried off, like the tricky politician that he was, to extricate himself from the complications into which his official responsibility had plunged him. He returned not to find the truth, but to save himself by crucifying the Son of God ! It is to be feared that thousands ask the question as an excuse for neglect. As though not knowing the truth about everything, they were free to do as they pleased about anything. Suppose we change the question, and, instead of asking what to think, we shall begin to ask what we must do ? The prophet's words are a perfect answer. The truth God wants is "truth in the inward parts"—truth in conduct, truth in character. The man that dwells in His Holy Hill must walk uprightly and work righteousness, and speak the truth in his heart. He must be pious, profitable, and pure.

2. Again, the answer covers the whole ground. Its completeness may be seen both in its form and in the principles it contains.

Let us first look at the form. There is a beautiful blending of these thoughts,

and an inter-relation that may escape the attention of the careless reader. We begin with the injunction to do justly. This we *can* do. We are not told that we must love to do justly. This we ought to do, but we ought also to be honest and harmless, whether we like it or not. There must be a place in every right endeavor where the will triumphs over the inclination. And just as society will not excuse a crime because the man who committed it had a strong bias toward evil, so we should be strict with ourselves, and determine to do right whatever we desire or suffer. But there is a place in character much higher than this; and there we need a higher motive and stronger impulse. So God requires us to "love mercy." We shall not do much mercy unless we do love it; but for this the affections must be right. And here I find God's requirements take me beyond myself. I cannot love or hate at will. My nature must be changed. He has a perfect right to require of me what His grace will help me accomplish. So this step fittingly leads to the next. We must walk humbly with God. He never intended that we should live alone. Only as He leads us can we reach our highest destiny.

Let us now turn our attention briefly to these principles. They are placed in an order that presents a climax beginning at the lowest and ending with the highest. To do justly is the negative side of a pure and right character. It is very important that we be innocent, that we do no harm; but it is not all of a true character by a great ways.

When Pope says :

"A wit's a feather and a chief's a rod,
An honest man's the noblest work of God,"

he says what may be true enough of an honest man when compared with a wit or a chief, but what is infinitely defective when compared with a saint. When Divine power taxed itself to complete its highest work, it did not stop with a mere negative character. "To love mercy" is to be like Him. It is not only to forgive offences, but to help the needy, instruct the ignorant, evangelize the world. All relations of love and goodness open to our vision under this head. But we only reach the finish when we add, "To walk humbly with thy God." It is fashionable with many to sneer at piety. But even if there was no God, it is ennobling to believe in one. But there is a God; and what wonderful honor is this that we can walk with Him! This means to agree with Him, to co-operate with Him. We humble ourselves to do it, but are never so highly exalted as when it is done. This is God's answer to this great question; let us accept no other.

Two conclusions are reached :

1. Let us as individuals take no man's authority in matters of duty. He may advise, he may instruct, but he must refer all authority to the Source of all authority and power. Infinite evil is bound up in a departure from this rule. The essence of our Protestant faith is found in placing every man directly before his God, listening for the word that sets duty plainly before him.

2. National security and prosperity depend upon the use and teaching of the Bible. A free Bible, freely read and carefully studied, will save us from the wreck of which all the nations that forgot God have been such fearful examples.

FOR THE PRIZE.

Going Well.

Prov. xxx. 29-31.

WE are all of us travellers. To each of us is appointed a journey. It begins at the cradle and ends at the grave. To

some the pilgrimage is measured by years, while to others it is but a matter of days. Whether long or short, it behooves us to travel it wisely and well.

What is it to "go well?" What does

the wise man mean? He calls our attention to certain objects, each of which he declares has a certain beauty in its going. Let us discover their teaching.

I. "The lion is strongest among beasts, and turneth not away for any." Two qualities are indicated—*Strength, Courage.*

1. Strength is a matter of very great importance. This world is an uncomfortable place for the weak. Go into the business world, into the professions, and success is very largely a question of power of endurance. The moral aspect of the question is especially important. Men were never so severely tried. Be strong!

2. The lion also teaches us the value of Courage. Conscience is to be followed. New ideas call for champions. Popular evils are to be assaulted. Be brave!

II. What is the lesson of the greyhound?

1. Celerity of movement. Life calls for haste. Too much time is lost. Men loiter. They fail in punctuality.

2. Certain varieties of the greyhound have not only great speed, but great scent. There is in man a quality which answers to this power of scent in the hound. We call it conscience, moral sense, spiritual discernment. It exists in varying degree. No man is more to be despised than he whose moral sensibilities are wholly blunted. On the other hand, no man is more to be desired than he whose moral nature is keen, alert. "Blest is he to whom is given the instinct that can tell," etc.

III. What may we learn from the goat?

1. Notice his ability to attain to apparently inaccessible heights. Where others fail he succeeds.

2. Observe his security in places of peril. We want men who are safe anywhere—not only in the protected places, but in the places of danger as well.

3. See how he finds subsistence where almost any other animal would perish. Life is not alike to all of us. We do not all feed in green pastures. Blessed

is he whose moral nature thrives not only in the luxuriant meadows, but upon the barren mountain-side. It is possible.

IV. "A king against whom there is no rising up."

1. Joseph Benson puts it, "A king and his people with him." He has their confidence and support. Wanted men in whom the world has faith! What a power is he "against whom there is no rising up."

2. A king, carrying with him everywhere the consciousness of royalty. *Noblesse oblige.* God hath appointed to us a kingdom. Go to it kinglike. So shalt thou "go well," and so at the end it shall be said unto thee, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

NATURA.

Self-Examination.

Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?—2 Cor. xiii. 5.

A DISPUTE about the claims of Paul to apostleship called forth this stirring appeal.

The text calls for activity in several very important lines.

I. Examination.

Specially important to these Corinthians because of ignorance and disorders. It is always proper for Christians, and especially when they would come to the Lord's table. It (1) should not be merely of outward conduct, but should include the inward life also; (2) must not make some doctrine a test; one may substitute a doctrine for Christ; (3) should be held on a principle of independence of opinions of others; (4) should use every means which reveals our characters; (5) should take into account small things; a very small leak will finally destroy the dyke; (6) needs to be a real casting up of accounts. Probing deeply is difficult, disagreeable, painful.

The examination should have two objects in view, viz.: (1) to know we are

in the faith; (2) to know *if Christ* is in us.

II. Self-testing.

"Prove your own selves."

Put your religion to the test. What has it made you do?

Have you combatted error, warned sinners, conquered self, borne affliction, suffering, wrong?

III. Knowledge of an indwelling Saviour.

"Know ye not your own selves how that Jesus Christ is in you?"

Do you not know your own character? May not a Christian know some things? "I know whom I have believed." "We know that we have passed from death unto life." "We know that we are of the truth."

IV. Note the conclusion:

"Except ye be reprobates"—*i.e.*, cannot stand the test. It is a sad, sad failure indeed if we cannot pass the examination.

PASTOR.

The Valley of Achor.

I will give her the valley of Achor for a door of hope.—Hosea ii. 15.

The valley of Achor is rarely mentioned. At each mention it is a door of hope.

1. *The Valley of Entrance.* It was the gateway of Canaan. In it was Israel's first camp on entering the land. It marked a great transition. Here pilgrimage ceased; here residence began. Here great changes occurred. Moses is gone. The cloudy pillar has vanished. The manna has ceased.

These great changes are accomplished by a very short march. The last, the shortest march of Israel, was the best, because it crossed a great boundary line, and brought the people home. The Valley of Achor was to Israel a door of hope, because it was the gateway to a full possession of the land.

Across the line within the kingdom of God's grace there is a door of hope. He who obeys the Divine command, crosses, enters, dwells, may through

this entrance valley pass into all the treasures of grace and glory.

With little knowledge of the land, with little strength for conquest, if yet the great transition be accomplished, the door of hope will open wide to all the riches of the kingdom.

II. *The Valley of Trouble.* The first camp became a scene of disorder and dismay. The attempt to capture Ai was defeated. An accursed thing is in Israel's camp. Achan, Israel's troubler, is stoned. The army of Israel marches to victory. Ai falls. The trouble encountered in the Valley of Achor became a door of hope, a pledge of victory.

Hard lessons yield a rich reward. Rough places become monumental. Victory is the outcome of defeat. Joy is made of sorrow. Crowns come of crosses. Success is the fruit of failure. The kite rises on adverse winds. The bird heads toward the source of storm, and keeps its plumage smooth. The forest tree mends its hold in the furious gale.

Rest in the valley is often interrupted. The interruption opens gates that were closed, to treasures that were concealed. The Valley of Trouble becomes a door of hope to brighter scenes and deeper joys.

III. *The Valley of Renewal.* The silence of centuries passed over Achor's vale. Israel had forgotten God, and broken all their vows. God recalled to Israel the valley of early vows and glad consecration, and proposed to make it the Valley of Renewal. He would blot out Israel's sins, and have Israel begin anew.

From farthest wandering, greatest sin, saddest ruin, deepest sorrow, God can bring back the troubled one to the Valley of Achor, where he may renew vows long neglected, sing songs of joy long silent, and be as if he had never wandered.

With God nothing is irreparable. Such are His power and grace. He opens to the lowest and the worst a door of hope. A ruined life, irreparable

by human skill, may here be renewed. Its sad record may be erased. Life may be begun again. God invites the wanderer back to the starting point, and in the Valley of Achor opens a door of hope.

HOSEA.

The same fountain is open for us. Through the merits of the same Saviour we may enter into the same heaven and enjoy the same blessedness and glory.

LUD.

The Vision of the Redeemed.

Rev. vii. 9-17.

WE have here John's vision of the redeemed. We see :

I. The great number of the redeemed (v. 9). All who have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ and who have died in the faith ; all who shall believe on Him in the future ages ; infants dying in infancy ; the great multitude who have come out of great tribulation. Many are the saved.

II. The eternal glory of the redeemed.

First. The glory of their appearance :

(1) "Clothed with white robes." They shine in the beauty of holiness. (2) "With palms in their hands." They are conquerors through Him that loved them.

Second. The glory of their service.

(1) Their service of song ; their song of *salvation* (v. 10) ; their song of eternal praise to God (v. 12). (2) Their holy ministry (v. 15).

Third. The glory of their eternal home.

(1) Their communion with God (v. 15). "He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them." (2) The heavenly provision (a) for their immortal nature. The Lamb "shall feed them." He is their eternal Shepherd. (b) For their constant refreshment. The Lamb "shall lead them unto living fountains of waters." (c) For their everlasting comfort, God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.

III. Our lessons from the redeemed.

First. Once they were sufferers such as we, or more than any of us. They came "out of great tribulation."

Second. Once they were sinners such as we. They had need of cleansing. They "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

THE power of the agents in the work of God is, first and last, the power of the Lord working in them, working with them, working above them, and also above all adversaries visible or invisible. Above them, far above out of their sight, is held a sceptre in the hands of the Lamb, who is Lord of lords and King of kings. When the Church had scarcely begun to go forth with the purpose of preaching everywhere, down to a time within the memory of living men, the classic lands of history, of the Bible, and of romance were surrounded with high walls and gates barred against Christian missionaries. The Turkish Empire, the Mogul Empire, the Chinese Empire, the Empire of Japan, and that of Morocco were all in this manner fenced round. The remote parts of Africa were guarded by *darkness* and *death* themselves ; and in Southern Europe rare were the spots where it was not an offence punishable by the police to circulate the Bible or to preach or worship except under forms prescribed.

But over the walls has passed the sceptre which eye seeth not, and they who before could only blow slender blasts outside the rampart now march up straight before them, and in the name of Jesus of Nazareth enter in. This is the Lord's doing, and how marvellous in our eyes it ought to be, we shall be better able to judge if we weigh the language used a hundred years ago by wise men of politics, showing how silly were hopes of any such change, and by wise men even of the churches, all alarmed at the danger of fanaticism. The same sceptre, in the same hand, is over us this day—over us here present ; over all our comrades in the war, now out with the field-force ; over every corps bearing any flag which is lowered before the kingly standard of the Lamb, but is held aloft and carried onward against any other—over all these and over every dominion of the earth waves that sceptre in this solemn hour, and He who holds it sits on the right hand of power till the Lord shall make all His enemies His footstool.—*Arthur.*

BORN from above. Take away that part of revelation, and you have a shorn Samson. We can then no more say, "Out of the strong cometh sweetness." Blot out "born from above," and you and I are left to the hopeless task of trying to polish clay into marble. Rejoice in constitutional gifts ; thank God for mental endowments. For the genius and consequent power which envelop the whole being and pour forth sweet and thrilling strains of music, of poetry, of marvellous invention, of tender life-giving sympathy, rejoice and be glad. But there is something beyond these—beyond them as the stars are beyond the taper. There is a holy of holies in this body-temple. Eye hath not seen it. The philosopher cannot kindle its fires. The scholar cannot write its commandments. The artisan cannot adorn its furniture. The bleeding warrior cannot sprinkle it with atoning blood. Its life, its power, its wisdom, its beauty is the spirit of the living God. The spirit of God, our inspiration !—*E. P. Ingersoll.*

THERE is an orator greater than Paul. It is the modern world. If any young man is standing on the border of an intemperate life, does he need the argument of those speakers who traversed our land thirty or forty years ago ? Do

not the streets speak? Do not the stones cry out? Orators fail to come because the public can outpeak them. We need no orator to tell us that snow falls in the winter. The public scenes so emblazoned have made all speakers dumb. Men blow out candles when the sun is up. There was an ancient orator who so discussed his subject that no other speaker was willing afterward to pass over the same field. Thus our age so paints temperance and intemperance that the individual heart feels little like following a speech so wise, so great, so pathetic. No tongue can paint intemperance as an age can paint it, and no tongue can bestow upon all moderation the rich commendation which the times bestow.—*Swing*.

MAKING bricks without straw? That oppression still goes on. Demanding of your wife appropriate wardrobe and bountiful table without providing the means necessary: Bricks without straw. Cities demanding in the public school faithful and successful instruction without giving the teachers competent livelihood: Bricks without straw. United States Government demanding of Senators and Congressman at Washington full attendance to the interests of the people, but on compensation, which may have done well enough when twenty-five cents went as far as one dollar now, but in these times not sufficient to preserve their influence and respectability: Bricks without straw. In many parts of the land churches demanding of pastors vigorous sermons and sympathetic service on starvation salary, sanctified Cicerus on four hundred dollars a year: Bricks without straw. That is one reason why there are so many poor bricks. In all departments, bricks not even, or bricks that crumble, or bricks that are not bricks at all. Work adequately paid for is worth more than work not paid for. More straw and then better bricks. When in December of 1889, at the museum at Boulak, Egypt, I looked at the mummies of the old Pharaohs, the very miscreants who diabolized centuries, and I saw their teeth and hair and finger nails and the flesh drawn tight over their cheek bones, the sarcophagi of these dead monarchs side by side, and I was so fascinated I could only with difficulty get away from the spot. I was not looking upon the last of the Pharaohs. All over the world old merchants playing the Pharaoh over young merchants; old lawyers playing the Pharaoh over young lawyers; old doctors playing the Pharaoh over young doctors; old artists playing the Pharaoh over young artists; old ministers playing the Pharaoh over young ministers. Let all oppressors, whether in homes, in churches, in stores, in offices, in factories, in social life or political life, in private life or public life, know that God hates oppressors, and they will all come to grief here or hereafter. Pharaoh thought he did a fine thing, a cunning thing, a decisive thing, when for the complete extinction of the Hebrews in Egypt he ordered all the Hebrew boys massacred, but he did not find it so fine a thing when his own first born that night of the destroying angel dropped dead on the mosaic floor at the foot of the porphyry pillar of the palace. Let all the Pharaohs take warning.—*Talmage*.

MR. INGERSOLL, not content with arraigning the God of theology, boldly attacks and criticises the God of nature. He implies that if he had been consulted he could have made a far better world than this. He would "make health catching instead of disease." Because there are earthquakes and pestilence and wars and human slavery, hence there can be no moral governor of the universe, else he would not allow this. This means one of two things, either there is no Infinite mind, and we are all irresponsible atoms in the grip of law, whose tendency even is not for good, or there then is a great controlling mind whose purposes are not beneficent. In other words, an evil God. It is an awful conception.—*Taber*.

THESE words of our Master—"What I say un-

to you I say unto all, Watch"—we will try, more and more, to learn what they mean. We know that they do not warrant us in watching other disciples with the eye of the critic or the censor; we know that this habit of mind is, above most things, hateful to Him. To watch ourselves lest we become suspicious and censorious and credulous of evil tales about our neighbors; to watch our conduct lest we hurt them by want of fidelity or want of sympathy—this, we know, is part of the lesson of vigilance that He seeks to teach us. But this is the smallest part of the lesson. To watch for hurts that we can heal for halting steps that we can steady, for burdens of infirmity or trouble that we can help to carry, for ways in which we may give our thought, our care, our love, ourselves, for the enlarging and the brightening of the lives of our fellowmen, serving them with humblest fidelity, and leading them with cords of sympathy and brotherhood in the ways of righteousness and peace—this is the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.—*Gladden*.

THE bond between us and God is simply an infinite thing, infinite in its beauty and strength, its loveliness. There is no such other bond. Think of it for a moment, for it would take a world's time, it does take a world's time to set it forth to our reception. It is just, I cannot think of a better phrase—the words are constantly failing, they are poor things; I cannot think of a better phrase than that of our own Goldsmith, who uses twice, in his book—in a book that nobody reads now, called the "Citizen of the World"—the words about God, "He loved us into being." That should be a bit of our national Bible: "loved us into being"—that is our relation with God.—*MacDonald*.

TAKE away Faith from men, and you insure the universal dissolution of all credit, of all commerce, of all civilization. Man would lapse into the savage life, and indeed far below the savage life; for there is not an African kraal which is not held together except by the faith of its members in one another. The world is bound together by Faith, without which there would come in all the disintegrating, disorganizing, and antagonistic elements of human nature, and without Faith the world would be one vast battle-field.—*Burns*.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Realized Presence of the Lord the Secret of Power in the Church. "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Zion."—Isaiah, viii. 18. Rev. William A. Thur, A.M., Washington, D.C.
2. Inconsistencies of Modern Scepticism. "Their rock is not as our rock."—Dent, xxxii. 31. E. H. Brumbaugh, M.D., D.D., St. Joseph, Mo.
3. The Union of all the Churches. "Now there are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God who worketh all in all."—1 Cor. xii. 4-6. Rev. Myron Reed, Denver, Col.
4. The Faith a Sacred Trust. "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."—Jude 3. Pres. Francis L. Patton, D.D. Brooklyn, N. Y.

5. Walking with God. "And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him."—Gen. v. 24. John W. Heidt, D.D., Atlanta, Ga.
6. The Reformation of Criminals. "For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."—Matt. xviii. 11. Rev. F. N. Dexter, Indianapolis, Ind.
7. The Harvest and the Laborers—A Contrast. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few."—Matt. ix. 37. Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, Richmond, Va.
8. The World, the New Reasoner. "And as he reasoned of righteousness and self-control and judgment to come, Felix trembled."—Acts xxiv. 25. Professor David Swing, Chicago, Ill.
9. Degrees of Spiritual Susceptibility. "The people, therefore, that stood by and heard it, said that it thundered; others said, An angel spoke to him."—John xii. 29. William V. Kelley, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
10. Life in Christ. "Christ liveth in me."—Gal. ii. 20. Henry D. McDonald, D.D., Atlanta, Ga.
11. Recognition after Death. "It is the Lord."—John xxi. 7. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., Washington, D.C.
12. The Conditions of Successful Prayer. "Thy will be done."—Matt. vi. 10. John H. Barrows, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
13. Some Laws of Christian Athletics. "If a man also strive for masteries yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully."—2 Tim. ii. 5. R. V. Hunter, D.D., Indianapolis, Ind.
14. Jesus the Saviour and the Ideal Man. "Now we see not yet all things put under him, but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man."—Heb. ii. 8, 9. Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, Richmond, Va.
15. Soul-winning. "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life; and he that winneth souls is wise."—Prov. xi. 30. Rev. Peter Thompson, Brooklyn, N. Y.
16. The Coming Sovereignty of Man. "Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he subjected all things unto him, he left nothing that is not subject unto him. But now we see not yet all things subjected unto him. But we behold him . . . even Jesus."—Heb. ii. 8, 9. John Clifford, M.A., D.D., Manchester, Eng.
17. The Higher Criticism. "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."—Heb. i. 1. J. H. Rylance, D.D., New York City.
18. The Head's Acquaintance with the Body. ("I know thy tribulation and thy poverty [but thou art rich], and the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and they are not, but are a synagogue of Satan."—Rev. ii. 9.)
19. The Only Owner. ("The most high God, possessor of heaven and earth."—Gen. xiv. 19.)
20. The Doctrine of Henry George Untenable. ("As many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them at the apostles' feet."—Acts iv. 34, 35.)
21. Unconscious Greatness. ("Art thou the prophet? And he answered, No."—John i. 21. "But wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet."—Matt. xi. 9.)
22. Enthusiasm in Christian Work. ("Whatever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord and not unto men."—Col. iii. 23.)
23. Filial Homage. ("And the king rose up to meet her, and bowed himself unto her, and sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king's mother; and she sat on his right hand . . . And the king said unto her, Ask on, my mother; for I will not say thee nay."—1 Kings ii. 19, 20.)
24. Applied Christianity. ("Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."—James i. 27.)
25. The Divine Challenge to Human Criticism. ("Search the Scriptures . . . they are they which testify of me."—John v. 39.)
26. The Accommodation of Law to Evil. ("For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept."—Mark x. 5.)

NEW YEAR'S THEMES.

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. The Sacredness of the Ballot. ("The powers
14. The New Year Call to the Drowsy. ("It is high time to awake out of sleep . . . The night is far spent, the day is at hand."—Rom. xiii. 11, 12.)

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

The Mystery of Godliness.

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.—1 Tim. iii. 16.

AN alternate reading, favored by not a few high authorities, punctuates this passage differently, as follows:

The pillar and ground of the truth, and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness or the Godhead, etc.

Bengel remarks that the reference of the words "pillar and ground" to the Church was not known as an interpretation until the sixteenth century. The reference of this passage is to the incarnation of God in Christ, which is the great revealed mystery of the whole Scripture, and is here declared to be without controversy great. If the reading suggested as preferable be adopted, this mystery is also set forth as both pillar and pedestal or prop of all other related truth, which about this centralizes and crystallizes.

This passage acquires additional interest as a probable relic of an ancient formula of confession or hymn used in the Apostolic Church, a sort of brief Apostle's Creed. It has all appearance of being constructed in poetic form with antithetical clauses or parallelisms, and can be understood best when so arranged.

GOD WAS

Manifest in the flesh,
Vindicated by the Spirit;

Seen of angels,
Proclaimed to the nations;

Believed on in the world,
Caught up into glory.

This arrangement shows the rhythm of thought.

1. Here the Incarnation is, first of all, declared to be incontrovertibly great as

a mystery. Its mysteriousness we may candidly admit, and abandon all thought of solving. It is one of those thoughts of God which are as high above us as the heaven is above the earth. We should not stumble at the mystery, for it is one sign of the Divine mind and hand that the products of His wisdom shall baffle our power to comprehend.

2. It is declared to be pillar and stay of all related truth. There is a law of scientific unity which arranges all truth in any department about a central principle—such as the crystal in the mineral realm, the cell in the vegetable and animal, the spinal column in the vertebrates, etc. The Incarnation is the scientific centre and principle of redemptive truth. Upon it all other truth rests, and by it is held up and supported. Christ was the *God man*, and every truth about man and God finds exhibition and illustration in Him.

3. The truth is here set forth in three couplets, which are remarkable and significant. They briefly cover the entire career of the Son of God from His birth to His ascension; and, taken as couplets, they briefly answer these three great questions: *Who was He? What was He? and Where is He?*

I. Who was He? He was God; the flesh was His form of manifestation, the Holy Spirit was His vindication as God. Here we must not be misled by the word "manifest." We use it often of a clear and plain showing forth of a truth or fact. Here it means simply that the flesh was the garment in which God appeared, though it did not clearly reveal the Godhead. The flesh was rather a disguise. The humanity of Christ none was disposed to dispute, for that was the apparent fact; the doubt was as to His divinity and deity. And hence He had to be justified in His claim to Godhood by the Spirit of God. That vindication was complete, and may be viewed from three points: 1. Prophecy.

2. Miracle. 3. Resurrection. (1) The Spirit of God vindicated Christ as God beforehand by the marvellous prophetic portrait which found in Him alone fulfilment. He prepared a minute predictive delineation of the coming Messiah; and when Christ was born, every new development filled out some prophetic feature until the correspondence was complete. (2) Miracle. The Spirit in Christ vindicated His claim. His words and works were such as could have been spoken and wrought only by God. Never before nor since were there such teaching and such working, such wisdom and power conjoined. It is inconceivable that these could be connected with a fanatic or impostor. (3) Resurrection. Here was the crowning vindication of Christ's deity. As prophecy anticipated His human career, so this followed it. When He was dead and ceased to speak or work in the flesh, the Spirit of God, who dwelt in Him, proved Him to be God by the fact that death had over Him no dominion, and that decay could not touch him even in the grave. Compare Romans i. 4.

II. What was He? The second couplet answers. He was the appointed Saviour; and hence His character and work were properly attested and proclaimed. In this second couplet the first member is probably mistranslated. Angels is a word meaning simply messengers, and so should be rendered "seen of messengers," in which case it includes both the angelic and the human messengers who were appointed of God to witness to the fact of His resurrection. Everything hung upon Christ's rising from the dead. Without this He could not be the justifier of sinners, for the death penalty would be yet upon Him; He would be a false prophet, for He foretold His own resurrection. He could not be the Deliverer from death while yet under its power, nor from Satan, who had the power of death committed to him. It was, therefore, of first importance that Christ should be fully and incontrovertibly

witnessed as having risen; and so messengers chosen of God, both angelic and human, saw Him and bore witness to His glorious rising, and He was preached to the nations by those who saw Him and ate and drank with Him after His rising.

III. Where is He? The third couplet beautifully responds: He is in the world as the present and living Saviour of all believers; and He has been caught up into glory as the advocate at God's right hand, a Prince and a Saviour, to carry on redemption to its consummation. No greater vindication of all Christ's claims as God can be found even on prophecy and miracle than this double fact; by faith He dwells with every penitent believing soul; to faith He is the perpetually exalted and crowned King and Lord. What He can be to you in this world you may test; love Him, trust Him, keep His words, and He will come and make His abode in you. What He can be to you as the King on the throne you may easily test by *prayer*. Ask Him what you will; present your needs, your sins, your sorrows, your work for souls; let Him be the partner of your life and toil and see how He will vindicate you as His servant, and your work as His work.

In conclusion, note the *three* great characteristic facts of Christ's career: Incarnation, Resurrection, Ascension. The first proved His true humanity; the second His divinity; the third the union of humanity with divinity in His person. We make not too much of His birth and death, but too little of His resurrection and ascension. Particularly His ascension; for the most stupendous mystery of all is this Man-Christ Jesus actually bearing up to the throne of the universe the *body and nature of man*. In His Incarnation God came down. In His Resurrection the Divine Spirit overcame death and brought out of the grave His body. But in the Ascension man went up where God is, and became, in Christ, God. Can any human mind have invented a mystery

so awfully sublime and so sublimely complete ?

Not ashamed of the Gospel (Romans i. 16). Paul means that he does not blush for the Gospel.

1. Its *genealogy*. It is the old Gospel descended by a long and honorable lineage from prophets and apostles, and Jesus Himself, from the first Father, God.

2. Its *ethics*. Its moral teachings lead in all ethical teachings, complete beyond addition, and allowing no subtraction.

3. Its *great example*. Christ, whether in His attitude toward God or toward men, was beyond comparison.

4. Its universal *applicability*. It touches and reaches man as man. Salvation for all sinners. A Brahman said to me, "Preach the Gospel, and let it defend itself. Don't *prove* it, but *preach* it."

5. Its *missionary* character, to be preached to the whole world. Every disciple a debtor to declare it to man.

6. Its *simple terms*. The only way for peace of conscience, reconciliation with God, and charity toward man—forgiveness, justification, sanctification.

7. Its *promises*. Life and immortality brought to light.

8. The *power of God* is in this Gospel.
G. F. PENTECOST.

POWER IN PRAYER.—In Abraham's intercession for Sodom it is to be observed that, although he so importunately pressed his plea that for the sake of the righteous therein the city might be spared, and notwithstanding he feared the anger of the Lord if he carried his importunity too far, it was Abraham himself and not the Lord who set the limit to his prayer. "Oh, let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak *but this once* ; peradventure there be *ten* found there." Although he had gone from fifty to forty-five, forty, thirty, twenty, ten, the Lord showed no impatience with his pleading ; but it was the patriarch's courage that gave

way. Who can tell how much farther he might have carried his intercession !

Moreover, it is noticeable that when God did destroy the city, He did what Abraham had not asked, He delivered Lot, the one righteous man that was there, and his family, and sordid abundantly above all that the patriarch had asked.

THE LAND OF PROMISE was undoubtedly the type of God's "exceeding great and precious promises," which are the believer's inheritance. If we examine carefully the gradual unfolding of God's thought in the Old Testament, we may find a rich lesson taught us as to our duty and privilege in relation to the promises.

Abraham was called to

1. *Separation*—to come out from the semi-idolatrous land and people of Haran, and come into the land God would show him.

2. *Survey*. "Arise, lift up thine eyes, look." He was to take a comprehensive view of the land, get some adequate conception of its length and breadth.

3. *Appropriation*. "Arise, walk through the length and breadth of it." He was to measure it off by his own feet, claiming it for his own by placing his pilgrim feet upon it (comp. Josh. i. 3).

4. *Abode*. He and his descendants were to pitch their tents there and abide in the land.

5. *Cultivation*. Afterward we find God leading Isaac to sow the fields, and so bring out the riches of the land, and we are told what an abundant crop he obtained.

What is all this but a type of the believer separating himself unto God, then surveying his inheritance in Christ, then taking possession, abiding in the promises, and diligently improving his privileges to make the promises fruitful in his life and power and service !

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE enriches preaching which is essentially a testi-

mony, not the mouth of a message only, but the mouth of an experience. Mr. Spurgeon says that when he has nothing else to say to his people he puts himself in his gun and fires it off. He means that from time to time he uses his own inner life, the knowledge God has given him of spiritual things in his own soul, the experience of answered prayer, rewarded toil, compensated suffering, fruitful faith, to illustrate God's faithfulness, and the privilege of believers. In lands where there is an established church men are prone to degrade the ministry to a *profession*, whose requisite is culture, and whose requisite is whatever price it can command. We should think of the ministry as a *Divine vocation*, and its highest requisite is a rich, deep, personal experience. In fact, there is no true knowledge of the Scripture to him who is not rooted and grounded in love, and so able to comprehend the wondrous things of God.

A HEARER'S CONTRIBUTION to the eloquence of the pulpit. Gladstone says that eloquence is the pouring back on an audience in a flood what is first received from the auditors in the form of vapor, as the skies send back in rain the moisture that is first drawn by evaporation from the earth itself. What a devout and appreciative hearer contributes to the power of the speaker is something never yet adequately apprehended. Peter could not help being a power in the house of Cornelius. Think of a preacher of the Gospel being met, at the very threshold of his work, by a body of hearers, who say, "Now, then, we are all here present before God, to hear all things which are commanded thee of God." There had been, before he came to Cornelius, fasting and prayer—a deep desire to know saving truth. The centurion had gathered together an audience of those who were like-minded with himself, and from the moment Peter opened his mouth he was met by open hearts, re-

ceptive toward the truth and will of God; and it is remarkable that as Peter "*began to speak*, the Holy Ghost fell" on all those that heard the Word. The Spirit of God was divinely impatient to bestow blessing where souls were divinely impatient to receive blessing; and so Peter had no sooner got out of his mouth enough truth to be the basis of saving power, than the Spirit of God came in His own might and brought that whole body of hearers to Jesus' feet. Suppose, in a modern church, disciples should rise early on the Lord's day, and spend an hour with God praying for a blessing on the day's duties, and especially the preaching of the Word, should then avoid excess of eating, that the whole mind might be awake and unclogged by a sluggish body, should themselves commune with the Word of God, and come to the house of prayer to hear all things commanded of God, what new power would attend preaching! How would the weakest man be uplifted and upborne on the wings of his people's prayers. The preachers to such a people could not long stay if he did not respond to their devoutness and craving hunger for spiritual food. Such a people would compel a preacher either to preach the Gospel or else make way for some one who would.

THERE are *four types of religious life*: 1. The *rationalistic*, in which all truth and doctrine are submitted to the reason as the supreme arbiter. 2. The *ecclesiastic*, in which the Church is practically the final authority. 3. The *mystic*, in which the "inner light" interprets even Christian doctrine. 4. The *evangelic*, in which the soul bows to the authority of the inspired Word, and makes the reason, the voice of the Church, and the inner instincts and impulses subordinate, as fallible sources of authority, to the one supreme tribunal of Scripture. Between these four every believer must make his election.

Dividing asunder of soul and spirit (Heb. iv. 12). This is the evasive, elusive borderland so difficult to explore without the aid of Scripture. Much of our life is *soul-life* prompted by our own carnal nature, in which our dependence is on our own will-power and fleshly energy. Christ cuts away that and teaches us to live by the energy of the spirit of God. F. B. MEYER.

All sin is therefore to be put away, and we are to be careful for nothing. We are to be like Pacific islands, which are by their coral reefs protected and environed, so that the sea cannot overwhelm them or sweep them away. Inside of the reef, in the lagoons, peaceful harbors may be found in the most desperate storm. F. B. MEYER.

THERE are *three sorts of men*. The *natural* (1 Cor. ii. 14); the *carnal* (1 Cor. iii. 3, Rom. viii. 7), and the *spiritual* (1 Cor. ii. 15). The natural man is the man left to himself without Divine light or guidance. The carnal man is the man depending on himself and living for the flesh. The spiritual man is the man filled with God and living by the Spirit. F. B. MEYER.

The Bible the Word of God.

WHEN Napoleon's horse ran away and a common soldier caught him, Napoleon said, "Thank you, captain," and the man at once went to the officers' quarters and sat down with them at mess. Had not the emperor called him "captain," and was not his place with the captains? Let us take our place with Christ. F. B. MEYER.

AT the opening of the Bible Conference at Northfield, Mass., Rev. A. Torrey, Superintendent of the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, told "Why I Believe the Bible is the Word of God." His ten reasons were these: First, the testimony of Jesus Christ; second, its fulfilled prophecies; third, the unity of the book; fourth, its immeasurable superiority to any other book, for it contains nothing but the truth—if you take from all literature in all ages the wheat you will not have a book to equal this book. Fifth, the tidings of the Bible; sixth, the character of those who accept it and of those who reject it; seventh, the influences of the book to lift men; eighth, its inexhaustible depths—generations have studied, and yet they cannot reach to the bottom; ninth, as we grow in holiness, we grow toward the Bible; tenth, the testimony of the Holy Spirit. We begin with God and end with Him.

Worry and sin are the two hindrances which keep the believer out of the practical rest of the heavenlies with Christ.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

JAN. 3-9.—VETO-POWER FOR THE NEW YEAR.—Neh. v. 15.

Some one says, "The heaviest charged words in our language are those two briefest ones, 'Yes' and 'No.' One stands for the surrender of the will, the other for denial; one for gratification, the other for character. Plutarch says 'that the inhabitants of Asia came to be vassals to one only for not

being able to pronounce one syllable, which is No.' A stout 'No' means a stout character; the ready 'Yes' means a weak one, gild it as we may."

You remember about Nehemiah. He was governor of Jerusalem under the King of Persia. There, amid all sorts of opposition from the hostile people round; amid lies that were sent to Babylon about him; amid snagging diffi-

culties of every kind, the ruined walls were rapidly rebuilt, the government of the city was thoroughly attended to, abuses and oppressions were hunted out, and the people began to get heart and hope again.

How was Nehemiah to get his pay for all his toil and trouble? There was one way, and that was the corrupt, oppressive, Oriental way—the hurt of which for all the years has been striking at the vitals of the Turkish Empire. When a man would get the government of a province in the Turkish Empire, he must first make the Sultan a present of a good many hundred thousand dollars often, then pledge the payment of so much every year into the national treasury from the province, and then look out for his own pay by a still further squeezing of the poor people of his province. How much he squeezes for himself the government does not care, provided he does well the promised squeezing for the government. This too was the financial method of ancient Persia. Such was the usual way, the expected way, the only alternative to which was the paying one's own charges out of one's own pocket. As methods of government were going then, it would not have been the wrong way had Nehemiah been governor of a prosperous province. But circumstances do alter cases. Those returned Hebrew exiles were poor, and at difficult work in a hard place; and so Nehemiah would dare say "No" to the usual and expected and self-rewarding thing. Out of his own means he provided for himself, and showed hospitality to others. And the secret of Nehemiah's strong, sweet, stalwart, tender, great and gracious character—as the Scripture portrays it for us—lies in this ability of saying "No" where it should be said. "So did not I"—that is, as all the other governors had done—"because of the fear of God."

I have the picture of a man, philosopher, seer, poet—perhaps the man most royally endowed of his entire century; and yet when you measure what Cole-

ridge did by what he might have done, his life is almost as pitiable a failure and fragment as can be found in literary history. "It used to be said of him that whenever either natural obligation or voluntary undertaking made it his duty to do anything, the fact seemed sufficient reason for his not doing it." There was no veto-power in him. There was no rocky ability of saying "No," like Nehemiah's. So he was but a mass of seaweed—a very gorgeous mass indeed, but drifted here and yonder as the tides listed, when he might have been a noble island or even a continent, had he but possessed anchoring power.

Our character and destiny are largely and really in our own hands, and that character and destiny must be, in great degree, as we use our veto-power; and, like Nehemiah, say when we ought to say it, a grand, firm "No" to things.

We must say this "No" in the realm of the thought. A young artist once asked an older and distinguished artist for some word of advice which would help him in the toilful professional struggle upward. The distinguished artist, looking round the young man's room, saw some rough, mean sketches hanging on the walls. "Take those down," he said, "for no young man desirous of rising in his profession should ever allow his eye to become familiar with any but the highest forms of art." And this artist went on to say that if the young man could not afford to buy good oil paintings of the first-class, he should either get good engravings of great pictures or have nothing on his walls. For the constant sight of vulgarity in art would surely result in depraved taste in the man who looked upon it.

Now we live in an evil world, and there is in ourselves enough of evil inherited and acquired, and so there is enough of bad pigment without us and within us to set the imagination at painting evil pictures. And so, here in the realm of our thought, we must put forth veto-power upon our thought and say "No" sternly and squarely. As a man

Shows a high value (Nehemiah's)

thinketh in his heart so is he. Not to say "No" here is to say "Yes" to impurity and ruin.

Also, we must say this "No" in the *realm of the appetites*. How often does this argumentation go on within a man: Here I am; I did not make myself; God made me; I am craving with certain appetites; I did not put them within me—God did; there are certain objects which will feed and fill these appetites; because the objects fit desire, why not let desire fly to object, and charge the blame, if blame there be, on God?

And such argumentation would be true and right, and could not be overthrown were it not that when men think thus with themselves they leave out a most essential fact—*viz.*, that God has put desire within and object without to meet each other *under the control of moral will and moral responsibility*. And that it is the business of this moral will to see to it that appetite is kept in slavery to its high behests.

Also we must say this "No" in the *realm of circumstances*. We must not allow circumstances to master us for evil; we must compel circumstances to be our ministers for righteousness, for tough endurance, for the upbuilding of noble character.

And the power for this "No"; the *veto-power* for the new year? It is for us where it was long ago for Nehemiah—in the fear of God.

JAN. 10-16.—THE STORY OF A BAD STOPPING.*—2 Kings, xiii. 18.

In those old times hostilities were often proclaimed by a king or general publicly and with due ceremony shooting an arrow into an enemy's country.

For sixty years the prophet Elisha has been witnessing for God in Israel.

But as every man at last must be, he is smitten with his mortal sickness,

* I have used here somewhat a chapter in a little book of mine, "The Brook in the Way," published by Randolph & Co.

and the rumor runs that the venerable and honored prophet is about to die.

Joash is the King of Israel. Even the king must pay respect to noble character. In the long run it is always character which grasps the real sceptre. So the king comes to make respectful visitation at the dying prophet's bedside.

After all, the true defence of nations is the strong character of its people. This the king feels in fresh fashion as he stands there beside the dying prophet's bed. To lose Elisha is to miss a bulwark of his kingdom. Sobbingly the king confesses it (2 Kings xiii. 14). That is to say, for real defence better than marshalled hosts art thou and thy service among the people, O dying prophet!

Syria was the constant and encroaching enemy of Israel. Lately Syria had been sorely pressing Israel.

Answered the dying prophet to the king: "Take bow and arrows." And the king took unto him bow and arrows.

"Make thine hand to ride upon the bow," commands the prophet.

And the king obediently laid arrow on the bow, and set its notch upon the string, as though he were about to shoot.

And Elisha put his hands upon the king's hands. Thus would Elisha, as the Lord's prophet, show that what was being done was doing by the Lord's direction.

"Open the window eastward," commands the prophet. And the lattice was flung apart.

"Shoot," commands Elisha. And the king sped the arrow. And as the arrow fled the prophet made formal declaration of war and promise of success in it against encroaching Syria (2 Kings xiii. 17).

But the king had still a quiver full of arrows. "Take them," said the prophet. And the king gathered them into his hand.

"Smite upon the ground," orders the prophet. That is to say, in token of determined and vanquishing war,

through the open lattice, shoot arrow after arrow, till all are gone, and they remain there smiting into and sticking in the ground as symbols of a dauntless purpose.

And the king shot one arrow, and it smote the ground.

And the king shot the second arrow, and it smote the ground.

And the king shot the third arrow, and it smote the ground.

And then, listlessly, or unzealously, or faithlessly, the king stopped.

And he smote thrice and stayed (2 Kings xiii. 19).

And so it was that King Joash gained but partial victory over the Syrians.

Is not the lesson evident? Smiting but thrice and staying—only half-doing, not pushing to the finishing in grand faith and unrelaxing purpose—is not that the trouble with multitudes of men? Here, then, is our story of a Bad Stopping.

(a) In the direction of *success in the daily life* men often make a bad stopping. They smite but thrice and stay.

Success is duty. The difference between men as to making the most of themselves is due, oftener than we are apt to think, to this simply, whether they smite but thrice and stay, or whether they not only smite thrice but—go on smiting.

"But it is hard," men say. Yes; but everything that gets up in this world must struggle up. One relates how Arago, the French astronomer, tells, in his autobiography, that in his youth he one day became puzzled and discouraged over his mathematics, and almost resolved to give up the study. He held his paper-bound text-book in his hand. Impelled by an indefinable curiosity, he damped the cover of the book, and carefully unrolled the leaf to see what was on the other side. It turned out to be a brief letter from D'Alembert to a young man like himself, disheartened by the difficulties of mathematical study, who had written to him for counsel. This was the letter;

"Go on, sir, go on. The difficulties you meet will resolve themselves as you advance. Proceed, and light will dawn and shine with increasing clearness upon your path."

Arago went on and became the first astronomical mathematician of his time.

"But I am too old," men say. But use is the law of growth. And the quickest way to bring upon one's self the worst sort of senility is to withdraw from life and the interests and duties of it. I have known many a rich man who, retiring from business, retired into uselessness, a quick coming and barren old age, a speedier death than would have come had the powers been kept in play.

"But I would be humble," men say. Yes; but if *you* do not amount to much, there is all the more reason *you* should make the most of yourself. And a true humility is never a withdrawing from service, but is always a readiness to set one's self to even the lowliest service for the love of God and fellow-men.

(b) In the direction of *overcoming evil habits* men often make a bad stopping. They smite but thrice and stay. As some one says, such men are like a man who, attempting to jump a ditch, will never really jump, but will forever stop and return for a fresh run.

(c) In the direction of *resisting temptation* men often make this bad stopping. They resist thrice, but at the fourth assault they yield.

(d) In the direction of *advance in the Christian life* men often make this bad stopping. Plenty of Christians through a long life do not get much beyond the initial stage of justification.

(e) In the direction of *becoming Christian*, men often make this bad stopping. They smite in the way of at least a partial and outward change of life, etc., but when it comes to a total and irreversible surrender of the self to the Lord Jesus, they stay.

Oh, let this new year be to all of us not a year of bad stopping, but of splendid advancing in all things pure, and true, and right!

JAN. 17-23. — THE UNSPEAKABLE GIFT.—2 Cor. ix. 15.

The Apostle Paul was not a Christian who believed that money and its management lay outside the circle of Christianity. He believed that money and its management lay very centrally within that circle. You shall find the epistles of the great apostle large in speech about the matter. To talk of money gathered, spent, given for the sake of Jesus and in the spirit of Jesus, was not break and intrusion—something apart from Christian feeling and thinking. The offering, in the apostle's thought, was never an element foreign to worship, but was an integral part of worship.

The apostle is writing just now about the offering for the poor saints in Jerusalem he has in charge. Then, as always with the apostle, what he is at present thinking of makes him think of the Lord Jesus. There is nothing, according to the apostle's way of thinking, that does not hold real relation with Jesus Christ. And, as the apostle thinks of Him, his heart takes fire, and he bursts out in our Scripture: "Thanks be to God for His *unspeakable* gift!"

This word "unspeakable" is a peculiar one. It is used only here in the New Testament. It means, literally, gift, *not to be told throughout*. It is as if he had said, "You can tell about this gift of yours of money, O Corinthians, what it can do; how it will bind into better brotherhood; how it will lift burdens from the poor saints there in Jerusalem; but when you come to God's gift of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—its vastness, its preciousness—why, that gift is untellable, it transcends speech, it cannot be told throughout, it is unspeakable.

First. In its total meaning God's gift of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is unspeakable. How can you put its whole significance into words? You must strain and struggle to even hint its meaning; and then the great unsaid part of it sweeps away as the ocean does

from the horizon you can see as you stand upon the shore. There is always a great Divine mystery brooding in this gift of God. Christ, the Divine-Human, the marriage-point of the human and the Divine, possessing in His undivided yet complex person the nature of God and the nature of man; and all the infinite reaches of the atonement He wrought out manward, Godward—how can you tell such things as these? Your widest, deepest, precisest words are too narrow, and too shallow, and too misty for such transcendently august conceptions.

Second. This gift of God is unspeakable in its *sacrifice*. God is not impassible in the sense of *not feeling*, but only in the sense that He is over and beyond this external universe; that therefore He is not moved by external influences to need and other emotions; that His infinite nature is sufficient for itself. God's impassibility does not mean that He does not have emotions. He has. He is full of them. Only for their movement He is not dependent upon the external universe. They well up *in* Him. And when God gave out of Himself His only begotten Son, there was infinite consciousness and emotion of sacrifice in Him. God's gift was His utmost gift. Even infinity could not give more. But how can you adequately tell these things? You cannot. They are beyond telling. They cannot be uttered through. They are unspeakable.

Third. This gift of God is unspeakable in its *latent possibilities*. What cannot God intend for you when He gave His Son for you! Streets of gold, gates of pearl—they are the merest dress and fringe of poorest comparison. What God means for the lowliest believer in the gift of His Son for him is—beyond the telling.

But even the smallest vision of this unspeakable gift of God ought to do and will do much for us.

(a) It ought to rid us of a very common but untrue and unworthy conception of God—viz., that the atonement and all the immeasurable blessings in

the gift of Christ were *wring out* of an at least semi-unwilling God. No ; God is Love. God gave out of love. God *so* loved the world. The gift of Christ is the utmost proof of the love of God.

(b) It ought to make it an easy thing for us to love God. Such love ought to meet in our hearts love answering.

(c) It ought to give us heart and hope in helping others. This is our message buttressed by the gift of Christ—God loves you.

(d) It ought to make us rightly use and rightly keep God's other gifts—*e.g.*, the Sabbath.

(e) The thought of this unspeakable gift of God will "gag" me at the last if I reject it. This was the question : "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having the wedding garment?" And the literal record is—the man was "gagged."

JAN. 24-30.—THE MEANING OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.—1 Thess. ix. 10.

Three chief elements of the Christian life are clearly brought out in our Scripture.

First a Turning—"and how ye turned from idols."

Second, a Serving—"to serve the living and true God."

Third, a hopeful Waiting—"and to wait for His Son from heaven."

The Christian life is a *Turning*, and it is a Turning of the most radical and deep sort. It is a Turning than which nothing can be more revolutionary. Says Paul, "If any man be in Christ, he is a *new creation*." Says our Lord, "Except a man be *born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

Culture is the mighty modern word. You need no regenerating turning ; you need no intrust of new forces ; you need no grafting in of a sort better and nobler ; you only need the culture of what you have already to bring forth the highest and holiest results.

Right here precisely is where much of our modern thinking breaks with Christ. Said a clever deacon once, when asked the difference between the

old divinity and the new : "The old divinity sends the prodigal son home in rags and utter poverty ; the new divinity brings him back with money enough to pay his own expenses." The old divinity is the truer. Christ never taught that a man in and of himself had moral capital.

"And how ye turned from idols," writes the apostle. This was the first thing about these Thessalonian Christians—they were regeneratingly turned. And such turning our Lord Christ demands as the primal factor and meaning of the Christian life.

This regenerating turning is a radical reversing of moral disposition. These Thessalonian Christians formerly loved idols and all the sin and license their idols gave. Now they, correspondingly, love God and His commands.

Here is a test for the professing Christian—are you really turned ?

Have you, at least in some measure, similarity of feeling with God ?

You say, perhaps, you cannot turn yourself. No ; but you can be turned. To turn thus is the regenerating function of the Holy Spirit.

Also, the Christian life is a *Serving*. Necessarily, out of such radical turning to God, service of God must bloom. The precise and particular test of the genuineness of the turning is the readiness, gladness, thoroughness of the serving.

Certainly it must be serving in the realm *distinctively religious*. If the moral disposition be radically turned toward God in love and reverence, then what specially stands for and represents God must be the object of spontaneous and glad service.

(a) The Church.

(b) The prayer-meeting.

(c) The Sunday-school.

(d) All God-honoring causes—*e.g.*, home and foreign missions, etc.

But a real serving may not stop here. It will push itself into the realm *usually called secular*, and there do all things for the sake of the Lord Jesus. David Livingstone tells it well :

"Nowhere have I ever appeared as anything else but a servant of God, who has simply followed the leadings of His hand. My views of what is *missionary* duty are not so contracted as those whose ideal is a dumpy sort of man with a Bible under his arm. I have labored in bricks and mortar, at the forge and carpenter's bench, as well as in preaching and medical practice. I feel that I am 'not my own.' I am serving Christ when shooting a buffalo for my men, or taking an astronomical observation, or writing to one of His children who forget, during the little moment of penning a note, that charity

which is eulogized as 'thinking no evil;' and after having by His help got information, which I hope will lead to more abundant blessing being bestowed on Africa than heretofore, am I to hide the light under a bushel, merely because some will consider it not sufficiently, or even at all, *missionary*?"

Also, the Christian life is a *hopeful waiting*.

(a) For results.

(b) For the Lord's coming to us in death.

(c) For the Lord's second coming in His glory.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

Surrender of the Mediatorial Kingdom.

BY PATON J. GLOAG, D.D., GALASHIELS, SCOTLAND.

Then cometh the end, when He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For He hath put all things in subjection under His feet. But when He saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that He is excepted who did subject all things unto Him. And when all things have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all.—1 Cor. xv. 24-28 (Rev. Ver.).

THE passage selected for exposition is not only one of great exegetical difficulty, giving rise to a vast variety of opinions, and of high mystery relating to the deep things of God, but it is remarkable for its singularity. It is a statement which stands alone in the New Testament. There are many remarkable revelations of a future state, but none resembling this; even in the Apocalypse no such information is conveyed to us as that here given us by

Paul. In that remarkable book there is indeed a glowing description of the new heaven and the new earth, the eternal abode of holiness and peace, where sin and sorrow never enter, and where nothing is permitted to disturb the happiness of the redeemed. And so also Paul himself, in his Epistle to the Romans, speaks of the deliverance of the creation from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God, which shall occur at the advent; and Peter speaks of the times of the restitution of all things. But in these passages there is no express mention of the relation of Christ to this condition; and certainly we have nowhere in Scripture any hint or indication that the time will ever come when Christ shall resign that kingdom, which was conferred on Him by the Father for the redemption of the world. Our passage goes beyond all these scriptural declarations. It reveals to us a condition that shall follow the resurrection of the dead, the universal judgment, and the restitution of all things. It pierces into the darkness of a future eternity, and makes known to us the great mystery that Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father, and that the Son also shall be subject unto Him that put all things

under Him, that God may be all in all.

Now precisely in consequence of the singularity of this revelation, and especially in consequence of its mysterious nature—the mystery of the relation which subsists between the Father and the Son, and the subordination of the Son to the Father—great caution must be exercised in its exposition. We cannot here compare the statements which it contains, or at least we can only inferentially support them with other declarations of Scripture. When we consider the nature of God—His unfathomable essence, His unity combined with His triune existence—we feel that we are standing on holy ground, that we have penetrated into the innermost shrine of the Divinity. Here, if anywhere, we must confess our ignorance, and proceed with faltering steps. Truly this passage is one of those things in the Epistle of Paul concerning which Peter says, “Wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.”

There is no important diversity in the readings of the different manuscripts, so that we have here the very words which the apostle wrote; nor is there much difficulty in the translation, as is evident from a comparison of the authorized and revised versions; but the exegesis of the passage is difficult, and requires attention.

Then cometh the end (ἐντα τὸ τέλος). Different meanings have been attached to the term “end.” Meyer supposes that by it is meant the end of the resurrection, when the wicked shall be raised; others understand by it the end of the world; and others think that the word is to be taken generally—the final consummation, the conclusion of the whole mediatorial dispensation, when all the elect shall be saved and all the enemies of Christ’s kingdom subdued. We are, however, inclined to adopt Hofmann’s interpretation. It is to be observed that there is no equivalent in

the original for the word “cometh;” it has to be supplied for the sake of the sense. Hofmann accordingly takes τὸ τέλος adverbially, in the sense of “finally;” and reads the whole passage thus: “Then, finally, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule, and authority, and power (for He must reign till He hath put all His enemies under His feet) shall death, the last enemy, be destroyed.” This translation is admirable in a linguistic point of view (comp. 1 Peter iii. 8), suits the connection, and saves the insertion of a word.

When He, namely Christ, shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father. Here also there is a great variety of opinions. Augustine supposes that it alludes to the presentation of the Church of the redeemed before God the Father; and Bengel that the reign of grace ceases and the reign of glory commences. The evident meaning is that Christ shall surrender to God the kingdom which was conferred upon Him for a special purpose, when that purpose shall have been accomplished. Its analogy of a victorious general who, having conquered his enemies, resigns his command to his sovereign, may help us to understand it. Lias finds an illustration in Titus’ returning from the capture of Jerusalem, and laying the spires of the holy city at the feet of his father, Vespasian.

When He shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. A similar list is given in the Epistle to the Ephesians: “When He raised Christ from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named.” Some understand by this all powers hostile or opposed to Christ’s kingdom, not only wicked men, but evil spirits. Others understand that all authority whatsoever, whether good or bad, shall be brought to an end. Thus Calvin says: “Hence, as the world will have an end, so also will all government, and magis-

tracy, and laws, and distinction of ranks, and different orders of dignities, and everything of that nature. There will be no more any distinction between servant and master, between king and peasant, between magistrate and private citizen. Nay, more, there will be then an end put to angelic principalities in heaven, and to ministries and superiorities in the Church, that God may exercise His power and dominion by Himself alone, and not by the hands of men or angels."

For He must reign (δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεῦσθαι). There is a necessity in the continuance of Christ's reign until the final victory is secured, both in accordance with God's government and in conformity with the nature of the case. Christ's kingdom cannot be defeated till *He hath put all enemies under His feet*. The words are taken from Psalm cx.: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool;" a Messianic Psalm applied by Christ to Himself, as being at once David's Son and David's Lord (Matt. xxii. 42-44); and by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Christ (Heb. x. 12, 13). In the Psalm it is God the Father who puts all things under the Son; but here the subject to the verb is Christ: "Till He Himself hath put all enemies under His feet."

The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. This rendering does not give the full force of the statement; for it might be said that although death should be the last enemy who would be destroyed, yet there might be other enemies still remaining. The original is much more forcible, and implies that after the destruction of death there is no longer any enemy to be destroyed. Hence we should read, "Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed;" then the victory is complete. Death shall be destroyed when the bodies of believers shall be raised from their graves and invested with immortality; when what was sown in corruption shall be raised

in incorruption. Death and Hades shall both be cast into the lake of fire.

For He hath put all things under His feet. The reference here is to Psalm viii. 6. The words primarily apply to the dominion of man over creation; but the apostle here refers them to Christ, the ideal or representative man. A similar personal application of them is made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. ii. 6-8). Here the subject of the verb is God, as is obvious from the words of the psalm, and from what follows. *But when He saith*—that is, when God in His holy Word saith, "All things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted which did put all things under Him." God gives to the Son the government of all things, but evidently in subordination to Himself.

And when all things shall be subdued unto Him—when His final subjection of all His enemies shall be effected, *then shall the Son also Himself be subject to Him that put all things under Him*. In this the great difficulty of the passage consists. What is meant by the subjection of the Son to the Father? How and in what respects is the Son subordinate to the Father? This is a great mystery—one of those secret things which belong to God. Reserving the further explanation of the passage, we would advert to the different interpretation which has been given to it. Some suppose that it is the expression of the entire harmony of Christ with the Father (Chrysostom); others refer it to the subjection of Christ in His human nature to God; that while according to His Divine nature He is the equal with the Father, according to His human nature He is subordinate (Augustine); others that Christ will transfer the kingdom from His humanity to His glorious divinity (Calvin); and others interpret the words "then the Son also Himself" as referring to His mystical body, the Church (Theodoret). The only passage of Scripture which seems to bear on the subject is the state-

ment of Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians, where it is said that Christ, "being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself" (Phil. ii. 6), *that God may be all in all*; the ultimate purpose of His subjection, that God may be recognized as the supreme Lord and King. The expression denotes absolute sovereignty.

An Exegetical Study of 1 Peter iii. 18-22.

BY D. F. BONNER, D.D., FLORIDA,
N. Y.

(Concluded from page 559.)

AND NOW the question is, Was this their condition when Christ's spirit preached to them? The current answer to this question is an affirmative one. Is that answer the true one?

In attempting to determine the point, let us remember the third principle of interpretation with which we started. In accordance with it, the right answer must unfold the apostle's argument and manifest its conclusiveness. The point the apostle is seeking to establish, is that the sufferings of Christ's flesh intensified the power of His spirit. It can only be established by comparison. If this preaching by Christ's spirit to the spirits in prison was to the disembodied spirits of those who perished in the flood, it must have been preceded by a preaching to these spirits in their embodied condition in the days of Noah. That there was such preaching may be accepted as a historic fact. In Gen. vi. 3 we are told that God said: "My spirit shall not always strive with man." This implies that God's spirit had been striving with man and striving ineffectually. This being the historic fact, it is certainly legitimate to claim that this striving included the preaching of Christ's spirit to the spirits of the antediluvians. This answer, then, meets the first requirement of the apostle's argument. It supplies a first preaching by Christ's spirit to the ante-

diluvians with which a subsequent preaching can be contrasted.

Was there a subsequent preaching? If so, when did it occur, and what were its results? The current interpretation answers the first of these questions also affirmatively, and holds that this second preaching was that described in our passage, and that it occurred in the interval between Christ's crucifixion and His resurrection. Does this meet the requirements of the apostle's argument? It must be remembered that he is seeking to prove that the sufferings of Christ quickened the spirit of Christ. If so, the second preaching must be more effective than the first. In the first instance the mass of the antediluvians were disobedient to the gracious message addressed to them. What evidence does our passage furnish that the preaching to these disembodied and imprisoned spirits by Christ's disembodied spirit was more effectual? It is not necessary to resort to a critical examination of the passage to secure an answer, for the reason that the advocates of this view themselves frankly admit that it furnishes none. "What was the intent of that preaching and what its effect is not here revealed; the fact merely is stated." (Alford, Greek Testament, *in loco*.) So also Archdeacon Farrar: "Of the effect of the preaching nothing is said." ("Early Christianity," p. 93.)

This interpretation, then, fails to make clear and conclusive the argument of the apostle, and hence, for that reason alone, if there were no other, is to be rejected.

But besides this, the interpretation is liable to another objection. It presents a doctrine not elsewhere found in the writings of Peter. More than this. It teaches a doctrine which seems to be excluded by other plain teachings of the apostle. In his second epistle the apostle refers again to the destruction of the antediluvian world. He does so in connection with two other signal illustrations of the power and justice of God. One of these is the punishment

of the fallen angels and the other the destruction of the cities of the plain. In two of these three cases there was signal illustration of God's grace, as well as of His justice; and hence to both features of His Providence attention is called in the general conclusion drawn from a consideration of the whole series of providences. That conclusion is thus expressed: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished" (2 Peter ii. 9). The Revision renders better: "And to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment." The words "under punishment" are the translation of the present passive participle of the verb "to punish." It means literally "being punished." The thought seems to be that as God's punishment overtook these objects of His wrath, His power grasped them and holds and will hold them in unchanged condition till the day of judgment. This is evidently the idea in the expression, "in prison." The spirits of these antediluvian sinners remain fixed in the condition in which they were when God's justice overtook them and destroyed their bodies. They are in prison—that is, in the custody, primitive safe-keeping of Divine justice. And there they are to remain until the day of judgment. This being the case, there is no room in the theology of Peter for a gracious visit to the spirits of the antediluvians on the part of Christ and an offer to them of salvation. An interpretation, then, which thus explains this passage is to be rejected for the two reasons: 1. That it fails to meet the requirements of the apostle's argument, and 2. That it is at variance with his theology.

An interpretation of the passage, meeting all the requirements of the case, is obtainable through identification of this preaching to the spirits with the historical striving of God's spirit with the antediluvian contemporaries of Noah. And such identification is justifiable. 1. It is a historic fact that

God's spirit strove with the antediluvians. Peter here affirms that Christ, in His unembodied spirit, preached to their spirits. It is not necessary to suppose that this striving consisted solely of this preaching. It is enough to believe that it included it, and that in his assertion about Christ's preaching Peter had reference to it.

2. God's striving with the antediluvians was ineffectual. So, on this assumption, was the preaching of Christ's spirit to their spirits. It is upon this that Peter dwells. They were disobedient. In consequence of disobedience they are in prison. The mass of the antediluvians perished. Only eight entered the ark graciously provided for them, and so were saved.

3. The historic reason for the failure of this striving was the fact that God's spirit was unembodied, while the antediluvians were embodied spirits. "My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh" (Gen. vi. 3). Pure spirit cannot successfully strive with incarnated spirit; and hence God will not always attempt it. Man has body as well as spirit, and is to be reached through the senses as well as the perceptions; hence a being must be incarnate in order to successfully influence him. It is worthy of notice that even Satan, the great tempter of mankind, succeeded in seducing our first parents and alienating them from God only by assuming a physical form, and so enforcing his suggestions to the mind of Eve by appeals to her senses.

Now all this is in closest keeping with the apostle's line of thought. He is endeavoring to justify his assertion that Christ's endurance of the extreme degree of physical suffering has resulted in His spiritual quickening. And his proof is furnished by contrast between the power of the pre-incarnate and the post-incarnate, risen, glorified Christ.

4. The historic failure indicates the line of present and current success. "The like figure whereunto," etc. (ver. 21). Literally, "Which you also the antitype now saves—baptism." In other

words, Peter affirms that salvation to-day through baptism is analogous to—literally, antitypical of salvation by water through the ark in the days of Noah. It is not likely that Peter meant to say that the waters of the flood were a type of that of baptism in the modern technical sense of the term. In fact, the current theological signification of the term does not seem to be its scriptural one. The word is used but twice in the New Testament—in Heb. ix. 24 and here. In the passage in Hebrews its meaning is clear. The tabernacle to be constructed by Moses was to be a copy—antitype is the word in the original—of that shown him in the mount. So here. The plan of salvation to-day is modelled after that of the days of Noah. This being the case, there is opportunity to contrast the effectiveness of the two plans, and this opportunity Peter embraces.

But how does he do it in such way as to prove that the sufferings of Christ quickened the spirit of Christ? He does so: 1. By declaring that the water of baptism is more graciously effective than the waters of the flood. The latter saved eight souls; the former is saving you. Peter is not exactly mathematical. The number saved in the flood is historic. He gives that. The number being saved now is known only to God; but no matter. It includes those Christians of the Dispersion. That was enough to them. They were at least greatly more numerous than those in the ark; and yet, however numerous they were, they were being saved by baptismal water.

Left unqualified, this declaration of the apostle would inevitably be used to prove the extremest doctrine of baptismal grace; hence he explains that he has reference to real and not to ritual baptism, to the formal and sacramental response of the loyal soul to God, and not the external application of water to the body.

2. By declaring that the efficacy of baptismal water is owing to the resurrection of Christ (ver. 21). But resur-

rection implies death. The sufferings of Christ, then, as leading to the resurrection of Christ, have wondrously increased the gracious power of Christ.

Nor is this all. Not only have the sufferings of Christ wondrously increased the efficacy of His present as compared with His former method of salvation—baptism now saving multitudes while the ark saved but eight—they have also secured for Him wondrously increased facilities for the accomplishment of His purposes of grace. As the risen, triumphant Redeemer, He has gone into heaven, and is now on the right hand of God, and has control of the entire host of heaven, "angels and authorities and powers being subject to him" (ver. 22).

It thus becomes evident that the passage under consideration does present proof of the apostle's assertion that suffering for good, when God's will wills it, is promotion of good. That proof is furnished by the contrasted results of two methods of salvation. Our race has twice been exposed to destruction. Once it was exposed to temporal destruction by a flood. Now it is exposed to eternal ruin by the punishment of sin. In both instances God has sought to avert the peril and save the race. In the case of the antediluvians He wrought simply as spirit. The effort failed. Now God works upon a different plan. Christ has become incarnate. Having become incarnate, He has suffered and died and risen again. The result is a wondrous increase of His saving power. Of this fact those to whom the apostle wrote were themselves grateful witnesses. In the light, then, of their own experience of the gracious power of their risen Saviour, the apostle urges those to whom he wrote to arm themselves with the same mind and seek, through similar patience under sufferings, a like increase of gracious power. "Forasmuch, then, as Christ hath suffered . . . arm yourselves," etc. (iv. 1).

Thus interpreted, the passage becomes the logical as well as the textual nexus

connecting iii. 7 with iv. 1. Not only so, but as thus interpreted its teaching is in harmony with the analogy

of faith, and presents no strange or doubtful doctrine for Christian acceptance.

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

What Does the Catholic Revival Mean?

THAT the revival is extensive and produces a great effect on the Catholic Church is beyond question. Its exact nature is, however, difficult to determine. The following points are given as the result of long and careful study of the subject.

1. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has concentrated more than ever the attention of Catholics on the Virgin Mary. The decree of Papal Infallibility by the Vatican Council has given the Pope an exaltation and an authority never attained even in the Middle Ages. The very opposition to these dogmas led the Church to use her power to the utmost for their maintenance and spread. The vast machinery of the Church, particularly the priesthood and the powerful orders, were used for this purpose. After these dogmas were decreed, the very existence of the Church depended on their acceptance. If in their decree the Church made a mistake, then the theory of the infallible authority of that Church is at an end. These dogmas, therefore, became a rallying point, and were used to inflame the zeal of believers. Those who objected to them were obliged to recant or to leave the Church. The Doellingers were not numerous. Bismarck's efforts to protect Germany against the effects of the Vatican Council resulted in the *Culturkampf*, the political union of the Catholics, and their complete victory.

2. The dogmas which absorbed the attention and inflamed the zeal of Roman Catholics are the very ones which most of all characterize Catholicism as distinct from Protestantism. Devout Catholics in past ages have often em-

phasized the doctrines which both churches have in common; but now the emphasis is placed on what is distinctively papal. This has determined the nature of the revival. It is ultramontane, exalts all that has made Rome most obnoxious to evangelical Christians, creates and intensifies a spirit of bitterness toward Protestantism, and is intent on establishing Roman Catholicism on the ruins of evangelical Christianity. This explains the efforts to degrade the Reformation and make it responsible for all the evils of modern times; this accounts for the violent abuse of Luther, as well as for the fanatical opposition to the churches which had their origin in the Reformation. The revival is Romanism intensified and carried to the extreme. We still distinguish between Catholicism and Romanism; but at the same time it is evident that Romanism has almost wholly devoured Catholicism.

3. The Jesuits are the most powerful order in the Catholic Church, and have gained a controlling influence. The dogmas decreed were essentially their dogmas; and the promulgation of the dogmas was virtually a promulgation of their power. They controlled the Vatican Council; they are "the power behind the Pope;" as an order they are not allowed to congregate in Germany, and yet individual Jesuits abound, and they to-day control the German Catholics. Ultramontanism and Jesuitism have almost become synonymous. Thus the revival means that the Jesuitical spirit is the dominant factor in the Church. This accounts for the exaltation of that order, and for the demand of their return to the lands from which they were banished.

4. In harmony with the emphasis on the peculiarly papal factors, the revival has been hierarchical and clerical. The Church has been exalted, the power of the priesthood has been emphasized. As the Church has become so largely a priestly institution, especial efforts have been made to increase the number of priests and to make the hierarchical machinery more efficient. Under the priesthood the laity are organized. These organizations are numerous and powerful. The confessional and the keys that unlock heaven and hell give the priest a kind of omnipotence with the faithful Catholic. The doctrines emphasized are in glaring conflict with the culture of the age; but men go from extreme to extreme, and atheistic liberalism becomes a feeder of ultramontaniam.

5. The revival has resulted in a vast growth of Catholic literature, and is, on the other hand, also promoted by this literature. In this department wonderful activity has been displayed, and astonishing results have been achieved. And this literature breathes the ultramontane spirit, and is either the product of Jesuits or largely under their control. Much is done in apologetics to overthrow the atheistic and infidel theories in science and philosophy. The polemic literature is directed almost wholly against Protestantism, and is able, shrewd, unscrupulous, and extremely bitter. The Catholic Church, with its institutions and orders, is lauded to the skies. The unbroken history and the vast extent of the Church, the compact unity, with all its internationalism, the great names which adorn its annals, the devotion of its orders, the mysticism and symbolism of its worship, its marvels of art—all are magnified for the promotion of the glory and attractiveness of Catholicism. History and biography are written to prove that all excellencies, even in Protestants, are really Catholic, and that all evils are Protestant perversions of the truth. Catholicism and atheism are represented as the only alternatives. To an age

agitated by doubt and immersed in scepticism, an absolute church and omnipotent hierarchy are presented as a refuge of peace and safety. Especially in Germany the power and magnitude of Catholic literature are such that an especial study is required to appreciate them. The journals have greatly increased in number and circulation, and popular pamphlets and learned volumes are constantly dropping from the Catholic press. And all this vast literature teaches the Immaculate Conception, Papal Infallibility, the glorification of the Jesuits, the restoration of temporal power to the Pope, the supremacy of the Church over the State, and the annihilation of Protestantism.

6. The revival has affected all departments of the Church, so that its whole life has been intensified. The laity have been inflamed with zeal. Numerous and enthusiastic Catholic conventions have been held in the interest of the Church. The problems of the day are carefully studied, and remarkable wisdom has been revealed in the attempts at their solution. With all its inflexible elements, that Church also has a marvellous adaptability to the demands of the age. Especially has great energy been displayed in meeting the crisis produced by socialism. But the zeal of the laity has largely been inspired by artificial means and by ultramontane tactics. The fiction of the prisoner of the Vatican has been repeated *ad nauseam*, a fiction believed as if it were a dogma, except in Italy, where it is laughed at. Pilgrimages are used to promote the zeal of the laity, indulgences are offered, and the coat at Treves is exposed to the reverence of vast multitudes for the same purpose. These means at the close of the nineteenth century are a significant revelation of the culture and piety in that Church. Not the great truths of Christianity, nor the culture of the Divine Spirit in the heart, are the inspiration of the zeal, but externals and what is mechanical. Whatever the immediate effect may be, there must

surely be a reaction, when all the emptiness of this zeal will be manifest and the Church will suffer for its Pharisaism.

7. The Catholic Church has by means of the revival made great gains in political and social power. Its compact unity, its resoluteness, and the persistency of its demands have had a powerful effect on governments. Even in Protestant Germany the Catholic Centre is the strongest party in parliament. Protestant divisions are everywhere confronted with Catholic unity. Even infidel liberals respect the power of the Catholic Church, while they treat distracted Protestantism with contempt. The papacy claims to be the conservative element in nations, the supporter of thrones, the promoter of law and order. This has a marked influence on many who dread revolution and anarchy; and especially is it claimed that the papacy will give to thrones the needed stability. Catholicism professes to be the only power that can check socialism. Its professions have not been realized; nevertheless, governments and society are anxious to secure its aid in saving the present social structure. In point of influence, the Catholic Church has within the last decades gained vastly, and in political and social power it is immeasurably superior to what it was while the Pope still held the temporal sovereignty in Rome.

8. Yet just as the zeal of the laity is largely artificial, so the boastful claims of the growth of Catholicism are calculated to deceive. The revival is confined mostly to the Church itself. The converts have not been numerous. For evident reasons, they have relatively been most numerous among princes and the nobility. But the power and influence gained by Catholicism have had their effect on other churches, in promoting what are called high church tendencies. Most of all is this evident in the Anglican Church.

9. This leads us to examine into the actual, as distinguished from the pretended progress made by Catholicism.

R. Buddensieg, a German writer, has for many years investigated this problem, and the results he has attained are here given. Leo XIII. has established 1 patriarchate, 12 archbishoprics, 65 bishoprics, and 53 apostolic prefectures. This shows that in various countries there has been an enormous development of the hierarchy, but more than this it does not prove. There have been great losses of power, particularly in Italy and France. In these countries, where ultramontanism seemed to have the undisputed supremacy, Catholicism is losing influence. The statistics of 1886 gave 27,000,000 Catholics in France, while 9,684,900 one fourth of the population, claimed to be without religion. The author affirms that a similar condition is found in Italy, Spain, Belgium, South America, and other Catholic lands. In Germany and Austria the ultramontanes hold their own, with neither progress nor retrogression. How about the ultramontane progress in the United States and England, which has been so often announced by Cardinal Manning and others? In these countries, too, the hierarchical apparatus has been developed marvellously during the last five decades, but the fruits have not been correspondingly great. The Catholic Directory of Cardinal Manning is proof that the progress is a fiction. In 1887-88 there were reported to be 1,354,000 Catholics in England; in 1888-89 the number was 1,360,000, an increase of 6000 souls. But this increase does not even keep pace with the actual growth of the population, to say nothing of the emigration from Ireland. For a long time the gain of the Catholic Church in England has been simply through the transfer of Catholics from Ireland. In spite of all the converts from the English Church, Roman Catholicism has never gained an influence over the masses in England.

In position and political power Catholicism has made vast gains in the United States, but in point of numbers it has more than it can do to hold its

own people. If in the past it had held its own, thrice as many members would now be in that Church as are actually there. He concludes that Protestantism is marching forward, and that its actual religious influence among the nations is much greater than that of its enemy.

For the last one hundred years the progress of the two churches is given as follows :

| <i>In Europe.</i> | | |
|--------------------|------------|-------------|
| | 1786. | 1886. |
| Protestants..... | 37,000,000 | 85,000,000 |
| Roman Catholics... | 80,000,000 | 154,000,000 |

That is, the increase of Protestants in Europe was 2.30 per cent, that of Roman Catholics 1.92.

| <i>In Europe and America.</i> | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1786. | 1886. |
| Protestants..... | 39,700,000 | 134,500,000 |
| Roman Catholics... | 110,190,000 | 201,000,000 |

Thus the Protestant increase was 3.36 per cent, the Roman Catholic 1.81, the former increase being nearly double that of the latter.

It is clear that the growth of Roman Catholicism has been political and social rather than in numbers. So far as the religious influence of Rome has extended beyond the Catholic Church, it has consisted mainly in promoting Romanizing tendencies in Protestant churches, not so much in making actual converts.

Biographical.

Edmond de Pressensé, D.D.—Presensé, the most prominent representative and ablest advocate of French Protestantism, died in Paris, April 8th, aged 67 years. He studied theology in Lausanne from 1842-45, where Vinet exerted a deep and lasting influence on his mind and heart. In Halle and Berlin, 1845-46, he was especially drawn to Tholuck and Neander. Not only the scholarship, but also the living faith and earnest spirituality of these three teachers became determining factors in his life.

From 1847 till 1871 he was pastor of Taitbout Chapel, Paris. His sermons

and pastoral work, however, represent but a small part of his activity. He delivered numerous addresses on religious, ethical, social, and political subjects, edited the *Revue Chrétienne*, and became a voluminous author. "The History of the Christian Church during the First Three Centuries," 1858-78, received the prize of the French Academy, and made him extensively known. His book on "Jesus Christ, His Times, His Life, and His Work," passed through seven editions. A number of his works have been translated into different languages. His numerous articles in French and other journals have made his name familiar in many lands.

The esteem in which he was held in other than theological circles is evident from the fact that he was elected to the National Assembly in 1871, to the Senate in 1883, and a member of the Academy of Sciences in 1889. His patriotism, his uprightness, his deep sincerity commanded the respect even of his opponents. "He was noble and at the same time simple, strong in faith and of great moral force." To purity of heart he added the most generous benevolence. The spirit of intolerance was most offensive to him, no matter to whom it might be manifested. Against the press he uttered bitter invectives because it so often becomes the minister of impurity and vice. Once he wrote, "If God takes me to Him, let it be known that the warfare against an infamous press was one of my intensest desires." During his political career he is said always to have ascended the tribune when a worthy cause seemed to need a defender. He was a strenuous advocate of religious freedom, and based his hopes on a Church permitted to manage its own affairs without State control. He was especially attracted to bodies which represent the unity of believers, and was a warm friend of the Evangelical Alliance. The Conference at Florence sent him, per telegram, hearty Christian greetings, and he returned a most grateful response. From his long and painful illness—the same

as that which caused the death of Emperor Frederick—he was released while the Conference was still in session at Florence, and Rev. Theodore Monod was requested to represent the Alliance at his funeral.

The funeral made it evident that he was one of the eminent men of France. Besides the large assembly of members and pastors of different Protestant churches, there were present the leaders in politics, in science, and literature—namely, Ministers of State, the rector and members of the Academy, and numerous other persons of distinction. He had been a voluntary chaplain during the war, for which he received the Cross of the Legion of Honor. He was buried with military honors. His death is a loss to French Protestantism, and it was becoming that preachers of different evangelical churches should deliver addresses at his funeral.

Dr. E. Reuss.—This eminent scholar died April 15th, in Strasburg. He was born in the same city July 18th, 1804, and it remained his home till his death. He pursued his theological studies in Strasburg, Halle, Goettingen, and Paris, making a specialty of Oriental languages, biblical literature, and historic investigations. Being equally at home in French and German, he wrote in both languages, exerted a powerful influence on the Protestant scholarship of France and Germany, and did much to promote the intercourse between the theology of the two countries. In 1828 he became Privat-Dozent in Strasburg; he was professor-extraordinary in 1834, and professor in ordinary in 1836. After lecturing for fifty years he closed his labors in the university at the end of the summer term of 1888.

His great influence at the university over students preparing for the ministry, for professorships, and for authorship, was supplemented by his numerous works, some in German, others in French. Four of these are of especial importance, and give an idea of the ex-

tensive range of his scholarship: "History of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament," "History of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament," both in German; "La Bible" and "History of Christian Theology in the Age of the Apostles," both in French. "La Bible," with Introductions and Commentaries to the various books of Scripture, including the Apocrypha, contains sixteen volumes. In the "Corpus Reformatorum" he edited the works of Calvin, with Introductions and Notes, a task which involved enormous labor.

In Reuss we see a scholar who pursued his studies for the sake of scholarship itself. The elucidation of the matter in hand was his law, not the practical application, which is now the chief concern of many theologians. As an investigator both of Scripture and of history, he belongs to the first rank. The rector of the university said at his grave, "What a scholar can attain he attained." He had a rare knowledge of philosophy, but did not favor speculative constructions in theology. He pursued the empirical method, with emphasis on facts and on grammatical interpretation. He was keenly critical, and anticipated some of the views promulgated by Wellhausen and Kuenen; but he was opposed to the critical details in which some seemed to lose themselves, and was too conservative to give expression to the extremely radical tendencies of the negative critics. His broad scholarship and many-sided views may have made him hesitate to give a final opinion where many others were ready to give a decision. The style of his works is superior to that of the average German scholar.

The amount of work he accomplished is marvellous. He seemed to need no vacations. Nature had no especial attractions for him. When he visited Geneva, he spent his time with friends and scholars, or buried himself in the archives and in the manuscripts of Calvin. Being in danger of distraction on account of the multiplicity of his

studies, he resolved to set himself a special task daily, and to this he strictly adhered. In old age he began to translate his French work on the Bible into German, and was about finishing the Apocrypha and taking up the New Testament when death called him from his labors. He had been physically delicate from youth, but his powerful mind had the mastery over his body.

He seems to have described himself in a sketch of the contented scholar. "He gladly opens the door to all who need him; but he keeps the key in his pocket, and in consecrated hours permits only the select ones to enter. Guests are welcome, but only such as come not merely for the sake of eating and drinking. He works vigorously himself, and no one about him is idle. The world outside and its opinions do not trouble him. If ill-natured persons criticise the color of his coat, he cares not, since it warms him; if affected stylists find fault with the sound of his words, his language nevertheless remains firm and forcible; if envious neighbors cast dirt on his field, it only makes the vegetation luxuriant."

Moltke.—So much has been written about this great strategist that we need not enter on details. His name is here mentioned for the purpose of directing attention to a few points which are of especial significance for readers of the REVIEW.

Moltke was a thinker, as Frederick the Great was a philosopher; but his thought had a practical aim. In this respect he is a representative of the modern trend of thought, Germany not excepted. It is surely not without meaning that the three names most celebrated in German history during the last decades are men of great practical achievements—William I., Bismarck, and Moltke. Not learning for its own sake is the demand, but thought that is power in action, and that has a national significance on account of its national results.

It is likely that Moltke was not great-

est in the things which have made him most eminent. He had inner, invisible characteristics which were the conditions of his outward success, and which would have been great even if the world had never beheld the victories he won. These inner qualities put him in striking contrast with the ordinary tendencies of the age. He was remarkable for what the Germans designate by that untranslatable word *Sammlung*. There was a calmness and poise which nothing could disturb.

In religion he was thoroughly evangelical. When asked what his favorite books were, he named the Bible first and the Iliad as second. On his eightieth birthday he said, "How different a standard from that of earth will be made the measure of this life in the next world! Not the brilliancy of success, but the purity of motive, and the faithful continuance in the line of duty, even in such instances where the effect scarcely appears before men, will decide the worth of a life. What a remarkable change between high and low will take place at that great review!" This emphasis on the motive is highly characteristic of the man. What a man is was in his estimate the most essential thing; what a man does has value only so far as it expresses a sincere, good heart. So truly was duty his life that he has been called the embodiment of the categorical imperative. He taught the officers under him to do their duty, but to let considerations of self vanish. "The ambition to shine or to receive recognition for what was only their duty seemed to him to rob the deed of all merit." The impulse of duty being his sole motive, he sought no other reward for his deeds. Not only was he unpretentious, simple as a child, apparently unconscious of any special deserts, but he was also free from fret and worry. Speaking of the night before the battle of Koeniggraetz, he says, "I am so fortunate as to have a healthful sleep, which enables me to forget the cares of to-day and to gather strength for the morrow."

He easily adapted himself to occasions as the circumstances required. When in youth he received the small pay of a lieutenant, he made the sacrifices necessary to live on the meagre income. That the task in hand could make him forget his own wants was illustrated at Koeniggraetz. He had not thought of providing himself with food. The whole day had been spent in the saddle without anything to eat. When the battle was over, a soldier gave him a piece of sausage, but had no bread. At the village to which he retired for the night nothing was to be had but a cup of tea. Exhausted, feverish, and hungry he threw himself on his bed to seek sleep.

As he could make sacrifices, so he could bear success without elation. A single day made him famous; but his whole life had been a preparation for the victory of that day. As another says, "On the morning of the day at Koeniggraetz he was a general known only to such as were familiar with the official list of Prussian officers; and on the evening of the same day he was a captain whose success by common consent placed him on a level with the greatest in history. This change affected him little; he was aware that on that third day of July he had done nothing more than what he had practised all the rest of his life—namely, his duty." Life to him was a grand mission of duty, and applause was but an accident or an incident. "He was convinced that an individual is not called to work for himself or for the present moment, but that his deeds are to affect the whole future, and are forever to produce good results."

For thirty-two years Moltke was chief of the general staff of the army. During this time he was not only the leader in the wars with Austria and France, but he was also the teacher of the German army. Not only in his brilliant successes will he live, but also in what he has made the officers and the entire service. In the papers he has

left and in what he has made the army he will continue his influence.

He was a specialist, but not narrow. Until his death he was a member of Parliament. It has been said that he was "silent in seven languages." He rarely spoke—never at length—but always to the point. His speeches proved that he had other than military interests. Both in his speeches and writings his style was direct, business like, characterized by force rather than ornament. It has been said, "Not less in the history of German prose than in German military history has he won for himself a permanent place."

In this age of unrest, of noise, of glittering show, and of selfishness Moltke is an anomaly. He seems to be an anachronism. His life was that of a soldier, his business was war, his achievements were battles; yet he was gentle as a child, kind and sympathetic. His erect bearing and firm step were symbols of his character, as the mild glance of his eye revealed his loving heart. He seemed to be a personification of the order, the system, the discipline, and the consecration to duty which have made the German army what it is. All this must be known in order to understand Moltke's place in the heart of the German people.

Notes.

REV. DR. BRAUN, one of the most earnest pastors in Berlin, recently announced from the pulpit that hereafter the church would be open all day, not only on Sunday, but also during the week. He stated that this was to be done in order that the church, as originally intended, might be a house of prayer for the congregation, this being especially desirable in our busy and distracted times. By thus leaving open the church, an opportunity would be afforded in the house of God, away from business and from company, for quiet meditation and prayer. The ex-

ample is a good one, and will no doubt be followed by other churches.

APPALLING revelations of crime have recently been made in Berlin. At the trial of a husband and wife for the murder of a night watchman a state of degradation became apparent, whose horrifying details were supposed to be impossible in this city. The wife is fifteen years older than the husband, and had before this trial been punished some sixty times, mostly for immorality. He had also been in prison repeatedly. By her lewd practices she supported both herself and her husband, and for the sake of this support he had married her. While she was plying her avocation, he spent his time in saloons. The witnesses largely belonged to the same class of society. After the most disgusting revelations had been made through the press for days, the trial had to be broken off, because the testimony of an important witness in Chicago is needed.

While the city was excited by these details from the lowest walks of life, a new excitement was created by the effort of a woman of fashion, with the aid of her brother, to murder her husband, a man of scholarship and of means. This excitement has not subsided, when it is discovered that a ser-

vant-girl of eighteen years murdered her mistress on last Sunday, in order to rob her of a little over one hundred dollars. After the deed she was full of levity, went to a ball, and spent her time till late at night in dancing. Sunday evening is the time when balls and all kinds of low amusements are best patronized. She has just confessed her guilt. Her age, the brutality of the deed, and her participation in the ball immediately after have a startling effect.

The cases mentioned are but a few of the revelations of crime made within a week or two. Suicides are so common as to excite attention only when attended by some unusual circumstance.

The papers cannot but comment severely on the revelations made. They try, however, to calm the public with assurances that the age is no worse than former times, that the only difference is that now crime is made more public by trial in open court and by the press than formerly. They also affirm that Berlin is no worse than other great cities. This, of course, does not satisfy the community, least of all the earnest Christians. With the vigilance and efficiency of the police it is thought that horrid crimes ought to be less frequent in a Christian city. Not a few behold in the revelations an evidence of the growth of atheism and of heathenish brutality.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

How to Avoid the Ministerial Tone.

BY PROFESSOR A. S. COATS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

In the first place, consider what a heinous sin the ministerial tone is. It is an oratorical sin, since of all unnatural and absurd voice movements it is the most unnatural and absurd, and hence best adapted to defeat the ends of public address. It is a sin against the Christian religion, since its sad and dismal monotony utterly misrepresents

the character and genius of that religion. "The voice, indeed," says Emerson, "is a delicate index of the state of the mind." There is little doubt that the preacher who so disgusted the royal hater of shams, that he went out of the church vowing that he would never enter a church again, accomplished this result not by the doctrine taught, but by the ministerial tone used in proclaiming it. His critic did not find fault with his thought or lack of thought, but simply with the fact that,

whereas the birds and flowers and sunshine outside the church were "natural," there was no touch of nature whatever about the preacher. The ministerial tone is a sin in the moral and spiritual sense of that term, a sin against God; for to sin against the laws of speech which God has ordained, and to misrepresent the religion through which He is seeking to redeem the world, is certainly to sin against Him, however pious and unconscious of wrongdoing the sinner may be.

Having come to realize in some degree the sinfulness of using the ministerial tone, the next thing for each individual preacher of the Gospel to inquire is: "Does this sin crouch at my door?" Many men are certainly guilty of this sin who are not aware of the fact. Indeed, if no one used the ministerial tone save those who are conscious of using it, *THE HOMILETIC REVIEW* would hardly need to call attention to a pulpit fault so little known. But it is one of the most common as well as the most extraordinary (suffer the paradox) phenomena for a preacher to insist on the necessity of emphasizing, in teaching and in life, the bright side of the religion of Jesus, its hope, its courage, its cheer, and yet in a tone of voice the absolute opposite of bright, cheerful, hopeful, and courageous. His thought is glad; his voice is sad. His thought is strong; his voice is weak. His thought is triumphant; his voice is discouraging. Longfellow says: "The soul reveals itself in the voice only;" and Plato used to say to a stranger: "Speak, that I may know you." Thus, it matters little that the thought is glad and strong and triumphant; the man's tone reveals himself, shows what is his deepest, truest conviction in regard to the thought he is uttering. If it were too much to say that the man, at bottom, is a hypocrite, saying one thing and believing another, it is not too much to say that the tone of his voice will have far more influence over his audience than will the thoughts expressed by his voice. If

his tone is depressing, his thought, whatever its character, will have a depressing effect upon his audience. The difficulty is found not in making the preacher acknowledge this, but in making him realize that he is guilty of using this abomination—the ministerial tone. How can the guilty man be led to see himself as others see him?

By leading him to hear himself as others hear him. Let him turn his ear upon his voice when it is in operation in public; and let him ask himself concerning it. Let not one of the questions be: "Is this my natural voice when in the pulpit?" Poor man, he has whined and moaned and droned so long when in the pulpit that this tone is as perfectly natural to him as it is unnatural to the thought he is uttering. The proper questions are simply these: "Is my tone like my thought?" "Does my matter dictate my manner?" "Is my thought glad, and is my voice also full of cheer?"

Again, the presence or absence of the ministerial tone can be determined, especially in reading the Scriptures, an exercise in which it frequently plays the leading role, even when it retires modestly into the background in the sermon that follows, by interjecting an occasional explanatory remark in a perfectly commonplace tone of voice. If the ministerial tone is used in the reading, the contrast in voice will be absurdly evident even to the reader himself, however gentle he may be as a self-critic.

Help in detecting the ministerial tone may also be secured by asking friends in the audience if they observe it. This resource, however, is not greatly to be relied upon, since, though the friends may be conscious of some unnatural peculiarity in the preacher, they may not be able to describe or name it, and since few friends are faithful enough honestly to point out one's faults even when able rightly to locate them, and when besought to do so.

A careful analysis of the elements that go to make up the ministerial tone

may also be of great service in deciding whether or not one is guilty of it. A "sad and dismal monotone" is not a technically correct characterization of this too common pulpit fault, though it is probably a more suggestive and helpful characterization than one technically correct would be. The tone in question is always sad and dismal, but never an absolute monotone. It is a semitone—that is, the inflection on each word is a half instead of a full note, as in more energetic speaking. Semitones are always sad in effect. The inflection on the closing word of the sentence is always the weak upward wave, instead of the strong, downward, assertive stroke of voice. No voice-movement can properly be called the ministerial tone in which positive thoughts, not negative, are spoken assertively, dogmatically, with the sign of completion and conviction, which is the falling inflection. The quality or timbre of the tone in question is usually dark and sombre, sometimes even sepulchral, especially in older ministers, the chest tone rather than the head tone.

The question may now well be asked why ministers use this tone so much more than other speakers as that it should have been named from them. It is not used by them alone. Laymen use it as well, especially in religious meetings; and the sisters in public address use it more than do their brothers. Lawyers sometimes employ it in summing up their cases before a jury, never in arguing a case before the judge alone; and politicians frequently drop into it in pleading for votes to save the life of their beloved country. Ministers use it for the same reason as do these—namely, because of its pathetic element. It is an emotional, not an intellectual voice-movement. It touches the heart, when it has not become a mere mannerism through constant use; at least, it is supposed to touch the heart, and probably does so when it comes from the heart; and hence it seems adapted to persuasion. Many ministers forget that they are to con-

vince as well as to persuade, to convince in order to persuade, to reason as well as to move the heart and bend the will. In such cases, the intellectual element being left out of the sermon, the emotional element seems necessarily to dominate in the delivery of the sermon. Frequently, however, the pathetic tone is used from the beginning to the end of a discourse which is not lacking in the grace of argument; and we are treated throughout to bathos instead of pathos.

Again, the tone under discussion requires no exertion for its production, in which fact we may find an added reason for its so frequent use by ministers. It is a lazy voice-movement. One has but to open his mouth, and the soft, sad semitone will seem to effuse itself. The weak upward wave at the end of the sentence is also much easier to make than the strong downward stroke. Hence the older one grows, and the more exhausted in physical strength even a young man becomes, the more likely is the ministerial tone to manifest itself in the preaching.

It is probably true, also, that the solemnity of the minister's calling, the vast issues that hang upon his rightly impressing the truth and persuading to action, has much to do in accounting for the prevalence of this tone in the pulpit. The monotone is always impressive. The semitone is always sad; but many ears cannot distinguish between the two, and many voices in attempting the one produce the other.

It is hardly necessary in so many words to point out the way in which to avoid or in which to overcome this tone—the greatest hindrance to ministerial effectiveness, so far as pulpit work is concerned, that inheres in the ministry itself to-day. Knowing what the disease is and its cause or causes, one also knows the remedy.

Use enough exertion in speaking to throw the voice into full notes when you are addressing the reason—that is, give each word in the sentence, and especially each emphatic word a quick,

sharp stroke of the voice. Speak with strong inflections; and be sure that the waves of voice at the end of assertions are downward, not upward. Let there be vivacity and sparkle in the voice. Make the voice glad when the thought is so. Be pathetic in manner only when you are uttering pathetic thoughts. When the thought is solemn and impressive force the voice down on a monotone, and do not permit it weakly to effuse itself in semitones. In a word, let your matter dictate your manner.

Our Young People.

BY REV. T. FELTON FALKNER, M.A.

To the pastor of a flock zealous for his Master's cause, mindful of his Master's charge, must come full often, and at times with terrible intensity, the sense of his responsibility as to the younger members of the community over which he has in God's providence been placed. No lovelier task (and none, be it told, more difficult) is there among the sacred duties of the Christian pastor than that of teaching Christ's little ones, of directing the course of home teaching, of superintending that of the Sunday-school and the Bible class, of planting in young and receptive minds the seed of the Word which is able to make them wise unto salvation. Sacred task, and yet how fraught with difficulty! In these days, when children, precocious beyond their years, know more of evil at nine or ten than their grandfathers did at nineteen or twenty—the devil-sown crop of worldliness and sin soon goes far toward choking the good seed sown with such anxious and prayerful solicitude—surely we may well tremble for our sons and daughters.

It is not, however, so much during the period of their stay under parental control, or under tutors and governors, that our anxiety is at its height; so long as the character-forming is allowed to go on in the midst of a pure, refined, cultured circle whose atmosphere is

charged with a spirituality itself heaven-born, all is well. But it cannot ever be thus. The time must come, in most homes at least, when the young plants must be moved away to bloom and thrive and fruit elsewhere, to be a blessing or a curse in a locality other than that which gave them birth. *Then* comes the test; then the trial of their grounding in the faith; then alike the hopes and the fears of those who trained them; then, most of all, the putting forward of earnest prayer that God's ever-watchful eye may be upon them, that He may never leave them nor forsake them.

How much, may we not fear, do the terrible proneness of our younger brothers to fall, the appalling aptitude of our sons and our pupils to succumb to the influences of moral corruptors and of atheistic reasoners, not owe firstly to our neglect of enforcing the fundamental principles of our Christian faith, and secondly, to our well-nigh universal custom of losing sight of those whom we have taught from their earliest days directly duty or the force of circumstances removes them from our midst!

To the former of these duties, the neglect of which is most assuredly so disastrous to the future of our sons and daughters, it should not be necessary to refer; but the fact that there is, beyond dispute, an inability among the rising generation, who stand, as it were, upon the threshold of citizenship in our towns and of the government of our country, to give a solid reason for the faith that is in them, tends to direct our thoughts seriously to the question of the religious education of the young. Why is it that in these days, when the light of revealed truth shines out more brightly than ever, our young men are so ready to follow the *ignis fatui* of free thought, positivism, and the like, until they flounder and perish in the dank morass of utter hopelessness? Surely there must have been something faulty, terribly faulty, in the teaching of either parents or pastors, or possibly

of both ! The good seed is, we know, ever the same ; but the soil is more or less congenial in proportion to the care and preparation bestowed upon it ; and it cannot be denied that in many, very many cases the home cultivation is sadly neglected. So it would seem that it is largely to the want of prayerful training on the part of mothers and fathers (more almost than on that of pastors and teachers) that the carelessness as to religion and want of stability, even when religion is professed, are to be attributed. To parents the souls of their little ones cry aloud for that which they, if not alone, at any rate best, can teach them ; that preparing of the young heart for a reception of Divine truth such as may ensure its springing up and yielding, through a life of useful devotion to God's service, fruit—some thirty, some sixty, some an hundred-fold.

True it is that precepts of ordinary morality and the duty of religious performance are impressed upon our young people in many cases ; but *how* are they impressed ? on what grounds are they taught ? Are they not based rather upon the requirements (exacting enough at times) of custom and respectability than upon obedience to and affection for a "faithful Creator," who is also a loving Father ? Do we, in teaching children how to refuse the evil and choose the good, teach them to make their selection according to the standard of God's law and the still small voice of conscience, or by the false standard of this world's usage and the uncertain rule of expediency ? When we tell them that to steal is wicked and wrong, do we tell them, further, that it is so because it is a sin against God, and not merely because it risks detection, punishment, and disgrace ? When they learn from us that it is disgraceful to lie, it is a part also of the lesson that it is disgraceful because it is a dishonor done to the God of Truth, and not only, or chiefly because it is ungentlemanly and perils the reputation for integrity and honor ?

Or, again, the performance of religious duties ; on what do we base our obligations here ? Do we take or send our children to a place of worship for custom's sake, or in obedience to a Divine command, "Ye shall keep My Sabbath and reverence My sanctuary" ? In all these things its teaching is useless and fruitless unless the lesson be based on religious and not on worldly grounds. It is the house founded upon the rock, the Master tells us, that stands when tempests rage, while that upon the shifting, uncertain sand totters, sways, and falls ; and so surely these excellent precepts implanted by every wise parent in the hearts of his children must be deep set on that foundation other than which can no man lay, which is Jesus Christ, "if they are intended to stand foursquare to every wind that blows," to withstand every storm that they may have to encounter in this world.

But given a youth of godly parentage, educated in the fear of the Lord, sent forth from the home of his childhood and the seat of his early education to fight life's battle amid the din and confusion of some vast city, or scenes hitherto by him undreamed of, what can be done for him ? Doubtless he goes forth accompanied by sincere wishes for his preservation from evil and for his prosperity in life, and prayers are offered up to the throne of God on his behalf ; but can nothing else be done ? It seems to me that when a lad slips his cable and leaves the safe anchorage of his own home, that the agent should advise some one at the port whither this fair craft, with a full cargo of human hopes and fears, of passions and caprices and weaknesses, and an *immortal soul*, is bound, that he may watch his interests on arrival. Here, I submit, we grievously fail in our duty toward our youths, and herein, to a greater extent than we are apt to think, we suffer loss in our Church, and permit (or, I should say, cause) those who should prove pillars of it to be but tottering supports to the outside of the

fabric, if they be not loose timbers, unsound and fruitful of decay.

There are yearly poured into the great workshops of the world thousands and tens of thousands of young men full of physical strength, of ambition, of enthusiasm. They find their way into our large merchant's offices, banks, counting-houses, and stores, or go to swell the number of our soldiers and sailors, artisans and laborers, there to come in contact with others senior to them in age and in wickedness, who will soon find and take opportunity to present to them sins hitherto unknown in a guise subtle and attractive. Friends these lads have not in this new sphere—save those they make for themselves—no kind adviser; “no man like minded who will naturally care” for their state; and what wonder if a false step (*c'est le premier pas qui conte*) be made, so false as to make it difficult if not impossible to recover? In these days of church organizations, societies, guilds, brotherhoods, etc., for binding together Christians of all sorts, it might be made well nigh impossible for a lad or youth to be lost sight of. Every member of a congregation is known (surely we may assume that) to the pastor or minister, and it should be a point of honor with those who are responsible to the Great Shepherd not to let *one* of His flock depart to any other congregation or place without sending after him or with him a letter of recommendation to some Christian worker in that congregation or place, who would, for Christ's sake, befriended the stranger on his arrival, so that no lad could say, as many, alas! have said and still are saying, “No man careth for my soul.” Of the prevalence of this neglect there is ample proof. The writer has had spiritual charge of a place through which pass annually some eight hundred young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. These youths remain in the place for about six months, previous to going to their duties, during which time they are undergoing a strict training which taxes

their powers of endurance, both moral and physical. Drawn from all parts, leaving, in most cases, comfortable homes, coming to enter upon a life full of danger to body and soul, they would, one would think, be objects of solicitude to those among whom they had grown up—sufficiently so, at least, to ensure a line being sent to the clergyman to enlist his sympathies and secure for them a warm welcome; but no! In only a very few cases was this done—not for one in a hundred! And as I came to know them all, I found how lamentable had been the neglect in those very points to which I have alluded, of these souls for which Christ died; how many of them had never been under religious influences at all, never having learned the simplest rudiments of Christianity.

I am led to think that this is not an unfair criterion of the condition of the young men of to-day; and what, if it be not altered, will be the end of it?

I stand sometimes at the gates of a vast factory, whence, just at closing time, there pours forth a stream of boys and men of all ages between fourteen and sixty, and I wonder how they stand—not on the muster-roll of their employers, but on the books of the Great King, and if in them marked “indifferent” or “bad,” how far the fault is their own and how far that of those who were responsible for their early training.

Brothers, pastors, and parents, let us look to it. Babes in Christ are crying to us for the sincere milk of the Word; our youths must graduate in the school of the Holy Spirit of God, and it behooves us to see that they are supplied with that which shall “stablish, strengthen, settle” them. The prosperity of nations depends upon it; and much remains to be done, done by the parent, done by the school, done by the college, done by the Church. All honor and praise to young men's societies, classes, guilds, brotherhoods, and institutes for good work already done; but to produce a perceptible result existing

agencies must be multiplied forty-fold to carry on the work initiated in the home and the Sunday-school.

Some Historic Facts on Liturgics.

BY PROFESSOR E. J. WOLF, D.D.,
GETTYSBURG, PA.

HAVING read with much interest Professor Painter's admirable paper on "Liturgics" in the November REVIEW, I beg leave to correct a false impression which a few lines in that paper are calculated to make upon some readers. "Historically considered," the Professor says, "worship will be found to have lost in spirituality as it gained in elaborateness of ceremonial." And, again, "The world will never be converted by fixed forms of prayer nor by the men that habitually use them." He thus reaffirms an outworn assumption that spirituality and missionary zeal are inconsistent with prescribed forms, giving to our Quaker brethren the palm both for earnest piety and missionary activity. It is not an unheard-of thing for men to find "historically considered" results that are in direct opposition to each other. Liturgics offer, it seems, an instance of this. The third century is usually and correctly credited with the elaboration of the primitive forms of worship. And this is interpreted by those who are adverse to "forms" as a proof of the invasion of worldliness. But the Church of the third century happens to have been the martyr Church, offering its worship amid the fires of persecution, thousands of its members sealing their world-conquering faith by their blood. It hardly becomes the men of this worldly generation to call into question the spirituality of the martyrs who did undeniably elaborate the ritual of public worship.

Even the claim commonly made that the Reformation was largely or mainly a revolt against the Romish ritual and a simplification of forms, is not sustained by history. The Reformation

was a revolt against error in dogma; error which, it is true, had embodied and entrenched itself in forms; but both the German and the English reformers were content with the exclusion of the forms which contained such error. Luther, who is so often quoted as favoring extreme simplicity, writes, in 1541, "God be praised, that our churches are so constituted with regard to the *adiaphora* that a foreigner from Spain or some other country, if he saw our service, choir, etc., would have to say that it was quite a papistic church, and that there was no difference, or, at least, very little from what is in vogue among themselves."

One of the most pronounced ritualists since the Reformation was John Wesley. It was his "High Church notions" and strict enforcement of ritual which involved him in serious trouble in Georgia. Is the founder of Methodism, then, to be charged with a lack of spirituality and with indifference to the conversion of the world?

The Tractarian movement at an early stage developed into extreme ritualism, and its adherents were stigmatized as Ritualists. We who claim to be thoroughly evangelical may allow no commendation for that movement in the Church of England; but every historian knows that "it has excited a vast churchly activity in every direction; and there is now more life and energy in the Church of England than ever before." And whatever criticism or ridicule we may direct against the ritualists in the Episcopal communion of this country, no one having personal knowledge of them or of their works will charge them with the absence of spirituality or with indifference to missions.

Professor Painter must certainly know what element in the last century made war upon the liturgy in Germany, "overturning the worship of God, both form and contents, from top to bottom;" but he may not know that men like Löhe, whose conspicuous zeal for elaborate forms has brought them—with some minds—under suspicion of

Romanizing tendencies, have done more missionary enterprise than any other for the revival of Evangelical Christianity in Germany and for its diffusion by class that has arisen in the Fatherland for fifty years.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

"Perplexed."

IN the October number of the REVIEW "T. M. S." says he is "perplexed" about an apparent historical discrepancy in reference to the length of the sojourn of the children of Israel in the land of bondage and the time of their affliction. Upon a question that has puzzled so many great scholars it may seem bold in a plain pastor to attempt an explanation; but the matter may not be quite so difficult as it appears on the surface.

The apostle, in Gal. iii. 17, says that the law was given four hundred and thirty years after the promise was given. This agrees with the statement given in Ex. xii. 40 that the nation came out of bondage four hundred and thirty years after its history had begun in its founder and father, Abraham. A careful reading of this verse will show that it is not here stated that the length of bondage in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years, but that the length of their sojourning was four hundred and thirty years. In other words, we are told that it was four hundred and thirty years from the time that Abraham, in accordance with the call of Jehovah, came a stranger into the land of Canaan, to the time when his posterity, the chosen and promised seed, came out of the bondage of Egypt. The Septuagint rendering of this verse confirms this interpretation, and with this understanding of the passage there is no contradiction between the statement of the apostle and that made in Exodus. The period of affliction is given as four hundred years in Gen. xv. 13—that is, the years in which the posterity of Abraham should be afflicted. Now we fall into error at

once by supposing that this period of affliction is meant to cover only the time when Israel was in Egypt. That time was two hundred and fifteen years. Hence the period of affliction must cover more than that, and the writer of Genesis tells us that this period embraces the whole history of Abraham's posterity from the birth of Isaac to the escape from Egypt, four generations, or a period of four hundred years. If we accept this interpretation, which seems a reasonable one, the apparent contradiction vanishes, and we find that both the apostle and the historical writer of Israel's career are one in their statements, and our difficulty is gone. We get into difficulty only when we try to read into the statement in Ex. xii. 40 what is not stated there—*i. e.*, that Israel sojourned in Egypt four hundred and thirty years, when it is simply said that the days of their sojourn as a called people, beginning with Abraham, up to the flight from Egypt, were four hundred and thirty years: or, when we interpret the days of affliction as simply the time during which they were in Egypt, when in reality it includes the whole period from the birth of Isaac, the period in Egypt being not simply affliction, but bondage, when they "served them."

G. W. RIGLER.

WOONSOCKET, R. I.

Wit in the Pulpit.

"A. G. L.," in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW for August, demands that we shall be so sober in the pulpit as to exclude wit and humor from our discourse. But is not the brother on a side track? Wit means "faculty of asso-

ciating ideas in an *unusual* manner." Surely we should study to present the old, yet ever new Gospel in an unusual manner, ever barring out, of course, the sensational. To my mind, literature affords us no grander record of true wit than that displayed by our Master in His answer to the chief priests, "I will also ask of you one thing;" "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?" (Luke xx. 1-8.) Hence I do but follow my Master if I so speak that my hearers shall *reason with themselves*. Men seldom reason when they can escape it by saying, "I heard that before!" Even in the treatment of "such tremendous realities as sin and death and hell" we should not always be painting in black, nor so letting out the lurid light of hell as to blind our hearers to the Light of Heaven, who comes with life and joy to all who let Him in.

GEORGE T. LEMMON.

BERLIN, N. Y.

Masonic Funeral Services in Church.

A CORRESPONDENT asks in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW for August ("Queries and Answers," 1), "Should permission to hold Masonic funeral services in Church be granted or refused?"

In reply I say without the slightest hesitation, "Refused." Freemasonry knows nothing whatever of Christ as a Saviour. The Grand Lodge in France knows nothing whatever of even a Creator. But with that exception Freemasonry distinctly acknowledges belief in one. It refuses to receive an avowed atheist into its membership. But it makes no distinction between "Jehovah, Jove, and Lord," Allah and Brahm. It boasts that it welcomes Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans. Of course, then, it knows nothing whatever of the Lord Jesus as a Saviour, as I have already said. Hence His name is most carefully kept out of all its prayers. They always end with these words, "So mote it be."

It would be in utter violation of the principles of Freemasonry to use in any of its prayers such an expression as this, "For Christ's sake." Now, I ask, is it not dishonoring to Christ to allow funeral services in which there is not the slightest reference to Him to be held in a building professedly set apart for His worship? "I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say." For the same reason I am as strongly opposed to the laying with Masonic ceremonies of the corner-stone of a church.

Of course I do not consider the fear of offending certain wealthy members of the congregation a valid reason for granting the privilege described in the question which I have answered above.

I admit that there are some excellent Christians in the Masonic body, but I judge Freemasonry on its own merits.

T. F.

WOODBIDGE, ONT., CANADA.

Put Asunder.

FOR some time past, by direction of the session, I have spent a part of the hour of our weekly prayer-meeting in studying the Sabbath-school lesson of the following Lord's day with those who come together to that service. Quite a number of the teachers attend, and seem to be interested in the exposition, but I have reason to fear that some of my people do not come because they regard the service as one peculiarly devoted to the preparation spoken of. Have any of the readers of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW made a like experiment, and if so, what has been their experience? If similar to my own, what have they concluded to do in the circumstances? In a multitude of counsellors there is wisdom. J. A. D.

Yes!

THERE is a matter upon which I would like to have the opinion of some of my brethren in the ministry—one of some delicacy. The other day two representatives of one of our city courts

came to me accompanying a man and a woman, the latter of whom bore in her arms a little babe, born out of wedlock. The party had been sent by the justice, that I might "perform the ceremony of marriage," if I should think it best to do so. It was impossible to feel that it was more than a ceremony, and the faces of the two bore evidence that love, in any true sense of the word, was an unknown quantity in their relations to each other. And yet there was the babe, and there was society to be thought of. And to my mind considerations concerning these overbalanced all others, and I consented to the service. Was my decision right? H. N. D.

The "Second Adam"—Who is He?

It is strange how readily an erroneous quotation is taken up and given

currency even by the most careful writers. I am inclined to question whether a majority of those who accept the doctrine of the federal headship of Christ do not use the name "second Adam" for that which has the apostolic sanction, "last Adam." Certainly it is in more common use in theological treatises. And yet it is entirely without scriptural warrant. Not only so, but it suggests a possible error. For "second," if it does not imply "third," at least does not prevent the inference that there may be a "third." But "last" allows no such inference, admits no such implication. There have been—there are to be—but two Adams, the "first" and the "last." It is enough to call the attention of my brethren to this truth to insure the correction of a wrong habit, if the habit has been formed. R. G. T.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

The Louisiana Lottery.

Ye are they that forsake Jehovah, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop [lit. luck], and that furnish the drink-offering unto that number [lit. chance].—Isa. lxxv. 11.

THE prominence which of late has been given to this evil is by no means beyond its due. For twenty-five years it has existed, becoming more and more menacing to the best interests of all sections of our country, until it now threatens to perpetuate itself by securing a constitutional recognition. To decide as to how far it is responsible for the increase of poverty, for the demoralization of individuals and communities, for the perpetration of crime, is, of course, impossible; but the fact that it has awakened the anxious concern of the better element in all parts of our land, and stimulated a determination to secure its extirpation, if possible, goes to show that it is regarded as one of our most threatening evils.

This great gambling concern received its charter from the State of Louisiana in 1868, during the period of reconstruction, when, politically speaking, the worst element was at the front throughout what had been known as the Confederate States. Gamblers and blacklegs of every description bought their way to office and used the office thus secured to more than reimburse themselves. Such the class of men who sought, and such the class of men who granted, the charter to the Lottery Company of Louisiana for a period of twenty-five years, on condition of the payment of \$40,000 annually to the Charity Hospital. Yet this, which to the war-impooverished State seemed a large sum, was but a pittance to a concern whose accumulations were such that its stock came to be quoted at from \$1300 to \$1400 above par, and to represent twice the value of the whole banking capital of the State. It almost passes belief, and yet the statement, officially made by the representatives of

the Anti-Lottery League at the recent demonstration in New York, was to the effect that the monthly and semi-annual drawings aggregate \$28,000,000 per annum, and the daily drawings \$20,000,000 more. The company is declared to have an immense surplus, while it pays dividends of from 80 to 170 per cent per annum out of but one half its net earnings, the other half going to the lessees. What wonder, therefore, that the swindle should desire a continuation of its license, or, more euphoni-ously, a renewal of its charter? And what wonder that it was ready to offer an enormous subsidy, or, less euphoni-ously, bribe, to obtain it?

Nearly two years since, when the floods threatened incalculable damage to the river-bordering plantations of the State, the Lottery Company subscribed \$100,000 to help strengthen the levees; but Governor Nichols had the moral courage to regard the contribution in its true light, and to return it to the donors with the frank words:

"On the eve of a session of the Legislature, during which the renewal or extension of your charter will be acted upon by questions vitally affecting the interests of the State, I have no right to place the people under obligations to your company, in however small a degree, by my acceptance of a gratuity from it. I herewith return your check."

The growth of the antagonism which the company was forced to recognize led it to seek a home for itself in the new State of North Dakota. Taking advantage of the destitution there prevailing, on account of the recent failure of the crops, it offered that State, through its Legislature, an annual gift of \$150,000 for the purchase of seed-wheat for the needy farmers resident therein. With magnificent courage the bribe was spurned. Whereupon the iniquitous concern, realizing the danger that threatened its existence, made its famous, or infamous, offer to the State of Louisiana of \$31,250,000, or \$1,250,000 annually, for the privilege of renewing its charter for another quarter of a century. The temptation was too great, and the bill, as introduced, passed the

Legislature. But aware of the antago-nism of Governor Nichols, and afraid of his veto, the Lottery Company in-duced the Legislature to adopt an amendment to the constitution of the State providing for the desired renewal. This adoption was by exactly the re-quisite two-thirds vote of both houses, which was reputed to have been secured by the most lavish expenditure of money. Governor Nichols vetoed and returned the measure. The death, meanwhile, of one of the senators who had voted in its favor originally, having rendered it impossible to pass it over the Govern-or's veto, the Secretary of State re-fused to make record of it, or to pro-mulgate it for popular action. The case was carried to the Supreme Court which, by a vote of three of its judges to two, issued a mandamus requiring the Secretary to record and publish it, on the ground that the adoption of a constitutional amendment does not rank with other legislative measures, and is not subject to the gubernatorial veto. The election in April will decide whether the people of the State desire the continuation or the abolition of "this monster evil."

How strong its hold is upon the polit-ical forces within the State has already been demonstrated, but this indicates only a part of its strength. It has sub-sidized three quarters of the Louisiana press. In the single city of New Or-leans it has one hundred shops where its policies can be obtained; and yet these indicate the sources of but an in-significant portion of its income. The statement is made officially that ninety-three per cent of its receipts are from other States of the Union than that whose name it disgraces. It has its agencies also in the provinces of Cana-da, and when it is remembered that it draws its vast accumulations mainly from the hard-won earnings of our la-boring classes, and so helps to increase the sum of their miseries, its baseness passes characterization.

Its attitude toward the law of the land is on a par with its work among

our social classes. It is notoriously a breaker of law. It is a pleasure to record that the Government has at length secured, in a Dakota court, indictments against its officers and directors for the violation of the laws proscribing the use of the mails in transmitting lottery advertisements, the extreme penalty for which, in the event of conviction, is five years' imprisonment and \$5000 fine. Could this conviction be secured before the spring elections, it would greatly strengthen the cause of the friends of good morals, who are combating the evil, and almost inevitably guarantee their success. The fight is already begun. The attempt is now making to secure the control of the Democratic State Convention, which meets on December 16th.* The city of New Orleans has already gone pro-lottery by a vote of two to one; but the hope of the Anti-Lotteryites is in the country parishes, whose moral tone is far higher than that of the cities. Concerning the election in the above-named city, the *New Delta*, the Anti-Lottery organ, says:

Money placed in the lottery column the vote of New Orleans, and rendered nugatory the efforts of those of her citizens who had a regard for her good name, to preserve that good name in the eyes of the world. Money was as plentiful as water in political circles of a certain sort yesterday. Bummers, to whom ordinarily a half dollar looks as big as the moon, and very nearly as far off, would flash twenty-dollar bills about, while sums of smaller dimensions were too common to even attract notice. The very air was redolent of corruption, and all expenses, legitimate and illegitimate, were met with lavish hand. In every ward of the city the trail of the lottery serpent was over all. Wherever one went in the city there could be seen the slippery track of the reptile. Every ward was touched with the hand of the leper, and the deadly influence withered and blasted its manhood.

Meanwhile all who sympathize with

those who are fighting evil in their noble struggle, will undoubtedly join in the sentiments so admirably expressed in the resolution adopted by the mass-meeting in Chickering Hall on the evening of the 12th of last November:

As citizens of New York, in mass-meeting assembled, we appeal to our fellow-citizens throughout the nation to join in the decisive contest now waging against the Louisiana Lottery. The issue is a national one. The lottery was born on Northern soil, is controlled largely by Northern capitalists, and is supported by Northern funds. It boasts that ninety-three per cent of its receipts are drawn from the people of other States than Louisiana. In spite of national law it continues to use the United States mails in drawing on the hard earnings of labor throughout the nation, and it uses without hindrance for this purpose our great national carrying companies. Under thin disguises, and in defiance of law, it advertises its specious schemes in Northern as in Southern journals. It sets at defiance the laws of every other State. If it continues to exist it will draw its income from every other State; if it is defeated in Louisiana there will be left for it no refuge within the boundaries of the nation. The evils it inflicts are numerous and great. It impoverishes the many that it may enrich the few. It incites the gambling mania, America's national bane and peril. It is now attempting to bribe a sovereign State by an unparalleled corruption fund of thirty-one and a quarter millions. It thus demonstrates its readiness to corrupt whosoever is corruptible in press, Church, or legislature. It assumes the lying maxim that "every man has his price," and the only service it has ever rendered the community is in the demonstration which the heroic resistance to it has offered of the unpurchasable integrity of those of our fellow-citizens of Louisiana who are engaging in a life and death struggle with it. We call upon the people of the nation to extend to these patriots their sympathy and their financial aid. We demand of Congress, without regard to party affiliation, the passage of such further laws, under the provisions of the Constitution respecting the regulation of interstate commerce, as may be practicable to prevent the transportation by private corporations of the advertisements and the tickets of the lottery company and the money of its victims.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Our "European Department."

We are sure that the letter from Dr. Stuckenberg, which we publish here-

* We are unable to chronicle the final results of this attempt.—Eds.

with, will be the occasion of deep regret to its readers. The distinguished ability which he has shown in the conduct of the department committed to him, has made it one of the leading features

of the HOMILETIC for the past four years. We part with his services with the greatest reluctance :

Editors of HOMILETIC REVIEW :

DEAR SIRS : With to-day's mail I send the matter for the European Department in the December number. This completes the fourth year of the existence of that department. The labor connected with it has been very great, and I have often desired to be relieved of the responsibility. The great influence gained by that department has, however, kept me at my post. Constant evidence has been given me that preachers, professors, and students looked to it for a knowledge of the trend of thought in Europe. With great reluctance I now ask you to relieve me of my task, for the reason that with my numerous other duties I have not the time to continue the conduct of that department. Every line that has appeared in it was written by myself. It is almost impossible to get efficient help, few being prepared to give the current theological and philosophical thought of the Continent. Neither for the sake of the REVIEW nor for my own sake can I afford to devote less effort to the department. My labors have so increased, and the demands on my time have so multiplied that I have thus far been obliged to neglect other journals and other literary work for the sake of the REVIEW. I cannot longer afford to do this. Therefore I herewith resign my position as conductor of the European Department.

You have left entirely to me the creation and conduct of the department, and for the courtesy thus shown me I am grateful. I shall continue my interest in the REVIEW, and may, if desired, occasionally furnish an article for its pages. In your responsible position as its editors I wish you all success. I have reason for my opinion that it is the best homiletic journal in the world, and this adds to my regret at the necessity of severing that intimate relation which I have so long sustained to it.

Yours very truly,

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG.

While regretting Dr. Stuckenberg's withdrawal, it is our pleasure to announce that the space devoted to the European Department will henceforward be given to the discussion of leading social problems by the ablest writers at our command. It is our hope thus to render the REVIEW more helpful than ever to its readers.

A Simple Cure for Drunkenness.

AN eminent physiologist has sent us the following, which he says he has often tested in his practice as a cure for

the craving after intoxicants, and has never known it to fail :

Let the sufferer, when the craving is upon him, swallow a large glass of moderately cold water in which has been dissolved a heaping teaspoonful of common table salt. Follow this in five minutes with a glass of clear water, and five minutes later with a second. The craving will have disappeared.

The remedy is a very simple one, and we should like to have it tested and the report of results sent to us.

We are aware that there is a marked divergence of opinion with reference to this matter of removing the craving for drink by medicinal prescription. On the one hand are the followers of Dr. Keeley, who put absolute faith in his so-called discovery ; on the other are those who, with Dr. Hammond, hold that "there is no medicine or combination of medicines that will cure a person of the habit of drunkenness—that will destroy his or her habit or appetite for alcoholic liquors." Between these two extremes are those who regard the question as "not yet settled." So Dr. Elon N. Carpenter, in his article in the September number of the *North American Review*.

While the question is thus under discussion, there comes a sad instance tending to confirm in their scepticism those who look askance on Dr. Keeley's "cure." In the October *North American Review* Colonel John F. Mines, better known by his pseudonym of "Felix Oldboy," gave a striking account of the conquest of his own confirmed habit by the treatment of the Dwight institution. Almost before the number had reached its more distant readers Colonel Mines was lying dead in the Blackwell's Island workhouse, the victim of a prolonged debauch. Of course it is not fair to infer that Dr. Keeley's remedy is valueless because it is not infallible. He does not claim that it will be found universally efficacious. But the instance cited illustrates the tremendous power of such a habit as that of intemperance, and the absolute need of what is stronger than any

merely natural agency in order to its final overthrow—the gracious help of an Almighty God. Any reader of the life-story of Colonel Henry H. Hadley, now in charge of one of the most successful rescue missions in New York, will hardly fail to note in how marked a manner his experience illustrates and confirms the positions of Dr. Chalmers in his renowned sermon concerning “The Expulsive Power of a New Affection,” that the true and only infallible antidote for sin of any kind is to be found at the cross of our blessed Lord. It was when the thought first came to him, like a new revelation, “The Saviour endured the cross, with all its shame and agony and awful thirst, for thee; and canst thou not endure the torture of thy thirst for Him?” that Colonel Hadley declares he was instantly and absolutely freed from the bondage of his habit, and that from that moment till the present he has not once known the craving of his old passion.

This is the simplest, surest cure of all. It goes to the very root of the evil, which is not merely physical, but of the heart and will. It wakens a new emotion, supplies a new motive, creates “a new man.”

Announcement.

It will no doubt be a source of gratification to the readers of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW* to know that the papers which have appeared during the last two or three years from the pen of Professor Hunt, of Princeton, on “Ethical Teachings in Old English Authors,” are about to be issued in book form by the Funk & Wagnalls Company. To the ten or twelve articles already published Professor Hunt has added as many more, which as yet have not appeared in print, together with appropriate introductory and concluding chapters. The authors discussed will represent ethical English from the seventh century to the sixteenth, from Cædmon’s “Scriptural Paraphrase” to Tyndale’s translation of the Bible.

Those as yet unpublished are as follows: “The Ethical Teaching in Beowulf;” “King Alfred’s Version of Bœthius;” “Old English Saws and Proverbs;” “The Church and the School in Old England;” “The Cursor Mundi: A Bible Homily;” “John Wiclif, English Reformer and Translator;” “Sir John Mandeville, the Palestinian Traveller;” “John Gower, an Old English Patriot and Reformer;” “Old English Religious Satire;” “Layamon: An Old English Rhyming Chronicle;” “William Tyndale and his Christian Work;” “Richard de Bury, an Old English Book-Lover.”

The full announcement is made in the advertising pages of this number of the *REVIEW*.

It is hoped that the treatise may commend itself to the clerical patrons of the *REVIEW*, and to the general literary and Christian public. We are certain it will furnish valuable homiletic hints to divinity students in America and England.

Water and the Saloons.

THE evils resulting from the saloon system have been held up to the public gaze until they have become so familiar as to be despised. But every little while some new emergency will emphasize the greatness of the dangers arising from this system in an unexpected way. During the recent water famine in the metropolis the fact was brought before the community that out of the 80,000,000 gallons of water daily used in the city, about 15,000,000 were consumed in the bar-rooms alone—a very large proportion of this quantity representing an absolute waste. In one of the breweries of the city 63,000 gallons are drawn directly from the mains; and there are sixty-five of these death-dealing concerns, many of which use not much less in quantity, and so increase the amount of waste by from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 gallons more.

And yet the large majority of New York’s citizens are either apathetic in

regard to the traffic that so endangers their comfort, and even their safety, or else desire its continuance. This is manifest from the system of dealing with it which they have adopted. They give it the license to exist. They prefer the revenue it brings in to its extirpation. Is it too much to say that their attitude to it is responsible, in measure at least, for the anxieties and privations they have had to endure? They have our sympathies, but precisely in the same way and for the same reason that the self-tortured Hindu has our sympathies; in the same way and for the same reason that any one has our sympathies who is reaping the consequences of his own misdoings.

There is but one consistent, logical,

successful method of dealing with this iniquitous traffic, and that is to brand it *in toto* with the brand of illegality. Under the old Mosaic economy there was a law the principle of which applies here irresistibly. "If the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned, and the owner also shall be put to death." The death-dealing ox was not to have the short rope of a high license, or the long rope of a low license, but death. His death was society's only security. The "pushing" ox of to-day is the saloon. Let it meet the fate of the "pushing" ox of Moses' day!

BLUE MONDAY.

The Best Parishioner.

HE was a man in the livery business, who was converted when more than forty years old. He said to me when I became his pastor, "Come over and get a horse whenever you wish to ride;" and for more than nine years he furnished me *gratis* with teams for my use in a country parish extending five miles in every direction, and often carried me through the country twenty miles at a time on my exchanges, to my conventions and appointments. And on one occasion, when I was going away for three days more than twenty miles, I told him I wanted the team and wanted to pay him for it. I paid him \$5, but in the spring-time he brought me a load of manure for my garden because he took the \$5 for the team. Whatever he did was done cheerfully; yet he was far from rich. He helped me to stay nine years on a small salary.

A Champion Deadbeat.

IN the Free Baptist Church at Belmont, N. H., was an old man. He was worth nearly \$100,000. Just before his death a child came to buy some eggs. He went to the barn for them. Took pay for twelve, when there were but eleven, and when a friend who saw him count them protested, he said, "Keep still." When the mother of the child tried to use them, she found a part of them nest eggs and rotten. She sent the child back with them, and he said, "I have no money," though his safe stood in the house well filled. This is a fair specimen of his life. He said that he had not had a new vest for thirty-five years.

IN the same district, not far from the same place, at another meeting, during which the

minister in a speech declared that all the best men in the neighborhood were voting for the temperance measure, a hearer arose, and challenging the statement, vehemently declared that such was not the case, and cited himself as an instance of one of the best men in the community voting the other way. "Brother," said the minister, "I am glad you came to the meeting. Let us spend a short time in prayer. Will you kindly lead us?" Silence reigned supreme. W. A. H.

A Generous Helper.

A MAN who was a member of another denomination often called on a neighboring Baptist minister, expressing his great satisfaction in said minister's sermons and services. One day, after thus freeing his mind, he said, "I have often intended to help you." As the gentleman was very well-to-do, the minister thought something substantial was forthcoming. But he went on to say, "Now, there is a pond of water in one of the fields back of my farm, and any time you wish to baptize there you can do so, and it won't cost you a cent, either." LOUIS J. GROF.

WEST SOMERSET, N. Y.

DURING a pastoral visit the minister was very much interested in a little boy, four years old, who conversed with him in English, and turning around would immediately address his father in Gaelic. The pastor laughed and remarked to the father, "I see you have taught your boy to speak in two languages." "Yes," said the father, proudly, "I thought I would teach him the Gaelic, and then if anything ever happened to me he could not say I had not done my duty to him." W. A. H.