

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXV.—APRIL, 1893.—No. 4.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—THE PRESENT TASK OF THE APOLOGIST.

BY PROFESSOR ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE, D.D., GLASGOW, SCOT.

The duty of the Christian apologist at any given time depends on two things : what he has to defend and against what he has to make a defence. It might be supposed, indeed, that the former of these two things was constant and invariable. Is not the cause to be defended always Christianity and what is vital to the Christian interest? True, but opinion may vary from age to age as to what is vital to Christianity. And, in matter of fact, opinion has changed greatly on this subject. Formerly the idea, at least in the Protestant section of the Christian Church, was that the Bible was the citadel of the faith, to be defended at all hazards and against all comers. In those days apologetic was an introduction to dogmatic, and even now it occupies this place in some theological seminaries. The theory underlying the arrangement was this : The Bible is the only rule of faith and practice, expressly given to men by God to tell them what to believe concerning God and what duty He requires of them. The business of the dogmatic theologian is to extract from the sacred Book what it teaches under these two heads, and especially under the former, and to reduce its teaching to definite statements, duly supported by proof texts. But before proceeding to this, his proper task, he has a preliminary duty to perform. A book which is to be used as an authoritative rule of faith must possess certain characteristics. It must be given by a divine inspiration which guarantees inerrancy in every respect. The men who wrote it must be accredited as the agents of a divine revelation, and their appropriate credentials must be forthcoming in the book in the form of miracles, whether miracles of power, such as the plagues in Egypt, or miracles of knowledge, such as the predictions of the prophets. Finally, the writings which are meant to serve the purpose of a divine revelation must be a certified, exclusive collection. It is necessary, and it must be possi-

ble, to be quite sure that no books are there which ought not to be there, and that no books are missing which ought to have a place in the collection. Hence the dogmatic theologian, before beginning to set forth in order the doctrines revealed in Scripture, must prove that the Bible is, or contains, a divine revelation, duly authenticated by miracles and prophecies attached to it as evidential adjuncts ; that it is throughout so inspired as to be absolutely infallible, so that every statement it contains can be confidently appealed to in proof of doctrines ; and that we have in the collection of sacred writings a fixed, certain canon, on no account to be added to or subtracted from. And to make the service of apologetic, as the handmaid of divinity, more complete, it will be well if the evidences of revealed religion be prefaced by some lectures on the evidences of natural religion in the form of proofs of the Being and the attributes of the God who is held to have specially revealed Himself in the Bible.

Such was the programme of the older apologetic, viewed as the handmaid of dogmatic theology, and having for its central object of defence the Bible. But now the centre of Christian interest is not the Bible, but Christ. The Bible is still held in high and reverent esteem, but it is not conceived to be vital to faith to prove all that Christians of a former generation believed to be true concerning the Bible. What is now felt to be of vital moment is to know truly Jesus Christ and to think and feel rightly concerning Him, and it is held to be possible to do this before arriving at final conclusions concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures and the many questions bearing on the canon. Hence the problems of the older apologetic, formerly supposed to be vital, are either altogether set aside, or postponed, or relegated to a position of subordination, and new problems come to the front. The great questions now are : Can we know Jesus Christ ? How far are the memoirs of Him historical ? What were His thoughts concerning God and man and their relations ? How far is Christ's idea of God and man verified by all we know of the universe ? What are the historical presuppositions of Christ's person and teaching, and how far are these presuppositions—an elect people, a sacred literature, a Messianic hope—objectively valid, and not merely subjective illusions ?

That the hostile influences against which the apologist has to defend Christianity vary from age to age does not need to be proved. Speaking generally, the function of apologetic is to adjust faith to its intellectual environment. There may be no real antagonism between faith and its environment, but till the adjustment has been made there may seem to be, and the impression that there is, even though ill founded, may be as prejudicial as if it were well founded. Now, every one knows that the intellectual environment is incessantly changing, and that in the course of a generation the change may be very great. Seldom has there been a greater change than has taken place in our time. We have got a new way of viewing the universe as the product of evolution. We have got a new view of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, the result of the mod-

ern science of biblical criticism. We have got a new view of the religious history of mankind, the result of the equally modern science of comparative religion.

Faith has to adjust itself to the new situation in all three respects. Till it has done so it must have an uncomfortable suspicion of being out of date and incompatible with the present condition of knowledge. For its own comfort and confirmation it has to ask and answer these questions: Is Christ's idea of God as a Father, and of man as His son, contradicted or confirmed by the evolutionary theory? Can the critical view of the Old Testament literature be held compatibly with the recognition of Israel as a people having a special vocation within the sphere of religion, and of the Hebrew Scriptures as giving us a reliable account of that people's history and its religious significance? Can the idea of Israel as an elect people be held compatibly with a just view of the religions of other peoples, her contemporaries, and of the character of God as One who is good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all His works? Finally, as Jesus Christ is the central object of trust and reverence for every Christian, and the true Light of the world, and ultimate authority in religion, all questions relating to the Christian origins become of supreme concern for the present-day apologist. Can Jesus be known? was He the Christ? did He rise from the dead? with what right did the primitive Church worship Him as Lord? Here, as also in connection with the election of Israel, faith has to reckon with something besides criticism or impartial historical investigation, even with a *naturalistic philosophy* which assumes that there can be no breach of continuity in any sphere, no miracle, physical or moral, not even a sinless man, that all religions alike are naturally evolved, and that all men, Jesus not excepted, are the product of their time; possibly greater than all who went before, but not unsurpassable by those who come after.

In dealing with the first of the foregoing questions, which takes us into the speculative or philosophical sphere of thought, the apologist has to reckon with present-day *agnosticism*. In meeting that formidable foe he has not so much to prove *that* God is, but rather to make out that we have means of knowing to a certain extent *what* God is. The agnostics, as represented by Herbert Spencer in England, and John Fiske in America, do not call in question the existence of a great unknown something to which may be given the name of God. What they doubt is the possibility of ascribing attributes to God on any valid, verifiable grounds. You may know that God is; you may not know what He is, whether—*e.g.*, as the Scriptures teach, He be "good," or "just," "the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." The present-day apologist has to adapt himself to this attitude, and, instead of wasting his time on the proof that a God of some sort exists, to concentrate his attention and strength on the proof that God is knowable; or, to put the matter otherwise, that the Christian idea of God as a Father, to whom man stands in the rela-

tion of son, is a hypothesis which all we know of the universe tends to verify.

The evolutionary view of the universe really helps rather than frustrates faith at this point. Christ's doctrine of God makes much of man, represents God and man as similar in nature and in close affinity as Father and Son. But evolution does the same thing. It also exalts man, representing him as the crown and consummation of the great evolutionary process by which the universe has been created. Nowhere, hardly even in the Bible itself, has man's importance been more emphatically and eloquently asserted than in the writings of Mr. Fiske, a thorough-going believer and most capable exponent of the evolutionary theory. It is unnecessary to quote passages in proof of this statement, as the fact must by this time be familiar to all. But what then? If man occupy so important a place in the universe, is it not reasonable to regard him as the key, to the final cause of, the whole evolutionary process, and even as a revelation of the nature of the great Being who is the ultimate ground of the universe, and the real cause of all that is? The Scripture teaches, on its very first page, that man was made in God's image, and, therefore, is like God. Does not the science of our day justify us in making, as against agnosticism, the correlative assertion that God is like man? It is satisfactory and reassuring that here Christian faith and science speak the same voice, and concur in the testimony that there is an intimate affinity between the divine and the human. Agnostic men of science may not admit this, may even protest against the very notion as anthropomorphism, but in spite of their protestations the very men whom they have taught to look on the universe as an organism constantly undergoing transformation, with the great unknown behind all, will find in man the latest and highest product of creation, the key which unlocks the mystery of the Creator. And what the apologist has to do is to lead the way in this line of thought and to view man in his intellectual and moral nature as the manifestation of God.

In dealing with the second question, the bearing of biblical criticism on faith in a special revelation of God to and through Israel, the apologist must carefully distinguish between criticism proper and the naturalistic philosophy that is sometimes associated with it. Failing to do this he will inevitably come to the conclusion that faith in revelation demands the renunciation of the critics and all their theories. Yet this is surely a false conclusion. Much that the critics say may be accepted as true, yet the reality of a self-revelation of God to Israel remain intact. Suppose—*e.g.*, we allow that the Levitical law took its present shape long after the time of Moses, would that alter the value of the sum of moral duty contained in the Decalogue, or of the ethical conception of God implied in the Decalogue? If the Ten Words and the lofty idea of God associated with them were all that Moses contributed, would it not be enough to support his claim to be the agent of a divine revelation? Is not his claim even enhanced by making his contribution so purely ethical, towering in this

respect above all contemporary religions, like the Egyptian, in which the ethical is so strangely mixed with the ritual? Let us not be afraid. Revelation will stand after criticism has done its utmost, and to propagate this conviction and to deliver the Church from unreasoning panic is one of the urgent tasks of present-day apologetic.

The reconciliation of the election of Israel with all that we learn from the science of comparative religion concerning the religious history of pagan peoples is a third important apologetic task. For this purpose care must be taken to form a true conception of the idea of election, as not meaning choice to exclusive favor, but rather to an important function in which the good of the whole world is involved. On the former view of election the reconciliation of faith with the science of religion is impossible; on the latter view, on the other hand, it is not only possible but may be effected so as to yield an important confirmation of faith. For the facts are just such as the hypothesis of election properly understood would lead us to expect: some light even among pagan peoples showing that God had them all the time in His heart for good, yet less light than in Israel; but amid all defects and failures a preparation going on in heathendom for *receiving* the blessing of the true religion simultaneously with the preparation going on in Israel for *communicating* it.

In connection with the Christian origins a very important part of the apologist's task is to establish the general historicity of the evangelic records. It was for Jesus of Nazareth that the world had waited for many centuries, and that the whole history of Israel had been preparing. His life and teaching were the final, highest revelation of God; His words are the very core of Scripture, by which all other parts of Scripture are to be interpreted and valued. How important, then, to know the real man as He appeared in Palestine, and the very words of wisdom and grace He spoke! Important for theology, it is not less important for the health of religion. Christianity not based on a sound, exact knowledge of the historical Christ, and permeated by His spirit, must be a sickly, unattractive thing, and may even be a corrupt, repulsive, pernicious thing. "Back to Christ" is in this view a thoroughly wholesome and legitimate watchword. But it presupposes that the true Christ of history can be known, and it is for modern apologetic to show that such knowledge is attainable. Believing scholars have been working at this task for half a century, since Strauss published his famous mythical theory of the "Life of Jesus." But new attacks call for new defences, and in presence of such a work as that of Pfleiderer's "Urchristenthum," which treats many of the most beautiful words of Jesus as compositions of the evangelists, it becomes necessary to show anew that the Gospels are, in the main, history, and not fiction.

From all that has been said in this article it will appear that I do not reckon it as among the urgent apologetic problems of the present time to furnish the Church with a theory of inspiration. It is a question whether

such a theory be possible ; whether inspiration be not rather a religious idea than a theological conception capable of exact definition. The chief office of apologetic in reference to inspiration at the present time is to protest against false, *a priori* theories of inspiration, which have acted as an obstruction to scientific biblical study and given rise to a large amount of unprofitable harmonistic exegesis in the gospels and other parts of Scripture, where different accounts of the same matter occur.

II.—THE OUTLOOK OF THE CHURCH.

BY H. K. CARROLL, LL.D., NEW YORK CITY.

BEFORE we can get a proper outlook we must take an inlook. What the immediate future of the Church is to be is determined by what the Church is now. We must, therefore, consider its purpose, its power, its appliances, as it exists to-day.

What is the purpose of the Church of to-day ? I think its great idea is the fulfilment of the Lord's command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." There was an element of selfishness pervading the Church until the opening of the present century. It regarded itself as distinct from the world, and better than the world, and seemed to feel little responsibility for the condition of the world. Many of our grandfathers evidently thought the Divine love was lavished upon the Church, but not upon the world, and no one could have it until he had first been brought into the Church. They conceived of the Divine love as a love of complacency and not as a love of benevolence. We have a better understanding of God's attitude toward men. He loves the saint, but He loves the sinner. He has especial graces for the good, but He pleads with the unconverted with infinite tenderness. The Church no longer feels justified in "sitting together in heavenly places" in simple enjoyment of the Divine blessings, quoting with sublime complacency, "Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated." It realizes that men are saved to serve ; and its earnest purpose is to make of itself a great instrumentality for the spread of the Gospel. It does not go forth as though it were taking to the great multitude outside a first supply of this divine love ; but it considers itself an ambassador to remind them that God already loves them and has always loved them, and to induce them to respond to His love by obedience. The Church also believes that the Gospel is to be spread not merely by the preaching of it, but also by the doing of it. The Christianity of the present is a gospel of works as well as words. As the Saviour went about doing good, so do His earnest disciples at the close of the nineteenth century. He healed the sick—so they build hospitals ; He blessed the children—they gather them into Sunday-school and church ; He had regard for the widow and orphan—they open asylums and homes

for them ; He ministered to the poor—they study the causes of poverty and establish measures of prevention and relief ; He was busy teaching—they endow schools, colleges, universities for general instruction ; He ate with publicans and sinners and fed the rabble—they go into the world and seek by all means to do men good. This is the ideal of the Church to-day. This is what it is trying to do. It believes that the Church was made for man and not man for the Church ; and that as the ministries of Christ were broader than the spiritual wants of the multitudes of His day, those of the Church of to-day must be equally comprehensive. A church which is struggling toward such an ideal must be conceded to have a high aim and an earnest purpose.

With such a purpose the Church may be expected to achieve in the future according to the measure of its power and appliances. What is its power ? It is, I think, to be found in its spirituality. How thoroughly is the Church of to-day grounded on the verities of religion ? What is the character of its faith ? In proportion as it holds to the Gospel of Christ, acknowledging His divinity, the necessity and completeness of His atonement, salvation through faith in His meritorious sacrifice, communion with God, growth in grace, and the fruits of faith—in this proportion has it spiritual power. I believe that while there is much theological controversy, variant views respecting the inspiration of the Bible, the person of Christ, and the nature of the atonement He made, there is practical agreement that in all spiritual concerns the Bible is infallible and that the mission of Christ was to save men from their sins. I do not say there is not much that is harmful in the speculations on these vital subjects, but I do not find that the result has been to the advantage of the non-evangelical bodies. These, excepting the Roman Catholic Church, which, whatever errors it may countenance, holds firmly to the fundamentals of the Christian faith, are not increasing so rapidly as the evangelical denominations. The census of 1890 shows us that these non-evangelical bodies constitute only one and one third per cent of the total of communicants. It is true that discipline has been relaxed in many of the denominations accounted orthodox, and beliefs are tolerated which formerly were denounced. There is a more liberal feeling prevalent. The emphasis in preaching is laid on different doctrines. We hear from the pulpit more about the fatherhood of God and less about His wrath ; more about heaven and less about hell. There is some danger that this may become a sort of universalism, an offer of heaven to everybody without conditions. Then, too, there is a distinct change in practice. The Sabbath is not observed as it used to be, and I have no doubt there is more secularity in the Church. These things are to be considered. Some of them injuriously affect the spirituality of the Church. The secular tendency is likely to increase in the future, and on this side the Church will unquestionably lose in power. Strong personal faith is the true motive of personal consecration and good works. There is danger that practical Christianity may degenerate into dead works.

Men may be led to believe that free gifts of money for the various objects of the Church are all that God requires of them.

But with all due allowance for the spurious element (and when has the Church been free from it?) I cannot think that the Church of to-day is inferior in spiritual power to the Church of any previous age. Certainly it is growing in numbers and is increasing its activities. In the last ten years the regular Baptists have increased their membership by 37 per cent, the Lutherans by 68 per cent, the Episcopalians by 48 per cent, the Congregationalists by 33 per cent, the Presbyterians by 39 per cent, the Methodists (Northern) by 30 per cent, and the Southern Methodists by 57 per cent. These denominations, which fairly represent the body of evangelical Christianity in this country, have had a net increase in the ten years of 42 per cent, or 17 per cent beyond that of the population in the same period. This indicates that there is a vast spiritual power in the Church, and that it is of an aggressive character. Members are dying and members are being lost to the Church in one way or another every day; but their loss is made good by conversions, and there is a handsome net increase besides.

By the appliances of the Church I mean its instruments and methods of work—its missionary, educational, Bible, temperance, and other societies; its Sunday-schools, its Christian Endeavor organizations and leagues of young people, its evangelistic meetings, etc. There are a few small groups of Christians, such as the Primitive and Predestinarian Baptists, who frown upon all such Gospel instruments. They say that Christ is a competent and complete Saviour, abundantly able to save all who are to be saved, without any help from man. Preaching is only needed for those who have been effectually called and regenerated, for the "comfort of Zion," for the "edification of the saints," not for the conversion of sinners. These benighted Christians protest against Sunday-schools, missionary societies, theological seminaries, and similar institutions as an abomination. Numbering, perhaps, 100,000 in all, they are so completely out of the current of Christian thought and activity that few have ever even heard of them. They present a strong contrast to the alert, aggressive Christianity represented in every community in the country. This aggressive spirit has not always possessed Christianity in so great a degree. We see more of it to-day than in any previous age. It takes, with John Wesley, the world as its parish, and all men as the objects of its saving efforts. It does not confine itself to the children of its members; it regards them as its special heritage, and surrounds them with Gospel influences. But it has a special message to the unconverted. First to the unconverted at its doors; second, to the unconverted everywhere. It organizes missionary societies and sends men and women into foreign lands where the Gospel has never been preached, and sustains them while they evangelize the heathen. It organizes Bible societies that the Word of God may carry light and conviction everywhere, and make men wise unto salvation.

t
r
s
v
ki
be
m
wa
ser
or
ciel
tiar
pel
Japa
mac
W
Chin
eigne
and t
Bible
sional
of ma
for a l
and we
lect an
Orga
The ide
or mor
for co-
fully th
understc
serve, an
we organ
and spec
they can
aptitude.
than our
our young
century ii

Each individual church is interested in these universal instruments of the Gospel. Working its own field through its own pastoral and lay agencies, it has spare energies to devote to the common work of Christianity, and furnishes men and women to be pastors and workers in the destitute places of the earth, and money to insure their support. This is organization on business principles. The business of saving the world requires organization, complete and extensive ; it requires administrators, agents, means, machinery, enterprise. All these the Church has provided, and a great system has been worked out, rivalling in its universal operations and the volume of its transactions that of any commercial project that we have knowledge of. Any kingdom, country, province, island, settlement can be reached directly and quickly through the numerous channels of communication established by Gospel enterprise. If a devoted man or woman wants to enter a field of work abroad, the widest range of choice is presented. Any country between Greenland and New Zealand in the western or eastern circuit of the globe may be selected, and there is a Gospel society to commission him and send and support him. Has some aged Christian a thousand dollars or so to be applied to the proclamation of the Gospel? He may expend it in any presidency in India, in any division in Japan, in any kingdom in Africa, or in any island of the sea. The machinery exists to place it wherever he wants it to go.

We have the same appliances for work at home. Here are Indians, Chinese, and Negroes ; ignorant and vicious populations ; groups of foreigners ; the frontiers of civilization and the centres of cities ; the prairies and the slums ; the jails, asylums, and workhouses. Here are book and Bible work, evangelistic work, reformatory work, educational work, missionary work, and many other forms of Gospel benevolence, with abundance of machinery for all the exigencies of service—everything, from a posey for a fever cot to the conquest of Africa. Places are ready for the men and women ; and societies exist to commission and direct them and to collect and administer the necessary funds.

Organization is, indeed, one of the characteristics of the Church of to-day. The idea of organization was in the first church ever formed. Where two or more believers are, there is a call for fellowship, for association, and for co-operation. The Church of the present is but working out more fully the central idea of Christian fellowship. This fellowship is now understood to be for mutual helpfulness and for service. We are saved to serve, and we can serve best if we serve according to some system. Hence we organize. Every church has come to have its committees for regular and special work. The women are organized for those parish duties which they can best perform ; for missionary work for which they have special aptitude. They are given a much larger share of the Lord's business than our forefathers dreamed of allotting to them. We have organized our young people. This is one of the most remarkable movements of the century in religious work. The mighty development has come almost

within a decade. The young people of both sexes have been banded together into Endeavor societies, Epworth Leagues, Christian unions and the like, and their members are numbered by the million. By organization for prayer, praise, and Christian work, and particularly training in public service, a great body of young believers have been made a positive, aggressive force in all our churches. Who can measure the influence which these young people thus organized will exert in the immediate future? Not many years ago the cry was raised, "We are losing our hold on the young people. They are not coming into the Church. They are growing up indifferent to religion." To-day we have no more devoted and enthusiastic and helpful workers in the Church than the young people.

The methods of reaching the unconverted have changed in the last quarter of a century. Professional revivalists were then considered a necessity. Now the idea is, "Every pastor his own evangelist." We have, it is true, general evangelists like Moody, and Mills, and Munhall, but the meetings which they hold are not congregational, but community meetings, in which the various local churches unite. Each pastor gathers in his own share of the results. The settled policy of pastors is to reach the unconverted by ordinary methods, and they resort more and more rarely to the extraordinary. The result is not a spasmodic effort once a year, but a constant endeavor to draw men and women and children into the fold of the Church.

No doubt this outlook will seem too optimistic to many. Perhaps it is; but I have tried to keep constantly in mind the unfavorable indications and to make due allowance for them. If I were writing on the perils of the future, I should have something to say on certain tendencies to lower the standard of belief, to open too wide the doors to church membership, to relax discipline, and to let in secularity. In time of great prosperity it would be wise to be on our guard against the development of special evils. This, however, is not the purpose of this article. I have simply described the leading characteristics of Evangelical Christianity as they are manifested to-day in the United States, and I find, on the whole, much to encourage and little to discourage those who hope and pray for the increase of His kingdom.

III.—THE HOMILETIC VALUE OF THE WRITINGS OF JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES O. MURRAY, D.D., PRINCETON, N. J.

As the title of this essay suggests, it is not any critical estimate of Lowell's poetry or prose that is in view. It assumes, of course, that his poetry and prose are among the best products of literary genius, since it is

only such that repay the preacher for turning aside from the severer and higher studies of his vocation. It were well, indeed, if the ministry could learn that life is too short and too precious to justify study of second-rate authors. This may be left to literary critics or literary historians, and for them often proves a somewhat dreary task. Quite aside, however, from all the high merit of Mr. Lowell's work, viewed simply as embodying a rare and pure poetic art, there are reasons which commend him to the acquaintance of preachers in their studies outside strictly professional lines. These come mainly from the religious element in Mr. Lowell's poetry. It may surprise some who associate him mainly with "The Fable for Critics" or "The Biglow Papers," to be told that this element is a pervasive one in his poetry. But any careful reading of his poems will show that it is found alike in his earlier and in his later poems; alike in the shorter and the more elaborate; that it colors the vein of poetic thought when it may have no formal expression.

Both in type and degree this is referable to his early religious training and associations. He was the son of the Rev. Dr. Charles Lowell, settled as the pastor of the West Church, Boston, in 1806. Dr. Lowell, in the theological controversy that marked so strongly the ecclesiastical history of Eastern Massachusetts in the first quarter of the century, espoused the Unitarian views. But the earlier Unitarianism differs essentially from the later type. The Unitarianism of such men as Drs. Channing, Dewey, Lowell, and Gannett was a reactionary movement from the "orthodoxy" of Hopkins and Emmons. It repudiated with emphasis and sometimes with bitterness the distinguishing points of Calvinism as then interpreted by New England theologians. But it held also to a large body of positive beliefs. The later Unitarianism seems to be an assimilation of the modern destructive criticism as applied to Christianity. The line of cleavage begins with the teaching of Theodore Parker.

The earlier Unitarianism laid great stress on the personality of God as manifested in His Fatherhood; it emphasized also the inspired character of the Bible, though insisting more on the internal than on the external evidences; and while it denied the deity of Christ, it accepted His divinity in a modified sense and lifted into great prominence all that side of the Redeemer's work on earth which makes His religion the religion of humanity. Candor must allow that in this latter view they rendered a real service to true religion. The impress of this is seen from first to last in the poetry of Mr. Lowell. Its note is clearly struck in one of his earlier poems, called simply an "Ode." The poem depicts and estimates the fulfilment of the poet's mission in the past, the present, and the future. In its first strophe the poet of the past is described as one who

" Could believe the promise of to-morrow,
And feel the wondrous meaning of to-day;
He had a deeper faith in human sorrow
Than the world's seeming loss could take away

To know the heart of all things was his duty,
 All things did sing to him to make him wise,
 And, with a sorrowful and conquering beauty,
 The soul of all looked grandly from his eyes.

* * * * *

He knew that the One Soul no more rejoices
 In the star's anthem than the insect's hum.
 He in his heart was ever meek and humble,
 And yet with kingly pomp his numbers ran,
 As he foresaw how all things false should crumble
 Before the free, uplifted soul of man ;
 And, when he was made full to overflowing
 With all the loveliness of heaven and earth,
 Out rushed his song, like molten iron glowing,
 To show God sitting by the humblest hearth."

The second strophe, characterizing the poet of the present as an "empty rhymers,"

"Who lies with idle elbow on the grass,"

utters a verdict of condemnation and protest.

"Not his the song, which, in its metre holy,
 Chimes with the music of the eternal stars,
 Humbling the tyrant, lifting up the lowly,
 And sending sun through the soul's prison-bars.
 Maker no more,—oh, no ! unmaker, rather,
 For he unmakes who doth not all put forth
 The power *given freely* by our loving Father
 To show the body's dross, the spirit's worth."

In its third and last strophe the mission of the coming poet is portrayed. It is all surcharged with religious feeling, and recalls John Milton's noble words on the poet's calling. This poet of the future should, in Lowell's thinking, be one

"Who feels that God and heaven's great deeps are nearer
 Him to whose heart his fellow-man is nigh,
 Who doth not hold his soul's own freedom dearer
 Than that of all his brethren, low or high ;
 Who to the right can feel himself the truer
 For being gently patient with the wrong,
 Who sees a brother in the evil-doer,
 And finds in Love the heart's-blood of his song ;
 This—this is he for whom the world is waiting
 To sing the beatings of its mighty heart,
 Too long hath it been patient with the grating
 Of scranrel-pipes, and heard it misnamed art."

These early lines of Lowell are prophetic of his own career. No one can study his poetry and not feel that for him, from the first and all the way through, poetic art has been consecrated to high and uplifting purposes. There is a later poem entitled "The Search," in somewhat similar

vein, but emphasizing far more deeply the life of religion in a true humanity. It begins :

" I went to seek for Christ,
And nature seemed so fair,
That first the woods and fields my youth enticed,
And I was sure to find Him there."

But nature did not disclose Him. Then the seeker turned back to the world, "spurning the cramped alley and the tent," and sought Him "mid power and wealth," but found only Christ's tomb. Then shaking from his feet "the dust of the proud world," he saw

" Fresh-trodden prints of bare and bleeding feet
Turned to the heedless city whence [he] came."

* * * * *

" Love looked me in the face and spake no words ;
But straight I knew those footprints were the Lord's.
I followed where they led,
And in a hovel rude,
With naught to fence the weather from His head,
The King I sought for meekly stood ;
A naked, hungry child
Clung round His gracious knee,
And a poor hunted slave looked up and smiled,
To bless the smile that set him free.
New miracles I saw His presence do,
No more I saw the hovel bare and poor,
The gathered chips into a woodpile grew,
The broken morsel swelled to goodly store ;
I knelt and wept : my Christ no more I seek,
His throne is with the outcast and the weak."

In the poem called "A Parable" he embodies the same thought in a different form :

" Said Christ our Lord, ' I will go and see
How the men, my brethren, believe in Me.'
He passed not again through the gate of birth,
But made Himself known to the children of earth."

It describes Him as going from palace to palace and church to church.

" But still, wherever His steps they led,
The Lord in sorrow bent down His head,
And from under the heavy foundation stones,
The Son of Mary heard bitter groans."

The children of men are there charged with this awful desecration of His image in the degradation of soul and body. They plead the example of their fathers in reply, and point to the images of Christ standing sovereign and sole over the land. But the Lord cannot away with such a defence, and the poem ends with His rejoinder :

“ Then Christ sought out an artisan,
A low-browed, stunted, haggard man,
And a motherless girl, whose fingers thin
Pushed from her faintly want and sin.

“ These set He in the midst of them,
And as they drew back their garment-hem,
For fear of defilement, ‘Lo, here,’ said He,
‘The images ye have made of Me!’ ”

It is evident that this view of the religion of humanity haunted Lowell. It was no passing mood of sentiment. He had imbibed the conception of Christ's identification of Himself with the lowly, the suffering, and the oppressed as the cardinal and distinctive feature of the Christian faith. He was not content with such embodiment of the truth as his shorter poems contained. He gathered up his forces for a longer and more perfect effort. That poem we have in his well-known “*Vision of Sir Launfal.*” According to Mr. Underwood,* “this was composed in a kind of fury, substantially as it now appears, in the space of about forty-eight hours, during which time the poet scarcely ate or slept. It was almost an improvisation, and its effect upon the reader is like that of the outburst of an inspired singer.” The theme of the poem is the legendary search for the Holy Grail, the cup out of which Jesus partook of the Last Supper with His disciples. This theme has been a favorite one with the poets, but none of them, not even Tennyson, has given so poetic a rendering to the legend, and none has brought into it more of a tender and true religious feeling. The power of Lowell's rendering lies in the contrast between the closing stanzas of Part I. and Part II. In Part I. Sir Launfal, with mourning in his heart, goes forth from the castle gate on his long search; his eye falls on a leper, loathsome and moaning, crouched hard by. He tossed the leper a piece of gold in scorn.

“ The leper raised not the gold from the dust :
‘ Better to me the poor man's crust,
Better the blessing of the poor,
Though I turn me empty from his door.
That is no true alms which the hand can hold ;
He gives nothing but worthless gold
Who gives from a sense of duty ;
But he who gives but a slender mite,
And gives to that which is out of sight,
That thread of the all-sustaining Beauty
Which runs through all and doth all unite—
The hand cannot clasp the whole of his alms,
The heart outstretches its eager palms,
For a god goes with it and makes it store
To the soul that was starving in darkness before.’ ”

Sir Launfal has returned from his quest,

“ An old, bent man, worn out and frail,”

* Sketch, p. 59.

his castle gate shut against him by an heir to his earldom, and he mused as he

“ Sought for a shelter from cold and snow.”

And again he saw the leper coming beside him,

“ In the desolate horror of his disease.
And Sir Launfal said : ‘ I behold in thee
An image of Him who died on the tree.’ ”

He shares with the leper his last mouldy crust. He looks, and lo ! the leper is transformed into a shining one, and thus in stanza eight Lowell brings out all the power of the contrast. The lines have been often quoted, but will bear quoting once more :

“ And the voice that was calmer than silence said :
‘ Lo, it is I, be not afraid !
In many climes, without avail,
Thou hast spent thy life for the Holy Grail ;
Behold, it is here—this cup which thou
Didst fill at the streamlet for me but now ;
This crust is my body broken for thee,
This water His blood that died on the tree ;
The Holy Supper is kept, indeed,
In whatso we share with another’s need ;
Not what we give, but what we share—
For the gift without the giver is bare ;
Who gives himself with his alms feeds three—
Himself, his hungering neighbor, and Me.’ ”

There are other poems of Lowell which breathe the same deeply religious spirit in the same key. In all the range of our devotional poets I do not know where to seek a lovelier embodiment of that side of our Christian faith which holds up the oneness of all believers in Christ. In his poem on “ Ambrose ” the plea for tolerance shines through all the structure of the verses and sings to us in their melodies. Mr. Lowell is no friend to creeds. He is in sympathy with those who think their day is over. We may or may not agree with him in this ; but we cannot refuse our admiration to the poetic beauty which he has thrown around these humanitarian views.

Puritan blood flowed in Mr. Lowell’s veins. Puritan characteristics are found in his mental and moral constitution. That virile and intense love of righteousness, that hatred of oppression, that scorn of double-dealing and trifling with moral distinctions, that repudiation of expediency as any arbiter when principles of right are at stake all this has found in his poetry frequent and abundant expression. They are the Puritanism of the nineteenth century refined and cleansed from its older austerity and hardness. They are founded, however, in religion. They are worthy the attention of every minister as an embodiment of what religion is to be in such themes.

Among the earlier poems is one entitled “ The Present Crisis.” It was

written in December, 1844. Its inspiration came from the great struggle between the forces of freedom and slavery, then just beginning. He never had any sympathy with that class of abolitionists who were ready to free the slave by pulling down the pillars of State, and sounding then a general decree of emancipation. But from the first he was a stout and staunch opponent of the system of slavery. His muse had the intensest delight in freedom. It was with him a religion to proclaim its eternal foundations; and so in the poem "The Present Crisis" we find the deep, subduing religious sense which gives to his "Commemoration Ode" so profound and so solemn a movement. "The Present Crisis" has been read and quoted as perhaps no other lines of American poetry, unless it be Bryant's "Thanatopsis." Many of its ringing verses have been heard from the lips of popular orators on platforms and of preachers in pulpits; such, for example, as the stanzas beginning

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide."

"Careless seems the great avenger; history's pages but record."

"By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track."

"For humanity sweeps onward; where to-day the martyr stands."

Two of its stanzas, less known, seldom quoted, have, however, in them a truth of equally solemn moment. That beginning with the line

"For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along"

and that one ending with this far-reaching, deep-reaching truth:

"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

In the well-known "Biglow Papers" the same spirit is shown, but in wholly different vein. Never since Chaucer satirized the corruptions of religion has satire done nobler work than in Lowell's satire of the corruptions of politics in the interest of slavery. It would be quite superfluous to point out in this article what the "Biglow Papers," in both series, were. They are household words. The American people were quick to see underneath the satirical humor the indomitable love of truth and righteousness; the scorn of temporizing expedients; the religious love of freedom and hatred of slavery; the moral courage which dared to stand

"In the right with two or three."

Scattered through the twofold series are couplets which embody imperishable truths. We smile at the satiric thrust, but every honest heart responds with a glow of moral feeling to Mr. Lowell's downright assertion of moral law above all expediency. Together with Longfellow and Whittier, Mr. Lowell lent his muse to the cause of anti-slavery. What a triumvirate of poets of freedom they are! The pulpit should study them, not as mere recreation for vacant moments. They are a chapter in our literary

I

h
r
e:
L
u
fo
w
w
ho
ev
lesthe
wh
dee
De
in t
starOr ex
of on
score
with j
beginIs n
to whc
from a

• Pag

history, of which the American pulpit cannot afford to be ignorant. They represent a phase of Puritanism in our poetry which should have constant expression in our preaching. For all evils did not perish with slavery. Let our metropolitan pulpits look round at the enormous evils developing under our corrupt politics. Is no voice of rebuke, of protest, of assertion for the old-fashioned ideas of purity and honesty needed? Some pulpits were shamefully silent while Mr. Lowell flung out his satiric attacks on the wrongs of the time. But the day is past when the preacher can retain his hold on men, unless his courage is equal to any proper assault on growing evils in the social, or business, or political world. He may learn useful lessons from the "Biglow Papers" for this side of his work.

There is also a class of poems deeply religious in their vein, which the preacher will find it good to know. They express often truths which touch the deeper questions of human destiny, or which reveal the deeper workings of the human heart. Take such a poem as the "Si Descendero in Infernum, Ades." The dominant note of the poem is faith in the possible recovery of souls seemingly hardened and lost. Let a single stanza illustrate its power : *

" Looking within myself, I note how thin
 A plank of station, chance, or prosperous fate,
 Doth fence me from the clutching waves of sin ;—
 In my own heart I find the worst man's mate,
 And see not dimly the smooth-hinged gate
 That opes to those abysses
 Where ye grope darkly—ye who never knew
 On your young hearts love's consecrating dew,
 Or felt a mother's kisses,
 Or home's restraining tendrils round you curled ;
 Ah, side by side with heart's-ease in this world
 The fatal nightshade grows and bitter rue !"

Or examine the poem entitled " Extreme Unction." It pictures the death of one who had basely thrown away gifts and opportunities through four-score years ; who had lived only to himself, and who was face to face with judgment and eternity. What an awful pathos trembles in that stanza beginning

" But look ! whose shadows block the door ?"

Is not our land filling fast with men who have amassed their millions, and to whom the next stanza is a gospel of warning as faithful as ever came from any pulpit ?

" God bends from out the deep and says : †
 ' I gave thee the great gift of life ;
 Wast thou not called in many ways ?
 Are not My earth and heaven at strife ?

* Page 169, vol. i.

† P. 203, vol. i

I gave thee of My seed to sow,
 Bringest thou Me My hundredfold ?
 Can I look up with face aglow,
 And answer, ' Father, here is gold ? ' "

I can only regret that want of space compels me to forbear more quotation. But I am sure that any preacher who will read the whole poem will thank me for having called his attention to it.

Many of us might take a lesson in the great office of consolation from the lines on "The Death of a Friend's Child." Pastors are so often called into scenes of mourning that the danger is of putting on a professional tone, of saying over and over again well-meant platitudes; the commonplaces of such occasions, the stereotyped utterances which leave the wounded spirit aching with a sorer pain. It is good for us to read Lowell's inimitably touching lines "After the Burial." What parent who has ever buried a little child but has known the struggles of heart so vividly given in the poem. What bereaved soul but has known pain and revulsion from well-meant attempts at consolation, which did not console, which preached homilies rather than quietly offered healing sympathies.

Any notice of the religious element in Mr. Lowell's poetry which omitted reference to "The Cathedral" would be sadly incomplete. It is in reference to this poem that Mr. Underwood has said: * "In particular it may be observed that though the physical aspect of evolution had engaged his attention, as it has that of all intellectual men, and had commanded, perhaps, a startled and dubious assent, yet his strong spiritual nature recoiled in horror from the materialistic application of the doctrine to the origin of things. Force could never be to him the equivalent of spirit, nor law the substitute for God. In conversation once upon the "promise-and-potency" phrase of Tyndall, he exclaimed with energy, "Let whoever wishes to believe that the idea of Hamlet or Lear was developed from a clod, I will not."

"The Cathedral," suggested by his visit to the cathedral of Chartres, is full of passages indicating his firm belief in the Personality and Fatherhood of God, of His Divine purpose running through human history, of the need and blessing of His worship. He indicates plainly his indifference to or divergence from many accepted creeds, but the force and beauty of his theistic sentiments are not readily surpassed in modern poetry. A few quotations will make this clear :

"Is old Religion but a spectre now,
 Haunting the solitude of darkened minds,
 Mocked out of memory by the sceptic day ?
 Is there no corner safe from peeping Doubt
 Since Gutenberg made thought cosmopolite,
 And stretched electric threads from mine to mind ?"

* Biographical sketch, page 138.

“ Be He nowhere else,
 God is in everything that liberates and lifts,
 In all that humbles, sweetens, and consoles.
 Blesséd the natures shored on every side
 With landmarks of hereditary thought !
 Thrice happy they that wander not lifelong
 Beyond near succor of the household faith,
 The guarded fold that shelters, not confines !”

* * * * *

“ This life were
 Fruitless, except we now and then divined
 A mystery of purpose, gleaming through
 The secular confusions of the world,
 Whose will we darkly accomplish, doing ours.”

“ If sometimes I must hear good men debate
 Of other witness of Thyself than Thou ;
 As if there needed any help of ours
 To nurse Thy flickering life, that else must cease,
 Blown out, as 'twere a candle, by men's breath,
 My soul shall not be taken in their snare,
 To change her inward certainty for their doubt,
 Muffled from sight in formal robes of proof ;
 While she can only feel herself through Thee,
 I fear not Thy withdrawal ; more, I fear,
 Seeing, to know Thee not. . . .”

Those readers who shall turn to the religious element in Mr. Lowell's poetry, expecting to find in it anything like the religious views of George Herbert or William Cowper will be disappointed. But in the larger, or, if you choose, more general views of religious truth, his utterances are surely noteworthy. They stand in very marked contrast with the agnostic or hesitating and mournful unrest of Matthew Arnold's poems touching religious life. They are deeply Christian if not evangelical. At all events, they are such that the ministry cannot afford to be ignorant of them.

Only brief space is left in which to speak of Mr. Lowell's prose writings. That he is in the foremost rank of our prose writers, few, if any, will question. It would be possible, certainly, to name some limitations which beset him here ; as, for example, a mannerism which is noticeable in some of his earlier literary essays, but which he seems to have outgrown largely in his later writing. But any clergyman who wishes a literary guide whose critical judgment is singularly sound and catholic cannot do better than to study Mr. Lowell's papers on the authors he has discussed. He fulfils nobly and spaciouly the needed office of the interpreter of literature. His learning is as large as his taste is pure, and there are very few of his literary judgments which can safely be questioned.

Then, too, valuable hints may be gained as to style. The “ art of putting things” is the great art for the pulpit to study. It will be found

that Mr. Lowell's illustrations illustrate. He does not disdain the use of common things to make clear his meaning. And then his unflinching vivacity. He is never dull. Alas! that so much sermonizing has this "easily besetting sin" hindering its efficacy. When will our pulpits learn the great secret of being vivacious without the vulgarizing expedients of sensationalism? It may be a great thing to ask, but is not the future of the pulpit dependent on knowing it? And may not the preacher learn useful lessons here from one who has proved himself a master in this art of making threadbare topics live with new life?

IV.—THE GOSPEL OF PETER.

BY PROFESSOR ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY, COBB DIVINITY SCHOOL,
LEWISTON, ME.

"THE Gospel of Peter" has long been known by name to students of patristic literature. Eusebius * ranks it with "the Acts of Peter," "the Preaching of Peter," and "the Apocalypse of Peter" as spurious. Jerome † a generation and Theodoret ‡ a century later than Eusebius give in substance the same judgment. Two earlier writers make mention of the Gospel: Origen briefly, and Serapion most extensively of any witness we have.

Origen, in his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, § merely cites the Gospel of Peter as an authority for the perpetual virginity of Mary. Serapion is known to us only through the history of Eusebius; but Eusebius has preserved a portion of a letter, || written by Serapion to the Church at Rhossus, in Syria, in which the Gospel of Peter is described at some length. It is called "the Gospel which they put forward under the name of Peter;" it is said also to have been used by the followers of the Docetæ, of whom Serapion procured a copy; and he adds: "We have been able to read it through, and we find many things in accordance with the true doctrine of the Saviour, but some things added to that doctrine, which we have pointed out for you further on."

From the time of Serapion's bishopric at Antioch, which must have been between 190 and 203 A. D., ¶ the time of the composition of this Gospel is set with great probability at about the middle of that second century. Zahn, in his "History of the New Testament Canon," ** places its composition in Antioch at about 160; and conjectures that, since the second Gospel, which hitherto had received the designation "according to

* "Ch. Hist.," iii. 3, 25. † "De Vir. Ill.," 1. ‡ "Hæret. Fab.," ii. 2. § x. 17.

|| "Ch. Hist.," vi. 12.

¶ See McGiffert's notes on Eusebius, "Ch. Hist.," v. 19, "The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," 2d series, vol. 1. p. 237.

** 2^{er} Band, 2^{te} Hälfte, II. Abtheilung, S. 751.

Peter," now began to be called exclusively "the Gospel according to Mark," the name "according to Peter," thus disengaged, became easily and naturally attached to a collection of narratives, relating to the Saviour, recently put together.

Besides these few references to the document no other knowledge of it was in hand until the present time, when we are reminded by the appearance of a work in Paris of the great discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript by Tischendorf in 1859, and of the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles by Bryennios in 1873. What the monasteries and tombs of the East may yet disclose no prophet can declare. This French work bears the title "Memoirs Published by the Members of the French Archæological Mission at Cairo, under the Direction of M. U. Bouriant, Volume IX., Part I. : J. Baillet, The Mathematical Papyrus of Akhmim; U. Bouriant, Fragments of the Greek Text of the Book of Enoch and of Certain Writings Ascribed to St. Peter. Paris, Leroux, 1892." It is the last portion of the title which attracts the attention of the New Testament student. The Book of Enoch, quoted in our canonical Epistle of Jude,* outside of a few allusions in ecclesiastical writings, has hitherto been known solely in an Ethiopic translation. The writings ascribed to St. Peter are the Gospel and Apocalypse bearing his name. Of the latter, nearly a half is given; of the former, merely a fragment; but of both most interesting and valuable portions.

These manuscripts were discovered in a Christian tomb at Akhmim, in Upper Egypt, as long ago as the winter of 1886-87 by members of the French Archæological Mission at Cairo. The length of interval since discovery is in part due, no doubt, to the slow routine of such organizations, and in part to the necessary time for deciphering and editing the text. The editors state in excuse simply "obstacles have retarded, concerning which it is useless to be explicit." The manuscript, in cursive characters, was written, according to M. Bouriant, not earlier than the eighth and not later than the twelfth century.†

The fragment of the Gospel begins abruptly in the midst of an account of the Passion, and reads as follows :

"But of the Jews no one washed his hands, neither Herod, nor any of his judges, even of those who wished to wash. Pilate rose up, and then Herod the king ordered the Lord to be seized, saying to them, 'All that I ordered you to do, do to him.' Now came there Joseph, the friend of Pilate and of the Lord, and, having learned that they were about to crucify him, he went to Pilate and begged the body of the Lord for burial. And Pilate having sent to Herod, asked for his body, and Herod said, 'Brother Pilate, although no one had asked for him, we should have buried him, since the Sabbath is dawning; for it has been written in the law that the sun should not go down on one who has been put to death on the eve of the Feast of Unleavened Bread'—their festival. But those who

* Verse 14. † See Shürer's critique in "Theologische Literaturzeitung," December 10, 1892.

had seized the Lord were pushing him, while they ran, and were saying, 'We have found the Son of God, having got power over him,' and they proceeded to throw a purple robe round him, and sat him on a seat of judgment, saying, 'Judge righteously, O King of Israel;' and one of them, bringing a crown of thorns, placed it on the head of the Lord, and others, standing, were spitting on his eyes, and others struck his cheeks, others were prodding him with a reed, and some were scourging him, saying, 'With this honor let us honor the Son of God.' And they brought two malefactors and crucified the Lord between them. But he himself held his peace, as if he had no pain; and when they had erected the cross, they wrote on it, 'This is the King of Israel,' and, having placed his garments before it, they distributed them and cast a lot for them. But one of those malefactors reproached them, saying, 'We have suffered thus on account of the sins which we have committed, but this man, being the Saviour of mankind, what wrong has he done you?' And, being enraged at him, they ordered that his legs should not be broken, in order that he might die in torture.

"Now it was noon, and darkness covered all Judæa, and they were thrown into confusion, and were distressed, lest perchance the sun were going down when he was yet alive. It has been written for them that the sun should not go down on one who has been put to death. And one of them said, 'Give him to drink gall along with vinegar,' and, having mixed it, they gave him to drink, and fulfilled all things, and accomplished their sins on their heads. But many were going about with torches, thinking that it was night, and they fell. And the Lord cried out, saying, 'My Power, My Power, Thou hast left me,' and having said this, he was taken up, and at the same hour the veil of the temple of Jerusalem was rent in twain. And then they took out the nails from the hands of the Lord, and placed him on the ground, and all the ground was shaken, and great fear arose. Then the sun shone, and it was found to be the ninth hour. But the Jews rejoiced, and gave his body to Joseph, in order that he might bury it, since he had seen all the good things that he had done. But having taken the Lord, he bathed him and wrapped him in a fine linen cloth, and brought him into his own tomb, called Joseph's Garden. Then the Jews and the Elders and the Priests, having seen what an injury they had done to themselves, began to beat their breasts, and to say, 'Woe to our sins, the judgment and the end of Jerusalem have come near.' But I, with my companions, was grieved, and being wounded in mind, we hid ourselves, for we were being sought for by them as malefactors, and as wishing to burn the Temple. But for all these things we fasted, and we were sitting down mourning and lamenting night and day until the Sabbath. But the Scribes and Pharisees and Elders being gathered together to one another, having heard that all the people were murmuring and were beating their breasts, saying, 'If these very great signs happened by reason of his death, see ye how righteous he is,' the Elders were afraid, and came to Pilate, begging

of him and saying, 'Give us soldiers that we may guard his tomb for three days, lest haply his disciples coming may steal him, and lest the people may suppose that he has risen from the dead, and lest they may do harm to us.' And Pilate gave them Petronius, the centurion, with soldiers to guard the tomb, and with them came Elders and Scribes to the tomb, and having rolled a great stone by the aid of the centurion and the soldiers, all those who were there together placed it at the door of the tomb, and put on it seven seals, and having fixed a tent, there they kept guard. But early, when the Sabbath was dawning, came a crowd from Jerusalem and the neighborhood in order that they might see the tomb sealed. But on the night on which the Lord's Day was dawning, when the soldiers were guarding it two by two on guard, a loud voice was heard in the heaven, and they saw the heavens opened and two men coming down thence with much light and standing at the tomb. But that stone which was put at the door being rolled away of itself, partly withdrew and the tomb opened and both the young men went in. Then those soldiers seeing them roused the centurion and the Elders (for they also were present, keeping guard themselves), and when they related what they had seen, again they see coming forth from the tomb three men, and the two supporting the one, and a cross, following them, and of the two the head reached up to heaven, but the hand of him supported by them overpassed the heavens, and they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, 'Hast thou preached to them that sleep?' And an answer was heard from the cross, 'Yea.' Accordingly they considered with one another about going away, and showing these things to Pilate; and while they were yet deliberating, the heavens again appeared open and a man appeared descending and entering the tomb. Those who were round the centurion 'seeing these things' hastened to Pilate by night leaving the tomb which they were guarding, and they related all things which they had seen, being greatly distressed thereat, and saying, 'Truly he was the Son of God.' Pilate answering, said, 'I am pure from the blood of the Son of God, but to you this seemed good.' Then all going to him begged him and exhorted him to order the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing of what they had seen. 'For,' they said, 'it is enough for us to have committed a very great sin before God without falling into the hands of the people of the Jews and being stoned to death.' Then Pilate ordered the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing. Now when the Lord's Day dawned, Mary Magdalene, a disciple of the Lord, who, being afraid on account of the Jews since they were ablaze with anger, had not done at the tomb of the Lord what the women are accustomed to do for those who are dead, and for those who are loved by them, taking with her her friends, came to the tomb where he was laid. And they were afraid lest the Jews should see them, and they kept saying, 'Since on that day on which he was crucified we were not able to weep and beat our breasts, even now let us do these things at his tomb. But who will roll away for us the stone which was placed at the door of

the tomb in order that going in we may place ourselves beside him and perform the rites? For the stone was great, and we are afraid lest some one may see us, and lest we shall not be able. And if we throw down at the door the things which we bear for a memorial of him, we shall weep and beat our breasts till we come to our house.' And going away they found the tomb opened, and, approaching it, they stooped sideways there, and saw a young man seated in the middle of the tomb, beautiful, and clothed in a shining garment, who said to them, 'Why did you come? whom do you seek? is it not him who was crucified? He has risen, and has gone away. But if you do not believe, stoop down and see the place where he lay, that he is not here. For he is risen, and is gone away to that place whence he was sent forth.' Then the women, being frightened, fled. Now it was the last day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and many went away, returning to their homes, the festival being ended. But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, were weeping and grieving; and each grieving on account of what had taken place, departed to his home. But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, having taken our nets, went away to the sea, and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord—"*

The fragment terminates more abruptly than it begins. We wish there was more.

Four questions now naturally confront us: Who was its author? Where was it written? What is its relation to our canonical Gospels? What practical benefit can this discovery render to the religious world?

I. Its authorship. We have already seen that Eusebius and Theodoret term it the "*so-called* Gospel of Peter," and classify it with the rejected writings. Eusebius distinctly places it among books "that are cited by the heretics under the name of the apostles,"† and says of it and the Acts and Preaching and Apocalypse, ascribed to Peter, that they "have not been universally accepted, because no ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern, has made use of testimonies drawn from them."‡ He indicates that the reason why it was not accepted was solely because its genuineness was doubted. So Serapion wrote. The Gospel had been "put forward under the name of Peter," but it was otherwise unobjectionable, he supposed, until it was reported to him that some heresies were referred to it for countenance and support, when he read it carefully, and then, it would seem, though unfortunately this portion of his epistle does not remain to us, he proceeded to point out in detail wherein this Gospel differed from the true records. We will read entire what Serapion says as Eusebius has preserved it.§ Eusebius speaks of a work composed by Serapion "on the so-called Gospel of Peter," and continues, "He wrote this last to refute the falsehoods which that Gospel contained, on account of some in the parish of Rhossus who had been led astray by it into heterodox notions.

* W. M. Crook's translation in "The Review of the Churches," December 15th, 1892.

† "Ch. Hist.," iii. 25.

‡ "Ch. Hist.," iii. 3.

§ "Ch. Hist.," vi. 12.

It may be well to give some brief extracts from his work, showing his opinion of the book. He writes as follows :

“ For we, brethren, receive both Peter and the other apostles as Christ ; but we reject intelligently the writings falsely ascribed to them, knowing that such were not handed down to us. When I visited you I supposed that all of you held the true faith, and as I had not read the Gospel which they put forward under the name of Peter, I said, “ If this is the only thing which occasions dispute among you, let it be read.” But now having learned, from what has been told me, that their mind was involved in some heresy, I will hasten to come to you again. Therefore, brethren, expect me shortly. But you will learn, brethren, from what has been written to you, that we perceive the nature of the heresy of Marcianus, and that, not understanding what he was saying, he contradicted himself. For having obtained this Gospel from others who had studied it diligently, namely, from the successors of those who first used it, whom we call Docetæ (for most of their opinions are connected with the teaching of that school), we have been able to read it through, and we find many things in accordance with the true doctrine of the Saviour, but some things added to that doctrine, which we have pointed out for you farther on.” *

From the second century we have no witness as to authorship except Serapion. The third century sheds no light on the subject, for Origen, though citing the work by name, gives no clear indication one way or the other as to who wrote it. The fourth yields Eusebius, and Jerome, and Theodoret, unanimous in declaring it unapostolic. So far, therefore, as external testimony goes, the gospel must unhesitatingly be pronounced spurious, not the work of the Apostle Peter.

The fragment in two places refers to its author in the first person. “ But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother ” is found at its close ; but such claims of authorship are very common in the apocryphal literature of the New Testament, most of which had its origin in the latter part of the second or in the third century. The writer’s expression, “ But I, with my companions, was grieved, and being wounded in mind, we hid ourselves, for we were being sought for by them as malefactors, and as wishing to burn the temple,” accords well, it must be confessed, with the cowardice and evident fear of arrest which Peter showed when, as the synoptical Gospels relate, he denied connection with Jesus. But these characteristics are such as a forger would be first to think of and first to simulate. No incident in Peter’s career has impressed the ancient as well as the modern ecclesiastic more forcibly than the denial.

Two obvious traits of this document are entirely unlike any other utterances we have of Peter : 1. The general diffuseness of style is totally unlike the reports of Peter’s speeches as given in the Acts and his undoubted first Epistle. It is more lengthy than the narrative of the same events in the canonical Gospels. But Peter’s style is particularly vigorous

* McGiffert’s translation : “ The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,” 2d Series, vol. 1. p. 268.

and direct. This fragment is diffuse and well-nigh tautological. Serapion's verdict, that it has additions, or amplifications, seems correct. 2. The indications of docetism, to which Serapion referred, are obvious, and unlike Peter. The following phrases may be pointed out: "But he himself held his peace, as if he had no pain;" "And the Lord cried out, saying, 'My Power, My Power, Thou hast left me.'" But Peter, in his first Epistle, speaks repeatedly of the "blood" of Christ and the "sufferings" of Christ.*

We must conclude, in view of the evidence, both external and internal, that Peter could not have been the author. Nor can the peculiar agreement between this fragment and Peter's genuine writings in reference to the Lord's preaching to the dead impair our conclusion.† Indeed, the chief features of the fragment mark it as belonging to a post-apostolic age, when phrases, names, and details were added somewhat freely to the simplicity of apostolic narrative.

Who then wrote the Gospel? I am not aware that this question can be answered more nearly than to indicate—by probabilities, however—the place of composition.

II. Where was the Gospel of Peter written? The docetic cast of the fragment, with Serapion's direct testimony, make Antioch the probable place. This Syrian Antioch shares with Egypt the honor of being the place of origin and development of gnosticism, and of docetism in particular.‡ Ignatius, who combats docetism more directly than almost any other writer of the sub-apostolic period,§ was Bishop of Antioch. Origen, who quotes the docetic character of the Gospel of Peter, had, as Zahn points out,|| but recently made a stay of some duration in Antioch. Serapion himself, at the time of his writing, was Bishop of Antioch. While Rhossus, where the Gospel had currency and was doing mischief, was a town on the Gulf of Issus, in Syria, a little to the northwest of Antioch.¶ All the testimony we have, therefore, connects Antioch in some way with this document, and it becomes apparent upon what basis Zahn finds his conjecture that this is the place of composition.

In Antioch, then, some disciple, or disciples, of docetism enlarged and adapted the narrative of Christ's life to suit their own dogmatic tenets. This is probable. In this manner we know that Marcion constructed his favorite Gospel; and we have reason to believe that thus arose many of the other apocryphal writings.

* See i. 2, 11, 19; ii. 21, 23, 24; iii. 18; iv. 13; v. 1.

† 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6. An interesting discussion upon "The Descent of Christ into Hades," by correspondence between Professor Franz Delitzsch and Professor von Hofmann, is given in "The Expositor," 4th Series, vol. iii., pp. 241, 361. Professor Delitzsch does not think the doctrine of Christ's preaching to the dead is peculiarly Petrine, but finds it implied, if not taught, in Eph. iv. 8-10, cp. Col. ii. 15, as well as in 1 Pet. iii. 19 and Acts ii. 24.

‡ Principal Tulloch, "Gnosticism," Encyc. Brit., vol. x., p. 702.

§ See particularly his epistles to the "Smyrneans," §§ 1-3, and to the "Trallians," §§ 9-11.

|| "Geschichte des neutest. Kanons," 2^{er} Band, 2^{er} Hälfte, II. Abtheilung, S. 750, note 1.

¶ McGiffert's note, 6, p. 258, "The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," 2d Series, vol. i., "Eusebius."

III. What relation does this Gospel of Peter bear to the canonical Gospels? Of course a comparison can be made only with portions of the canonical Gospels covering the same ground as this fragment.* It is practically twice as long as the same account in Mark or in Luke; it is sixty per cent longer than Matthew's account, and about forty-five per cent longer than John's.

The Fourth Gospel is more ample in detail than any one of the other Gospels. The Gospel of Peter is more ample still. This tendency toward expansion in description and narration, distinctly characterizing the apocryphal literature of the second century, discernible also in John, need not necessarily impair confidence in the genuineness and integrity of John's writings, for greater precision in circumstance and in conversation reported would naturally characterize the record of an old man, whose memory reproduced most faithfully the scenes and experience of his youth, when life for him assumed its first great significance. The minutiae of statement in John, as compared with the synoptical accounts, can be—I will not say must be, while the remaining problems of the Johannine question remain to us †—thus naturally explained; they are themselves simple and unpretentious; but the amplifications of a later time become extravagant, sometimes grotesque in an evident effort after the marvellous. While free from the extreme exaggerations of other apocryphal Gospels, this of Peter nevertheless carries a confession of its late origin in such amplifications of the plainer New Testament account as “pushing him, while they ran,” “spitting on *his eyes*,” “his legs should not be broken, in order that he might die in torture,” “darkness covered all Judæa, and they were thrown into confusion, and were distressed,” the lament of the elders and priests, “of the two the head reached up to heaven, but the hand of him supported by them overpassed the heavens.”

In this Gospel the Jews are brought into more unfavorable prominence than is given them in the canonical Gospels. The order for His crucifixion is given by Herod; the execution of this order and the accompanying maltreatment of Jesus is not ascribed to Roman soldiery, but to the Jewish mob; “the Jews and the Elders and the Priests” step into conspicuous notice. Such marked antipathy to the Jews belongs to a later period than that of the composition of the canonical Gospels, in which distinct anti-semitism is wanting.

Most important of all, however, in a comparison of Peter's Gospel with the canonical Gospels, is the fact that the former indicates an acquaintance with all the others. Much of the matter is seen at first glance to be common. But certain passages, apparent in the translation, are peculiar to one Gospel alone. The trial before Herod, implied in this Gospel, is recorded only by Luke. The watch at the sepulchre and the earth-

* Matt. xxvii. 26—xxviii. 8; Mark xv. 15—xvi. 8; Luke xxiii. 24—xxiv. 10; John xix. 1—xx. 13.

† See Professor Sanday's “The Present Position of the Johannine Question,” “The Expositor,” 4th Series, vol. iv., pp. 321, 401; vol. v., pp. 12, 161, 281, 372.

quake are peculiar to Matthew. Yet more significant still are the agreements with the Fourth Gospel. Reference to the unwillingness to allow the body to remain on the cross over the Sabbath, to breaking His legs, to Joseph's own tomb and its position in a garden are paralleled only in John. The nails in the hands, also mentioned only by John, are spoken of in the fragment. A comparison in the Greek discloses even closer and more remarkable resemblances to the four Gospels of the New Testament. J. Armitage Robinson, editor of the Cambridge text, issued December 1st in England, finds expressions peculiar to Matthew used six times, peculiar to Mark five times, peculiar to Luke nine times, and expressions peculiar to John used no less than eleven times. These likenesses show the early origin of the New Testament gospels, particularly of the fourth, and anew add to the discomfiture of the critics who would walk in the steps of Baur.

IV. The practical benefit which this discovery can render to the religious world lies almost wholly in the domain of New Testament criticism. Church history is not enlightened as it was by the recent discovery of the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Incentives to practical Christian living or to higher faith and greater devotion are not multiplied; but some of the difficulties in estimating rightly the testimony of the second century to the New Testament are in part at least relieved. For example, in Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho"* occur these words: "It is said that one of the apostles was called Peter after his name was changed, and this is recorded in *his* memoirs." The ambiguity in the pronoun "his" has been variously interpreted. Drs. Roberts and Donaldson † render the phrase, "in the memoirs of *Him*," referring the pronoun to Christ, because Justin's habit is to mention the Memoirs of the Apostles, which relate the words and deeds of Christ. Others have supposed the reference to be to the Gospel of Mark, because this gospel records that change of name and also was known in the early Church as the Gospel according to Peter. Others still have thought to amend the text, either by altering the singular to the plural, making the reading then "in *their* memoirs," referring to the memoirs of the apostles, or by inserting the word "apostles," supposing it to have dropped out, then reading "in the memoirs of *His* apostles." ‡ All of these interpretations are in keeping with Justin's frequent allusions to the "Memoirs of the Apostles," in which an account of Christ's life is given; and according to these views, Justin is cited as a witness from the first half of the second century to the existence of our canonical Gospels at that time. One school of critics, however, belittling all evidence to the historicity of Christianity, turns and twists upon this pronoun "his," making it refer to Peter and to mean the "Gospel of Peter," which now comes to light, deducing therefrom that Justin intends throughout by allusions to the "memoirs" to indicate this document and not the

* Chap. cvl.

† "The Ante-Nicene Fathers" (Am. ed.), vol. 1, p. 262.

‡ See Watkins' "Bampton Lectures," 1890, "Modern Criticism and the Fourth Gospel," p. 66.

* Part II
6th edition]
† "Dialo
the Father
being the 8
‡ *Ibid.*, c
§ *Ibid.*, cl
l "Super

Gospels of the canon. The author of "Supernatural Religion" * follows this course of reasoning, and identifies the "Gospel of Peter" with the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." This fragment, brief as it is, helps refute such conclusions. Justin Martyr could not have used a docetic document such as this, for he distinctly declares that Christ became "truly a suffering man." † Justin also quotes scenes and sayings at the crucifixion which are not contained in this Gospel of Peter, but are found in the four of the New Testament, as the following passages show: "For when Christ was giving up His spirit on the cross, He said, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit,' as I have learned also from the memoirs," ‡ or "For they that saw Him crucified shook their heads each one of them, and distorted their lips, and twisting their noses to each other, they spake in mockery the words which are recorded in the memoirs of His apostles: 'He said he was the Son of God; let Him come down; let God save Him.'" § Further critical study of this document and comparison with Justin's writings will doubtless more fully dispose of these sceptical contentions.

The relation of this Gospel to the Clementine homilies, ¶ to the "Epistle of Vienne and Lyons," ¶¶ and to other writings of that period may at length be ascertained even from this fragment, and then the field of New Testament criticism be by so much defined and enriched.

Every discovery from the past has some tale to tell, directly or indirectly, that cannot fail to benefit the world under the eagle eyes of modern criticism. We have every reason to expect other treasures to come to light when all the sepulchres, and monuments, and secluded libraries of Eastern convents and recluses have been explored.

NOTE.—The daily press of December and the religious press since have given much attention to this Gospel. The following are well worth consulting: *The Independent*, December 22d, pp. 10, 20; February 9th, p. 14; *The Review of the Churches*, December 15th, p. 162; *The Sunday-School Times*, December 24th, p. 819; *The Expositor*, January; *The Biblical World*, January, p. 33; February, pp. 88, 134, 146; *The Thinker*, February, pp. 101, 174; *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, December 10th, columns 609-614; and of separate publications, "The Gospel According to Peter and the Revelation of Peter," by J. Armitage Robinson, and Montague Rhodes James (London); "The Newly Recovered Gospel of Saint Peter," by J. Rendal Harris (New York); Adolph Harnack's "Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus" (Leipzig).

* Part II., chap. iii., "Justin Martyr," especially pp. 250, 337-345, vol. I. (Rose-Belford reprint of 6th edition).

† "Dialogue with Trypho," chap. xcix; also chap. ciii.: "In order that we may perceive that the Father wished His Son really to undergo such sufferings for our sakes, and may not say that He, being the Son of God, did not feel what was happening to Him, and inflicted on Him."

‡ *Ibid.*, chap. cv., cp. Luke xxiii. 46.

§ *Ibid.*, chap. ci., cp. Matt. xxvii. 39, 40; Mark xv. 29, 30.

¶ "Supernatural Religion," vol. I., p. 388 sq.

¶¶ *Ibid.*, p. 517.

V.—LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TEXTS FROM RECENT DISCOVERIES.

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

III.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CIVILIZATION.

HEBREW antiquity was familiar with both Egyptian and Babylonian culture and history, and it deliberately preferred the latter as the origin of the former. Although Palestine was at the very door of Egypt and far removed from Babylonia by the distance of a long detour about an impassable desert country, yet it denied the superior antiquity of ancient Egypt, and asserted that the human race had its origin, not in the valley of the Nile, but of the Euphrates. This was not to be expected; it would seem hardly probable. Not only would the contiguity of an extreme antiquity have seemed likely to make an old Hebrew give the preferences to Egypt, but, so far as known, up to a very late period the succession of historical dynasties would give the modern scholar the same impression. Egyptologists have put the first dynasty back to four, five, or six thousand years before Christ, while Assyriologists were very slow to claim an antiquity of more than two or three thousand years before Christ for the earliest known kings of Babylonia.

Civilization had to begin, we may say, in some such region as the valley of the Nile or the Euphrates. It could not begin with a pastoral people. Civilization could have its origin only in a closely compacted population such as is allowed in a rich alluvial valley, where the crops can be assured not by rains, but by irrigation. Here separate industries could grow up—those of the farmer, the house-builder, the tool-maker, the brick-moulder and others. This requires individual property, laws of barter, seals, and other proofs of possession, and records of purchase and sale. It is reasonable that the oldest marks of civilization should be found in these two valleys which provide ideal conditions for its development.

Within the last ten years by general consent the antiquity of the Babylonian civilization has been thrown back very greatly. This began with the discovery of a date given by Nabonidus, father of Belshazzar, which puts back the age of Sargon I., the old Babylonian king, who must not be confounded with the much later Assyrian Sargon, to nearly four thousand years before Christ. A more careful study of the early Babylonian dynasties—those which antedate the supremacy of Babylon and the reign of Hammurabi—with the discovery of many new names, and the more thorough investigation of the history of early Babylonian art and writing, has led scholars to accept the chronology given by Nabonidus as probably correct, with all the conclusions involved as to the time necessary to produce the civilization and the power which at that remote time made it possible for Sargon I. to send an army up the Euphrates and across by the route of Damascus to achieve his conquest of the Syrian coast of the Mediterranean Sea. This makes the antiquity of Babylonia as old as that of the beginning of Egyptian civilization, and makes it for the first time seem possible, from the standpoint of the student of other than sacred history, to believe that Egypt may not be the oldest of nations, but may only be a rival in age with Babylonia.

Having thus put back the beginnings of Babylonian civilization to a period no later than those of the Egyptian, scholars now ask with not a little interest if any evidence is available to prove that either was the source of the other. This has been the subject of a careful study by Dr. Fritz Hommel, Professor of Semitic Languages in Munich, which was read before the meeting of the International

EASTE

By Pi

[EVA

LOGIC

SITY

BELOV

Jesus!

too, a lo

deeds of

Oriental Congress held in London last autumn, and is now published in autograph. He devotes his paper to an argument to show that Egyptian culture originated in Babylonia. The evidence, when one goes back of documentary sources, cannot easily be conclusive, and it has not yet met the sharp criticism of Egyptian scholars, but it has weight enough to be well worth consideration.

At first view the culture of Babylonia differs so much from that of Egypt that no connection seems likely. The languages are different, as their hieroglyphic writing shows little evident affinity. But as a first evidence of a relation between the two, Dr. Hommel mentions that the oldest city of Babylonia—Eridu—or the oldest of Egypt—Memphis—both have the same meaning—"City of the Good"—that is, of the good God. He thinks it probable that the earliest emigrants from the Euphrates to the Nile valley carried with them the name of their city.

The oldest Babylonian trinity of gods consists of Anu (or Anum, also called Nun), god of the upper heaven of the stars; Bel, god of the middle air; and Ea, god of the earth. The earliest Egyptians had a primitive trinity with precisely the same functions, and one of them with the same name—Nun, god of heaven; Shu, god of the air, and Seb, god of the earth. This is a very curious coincidence, which Dr. Hommel develops farther by analogies of other gods. Thus he identifies the name of the Egyptian god Khonsu with that of the Babylonian Enzu, and Istar with Isis.

But Dr. Hommel, in his fuller discussion of the subject in his lately published brochure, "*Der Babylonische Ursprung der Ägyptischen Kultur*," devoted himself more especially to the evidence of the Semitic origin of the Egyptian language and writing. As to the former, he represents a growing opinion of scholars that Egyptian has more intimate Semitic relationship than has been generally admitted. Dr. Hommel not only specifies a number of identical words, but, what is much more important, shows the grammatical relations of the two languages in what is a fresher and perhaps more striking evidence; he puts side by side more than thirty hieroglyphic characters which resemble each other in the two languages both in form and signification or even in sound. While pictorial figures must show much in common, his argument and the cumulative effect of his example are of considerable weight. The conclusion, not from Dr. Hommel's argument alone, but from the discussions of other distinguished Semitic and Egyptian scholars, such as Lagarde and Brugsch, makes the conclusion not at all improbable, from the side of history and linguistics, that human culture had its origin, as the Bible tells us, in the valley of the Euphrates.

SERMONIC SECTION.

EASTER MESSAGE AND EASTER JOY.

BY PROFESSOR DR. E. KANTZSCH
[EVANGELICAL], DEAN OF THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE.

Matt. xxviii. 1-10.

BELOVED congregation in Christ Jesus! There was a time, and that, too, a long time, during which the great deeds of God were sung in the churches

of Western Christianity only in the Latin tongue. The songs which at that time resounded to the praise of God also in the churches of our peoples were indeed solemn, and many of them were from the earliest days; but the lips of the people themselves were condemned to silence, or they could only sing that which they did not understand. The behest of the apostles (Col. iii. 16), "Teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual

songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God," could not be complied with. And yet there was one day on which nobody could have prevented the Christian congregations, in the mighty power of their grateful hearts, themselves to join in swelling choruses to the praises of the Lord, and that, too, in their own mother tongue. And this day was Easter day; for from the time long before the Reformation the grand hymn "Christ is Risen" was sung all over Germany. This hymn maintained its position amid all the Latin hymnology of the olden times, as a living testimony of the fact that the congregation of Christ knew of no higher and more intense joy than that of the Easter messages; and in this their Christian feelings and sentiments were correct. And if ever the time should come in which the congregations could not longer join in the chorus, "Christ is risen, let all rejoice," then the hour of her doom will have struck; then the Church will have been removed from that cornerstone upon which the apostles have built it. Therefore it behooves us to cling firm and fast to our Easter confession: Yea, the Lord has risen out of death and the grave: therefore we can rejoice and be glad that He has become to us a comfort beyond death and the grave. And not the less it behooves us to be thankful to our God with our whole heart, that He has caused this Easter message to be proclaimed to us; that we need not lament as those who have no hope. And may He give His grace that this message may this day and at all times be proclaimed and be received with joy in His congregation, and bring comfort and peace to our hearts. Amen.

When we approach the text of our Easter lesson, we find in it a double promise of Easter comfort to the women who came to the grave of Christ, the one in the mouth of the angel, the other in the mouth of the risen Lord Himself. Both begin with exactly the same words: "Fear not." Let this admonition engage our attention in our thoughts to-day.

Fear Not.

And let us consider, I. How this admonition presupposes an Easter faith; II. How it aims to produce Easter joy.

I. "Now, late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." We do not need to ask what impelled the women to seek the newly made tomb of the Lord. Even if we did not know from the other gospels that they went there to anoint the body of the Lord, the words of our own text would not leave us without an answer. "I know that ye seek Jesus, which hath been crucified," the angel says to them. Yes; they came to look for the Crucified One, even if they thought that they must seek Him among the dead. To Him they had clung with all their hearts and minds; with Him they had suffered; Him they had seen die and laid into the tomb. But their hearts would rebel against the thought that all this had been reality and not merely a horrible dream. And even when they saw themselves compelled to accept the bitter fact, they could not believe as yet that the bond of communion between Him and them had been forever severed. It seems to them as if a mere look at the place where they had laid Him would soften their grief and satisfy their longings for Him. Alas! it is only too natural for the human heart to the present day yet to cling to the mere appearance of a communion with the beloved dead; to be constantly filled with a longing for only the last glance, the last touch of the dead, once more to take the hand of the beloved one before the final separation takes place. To this natural tendency of the heart the women in the Gospel yield; but they start on their journey to the tomb without comfort and without hope. That something extraordinary would take place suddenly, to change their sorrow into joy, did not enter their minds. How could the grave give up that One who before their own eyes had died such a martyr death? And when

they came near the sepulchre and saw the changes that had taken place, it was no more than natural that they should at first be filled with grief. What was that to signify that their eyes beheld? Was it not natural that their first thought should be that the grave had been opened only for the purpose of disturbing the final rest of Him whom they had laid there? While filled with such fear, the words of the angel fell upon their ears: "Fear not; for I know that ye seek Jesus which hath been crucified. He is not here; for He is risen, even as He said." What words could have been spoken to them that could more effectually remove their fear than this, "He is risen, even as He said"? These words are the sun that suddenly breaks through the dark clouds of sorrow in their hearts and makes the darkness day, and teaches them that all their fears have been only a terrible dream. But however grand and great the message of the angel was, it could be grasped only by faith. Yes, an Easter faith is needed for the appreciation of the words "Fear not." Without this faith, it was impossible to convert their sorrow into happiness. And even if they followed the admonition of the angel, "Come, see the place where the Lord lay," Him—the Lord Himself—they did not yet see. They still had to believe that the tomb was empty because the sepulchre was not able to hold Him, because through His resurrection death had been swallowed in victory. And the women did have faith in the Easter message. As soon as they had been told, "Go quickly, and tell His disciples He is risen from the dead," then they no longer seek the living among the dead; but they hasten away from the tomb, still filled with fear, on account of the wonderful thing they had witnessed, but also with joy over the glorious message they had heard and had believed. And this joy gave them fleetness to tell His disciples of what had occurred. But they were not to leave the place without also having seen that which they had believed. The

Risen Lord Himself appears to them and greets them. And when they had fallen down before His feet and desire to embrace them, they again hear a certain seal and comfort of their Easter message in the words, "Fear not; go tell My brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there they shall see Me."

And thus since then it resounds through all the ages, "Fear not." And even if this appeal no longer comes from the lips of the angel, or even from those of the Risen Lord Himself, it is none the less as comforting as it was then. Indeed, mankind stood in need of such words: "The Lord is risen indeed," and we stand in need of them every year anew. For how can we deny it that we, according to the flesh, are filled with fear of all things that are connected with the tomb and with death? Everything that has the breath of life, it by instinct feels a natural fear of death and seeks to escape it as much as possible. And even if there are each year hundreds who violate the most sacred ordinances of God by laying hands upon themselves, yet these, withal, constitute unnatural exceptions. Yea, we fear death; we fear even the thought of forgetting all those things which have engaged our attention on this earth, and in which we have found our delight, not to mention the thought of a total decay of our bodies and entire decomposition. And this we fear not only for ourselves, but also for all those who are near and dear to us. For even if so much of that which pretends to be love between man and man is hypocrisy, and can be changed into hate and indifference, there is, nevertheless, genuine love and fidelity among men; and where there is such feeling there the thought cannot be endured that the communion of hearts has been finally severed by death; and if death has come suddenly to sever this union, how is it possible not to think with fear of this monster, who with one single blow can destroy whole families, and yet the end is not yet. It is not only the shuddering at the idea

of decomposition that overwhelms the heart at the thought of death, but still more the anxiety of what shall follow after death; and whether we accept the teachings of Scripture or not, it is certain that all are by nature filled with awe at the thought of their fate after death, and in their hearts is indelibly inscribed the truth of the words, "Death is the wages of sin." Yea, even death is only the beginning of the judgment that is passed on sin, and no one can tell what the end will be. And even if some pretend to scoff and sneer at these thoughts, the natural feelings of their hearts convict them of falsehood; and history tells us of many a one who, during life, has ridiculed the fear of death, yet at the hour of departure trembled and endured sufferings that no tongue could describe. Yes, the natural man fears death; and, as contradictory as it may seem, he fears both the destruction resulting from death, as also the great unknown future that follows upon death, which may be worse than annihilation.

And yet the many means and ways which men have devised to escape from death and its consequences have proved futile and false. The many variations in which man tries to cry out "Fear not!" in the presence of the grim monster do not accomplish their purpose. In the critical hour they prove to be of no benefit or profit. They are a broken reed, not a staff upon which a man can support himself when wandering through the dark valley of death. When in this state, the mere words "Fear not" will comfort him but little, unless they are based upon the certain hope that they are not vain and empty words, but are founded upon facts that can sustain and support the heart over death and the grave, and awaken the firm assurance that death and the tomb are for us the entrance to a higher and eternal life, in which faith shall be converted into sight, and unrest give way to peace and happiness. But there is only one message which can arouse this conviction, and that is the Easter mes-

sage, "He is not here; He is risen." He who can appreciate this message in its whole length, breadth, and depth in genuine Easter faith, he has a double assurance and certainty in it. The one says to him, "We have a living Saviour, who is with us all our days to the end of the world;" the other says, "He is risen; He is the first-fruit of them which are asleep."

You say, "Yes; if this would be repeated now, and an angel or the Risen Lord Himself would with their own lips bring us this message, then, indeed, it would be easy to have an Easter faith in the Easter message; but our condition is different from that of the first recipients of this message; we are confined to faith in this matter; and in this respect too the Apostle's word prevails, that faith is not within the province of every one." Of this fact our Gospel lesson already gives us sufficient evidence, as we see from the actions of the high priests who tell the watchers to report that the disciples had stolen the body of the Lord. And the Gospel adds that they did this, and this rumor was spread abroad among the Jews, and continued to the present day. From this we see that even after the sealing of the tomb and the placing of the watchers had been in vain, the rejection of the resurrection miracle did not give way to faith in the Easter miracle. And since that there have been many others who have believed that still larger seals are upon the Saviour's tomb, and have declared the question settled for all thinking men, that the power which rolled the stone away was only the pious anxiety and the faith of the women, and that it is to them the Church owes her belief in a risen Lord.

We have seen that this view contains this kernel of truth, that it was in these women in whom for the first time the Easter message is changed into Easter joy. But that this faith was based not only upon the message, but also upon the fact that they themselves soon afterward with their own eyes saw the risen Lord, for this we have not only the

test
com
vio
of
test
mar
can
fact
den
Chu
ever
the
that
ing
Thi
very
the
they
whe
unte
of t
mus
won
whil
And
know
of t
doub
apos
sage
we s
of P
sum
give
the
pow
entir
lies
whic
conq
mies.
make
mira
cle t
woul
An
Easte
must
those
witne
pende
ance
been

testimony of the evangelists themselves concerning the appearances of the Saviour after His resurrection in the midst of His disciples, not only the powerful testimony of St. Paul, and his appeal to many still living who saw Him, but we can also, in proof thereof, appeal to a fact which no one would venture to deny—namely, the existence of the Church of Jesus Christ herself. Wherever we look into the earliest records of the establishment of the Church, we find that she was founded upon the preaching of the Gospel of the risen Lord. This proclamation went out from those very men of whom we are told, that in the night in which He was betrayed they all deserted Him and fled. And when we afterward find these men as unterrified and death-defying witnesses of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, then we must conclude that something most wonderful had transpired in the meanwhile to cause this change in them. And what this wonderful cause was we know clearly from the early accounts of the apostles. On this there is no doubt. The central thought of the apostolic preaching was always the message of the resurrection of the Lord, as we see already in the Pentecost sermon of Peter. And wherever there is a brief summary of the apostles' sermons, it is given in the words that the message of the risen Lord gave their testimony power. On this testimony rests the entire structure of the Church; here lies the secret of her strength, with which she goes out conquering and to conquer, and subduing a host of enemies. Whoever would deny this fact makes the Church an unintelligible miracle, which would be no less a miracle than is the resurrection, which they would deny.

And when we think again of this Easter admonition, "Fear not," we must not forget one thing: also among those who have not with their own eyes witnessed the resurrection and are dependent on their faith in their acceptance of this great miracle, there have been and there are still a great num-

ber upon whose faith sight has followed—a sight with the eyes of the soul—and such a sight that thereby was effected a conviction firm as the eternal hills that their Easter faith was not imagination, but an actuality and a fact. They have felt the blessed presence of the Lord in them; and out of the certainty that He lives they have gained the firm conviction that they too shall live, and live with Him, and nothing shall separate them from Him. It was their Easter faith that gave them the power to resist all the attacks of the enemy, above whose din and threats they heard the words, "Fear not!" They knew as a certainty that those who kill the body cannot harm the soul, which the Lord has redeemed and made the heir of eternal bliss.

II. It is the Easter faith that removes all fear; it is Easter joy that takes the place of this fear. This is the second thought I wish briefly to emphasize. When we are told in our text that the women, having heard the good news, hasten away from the tomb with fear and great joy, we already know that it was a different kind of fear from that which filled their hearts when they came to the sepulchre. It was the fear that ever fills the believing heart when it sees the workings of the hand of God; the fear if man is worthy to behold the wonderful doings of the Lord; the fear that through its own fault it may be deemed unworthy of the heavenly promises. Such fear is proper for us even to this day yet when we hear the Easter message; but it does not prevent our full Easter joy. There are many things in the world which are regarded as proper reasons for joy; and far be it from us to condemn all that the world calls joy. We have the testimony of the Scriptures to the effect that the Christian too can partake of those joys of the world which he can receive and use with thanksgiving toward God the giver. We can rejoice over the wonders and beauties of God in nature, for such a joy is united with thanksgiving to the Lord that with each

year He renews His mercies to mankind in the world around us. We can rejoice over the blessings which He bestows upon the labors of our hands, upon the work which is done in His name and to His glory; we can rejoice over the prosperity of our beloved ones, our children and kin, when we see in their well-doing the hand of our God. But yet all these joys have in them the beginnings of decay and failure. They are in the nature of the case transient. As the beautiful flowers may be cut down by one night's frost, thus also, if God so wills it, these and other earthly joys may fade and disappear, even if in themselves they are legitimate and pure. This shows that for genuine and lasting joy we must look elsewhere; and, thanks be to God, He has not denied us joys of this kind too—joys that are not subject to change or decay. And we can say that all that has been given us in this direction can be summoned upon in the single word "Easter joy," which has been effected by the Easter message. If you heartily rejoice in the glorious truth that God has also sent His own Son to redeem you, and by His sufferings and death has also made you His child, then does Easter joy stamp its seal upon this truth; Easter becomes the completion and fulfillment of the passion and the work of Christ; the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the amen of God to all His deeds for the salvation of man. And if you further can rejoice that nothing can now separate you from the love of God, then your Easter joy on earth is a foretaste of the heavenly Easter which you can enjoy with your Father above. And this joy is a genuine joy; it endures in the midst of all troubles and tears; and when, according to the will of an all-wise God, we are not spared the sorrows of the death of our beloved ones, then we have this comfort and assurance in the Easter message, that that which is sown in corruption shall arise in incorruption.

And now, one word yet in conclusion. We read in our text that the women

hastened to inform the disciples of the resurrection of their Lord. And when they saw the risen Lord, He said to them: "Go; tell My brethren." They hastened and told the good tidings. True joy must always communicate, it cannot keep the good things to itself, it cannot rest until others rejoice also. Now, then, let us heed this admonition: "Go and tell My brethren." If you have genuine Easter joy on account of the Easter message, then will you too become an Easter messenger. Whenever you see those in sorrow or distress, tell them "Fear not, the Lord is risen." Yea, He is arisen; He is our comfort and our joy. Amen!

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

BY REV. J. L. ALBRITTON [METHODIST], FREMONT, O.

But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?—1 Cor. xv. 35.

The fifteenth chapter of Corinthians is devoted entirely to the subject of the resurrection. Paul begins with a declaration of the Gospel, and closes with a glorious shout of triumph. The argument is divided into three parts: First, Christ's resurrection; then ours through Him who is the first fruits; and, having substantiated these facts, the apostle dwells at length upon the nature of the resurrection body. The question, "How are the dead raised up?" has nothing to do with the possibility of the resurrection—that is already settled—"As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive"—but it relates entirely to the manner or mode of the final resurrection.

On no subject of revelation has there been more controversy and speculation than on this, of the resurrection of the body. Many have been the theories suggested and given up, and many theories are held by the Christian world to-day. That there are mysteries connected with the resurrection we do not for a moment deny. Paul says, "Be-

hold, I show you a mystery," etc., and again, speaking on a subject in which the resurrection is included, he says, "Great is the mystery of godliness," etc. It is a doctrine dependent upon revelation for its proof, and upon the person of God for its realization. The term resurrection means "to rise again—a resumption of vigor," therefore we see, by the meaning of the term, that the resurrection of the body has to do with the body that has fallen into decay or death.

I. *The theories of the resurrection.*

I wish to notice the more popular theories that exist to-day, and the objections that naturally suggest themselves to them.

1. *The Swedenborgian or New Church theory.*

Emmanuel Swedenborg taught that, in addition to our visible, material body we possess a thin, airy, spiritual corporeity, which forms an immortal covering or body for the soul. When the outward, material organism dies, the soul, clad with this spiritual corporeity, glides out into the invisible world, its body glowing with wondrous splendor. Now, this is the resurrection of the body. I ask, where is there anything like a resurrection here? It is, rather, the laying off of the body, and in no sense is there even a suggestion of rising again.

2. *Then we have the germ theory, or that of vegetation.*

Those who hold to this theory affirm that in every one there is an inappreciably minute germ, not subject to the ordinary law of decay, but retaining its identity after death. That this indestructible germ is stamped, labelled, and waits for a body to gather around it, and this will be the resurrection body. Paul's word of the seed falling into the ground and dying is quoted to prove this theory true; but if one will think of rising again, he will be convinced there is no resurrection here; and the apostle's reference to the decaying seed, and after dying bringing forth fruit, is simply a suggestive argument

that dissolving into dust is no objection to living again.

3. *The theory of common elements, or a new body,* is also open to the same objections, only more positive, than the above. "The body," say the advocates of this theory, "does not consist in the gathering together again of the identical particles; the identity of the body is not that of particles, but of substance. So the oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, phosphorus, and lime are brought together; flesh and bone is the result." This is not a resurrection, but a new creation. It is not resurrection, but a substitution. Three years ago the building upon this site was burned to the ground, and this one was erected in its stead. I am told that this audience-room is very much like the old one, and the outward appearance is very much the same; but no one supposes it is the same old building erected again. It is on the same site—aye, on the same foundation; but to be a re-erection it must come from the same brick, and mortar, and boards, and nails, and paint, and oil, and everything that composed the old church. It is not the old building raised again, but a new house. The theory of common elements will not answer the fond expectation of the believer in the risen Jesus. The ties of affection are strong, and God respects them. Jacob would sleep in Machpelah, and Joseph would have his bones carried back to Shechem. I pass through the halls and rooms of the dwelling of him who lately passed from us,* and I see in various places many cherished mementoes. Why were they treasured so highly? For their intrinsic value? However much they might have been worth intrinsically, they had a value to the owner far above this. The skilled artisan might have duplicated everything that is there, but they would not have answered the purpose of these. Every one possessed a memorial value peculiar to itself. One was the gift of a dear and departed friend, another reminded the owner of a scene he did not

* Ex-President Hayes.

wish to forget. One took him back to a time when he led the forces in defence of the Union against the enemy; another suggested that more fiercely fought battle, in which he played so conspicuous a part, in the reconstruction of the affairs of the nation. All these served their purpose, and a duplicate of them would have been valueless.

A soldier lay upon the operating-table after the battle of Fair Oaks. His arm had been mangled by a ball from the enemy, and amputated while he was under the influence of anaesthetics. Recovering consciousness, he asked, "Where is my arm? It is my right arm; bring it to me, that I may see it again;" and from a pile of arms and legs his arm was brought to him, and he took the lifeless arm and hand in his remaining hand and exclaimed: "Good-by, old arm, till we meet again. No more will you wield the sabre or handle the musket in defence of our country; no more will you write letters to mother, and sisters, and loved ones at home. Good-by, old arm, till the resurrection morning." I have heard that Bishop Gilbert Haven, when dying, held up his arm, on which the signs of decay were already visible, and cried, "I believe in the resurrection of the body!"

A mother went to a national cemetery in the South to take to her Northern home the body of her soldier boy. The body was taken up and placed in a casket, and with it the mother started on her homeward way; but before she arrived at her home, a telegram overtook her, saying, "A mistake has been made; a wrong body has been placed in the casket, so you have not the body of your son with you." "Away with it! away with it!" cried the mother. "Take it back again; give me the dust of my own boy; I want no one else!" It mattered not to this mother that she bore the dust of a soldier equally as brave, and true, and good in every particular. It was not her boy, and no one else would satisfy her. The theory of common elements will not answer the

fond expectation of our regenerated human nature.

What then is the theory taught by revelation and inspiring the soul with fond, delightful anticipations? I answer:

4. *That of the literal resurrection of the body.*

"Thy dead men shall live again." "My flesh shall rest in hopes." "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body?" Bishop Newman, in a recent sermon, said: "The Scriptures teach the literal resurrection of the body which was possessed at the hour of death. It may be changed; much matter not essential to its normal condition and perfection may not be connected with it. The deformities upon it, the result of sin, may all be removed; but as to the identity of particles, that is a great scriptural fact, and is not irrational, nor is it contradicted by sound philosophy."

The principal objection to this theory is the incorporation of the body into other bodies, and, therefore, the resurrection of the identical body is an impossibility. I see nothing more objectionable to this theory than to the fact that the dead shall rise again. The resurrection is dependent upon the power of God, and the gathering of the particles is also; and surely His power is equal to the work. He that numbers the hairs of our head can watch our sleeping dust. He that fashions the countenance of man, that no two are alike, and makes the millions of leaves and blades of grass, and yet makes a difference in every one, can surely hold the particles of our fallen bodies till the day when He wills them to rise again. And if God can hold the germ inseparable to that day, He can just as easily hold the body entire. But see what man can do. Take a gold piece, and bring to bear upon it certain chemicals, and you are ready to say at once, "My gold piece is gone;" but let the chem-

ist's wand be brought upon it again, and the piece is restored without a particle of loss. Take a measure of sand, and mix well with it a handful of steel filings, and apparently it is impossible ever to separate them again. But use the magnet upon the sand, and every particle of the steel will cling to it and leave the sand alone. May not our Father possess the soul with the power of the magnet? or may not He who gave the power to the magnet give the power to the soul, on the resurrection day, to claim for its own all that formerly belonged to it?

We say, with Bishop Newman, "The resurrection of the body is a great scriptural doctrine." It rests upon the power of God, and our God is omnipotent. But,

II. Paul's argument is mainly upon the nature of the resurrection body. He is dealing unmistakably with the resurrection body, and his question has this thought directly in it: "How are the dead raised up; and with what body do they come?" We are told there are but two primordial elements in the universe—mind and matter. Paul is dealing here with matter; and his object is to show the capacity of matter for the purposes of deity. It is emphatically an argument on matter—an argument on the nature of that body that shall be forever with the Lord. "All flesh is not the same flesh"—there are different kinds. One kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another birds; but the primary elements are the same in all. "There are celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial." Celestial, as those of Enoch, and Elijah, and Christ's after His resurrection. Bodies terrestrial, as yours and mine; but that which makes the glorious body of Christ is the same matter as that which makes these common bodies of ours. "But the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another," and He illustrates this by the glory of the sun, moon, and stars: "And one star differeth from another star in glory." We see in the

evening time, as the heavens are declaring the glory of God, the bright evening star, almost rivalling the moon as the queen of the night; while far away, hardly observable by the natural eye, we see the dim star, helping in its small way to declare to us His glory. A story is told of Whitefield and Wesley, illustrating this thought. At the time when the opposition was the greatest between them, and their friends—so-called—were stirring up the strife, a party of admirers of Whitefield came to him with the question, "Do you think Mr. Wesley will be saved?" and Whitefield replied that he feared he should not see Wesley when he reached heaven. Here was food for gossip and seed to be sown to bring forth strife; but Whitefield, after a pause, continued: "Yes, I fear, for Wesley is so much like his God, and will be so near the throne, I may never see him in heaven. One star differeth from another star in glory." We see about us the capability of matter to the many forms of beauty and excellence. See the black cloud rising in the western sky in the early morning; how angry it appears! It is charged with wrath, and threatens to shut out the light of the day and deluge the earth with darkness and destruction. But the sun, mounting the heavens on his fiery course, looks out upon it for a moment, and behold! the bow of wondrous beauty reposing upon its bosom, as though an angel had kissed it. I look upon the root of the vine; there is nothing attractive or promising that I can see if I have not studied its nature; but I place it in suitable soil, and the vine grows, the leaves and flowers appear, and after awhile the luscious grape hangs upon the stem. I take the seed in my hand; there is nothing beautiful in it, but I plant it, and the flower appears, upon which I feast my eye, and it exhales its fragrance upon the air. "So is the resurrection of the dead." It is sown in corruption; to decay, to go back to the dust from whence it came. Just as soon as death comes corruption begins its work; the law of

decay is inflexible. But "it is raised in incorruption." No longer subject to this law, disease and decay are not known to the resurrection body. "It is sown in dishonor." Ah, how sad the thought, and yet how true, the body dead is in dishonor! You cannot make death beautiful or lovely, try as you may. Let me bury my dead out of my sight is the cry of every rational one. The very sight of the body, so beautiful in life, is painful in death. But "it is raised in glory." The dishonor is all taken away. Christ has removed it, and there is no dishonor attached to the resurrection body. We shall be glorious. This hope was the acme of satisfaction to David. "When I awake with Thy likeness." "It is sown in weakness," without strength, but carried by friends to be laid away; but "raised in power." Who can tell the power of a resurrected body? I have allowed myself to speculate upon this thought. I think every faculty of the soul and every sense of the body will be greatly enlarged. Our discriminating power will be finer, our receptive faculty will be greater, our spirits will take in God.

We shall see, as we do not here, not only new beauties in holiness, but new grandeur in all our Father's works. Philosophers tell us there is music in the rolling of the spheres; but we do not hear it, because we have not the hearing capacity. We shall hear then the song of the angels, the shout of the redeemed, and the ever-musical and loved voice of our Saviour saying, "Come to Me." Again, we are told that the voice of the redeemed, as they chant the praise of the Redeemer, is as the sound of many waters. You have stood and heard the awful roar of Niagara as its torrent rolled over and over. There shall arise a shout from the redeemed of earth as they come up victorious from the grave that shall be as ten thousand Niagaras. How easy it is to shout in the hour of victory, or when the memory of the triumph comes upon us! I have stood and listened at

a Grand Army reunion as thousands of the old soldiers together raise their voices in a patriotic song. How they sing! What a noise they make! Is there discord? Not to the one who is in deep sympathy with them; and when a tried and trusted leader appears in their midst, one who led them in the charge that resulted in the complete victory, how the shout goes up! So will the redeemed sing and shout, and it will be the shout of triumph—in memory of battles fought, and victories gained, and glorifying Him who led us safely through the conflict. "For when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory! O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!" And this song shall not be sung by the one hundred and forty and four thousand only, but of the ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, and the song will be, "To Him who redeemed us and washed us in His own blood, be glory, and honor, and power, and dominion forever and ever. Amen."

CHRIST'S CROSS.

By REV. JAMES E. W. COOK [BAPTIST],
NEW LONDON, O.

The cross of Jesus.—John xix. 25.

TAKING this beautiful expression out of the particular setting in which we find it, let us group around the phrase "The cross of Jesus" those thoughts of God, of His Son, and of ourselves that centre in Calvary.

Indeed, all our best thoughts will find their centre there. It is the central sun of our human system, the event around which the world's history circles. To it are gathered in one focus all the rays of light that fitfully flickered in ages

past ; from it flow forth to-day streams of light and influence that have altered the condition of the nations, and are yet destined to overmaster all that opposes it.

Since that rough and blood-stained cross was erected whole nations and tribes have disappeared. Since then the Jewish people have been scattered over the globe, crying,

"But we must wander witheringly
In other lands to die ;
And where our fathers' ashes be
Our own may never lie ;
Our temple hath not left a stone,
And Mockery sits on Salem's throne."

Since then the wisdom and philosophy of the Greek and the indomitable courage and ambition of the Roman have been humbled to the dust by "the foolishness of preaching" a crucified Saviour. And in still later times the persecution and martyrdom of saints, the horrors of slavery, the degradation of woman, the cruel treatments of old and young in our own and other lands, have been abolished by its power. Yet to-day "the cross of Jesus" stands in spite of human indifference and scepticism, the most enduring fact, the most powerful of all influences in the whole world. We can sing with grateful hearts :

"In the cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time ;
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime."

Our greatness also depends on our relation to that cross. The nearer to it we get the brighter will be the glory that falls upon us. The farther away we roam the greater our darkness, the denser our gloom.

Let the theme of our thoughts be "the cross of Jesus."

I. "The cross of Jesus" in its relation to God. What did it mean to Him ?

1. The cross gives us God's estimate of man's sin.

The Scriptures plainly assert the connection of the cross and sin. "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree." "He hath appeared

to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

We are apt to think lightly of sin, to excuse it to ourselves with the sophisms that call it "a passing weakness," "a momentary forgetfulness," "a trifle." The soil of Gethsemane was not moistened with "sweat, as it were great drops of blood" for a *trifle*. It was not a *passing weakness* that wrung the orphan wail from the very heart of Christ : "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani ?" Sin is more ghastly than we have yet realized. It broke the heart of Jesus at Calvary. It cost Him His life.

2. The cross shows us God's estimate of human nature.

I believe God created us because *He needed us*. "God is love," and He wanted—I speak reverently—beings on whom He could expend the riches of His affection, and who could return love for love. So He made man, and breathed into him the breath of His own life.

We have fallen since then ; but there are traces of our Divine origin in us still. The superscription on the coin has been worn, but not entirely obliterated. In our most confused thinking there are

"Strivings of a spirit which hates
So sad a vault should coop it."

In our wildest talk there are

"Mystic snatches of harmonious sounds,"

We have lost much of the Divine image ; but "the cross of Jesus" shows us what man was and the glorious possibilities of our nature.

"God so loved the world that He gave"—not something He did not want, as we so often give. The gift was dear to Him ; His Son was *most dear*—"His only begotten Son." He gave, so to speak, a part of Himself. This means sacrifice. God suffered on the cross for us, and in His suffering we see His estimate of human nature.

Remember, too, it was to save *sinners* that Christ died. Macaulay, I believe, tells the story of a stained-glass window, the pride of one of the English cathed-

drals. It was made by an apprentice out of the pieces of glass that had been rejected by his master. And, according to the tradition, when the master saw how far superior the window was to any of his own making, and learned whose workmanship it was, he was filled with jealous vexation and committed suicide.

All the builders before Christ had made their temples out of the "righteous," and had rejected the "sinners." "The Son of Man is come, not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." And it is a tribute to the possibilities and value of human nature, when God gives His Son to build Him a temple out of the very ruins of men.

3. The cross gives us an estimate of God's love for man.

Some speak of the cross as God's way of seeking satisfaction, or as the expression of His wrath because of sin, or as the necessary outcome of His justice. These statements are only partially true. The whole truth is that the cross manifests His love.

Nowhere else in the universe has such a revelation of God's love been given us. Nature is often cruel and relentless, and even in her most sympathetic moods we cannot fail to notice that her sun shines and her rains fall on the just and unjust alike, with a pure indifference that sometimes seems cynical. The tangled web of history presents problems equally distressing—riddles that we cannot answer, mazes for which we have no clew. Were we left to form our own opinion of the Divine Father from nature or history alone, should we not often receive the impression of His lack of sympathy, even of His cruelty? But the cross is the manifestation of His love. Love ever gives. And the greatness of His gift—"His only-begotten Son"—tells the greatness of His love.

II. "The cross of Jesus" in its relation to Christ.

Some years ago I stood within the ruins of the Coliseum at Rome. In the pale moonlight I thought I had never

seen so majestic a ruin. The proud old Roman boast came back to memory:

"While stands the Coliseum, Rome shall stand;
When falls the Coliseum, Rome shall fall;
And when Rome falls—the world."

"Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." So with this boast. The Coliseum is in ruins. Rome has become the gazing-stock of nations, the hunting-ground of tourists. But the world rolls on none the worse, perhaps all the better, for the change. No one can stand on that historic spot without thinking of the faithful men and women who there "fought the good fight of faith," and fell to receive a martyr's reward. And I thought of Him for whom they died, and of His more cruel, because less speedy, death. That was the greatest battle-field earth has ever seen—the struggle between light and darkness, God and Satan. What did the cross mean to Christ Himself?

1. The cross exhibits His obedience.

● "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." He need not have been. He might have withdrawn from the undertaking. He might have saved Himself, but He would not. In a very real sense His life was not taken from Him—He laid it down of His own accord. He obeyed the commission and will of Him who sent Him. It was no chance obedience. He knew from the beginning what lay in His path. The "shadow of the cross" accompanied Him from the outset. He had long foreseen the event. Nor was it a stolid, blind, partial obedience. You remember Christ refused the drugs, the spiced wine, the daughters of Jerusalem so mercifully used to prepare to deaden the pains endured by the malefactors who were crucified at Jerusalem. He would not lessen the trial by one moment's release from pain. He would not die with his eyes half-closed through stupefaction from the opiate thus kindly offered. He went down to death with His eyes open, His mind clear, His faculties unclouded. "He

felt all that He might heal all." It was a willing, intelligent obedience to the very end.

2. The cross exhibits His sufferings.

Not His suffering, but sufferings. They were complex, not single. Some of the elements were self-denial, physical pain, shame and humiliation, loneliness, and mental agony—the last, of all others, the hardest to bear. "His soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death."

3. The cross exhibits His infinite love toward us.

God showed His love by the gift of His Son. Christ showed His by the sacrifice He made. God's love is seen in His desire to reconcile men. Christ's love is manifested in His voluntarily undertaking to reveal this gracious design by "the death of the cross." And the suffering He endured gives us the measure of His love. Looking at the pain and at the love, we think of the language of Heine:

"I know not which was greater of the twain,
Only that they were great—both love and pain."

4. "The cross of Jesus" is the exhibition of victory.

That is what it meant to Him.

"And He said, 'It is finished,' and He bowed His head and gave up the ghost."

There must have been a flash of joy in the hearts of the surrounding Pharisees as they heard these words. They would take them as a confession of failure from the lips of the dying fanatic. The Sanhedrim thought "it was finished" through their power and determination, and they rejoiced that they had rid themselves of so dangerous a pest.

Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea thought "it was finished" as they embalmed and buried the body. All the disciples thought "it was finished" as the tomb was sealed and the guards were posted around it, and turned away with sadness, saying, "We trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel."

Finished! and so it was, but not in the way they thought. Failure, disappointment, defeat—these were not there. Christ's words are words of victory. The plan of redemption is completed. His life's mission is accomplished. His sufferings are ended. The battle is over.

"And Victory remains with love,
For He, our Love, is crucified."

It is no gospel of failure Christ has brought us. It is the gospel of hope, of success, of victory.

An old legend speaks of a good man, a kind father, and gentle husband, who suddenly became cold, indifferent, even cruel. Soon he lost all interest in those around him, and sank into a state of stupor and coma. His children called to him and shed tears upon his hands; his wife threw herself across his feet; his friends brought jewels and gold to tempt him, but all was of no avail. Human love was cold in his heart; he neither heeded nor heard.

At last they fetched an old hermit, and told him of their trouble. The good old man took a crucifix out of his bosom, and raised it so that its shadow fell across the cold, deadened father. And the shadow of the cross revived him, and he returned to life and to love.

It is only an old story; and we do not worship the sign or attach virtue to the crucifix. But there is a significant truth here. There is hatred, and indifference, and evil in the world. All remedies we may try will fail to counteract them. But "the cross of Jesus" will not fail. Raise *that*, and let its shadow fall on human hearts, and the indifferent will become interested; the sinful, pure; the dead, alive.

The old Romans' boast about the Coliseum and their city has failed; but there is a boast that neither time nor eternity will ever be able to break down. It was made by Jesus when He said: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

III. "The cross of Jesus" in its relation to men.

If we could have got back to God by

our own exertions, Christ would never have come into the world. It seems to be a law of God never to do for us what we can do for ourselves. But we were helpless, so Christ came. This is the pitiful testimony of history—not that men grew better, but that years only increased their ignorance of all that was spiritual and just. Among the Jews religion had become a lifeless form, a dead ceremony, and chilling in its moral effects. Among the heathen it was nothing more than the blind groping in darkness, and losing themselves in the doubled night. The strugglings of the human heart to find God were pitifully futile. The philosophy and wisdom of the Athenians (Athens was the university of the world) were baffled by the realities of life. Men were drifting helplessly into further depths of vice, and knowledge was no check to their course. "The world by wisdom knew not God." And "the cross of Jesus" stands forever as the memorial of our utter inability to save ourselves.

2. The cross is the witness of man's guilt.

We do not see the vileness of our guilt when in the midst of sin. The young man who has left his country home "to see life" in the great city, and is "seeing death" instead, does not realize the evil of his course amid the excitement of his carousals in the saloon, or his betting in the gambling hells. But when he comes back and hears his good old father say: "Ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave," he begins to realize his guilt. Gazing on the dying Innocent One, we see our sin in a clearer light.

3. The cross is the pledge and hope of man's salvation.

The chasm made by sin has been bridged over. The way to heaven is by the cross.

"As to the holy Patriarch
That wondrous dream was given,
So seems my Saviour's cross to me
A ladder up to Heaven."

He, the Son, became man that we might become sons. He took the cup

of sorrow that we may drink from the chalice of salvation. He tasted death that we might live. He had no reason to die for Himself, to suffer for Himself. It was all endured for our sakes. "And with His stripes we are healed."

In one of the English north country factories several girls and women were employed. In one of the rooms was a Christian girl, the butt for the sarcasm and spite of all the rest. The ring-leader among her persecutors was one day caught in the wheels of the machinery. She was being quickly drawn into a frightful death when the Christian girl ran up, at the sound of the cry, and thrust her bare right arm into the wheels, and so saved her tormentor's life. Don't you think her bleeding arm would bring healing to the other? Would it not fill the tormentor with sorrow and shame—but also with love?

So by His stripes healing comes to us. We learn to love Him, and the Father who gave Him. And the soul cries with heartfelt gratitude, like Paracelsus:

"And I look to Thee, and I trust in Thee,
As in a northern night one looks alway
Unto the East for morn and spring and joy."

"Salvation," that means justification, adoption into the family of God, sanctification, and, at least, glorification when He shall appear; and this is what "the cross of Jesus" means to us.

Yet our relation to the cross is a very different thing to the cross's relation to us. Can we pass by unheeding, or stand to mock? What is your relation to that cross? Will you look at it with despair, or as Paul did when he said: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Jesus Christ?" It remains for you to decide. Only remember, if this cross does not melt your heart, nothing else ever will. There is no other hope for you. Oh, let the influence of "the cross of Jesus" enter your hearts!

"And as fresher flowers the sod perfume,
Where buried saints are lying,
So our hearts shall gather a sweet'ning bloom,
From the image He left there in dying."

HUNTING HERETICS AND SAVING MEN.

BY SIMON J. MCPHERSON, D.D. [PRESBYTERIAN], CHICAGO, ILL.

And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against you is for you.—Luke ix. 49, 50.

It seems to be clear, then, that in the view of our Lord, a devoted disciple and even the Apostle of Love himself, may have an excess of zeal in trying to silence those who do hold his particular attitude of discipleship or share his peculiar methods of service. John and the others, who forbade this man to cast out devils in Christ's name because he did not follow them, were undoubtedly sincere and actuated by what seemed to them superior loyalty to the Master. But religious leaders require something more than sincerity and good motives. Paul told King Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 9) that before his conversion he verily thought with himself that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Therefore, in spite of his sincerity, ignorantly and in unbelief, he imprisoned many Christians, voted for their death, strove to make them blaspheme, and, being exceedingly mad against them, persecuted them unto foreign cities. He needed to know the truth as it is in Jesus, and to act in the spirit of the Saviour. As he says elsewhere (Acts xxiv. 4), he needed to learn to serve God after the way which orthodox Jews called heresy. But subsequently to his conversion, he not only saw the truth in a different light, but his sincerity took on a sweeter, because a Christian, temper. Accordingly, in the text, we find Jesus Christ rebuking John's misdirected zeal and breaking up his narrow prejudices.

Nor did our Lord stop even here. Immediately following the text, this very chapter gives a still broader illustration of the Christian spirit. When

the apostles, as Christ's messengers, went into a Samaritan village to make ready for His reception, the residents would not receive Him because He was on His way to Jerusalem, which they hated. It was an exhibition of narrow partisanship. James and John thought it an outrage, as indeed it was, and they asked Him whether they should call down fire from heaven to consume these contumacious villagers. That would have been "discipline" with a vengeance! "But He turned, and rebuked them. And they went to another village." Here we have a specimen of Jesus' method of dealing with those who seemed to be personally even hostile to Him, at least according to the text of the Revised Version of the New Testament. The Authorized Version of King James adds other phrases. For instance: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

If a digression can be permitted at this point, we may observe that this difference in versions raises an interesting question, which has a bearing on our recent heresy trials in the Presbyterian Church. Certainly there appears to be nothing inconsistent with Christ's teaching in these additional phrases of King James's version. Neither their insertion nor their omission could be ascribed to theological bias. Why, then, should they be excluded from the Revised Version? Simply because, on critical grounds alone, the revisers believed they were not in the original text of this gospel. Do we actually know that they either were or were not? We know, and now at least we can know, nothing about the original copy at first hand, for the good reason that it is lost. The margin of your Revised New Testament says that "some ancient authorities" add one or other of these phrases. But in the judgment of the revisers, the preponderance of testimony is against their admission. Therefore, without any ulterior motive, theological or otherwise, with no "authority" at all beyond that of the ap-

parent facts, these words were excluded in the light of such evidence as is at present available. By reverent and critical scholarship, the revisers and others have simply tried their best to find out what was probably in "the original autograph." Has, then, scholarship no function—has criticism, either this lower and textual or the higher and literary criticism, no function in the study of the Bible? Nobody worth considering seems to deny it. So long as it is reverent, capable, honest, and fearless, the more scholarly and critical investigation is given to the Bible, the better it is for us, because the better it is for the truth and the Bible itself. Eventually we must all face the facts, whatever they may turn out to be, and whether they agree with our preconceived opinions or not. The sooner we can get at them accurately, the sooner we can adjust our thinking and our living to them. I for one have no apprehension of the final result as to the Bible. It has endured ages of investigation, even of hostility; and it appears to be more vital, better understood and more blessedly influential than ever before. But quite aside from any such conviction, the questions just now at issue about the Bible are questions of fact. While there is a legal sense in which such questions can be judicially determined, I do not see how it can be ascertained by mere ecclesiastical authority, whether they are really true or false. The Roman Catholic Church might make such a bold claim of infallibility, but in the judgment of Protestants, ecclesiastical authority cannot be regarded as the real criterion. Investigation opens the only possible road to a knowledge of the facts.

But, returning to the text, our Lord Himself seems to give us the standard for testing an alleged heretic. "He that is not against you is for you" (compare Mark ix. 38-41). We are not to disfellowship those who differ from us in non-essential opinions or methods, but only those who fundamentally antagonize Christ. When He was accused

of doing His gracious work by devilish means, His reply was: "He that is not with Me is against Me; and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad" (Luke xi. 23). Those who actually destroy Christ's saving work are excluded. But those who help on His work, whatever their differences of opinion or of method, are to be cherished. To this effect is the general dictum (Luke xvi. 13) of the Sermon on the Mount: "No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God *and* Mammon." According to the plain teaching of our common Master, the one fundamental test by which a minister's good standing should be determined is, whether he is really serving Christ or anti-Christ.

Suppose that we apply this principle to the recent case, in Cincinnati, of Dr. Henry P. Smith. The question is not, "Has he ever been injudicious in his statements or rash in his speculations?" I think that he has been; but who of his accusers, or of us all, would dare cast the first stone at him on this account? The real gravamen of the charges against him appears to be that he announced a theory of inspiration which is not acceptable to many of us; and, in particular, through the medium of a paper which he had been invited to read before a company of ministers, he held that, while believing the Bible to be the Word of God and the infallible standard of religious faith and moral conduct, he did not regard it as inerrant on all subordinate matters of science and history. I do not say that he was right in that opinion. He may, and I believe he will, turn out to be mistaken in it. But that, to me, is not the important point in his case.

Let me say, also, that I do not believe his accusers were insincere or malicious. I have no doubt that they verily thought within themselves that they ought to secure his condemnation for what seemed to them heresy. But neither is this the controlling question.

It is acknowledged, I understand, by all, including his prosecutors, that Dr. Smith is a true Christian, of an honest, earnest, gentle, and consecrated spirit; that he has uniformly preached the saving Gospel of Christ, and that he has even not promulgated his questionable or disputed hypotheses in the classrooms of Lane Seminary, where he is a teacher. Nevertheless, he was convicted, and, by the narrow majority of four in a total of fifty-eight votes, the Presbytery suspended him from the ministry of the Gospel until he retracts his "views." Think of it! While our denomination recognizes the good standing of all evangelical ministers, many of whom differ radically on some points from our system of doctrine, this Presbytery, at least temporarily, deletes Dr. Smith's ordination altogether! The pulpits of the denomination are closed against him. "He cannot solemnize a marriage, pronounce a benediction, baptize a child, nor break bread at the Lord's table." Brethren, is that consistent? He follows not the majority of four in the Presbytery of Cincinnati, and therefore he is forbidden to exercise the functions of a minister of Christ. Is that in accordance with the teachings of Christ in our text? Would not our Lord rebuke that majority and those prosecutors as He rebuked John? Is it right or Christian? Is it not rather a shame and a scandal, a grievously excessive punishment and, generally, an unwarrantable condemnation? In the Master's name, I believe it is. Of what law of our Saviour is it "ministerial and declarative"?

I have never even seen this brother. With many of his opinions, as I understand them, I have no personal sympathy. But this disposition of his case, and indeed the whole judicial case against him, seems to me injurious and very lamentable. It is a step toward narrowing, almost asphyxiating, our beloved Church. It brings restlessness to many of our holiest ministers and members, so that some of them, to my sore regret, are already thinking of a

separation or an exodus, as a necessity, if the General Assembly should confirm this decision. It is contrary to the spirit of tolerance, liberty, and peace, and it tends to paralyze the concerted work of the Church. Why should we not all cultivate patience? Why, especially, should these prosecutors promote a panic in the Church over questions which, however new to some, are subordinate? Time, and time alone, will show both the truth and the falsehood in these so-called new opinions; but such an exercise of disciplinary power decides nothing discriminatingly. The counsel of Gamaliel (Acts v. 34-39) has an applicability to the case.

I may be a conservative in my doctrinal views, but I want a church as comprehensive as Jesus Christ requires. Day by day I am trying to avoid an intolerant spirit toward the attitude of these sincere but, as I think, intolerant and greatly mistaken prosecutors. I need to do so, for the Christian spirit (1 Cor. xiii.) is above all; and, conscious as I am of some capacity for fighting, I want to restrain it and to promote those things which make for peace, and which help on the King's urgent business of saving and edifying, not of destroying or pursuing, men.

Much the same things, with characteristic differences, might be said of the case of Dr. Briggs, who was acquitted the other day by the Presbytery of New York. His case has been appealed to the next General Assembly, with which the final and, in its possible influence toward harmony or disaffection, momentous judicial decision will rest.

Now, I bring no railing accusation against these prosecutors. I believe them to be entirely honest and sincere men, who think that vitals of our faith have been assailed. Some of them at least I personally know as men of fidelity and consecration, if not of any large special knowledge of the facts in controversy. Like many others who differ from them in view-point, I earnestly deprecate any attack upon their motives. But, at the same time, I regard them as

thoroughly mistaken in their methods and as made very timid by their narrowness of vision. I have no idea that the foundations of our faith are so shaky that they will cave in if we *men* do not hold them up. Worse storms have been easily weathered by our faith in many past ages. It is our faith's divine foundation, or, concretely, its incarnate divine Founder, that supports us; not we who support it. While God remains with us, its safety, most of all in non-essential matters, will not depend upon our judicial processes. Indeed, looking at the matter historically, it is difficult for me to make out any great benefit that heresy trials have ever brought to Christ in our church; but is it so hard to discern evils which they have inflicted? In particular, has the Bible suffered no loss of influence over men in past ages by the intermeddling of ecclesiastical authority? I am convinced that it is by no means necessary—it may even be presumptuous—for us to suppose that every time the vehicle in which we carry the Bible receives a jolt we must put forth our hands and make bold to steady it as Uzza would have steadied the ark of God. We stand upon and for the inspired Word of God, because it stands by us, against all enemies and adversaries. But, after all, the great business with it which He prescribes to us would seem to be—to preach and practise it rather than to prove any human theory about it. For when it is simply received and proclaimed, the Holy Spirit makes the Bible itself the best witness to its truth and grace.

On the other hand, however, I am by no means saying that Dr. Briggs is right in all his positions. Indeed, I think him quite wrong in many of them. While the "higher criticism," or the literary and historical scrutiny of the character and origin of the human elements in the Bible, unquestionably has a sphere of usefulness which we cannot afford to ignore or to shut summarily out of view, I have no personal doubt that at present much of it consists of

crude guesses and undigested hypotheses which will ultimately explode and disappear; and I am sure that in the hands of rationalists and naturalists like Kuenen and Wellhausen, some of it is radically false and injurious. But Dr. Briggs is a Christian and, by choice and conviction, a Presbyterian. Shall not such a Christian scholar as he is have liberty for thorough and reverent investigation within the Presbyterian Church? Must every such student be forced to go outside in order to find liberty for unbiassed research? I do not so understand Christ and His Church.

In this connection, candor compels me to say that Dr. Briggs has often, and most of all perhaps in his too-famous "Inaugural Address," been unfortunate in his manner and temper. Not unfrequently his words have been rasping and well fitted to excite opposition. Many a time he has made it extremely uncomfortable even for his best friends. Little as I know him personally, I have more than once found my own convictions and prejudices challenged to take up arms, as I have read his words. If he were left free to advocate his views on their merits in the arena of open discussion, I should, in my own modest place and with such poor resources as I have, take issues with several of his distinctive theories.

But the thing has now gone far beyond any matter of individual idiosyncrasy or weakness. It has become a question of the limits of toleration and liberty within the Church. I have so far, in the interest of peace and good will, kept silence in this pulpit as to this controversy. But I am convinced by the signs of the times that the hour has at last come when every minister of our church should declare himself and give his testimony. I therefore say to you that, however I may differ from him, I do not believe that he has attacked any fundamental or essential truth of Christianity. For that reason, in the name of legitimate liberty, I am with him *as against his accusers*. In some of the matters at issue, as I understand him, I

agree with him. But most of all, quite independently of what I particularly believe as to the subordinate matters in dispute, I plead for him as the casual representative of imperilled liberties and of a comprehensive rather than a narrow or uniform Church.

He has been charged with making the reason and the Church co-ordinate fountains of authority in religion with the Bible. I do not agree with that view. He denies that he does, and I believe him. He says expressly that they are subordinate, as I suppose all evangelical Protestants believe. But we all know that they do have an authority. If they did not, how could he be tried at all by reasonable men in the Presbytery, and how could his prosecutors find ecclesiastical authority to accuse him?

He has been charged with teaching "progressive sanctification" after death. His writings, as I have read them, are rather hazy on that point, probably because human knowledge of it is so. The Scriptures tell us little about it. He denies, however, that he believes, or teaches a belief, in purgatory, or in redemption after death. He believes that Christians become sinless at death. If he means to say merely that Christians make progress in capacity, knowledge, happiness and the achievements of moral character in the future world, it seems to me that we might all so far agree with him.

He says that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, and that Isaiah did not write half the book which bears his name. I think that he is mistaken in these opinions. But I might easily turn out to be the mistaken one. At any rate, I want to keep my mind open to any further light that may dawn upon such questions of fact. Will the inspiration of those books, which are attested by our Lord Himself, be destroyed, if they should be proved to have a composite character? Does inspiration depend upon human authorship? Who wrote the Books of Samuel, Kings, or Chronicles, or the Epistle to the Hebrews? Nobody in this genera-

tion actually knows. Both Dr. Smith and Dr. Briggs avow their belief in the Bible as the Word of God, and as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Unless their honesty be questioned and their motives traduced, is not that enough? If their avowals are not to be believed, had they not better be tried first on charges of immorality and falsehood? But so long as their sincerity is acknowledged—and who would question their competency or culture?—we may well inquire whether they are bound to hold the same identical *theory* of inspiration with me or with their accusers in order to be tolerated in the Presbyterian Church.

The real crux of the allegations against both, however, is found, as I suppose, in the third charge against Dr. Briggs; namely, that errors *may* have existed in the original text of Scripture as it came from the authors. They say that these errors, even if they did exist, did not affect the fundamentals, but only the circumstantialia of the Bible. Well, Dr. Charles Hodge, one of the noblest, as well as one of the most conservative, teachers that I ever had, is reported to have said that there are imperfections in the "minima" of the Bible, like specks of sandstone in the marble of the Parthenon. Does anybody claim that the Bible is, or that it was meant to be, a text-book in science? We do think it a text-book of a sublime sort on certain epochs and episodes of ancient history; yet it is at least a fair question whether any part was primarily written, and intended, to teach history in itself. Its histories seem to be in order to something else—what Jonathan Edwards called "The History of Redemption." But the Bible is, and by Drs. Briggs and Smith it is declared to be, pre-eminently the text-book on morals and religion, on the way of salvation by Christ Jesus.

Are these men, then, to be put out of the Presbyterian Church, with pain and stress and upheaval, because they believe, as an abstract fact, that there *may* have been errancy in the relative mi-

nutia of the "original autographs" of scriptural books? I have all along believed that those originals, if they could be recovered, would be found inerrant. I have believed, and I am still of the opinion, that not only the "various readings" of the text, but also the apparent discrepancies and the difficulties, for example, of chronology and numbers, no one of which affects any vital element of Christianity, might prove to be due to mistakes and "pious frauds" in transcription. I am aware, at any rate, that a growing knowledge of recondite history has already wonderfully removed many of these stumbling blocks. But how am I to prove that the original copies of the biblical books were absolutely errorless? They were lost or destroyed centuries ago. All existing copies date from some period at least about four hundred years after Christ. Can I lawfully claim such inerrancy by a mere appeal to dogmatic human ignorance? Shall our church take the unwarrantable, presumptuous, and hazardous position that every one of her ministers must assert without qualification that these originals were flawless? In the nature of the case, the minister cannot know it; he can have only an opinion as to such an abstract fact. He can know neither at first hand nor at second hand. He can but infer what the facts seem to him to be, after studying and comparing the copies of copies of copies of copies, in a series now indefinite and interminable.

The Bible itself appears to lay down no such explicit test of good standing in the ministry. Even our "Confession of Faith," in its famous first chapter, makes no such claim and demands subscription to no such theoretical fact. Indeed, the Committee on Revision have added a phrase to that chapter, in order, apparently, to make its claim stronger and closer. The majority of the Westminster Assembly, which formulated the Confession, undoubtedly held the opinion that the original text of the Scriptures was entirely errorless. But it would appear to be certain that a few

of them maintained a different opinion. Yet, knowing this difference of opinion, the Assembly did not insert a declaration of such inerrancy as belonging to the confessional system of doctrine. That is, as I am convinced, they did not assume the attitude of these prosecutors.

Nor, so far as I can ascertain, has our Presbyterian Church ever made it a constitutional or confessional test of orthodoxy. Had it done so, it would have discredited the ministerial standing of Richard Baxter, whose "Call to the Unconverted" and "Saints' Everlasting Rest" are commonly regarded as wholesome; of Martin Luther, who repudiated the Epistle of James without circumlocution, and possibly even of John Calvin himself, who, in some of his commentaries, seems to adopt a much less ultra theory of inspiration than these prosecutors. It would also, long ago, have discredited some of the best of our own Presbyterian ministers. Is not the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, historically interpreted, close enough for safety? The General Assembly is as truly subject to that constitution as the humblest individual minister. I absolutely deny the legal or moral right of the Assembly to impose new tests of orthodoxy, either by deliverance or judicial decision.

It is to me an abhorrent thing that at this day and in this country, our church should even think of making the old theological lines narrower. They need broadening, if anything. We need to take our attention off these abstract and subordinate questions of opinion, and to centre it upon the essential and fundamental and practical and vital questions of living Christianity for a dying world.

I love the Presbyterian Church. It is the church of my fathers. I was baptized in it, and I have spent the thirteen years of my ministry in its service. I am proud of her great achievements and of her Christ-like men of all shades of Presbyterian opinion. I do not want to see her divided or even disturbed. "Twice already," as a friend writes, "our church has been rent asunder

upon issues which have been recognized shortly afterward as unnecessary." I "dread the possibility of having such an experience wrought in our times." I am "persuaded that the great body of the church, laymen and ministers, have little sympathy with the extremes of dogmatic" opinion or with dogmatic conflict, "and are already weary of the strife of tongues and longing for peace and united labors." I am, therefore, sore-hearted at the obvious schismatic tendency of these ecclesiastical prosecutions. I am distressed to know that some of our most devoted and useful ministers are considering whether they can stay in the church if the General Assembly condemns these men on these grounds. I hear, but I hope to find the report "errant," that in New York the Episcopal Church is even now reaping a harvest from the controversies of Presbyterians. I am using what influence I possess to keep these restless ministers in our church until the existing foolish alarm shall have spent itself. I should like to use my influence to the same effect with any of you that feel disturbed. Let us stay here and stand not only for our own rights and liberties, but also for the equal rights and liberties of any of our fellow-Presbyterians that may differ from us in minor opinions. If parties must be formed, and some must, in obedience to conscience, eventually go out, forced thereto by narrow leaders who would have all Presbyterians of their own theological type, suitable action can be taken when the necessity actually comes. But may God spare any of us that necessity! We do not need more denominations. Division would be a terrible disaster to the cause of Christ, as, for example, to our missionary, educational, and benevolent work. We want tolerance and charity and good will and united endeavors.

Much as I love the Presbyterian Church, her history, her government, her polity, her system of Reformed teaching, I prize not so much her fringe of peculiar distinctives as the great

seamless robe of our common Christianity, which she shares with all the true churches of Christ. I may claim, let me hope, that it is Christ that I try to preach, not the mere suffix in the word and the thing that we call Presbyterianism. Unity and not separation, an emphasizing of the generic essentials and not of the divisive incidentals, is what the Lord enjoins and the world needs.

How petty and almost contemptible these controversies appear to me, when I look out upon the world lying in radical unbelief and sin and misery. Are we Christians not here, as the great Redeemer was, to save these multitudes for whom He died? Oh, men, my brothers, we cannot afford to waste this brief life, and to darken yonder swift-coming, mysterious hour of death, by splitting hairs over church platforms and church politics.

The living, life-giving Christ! That is our sole and sufficient theme. A life disloyal to him is the fundamental heresy. The constraint of His sweet and awful love is the essential orthodoxy. Christ, the Sacrifice for sinners; Christ, the Teacher of the ignorant; Christ, the King of faithful souls; the Emancipator of moral slaves; the Consoler of the sorrowing; the sure Hope of the dying; the Guide of the baffled children of God; the Heaven of glorified multitudes innumerable on high; my Christ, your Christ, humanity's Christ; He alone is the truth, the life, the bond, and the test of the true Church of God.

THE POWER OF THE KEYS.

BY REV. W. T. NOBLE, B.A., L.TH.
[CHURCH OF ENGLAND], QUEBEC
CITY, CAN.

Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.—
John xx. 23.

THESE words—like most words of transcendent importance to mankind, and perhaps on that account—have become the subject of bitter controversy;

and if their intrinsic value is to be measured by the extent and intensity of this controversy, then it is great indeed, if not incalculable. But here the same law prevails as in all matters subject to the control of fallible free agents; namely, the greater the power for good when rightly directed, the greater the power for evil when wrongly directed. Therefore the duration and unabated fierceness of this controversy indicate the importance of the issues at stake, and prove that the truth has not yet been discovered; for when Truth, in her native majesty and dazzling splendor, takes the field, darkness will vanish and error will disappear, like phantoms of the night when the sun has risen in his strength. But the pernicious deductions and sophistical quibbling with which these words are still surrounded, amply prove the magnitude of the unsolved problem, which now demands our consideration. If these words are correctly translated and mean all they say, they are laden with boundless blessings for all mankind; but if they do not mean what they seem to say, then they are a sublime mockery and a cruel sham, calculated to deceive and damn the souls of men. They are surrounded by every circumstance that can add solemnity and importance to the message they contain. For God incarnate, after His resurrection from the dead, breathed on His apostles and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John xx. 22). This is neither a prayer nor the profane acting of a sinful mortal, but the sober language of Christ commanding them to receive what He, and He alone, had power to give. It is the gift of One in whose wise and economical administration nothing is wasted. For what great and gracious purpose, then, was such a special blessing vouchsafed? Our text supplies the answer: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." This commission, thus translated, conveys to the apostles authority to remit or retain, to save or to damn, all mankind in every subsequent age or

nation; for there is no limitation placed on the exercise of this authority, and there are no conditions imposed. It contains a judicial as well as a dispensing power, for they are called upon and left free to determine whose sins they will remit, and whose they will retain—that is, whomsoever they will they may save, and whomsoever they will they may damn. Who is sufficient for these things? God alone. And yet Christ appears to surrender these divine prerogatives of justice and mercy to the apostles, and these He leaves them free to exercise according to their own good pleasure, without regard to the quantity or quality of any man's sins. Thus, having procured the world's redemption by His incarnation, life, death, and resurrection, He places the world's salvation in the hands of sinful men, to be disposed of by them according to the ruling whims and fancies of such beings; and henceforth every appeal for justice or mercy must be to the apostles, Christ having thus divorced Himself from the Church, "which He purchased with His own blood," and placed its eternal destinies in the hands of sinful mortals. All access to God through Christ is thus cut off or superseded, and we are left to the tender mercies of men.

This is no exaggerated dream, but the sober interpretation which has been placed on these words, and, if our Lord's language will bear this interpretation, many will have to reconsider their present position; but the very possibility of such an interpretation suggests something wrong somewhere.

This commission, thus interpreted, places an awful responsibility on the apostles; and if they recognized and realized it, their lives would henceforth have been spent in pardoning sinners. Now, when we turn to the apostolic history, to learn what interpretation they put upon their Lord's commission, we are struck with the remarkable fact that they never once presume to forgive the sins which men have committed against the God of heaven. If our Lord's words had conveyed this mean-

ing, it seems impossible that they could have remained all their lives ignorant of it; and if they consciously possessed the power, it is equally unaccountable why they did not exercise it. Shall we charge them with culpable ignorance, or criminal malpractice? Neither, at present, until we have examined the correctness of our English translation. Here we are met by the strange facts that the Greek word *aphiemi*, here translated *remit*, occurs one hundred and thirty-four times in the Greek New Testament, and is never so translated except in this verse; and the Greek word *krateo*, here translated *retain*, occurs forty-five times in the Greek New Testament, and is never so translated except in this verse. What motive could have produced this unparalleled rendering of these words? Now there is something unaccountably suspicious about this translation, derived—as it manifestly is—from the Latin, when read in the light of the history of the Middle Ages, with its sale of indulgences, for which some authority was required. Thus we have an unusual translation coming to us through the Latin or Roman Church, and we find that *this church* had a sufficient motive for adopting this translation, and that *this church* did actually avail herself of all the authority which it ostensibly conveys; and, as if to emphasize and utilize this authority, this commission, thus translated, was imported into the ordination service in the thirteenth century; hence the sale of indulgences, that woke the lion-hearted Luther, in the early part of the sixteenth century. And Rome has even gone beyond what this commission authorizes, and imposed conditions not contained in it; for she has classified sins into *venial* and *mortal*, and imposed penances on the living and purgatorial torments on the dead, remission from which, directly or indirectly, may be purchased for money. And it is a notorious fact that an enormous revenue has been derived from this source in the past. Thus the Church of Rome, having put the most literal interpretation on this mistransla-

tion, and regarding the commission herein contained as a hereditary bequest, claims a dispensing power over the living and the dead; and as this dispensing power has a market value, she has a vested interest in the sins of mankind; and the assumption of this dispensing power, thus regulated, is the chief source of wealth and power in the Church of Rome. And what a source of wealth and power it may become, in the hands of an avaricious and ambitious priesthood, the page of history unfolds. But this translation, with its obvious interpretation thus elaborated, is God-dishonoring and immoral, and has resulted in mortals assuming divine prerogatives and making merchandise of sin.

And hence we are driven to seek for another translation, more consistent with the teaching of Christ and the practice of His apostles. Is such a rendering of the original Greek possible? Yes; upon the authority of Liddell and Scott's "Greek Lexicon," it may be thus translated: "*Whosoever sins ye let alone, they are permitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye prevail against, they are vanquished.*" What a transformation this creates! It sweeps away at once all apparent sanction of the above blasphemous assumptions, and imposes such rational and practical duties as may be performed by men. The obvious duties here imposed on the apostles are to identify sin and brand it as such, and, with all the intellectual and moral forces at their command, to fight against it until it is vanquished. This is a great and important work, thoroughly consistent with the relative positions of God and man, gloriously possible, and highly desirable. And it was to qualify them for this work that Christ breathed on them and commanded them to receive the Holy Ghost, whose peculiar office it was to "reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment" (John xvi. 8). The necessity for this work Christ points out in the following words: "Of sin, because they believe not on Me; of righteousness,

because I go to my Father, and ye see Me no more ; of judgment, because the Prince of this world is judged" (John xvi. 9, 10, 11). Now Christ, the only perfect man who ever rendered a perfect obedience, in the letter and in the spirit, to the righteous law of God, was about to return to His Father ; and with the gift of the Holy Ghost He delegates to the apostles the responsible duty of upholding the standard of righteousness which He had exemplified in His own life on earth. To realize the importance of this work, we must remember that the Jews had made void the law of God by their traditions, and that the heathen by their philosophy—falsely so called—had obscured the light of nature and blunted the moral conscience ; and hence the whole world lay in darkness and the shadow of death.

In such a world there was no well-defined and commonly recognized line of demarcation between right and wrong ; and hence there could be no unconquerable love of right, and irreconcilable hatred of wrong. And yet these two principles, love and hatred, are essential to the destruction of wrong and the triumph of right. But wrongdoing is the offspring of error, and error can only appear as such in the light of truth. John says, "The Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John iii. 8). What are they ? The propagation of error, for Christ calls him "the father of lies" (John viii. 44). Now as Christ came to destroy the works of the devil, and as you can only destroy falsehood by the truth, how did Christ regard the accomplishment of this work ? He says, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (John xviii. 37). Thus Christ regarded the truth as the ordained instrument wherewith to destroy the works of the devil. And to His disciples He said : "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me" (Acts i. 8) ; that is, witnesses to the Divine witness to the truth, for the destruction of the works of the

devil. And to qualify these human witnesses for so important a work, He gave them the Holy Ghost to guide them into all truth, and to make them strong and fearless in proclaiming and defending the truth. The utility of all this is manifest from the fact that it is only in proportion as you clearly see, deeply love, and firmly grasp the truth, that you can hate error. And you must hate it with an intense and well-sustained hatred to prevail against it and vanquish it. Now the commission for the carrying out of which they received the Holy Ghost not only authorizes this kind of warfare, but is calculated to impress them with the importance of carrying it on, with all the energy and resources at their command. For the sins they let alone were permitted to the people, with all their damning consequences ; but the sins they prevailed against were vanquished, to the benefit of mankind and the glory of God. Thus the apostles were to carry out the work of the incarnate Christ on the very same lines and with the very same weapons which Christ employed ; restoring the standard of right by the manifestation of the truth, and putting an end to wrongdoing by the destruction of error, and thus destroying the works of the devil. It is worthy of careful observation that the practice of the apostles is in perfect accord with this translation and interpretation. For example : A member of the Corinthian Church marries his father's wife (1 Cor. v. 1), and if Paul had let him alone this practice would have been permitted, with all its pernicious consequences, as there was no other standard by which it could have been condemned and stamped out. But the apostle, mindful of the Divine commission, and sustained by the Holy Ghost, prevailed against this sin and vanquished it. This obvious interpretation of Christ's commission has been, and must remain, the practice of Christ's Church until the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ ; for to maintain the Divine standard of right and wrong,

and to drive wrongdoing out of the Church, must ever be the work of the Church militant. We must not let drunkenness, gambling, and Sabbath-breaking alone; but, guided by the Holy Ghost, and armed with the truth, prevail against them till they are vanquished. So, in like manner, lying, slandering, fraud, and robbery must be vanquished. For if we let these things alone, they will be permitted, to the present and everlasting destruction of human happiness. The work thus indicated in our Lord's commission, and recognized by His apostles, is still the supreme difficulty of our missionaries in heathen lands, where no true standard of moral right and wrong exists. Hence the question of polygamy in Africa, which baffled the united wisdom of our bishops at the Lambeth Conference in 1888. Not, therefore, the pardoning of sin, but the identification and extermination of sin, are the duties imposed by this commission, when rightly translated, and interpreted according to apostolic practice. And this will best promote the happiness of men, in time as well as in eternity. For it is necessary not only to create a deep love of truth, producing an intense hatred of error, but you must keep these alive in the soul, if men are to be saved from the evil that is in the world. Look, for a moment, at the contrast between the apostolic practice and the system of modern priestcraft. Priestcraft encourages sin by remitting the penal consequences thereof, and thereby weakening man's sense of its enormity; but the apostles go to the root of all evil-doing—error—and destroy it with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Priestcraft, usurping the place of God, comes between God and the sinner; but the apostles sought to present every man perfect in Christ, by whom we all have access to the Father. Priestcraft offers salvation for money and merits, while the apostles said: "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." Priestcraft puts a specific price on all sins, which the

sinner must pay; while the apostles teach that Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, and that His blood cleanseth us from all sin. This apostolic interpretation of Christ's commission was too much lost sight of in the subsequent ages, while an ambitious priesthood was arrogating to itself divine prerogatives. In the Jewish Church this assumption on the part of man was regarded as blasphemy. And Christ approved this view of the case, vindicating His own right to say, "Thy sins be forgiven thee" by working a physical miracle, which appealed to the eyes of the onlookers, and proved that He was God, and therefore, according to their own teaching, had the divine right and power to forgive sins (Matt. ix. 2-7). Thus Judaism and Christianity, in the person of Christ, teach that God alone can forgive sin, and that it is blasphemy on the part of mortal man to presume to do so. The translation in our Authorized Version, and its common interpretation, contradict this teaching; whereas the translation and interpretation here given are in perfect accord with the teaching of Judaism, Christ, and His apostles. It takes away all apparent Divine sanction of priestly assumptions, and establishes the right of all mankind to freedom of access to God through Christ, who alone can forgive sin. Who, for a moment, looking the matter squarely in the face, can imagine that God created and Christ redeemed the race of man, and then placed their eternal salvation in the hands of a few of their fellow-sinners, liable to all the ignorance, prejudice, and partiality of fallen humanity? Such a preposterous idea, if established, is enough to damn the whole Christian system, and to afford grounds for impugning the character of God Himself.

This commission, thus translated and interpreted, is in perfect accord with the teaching of Christ and His apostles, and it places simple, practical, and important duties before the Church in all lands: to identify sin; not let it alone, but prevail against it until it is

vanquished. The weapons to be employed in this warfare are the pentecostal tongues of fire, so powerful in apostolic times, when no blasphemous assumptions marred the simplicity of the Gospel, or hindered the onward march of the Church, whose great work was then, and is now, "To open men's eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Me" (Acts xxvi. 18). This will indeed be "proclaiming liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" (Isa. lxi. 1), and the most practical way of carrying out the commission of the risen Lord: "Whosoever sins ye let alone, they are permitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye prevail against, they are vanquished."

This is humbly submitted to the honest criticism of all lovers of the truth, with the earnest prayer that the Holy Ghost may guide us into all truth.

AN ESTABLISHED HEART.

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

It is a good thing that the heart be established with grace.—Heb. xiii. 9.

THIS saying immediately follows the exhortation with which it is contrasted: "Be not carried away with divers and strange doctrines." Now, it is quite clear that the unsettlement and moving past some fixed point which are conveyed in the word "carried away" are contrasted with the fixedness which is implied in the main word of our text. They who are established, "rooted and grounded," are not apt to be swept away by the blasts of "divers and strange doctrines." But there is another contrast besides this, and that is the one which exists between doctrines and grace; and there is a still further subsequent contrast in the words that follow my text, "It is a good thing that

the heart be established with grace; not with meats."

Now I need not trouble you with the question as to what was the original reference of either of these two expressions, "doctrines" and "meats," or whether they both point to some one form of teaching. What I rather want to emphasize here, in a sentence, is how, in these three principal words of three successive clauses, we get three aspects of the religious life—two of them spurious and partial, one of them sufficing and complete—"teachings;" "grace;" "meats." Turned into modern English the writer's meaning is that the merely intellectual religion, which is always occupied with propositions instead of with Jesus Christ, "who is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," is worthless, and the merely ceremonial religion, which is always occupied with casuistries about questions of meats, or external observance of any sort, is as valueless. There is no fixity; there is no rest of soul, no steadfastness of character to be found in either of these two directions. The only thing that ballasts and fills and calms the heart is what the writer here calls "grace," that is to say, the living personal experience of the love of God bestowed upon me and dwelling in my heart. You may have doctrines chattered to all eternity, and you may be so occupied about the externals of religion as that you never come near its centre. And its centre is that great thing which is here called "grace," which alone has power to establish the man's heart.

So, then, the main theme of these words is the possible stability of a fluctuating human life, the means of securing it, and the glory and beauty of the character which has secured it. Let us turn to these thoughts for a moment.

I. First, then, mark what this writer conceives to be the one source of human stability.

"It is a good thing that the heart be established with grace." Now I have a strong suspicion that a great deal of preaching goes over the heads of the

hearers, because preachers have not gauged the ignorance of their auditory, and that, howsoever familiar to the ear the key-words of Christian revelation may be, it by no means follows that there is any definite and clear idea attached to these. So I do not think that it will be a waste of time for just a minute or two to try and put, as plainly as I can, what the New Testament means by this familiar and frequently reiterated word "grace," which, I suspect, is oftener pronounced than it is understood by a great many people.

To begin with, then, the root meaning of that word, which runs all through the New Testament, is simply *favor*, *benignity*, *kindness*, or, to put all into a better and simpler form, the active love of God. Now, if we look at the various uses of the expression we find, for instance, that it is contrasted with a number of other things. Sometimes it is set in opposition to sin—sin reigns to righteousness, grace reigns to life. Sometimes it is contrasted with "debt," and put sometimes in opposition to "works," as, for instance, by Paul when he says, "If it be of works, then is it no more grace." Sometimes it is opposed to law, as in the same apostle's words, "Ye are not under law, but under grace." Now, if we keep these various uses and contrasts in view we just come to this thought, that that active love of God is conditioned, not by any merit on our part—bubbles up from the depths of His own infinite heart, not because of what we are, but because of what He is, transcends all the rigid retributions of law, is not turned away by any sin, but continues to flood the world, simply because it wells up from the infinite and changeless fountain of love in the heart of God.

And then, from this central, deepest meaning of active love manifesting itself irrespective of what we deserve, there comes a second great aspect of the word. The cause gives its name to the effect, and the communicated blessings and gifts which flow to men from the love of God are designated by this great

name. You know we have the same kind of idiom in our own tongue. "Kindness" is the disposition; "a kindness" is a single deed which flows from that disposition. "Favor" is the way in which we regard a man; "a favor" is the act or gift which manifests and flows from the regard. The water in the pitchers is the same as the water in the spring. The name of the cause is extended to all the lustrous variety of its effects. So the complex whole of the blessings and gifts which Jesus Christ brings to us, and which are sometimes designated in view of what they do for us, as salvation or eternal life, are also designated in view of that in God from which they come, as being collectively His "grace."

All the gifts that Christ brings are, we may say, but the love of God made visible in its bestowal upon us. The meteor that rushes through space catches fire when it passes into our atmosphere. The love of God, when it comes into contact with our manifold necessities, is made visible in the large gifts which it bestows upon them.

And then there is a final application of the expression which is deduced from that second one—viz., the specific and individual excellences of character or conduct which result from the communication to men of the blessings that flow to him from the love of God. So these three: first, the fountain, the love undisturbed and unalterable; second, the stream, the manifold gifts and blessings that flow to us through Christ; and, third, the little cupfuls that each of us have, the various beauties and excellences of character which are developed under the fertilizing influences of the sunshine of that love—these three are all included in this great Christian word.

There are other phases of its employment in the New Testament which I do not need to trouble you with now. But thus far we just come to this, that the one ground on which all steadfastness and calm tranquillity and settlement of nature and character can be reared is

that we shall be in touch with God, shall be conscious of His love, and shall be receiving into our hearts the strength that He bestows. Man is a dependent creature; his make and his relationships to things round him render it impossible that the strength by which he is strong and the calmness by which he is established can be self-originated. They must come from without. There is only one way by which we can be kept from being drifted away by the currents and blown away by the tempests that run and rage through every life, and that is that we shall anchor ourselves on God. His grace, His love possessed, and the sufficing gifts for all the hungry desires which come through that love possessed, these, and these alone, are the conditions of human stability.

II. And so I come, in the second place, to look at some of the various ways in which this establishing grace calms and stills the life.

We men are like some of the islands in the Eastern Tropics, fertile and luxuriant, but subject to be swept by typhoons, to be shaken by earthquakes, to be devastated by volcanoes. Around us there gather external foes assailing our steadfastness, and within us there lie even more formidable enemies to an established and settled peace. We are like men carrying powder through a conflagration; bearing a whole magazine of combustibles within us, upon which at any moment a spark may alight. How are such creatures ever to be established? My text tells us by drawing into themselves the love, the giving love of God; and in the consciousness of that love, and in the rest of spirit that comes from the true possession of its gifts, there will be found the secret of tranquillity for the most storm-ridden life.

I would note, as one of the aspects of the tranquillity and establishment that comes from this conscious possession of the giving love of God, how it delivers men from all the dangers of being "carried away by divers strange doctrines."

I do not give much for any orthodoxy which is not vitalized by personal experiences of the indwelling love of God. I do not care much what a man believes, or what he denies, or how he may occupy himself intellectually with the philosophical and doctrinal aspect of Christian revelation. The question is, how much of it has filtered from his brain into his heart, and has become part of himself, and verified to himself by his own experience? So much, and not one hair's breadth more, of the Christian creed is your creed. So much as you have lived out, so much you are sure of because you have not only thought it but felt it, and cannot for a moment doubt, because your hearts have risen up and witnessed to its truth. About these parts of your belief there will be no fluctuation. There is no real and permanent grasp of any parts of religious truth except such as is verified by personal experience. And that sturdy blind man in the Gospels had got hold of the true principle of the most convincing Christian apologetics when he said, "You may talk as long as you like about the question whether this man is a sinner or not; settle it anyhow you please. One thing I know, that whereas I was blind now I see." The "grace" that had come to him in a purely external form established as a foundation axiom for his thinkings that the man who had done that for him was a messenger from God. That is the way by which you will come to a hold worth calling so of Christian truth. And unless you come to it by that hold it does not matter much whether you believe it or deny it all, it is very little to you.

But, if there be such a living consciousness of the true possession of God's love giving you these blessings, then with great equanimity and openness of mind we can regard the discussion that may be raging about a great many so-called "burning" questions. If I know that Jesus Christ died for me, and that my soul is saved because He did, it does not matter very much to

me who wrote the Pentateuch, or whether the Book of Jonah is a parable or a history. I can let all such questions—and I only refer to these as specimens—be settled by appropriate evidence, by the experts, without putting myself in a fluster, and can say, "I am not going to be carried away. My heart is established in grace."

Still further, this conscious possession of the grace of God will keep a man very quiet amid all the occasions for agitation which changing circumstances bring. Such there are in every life. Nothing continues in one stay. Thunder-claps, earthquakes, tempests, shocks of doom come to every one of us. Is it possible that amid this continuous fluctuation, in which nothing is changeless but the fact of change, we can stand fixed and firm? Yes! As they say on the other side of the border, there is a "lown" place at the back of the wall. There is shelter only in one spot, and that is when we have God between us and the angry blast. And oh, brother, if there steal into a man's heart, and be faithfully kept there, the quiet thought that God is with him, to bless and keep and communicate to him all that he needs, why should he be troubled? "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings." What! In this world full of evil? Yes. "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings. His heart is fixed; trusting in the Lord." An empty heart is an easily agitated heart. A full heart, like a full sack, stands upright, and it is not so easy for the wind to whirl it about as if it were empty. They who are rooted in God will have a firm bole, which will be immovable, howsoever branches may sway and creak, and leaves may flutter and dance, or even fall, before the power of the storm. They who have not a hold upon that grace are like the chaff which the wind drives from the threshing-floor. The storms of life will sweep you away unless the heart be "established in grace."

Further, another field of the stability communicated by that possessed love of God is in regard of the internal occa-

sions for agitation. Passion, lust, hot desires, bitter regrets, eager clutching after uncertain and insufficient and perishable good, all these will be damped down if the love of God lives in our hearts. Oh, brethren, it is ourselves that disturb ourselves, and not the world that disturbs us. "There is no joy but calm;" and there is no calm but in the possession of the grace which is the giving love of God.

III. Lastly, my text suggests how beautiful a thing is the character of the man that is established in grace.

The word translated "good" in my text would be better rendered "fair," or "lovely," or "beautiful," or some such expression conveying the idea that the writer was thinking, not so much about the essential goodness as about the beauty, in visible appearance, of a character which was thus established by grace. Is there anything fairer than the strong, steadfast, calm, equable character, unshaken by the storms of passion, unaffected by the blasts of calamity, undevastated by the lava from the hellish, subterranean fires that are in every soul; and yet not stolidly insensible, nor obstinately conservative, but open to the inspiration of each successive moment, and gathering the blessed fruit of all mutability in a more profound and unchanging possession of the unchanging good? Surely the Gospel which brings to men the possibility of being thus established brings to them the highest ideal of fair, human character.

So do you see to it that you rectify your notions of what makes the beauty of character. There is many a poor old woman in some garret who presents, if not to men, at any rate to angels and to God, a far fairer character than the vulgar ideals which most people have. The beauty of meek patience, of persistent endeavor, of calm, steadfast trust, is fairer than all the "purple patches" which the world admires because they are gaudy, and which an eye educated by looking at Jesus turns from with disgust. And do you see to it that

you cultivate that type of excellence. It is a great deal easier to cultivate other kinds. It is hard to be quiet, hard to rule one's stormy nature, hard to stand "foursquare to every wind that blows." But it is possible—possible on one condition, that we drive our roots through all the loose shingle on the surface, "the things seen and temporal," and penetrate to the eternal substratum, that lies beneath it all.

Then, my brother, if we keep ourselves near Jesus Christ, and let His grace flow into our hearts, then we, too, shall be able to say, "Because I set Him at my right hand I shall not be moved," and we may be able to carry, by His grace, even through the storms of life and amid all the agitations of our own passions and desires, a steady light, neither blown about by tempests without, nor pulsating with alternations of brightness and dimness by reason of intermittent supplies from within, but blazing with the steadfast splendor of the morning star. "He that believeth shall not make haste."

STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

THERE is work to be done in the world, men and brethren, which can only be forwarded effectually when all those who owe it their help shall fall into line and serve with one shoulder. At the beginning of reforms, at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of all good government, there must be the appreciation of this fundamental principle. Until we can realize that the triumph of right is of more consequence than the triumph of our own personal whim or separate idiosyncrasy, a great many needed reforms for which the world is waiting will droop and languish.

And so, no less surely, will the Church of God. It is the glory of our age, we say, that it has in spiritual things emancipated itself from the tyranny of authority. But it ought to be plain to us that in things ecclesiastical as in things civil, that if we have dethroned the despotism of priests and creeds we must find some energizing and governing force to take their place. A church is first of all and before all an organism; it has a history, it has a heritage of truth to be held and taught, it has a ministry and sacrament. But besides these it must have a working constituency. Without that it is merely a huge machinery with nothing to do. But how can it have a constituency if you and I and the rest of the world simply appoint ourselves its critics, and stand apart to fault its methods and deprecate its methods?

"Why do you not join the Church?" said an aged Bishop on the frontier many years ago to one who had talked much and loudly of his interest in such matters. "I would, Bishop," was the reply, "if there were not so many bad men

in the Church. I am waiting to find a perfect Church." "You will never find it, my young brother," said the Bishop sadly; "for (unless you claim for yourself more than I think you will care to), when you once have joined it, it will cease to be a perfect Church."—*Bishop Potter*. (Zeph. iii. 9.)

CULTURE is the development of the manliest that is in us. It is knowledge, it is refinement, it is taste; it is also trustfulness—trust in our own faculties, and trust in the universe of which we are a part. Fear is born of ignorance. Culture faces danger and defies passion. It is the function of man as man bravely to place his commands on nature, and to put fear behind him. The great souls who appear in history were courageous, trustful and hopeful, and bravely ventured in action. They feared no ghosts, no demons, no treacheries. They freely breathed heaven's air, and bathed in heaven's sunshine; their only fear was that they did not enough trust their own faculties, and the friendliness of nature, and the hearts of their fellow-men, and the munificence of God's intentions. Manly culture is not suspicious; it is not pessimistic, nor cowardly, nor selfish, nor egotistic; but interests itself in things that relate to the common welfare. Matthew Arnold says, "Culture is not primarily a scientific passion for knowledge, but is a moral and social passion for doing good;" and John Morley says, "The end of education is not to make a man a cyclopaedia, but a citizen;" and Cardinal Manning says, "Culture brings with it a power and a grace which enables us to be more useful." Culture that does not do this is an unmanly and spurious culture, and falls of its function and falls of itself.—*Cleveland*.

WOMAN is God's answer to man. The questions that come from his deepest and highest nature find answers in her. When he is what he ought to be his moral and spiritual nature is highest in exaltation and power. If, then, woman more than matches him in moral force, if she has quicker moral intuitions and longer persistence in simple moral and religious fidelity, she must hold the sceptre of power. The religious faculty may be distorted and perverted, but in its purest expression it ennobles and supports morality. The almost universal religiousness of woman is a conspicuous fact. By her beauty, passion and wit, without morality, woman has been mighty, mightier still when without these she was a fresh, strong incarnation of conscience, but mightiest when with all these blended by the mastery of the religion of Jesus Christ she hath walked the pathway of consecration, transformed weaklings into giants, and with the sceptre of the Gospel transfigured the vilest into seraphs. She is something of a judge always, and Ruskin was right when he said that "it is for her to trace hidden equities of divine reward and catch sight through the darkness of the fateful tureads of woven fire that connect error with its retribution."—*Millard*. (Rev. xvii. 3 and xix. 7.)

Low levels limit the scope. The commonplace makes life commonplace and at last ignoble. Some one is anxious to see a great procession marching down the street, but he is standing behind six or seven solid rows of humanity before him; he can see nothing, though he may hear somewhat of the martial music. The secret of seeing is to change his standpoint, and the procession will be seen. The level is too low; let him rise to some higher one, above the crowd before him, and he will surely see. And if we transfigure that illustration, we will, I think, get into the spirit of this thought, that if we desire constant visions of true life—larger visions than we have ever seen—our duty is not to pray to have those visions move along our way, for they have been all around us all these years, and we may have caught somewhat of their beauty; but, like the half-blind man whom Jesus healed, and who

saw men as trees stalking along, we have only caught a part of the vision—not all of it, perhaps not much of it. Our privilege is to hear God's blessed invitation, "Come up hither, higher, to higher altitudes, with waiting, expectant attitude." God help us to break the spell that keeps us down; God help us to unlock the bolts that shut us in; God help us to fling aside the shutters that keep us in the dimness; God help us to be as free as His truth makes us, and then, when we truly behold, how beautiful everything will grow. Just as the little child, long blind, has at last her sight restored, said to her mother, as she looked for the first time upon the beauty of nature; "How beautiful! why didn't you tell me how beautiful everything was."—*Eberman*. (Rev. iv. 1.)

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

- The Willing Shoulder. "For then I will turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one shoulder."—Zeph. iii. 9. Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, D.D., New York.
- The Principle in Man's Spiritual Uplift. "Then Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."—John vi. 68. Rev. R. E. Macduff, New Orleans, La.
- Poverty and Piety. "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me: lest I deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain."—Prov. xxx. 8, 9. Rev. Myron W. Reed, Denver, Col.
- Human Ambition. "They themselves, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are without understanding."—2 Cor. x. 12. Rev. S. M. Crothers, St. Paul, Minn.
- The Unashamed Workman. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."—2 Tim. ii. 15. John H. Barrows, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
- The Complete Man. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."—Rev. Edwin E. Small, Cincinnati, O.
- Sunday Closing. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy."—Ex. xx. 8. Rev. W. F. Taylor, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Corruption in High Places. "Beware! this is a people robbed and spoiled."—Isa. xlii. 22. Rev. David Beaton, Chicago, Ill.
- The Suffering Saviour. "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from Him; and He was despised, and we esteemed Him not."—Isa. lii. 3. David Gregg, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Our Honored Dead. "Render therefore to all their dues; . . . honor to whom honor."—Rom. xlii. 7. Rev. Frank M. Bristol, Chicago, Ill.
- The Sure Reward of Unwearying Service. "Let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."—Gal. vi. 9. John R. Davies, D.D., New York City.
- Religious Enthusiasm. "Howbeit, then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods."—Gal. iv. 8. R. S. Pardington, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- The Rights of Citizens. "They have beaten us publicly untried, men that are Romans, and have cast us into prison: and do they now cast us out privily? Nay verily; but let them come themselves and bring us out."—Acts xvi. 37. Rev. A. A. Cameron, Denver, Col.
- The Ideal Man. "Be men."—1 Cor. xiv. 20. Rev. T. Newton Stanger, Philadelphia, Pa.

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

By Rev. J. P. Gerrie, B.A., Toronto.

- The Best Flag. ("Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth."—Psalm lx. 4.)
- The Seen and the Unseen. ("While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal."—3 Cor. iv. 18.)
- The Growing Church. ("And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."—Acts xxii. 47.)
- A Man's little Faith. ("Oh, thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"—Matt. xiv. 31.)
- A Woman's Great Faith. ("Oh, woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt."—Matt. xv. 28.)
- The Secret of Preferment. ("Then this Daniel was preferred above the presidents and princes, because an excellent spirit was in him."—Daniel vi. 3.)
- A Prudent Man. ("Sergius Paulus, a prudent man, who called for Barnabas and Saul, and desired to hear the word of God."—Acts xliii. 7.)
- Worthy Citizenship. ("And when they came to Jesus, they besought Him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom He should do this: for he loveth our nation and hath built us a synagogue."—Luke vii. 4, 5.)
- Provision for a Time of Need. ("And let them gather all the food of those good years that come, and lay up corn under the hand of Pharaoh, and let them keep food in the cities. And the food shall be for store to the land against the seven years of famine, which shall be in the land of Egypt; that the land perish not through the famine."—Gen. xli. 35, 36.)
- Human Impossibility and Divine Possibility. ("The things which are impossible with men are possible with God."—Luke xviii. 27.)
- The Duty of a Patriot. ("If the Syrians be too strong for me, then thou shalt help me; but if the children of Ammon be too strong for thee, then I will come and help thee. Be of good courage, and let us play the man for our people, and for the cities of our God; and the Lord do that which seemeth Him good."—2 Sam. x. 11, 12.)

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

The Two Questions About Death.

Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? If a man die, shall he live again?
—Job xiv. 10, 14.

Job asks here the two great questions about death: When a man gives up the ghost, where is *he*, the real man? And shall he live again—*i. e.*, the body that gives up the spirit of life?

Compare this with John xi. 25, 26. Does not Christ answer both questions? I am the Resurrection (to the body), and the Life (to the undying soul). He that is *dead* shall yet live, and he that *liveth* shall never die.

The Bible seems to me to teach throughout one consistent truth: that the life of the body shall be resumed after death; that the life of the spirit is uninterrupted by death.

I. Of this truth we have HINTS IN NATURE.

1. The soul's longing is a promise and prophecy of immortality. The bird's wing and fish's fin prophesy air and water; the eye and ear, light and sound. If man's hope has no object it is the single exception in nature.

2. Force is never lost. It is invisible and indestructible. It passes from body to body, changes its form and mode of manifestation, but never lost or even lessened. No energy is ever lost.

3. Life, the grandest force, is therefore indestructible. Even thought cannot die; how, then, the thinker himself? Death is dissolution, decay. What is there in mind to dissolve or decay?

4. Metamorphosis in nature hints and illustrates life as surviving changes of form and mode of existence.

II. Hints in the WORD OF GOD.

1. Man's creation. Made of dust. Living soul inbreathed. Death penalty inflicted on the body; but soul never said to die in same sense. (Comp. Luke xv., where death is alienation of son from father; Rom. viii., where carnal-mindedness is death.)

2. Man's death as described in Eccles. xii. Dust returning to the earth. Spirit unto God. Plain reference to the story of creation. The breath is given up, but does not *die*, and symbolizes the Spirit.

3. This truth is inwrought into the whole structure of the Scriptures. The blood of Abel represented his life that was vocal even after he was dead. (Comp. Rev. vi. 9, where the souls or lives of martyrs cry unto God.) The great incentive to righteousness in both testaments is *union with God* here, merging into such union perfected yonder, as illustrated in Enoch and Elijah.

4. Immortality is assumed. (Comp. Matt. xxii. 23, when Christ confronts the Sadducees.) He teaches that souls in heaven live under new and unearthly conditions; and so God is the God of the *living*, not the dead.

III. But there is distinct teaching on this subject.

Examples: The transfiguration, where Moses represents saints who have died, and Elijah saints that pass into glory without death, but both equally alive. The words to the penitent thief: "Today with Me in Paradise." Stephen's dying vision and exclamation: "Receive my spirit." Paul (Phil. i. 23, 24; 2 Cor. v. 6, 9; 1 Thess. iv. 14-16; 1 Cor. iii.), where a future life is shown to be necessary to complete the awards of this life. (Comp. Luke xvi., the parable of rich man and Lazarus.)

THE Emperor of Brazil said the difference between Brazilians and the people of the United States was that Brazilians always said, "Manana" (tomorrow), but the others "to-day." Promptness of action, immediateness of obedience, is the great secret of service. Procrastination is not only the thief of time, but of opportunity, and strength, and life.

INDUSTRY is the rival of genius. Carey says, "My secret was, I could plod." Industry brings fertility of results, facility in work, and even variety and versatility of activity. What can genius do more ?

EDUCATION is not accumulation, information, scholarship, but *power*. The mind is a chest of tools, to be whetted, put in handles, and used. He is an educated man who learns to sharpen and handle his own memory, imagination, reason, analytic and synthetic powers. However he gets this power to use his own brain he is educated.

GENUINENESS is the basis of character. To be what one seems ; to aim at reality, not shams or shadows ; to love truth and embody it—to live it, teach it, exhibit it—that marks the man. If the shrewd business man misrepresents the value of an article in a sale, he is said to make profit ; the fact is, he makes loss. He *sells the truth* and himself for the trifle of advance he gets over the cost of his goods.

To make profit, one must have discernment, a sense of real values, a weighing of all circumstances, and an eye to ultimate results.

A Funeral Sermon.

Heb. xi. 4.

HE being dead yet speaketh. The dead have a voice, and it is the voice of those who, though dead, yet live. (Comp. Heb. xii. 24 ; Rev. vi. 9, 10.) Take, for example, Charles H. Spurgeon and the witness of his life,

I. To the power of *will*. Indomitable purpose. A strong will does three things : 1. It economizes energy and prevents waste. 2. It promotes activity and directs power. 3. It assures success. Better to be anything than nothing.

II. To the power of *work*. Work is needed to direct the will. Genius is a

curse to many. Spinoza says, "Conceit begets laziness." Carey said, "I can plod." The genius of industry secures all that any genius can—fertility, facility, versatility. A true worker economizes time and employs opportunity. Education is the result of work—mastery of the mind.

III. To the power of *truth*. Buy the truth and sell it not. There is no profit in any gain which comes by the sale of honesty. Aristotle says, "It needs a true man to see the truth and value it ; so genuineness is at bottom of all heroism."

IV. To the power of *faith*. Kant says, "The three questions of life are, What may I know ? Ought I to do ? and May I hope for ?" Faith is more than belief—a bond of union with God. He who is one with God finds God's will pervading his own, and His work becomes man's work. Faith brings certainty of knowledge and power to testimony. We believe, and, therefore, speak.

V. To the power of *love*. This is needed to prevent the will from being despotic and the work from being selfish. As a quality of heart it makes home radiant and widens influence immeasurably ; but when it is fixed on a *personal Saviour* it makes all suffering and sacrifice possible with joy. (Comp. Philippians.)

VI. To the power of *one life*. Mr. Spurgeon was fifty-eight when he died. Forty years had been spent in public life. During that time he had directly reached by his voice half a million people, and by his pen twenty times as many. His money had been so generously expended that everywhere he had planted or nourished institutions which survive him and call him blessed. He had in various ways a large income, but died comparatively poor.

VII. To the power of *one man's manhood*. All these elements go to make up character, which is the secret of all influence. Reputation may belie us, character never does ; and by that we are *tried* in this world and the next.

Every such life witnesses *for* or *against* every other life that has felt its power. To have been uninfluenced and unmoulded by another beautiful and holy character is a sin and a crime.

Marks of a True Church of Christ.

Phil. iii. 3.

1. SPIRITUAL worship. 2. Union with Christ Jesus. 3. Spiritual confidence.

I. Worship means *worship*—i.e., ascribing worth to God. It implies exaltation of God alone. Idolatry found its way into worship in the old time in three ways :

1. Symbolism. Example : The golden calf at Sinai, which was worshipped as symbol of Jehovah (Ex. xxxii. 4-8).

2. Sacramentarianism ; or, exalting unduly what had been put to sacred uses and associated with divine command and power. Example : Brazen serpent, which Hezekiah broke in pieces and called Nehushtan—a mere "piece of bronze" (2 Kings. xviii. 4).

3. Priesthood. Example : The worship of Gideon's ephod (Judges viii. 27) and Micah's idolatry (Judges xvii. 5).

How these correspond to modern idolatry of symbols, sacraments, and priestly attire ! What a tendency to associate worship with sacred times, places, persons, and forms !

Christ said : " Out of the mouth of babes . . . Thou hast *perfected praise*." The farther we get from the simplicity of worship, of childlike praise, the farther from true worship.

To exalt human oratory, music, art, culture, worldly attraction, is all idolatrous.

II. Joy in Christ Jesus. The grand doctrine of the New Testament is the union of saints with Him. The one phrase " IN CHRIST " is the key to every epistle. Romans : " In Christ justified ; " Galatians : " In Christ sanctified ; " Philippians : " In Christ satisfied," etc. The true church *magnifies Christ* as the only bond of union with the Father or with each other. Not by

our own works, merits, struggles, but by our union with Him alone comes every good.

III. No confidence in the flesh. The flesh is the opposite of the spirit. The true Church of God is not carnal, but spiritual—relies on spiritual methods and means.

1. The inspired Word of God, as an infallible guide in doctrine and duty, and the Gospel message as the power and wisdom of God unto salvation.

2. The inspiring Spirit, source of regeneration and sanctification. His " demonstration " convinces and converts. He guides the Church as representative of the Head.

3. Prayer in the Holy Ghost as the secret of all gracious progress and prosperity—not by worldly schemes, and measures, and management, etc.

4. Spiritually minded ministry and officers as alone competent to discern the mind of the Spirit or direct the affairs of the body of Christ.

Hence a true Church of Christ will seek to develop spiritual character in its membership.

DEATH is both the *fruit* and *wages* of *sin*. (See Rom. vi. 21-23.)

Fruit represents the natural result of sin ; wages the judicial penalty.

Death here obviously means more than physical dissolution, though including that. It means *loss* and damage to the whole intellectual, moral, and spiritual being ; loss of power, of holy sympathy and affinity ; loss of purity, holiness, and clear vision ; loss of will power in right directions, and of tender conscience. It means spiritual decay and corruption, with all its offensiveness, and hence alienation or distance from God and holy being.

Wages implies something earned and deserved by the work done, and hence a debt or obligation due ; and the honorable, honest master pays when the work is done, and pays in full.

Life is a *gift* every way in contrast with wages—not deserved, not a debt, not *paid*, but bestowed.

Thus the very passage which presents very sternly the severe penalty of evil-doing presents in most vivid contrast the blessedness of faith—justice in its awful majesty, mercy in its sublime tenderness, wrath and grace, holy anger and holy love. How perfect God is! His whole nature abounds in absolute and unique symmetry.

THE one voice that comes to the Church in this age which is most imperative is in the same language with which our Lord addressed disciples in the so-called Sermon on the Mount: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." That should be emblazoned on the banner of the Church, written on the palms of our hands, and on the door-posts of our gates. To incorporate the righteousness of Christ in our personal life, and then to extend the kingdom of God, and then to bring other souls under its sway is the complete sum and substance of holy living. What is the kingdom of God? A kingdom is a territory over which a single monarch presides. It may be consecrated, it may be scattered, it may be gathered into one compact territory, it may be a collection of provinces and colonies; put wherever the rule of the king extends there is a portion of the kingdom. We cross a narrow river in the United States and pass from the republic to the kingdom of Great Britain. We leave behind us the Stars and Stripes, the blue coats and the ensign of the republic, and we come to the Union Jack.

This kingdom of God must be sought first—first in order of time, first in order of preference, and first in order of im-

portance. Everything else must be subordinated to it; it must be to every disciple at all times and in everything absolutely the first and foremost object of search and of pursuit. This is the Divine idea and ideal, and only so far as we approximate it in practical life will missions be successfully prosecuted.

WE can learn much about missions from Psalm lxxii. Whatever may have been its original application, the insight of prayerful study will reveal the Messiah as its centre, encrowned and enshrined, to whom the prayers of the Church, as well as the praise of the Church, and to whom the gifts of the Church shall be brought. In this psalm is the only verse in the Bible in which praising, praying, and giving are associated. It is manifestly Messianic. Here the character of the Messiah's government is set forth as righteous, merciful, benevolent, benignant; here the duration of His government is set forth as perpetual or everlasting; here the extent of His government is indicated as worldwide and universal. The psalm is a prayer. It sets forth an ideal monarchy. It is not merely poetical, but prophetic and Messianic; its prayers become promises because they are inspired prayers. It gives us a vision of the time when from sea to sea—that is, over the entire habitable globe—from the rivers that flow through the land even to the ends of the earth, that border and limit the land—He shall reign. There are two ways of measuring territory—from centre to circumference, or from end to end—and both measures are here adopted to express the idea of universality.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

APRIL 2-8.—THE RESURRECTION THE REASON FOR VICTORY.—Mark xvi. 2-4.

And so the loving women, pressing on in the way of faith and love, not

withstanding the obstacle of the great stone, found it rolled away for them. The teaching is evident. Obstacles will be vanquished for us in the presence of

sincere attempt by the power of the risen Christ.

1. Obstacles shall be vanquished for us in presence of sincere attempt at becoming Christian. Precisely what is it to become a Christian? Let us seek clear conception. Think with me a little.

(a) Every one of us is in relation with God; that relation is unescapeable; instinctively our deepest hearts respond to the sublime statement of Psalm cxxxix. : "O Lord, Thou hast searched me and known me. Thou knowest my down-sitting and my uprising. Thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compasses my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. Thou hast beset me behind and before and laid Thine hand upon me.

(b) God is holy (Isa. vi. 3). Holiness is wholeness, and God is holy in two respects—in respect of purity of substance; in respect of energy of will.

(c) God is unchangeable, and so is unchangeably holy.

(d) But now, if I know anything about myself, I know that I am not holy.

(e) How, then, can I, the unholy, come into right relation with God?

Not by expecting that God will wink at my sin. Not by thinking that God will lower His demands. Not by imagining that I have ability to conform myself to the demands of His holiness.

(f) God is love. How they slander who declare that the doctrine of the atonement is athwart God's love. It is the utmost bloom and illustration of it. God in Jesus Christ assumed our nature, and in Him my nature is complete. And now, becoming Christian is simply accepting Jesus Christ as Saviour and as Lord. As Saviour He has expiated my sin; as Lord He is my sovereign.

But, you say, it is difficult to become a Christian. As you think of it you find obstacles in the way like these:

(a) That you do not feel as you think you ought.

(b) That you are not fit.

(c) That you are prevented by some unchristian habit.

(d) That you cannot live a Christian life.

(e) That you fear that Christ will not receive you.

But make not the mistake of these loving women. They thought they were going toward the *dead* Christ. They were really going toward the risen and the living one. The resurrection is the proof that Christ is the Christ of power. Give yourself in grand volition to Jesus Christ, and for you the stone shall be rolled away. He will give you feeling; He will make fit; He will unclasp that habit; He will furnish strength for Christian living; He will certainly receive.

"If I seek Him, if I ask Him,
Will He say me nay?
Not till earth and not till heaven
Pass away."

2. Obstacles are vanquished for us in the presence of sincere attempt in the direction of Christian service. Stones like these are often in the way of Christian service: a natural diffidence; a certain fear in special circumstances; a kind of disinclination; the long habit of non-service.

But consecration of the self to Christ for service, notwithstanding obstacles like these, will certainly remove them. I have read how years since some one said to Mr. Moody: "It is yet to be seen what God will do with a man utterly consecrated to Him." Mr. Moody's answer was, "That shall be seen in me." What obstacles, of want of early training, natural diffidence, etc., toward Christian service has not the consecrated Mr. Moody found removed.

3. Obstacles shall be rolled away in the presence of sincere attempt in the direction of speculative difficulty. Forevermore this promise stands—He that is willing to do My will shall know of the doctrine. The man who does up to his light will surely get more light.

The thing for us to remember is, that since Christ is the risen Christ, He is the Christ of power, and, therefore, mightier than any obstacle confronting us.

APRIL 9-15.—OPPORTUNITY.—Gen. xli. 37-45.

Our Scripture tells the opportunity opening before Joseph. Certain lessons about opportunity this turn in the affairs of Joseph evidently teaches. Opportunity of some sort will surely come. I do not mean that you will ever, very likely, stand on the threshold of such grand and sudden and surprising elevation as Joseph did. What one calls a tremendous streak of good luck may never come to you. But it is certain that upon the tide of your affairs there will surely be wafted to your feet some ship of place or opportunity, embarking upon which you shall have the best tasking and culture of your powers; you shall find the best room in which to make the most of yourself for God's glory and for the good of your fellow-men. Perhaps you will not recognize your opportunity when it comes. Perhaps you will think it low and mean and no chance at all. Perhaps you will not be ready for it in any wise, and cannot fill it as Joseph filled his opportunity. All this may be. The point is, and the fact is, that before each man some open door is somehow and at some time set. God did not put you into the world for nothing. God did not so variously endow you for nothing. Over against you God will set the best place for you in which you can best use yourself and best become that which you can and ought.

Analogy ought to teach us this. There are in nature no half-hinges. The fin of the fish is matched by the chance of the water. The wing of the bird is matched by the chance of the air. The capacity of growth in the seed is matched by the sunshine and the moisture and the soil. We are better and lordlier than such as these. For you is to be or has been the matching of the kindest opportunity for you. God's providence is not at loose ends. As some one else has suggested, there is an under-law about this matter of opportunity. It seems fortuitous, but there is a law of averages which quite per-

fectly controls it. Death seems to be something almost out of law and dropping suddenly down, now on this man, now on that. It looks so to you and me. It does not look so to the life insurance actuary. In such a number of lives he can tell the number of deaths which will take place in a given time. He cannot tell whether Mr. A. or Mr. B. shall live or die, but he can say that out of such a number of lives such a number will be living at such a time; for such a number the opportunity will have passed away.

Of course opportunity of every sort is on the side of the young. That is the law which the study of life discloses—that is God's order about opportunity. As we grow older the doors close.

Take, for example, the momentous matter of the opportunity for salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord. To be sure, the message is, "Whosoever call eth on the name of the Lord shall be saved." That is to be preached constantly. Whosoever—the oldest as well as the youngest. Whosoever—the most guilty possible. But while it is true, and constantly to be preached, it is also true that as the years pass with men they become less and less likely to accept the good things of God, and to come into the salvation of Jesus Christ our Lord. Here, too, there is a certain under-law of averages which is even terribly startling. I know a minister who has made a careful study of this matter for ten years. He says that it turns out like this: "Given one hundred new converts to the Gospel, the under-law works as follows: not three of that hundred are above fifty years of age; not five are between that age and forty; not ten between forty and thirty, while more than eighty out of the hundred are under thirty years of age when converted. Opportunity waits on you. You who are accustomed to estimate percentages, read the law of likelihoods, which declares that more than eighty per cent espouse the Faith and on the sunny side of life. Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth."

This is the point. Opportunity comes, and it comes more multitudinously to youth. It was to the young man Joseph that the great chance came.

Doors of all sorts close as the years go on. Youth is the time when the gates stand open. Youth is the time when the gate of conversion is open widest. Seize the accepted time. Now the under-law of averages is for you. Do not wait until it begins to work against you.

This is the second lesson: In order that the opportunity may be worthily occupied, it is needful that there have been for it worthy preparation. Those were glorious gates before whose opened leaves Joseph just now stood. The seat next the throne in honor; the chariot second only to the king's; the royal signet on his finger; the royal linen wrapped around him; the immense authority into which he came; going through the land of Egypt with the voice of a ruler and the port of a prince. And how magnificently he filled his opportunity! How wise his rule! No complaint from either king or people. The heavy taxes laid upon the harvests of the plenteous years, the store-houses builded, the grain gathered together, and so the years of famine baffled.

But there upon the threshold of these glorious gates stood a young man fitted to pass through them. For it was not the careless, complaining, shiftless Joseph who stood there on the threshold; it was the young man Joseph, discreet and wise. And such character he had gathered. In his many-colored tunic he had been haughty—telling his dreams. He had been indiscreet—gathering against himself the needless hostility of his brothers, telling tales against them. But now no longer is he indiscreet and foolish, but discreet and wise. And how had he become discreet and wise? Plainly by accepting the discipline of providence, by doing the best and making the most of himself as slave and prisoner. Thus the opportunity needing a man found a man prepared. The young man, discreet and wise, had

a right to pass through those radiant gates because he had become fitted to pass through them. It is the prepared man who can enter a prepared opportunity.

The third lesson: For the man who does not hinder God, God's providence is working all the time toward the best opportunity and blessing. All things work together for good to them who love God. Let us see. Human freedom—that is a truth. When the brethren of Joseph sold him into slavery, they were free. When Potiphar bought Joseph, he was free. When the temptation smote Joseph in the house of Potiphar, the enchantress was wickedly free. When Potiphar threw Joseph into prison, he was free. When Pharaoh cast his chief butler into prison, he was free. When Joseph, in sympathy, noticed the shadow on the chief butler's face and offered his services of interpretation, he was free. When the scribes and the sages could not interpret the dream of Pharaoh, they were free in their ignorance. But the world is not at loose ends. That is a truth as true as that human wills are uncontrolled. Every one of these things—the selling into slavery, the buying by Potiphar, the temptation in the house of Potiphar, the imprisonment, the anger of Pharaoh at his cup-bearer—every one of these things was, under God, but another step and force toward the leading and the pressing Joseph into his noble opportunity. To them that love God all things work together for good.

APRIL 16-22.—AND LET JERUSALEM COME INTO YOUR MIND.—Jer. li. 50.

Vast walls, in circumference over forty miles, including an area of at least one hundred square miles.

The walls themselves from seventy to eighty feet in height, proportionately thick, guarded by numerous watch-towers, pierced by a hundred gates whose leaves were bronze. Within the first space, clasped by huge walls, gardens, orchards, pleasant places, straight, wide

streets, houses of an immensely numerous population, palaces of untold magnificence; hanging gardens, counted among the wonders of the world; temples of towering height, which, as they rose, massive tier above massive tier, glowed in every part with gorgeous color.

The king upon the throne among the mightiest rulers of history, and just now at the zenith of his glory—Nebuchadnezzar the Great.

But one of God's prophets speaks against the world-compelling and metropolitan Babylon. This is what he says: "And Babylon shall become heaps" (Jer. li. 37).

Listen to Professor George Rawlinson: "Such was Babylon. When we turn from this picture of the past to contemplate the present condition of the localities, we are first struck with astonishment at the small traces which remain of so vast and wonderful a metropolis. The traveller who passes through the land is at first inclined to say that there are no ruins, no remains of the mighty city which once lorded it over the earth. By and by, however, he begins to see that, though ruins in the common acceptation of the term scarcely exist, though there are no arches, no pillars, but one or two appearances of masonry even, the whole country is covered with traces of exactly the same kind which it was prophesied Babylon should leave. Vast heaps or mounds, shapeless and unsightly, are scattered at intervals over the entire region, where it is certain that Babylon anciently stood." And Babylon shall become heaps—the Prophet Jeremiah. Babylon has become heaps—the searching British explorer, Professor Rawlinson.

Surely here is reason for belief in the Scriptures—that of fulfilled prophecy. Whatever the Scripture declares is to be, inevitably comes to be.

But before this prophecy against Babylon was to be accomplished, there was another prophecy to be accomplished against the Jews—that of the

captivity of the Jews in Babylon for seventy years.

This too, which God, through His prophet Jeremiah, said should be because of the people's sins, became. Nebuchadnezzar did capture and destroy Jerusalem and did carry the inhabitants into Babylonian captivity.

But these captive Jews were not to be despairing Jews. In seventy years their captivity was to end. Meantime, as a resource against discouragement, against the infecting Babylonian evil with which they were to be surrounded, Jeremiah commands these Israelites—"And let Jerusalem come into your minds." Think of what she has been; think of what restored Jerusalem is to be; remember that you are really citizens, not of this Babylon, but of God's Jerusalem; and as citizens of this Jerusalem, even though you be in Babylon, endure, hope, live.

Everywhere in Scripture the earthly Jerusalem is the symbol of the heavenly. We have right to generalize. From the fact that whatever God says is to be in this world comes to be, we have reason to believe that whatever God says concerning the other world certainly is. When the Scriptures tell me that the earthly Jerusalem points to a heavenly Jerusalem, because I find God's Word so true about everything in this world, I have right to believe it true about things in that; I have right to believe that there is a heavenly Jerusalem.

So let the heavenly Jerusalem come into your minds.

(a) Let Jerusalem come into your mind when it seems to you as though life were not worth the living. There is a better life beyond, for which this is preparation.

(b) Let Jerusalem come into your mind when you seem to yourself specially baffled.

(c) Let Jerusalem come into your mind when the fight with sin is sore and weary.

(d) Let Jerusalem come into your mind when death seems complete victor.

This is the greatest of questions for each one of us : Have we any title in that Jerusalem? Can we let it come into our minds as our own?

APRIL 23-29.—A TRUE SELF-RESPECT.—Acts xvi. 37.

Paul and Silas are at Philippi. With Lydia, the seller of purple, and her household as nucleus, they are gathering a Christian Church. Possession by demons is a subject of much obscurity; but if we are to believe in any wise the Scripture, we must believe that at the time of Christ, and at least for some time thereafter, such possession was a by no means uncommon fact. Some external spirit swooped down upon and into the personality of some one living in this world; veritably took up its residence in that person; captured the will; submerged the person's self and ruled within him as another's self—wrought through his hands, spoke through his speech. Is such possession now possible? For myself, I am free to say I do not think it at all impossible.

Here in Philippi was a poor slave girl thus possessed. To her masters she was a most profitable slave. The time was densely superstitious. Her ravings were esteemed by the ignorant populace revelations from gods and forecasts of the future; and being freely paid for by the people, got for her masters plentiful gains.

This demon holding sway over the poor creature Paul exorcised in the name of Jesus Christ. At once the poor girl was calm and sane and self-possessed.

The girl's masters stirred up a mob, seized Paul and Silas, hurried them before the magistrate, preferred against them various charges; those ancient city officers made quick surrender to the mob; without investigation, without pretending even to observe any of the forms of law, the clothing of Paul and Silas is torn from them, their bared backs lacerated by the cruel lashes of the lictors. Down into a subterranean,

chilly, noisome hole, called the inner prison, they are thrust, and their feet are fastened in the stocks.

Soon there is the earthquake, the quick conversion of the jailer, the tender treatment of Paul and Silas by the changed jailer.

News of all these proceedings reaches the magistrates in the morning. Probably, too, an inkling as to who the so injured men really are has come to them, for they are Roman citizens.

And hoping to get a bad and lawless job easily and swiftly off their hands, the magistrates send the lictors to the jailer with the order, "Let these men go." Then Paul makes the answer of a most stringent and righteous self-respect. And every word of his reply is a distinct and telling indictment of the lawless magistrates. "It would be difficult to find or frame a sentence superior to it in point of energetic brevity." They have scourged us, men who are Roman citizens; but the entire Roman law made it a crime to inflict blows or any species of torture on a Roman citizen. And publicly—it would have been a crime to have struck them even a secret blow—but they have been openly scourged before multitudes of witnesses. Uncondemned—according to the Roman law, a most sacred right of a citizen was that, being accused, he should have regular trial and according to due form; but Paul and Silas had been given into the raging rule of the mob. "And have cast us into prison"—not only scourged had been these Roman citizens, but illegally cast into prison. "And now do they thrust us out secretly"—will they squirm out of their illegal deed? Nay, verily, but let themselves come and fetch us out; let them take the responsibility of their lawless deed. Here is an instance of a most grand and righteous self-respect. Christianity is no poor, white-livered thing.

Think :

1. Self-respect is a proper recognition of the self and of what is rightfully due the self. Self-respect means looking back upon the self. And we have right

and ought to look back upon the self, that we may know who and what we are. Paul had right to claim things, being the Roman citizen that he was. We have right to claim things, being who and what we are. Estimate yourself a little, that you may know how worthy you are of the respect of yourself.

(a) You are spiritual. Says Pascal: "Man is but a reed, weak in nature, but a reed which thinks. It needs not that the whole universe should arm to crush him. A vapor, a drop of water, is enough to kill him. But were the universe to crush him, man would still be more noble than that which has slain him, because he knows that he dies, and that the universe has the better of him; the universe knows nothing of this."

(b) You are immortal.

(c) You are dowered with moral sense.

(d) You have ability of choice.

(e) You are of such inestimable value that Christ died for you.

Yes, you are worthy of self-respect. Rightfully Robert Browning sings, "Thank God, I was a man."

2. A true self-respect will prevent one from the too common failing of affronting the self by doing meanly. Paul, being what he was, would not do meanness to what he was; would not

slink out of prison as though he were a criminal when he was no criminal. But what a common thing it is for a man, being who he is, to forget a righteous self-respect and allow the self in meanness. You are spiritual, but you are like Bunyan's man with the muck-rake in his hand. You are immortal, but you refuse to think of the vast life to which you hasten. You have a conscience, but you affront it. You have power of choice and self-control, but how often you abdicate your self-control in the presence of some bad habit. You are so valuable that Christ died for you, and yet you do not esteem yourself enough to accept the atonement He purchased for you at pains so infinite.

3. A true self-respect will prevent us from whimpering when for the sake of right we must endure hardness. Though they were scourged and thrust into prison and their feet were fastened in the stocks, there was no whimpering in Paul and Silas. And yet what a common failing it is for a little necessary self-sacrifice to set us whimpering, utterly forgetful of a proper self-respect.

Christ in our hearts, as He was in the hearts of Paul and Silas, will nurture in us, as such indwelling did in them, a noble and lofty self-respect.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

The Church of Mankind.

(AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF EPHESIANS
ii. 11-22.)

BY GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D.D.,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(Concluded.)

It is touching to remember that when David Mendel, himself of Jewish descent and kinsman of the noble Mendelssohns, was converted to Jesus Christ, he reverently gave up his ancestral name of Mendel, and compounded for himself the Greek name "*Νεος-Ανθρωπος*, Neander, New Man." This "new

man" of our paragraph is the new race in Jesus rising out of the ruins of the old race in Adam; the new humanity emerging out of the chaos of the old. The new man created in Christ is the Church of the Lamb.

"One new man." One new man, because in the one Christ. The two old hemispheres of Jew and non-Jew are henceforth to be joined into the one new sphere of humanity. Not that all distinctions of personality or of nationality are to be abolished; for variety is essential to harmony; diversity is indispensable to unity. Many different

members, one common body ; many different stones, one common temple ; many different branches, one common vine ; many different sheep, one common shepherd ; many different tribes, one common Israel ; many different churches, one common Church ; many different men, one common Man ; this is St. Paul's magnificent conception of the one new man in Christ. And Christians of all races, lands, times, conditions, creeds, form this one new man, because they are in Christ. As many of us as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ ; in whom there is and can be neither Jew nor non-Jew, neither Greek nor barbarian, neither bondman nor freedman, neither male nor female ; for we are all one new man in Christ Jesus.

"So making peace" (establishing everlasting amity between the peoples) ; "and might reconcile them both in one body unto God" (not only might fuse Jew and non-Jew into one body ; but also might reconcile both Jews and non-Jews in this one body of mankind unto the one God) "through the cross" (the grand solvent of all problems), "having slain the enmity thereby" (the enmity between man and God, and therefore the enmity between man and man) : "and He came and preached peace to you that were far off" (converted pagans of Ephesus), "and peace to them that were nigh" (sons of the true Israel) : "for through Him" (Jesus Christ) "we both" (Jews and non-Jews) "have our access" (introduction, *entrée*) "in one Spirit" (even the Holy Ghost) "unto the Father" ("Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost ; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen"). "So then ye" (Gentile converts at Ephesus) "are no more strangers and sojourners" (no longer aliens and semi-aliens), "but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints" (admitted with the true Israel to all the rights of full citizenship under the spiritual theocracy), "and of the household of God" (children in God's family as well as citi-

zens in God's kingdom). Such is our apostle's picture of the blessed reconciliation.

"Being built" (then the Church is a Divine structure) "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (then the apostles and prophets of the primitive era are themselves the foundation-stones of Messiah's Church ; the temple of God is being reared on the basis of their testimony, their teaching, their rule, their activities, their character ; in a single word, their personality ; nor need we any additional foundations either of post-apostolic traditions or of post-apostolic argumentations ; enough that on the twelve foundation-stones of New Jerusalem are the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb), "Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone" (then the Son of God Himself is really a part of this great structure of the Church ; corner-stone, foundation-stones, superstructure—all being one building ; even as root and branches are one vine, head and members one body, husband and wife one flesh or personality ; and Jesus Christ is the principal member of His Church ; He is the chief corner-stone, the dominating angle stone ; "Unto whom coming, a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house") ; "in whom" (then Jesus Christ Himself, in virtue of His being the chief corner-stone, is the common starting-point and dominating force for His whole Church, binding foundations and walls and roof, dictating the form and character of the entire structure, the architectural lines of the edifice being but the extension of the lines suggested by the principal angle stone ; the ideal church or corporation of Christian characters being a sort of continuous incarnation or unfolded Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all) "each several building" (then the temple of the Church consists of every variety of form and detail—porch and apse, column and arch, shrine and tower), "fitly framed together" (then the

temple of the Church is divinely symmetrical; and this because divinely keyed or bonded together by the common cornerstone; diversity of materials and forms being matched by diversity of aims and functions; Abraham and Melchisedek, Paul and James, Calvin and Arminius, Bunyan and Milton, Kothabyoo and Livingstone, Spurgeon and Brooks, Baptist and Quaker, reason and imagination, talent and sacrifice, money and prayer, creed and life—each taking the place divinely assigned it in the unfolding ideal of Jehovah's temple), "groweth" (then the holy fane is not completed; Paul dies, but Augustine follows; Augustine dies, but Luther follows; Luther dies, but Carey follows; Carey dies, but Moody follows; the Church is growing laterally as well as vertically, in practice as well as in doctrine, in character as well as in numbers; Gentile Hiram's are helping Hebrew Solomons in rearing the glorious fabric; one age has laid a floor, another reared a shaft, another sprung an arch, another decorated a window; each era has had its own cunning Bezaleels and Aholiabs, whom God fills with His Spirit to devise curious works, in gold and silver and brass and stones and wood, in all workmanship of the engraver and embroiderer and weaver, in blue and purple and scarlet and fine linen; Shem long ago brought apostles and prophets for foundation stones, Japheth for centuries has been bringing exegesis and creed-statement for pedestal and column, Ham, it may be, shall ere long bring a perfected polity for entablature and vaulting; what though there seems at present some lack of symmetry—here and there shapeless masses of coarse materials, yawning gaps between buttress and buttress? Do not criticise the Divine Architect's own plan too soon; await the unfoldings of time; as God's minister grows through the centuries, studying mortising with beam, arch coupling with arch, tier rising on tier, it will be seen gathering more and more of design and symmetry, till in the Master Builder's own time and hands the topstone

shall be brought forth; then shall cherubim and seraphim shout, Grace, grace, unto it!) "into a holy temple in the Lord" (then the meaning of providence, of theology, of ethics, of missions, of history, is the Divine enshrinement of the Man of Nazareth); "in whom ye also are builded together" (then non-Jews as well as Jews are being alike incorporated into this growing cathedral, heathendom being in a very special sense the grand quarry for Messiah's Church; what though the materials are coarse and contemned by men? even so it was with the Cornerstone itself; but here, as elsewhere, many that are first shall be last, many that are last shall be first; there is a stained window in an English cathedral concerning which tradition reports that it was made by an apprentice out of bits of glass rejected by his master, but which proved so superior to every other window in the edifice that the envious artist killed himself in sheer vexation; many a rough block, spurned by this world's architects, shall be seen in the heavenly temple as a cornerstone hewn after the fashion of a palace; how countless and majestic the plinths and architraves and finials unhewn as yet in the mighty quarry of pagandom!) "for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (then the final purpose and outcome of creation and redemption, of Sinai and Calvary, of Gospel and Church, of prophecy and history, is the eternal entempling of Godhood in manhood; this is that true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man, wherein is fulfilled the prediction of Haggai, "The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former, saith Jehovah of hosts;" that was of cedar, this is of men; that was a rubric, this is a character; that was the house of prayer for the Jews, this is the house of prayer for all peoples; that was inhabited by the dazzling Shechinah, this is inhabited by Deity Himself, the habitation of God in the Spirit). Such is our apostle's picture of the Divine entempling.

And this paragraph we have been studying is but a sample of the general tenor of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Indeed, this letter is the great missionary epistle of the New Covenant; declaring the Church of Mankind to be that one temple of which Christ is the chief corner-stone, that one body of which Christ is the head, that one bride of whom Christ is the bridegroom. This is the majestic ideal which haunted and completely domi-

nated the Apostle Paul, transforming the narrowest of Jews into the broadest of missionaries. This it is which makes him the model missionary; and just in proportion as the followers of Christ since then have shared in St. Paul's enthusiasm for the one new man in Christ, in that same proportion have our missionary plans been the broadest, our missionary methods the wisest, our missionary zeal the intensest, our missionary successes the most brilliant and abiding.

SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

Anarchism; or, the Idolatry of Lust.

BY CHAPLAIN C. C. BATEMAN, U. S. ARMY.

A SUBJECT which is commanding the attention of the wisest statesmen and philosophers of this and other lands, which occupies leading pages in not a few important periodicals, whose illustrations give sad emphasis to shocking data, is surely well worthy of the closest heed. At some pains I have collated the creed of the anarchist. In my research I have found the Bible and the Apostles' Creed of no service to me. My original materials were the newspapers, the proceedings of the criminal courts, and the testimony of intelligent gentlemen of wide experience who have known individual anarchists. If this creed of the negation of all things can be formulated, it will read about as follows: "I believe in no God." "I believe in no hereafter." "I believe in no government." "I believe in no civilization." "All law is a lie." "Right and wrong are mere prejudices." "I believe in no flag but the red flag of anarchy." "The rich are only proper food for gunpowder and dynamite." "I am sworn to live and die under the articles of this creed."

A strange confession of the "doctrines of devils" surely. "All law is a lie;" "right and wrong are mere prejudices!" What is a lie? What are

prejudices? Satan should learn consistency. There is no black—white is certainly black! The most dangerous man on this planet is he who has schooled himself to believe a lie, and is ready, if occasion require, to die for that same darling lie. Quite clearly it requires no special powers of penetration to discover covetousness as the master basic passion of modern anarchy. It is not necessary that a man should say a prayer to be a worshipper, nor prostrate himself before an image to be an idolater. Excessive attachment to any object may make a man an idolater or a worshipper of that object. Hence we have a misdirection of the worshipful impulse in forms of fetichism, hero-worship, or even Satanic propitiation in thought or service. All forms or manners of worship apart from heartfelt recognition of the one living and true God debases or belittles the worshipper. It is a principle well understood among theologians in every part of the world that the worshipper becomes in character like the object he worships. Anarchy is the result of unbridled devotion to a colossal lie. The anarchist has set about the gratification of his evil passions at the expense of established order, and is so desperately in earnest that he is ready to yield up his life that his fellows may see the accomplishment of this all but inconceivable purpose. I do not see how lust could reach a high-

er pitch of desperation. There is nothing of the fury of "battle madness," which often possesses men in the savage moments of action; but in cold blood you are told to hand out your purse, or take hot lead and cold steel as the price of refusal. There is a passing satisfaction in the reflection that anarchy is not a product of American soil, but, in fact, a transplantation from the atheistic dunghills of foreign lands. We judge trees by their fruits. Men and doctrines are to be judged in the same way. What would be the inevitable consequence should anarchy prevail? The real nerve of civilization is, after all, confidence, FAITH, without which there are no guarantees of safety to life and property. There was a sottish recklessness in the old epicurean invitation: "Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die;" but the anarchist cries: "*Let us cause the rich to die, that we may eat, drink, and be merry.*" One of these idolaters of lust has said: "Let me have a good time for ten years, and you may throw me into the deepest well." In such an event, indeed, it were a pity to spoil sweet waters with so foul a carcass. Lust and riot are too often akin. Anarchy is covetousness in the extreme, and such covetousness is sensual idolatry armed to the teeth. This is the verdict of history. Let such principles obtain, and life were not worth living. No longer would commerce spread her white wings to the breeze, nor her thousand prows to the auspicious wave. The spindles would rust in their bearings and the plough fall to pieces in the furrow; the steel-shod iron horse would no longer thunder across territories and States, nor the weaponry of abundant harvests glint and murmur along our plains. Picture the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not: churches in ashes, schoolhouses in ruins, the gallows falling from very weight of innocent victims, while from every quarter there arises the awful detonation of dynamite explosions, accompanied by the terrific shock of artificial

earthquakes; the land is filled with violence and bloodshed, and the demon of destruction is enthroned supreme!

Now, it is most certain that God's Word is not silent on the subject of human character, of what kind soever it may be. Do not these words from the Epistle of Jude sound as if written for our special edification at times like the present: "These rail at whatsoever things they know not; and what they understand naturally, like the creatures without reason, in these things they are destroyed. Woe unto them! for they went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah. These are they who are hidden rocks in your love feasts, when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves; clouds without water, carried along by winds; autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved forever." Still more explicitly are we told of the fool who has "said in his heart, There is no God."

1. It is noteworthy that the dictum of anarchy involves primarily practical atheism. It does not follow, however, from this that every atheist will be an anarchist; but it does follow that a denial of the existence or sovereignty of God is a necessary first step in the moral experience of every man who proposes to trample upon the obligations of law, human and divine. All atheists are not anarchists, but all anarchists are atheists. A clearly defined belief in God, a Being of love and goodness, could not by any possibility be that of the anarchist. His whole life and aims are diametrically opposed to such belief. When a man's principles clash with his calling, the principles must be forcibly ejected or the calling given up. Angosticism is a long step toward atheism. The moral agnostic, with his presumed unimpeachable integrity, his unquestioned purity in domestic life, may

unconsciously become the teacher of those who will go beyond him. Voltaire saw this when he discovered that people would draw a universal conclusion from a particular premise. The ignorant and vicious would, protestations to the contrary, construe his denials as so many licenses for the perpetration of crime, because, forsooth, Voltaire had served a writ of ejectionment on the Almighty, and politely bowed Him out of His own universe. Voltaire vainly sought to correct the mischief he had done, and to a friend wrote: "Unless there be defused among mankind a belief in a Power to whom day and night are just the same, who takes cognizance of secret as well as overt action, all law must prove inefficacious." One of the very best incidental arguments for the existence of God is that no nation has ever been *humane* without the God idea.

The Reign of Terror in the dark days of France came only after the popular mind had been saturated with atheism. The necessity of any law at all, points to the universal reign of law throughout this and every other world. It is one of the delights of modern science to reveal law everywhere. We thank science for what it has taught us along this line. So with one of old we fervently pray: "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law." By this divine tuition we have found obedience in the air we breathe, in the clouds which traverse the sky with reservoirs of rain, in the stars which gleam like camp-fires and signal beacons on the plains of heaven, in the magnificent sidereal sweep of the sun, giving life to all beneath its beam; in the seed which bursts its pericarp and springs into the oak, the vine, or flower; and, indeed, in so many places and in so many forms of design and beauty do we discover the law of obedience and obedience to law, that eye hath not seen nor ear heard one half of the mysterious ways of our God. We cannot find out God or know Him to perfection. His ways are past finding out. At best we

may only learn here and there a letter of this divine alphabet with which to spell out, in a blundering fashion, a few syllables from this vast volume of God's revelation in nature. That man has lived to little purpose who in our day cannot appreciate Newton's sense of limitation when confronted by an ocean of the unexplored. Are not those who deny God's sovereignty as great fools as those who deny His existence? It is said that a certain number of men in a million may be born without brains. These are called monsters. Atheists are so rare that many have doubted if an honest one ever existed. When you find even one, it is safe to say that you will find him a moral and mental monstrosity. Absolute atheism is an extraordinary condition of mind and heart, possible only to men naturally deranged or so steeped in sensuality as to possess "consciences seared as with a hot iron." To the latter class the anarchist belongs. He would change our text to read, "*GRATIFY your members which are upon the earth,*" etc.

2. Avaricious lust, the natural precursor of anarchy, can be fostered only by those who deny the certainty of a future state of the human soul. No atheist ever yet believed the sublime doctrine of immortality. The denial may be made a thousand times that the primary truths of our holy religion have to do with the practice of morality; but an appeal to the tribunal of history will, as in the case of atheism, never sustain the denial. The world's experience has been large at this point; experimentation has sustained Christ, the apostles, and the Church.

Much crime has, it is true, been committed in the name of religion, but true religion was never responsible for the perpetration of crime. Never! Men are doubters before they are criminals; atheists before assassins. A bad man never believes in hell, because he not incorrectly concludes that that penal institution is maintained for his special benefit; heaven he does not believe in, because he would certainly be in hell if

in such good society. So, having got rid of God, he throws all concurrent doctrines overboard, and stands bristling like a brute against Christian society, the personification of all that is repulsive in human nature. Banish this divine doctrinal safeguard, and by natural moral gravitation society lapses into anarchy and barbarism. But are there not many moral individuals who are quite irreligious? I have not met any conspicuous for morality who ignored amenability to Divine law. If there be any, it would only prove that the usual course of declension had been in the exceptional case arrested. The rule would be found verified by a marked suspension of natural downward development here and there. The end of materialism is moral desolation and spiritual despair.

We turn now to the social and political phase of our subject.

3. The anarchist is a rebel, and must be treated as such. When he appears upon a stormy scene of socialistic agitation in Europe, we say, "That is due to monarchy." But when the same man steps in at the critical moment when our communities are rent with strikes and "lockouts," and, before the peaceable work of arbitration can begin, shocks this nation by the murderous discharge of his pistol or the tremendous explosion of his infernal machine, we are dumb with consternation. We learn that with the anarchist it is not a question of what kind of government, but a determination on his part, if possible, to have no government at all. Such methods anywhere will fail so long as God lives and reigns. War is sometimes by reflex influence a civilizer; war may in the end prove beneficial in removing great and unbearable evils; but the warfare of the murderer and thief never, a thousand times never! It were wholly inconceivable, were it not a fact, that a man could be found on our soil who in the sacred names of "liberty and equality" would seek to introduce the bloody bondage of the Commune. There is here no sovereignty but that

of citizenship, no aristocracy but that of brains, no superiority but that of manhood. There is no ignorance that by the best system of public instruction may not be enlightened, no poverty that may not be relieved, no honest toil that may not be rewarded. That man who hauls down the "Stars and Stripes," who would strike down our free institutions, and for sheer gratification of beastly lust would light the torch of treason at the shrines of loyalty, or grinds the knife of the assassin in order to destroy our people, will find himself confronted by a wall of bayonets upon whose burnished points there can be found no stain of defeat, no blemish of dishonor. The fires of patriotism have not gone out. There are real troubles between the forces of labor and the corps of capital. The anarchist is not a laborer nor a capitalist; he is a social vulture, seeking to prey upon all classes. He has no interest in the laborer beyond making him the scapegoat of his crimes. Time and again have the labor forces been embarrassed in their efforts to gain a respectful popular hearing. The possession of property does not make human life more or less valuable. The life of a good rich man is just as valuable as the life of a good poor man, and not more so. A bad poor man is no better than a bad rich man. The man who is always crying out against the rich simply because they are rich is hardly to be trusted with much property, nor will he be likely to have much unless he steals it. There is an insidious error in the cry for an equal division of property throughout the world. Some minds are greatly taken with the idea. How much would we all have if there were an equal division made to-day among the inhabitants of the earth? The enormous sum of \$5.10! This amount represents the total capital per capita of the world. We should not be burdened with our shares. The fact is, for the most part the wealth of this world is in good hands. But suppose such a division could be made; how long would it be before the same inequalities which

now exist would again obtain? Largely in one year, precisely so in five years. You do not keep your money, I do not keep mine. The disburse impulse is greater with us than the acquisitive. We have not the money-making talent. Shall we, therefore, be so silly as to deny to others the exercise of a talent which we do not possess? Now, this is exactly what the anarchist does. He is destitute of thrift, forethought, diligence, and honesty. He is a mental failure because he is, first of all, a moral failure. His delinquencies may be readily discovered by the places he frequents and the company he keeps. So far as lies in him he leaves no appetite ungratified, the amount in his purse being the only limitation. The drinkshop is the home of the anarchist, the thief, and the cut-throat. Against the ascendancy of these desperate classes we may be called upon to stand, if needs be, in solid squares and to the bitter end.

It cannot be denied that there are things radically wrong in our civilization, some of which I have pointed out. I would wish that the rich were more considerate for the poor; that the tyranny of capital might receive at times a just rebuke from honest labor; that the laborer were always wise in his methods of making out his bill of grievances, and never in turn became himself the instrument of tyranny to his own brethren who are willing to work at any price rather than be idle; I would wish that society had less of hollow mockery; that the State were freer from fraud, the judicial ermine from prejudice, and the jury-box from bribes. God pity us if that day ever comes when on this soil, made sacred to human rights by the

blood of our fathers, there shall be one law for the poor and quite another for the rich. Adjustment of wrongs can never come by means of personal violence. "Two wrongs never made a right."

The Gospel of Jesus Christ comes with the sword of the Spirit to proclaim peace. The weapons of carnal warfare are not to be taken up at every sound of alarm. We see in these unhappy strifes how much poor human nature needs the Gospel. Christ Jesus was the best friend man ever had. He believed much, He loved much. His word, His example are far in advance of the age. Love to God and love to man were the flash lights which shot forward on our pathway two thousand years since. "God so loved the world," "Blessed are the pure in heart," "It is more blessed to give than to receive," and such like precious truths, are as luminous vistas from the sun of righteousness, along whose gleaming highways we have not half ascended.

Let us beware of sin and its consequences. "The wages of sin is death." If we shudder at the selfish lust of the anarchist, who will lay down his life in the service of a falsehood, let us learn to what extremes the sin of covetousness may lead men. Let us examine our own hearts and guard them well, lest after condemning others for covetousness, we are ourselves at last adjudged guilty of a like idolatry. "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God" (Eph. v. 5).

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

The Public Reading of the Scriptures.

By REV. WILLIAM S. JEROME, PONTIAC, MICH.

WHEN Paul wrote to his son in the faith, "Give heed to reading" (1 Tim.

iv. 13, R. V.), he taught two lessons, which apply to the modern minister as well as to the youthful Timothy.

The first is, the propriety of the public reading of the Scriptures. The reference is not to Timothy's private

I
S
F
g
F
n
e:
ol
P
pi
w
th
R
ha
th
old
as
by
in
Inc
dep
tow
the
the
obli
the
criti
Bibl
thes
poin
Mass
such
Christ
shou
the I
At
publi
ly es
churc
servic
tice c
manif
have
Churc
for th
Script
import

studies, but to his conduct of public worship. "Reading" is joined with "exhortation" and "teaching," as constituting part of his public duties as a Christian minister. It was the well-known custom of the Jews to read the Scriptures in their synagogues. Jesus Himself read from them in the synagogue of Nazareth. At Antioch of Pisidia, "after the reading of the law and the prophets," Paul preaches his sermon. It seems strange that with such examples before them men should ever object to their imitation. Yet this the Puritans did. In the reaction from prescribed and obligatory forms of worship, they forbade the reading of the Bible in the churches. Between Romanist and Puritan the Book had a hard time. And it was but slowly that the new ideas, which were really the old ideas, gained a foothold. As late as 1755 great opposition was aroused by the public reading of the Scriptures in the church at Longmeadow, Mass. Incredible as it may seem to us, the new departure was regarded as a long stride toward Episcopacy, with Romanism in the not distant future. So bitter was the feeling aroused, that the pastor was obliged to preach several sermons on the subject. A Scotch clergyman, when criticised for his public reading of the Bible, overwhelmed his critics with these words from the title-page: "Appointed to be read in churches." The Massachusetts pastor could invoke no such authority. But the example of Christ and the injunction of the apostle should certainly have been sufficient for the Longmeadow critics.

At the present day the custom of publicly reading the Scriptures is firmly established. In every Christian church it forms a part of the usual service. We have returned to the practice of Christ and the apostles, with manifest propriety and profit. If we have no "lector," as in the early Church, no official especially set apart for the purpose, yet we recognize the Scripture reading as an integral and important part of the service.

The tendency to-day is to more and more exalt the idea of worship in the services of God's house. And if the sermon is sometimes unduly depreciated, there is a compensation in the changed attitude toward the Scriptures. At least one selection now forms part of every service. In very many churches a psalm is regularly read, either by the minister alone or responsively with the congregation; and in some, two lessons are used, from the Old and New Testaments, as in the Episcopal Church. Some pastors make their own lectionary, and read in regular course, without regard to the subject of the sermon. The greater number probably select the chapter with direct reference to the sermon, that giving the key to the entire service.

The spirit represented by the New England and Scotch objectors is a thing of the past. No objection is now raised to the once forbidden practice. Paul's rule is followed, as far as the practice itself is concerned. But an important element in his injunction is often overlooked. The difficulty now is, not to have the Scriptures read, but to have them read well. Yet this point also is covered by Paul's words to Timothy. The apostle virtually says, "Read the Scriptures, and read them well." "Give heed" means "take pains." It suggests that good reading is not a natural gift. It is not an easy thing to do. It requires effort and care. We might suppose that practice would make perfect; that the minister would become a good reader merely because he must read so much. But that this is not the case is proved by the many complaints and criticisms called forth by poor reading in the pulpit. A writer in one of our religious papers voices a common sentiment when he says, "People rarely pay much attention to Scripture reading in church. The children hear the customary monotone, and their thoughts wander off to marbles, or skates, or dolls, or what not. The adults hear it, recognize some familiar passage, and patiently wait for it to be finished."

I think that there can be no doubt that this testimony is true. "'Tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis 'tis true." It is a discredit to the ministry, a loss to the church, and a dishonor to God's Word that such is the fact. How few good readers there are compared with the good preachers! How often we hear the most beautiful chapters mangled and marred by careless, slovenly, hasty reading! I once heard a city pastor, decorated with the double D., whose reading of a psalm was as bad as anything could be—absolutely without expression, and with no apparent appreciation of its beauty or meaning. Such cases are common. The family of poor readers is large and varied. There are clearly marked classes, to which different men belong. There is the indistinct style. The believer in this theory of elocution prefers that the trumpet shall always give an uncertain sound. Anything like sharp distinction is distasteful to him. His words are lost in a subdued mumble, supposed to represent the Word of God, which is called a two-edged sword. The edge of the sword is so swathed in flannel that it cannot cut. Closely allied with this is the melancholy or "holy tone" so popular in some pulpits. Then there is the hop skip-and-jump style; the rocking-horse reader; the dramatic interpreter; the drawler, and the racer. Every denomination can furnish specimens of these different varieties. These evils are confined to no place, no pulpit. Every Sunday the Gospel is dispensed by the preacher, and "dispensed with" by the reader.

What is the remedy for this state of things? The apostle gives the clew—"Give heed to reading." Take more care. Make more of it. Prepare properly for it. Many of the mistakes made arise from a low and unworthy view of the exercise itself. In theory we recognize the importance of this part of the service, but in practice we make very little of it. Upon our sermons we put hours of labor and study. Our public prayers receive some attention.

But the Word of God—this we evidently think can take care of itself. Too many ministers make their selections hurriedly, perhaps after reaching the pulpit. They read the chapter for the first time in the public service. There is, of course, no opportunity then for its due study. The secret thought of many ministers is that the reading of the Scriptures is something secondary, and comparatively unimportant. The common habit of calling the service of worship "the introductory exercises" arises from this idea that the sermon is the chief thing, and that the prayers and praise are of little value except to prepare the way for that. In other words, the minister's discussion of God's Word is more important than that Word itself. His speech to the people is more important than their approach to God. A right estimate of the importance of the "service," so called, is necessary to reform in this direction. How few Presbyterian ministers have ever read the words of their own "Directory for Worship": "The reading of the Holy Scriptures in the congregation is a part of the public worship of God." "The Holy Scriptures shall be publicly read, from the most approved version, in the vulgar tongue, *that all may hear and understand.*" "Ministers ought not to make their sermons so long as to interfere with or exclude the *more important* duties of prayer and praise." The propriety and purpose of reading the Scriptures is well expressed in these words. They are to be read as "a part of worship;" they are to be read so "that all may hear and understand;" the service is "more important" than the sermon. An improvement in Scripture reading will come when we have more sense of the importance of the act itself. Too many reverse the famous saying of the eloquent McCall: "If the Lord had appointed two officers in His Church, the one to preach the Gospel and the other to read the Scriptures, and had given me the choice of these, I should have chosen to be a reader of the inspired

Word of God." The spirit of that utterance carried into all our pulpits would vastly improve this important part of public worship. We should then "give heed to reading," as well as to exhortation and teaching, to the Scriptures of God, as well as the sermon of man. Certainly, if "what is worth doing at all is worth doing well," it is worth while for the Christian minister to learn to read the Christian Scriptures, to "take heed" that his reading be appropriate, dignified, and intelligible.

Another cause of the trouble is a lack of appreciation of the variety and interest of the Scriptures themselves. Sameness and monotony are the most prevalent forms of this evil, and they result naturally from dulness of imagination and an absence of literary taste. I once recommended a brother minister to a certain vacant church. Not long after his visit I met one of the session of the church. "How did you like Mr. —?" I inquired. "His sermon was good," said the elder, "but his reading was very poor. He read the most pathetic incident, the most triumphant psalm, and the narrative of ordinary events in exactly the same way." And I judged, from the elder's words, that the one way was a poor way.

This incident is typical. It reveals a very common source of poor reading. The reason why this good brother read every part of the Bible in the same way was because to him they were all the same. He had never perceived that there was any difference between poetry and prose, between history and prophecy. The pithy sayings of the Proverbs, the linked arguments of Paul, the sweet narratives and parables of the Gospel, were all alike to him. They were all parts of one holy Book. And if he had perceived any difference in them, he would probably have thought it wrong to make any difference in the reading. Says the writer I have before quoted: "Not one minister in fifty (a very mild statement) makes any 'distinction in the sounds' in reading from different

parts of that most varied collection of books. Prophetic vision, simple narrative, impassioned poetry, didactic instruction, dramatic interchange of dialogue, remorse, joy, repentance, exultation—all are droned out in the same unmeaning, hard, 'holy tone.'" And this "holy tone" is the direct result of a false conception of Scripture. It is said that the clergy in a certain denomination are taught to read the Bible in a sort of sepulchral and monotonous tone, avoiding any emphasis or variety, "that the holy words may have their due effect." But as the holy words cannot have effect unless properly read, this is a case where the Word of God is made of none effect through the traditions of ecclesiastical elocution. The idea that the Bible should be read differently from other books because it is holy is responsible for this perversion. If holy, it would seem as if the greater care should be taken to make it audible and intelligible. And though a religious Book, it is also a living Book. It is not only *from* God; it is *for* man. And a correct conception of the Book itself will lead to correct elocution. If the Scriptures appear to the reader as a dead level, a flat plane of pious platitudes, they will be read in a manner suited to such a conception. If the Bible is regarded as a single volume, whose only characteristic is its "holiness," mere mouthing, or the recitation of the words by a phonograph, will do well enough. But he who has entered into the spirit and meaning of the Scriptures, who appreciates their grasp on human life, their infinite variety and beauty, their close dealing with the problems and sorrows of men, can never be content to mumble or mutter the words of life. Such a man will not regard the reading of the Bible as mere "preliminary exercises," to be hurried through as quickly as possible, nor as a "religious function" which consists in the mere pronouncing of certain "holy words," possessing in themselves magical or spiritual power. It was against such Bible reading as this that our Puritan

ancestors protested, and better the silence of the Friends' meeting-house, the "still small voice" that speaks within, than this misuse and abuse of God's Word.

What is needed, then, for the correction of the evils complained of is a *higher sense of the importance of the act, and a truer conception of the Book itself*. Right ideas on these subjects will inevitably lead to obedience to Paul's injunction. Ministers will "give heed to reading." And how much more of variety, interest, and power would thus be introduced into the service of God's house! Here certainly is a field which every man can enter. We may not all possess the eloquence of Beecher or Brooks. We may not all be great theologians or profound scholars. But what need hinder us from being good readers? Any man competent to preach the Gospel ought certainly to be able to read the Bible. It is only a question whether we will "give heed" to the matter. The selection of the chapter should not be left to the last moment. The passage should be carefully read over in the study, the various points of emphasis noted, and the course of thought followed out. Read it as you would tell it to a friend is a good rule. Mr. Beecher used to read the familiar stories in the Gospel so that they seemed new. But one need not be a Beecher to do this. An intelligent purpose and proper study will enable any man to vastly improve his reading, and hence increase the pleasure and profit of his people.

"Good reading," says Dr. W. M. Taylor, "is good interpretation." And in order that we should interpret well, we must understand our author. And after all the study we can give to the passage, we must endeavor to make the people understand him also. The object of reading the Bible is instruction; and in order to instruct, one must be understood. It is better, as Paul said, to "speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in an (unknown) tongue." To this end

nothing is small or unimportant. The emphasis of a word, the inflection of a sentence, will make all the difference between sense and nonsense, between correct interpretation and the entire concealment of the writer's thought. In John xi. 25 the emphasis is on the word *am*—"I *am* the resurrection, and the life." The resurrection is not a future event, it is a present power. In Luke xv. 29 the point of the elder brother's complaint is not only that his father had done for the prodigal what he had never done for him, but that "thou never gavest me a *kid*," the smallest, most common animal of the flock, but for him "thou hast killed the *fatted calf*." And so all through the Bible, the careful student will be well repaid for his care by finding new beauties in the familiar words, which he can share with his people.

It was recently said of a young minister that it was worth going five miles to hear him read the Bible. Why should not this be said of any of us? People appreciate good reading, even though they may not always say so. A correspondent of one of our religious papers writes: "Last Sunday it was my privilege to worship in a church on Fifth Avenue that has recently got a new pastor; and, to say nothing of the excellent sermon, I was struck *by the impressive manner of reading the Bible*. The chapter was that which describes the appearance of Christ before Pilate, and when the cry went up, 'Not this man, but Barabbas,' it was read with an emphasis that brought the whole scene to view. Such a reading was almost as good as a sermon—to say the least, it helped greatly to prepare the way for the discourse that followed. Does not this furnish a suggestion to those who are careless in their manner of reading the Scriptures in the pulpit?" We may be sure that wherever a minister has established a reputation of this kind it will prove a great help to him in all his ministrations, and will add to the popularity and attendance of his church. Good reading will attract

men to the church, and when heard will long remain a tender and cherished memory. In 1865, at a conference of missionaries in Lahore, India, the Rev. John Newton, D.D., the veteran missionary, read a part of the first chapter of the Acts; and said one who heard him that day, "The impression made by his merely reading a few verses has not been effaced by almost thirty years"—a striking suggestion of the power which lies in the proper reading of the Scriptures. It was said of Bishop Ravenscroft, of North Carolina, that "he literally preached the Word in reading the lesson from the desk." And one of the pleasant and precious recollections of President Mark Hopkins, says one of his students, was "this wonderful reading of the Scriptures at chapel prayers."

Besides the spiritual advantages to be obtained, it is not to be forgotten that there are other indirect results. A minister, by his reading, may teach his people much beside the truth contained in the chapter read. He may teach them how *they* should read the Bible. He should not hesitate to disregard the divisions of chapter and verse which so often dislocate the sense, and distort the meaning of the Bible. Even if the reading is from the Authorized Version, it should always be compared with the Revised Version, and attention paid to the true beginning and ending of paragraphs. If we are going to read the account of the appointment of the twelve apostles (Matt. x.), begin back with chapter ix. 35, which gives the occasion and motive of Christ's act, and thus adds meaning to what follows. If the first chapter of Hebrews is read, go on through the first four verses of the second chapter, which complete the thought. So the roll of the heroes of faith in Hebrews xi. should never be disconnected from the appeal of Heb. xii. 1, 2. That "therefore" should not be disregarded. The twenty-first chapter of the Acts leaves Paul with his hand outstretched and his words unspoken, but that is no reason why we should do

so. In 1 Cor. x.; 2 Cor. v. and vi.; Gal. iv.; Eph. v.; Col. iii., the sense requires the reading of part of the next chapter, and there are many similar cases. In all such a valuable lesson may be taught by simply and silently correcting the divisions made in our English Bible. Even if the Revised Version is not used in the pulpit, misleading words should be quietly corrected. "Righteousness" should replace "alms" in Matt. vi. 1, and "Joshua" should be read instead of "Jesus" in Acts vii. 45 and Heb. iv. 8. We may do much to train our people in intelligent use of the Bible in this way. Accustom them to think of the truth contained in the books as a whole, and not merely of chapters and verses. And a right understanding in these things will help to a clearer comprehension of the Scripture itself.

This is an age of renewed interest in the Bible, increased study of its message. Shall we not see also a revival of interest in the Book as used in the pulpit services? No one thing would more promote the interest and power of our Sunday gatherings. We have long exalted the sermon. Let us exalt that upon which the sermon is based—the Word of God. The world delights to hear of William E. Gladstone reading the lessons in the village church at Hawarden. The church is waiting to hear the Word of God in its public services well read. Congregations want ministers who, like Nehemiah's scribes, "read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly; and they gave the sense, so that they understood the reading." The question of the people is that of the Ethiopian: "How can I (understand) except some one shall guide me?" Be it ours to guide our people into the ways of God's truth not only by the preaching of His Gospel, but by the intelligent reading of His holy Word.

CHRIST will bear man's burdens only on the condition that man will lay them on Him.

One for All; or, Representative Imputation.

BY WILLIAM C. CONANT, NEW YORK CITY.

DOCTRINE and docility are correlative factors—both now well-nigh obsolete. The general rejection of masters in an "age of reason" makes it imperative to carry philosophy far enough to prove anew that our philosophy both needs and has "one Master, even Christ." This proof the agnosticism of our day has notably aided; if we would but take advantage of its confession and its argument, discard the factitious authority of "natural religion," and insist on a demonstrable Divine revelation as the only possible source of Divine knowledge.

The obsolescence of pulpit doctrine as a power is no mystery. It goes, of course, with the loss of popular docility, and necessitates a change of base from the hierarchal method of teaching by authority or by assumption to a re-establishment of rational faith in the One Master, on scientific-historical foundations; and, thence, further, to philosophical modes of conceiving and representing the great facts which the Master has pointed out while expressly referring the full disclosure of them to the Holy Paraclete and to such times as we should be "able to bear them."

For a second illustration (following the philosophical synthesis of Divine love and wrath in a late number of the HOMILETIC REVIEW) let us take the great principle of representative imputation which underlies the Gospel on both sides—that of condemnation and that of reconciliation. In the very act of establishing the principle as a doctrine, by a consensus of all relevant words of the Master and of the teachers authenticated by Him—the only way, be it remembered, to have primary assurance of any religious or supernatural truth—we shall discover many suggestions of its existence also as a fact throughout the natural as well as the supernatural world; and these suggestions will be

confirmed by many illustrations visible in our common experience.

It is important, however, to notice that the death of Christ is never spoken of in the New Testament as suffered for us in the sense of substitution, which would be indicated by the preposition *avri*, nor in the sense of benefit, which would usually employ *περι*. Yet these two notions are, in point of fact, all that is conveyed to the general Christian mind by Bible or preaching, through our ambiguous preposition *for* in all the passages that relate to the subject. Quite otherwise, the invariable use of *επερ* to connect man with the sacrifice of Christ (*over* leading to the notion of covering or comprehending), indicates the representative capacity in which He died for us—*i. e.*, on our behalf as identified with Him.

The distinction may seem to some a slender one; but in a matter of such transcendent magnitude the angle of divergence is like one in mathematics that may be too small to enclose any considerable space within the bounds of this world, but in celestial trigonometry subtends a base of immensity.

The great apostle of philosophic inspiration abounds in expressions which require the precise discrimination here stated for any clear or consistent sense. Examples: If one died for all (standing for all), then (in Him) all died. Through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin, death. Through the offence of the one, the many died. (Elliptically) as upon all men unto condemnation through one trespass, even so upon all men to justification of life through one (*δικαιωση*) satisfaction to justice. As through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be set righteous—*i. e.*, justified (our ambiguous word *made* again obscuring the sense in the version). Our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away. If we died with Christ we believe that we shall also live with Him. One died for (on behalf of) all; therefore the all

died, and He died on behalf of all, that the living should no longer live unto themselves but unto Him who died and rose on their behalf.

Representative imputation is indeed a hard saying; especially so on the condemnatory side. The weaker stomachs for the strong meat of supernatural mystery are often fain to swallow an indigestible doctrine of imputed righteousness for their own behoof, but spew out the correlative truth, no less enforced by both inspiration and experience—of imputed or representative responsibility; except indeed as laid upon the only innocent representative of their race. But hard as the saying is, it is engraven with a pen of iron in all the adamantine tablets of history; it is water-marked throughout the tissue and fibre of every human lineage or individual career. We do well to let the paradox stand, for it does stand and will stand. There is no arguing against the fact that every man is bearing the sins of all who went before him, and the more incisive fact that our own sins will have to be borne by all who shall be related to us by association or generation, together with the all-aggravating and intolerable circumstance that multitudes on every side are suffering, have suffered, and will suffer to the end of time, and even in eternity, for vastly more sin of others than of themselves. Can there be a saying harder than this hard fact? But with infinite aggravation transcending all the undeserved imputations ever suffered by mankind besides, our whole universal complex of

imputation was accepted by the One Man of men, Most Holy, and Divine, "Even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." Who are we, then, to repudiate the same?

We need not, indeed, accept the imputation in a moral sense. Perhaps the want of a discrimination here is the stumbling-block in the way of an intelligent and full acceptance of the Pauline doctrine. But we must submit to the fact of suffering, or *practical* imputation of sin, all round, without impeaching Divine justice; recognizing the law of universally ramifying and interwoven consequences from every act, "after his kind," as a thread running (as it should) throughout the nature of things, black and bitter with sin, as it is golden and blissful with obedience. Is not this right? Is not this well? But our Jesus gathered into His own holy bosom all the black and bitter tangle, as *the Son of Man*, standing by Divine right and authority for every man, bearing in guiltless innocence the practical imputation of the sins of the whole world, and conferring on us in return the practical imputation, and impartation too, of His own Divine righteousness. Comparing the position of the Representative Man with that of the private man, we find them consistent in this: each in his measure bearing a practical imputation of sins not committed by him, while morally answerable for no more than his own, which in the former are *nil*, and for the latter are divinely borne and carried away.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

The Hardships of Ministers.

In the February number T. L. F. makes a good point when he says that if a minister's path was invariably strewn with flowers, "the ministry

would soon be crowded with unworthy men." But it seems to me the good brother makes a great mistake in crediting small and belated salaries, double charges, and other artful dodges as legitimate sources of hardship. The

Church has no call to torment the pastor, nor has the little, ignoble nature a right to dominate his nobler brotherman, though the latter be one who "ministers." Self-respecting and manly St. Paul never meant to have his words, "endure hardness," interpreted as meaning, "tamely submit to injustice and ungentlemanly treatment on the part of parishioners." This spiritless toleration of what is obviously un-Christlike is the one blot on the fair escutcheon of a noble ministry. It appears in permitting one man to browbeat an entire presbytery or conference into abject compliance to his will; it enables some very ordinary citizen to have minister after minister "under him;" it is the prolific source of short pastorates. Oh, if we preachers could only band together, like modern Knights of St. John, and insist that justice and humanity shall characterize our entire relation to the churches, what an unspeakable advantage this would prove to be! I warrant you there would be ample occasion to give and take hard knocks with certain men in the church, but in the end the way would be cleared for such an onslaught on the devil and all his works as would bring into requisition all the toughness and bravery of a good soldier.

J. F. FLINT.

HARVEY, ILL.

The Great Sin of the Age.

You did a brave thing when, in a recent issue, you exposed, condemned, and put in its true light "the crowning sin of the age."

I see by January's number that "Virtue" attempts a justification of its condemnation in evil, which I think ought to be designated, "the great sin of the age." If your citation of the fact that in Massachusetts there are some eighty-two thousand families with one child only in each does not demonstrate the prevalence of the great crime of child-murder, it does reveal a terrible condition of things, and shows that there are

thousands of married persons who are unwilling to assume the responsibilities of married life. *The prevention of offspring by married persons is the crowning sin of our age.* It is depopulating our country homes, making barren our villages, and New England itself, so far as Americans are concerned, and passing over to the foreign-born, to the Romanist, to the illiterate, and to the criminal classes our fair land. Does not every patriot see the evil and the danger which threatens us when eighty-two thousand families in one State have but one child in each, or when one can boast of being married fifteen years and having but one child? It makes extinction of a people but a matter of a short time. It is not *quality* that is produced, but the dying out, or rather the blotting out of the American people, should such a state of things continue.

The excuses given for this stupendous evil are as trifling as the sin is great. The plea that women have rights. Certainly they have; and no more sacred one than that of motherhood. It will be a sad day when any human being regards maternity as beneath the desire or reverence of the highest woman of the land.

To the cry so often raised that we should endeavor to have quality rather than quantity. Certainly we should. But where shall we look for the quality? Shall we find it in the home of the *one* child? The single product of fifteen years ought to be a wonder. But how much nonsense there is over this whole subject. Did we not have a recent instance of a person who not only believed in but told how to have remarkable offsprings—quality rather than quantity—and she lived to see her own child tried and found guilty of one of the most diabolical murders on record? And yet, if you would see quality, go to the large families, for there you will find parents have not time to spoil a child, while lessons of patience, self-denial, and helping others are taught as they cannot be in other homes. I recall standing, in Bunhill-

fields burial ground, London, by the grave of Mrs. Susannah Wesley, and I remember reading on the memorial-stone that rests o'er the dust of that consecrated woman, "She was the mother of nineteen children, of whom were the Revs. John and Charles Wesley, the founders of the societies called Methodists." I think she gave to the world and to the Church not quantity only, but quality also.

Upon this point, in his admirable life of Wendell Phillips, Carlos Martyn well says, "It was further happy for young Wendell that he was one of many children. An only child is apt to be petted and spoiled. Where there are a number, each demands so much that no one can get all. Besides, it should seem to be a psychological fact that the friction of several minds from the nursery up to adult life is necessary to the best development of genius. There is scarcely an instance of an only child's achieving greatness. Even when latent ability gasps and dies for lack of elbow-room and play. On the other hand, history is full of characters that were helped out and thrust forward by early attrition at home. Thus Napoleon was one of thirteen children, Franklin was one of seventeen, General Sherman was one of eleven, Charles Dickens was one of eight, Gladstone was one of seven. Those large American families which were universal a generation or two back—were they not so many schools of genius? Their infrequency to-day—is this not suggestive, ominous?"

I am glad to say that this great evil which threatens the extinction of the natives of New England, and is the cause of many divorces—for nothing holds hearts together like children in the home—is comparatively unknown in the great Southland. There you will find families that number from seven to twelve children to be vastly more than those of a fewer number. And the sight is beautiful. The family life, the home life there is one of the sweetest things in the South. I feel free to say this, not belonging to them by

birth or by any long residence, but having seen their charming home life in different Southern States. I suppose nowhere is woman more esteemed, more loved, or happier. Would to God it were so throughout our beloved country! Long be the day when the American home shall be a thing of the past.

HUMANITY.

Death in Law a Ground of Divorce.

IN "Living Issues for Pulpit Treatment," in a recent number of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, it is said that the laws regarding divorce in the United States "are as various as the States that enact them." Then immediately follows a list of the different grounds of divorce allowed by all the States together, taken from an article in a late number of *Blackwood's Magazine*. Of these there are twenty-two, some of which can fairly be classed together as really one and the same. The first and second mentioned are adultery and wilful desertion. In your remarks on that list you say: "And on grounds such as these, the only scriptural one of which in all the number is the first (adultery)," etc.

All professing Christians who believe that marriage can be lawfully dissolved during the lifetime of both parties, unhesitatingly admit that Scripture allows it to be dissolved on the ground of adultery. Reason assents to such dissolution; but many professing Christians hold that wilful desertion is another lawful ground of divorce. That it is, forms part of the creed of the Presbyterian Church—the one to which I belong. The doctrine is agreeable to both Scripture and reason. Adultery and wilful desertion can very properly be compared to the two kinds of sin. The Shorter Catechism of my Church thus very correctly defines sin—"Any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God." That is, sin is either not doing what God commands, or doing what He forbids. So adultery is transgression of the marriage covenant;

wilful desertion, the non-fulfilment of it. Both, therefore, seem to be equally good grounds for divorce.

Take the following case. Some years ago a French priest, a M. Cauboue, was received into the ministry of my Church. After a while he became pastor of the Presbyterian congregation of St. Hyacinthe, Quebec, in which charge he remained some time, but not very long. During his pastorate he married. At length he went back to the Romish Church, and soon after went into a monastery in France, where he still is, and, to all appearance, will remain to the end of his life. Now, is it not most absurd, most unrighteous, and most cruel that his wife should be condemned to what is really perpetual widowhood during his lifetime for the infamous conduct of the wretch to whom she was lawfully married?

I must pass on to the special theme of this article; but before doing so, I would say that, according to the law of God, the divorced party cannot marry again as long as the other is living. Whatever the law of man may say to the contrary is utterly worthless. Man cannot make that a virtue which God calls a sin.

I come now to my special subject, "Death in law a ground of divorce."

That the natural death of one of a married couple gives the other liberty to marry again no one denies. The fourth ground of divorce mentioned in *Blackwood's* list is "imprisonment for felony." Well, I must say that when this imprisonment is for life, it seems to me a perfectly lawful ground for divorce. He who is imprisoned for life is dead in law. True, he is entitled to protection from cruel treatment, but he cannot exercise the rights of a citizen. Some years ago a person was tried in Toronto for being connected with the death of a young woman who was butchered in an operation for abortion performed on her by a ruffian calling himself "Dr." Davis. Shortly before the "Dr." himself was tried for what he had done, found guilty, and sen-

tenced to be hanged. His sentence, however, was changed to imprisonment for life in the Kingston Penitentiary. When the other trial came on he was brought up to Toronto to give evidence at it; but the counsel for the accused objected to his evidence being taken, on the ground that he was dead in law, and, therefore, could not give evidence. The judge sustained the objection. Now, it seems to me that when a married person becomes dead in law, the marriage tie is as truly severed as it is by natural death. Suppose a man commits a murder, for which he is in due form sentenced to death, but afterward has his sentence changed to imprisonment for life. Is it not most cruel, most unreasonable, and most unfair that his wife should be doomed to widowhood as long as he lives? I cannot see that it is anything else.

It may be said, "The person imprisoned for life may be set free." That not seldom happens. The ruffian Davis, of whom I have already spoken, was set free after a few years' imprisonment, and very likely is now again at his old infernal business. But no one should be set at liberty who deserves to be imprisoned for life. It may be said, "If one imprisoned should be proved to be innocent, as sometimes happens, should he not at once be set free?" Certainly he should; but no one should be sentenced to imprisonment for life, any more than he should be put to death, whose guilt is not most clearly proved. If there be the slightest doubt as to the guilt of the accused, he should be set free. To imprison a person for life, instead of putting him to death, because, perhaps, in course of time his innocence will appear, is most outrageous. The Declaration of Independence very justly says that all men have, by nature, a right to *liberty* as well as to *life*.

IN the February number of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW there is an instance of incorrect English. See page 157, middle of the first column. It is there

said, "A man sentenced to be hung was not hung."

The verb "hang" has two distinct literal meanings. 1. To put to death in a certain way, as to hang a murderer for his crime. 2. To put lifeless things, or things treated as lifeless, into a certain position, as to "hang the trumpet in the hall," or to strap a pappoose to a board, and then hang it on the branch of a tree. Now, the correct past participle of the verb in the first sense is "hanged." The correct one of it in the second is "hung." The latter word is very often used, but altogether wrongly so, in the sense of the second, as in the passage in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW above quoted. The following sentence shows very clearly the difference in meaning between "hanged" and "hung"—"Guiteau was *hanged* for the murder of President Garfield, and his skeleton, so it is said, was *hung* up in a certain college." Here "hang-

ed" means putting a person to death in a certain way, and "hung," putting a lifeless thing—his skeleton—into a certain position.

In the Authorized Version of the English Bible the word "hung" is never found. "Hanged" is always used in speaking of lifeless things, as in Ps. cxxxvii. 2, "We hanged our harps upon the willows;" and in Mark ix. 42 and Luke xvii. 2, "A millstone hanged about his neck." Such use of the word was correct when the Authorized Version was made, now well nigh three hundred years ago, but it is not so now. It is true that the Revised Version makes the same use of the word "hanged," but this is one of the instances in which the Revisers preferred keeping a word which, wholly or in part, is now no longer used, to changing it.

C. FENWICK.

WOODBRIDGE, ONTARIO, CANADA.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

God in America's History.

He brought forth His people with joy, and His chosen with gladness, and gave them the lands of the heathen.—Psalm cv. 42, 43.

RIGHTLY to estimate the significance of an historic event demands just that which is required in the criticism of a work of art—the selection of a proper point of view. It is equally possible to be too near or too far away from an occurrence, as well as a picture, a statue or a building, to estimate its proportions aright. One needs to see it in its relations to the events that have preceded or succeeded it. Even the incarnation of the Son of God was not rightly valued by those in whose presence it took place. But as the ages have passed the true significance of that event has come into a clearer light, and men are

coming more and more unanimously to affirm that it constitutes the central event of all history.

Equally true is this of that event for the commemoration of which such preparations are now making, the discovery of a new world by Christopher Columbus. A new world! The significance of that phrase cannot be overestimated. It was "new" in every sense of the word worth regarding; as truly new as though it had but just sprung from the hand of the Creator, although it had been inhabited from time immemorial, and although it had seen successive civilizations flourish, grow old and die—civilizations, the remains of which are the wonder of the world of to-day. New to the old world, it was to become its renovator. From it influences were to issue that were to change the character of all the other

continents of earth. Out of it were to flow streams of wealth that should fill and overflow the exhausted coffers of old-world countries. In it were to be solved problems, political and social, that had overtaxed the genius of the lands across the water. All this was to be, and yet none of this did the discoverer understand when that which had long been his dream became a reality. Only as the centuries have passed has the significance of America's discovery come to be properly appreciated.

It is instructive to contrast the world of 1492 with that of 1892, not simply for the gratification of a passing curiosity, but to find occasion for magnifying the wisdom and the goodness of God, whose hand is in all the outworkings of human history, whose purpose includes the veiling as well as the revealing of things, checks put upon discovery as well as openings of the way for discovery. The times of the world and of the nations of the world, as well those of individuals, are in His hand.

Not yet was the world rid of its belief in the old Ptolemaic delusion, that this earth was the centre of the heavens, when the shores of San Salvador broke upon the anxious vision of the great seeker for a new route to India. And this delusion, be it remembered, modified not only the science and the philosophy, but also the theology of the then world. Copernicus had not yet reached his majority. Printing with movable type had been invented but half a century. The story of the renowned Caxton press of England was but fifteen years old. The great artists of Europe, who through all subsequent time were to be known as masters, were either not yet born, or had not yet begun to accomplish their famous work. Michael Angelo was but a lad of seventeen, Titian fifteen, Raphael nine. No hint of the glory of their genius had yet been given. The great works of the poets of Europe were yet to be produced. Newton had not yet won the fame of his discovery of the law of gravitation or of that of the composi-

tion of light. Harvey had not yet immortalized himself by his annunciation of the law of the circulation of the blood. Africa still exerted a waning influence over a portion of Europe. The year that saw the opening up of a new domain for old Spain saw the end of the Moor's dominion within her borders. It was a period of papal supremacy, when one man gave the law for nations, set up or dethroned kings, marked out the boundaries of States, apportioned provinces won by force of arms, confirmed or annulled marriages, as the interest of the papacy demanded. In the religious world everything was dark as midnight. The great Reformation was not yet begun. He who sat at Rome, self-styled vicergerent of God, claimed authority over consciences as over States; while he who, under God, was to be the chief agent in overthrowing his authority for all time, Martin Luther, was a little child of nine in his father's house. Zwingli, his Swiss coadjutor, was but eight. Savonarola, indeed, was carrying on his work of partial reform in Italy, a work for which he was to pay so dearly with his life five years after the discovery of that land, where men in the future should claim and maintain their right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences; but Melancthon and Knox and Calvin had not yet looked upon the light of the sun. No English translation of the original Scriptures had yet been given to the people of England. Only Wiclif's version—a translation of the Latin Vulgate—was in the hands of any of them. The Inquisition was raging under the notorious Torquemada in Spain. Its spirit was everywhere prevalent. Under it Latimer, Ridley, Frith, and many another were to lay down their lives ere long. Freedom of conscience and freedom of thought were alike unknown. The long night of the Middle Ages was but just beginning to give way to the light of the dawn.

To the Christian Church, as represented by the Church of Rome, the

great outside world was an enemy to be overcome, not a vast mass of human souls to be won for Christ. The sense of obligation for the evangelization of the world seems to have been altogether wanting. The only sword of conquest recognized by the existing Church was the sword of steel. The Gospel—the glad tidings of salvation for the world—was kept under watch and ward, not heralded as the message of abounding and infinite love. Even within the Church itself the love of God was hardly recognized. Men dwelt upon His justice as though in it was that which held satisfaction for the craving of lost souls. That was the era when the doctrine of purgatory was formulated, a doctrine that had its rise in false views of the plan of salvation, the latest outcome of the idea that man must work out his salvation for himself from start to finish. No words could more fittingly describe the times than those which the great genius that irradiated the world a century later put into the lips of Hamlet; they were "out of joint."

And now in contrast let our thoughts rest upon the times in which we are living. This contrast cannot be elaborate, but simply in hints which may be followed out at leisure. We are impressed by the marvellous changes effected by the printing-press; the possibility which is ours of acquainting ourselves with the best thoughts of all the ages, and of daily informing ourselves as to what is doing in the great world about us, so that no man who can read has any excuse for not knowing the progress of events; and no man has any excuse for not possessing the ability to read; for here is another contrast, the marvellous advance in popular education. Where but a comparatively small and favored class was able to read the few books that had found publication four hundred years ago, our school system has given that privilege to all. We recall the progress in the physical and mental sciences; the advances in the arts, especially the inventive arts and

remember what they have done to render so comfortable the life which so short a time since was burdened with discomforts. What almost inconceivable changes have been effected by the discoveries as to the possibilities of steam and electricity! What changes in our home life by the enlarged acquaintance with the laws of sanitation! We think of the increased sense of security in the presence of impending dangers, as, for example, that of the pestilence that walketh in darkness, the destruction that wasteth at noon-day; of the progress of opinion with reference to national complications, and in how many instances the red flag of war has given way to the white flag of peace, honorable peace, as arbitration has come to take the place of the sword, the rifle, and the cannon. And freedom—freedom of thought and freedom of conscience—which we now regard as a natural prerogative, which we have come to take so for granted that we forget to thank God for it, let this be set over against the bondage of those old days, when thought and worship were at the dictation of another; and beyond these things we think of the conquests of Jesus Christ through His Church in the world, and of what lies back of these, the changed opinions of Christian men as to the worth of unsaved souls and their claims upon the Church. There is nothing that so emphatically marks the contrast between the two periods which we are regarding than that which is to be a peculiar feature of the great Exposition of this year, the Parliament of Religions, wherein representative men from various parts of the world will meet to speak upon the resemblances and divergencies of the great historic religions that command the faith of the world's peoples. Such a parliament would not have been a possibility in the days of Columbus; indeed, nothing could have been farther from the thought of even the most imaginative, much less from the desire of the most liberal. Those were days when Christian men, such in name if

not in spirit, could not tolerate divergence of views from those which themselves held, when death was the penalty of such divergence. Beneath and behind the Parliament of which we are speaking is what is the great basal truth of the ages, the truth by virtue of which men are enabled to recognize and respect the sincerity of their fellows, however mistaken their views may be deemed, the truth which it has been the peculiar privilege of our age to emphasize, that of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is verily a new world of thought on which we are entering, and one that we may trust will do for the Christian faith what the new world of geography has done for political science, afford a field for the outworking of its grandest problems. When in that Parliament it is seen, as it must be seen, what a mighty contrast exists between a Christian civilization and every other, not only in its higher morality, but in intellectual ability, in inventive ingenuity, in all that goes to make life worth living, who can doubt that the issue will be such an influence as shall ultimately tell on all the peoples of the earth? We are persuaded that then, in a peculiar and important sense, the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together, see it representatively, and recognize, with a measure of conviction, that "the Lord, He is God." In view of the immense possibilities of that event not one can fail to echo the prayer of Dr. Barrows, the Chairman of the Committee on Religious Congresses: "May the Holy Ghost be the Divine Apostle preaching Jesus to an assembled world!"

But we are brought face to face with another thought in view of this event in our continental history, the thought of America's part in the development of the world, a part for which she was manifestly designed in the providence of God. Our lesson is not done when we have contrasted the present with the past, only in so far as we ourselves are concerned in respect of privileges

which we are enjoying—privileges denied those who went before. It is what God has enabled America to do as well as to receive that should engage our thought. Close and sharp were the lines that for ages had divided man from man. In State, in Church, in society, the law that prevailed was that of separation. Race from race, priest from people, high from low, rich from poor, learned from ignorant, prince from peasant held aloof. Babel was in the ascendant. That for which, in part, Christ had come into the world, that men might learn that all men are brethren, was as yet unlearned. Nor was it possible for the lesson to be learned while things continued as they had through centuries. The ruts were cut too deep. The new wine needed a new bottle; and it was when this need was at its greatest that the bottle was revealed all prepared for that which should be put into it. America was to see the solution which Europe could not otherwise have seen. Here the problem was to be wrought out in the providence of God which had clamored vainly for a solution for ages. Here it was to be proved that there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, male or female. Here it was to be shown that men could look one another in the face with level eyes, that manhood is more than condition. Here the work of Babel was to be undone, and unification to take the place of separation. Here was to be tried and proved the plan of popular self-government, that it was both feasible and desirable. Here the Christian Church was to prove its greatness, and hence were to go forth influences that were to effect marvellous changes in the spiritual and social condition of the whole world. The little caravel that brought Columbus and his companions to these shores was to be followed after many days by vast ships with their precious burdens of humanity, representing all the nations of earth, men and women and children, who should come to speak one language, enjoy common privileges,

recognize common obligations, and fulfil a common destiny. Drawn hither by the promise of advantages presented by no other land in all the world, or driven hither by disadvantages or injustices experienced in other sections of the world, or brought hither involuntarily and unrighteously from benighted quarters of the world, a developing humanity, together with the abiding racial attachment, was to lead to the devoted effort to secure the uplifting of the entire world to a higher plane of thought and life. Here it was that the great lesson of responsibility coextensive with opportunity was to be learned. Think of it. How wonderful it all seems now that we can see the hand of God in it, this outblotting of old national and continental distinctions, this making of one people, and that a Christian people, out of many, which has found its voice in our national motto, "E pluribus unum," one out of many. Yes, here the work of Babel is to be undone, and union to take the place of separation, and hence, we have every reason to believe, the spirit of union is to speed to all the lands of the world and hasten the time when the Gospel of the annunciation of a Saviour come shall prove a world's gospel, peace to men of good will. This is not a dream of the imagination. Every indication is that it is a growing reality. We are not—alas that it should be true—altogether through with deeds of injustice between man and man. We do not always and everywhere do to others as we would have them do to us. The millennium is not yet here; but that such is the increasing disposition is more and more manifest. We are not altogether through with class distinctions, not altogether through with alienations in society, in State, in Church. Denominationalism has not ceased to produce its manifold evils; partisanship its bitternesses. But it may be said truly that there is a growing tendency to look with charitable eyes on the rights of one another; and the emphasizing of this lesson is a part of the

duty and the destiny of America. The Exposition in which we are all, not only spectators, but interested participants, may we not hope, and with measurable confidence expect, is to prove a step toward the result which not one of us can fail to regard as most desirable, because in full accord with the mind and will of God.

We who have hitherto been indifferent, who have lived lives into which the great world of human souls has not once entered with its pressing claims, shall not we yield to the inspirations of the occasion and find the significance of the baptism of the Spirit of consecrated effort for others? Let us prove that the world of the days of Columbus, when self was the centre in the social and religious systems as earth was the centre in the celestial system, is a past world; that there is some significance in the name of Him who is our professed leader and whose golden rule is our professed law of action, doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, and doing good to all men as we have opportunity. The Christian religion is to be on exhibition at the coming celebration. Its institutions are to be seen by many perchance whose eyes have never beheld them. Through the strength of Christian sentiment in our land, we trust the Sabbath is to be observed sacredly. The trophies of a Christianized press are to be seen, a quarter of a thousand Bibles in differing languages or dialects, prepared by consecrated Christian men for the realization of their Master's will concerning the world. It is a striking and interesting fact that the so-called sacred books of the world other than that of Christians have been dependent for their translation into other languages than those in which they were first written by men who, if not themselves professing Christians, have at least represented a Christian civilization. It has not been the enthusiasm of those who held to the truth of their contents who sought to obtain for them wider circulation. This is the distinc-

tive characteristic of that religion which we have a right to call national, in so far as America is concerned, that it is also universal, can flourish as well in one habitat as in another.

There is a final thought which ought not to be overlooked. That Columbus was as truly raised up of God as was Moses to do a definite work, one, perhaps, of far greater importance than that of Moses, in so far as its bearing upon the world's development was concerned, none can fail to be assured. We speak of certain events as special providences, though perhaps one event is as truly a special providence as another. As McDonald says, "There is a special providence in the fall of a sparrow." But however this may be, one thing is certain, that there was a special providence in the flight of the birds that drew the great discoverer away from the course he was pursuing and led him southward. That the feet of Columbus first rested upon San Salvador and not upon Plymouth Rock, we can never be too thankful. What the country in whose name he was prosecuting his discoveries would have done for that portion of this continent which is now the abode of freedom we have only to look southward to see. Had his caravel entered a harbor along that coast which is now known to us as the coast of New England, the whole course of history had been changed, and the world's progress been put back for centuries; and, therefore, while at this time expressing our gratitude to God for His goodness in connection with the discovery of the land that is our home, let us also express our gratitude that He ordered the circumstances of that discovery as He did; that not to papal Spain or Italy, but to Protestant England and Holland we owe the

beginnings of our national life and the principles that gave the bent to national character. As we contrast our own history with that of our neighbors in Central and South America, let us not boast ourselves of our superiority, but let us make our boast in God, who in His goodness and in His wisdom has brought about the differences in national experiences.

And now with these contrasts in mind, the contrast of our age with that in which the great discoverer lived whose discovery we are celebrating, the contrast of a world with America and a world without America, and the contrast of our national life and history with those of our neighbors to the south of us, let the inspiration of the deed of Columbus come upon us with all its energy. Let the words of him who recently passed from us to that land whose shores make beautiful the other side of the sea of death, come to our minds, words put by him into the lips of the discoverer, whose name is to-day on all lips:

"For me, I have no choice;

I might turn back to other destinies,
For one sincere key opens all Fortune's doors;
But whose answers not God's earliest call
Forfeits or dulls that faculty supreme
Oft lying open to his genius
Which makes the wise heart certain of its ends.
Here am I; for what end God knows—not I;
Westward still points the inexorable soul....
Endurance is the crowning quality,
And patience all the passion of great hearts;
These are their stay, and when the leaden world
Sets its hard face against their fateful thought,
And brute strength, like a scornful conqueror,
Clangs his huge mace down in the other scale,
The inspired soul but flings his patience in,
And slowly that outweighs the ponderous globe.
One faith against a whole earth's unbelief,
One soul against the flesh of all mankind.

One day, with life and heart,
Is more than time enough to find a world."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"The Pastor and the Sick-Room."

ONE of the most important duties of the pastor is that of dealing with the

sick and the dying. It is a serious problem that confronts him when he stands face to face with such, for he is compelled to think of two things, the

interests of the body and those of the soul. He must be careful not to undo the work of the physician by an unwise awakening of fear, and he must also be careful not to jeopardize the salvation of an immortal soul by an unfaithful failure to point it to the Great Physician. A little book, containing three lectures delivered to the students of Princeton Seminary by one of the trustees of that institution, the Rev. J. D. Wells, D. D., a Brooklyn pastor of large experience, has lately come into our hands, and it is a pleasure to commend its practical suggestions to those in the pastoral office, especially those who have just entered upon its responsibilities. Questions touching the wisest way of dealing with those who are passing out of time into eternity will be found plainly answered in it. Wrong methods are also discussed and plainly criticised from the standpoint of a long experience.

Moving Sermons.

"MANY a clergyman," writes Mr. Gladstone, "will think that, if he has embodied in his sermon a piece of good divinity, the deed is done, the end of preaching is attained. But the business of a sermon is to move as well as to teach; and if he teaches only without moving, may it not almost be said that he sows by the wayside?" It is in a comprehensive sense, doubtless, that he uses the word "moving." We have come to restrict it very generally to that which takes effect upon the feelings only. A "moving" discourse is understood to be one that touches the emotions, that "moves to tears;" but to draw tears is an easy trick to him who knows how to play upon the heart, one that is thoroughly understood by every elocutionist and by every writer of fiction. That is a truly moving sermon which moves the whole man to consecrated activity; which startles sleepers from their somnolence and gives them an impetus to devoted service; which sets

the idler thinking. "Why stand I here all the day idle?" Truth apart from life is useless. Dogma that does not end in *pragma* is a delusion. Let the fountain be stirred by the angel, by all means, but let its healing influences be known by the diseased, or the stirring ends in vanity. "If thou do know better than I what is good and right," wrote Carlyle in "Past and Present," "I conjure thee in the name of God, force me to do it."

The Prize Contest.

As our readers will recall, we announced last December that we would offer for the year 1893 a number of prizes for the best twenty illustrations of texts or truths of Scripture from recent scientific discoveries or historic developments. The request has come to us that, in view of certain considerations which affect all contestants alike, the time limit be extended. As those who have already sent in their contributions are more nearly interested in the matter than any one else, we are willing to submit the question to their judgment, and with their consent we will extend the time to the first of June.

Queries and Answers.

Questions of general interest to clergymen will be printed in this department. The questions sent to us should be put in as brief forms as possible. Answers from our readers are requested. They must be (1) brief; (2) preceded by the number of the question to which they reply; (3) the name and address of the writer must accompany each answer. The name of a writer will not be published if we are requested to withhold it.

1. What is the best book touching upon the subject of the death of little children?

A. One that has perhaps given as much comfort as any is Dr. Cuyler's "The Empty Crib," published by the Baker & Taylor Co., New York.

2. I want information on the general subject of Faith Cures, Christian Science, etc. Can you tell me where to look for such?

A. There is no single volume with which we are acquainted that can compare with that of Dr. Buckley, the accomplished editor of the *Christian Advocate*.

3. What is the best work on the men of the Old Testament? of the New Testament? on the mountains of the Bible? on the night events of the Bible? on the diseases of the Bible?

A. In reply to the first two questions, see the last volume of "Thirty Thousand Thoughts." Dr. Daniel Marsh, we believe, wrote a book on "The Night Scenes of the Bible." Some standard Biblical cyclopædia would probably be the best work to consult as to the other questions.

BLUE MONDAY.

"FATHER MILLS," of Torrington, Conn., was so eccentric, that the ministers of the association to which he belonged took occasion once to admonish him, and beg him to abandon the use of some of his odd expressions. This is not surprising, for he is known on good authority to have said in public prayer, "O Lord, we are good-for-nothing creatures; we all deserve to be hanged." The good man listened attentively and tearfully to the exhortation of his brethren, simply remarking that he was not aware that he was saying anything out of place, but he would "try to turn over a new leaf." At the close of the meeting Father Mills was called on to pray. He most reverently thanked the Lord "that they had had a good meeting, and been enabled once more to hitch horses together." After that the ministers let him alone.

Two notices were given out in an Episcopal Church in England one Sabbath day, and being mixed up a little did not fail to excite the risibles of the congregation. One had reference to a hymn-book, the other to a baptism.

"The new hymn-book," said the minister, "will be used the first time on Sabbath next. I would also call attention to the delay which often takes place in bringing children to be baptized. I would particularly impress this on mothers who have young babies." "And for the information of those who have none," said the clerk, in a gentle and kindly tone (who was deaf and had not heard what the rector had said), "I may state, that if wished, they can be obtained on application in the vestry immediately after service to-day. Single ones, one shilling each; with stiff backs, two shillings."

REV. MR. WALKER, of Connecticut, saw his brother minister, Mr. Read, sitting in one of the pews of his church

just before the commencement of the services one Sabbath morning, and he went to him and begged him to preach. Mr. Read at first declined, saying he had made no preparation, but being pressed, yielded and went into the pulpit. After a few moments' reflection he pitched on Job i. 7, "Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, from going to and fro on the earth, and from walking up and down in it." From this text he drew the doctrine and announced it boldly, that the devil is a great *Walker*. He rung the changes on the name of his friend till the people took and signified their notice by a smile.

Mr. Walker ascended the pulpit in the afternoon and took for his text Matt. xi. 7, "A *reed* shaken with the wind." The doctrine of the text, he said, is the instability of *Reeds*. On this theme, it is said, he discoursed till Mr. Read wished that he had never ventured his wit in the pulpit at the expense of his friend Walker.

REV. ROBERT HALL is said to have been unhappy in his courtship of Miss Steel. When he was perhaps smarting beneath the disappointment he went out to tea. The lady of the house said, with no very good taste, "You are dull, Mr. Hall, we have no polished *steel* here to entertain you." "Oh, madam, that's not the slightest consequence. You have plenty of polished *brass*." On another occasion, when some rumor of marriage had gone about, he broke out decidedly, "Sir, sir, marry Miss —, sir! I would as soon marry the devil's daughter, and go home and live with the old folks."

His genius for happy retort never slumbered. One of his congregation, a sickly, querulous old mortal, met him in the street. "Ah, Mr. Hall, you have — never — been — to see me — sir. I've — I've been very ill. I've been at death's door, Mr. Hall." "Why didn't you step in, sir? Why didn't you step in?"