

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

Vol. XV.—MAY, 1888.—No. 5.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—CRITICISMS ON SOME OF THE ABLEST REPRESENTATIVE PREACHERS OF THE DAY.

BY AN EMINENT PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS.

NO. VI.—REV. R. S. STORRS, D.D., LL.D.

“THE prince of living pulpit rhetoricians,” would be a true, but it would be a very inadequate, and it might be a very misleading, characterization of the subject of the present paper. Dr. Storrs is easily that, but he is alike more, and other, and better than that. He rises upon occasion from the rhetorician to the orator; and even when he is least the orator and most the rhetorician, he is always so sterling in thought, and so lofty in moral or religious purpose, that to think of him as only, or as chiefly, a rhetorician, would be to make a capital, a vital, mistake in critical appreciation of his quality. He is a great sincere and serious soul, in whom—by a mere chance perhaps of early determining choice on his own part—the genius of the orator was destined to be somewhat overborne by the culture of the rhetorician. It is bold pure conjecture to hazard, but I can easily conceive how, if the youthful Storrs who was a student-at-law of Rufus Choate had taken his lifelong bent in style of thought and expression from a Dorian master like Webster, instead of a Corinthian master like Choate, he might have issued a quite different speaker from that stately, that magnificent, pulpit orator who is our national joy and pride in the actual Dr. Storrs of to-day, bearing so strongly and so lightly the burden of his well-nigh seventy useful and honorable years.

Do you say, ‘But warmth of temperament was wanting to this otherwise prodigally gifted nature, and that deficiency was from the first in itself enough to have made him, and hopelessly to keep him, the style of orator that he is, capable indeed of shining like the sun, but incapable of warming as the sun warms?’

A natural judgment, but probably fallacious. A mask of oratoric manner, early put on and twenty years unceasingly worn by a public

speaker, acquires almost unlimited power to hide in that speaker a fundamental reality of natural endowment; nay, to work, by reflex reaction of influence, or well-nigh, for the uses of public speaking, to work, as it were, an utter extinction of some inherent personal trait in the man. I have misinterpreted a certain signal public utterance of this great orator, if, on one occasion at least, breaking through the exterior crust of calm which Dr. Storrs before an audience usually exhibits to observers, there did not appear an escape of noble elemental passion in speech, betokening within the central core of his being the presence of power originally his to have become a shaker of assemblies like Demosthenes himself, or, to use a fitter comparison, like Chrysostom preaching in the basilicas of Antioch and Constantinople.

Such, however, is not in fact the character in which Dr. Storrs is familiar to the public, and in which he will be known in the history of later pulpit eloquence. We properly deal here with what he is, rather than with what he might have been; and still what he might have been is, in its measure, necessary to be considered in order to estimating accurately and adequately what he is.

Dr. Storrs, if you count by generations, stands fourth in a long and splendid line of hereditary ministerial succession. His father, his grandfather, his great-grandfather, were ancestors to him in office as well as in blood. Something of an hereditary cast of character, ennobled perhaps with each successive transmission, has, so it is easy to imagine, descended along the whole line from sire to son. It does not seem to be the separate single individual alone who looks upon you from Dr. Storrs's pulpit with that commanding mien, and who speaks to you thence in those commanding tones. Your imagination beholds also the invisible faces, your imagination hearkens also to the inaudible voices, of an illustrious dead ancestry standing with solemn and impressive port, behind the living speaker. You somehow feel besides that the speaker himself is not unconscious of such influence, sympathetic and collaborant with him, derived from his own ancestral past.

It is very easy, very delightful, and, in the present case, to the present writer, almost irresistibly instinctive, to dwell thus in imagining and admiring. I must not, however, be beguiled to forget that my business now is neither to imagine nor to admire, but to criticise. Happily, to criticise is to judge, and not merely to find fault. To praise, certainly not less than to blame, is the critic's true office. Blaming where blameworthiness is found, praising where praiseworthiness, and balancing the two against each other in the nice equipoise of justice and truth,—that, in short, is the genuine critic's oft-misapprehended duty and delight. But I have not completely stated the business of criticism until I have gone farther and said that there is to be adjoined the still more delicate and difficult task of merely distinguishing, and designating with accuracy, qualities and quantities—through all the varying

shades and degrees in which they may exist in a subject criticised—without impertinently attributing either praise or blame for differences properly demanding neither the one nor the other. Let us now—I venture to associate my readers—in the case before us, at once address ourselves to our task thus defined.

Whether one listen with one's ears to the living speaker or listen with one's eyes to the speaker's words in print, in either case equally, I think, the first and strongest impression taken is a moral impression, the impression of high personal character in the man. This perhaps has already been implied; but it needs thus to be said expressly, and said with the emphasis of reiteration. And to say it does not travel a step outside the strict and proper purview of the critic of eloquence. For, since Aristotle, it has been a commonplace of rhetorical teaching that to be a good orator you must, most important of all, be a good man. This condition in Dr. Storrs's case his hearer feels to be completely fulfilled.

We have here to distinguish a little. A certain great preacher, and one who is at the same time a great teacher of preaching—a man of whom it will soon be the present writer's duty to attempt a criticism in these pages, Dr. Broadus—lays it down as a prime maxim for the pulpit, Secure the sympathy of your audience. By sympathy, Dr. Broadus of course does not mean compassionate regard. On the other hand, however, it is something more than good will that he means. He means good will touched and vivified with lively emotion. This sentiment, Dr. Broadus, by the way, exemplifies his own maxim by himself exciting as orator to a remarkable degree in his audience.

It is not exactly such an effect as this of conciliation and ingratiation that Dr. Storrs produces, by the impression which he makes of personal character on the sense of one hearing him or reading him. He does not enlist your sympathy, so much as he compels your respect. You are commanded rather than won.

Evidently, for the purposes of the popular orator, it would be an advantage to Dr. Storrs to be persuasive as much as convincing. But it is, on the other hand, to be remembered that the Christian preacher is not simply a popular orator speaking from the pulpit. The Christian preacher is likewise a pastor, a citizen, and a man. Besides this also, for the case of a minister like Dr. Storrs, it must be considered that in any very large city, the preacher, out of a population there sufficiently numerous to allow it, comes in the end to select his own audience. This process of selection on the part of preacher and preacher was always of course active in Brooklyn. Emotional people Mr. Beecher naturally drew to himself far more than could be the case with Dr. Storrs. Mr. Beecher engaged their sympathy more. Dr. Storrs, however, has never lacked those who, though less impressionable, were in their way not less responsive to his own peculiar personal influence

than were Mr. Beecher's adherents to his. There always are persons who do not desire to have their emotional susceptibilities played upon, who like better to be addressed in their reason than in their passion. Such persons are naturally elected to be of the congregation of a preacher and pastor like Dr. Storrs. A congregation so composed may make up in solidity, stability, weight, what it lacks in impulse, mobility, *verve*. Dr. Storrs's work has been other, but perhaps it has not been less, than it would have been had he possessed the broadly and obviously sympathetic qualities which in fact he lacks. He would in that case have attracted a different congregation, larger perhaps, but one which in counting more might have weighed less. At any rate, the personal character which you feel as a force in Dr. Storrs the orator works for him with you rather by commanding your confidence than by enlisting your sympathy.

Apart from such direct effect of personal character felt by his hearers, and additional to it, there is to be reckoned also a sense awakened on the hearers' part that the speaker himself has a constant conscientious feeling of his own personal character and of what is due to it from himself at least if not from them. The trait I now mean is far enough from vanity and it is equally removed from pride. It is sober, mindful, serious sense of personality and worth; in one word it is true dignity. 'This man'—such is your instinctive, though it may be unformulated, impression—'this man will reason with me, will teach me, will warn me, will remonstrate, will invite, will threaten; but one thing there is he never will do, he will never play me a trick, never cheat, never cajole. If he were not otherwise above such conduct, he has too much lofty dignity for it, he respects himself too much.' Dr. Storrs could never have been a demagogue, he could never have been an actor, he could never have been the pliant favorite orator of the populace. He will not condescend enough.

This conscious dignity of which I speak would be in Dr. Storrs's way if he were to resolve on mixing histrionism with oratory, and on seeking to succeed in the pulpit, as the play-actor succeeds on the stage, by pleasing his audience with various mimicry, instead of purifying them with reason and with terror. But of course this conscious dignity in him would also prevent his ever forming such a resolution. In short, Dr. Storrs is, by a certain moral superiority in him, incapable of being an orator to wheedle popular moods, and to seem to rule, by really indulging, his hearers. He recalls the noble words spoken by that frugal encomiast, Thucydides, of the great Athenian Pericles.

"He [Pericles], deriving authority from his capacity and acknowledged worth, being also a man of transparent integrity, was able to control the multitude in a free spirit; he led them rather than was led by them; for, not seeking power by dishonest arts, he had no need to say pleasant things, but on the strength of his own high character could venture to oppose and even to anger them. When he saw them unseasonably elated and arrogant, his words humbled and awed them. . . . Thus Athens, though still in name a democracy, was in fact ruled by her greatest citizen."

It is in some such an attitude of moral superiority as is thus attrib-

uted by Thucydides to Pericles, that Dr. Storrs presents himself to his audience. His is emphatically an eloquence of character and of dignity.

In considering what characteristic of Dr. Storrs's oratory next to name as next in order of importance, I pause in almost hopeless balance between two quite different, and even as it were contradictory things, the one moral, and the other mental, the one an original endowment, and the other an adventitious acquisition: I hardly know whether to say moral earnestness or elegant culture. The impression of moral earnestness must be very strongly made on you by Dr. Storrs to assert itself at all, much more to assert itself in doubtful rivalry against an elegant culture in him impressing you with such unparalleled power. For Dr. Storrs seems to me to be in this respect without peer anywhere in the world among the preachers of his time. By elegant culture I mean not exact scholarship, not multifarious learning, not wide information, but a certain grace and finish of mind, the "bright consummate flower" of arduous self-discipline conducted by one possessing beforehand that inborn fitness for it which is the incommunicable gift of taste or of genius.

The circumstance that elegant culture strikes one so strongly as a trait in the oratory of Dr. Storrs may be largely due to the fact that he makes his general public impression through occasional sermons and addresses rather than by the ordinary average strain of his preaching of the gospel. He has never published a volume of parochial sermons; while as orator for occasions of an elevated character he is perhaps as near as any living American to being now the elect favorite voice of the nation. It is natural and proper that in occasional eloquence—epideictic the Greeks who originated it called this kind of public speaking—there should be used a style more studied and ornate than would be fit in ordinary pulpit discourse. But under all the ornament with which Dr. Storrs loves, on a select signal occasion, to decorate his speech, there never fails to beat a heart of genuine moral earnestness. I cannot doubt that in his habitual pastoral preaching, moral earnestness exercises its unquestioned right to be unmistakable lord paramount of his discourse.

The truly magnificent oration delivered by Dr. Storrs in 1880 before the Phi Beta Kappa Society in Harvard University is perhaps the single specimen among such utterances of this orator, best deserving to be styled his masterpiece in epideictic eloquence. Here the epideictic character almost disappears consumed in the noble intensity of moral earnestness that burns throughout the discourse. But no stress of moral earnestness, kindled to whatever sevenfold heat, could prevail to consume the decoration, proof as of diamond, which Dr. Storrs's taste and culture have united with his labor of art to lavish upon this production.

Take the following sentence. The orator is drawing argument for

the supernatural, as a force in letters and in life, from the introduction by Homer into his poems of interferences from the gods in human affairs. Dr. Storrs says—how full of the scholar's enthusiastic reminiscence, how full of the rhetorician's power with words, is his language!—:

"The wine-colored waters breaking around the high-beaked ships, the camp-fires glittering on the plain, the splendor of armor shining in the air as with the flash of mountain-fires, the troubled dust rising in mist before the tramp of rapid feet, greaves with their silver clasp, helmets crested with horse-hair plumes, the marvelous shield, with triple border, blazoned with manifold intricate device, and circled by the ocean stream, the changeful and impetuous fight, the anguish and rage, and the illustrious funeral-pile—not by these, though moving before us in epic verse, and touched with iridescent lights by the magic of genius, is the mind held captive to the Iliad, as by its shadowy morning-time spirit of 'surmise and aspiration'; by the tender and daring divine illusions, which see the air quick with veiled Powers, and the responding earth the haunted field of their Olympian struggle and debate."

How a sentence like that seems to illumine its page as with shifting sheen of color and of light! The very senses are, through the imagination, delighted with it—to such a degree delighted that the mind almost forgets to consider whether the orator's main thought here is strong enough to bear the weight of decoration with which the rhetorician's art and the scholar's wealth of Homeric recollection together have freighted it. The merely natural charm of Homer has first been, at such length, so richly and so sympathetically described, that the supernatural charm afterward more briefly attributed is hardly felt to be greater—as, however, for the orator's purpose, it had need to be. The rhetoric well-nigh gets the better of the oratory.

The chaste brilliance of the passage just shown does not over-represent the pure rhetorical splendor of the discourse as a whole. The eyes fairly ache with enjoying and admiring. And Dr. Storrs's style of delivery well corresponds—lofty, grave, continuously majestic. The speaking takes up the effect of the writing and carries it to its height.

If we resolutely release ourselves from the fascination laid upon us by the oratory to study at leisure the secret of its method, the first thing perhaps to strike us is the diction of the discourse. This is choice, copious, varied, but it is especially rich in adjectives, and adjectives of a certain class—a class attributing loftiness, largeness, splendor, opulence. The frequency and recurrence of such adjectives is remarkable. The sense is sated with them. Save that they are so select, and so apt, and so picturesque, in Dr. Storrs's use, there would at length be felt something like the fullness of satiety. And the English language is not rich enough to supply so many of this class of adjectives as not to leave the orator obliged to repeat noticeably certain favorite ones, among them, "imperial," "supreme," "majestic," "supernal," "radiant," "transcendant," "superlative," "sovereign," "august," "stately," "lucid," "luminous," "iridescent"—these adjectives, and adjectives like these stud, Dr. Storrs's ample pages as stars and constellations and galaxies stud the firmament of heaven. A trace

of the authentic effect of the magnificent discourse itself seems produced by a mere miscellaneous assemblage like the foregoing, as in a procession, of its buskined and togated adjectives.

And apart from the adjectives, the diction in general partakes with these of the character which I have now sought to describe. The substantives are worthy of the adjectives that attend them, while the verbs set the substantives in action always in a manner comfortable with the dignity which they must not disparage. The keeping is perfect. The state and equipage are throughout unimpeachably maintained.

And yet to what general statement is there no exception that candor must note? Occasionally a discord jars the majestic harmony of Dr. Storrs's diction. Here is an example, not a very striking one, but apposite, for it occurs even in that same academic discourse which I reckon the glory and crown of Dr. Storrs's occasional eloquence :

"No mechanical philosophy has had secular supremacy; and that form of speculation which reduces the personal spirit in man to physical terms, making thought itself, volition, passion, the result of simple molecular action, and binding the race in a sterner fatalism than any theologian ever imagined—it has *spurred* into sight in different communities, but it nowhere has reached abiding power."

The plebeian sound and the ignoble association of the word "spurred" do, one admits, go far toward justifying its introduction here, as an expedient of righteously degrading that materialistic spirit which it is the orator's present business to condemn. In truth I do not blame, I only note, this trait of diction. Perhaps indeed I ought to praise it; but at any rate it is a jar in the harmony of the elevated language in which it occurs. It serves thus by contrast to make one more keenly aware how sustained and even a high tenor of choice in words has prevailed. The adjective "secular," in the sentence quoted above, is of course employed in its classic sense of "age-long." It is a Latinism not uncharacteristic of the taste and habit of the orator.

Another thing noticeable, still in the line of diction, is Dr. Storrs's manneristic pluralizing of certain substantives generally used only in the singular. "Freedoms," "knowledges," "welfares," "enthusiasms," "generosities," "defiances," "wealths," are examples. This peculiarity sometimes has a genuine effect of heightening the value of meaning expressed, and where such effect is illusory the illusion is yet not without its charm to the imagination.

Dr. Storrs still further enriches and individualizes his diction by bringing into use upon occasion a word (or a form of word, as "heroical"), that his reader will seldom or never have met in any other writer. For instance :

"It is not only that in ecstasy or in agony it [the human spirit] transcends situations, finds no complete image of its intense life in anything physical, and in its bright or awful solitude is conscious only of timeless relations, and of being *affined* to imperial spirits."

My readers must instinctively have noted the lofty monotony, of diction not only, but of phrase and structure of period, that recurs in every quotation here introduced. Such is the stately Virgilian character of

rhetoric everywhere prevailing in Dr. Storrs's elaborate discourse. There never pauses the processional pomp of numerous rhythmic prose. Or, to use now a different figure, it is like one prolonged orchestral harmony sustained throughout by imperial organ tones.

I have thus far sought to characterize, rather than to imply judgment for or against. If now it were made my duty to judge, I think I should be obliged to say that in my own opinion Dr. Storrs commits the rhetorical fault of splendid excess. He always has a meaning; but he sometimes makes his meaning dark with splendor. His words dazzle us till we fail to see the thought itself which they over-illumine. This is at times true both of the particular sentence and of the whole discourse. Even his topic Dr. Storrs does not always state in a manner sufficiently direct and unadorned to fulfill Quintilian's requirement that you should say things not only so clearly that men can understand them, but so clearly that men cannot help understanding them. For example, in the Phi Beta Kappa oration already quoted from, the speaker, having used nine brilliant pages to introduce his topic, glides then so imperceptibly into his statement of this, that you, supposed a hearer, are hardly aware how important a thing is in progress until all is over; then you strive, perhaps not with entire success, to recall exactly what has been said. The manner in which the statement of topic referred to appears on the printed page may fairly be taken to represent the effect that would be produced by that statement as heard by an audience. The statement stands, typographically undistinguished, in the midst of a paragraph, as follows:

"I would offer, with your permission, a brief plea for the fresh and controlling recognition among us of what is essentially Supernatural: which can not be the object of present demonstration, yet whose reality is suggested by many facts, and the glory of which man may in a measure prophetically feel, though only its vague outlines can he see."

The foregoing is, as I think, an oratorically ineffective statement of topic. It is not simple, not straightforward, not brief and unencumbered enough. And, besides this, it is too unannounced and informal. It produces the effect of being itself a part of the discourse rather than of announcing the subject of the discourse.

A like oratorical error seemed to me to be committed in the orator's not setting forth the order of treatment which he intends to pursue. All is left vague and undefined. The discourse moves, it moves strongly, majestically, magnificently, but it moves along no highway perceived, and toward no goal foreshown. There is movement, in short, without progress, or at least without progress that the hearer or reader is able distinctly to feel and enjoy. It is more like the movement of an army on parade than it is like the movement of an army on the march, much more than like the movement of an army rushing to battle.

There is one printed discourse of Dr. Storrs's which presents a noteworthy exception to his habitual excessive neglect of analysis, neglect, I mean, of obvious, of confessed and formal analysis. This is the dis-

course delivered by him in 1873 before the Evangelical Alliance on "The Appeal of Romanism to Educated Protestants." In that discourse Dr. Storrs is exemplarily clear both in stating his subject and object, and afterward in marking the successive stages accomplished of progress toward his goal. The method of the orator is then, in nearly every respect, completely satisfactory.

I think it not unlikely, however, that the distinguished orator himself, if consulted, might say, 'The discourse you thus praise is in my own view less an oration than an essay. It was a paper read rather than an address delivered. The analysis you like was fit to its character as an essay, but it would not have been fit to its character if it had been a proper oration.' In other words, I must not doubt that so experienced and considerate an orator as Dr. Storrs proceeds in this matter according to a method which his own mature and deliberate judgment recommends. He conceals, as in general he does conceal, his plan of discourse, because he thinks that so to conceal it is wisest and best. I can only, with modesty, but without diffidence, record my own opinion that this method is for any public speaker a serious oratorical mistake. It immensely diminishes the present effectiveness of a given discourse with the hearer, and it powerfully reacts to make the orator himself less clear in thought, less intent on progress in argument, and less urgent in aim.

Of all the printed discourses that I have seen of Dr. Storrs, the discourse last named, "The Appeal of Romanism to Educated Protestants", is probably the one best adapted to afford pleasure and profit to the average man. It is sufficiently splendid in rhetoric, and it gives the reader what, as I have implied, he often misses in Dr. Storrs's discourse, a satisfying sense of progress continually made from point to point as he reads.

In several previous critical papers belonging to this series, the writer has had occasion to point out defects of literary care on the part of preachers, especially those in loose, inaccurate quotation. Nothing of this sort can be brought home to Dr. Storrs. He everywhere displays a fine literary instinct and conscience. Conscience I judge it must be, as well as mere instinct; but Dr. Storrs's phenomenal memory might perhaps almost be trusted, in conjunction with his instinct, to guard him against faults of literary negligence, even if he felt within himself no pricks of literary conscience to be careful. It is well known what feats of memory in matters of fact involving dates, and numbers, and names of men and places not generally familiar, Dr. Storrs has achieved, pronouncing without notes, discourses on historical subjects singly occupying hours of time.

This form of memory is not, however, the secret of Dr. Storrs's success in extemporaneous speaking. Real extemporaneous speaking it is that he does, not speaking from memory. He neither writes his sermons,

nor composes them without writing as was to some extent the practice of Robert Hall. He premeditates them of course. That is to say, it is not extemporary thinking that he gives his hearers; and much less is it extemporary speaking without thought. It is prepared thought taking body at the moment, as of its own accord, in unprepared expression. Naturally, inevitably, in the course of previously preparing his thought, the thinker will have called up to his mind many words fit to the expression of the thought. Such words will instinctively recur to him in the act of oral delivery. But there will have been little or no framing of sentences. The sentences will frame themselves as the sermon proceeds. With Dr. Storrs, however, the sentences will not frame themselves in that absolutely simple, spontaneous, and therefore endlessly varying order, the order of nature, which was the beautiful marvel of Mr. Beecher's unparalleled eloquence. The mould of period in which Dr. Storrs habitually casts his expression is much more that of written than it is that of spoken discourse. He trained himself to write; and when he speaks now without having written, it is in the rhetorical style of composition, proper for instance to one dictating elaborate discourse for committal to writing. The product is wonderfully fine, considered as mere composition turned off at so rapid a rate. Still it is necessarily far from being finished and polished up to the standard of his confessedly written discourse.

Let not the young preacher believe or admire unwisely. No merely human speaker ever yet spoke on this planet, whose extemporary utterance taken down without change absolutely as it fell from his lips would read grammatically, rhetorically, and logically clear of fault—judged, I mean, by the relative standard of that same speaker's own written production. The extemporary utterance may be far better, considered as oratory, than the carefully written; but that result, if it exist, will be due to the presence in the extemporary utterance of certain virtues not belonging to the written; it will by no means be due to the absence from the extemporary, of faults such as perhaps the written utterance would altogether avoid.

Dr. Storrs, then, as extemporary speaker, presents an example of what long careful practice with the pen will enable a gifted man to do in producing, if the paradox will be pardoned, *written* discourse rapidly with the *tongue*—this, rather than an example of the successful off-hand pulpit oratory strictly and properly so called. To become a master in this latter kind, the only way is to form your style through speaking rather than through writing. Write as much as you please, the more the better, if you write with care. But see to it that you learn to write as you speak, instead of learning to speak as you write.

At the outset of this paper I expressed the opinion that Dr. Storrs had it in him by nature to become an orator of a very different type from the calm, dignified, self-contained, unimpassioned speaker that,

as matter of fact, he prevailingly is. I then also, without naming it, alluded to a particular occasion of his eloquence which I thought demonstrated this. That occasion was the "silver wedding," so styled, in which the twenty-fifth anniversary was celebrated of Mr. Beecher's commencing as pastor of Plymouth Church. One session of that prolonged festival of commemoration was chiefly given up to an address by Dr. Storrs.

Dr. Storrs was in the prime of his age and in the fullness of manly health refreshed from an interval just previously enjoyed of rest and foreign travel. The occasion was animating, the subject, "Mr. Beecher as a Preacher," was a personal one that touched and vivified the speaker, the reciprocity between speaker and hearers was perfect, was electric, and in short all conditions conspired to put Dr. Storrs at his very best in a vein of truly natural eloquence. The result was an address which, for spontaneous felicity, beauty, humor, pathos, power, Mr. Beecher himself in his happiest inspirations rarely surpassed. I wish every reader of this criticism could read that address in full. It is now hardly accessible, I suppose. It was preserved in a pamphlet record of the entire occasion, published at the time, but that record has long been a rare publication difficult to find. Perhaps a sufficient number of inquiries for it from subscribers might induce the editors of *THE HOMILETIC REVIEW* to reprint Dr. Storrs's address in these pages. I give here an extract or two. Does not the following passage exhibit Dr. Storrs in the light of a speaker capable of doing almost anything he might please to attempt in the way of ready, effective, popular handling of a subject? The contrast will be immediately felt between the studied and stately rhetoric exemplified in preceding citations, and the free, easy, masterful style exemplified now. Dr. Storrs is engaged in analyzing the secret of Mr. Beecher's power. He says:

"I think I should put second [among Mr. Beecher's endowments] immense common sense; a wonderfully self-rectifying judgment which gives sobriety and soundness to all his main processes of thought. I don't know but I have been more impressed by that in Mr. Beecher than by any other one element of strength in him. I have seen him go to the edge of a proposition which seemed to me dangerous and almost absurd, again and again, but he never went over. He always caught himself on the edge, not by any special volition, but by an instinctive impulse; by the law of a nature that rectifies mistakes almost before they are made. If he has taken an extravagant view which seems about to diverge from the solid ground, it never fairly and finally does so. He reminds me of sensations which I have had a hundred times in crossing the ocean. For instance, coming back from Europe in the *Russia* during a heavy blow, we were taking the waves 'quartering.' Down would go the starboard side, and up would go the larboard; down would go the stern, and up would go the bows; then the great ship would ride for an instant balanced upon the top of the wave; then, as she reeled over, the bows would go down and the stern would go up; the larboard side would go down and the starboard up; but the grand old ship would always swing herself to a level in the valleys between those ridges of water. She was perpetually diving or climbing, but balancing herself between and always swinging to her level again. And whatever she did, she was forever going on toward the distant harbor. As one sea-sick fellow-passenger of mine said, 'Confound it, making that gigantic figure 8 all the time!' But that gigantic figure 8 was what was driving us on, through storm or shine, toward Sandy Hook."

This passage, let it be observed, is itself like what it so well describes

in the sea voyage and through that in Mr. Beecher, a "figure 8," not "gigantic," indeed, but for its purpose amply large enough, and everywhere alive with movement and progress. Such felicity and fitness in description are not the product of forethought and labor; they are the inspiration of genius.

Of course no such necessarily brief extract as it would be suitable here to introduce could do anything more than merely hint even to the very wise and thoughtful reader what capacity of versatile adjustment to the needs of various expressions the whole noble and beautiful address exhibits as held in possession by the orator. The life, the movement, the progress, the power, you must read the address throughout in order adequately to feel. I give one more passage—that in which the speaker modulates humor, analysis, anecdote, reminiscence, all, to the lofty, pathetic *magnificent* of his close:

"We have stood side by side in all these years; and they have been wonderful and eventful years.

'Our eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord,

When he loosed the fateful lightnings of his terrible swift sword,

And his truth went marching on!

"We have differed many times, but two men so unlike never stood side by side with each other, for so long a time, in more perfect harmony; without a jealousy or a jar! Though we have differed in opinion, we have never differed in feeling. We have walked to the graves of friends in company. We have sat at the table of the Lord in company. He knows, as he has said, that when other voices were loud and fierce in hostility to him, mine never joined them. When other pens wrote his name, dropping gall and venom as they wrote it, my pen never touched the paper except in honor and admiration of him. And I know that whenever I have wanted counsel or courage given me from others, he has always been ready, from the overflowing surplus of his surcharged mind, to give them to me.

"So we have stood side by side—blessed be God!—in no spirit but of fraternal love, for that long space of twenty-five years, which began with the Right Hand of Fellowship then, and closes before you here to-night.

"I am not here, my friends, to repeat the service which then I performed. It would be superfluous. When I think of the great assemblies that have surged and thronged around this platform; when I think of the influences that have gone out from this pulpit into all the earth—I feel that less than almost any other man on earth does he need the assurance of fellowship from any but the Son of God! But I am here to-night for another and a different service! On behalf of you who tarry, and of those who have ascended from this congregation; on behalf of Christians of every name throughout our city, who have had such joy and pride in him, and the name of whose town has, by him, been made famous in the earth; on behalf of all our churches now growing to be an army; on behalf of those in every part of our land who have never seen his face or heard his voice, but who have read and loved his sermons, and been quickened and blessed by them; on behalf of the great multitudes who have gone up from every land which his sermons have reached—never having touched his hand on earth, but waiting to greet him by and by; I am here to-night [taking Mr. Beecher by the hand] to give him the Right Hand of Congratulation, on the closing of this twenty-fifth year of his ministry, and to say: God be praised for all the work that you have done here! God be praised for the generous gifts which he has showered upon you, and the generous use which you have made of them, here and elsewhere, and everywhere in the land! God give you many happy and glorious years of work and joy still to come in your ministry on earth! May your soul, as the years go on, be whitened more and more, in the radiance of God's light, and in the sunshine of his love! And, when the end comes—as it will—may the gates of pearl swing inward for your entrance, before the hands of those who have gone up before you, and who now wait to welcome you thither! and then may there open to you that vast and bright eternity—all vivid with God's love—in which an instant vision shall be perfect joy, and an immortal labor shall be to you immortal rest!"

"This magnificent concluding passage," said the Brooklyn *Union* of the next day,

"was uttered with an eloquence that defies description. At its conclusion Mr. Beecher, with tears, and trembling from head to foot, arose, and placing his hand on Dr. Storrs's shoulder, kissed him upon the cheek. The congregation sat for a moment breathless and enraptured with this simple

and beautiful action. Then there broke from them such a burst of applause as never before was heard in an ecclesiastical edifice. There was not a dry eye in the house."

I could not refrain from subjoining an immediate journalistic testimony to the overpowering effect which this address, with its close, produced as delivered. Much doubtless was in the occasion itself, and in the moving spectacular response which the eloquent sincerity of Dr. Storrs evoked from Mr. Beecher; but what inextinguishable quintessence of oratoric power survives even in the printed words! For my own part, I am willing to confess that I can scarcely now read the passage over, for perhaps the twentieth time, without tears.

It is painful, but it seems necessary, to recall that within a few months of the time when Dr. Storrs poured out his heart to Mr. Beecher in the manner just shown, that darkness as of eclipse passed suddenly over the face of Mr. Beecher's fair fame, then riding high like the sun at midnight in its zenith of glory. The long disastrous twilight that succeeded the daytime of splendor!

Through no fault, as I believe, of Dr. Storrs, and for no reason personal to himself, the fellowship which he had but now so magnanimously celebrated was broken for life. He never, I think, unsaid those generous words, but also he never, alas, could say them again. "May your soul, as you go on, be whitened more and more"—the wish and the prayer half seems now in the retrospect to have had in it already something of the sadness of unconscious prophetic foreboding. Words refuse to utter the burden of the pathos, the tragedy. Let us think of it, not speak of it.

But of Dr. Storrs himself, and of his work, we may freely both think and speak with unmingled grateful joy. His work is not done; it yet awaits, we may hope, a long glorious consummation. That work, when finished, we need not doubt, will abide; and then always, still greater, still better, than his work, to make his work stronger, more beautiful, will abide, unflawed, the character of the man that achieved it.

II.—PREPARATION FOR THE PULPIT.

BY W. ORMISTON, D.D., LL.D., NEW YORK.

"In all matters, before a beginning, a diligent preparation should be made."—CICERO.

"No man can be a perfect orator unless he is a good man."—QUINTILIAN.

"I preached as never sure to preach again, and as a dying man to dying men."—BAXTER.

"It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing."—PAUL.

HAVING in previous articles spoken of the *kind of men* required for the pulpit and of the *varied training* requisite to qualify them for its sacred functions, we now propose to speak of the modes of *preparation* for the work of the pulpit.

In treating of the training usually furnished in our regular theological seminaries we ventured to suggest that some changes might be intro-

duced into the course of studies prescribed so as to adapt the instruction to different classes of students and to prepare them for the diverse kinds of work demanded by the church. Since that paper was written I have read a very suggestive article in the last number of the *Presbyterian Review*, by the Rev. Professor Briggs of Union Theological Seminary, in which, among other important practical suggestions, he alludes to the propriety and necessity of some such changes as those proposed in our last paper. I cannot do better than cite the following sentences. He says: "It is a marked feature of American Presbyterianism that it has never been able to supply a sufficient number of educated ministers. . . . A considerable party have always been willing rather to let the outlying districts suffer from a lack of ministers and go without the gospel than to give them a ministry without a full education. . . . The fields belonging by historic right and by the class of emigrants to the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, but which they could not supply with an educated ministry and refused to supply with an uneducated ministry, were at once occupied by the Baptists and Methodists, and these denominations reaped the fruits of their wise policy and self-sacrificing zeal." He adds the following paragraph, and with the sentiments expressed in it I most heartily concur: "I would be the last one to advocate an uneducated ministry or to lower in any degree the requirements of our standards and of our customs for ministerial education. Our theological education ought to be still further advanced, and more should be required of theological students rather than less. But I am convinced it is of the first importance that the simple gospel of Christ should be preached to the people and that this must be accomplished in the best way that is practicable. If we cannot find a sufficient number of educated ministers we should not hesitate to use pious men who are less equipped for their work."

I would simply add here that it is neither practicable nor necessary that all candidates for the ministry of the gospel should be equally erudite in theology, learned in science, or skilled in dialectics. A thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, an experimental knowledge of the power of the gospel, and a ready command of the English language will enable a man to become an able minister and a successful preacher of the gospel. It is owing largely to employment of such men that the Methodists, Baptists, and Cumberland Presbyterians have made such rapid progress and multiplied the number of churches in our land. But for the employment of a vast number of comparatively illiterate but godly men in preaching the word, Methodism in England could not have achieved its grand triumphs for Christ and his kingdom.

The object and design of the Christian ministry is to bear witness for Christ, to testify the gospel of the grace of God, to bring men to Christ as a personal living Saviour, and to unfold his unsearchable riches. In order to convince or persuade others the preacher must have strong

convictions himself and be firmly persuaded in his own mind of the absolute truth and momentous importance of what he proposes to declare, and that he may be able to present any topic, theme or doctrine clearly to the comprehension of others, he must first be sure that he clearly understands the subject himself; he must feel that the subject or theme proposed is sufficiently great to occupy the attention and command the interest of the congregation to whom it is addressed. He must further have a distinct aim in his discourse and keep it ever before his mind and have practical sympathy not only with his theme but with his audience.

Not only is it necessary to have a distinct purpose and a great subject for every sermon, but the thoughts should be naturally and logically arranged, expressed in clear, precise and suitable language, and enforced by apt and appropriate illustrations. An orderly arrangement of facts, a skillful marshaling of arguments and a judicious use of striking illustration is essential to perspicuity and impressiveness on the part of the preacher, and to interest, attention and edification on the part of the hearer.

The preacher in the pulpit must not fail to remember that he is a *herald* to proclaim authoritatively divinely revealed truths and to testify well-attested facts, most surely to be believed, not an *advocate* to argue and defend some thesis or proposition; that he is an ambassador to make known the will and announce the message of the sovereign who has commissioned and sent him, not a *philosopher* to speculate curiously concerning a theory or reason, however soundly, as to the origin or application of some principle in ethics or economics. Nor is he to regard the pulpit as the place for a learned lecture on apologetics in defense of Christian truth, or for an elaborate refutation of some prevalent heresy, or for the discussion of some passing aspect of social or political life. The pulpit is not a mere platform for the discussion of civil, municipal or national affairs, nor a rostrum for the display of oratory, nor a forum where intellectual gladiators may enter into contest about the affairs of the commonwealth or the condition of the state. But it exists for the one express purpose of preaching *Christ* and *HIM* crucified—Christ Jesus who is the Resurrection and the Life—Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God, through whom we have now received the reconciliation and in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses according to the riches of his grace. What a theme! Surely it demands the most devout, earnest, and prolonged meditation from him who would wisely and advisedly speak of it. Careful, honest and thorough preparation is indispensable to one who would acceptably and profitably attempt to persuade men to acknowledge the Lord Jesus as their Master and to give themselves to him.

In such preparation much of the power and usefulness of the

preacher lies. The apostolic injunction in this matter is, "Give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. Neglect not the gift that is in thee. . . Be diligent in these things; give thyself wholly to them that thy progress may be manifest to all."

In preparing a sermon it is necessary, after selecting a text or paragraph, which makes complete sense, as the subject of discourse, to ascertain, by a painstaking, diligent, independent study of the entire context and by the use of such aids as are attainable, the true meaning of the text, and make that, and not something else suggested by it, the theme of the sermon. It may be allowable occasionally to use a text by way of accommodation, but such a course is seldom necessary and should be rarely adopted. Having obtained a clear conception of the meaning of the text and having settled the use to be made of it, it is further necessary to determine the purpose in view in selecting the text and the method of discoursing from it. The central truth may be succinctly stated and a few propositions laid down which gradually unfold it and lead to its practical application. This method, usually termed topical, gives unity to a sermon and culminates in a satisfying conclusion and a pointed, pungent appeal, or the divisions of the sermon may be textual. This method allows, nay compels, a more varied treatment, which is better adapted to the mixed character and different attainments of a general congregation. It is best to use both methods; some subjects may be presented most impressively in one way, and some more instructively in the other. No uniform monotony or stereotyped form of constructing a sermon should be adhered to. Sometimes the preacher may indicate at the outset the plan of the sermon, at other times he may allow each division only to appear in its order, but in any case there must be a definite plan distinctly formed and followed throughout. Occasions may arise when, influenced by the audience, the mind of the preacher may see while standing in the pulpit what did not occur to his mind while seated at his desk, and it is well to give such thoughts utterance in a natural and easy way, or it may be in a higher style of expression. The sermon being prepared, either by thorough mental elaboration or by careful, well-digested and properly arranged analysis, or, as is on the whole best, written out in full in language exact and select, how should it be delivered? Shall the preacher extemporize? That is, preach, not without premeditation, but without the use of notes or manuscript. This he may do in two ways, either as the result of purely mental preparation; or, having previously written and thoroughly mandated what he purposes to say. Or he may make use of an outline which has been made out and studied with assiduous care, and leave to the time of delivery the clothing of his thoughts in appropriate language.

Shall the preacher use a fully-written manuscript? This may be done in two ways. He may render himself so familiar with the manu-

script as to feel great freedom in delivery—the style approaching and differing but little from extemporaneous utterance—or he may read the manuscript as closely as he would a printed page composed by another. This is probably the least impressive of all the methods. Some men succeed best in one way, some in another; no one rule can be given for all. If the preacher is in full physical vigor and his mind trained to alert activity, and if he has further acquired by extensive reading and much writing a ready command of good language, the extemporaneous method will prove most effective. But unless great watchfulness is exercised there is danger to be apprehended in diffuseness of expression, inaccuracy of language and unconscious repetition. In any method the frequent use of the pen is required to render it acceptable and effective.

Intense study and extensive reading will supply the material for the sermon; clearness and naturalness in the arrangement of the matter of discourse will greatly assist in the delivery of it, whatever method may be adopted. Each must employ the method by which he is able to render the most efficient service.

For many years I used neither note nor outline in the pulpit; then I used a mere outline or analysis of the discourse. During later years I have taken more copious notes to the pulpit with me. Seldom, however, have I ever read a full manuscript, except on some special occasion; and now, after forty years' service in the work of the ministry, I can use any of the methods mentioned. During all my ministry, except when called upon to preach so frequently that I had no leisure to write, I have constantly used the pen, and continue to prepare with as much assiduity and pains as I did in the first years of my ministry.

I would earnestly advise all young preachers to bear in mind that the pulpit is their throne, and to urge upon them the necessity of constant, thorough preparation for every service. Never serve at the altar except with "beaten oil." No personal charm of manner, no special grace of deportment, no social qualities, however pleasing—not even pastoral work, however faithfully performed—will atone for failure in the pulpit. To any who may have the gift of ready utterance this counsel is specially necessary. Mere fluency of speech is not necessarily eloquence; nor is an unprepared and irrelevant harangue, however rapidly or boisterously uttered, a sermon. Never go to the pulpit without a prepared message, and then deliver it in the best way you can. Do the very best you can every time you preach.

We conclude with a brief summary. The *men* required for the ministry should be healthy and hearty, sympathetic and magnetic, zealous and enthusiastic, ready for any self-sacrifice to secure fitness for the work, and to endure hardness in it.

The *training* furnished to the candidates should be thorough as far

as it goes, varied to suit different classes of students to fit them for different kinds of work in the church.

The *preparation* for the work of the pulpit should be constant and careful, diligent and laborious, honest and earnest, ever giving the best possible and doing the most practicable.

III.—THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL VIEWS OF HORACE.

BY PROF. A. A. BLOMBERGH, LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

PART I.

THERE are many excellent poets, but only a few great ones. He who sang of the wrath of Achilles and the wanderings of Odysseus; he who stirs up our inmost soul by the terrible fatality shaping the life of Oedipus; he who makes us weep and laugh over a Don Quixote; the creator of Tartuffe, the maker of Faust—these stand alone in solitary grandeur. But there is one who is perhaps more widely read than any other, for if the great ones are "*paene divini*," the latter is nearer to us, *homo est*; he appeals more to the human heart, he is still what he said once so nicely, "*unus ex multis*"—one of us, of the great mass of humanity. And because he is a "*homo*" in the best sense of the word, because he is both human and humane, he was more than any other poet the mouthpiece of humanity. In his lifetime he was the companion, the delight, the guide of the foremost of his age; during the Middle Ages he solaced the leaders of human thought in their lonely cells, for these leaders were monks; since the revival of classical learning he became the intimate of the scholar, the churchman, the statesman, the soldier. I mean Horace, and of him I will talk, chiefly of his religious and philosophical views. Yes, dear reader, of the religious and moral views of Horace; for so far from being irreligious or immoral, I rather think Horace had more positive religious notions than any of his contemporaries; and in an age when in Rome vices were prevailing which among Christians are not even named, Horace was, relatively speaking, a moral man.

What did Horace think of the prevailing idolatry?

"A fig-tree was I once, a useless block of wood;
The carpenter, not sure if he should make of me
A bench or god, made me a god at length."

A carpenter sees in his shop a block of wood. Not of the precious, durable oak, but of the fig-tree—cheap wood, comparatively "*inutile*," good for nothing. Still it might serve for a bench or a *god*. He considers, and finally concludes it would be good enough—not for a bench, but for a god. In two and a half lines Horace characterizes the folly of making gods of stock and stone as scathingly as the Hebrew prophet in Isaiah xl. 18-20.

But, say some, if he did scorn and ridicule the stupid idolatry of his

time, he was at the best an infidel, a follower of Epicure. No doubt, just as the thinking minds of our age are affected by the ever-changing philosophical movement, so Horace was affected by contemporary thought about God, man and nature, and he reflected in his poems his notions on these subjects as he entertained them at different periods of his life. A student at Athens, then the hotbed of every ism, he was first a disciple of Epicure, just as our age inclines to positivism.

"I learned that God cared nothing for the world,
And if aught strange and wonderful did happen,
God was a stranger to it."

Yet he found good reasons to change frequently his views—changes which he expressed beautifully:

"I never followed any definite sect ;
Where'er the wave me carried, there I was a guest.
Now active and a man of public spirit,
The keeper and strict guardian of virtue,
Now Epicure's disciple, I'm the master
And not the wretched slave of things about me."

But though affected by the floating isms of his time, he was never enthralled by them. An accident, a miraculous escape from danger would bring back his faith in an overruling Providence, and like David (Psalm lxxiii.), who also had occasionally his doubts, he would write a handsome palinode :

"Worshiper rare and niggard of the gods,
While led astray, in the Fool's wisdom versed,
Now back I shift the sail,
Forced in the courses left behind to steer.
For not, as wont, disparting serried cloud
With fiery flash, but through pure azure, drove
Of late Diespiter
His thundering coursers and his wingèd car."

Yes, he who had confessed above that the gods, indifferent to human affairs, left the universe to itself, and that miraculous events in nature were not their doing, acknowledges now God's direct interference. The Epicurean spoke above of the *gods* ; the believer in Providence speaks now of Diespiter, the Father of Light. And this God interferes not only in nature, he overrules man's destiny, "he giveth and taketh away," "he pulleth down the mighty from their seat and exalteth them of low degree."

"A god reigns,
Potent the high with low to interchange,
Bid bright orbs wane, and those obscure come forth :
Shrillingly Fortune swoops—
Here snatches, there exultant drops, a crown."

Notice, he talks here not of gods, but of God, and not of a God far off, but nigh.

"Present to lift Man, weighted with his sorrows
Down to life's last degree,
Or change his haughtiest triumphs into graves."

In what stately, sonorous, magnificent terms does he express his belief in the sovereignty of God !

"Dread kings control their subject flocks ; o'er kings themselves reigns Jove."

Could he have expressed better the sovereignty of God than by the word "imperium," the epithet belonging exclusively to sovereign, eternal Rome, which invested the kings of the earth with crowns and scepters? Even so, all powers and monarchies are but fiefs of him "that sitteth in the heavens, who shall laugh at the kings, who set themselves together and take counsel against his anointed."

I know only one expression which painted more strongly than Horace or the psalmist the sovereignty of God. But that expression became strong only by the situation. Louis XIV., the "grand monarque," was lying in his shroud. He who had given his orders in the proud words, "*Car tel est notre plaisir*;" he by whose command the Palatinate went up in flames; he who had dictated to Europe at Aix-la-Chapelle, Nimeguen and Ryswick; he who had bombarded Algiers and Genoa; he whom the scholars of Europe called their Mæcenas; he whom Boileau, Racine, Molière, Lafontaine celebrated in their poems; he to whom Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fléchier offered incense in their sermons, was lying a corpse in his coffin. Princes and princesses, peers, bishops, marshals, statesmen, magistrates, with the insignia of their rank and office, were present to assist at the funeral rites. And Massillon, the great preacher, cast a look at the dead king, and then looking upward said, "*Dieu seul est grand, mes frères.*"

Does Horace believe in the punitive justice of God? Read the ode.

"Now of dire hail and snow enough the Sire
Has launched on earth, and with a red right hand
Smiting the sacred Capitolian heights,
Startled the city," etc.

The same ode contains an allusion to the deluge as a judgment; nay, he speaks of a "*scelus expiandi*," and I often wondered why the fathers, who saw in Virgil's "*nascenti puero*" and "*clara soboles*" a type of Christ, could not see in the "*nube candentes humeros amictus Apollo*" the Saviour, to whom were given the "*partes expiandi scelus.*"

You see, Horace believes in a God sovereign, a God of Providence, a holy and just God, who punishes sin, but who will give to one the part of expiating for sin.

But does he pray? For prayer is the criterion of religion.

"Sed satis est orare Jovem qui—donat et aufert."

Yes, he prays to Him "who giveth and taketh away;" he prays for grace to enjoy life properly.

"Let me enjoy in health of mind and body
What I acquired; also an honorea old age."

He has a prayer which might be recommended to professors in undowered colleges and the clergy generally.

"Grant me abundant books, my daily bread,
Nor let me be the everlasting slave
Of an insecure position."

And he makes an accurate estimate of the prayers of the hypocrite.

"Facing the forum and a large assembly
When sacrificing something to the gods,
He cries aloud, O Jupiter, O Phœbus !
But mutters half-loud, Beautiful Laverna,
Help me to cheat, to appear saintly and good,
Cast o'er my rascally life a covering veil."

A man who has such correct views about God and prayers must have very correct notions concerning man. And indeed Horace believes in nothing less than total depravity. If Virgil, according to the fathers and Principal Shairp, is almost a Christian, I claim Horace in this point for the Presbyterian Church. He has decidedly Calvinistic notions.

"Without sins none is born ; he is the best
Who has the least."

And the innate power of sin, the proclivity, the natural tendency, the impulse to do evil he expresses by his terse

"We aim at the forbidden."

But he knows well enough that not all people think so ; that most people have an excellent opinion of themselves, hence he recommends close, rigorous self-examination.

"Search whether sinful nature, wicked habit
Sowed in thee any vice.

He reminds us of the danger of neglect.

"If you neglect to burn the poisonous weed,
Soon the whole acre by it will be covered."

He insists on a radical cure, the rooting out of the evil concupiscence.

"Erase the elements of wicked lusts."

He suggests severe discipline for the tender age when the heart is still pliable.

"Form by severer discipline the minds
When they are tender still."

He urges instant efforts to repent and follow after virtue.

"Thou who dost quick remove what hurts the eye,
Why dost thou day by day postpone to cure
Diseases of thy soul ? Dare to be wise ! Begin !"

He gets almost out of patience with people who delay the time of making their calling and election sure.

"Bandits get up at night to slay their victims,
And thou wilt not awake to save thyself !"

And what is his view of religion ? Has he a high standard, or is it low, mercenary ? What constitutes righteousness with Horace ? Righteousness is

"nil conscire sibi ; nulla pa lesocere culpa."

This is perfect righteousness, such which alone God can accept, and which Horace knew well enough was not in man. Still he knew the standard, and, more yet, he knew the motive which should actuate the good man :

"oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore."

Not the fear of punishment, but the love of holiness should be the

motive of our action. The verse almost reminds us of the passage, "If you love me (the standard of holiness) you will keep my commandments." There is an article in our creed, "He descended into hell." The old interpretation was that Christ descended into Hades and presented himself as that perfect righteousness to the souls of the pagans in limbo, who in their earthly life believed in and hoped for a righteousness which, as Luther says, *vor Gott gilt*, which souls accepted him then. For Horace's sake I wish the interpretation were true.

We have shown thus far that Horace had correct views concerning God, believed in prayer, had a right estimate of human depravity; that he felt the necessity of repentance—not delayed, but instantaneous; that he knew that the righteousness required of God was a perfect righteousness, and that the motive of this righteousness should not be fear of punishment, but *amor virtutis*—love of holiness. Let us see now in what light he viewed contemporary life.

There are sins peculiar to certain epochs, to certain races, to certain localities; just as certain plants push with greater vigor in certain soils, so peculiar circumstances brought certain vices to greater rife and luxuriance at Rome in the time of Horace. The monarch, absorbing all political power, real merit was no longer necessary to distinction; the vile flatterer, the spy, the pander, the minion of a favorite freedman of Caesar succeeded as well, perhaps better than a meritorious officer. This consequence of a despotic government was not yet so patent under Augustus; the evil reached its acme under Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, when Sejans, Pallas, Tigellius, Messalinas and Agrippinas disposed of the life, fortunes, honors of the Romans. But already under Augustus we notice a gradual withdrawal of nobler minds from the political arena, because the old republican spirit would not owe promotion to one who was formerly their equal. In absolute governments the best resource of the subject is money. The mind barred from higher pursuits seeks satisfaction in pleasures; money will buy them. Money, too, will buy protection and safety. The peace which Augustus gave to the Roman world encouraged all kinds of enterprises. The Roman patrician became a usurer and banker, the knight a fermier général; and the merchant, the manufacturer, the dancing-master, the pantomime, the cocotte, in short, all who could minister to the demands of an unbridled luxury, went to Rome to make money. The Rome of Augustus was the Paris of Napoleon III.—a huge exchange, a gilded brothel. Among this busy, greedy, money-making populace stood Horace, a preacher of moderation, of contentment, of the golden means, nay, even of poverty, if a competency was to be bought at the expense of manly independence.

"Who covets much, much wants;

God gives most kindly, giving just enough."

He well knows that

"Care grows with wealth, with wealth the greed for more."

Therefore he says :

" I do not side with wealth, but lightly armed,
Bound o'er the lines, deserting to Contentment."

Nor is this an idle assertion ; he is contented with his lot—" *laudo manentem*"—but if fortune should change he would fall back on his own resources, his probity, which is able to stand poverty but not dishonor.

" si celares quatit
pennas, resigno quae dedit et mea
virtute me involvo probamque
pauperiem sine dote quaero."

Yes, Horace has resources within himself to live in honorable poverty, and he challenges his patron, Maccenas, who wanted to encroach on his time and independence.

" Try if I cannot cheerfully give back
Your gifts."

IV.—THE LEGAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CLERGYMEN.

BY REV. WILLIAM HULL, HUDSON, N. Y.

THE terms priest, minister, clergyman, pastor, and rector are synonymous in law, and are used to designate persons who are set apart by license or ordination for the services of religion, and to preside over religious societies as teachers of religion and leaders in public worship.

These persons are made such teachers and leaders by representative bodies of the various denominations ; by synods, presbyteries, conferences, etc., and they hold the religious office subject to such ecclesiastical bodies. If they are expelled by these and deposed from the ministry, they are no longer recognized by law as clergymen, and are not entitled to any of the rights conferred by law upon them, except where they appeal from a lower to a higher body and the case is in abeyance. If the decision goes against them finally, they are no longer clergymen.

After having been set apart for his work by a proper ecclesiastical body, the minister must be sent to some field of labor by his superiors, as the bishop of the diocese in the Roman Catholic Church, or by the bishop presiding at the conference in the Methodist Church. In other denominations he must be elected by the religious society that desires his services. The mode of election and the proportion of the votes necessary to elect are determined by the rules of the denomination with which the church is associated, or the rules of the particular religious society. When thus duly elected the law recognizes him as the incumbent of that position, and it throws over him the wing of its protection.

1. *The law protects him in his reputation.* In all cases in which a felony is charged, the law presumes damages and the individual need not prove special damage. In other cases less than a felony, general

damage must be *proved* in order to recover. But in all slanderous charges made against a clergyman, affecting his character, the law presumes damage and he need not prove that he has suffered injury by the false accusation.

2. *The law favors him in the matter of taxation.* It recognizes the fact that he is a public benefactor, that he is a teacher of morals and religion, foundation stones upon which government rests. The more the lessons he imparts are heeded, the less crime, public expense and misery, and the more happiness, prosperity and security to the state. The dangerous classes could not be kept in subjection and under control without the moral and spiritual lessons he imparts. Without his labors those classes would be largely augmented and soon would be the controlling power. The law also recognizes the fact that the teachers of religion as a class are poorly paid, although their services are so invaluable, and in the State of New York clergymen in good standing in their denominations are exempt from taxation to the extent of fifteen hundred dollars.

So important are these services to the general welfare that the houses of worship in which these men in holy orders officiate are also exempted from taxation.

3. *The law throws the arms of its protection around these teachers of religion in the discharge of their ecclesiastical duties.* While conducting the services in the place of worship no one is allowed to make any disturbance in or near the place. Racing, shows and liquor-selling are prohibited in the vicinity. In all the States severe penalties are inflicted on all persons who in any way disturb religious meetings.

In his pastoral work and acting as the spiritual adviser of those committed to his charge, the law regards communications made to him by the penitent and conscience-burdened, privileged communications, which he cannot be compelled to divulge in a court of law to the detriment of his parishioner. They are sacred as between him and the party who makes them.

4. *The law protects him in his livelihood.* If no compensation for his services has been agreed upon, then he can recover for what he may be able to prove them worth; if a specific sum has been designated, then he can resort to legal process for its recovery, if it is withheld. The law provides that all the real and personal property of the religious society he serves shall be liable for his claim.

As his call issues from the congregation as a religious corporation, it has been decided by the courts that those officers who sign the call are not individually liable to the minister, but he must look to the property of the corporation for his compensation. See *Paddock vs. Browne*, 6 Hill, N. Y. Reports, 530.

The courts have also decided that if for faults of his own a minister be suspended and he appeal from the lower to the higher judicatories

of the church, and finally the sentence of suspension be sustained by the higher ecclesiastical court, the sentence of dissolution of the pastoral relation relates back to the suspension, and that he cannot recover salary for the period intermediate the suspension and dissolution and the final decision. See *Dutch Church of Albany vs. Bradford*, 8 Cowen's N. Y. Reports, p. 457.

It has also been decided that while a minister is under sentence of excommunication, the corporate property of the religious society cannot be applied to his support and compensation against the will of the society. See *Robertson vs. Bullions*, 11 N. Y. Reports, p. 243.

In the same case it was decided that the fact of his excommunication did not prevent a majority of the corporators from employing him as their religious teacher, although such action might subject the congregation to spiritual censure or ecclesiastical penalties by the synod or other body with which it was connected and associated.

The courts have also decided that if a minister and his congregation secede from the denomination with which they have been associated, and connect themselves with another denomination, a court of equity cannot compel the congregation to support a minister sent by the ecclesiastical judicatory from which the congregation has separated, or to apply its revenues for the support of such clergyman. They have the right to retain and support the minister which separated with them and went with them. See *Burrell vs. Associate Reformed Church*, 44 Barbour's N. Y. Reports, p. 282.

5. *The law also protects him in the duration of his pastorate.* This subject has given rise to great difficulties from time to time. If his call be for a definite number of years, then his relation with his congregation ceases at the expiration of that time, and if no new call be extended he is expected to vacate the position at the expiration of the contract. The different denominations have had different usages, and it is seldom that such a limited call is extended, and there is a feeling against such an arrangement on the part of pastors. It looks too much as though they were hirelings, who were to serve for so long a time for so much, and not as though they were shepherds entrusted with the care of flocks, over whom the Lord had made them overseers.

The English law contemplates the permanency of the relation between the rector and the parish. The tie cannot be broken except by judicial sentence, or resignation to and acceptance by the ordinary. Bishop Gibson states that the ordinary is not bound to accept, but is the judge of the motives for the application, and that there is no remedy if he will not accept more than if he will not ordain. As early as the year 740 it was declared in a case "that priests be neither constituted to any church nor ejected from it without the authority and consent of the bishop."

Tyler, in his work on "American Ecclesiastical Law," says :

"When a minister is called to and settled in charge of a Protestant Episcopal parish, unless something to the contrary is distinctly expressed in the call and settlement, he cannot be dismissed except by mutual consent, or by superior ecclesiastical authority on the application of one of the parties. It seems to be the rule or regimen of the Episcopal church, as to the tenure of its parish ministers, that when they have once been placed in charge of congregations they can neither leave nor be dismissed, except by mutual consent, without the intervention of the bishop." See *Youngs vs. Ransom*, 31 Barlow's Reports, 49.

He further says : "The Roman Catholic churches have a similar rule with respect to the settlement of their priests to that of the Protestant Episcopal, as stated in the last preceding section. But in all other denominations, unless the terms of the contract between minister and people make the pastoral relation perpetual, the relation can be terminated at the option of either party. Sometimes the relation is made perpetual by the terms of the call and acceptance. In such cases the pastoral relation probably cannot be severed except by mutual consent or the death of the minister or the existence of some good and legal reason why the same should be terminated."

Murray Hoffman, Esq., in his work on "Ecclesiastical Law in the State of New York," says (p. 260): "We should, however, first recollect the decided assertion of the permanence of the relation of rector and parish found in the English law. The eloquent language of Lord Stowell as to the relation of husband and wife may well be applied here : 'When people understand that they must live together, except for a few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften by mutual accommodation that yoke which they know they cannot shake off. They become good husbands and good wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives, for necessity is a powerful master in teaching us to bear the duties it imposes.'"

Rev. Mr. Thatcher of Massachusetts said many years ago : "No description of men under the government of Jews, Turks or pagans were so badly off as the clergy of New England, on the supposition that the power of dismissal lies with the people."

In the case of *Avery vs. Tyringham*, 3 Massachusetts Reports, the Supreme Court of that commonwealth thus declared the law of the State :

"It has been the uniform opinion of all the judges of the higher courts that where no tenure was annexed to the office of a minister by the terms of settlement, he did not hold his office by will but for life, determinable for some good and sufficient cause, or by the consent of both parties."

Where the rules of a denomination have provided that a dissolution of the relation shall occur on the advice and recommendation of a church council of neighboring churches, or where the judgment of a presbytery or classis is in favor of such dissolution, the courts have recognized such provision of the church. The court has, however, looked behind the adjudication to see that it appeared, (1) That the cause for calling the council was sufficient; (2) that the members were properly selected; (3) that they proceeded impartially and with respect to the

rights of all the parties; and (4) that their conclusion, besides being formal and explicit, is based on grounds that will support it.

The rule of the Episcopal Church upon this important subject, as amended in 1865, is:

"In case a minister who has been regularly instituted or settled in a parish or church be dismissed by such parish or church without the concurrence of the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese, the vestry or congregation of such parish or church shall have no right to a representation in the convention of the diocese, until they shall have made such satisfaction as the convention may require, but the minister thus dismissed shall retain his right to a seat in the convention, subject to the approval of the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. And no minister shall leave his congregation against their will without the concurrence of the ecclesiastical authority aforesaid; and if he shall leave them without such concurrence he shall not be allowed to take his seat in any convention of the church, or be eligible into any church or parish, until he shall have made such satisfaction as the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese may require; but the vestry or church shall not thereby be deprived of its right to a representation in the convention of the diocese."

Mr. Murray says:

"When the sanction of the ecclesiastical authority is sought a duty is imposed as well as a power conferred. It cannot concur upon any *ex parte* statements or without an examination. The right to be heard is a common law right, and must be observed before any penalty of any description can be lawfully inflicted. If the consequence of a dismissal with concurrence is to dissolve and discharge the civil relations and contracts of the parties, it can only be so permitted when the essential rules of law are observed. A competent authority to hear and decide, a proper reasonable notice of the matters objected to, an opportunity to meet and reply to them, are fundamental."

Mr. Murray further says on this point:

"The opinion of that sound lawyer and canonist Mr. G. M. Wharton, upon the case in Michigan was, that a vestry has no right to dismiss a rector without accusation or trial. The legislation of 1865 prevents the dismissal of a minister by a vestry, with the assent of the bishop from being uncanonical, and relieves the parties from the penalties of the canon. I do not think, however, that it makes a good dismissal without trial, or that it dissolves the contract between him and the parish. Such a result would be a violation of general principles, and I think the law of 1865 should be construed in subordination to these."

In the Presbyterian Church it is provided that there can be no removal of a minister from one church to another, nor a call for that purpose, except by the permission of the presbytery. The rule on that subject is as follows:

"And when a minister shall labor under such grievances in his congregation as that he shall desire leave to resign his pastoral charge, the presbytery shall cite the congregation to appear by commissioners to show cause why the resignation should not be accepted. And if any congregation shall desire to be released from their pastor a similar process *mutatis mutandis* shall be observed."

This being a part of the ecclesiastical polity, a minister's contract is subject to it, and the governing power has authority to dissolve the relation. A presbytery consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district.

In the Dutch Reformed Church a similar polity prevails, and if a minister desire to dissolve his relations to a congregation, or the congregation desire his dismissal, application is made to the presiding officer of the classis to convene that body and take the matter into consideration. Their judgment on the subject is controlling.

In the Lutheran Church the call of a pastor is usually for an indefinite time. Sometimes a provision is inserted in the call that if either party at any time desire a dissolution of the relation, notice of a specified length of time be given to either party. It requires a two-thirds vote to elect, and the presumption is that it requires a two-thirds vote

to dismiss. No provision is made in the general polity of the denomination for the dismissal. No body outside of the congregation or above it has any supervisory power on the subject, and the relation is entirely between the pastor and the congregation.

In order to prevent difficult questions in regard to the dismissal of a minister or his leaving his field of pastoral labor, it would be well if the call should explicitly provide the manner in which the relation might be dissolved on the desire of either party to have it terminate. A lack of provision for this, or an obscurity in the provisions often leads to great difficulty and hard feelings, and often litigation to test the civil rights of the party aggrieved.

V.—THE ADDRESS OF PAUL AT ATHENS HOMILETICALLY CONSIDERED.

BY REV. S. C. LEONARD, ORANGE, N. J.

1. It was delivered in response to a request, with which the occasion and circumstances so combined as to determine and virtually pre-announce the subject.

2. It was interrupted, and so has not a completed conclusion.

3. It was not connected with stated services of worship like the modern sermon.

4. It was addressed to intelligent people who were unacquainted with the system of Christian truth.

5. We have of it an outline only. It is perhaps of two or three minutes in length, if read deliberately. It is the work, however, of a skillful pen. The historian had excellent opportunity of procuring an abstract of it directly from the apostle.

THE EXORDIUM.

The address finds its point of departure in a *fact*—one of the most satisfactory forms of the beginning when skillfully managed. The starting point invites progress not only, but attracts the minds of listeners into an attitude favorable to the reception of what they see connecting itself with what is unquestionable. Vinet gives it the fifth place in his enumeration of some of the chief sources of exordiums, under the remark that “there is always an exordium which is better than any other, and it is that on which the true orator ordinarily falls first,” and characterizes it as a “calling to mind a fact by which the subject is individualized or from which it springs,” and adds, “a favorite method of Saurin.”

There is a choice of facts. That which the apostle seized to conduct him into his subject was connected with an object of which the senses could take cognizance, and familiar to his hearers. With exquisite oratorical skill he laid his hand upon an altar erected to an unknown god, and transformed it into a porch of a temple of Jehovah.

The exordium is skillfully and gracefully conciliatory. An unwise word would have rendered sympathetic approach of speaker and hearer impossible. In the Revised Version the objectionable term "superstitious" is retained against the judgment of the American committee, who desired to have the words "very religious" stand in the text, and to relegate the older and less accurate rendering to the margin. The apostle commended the Athenians for their "carefulness in religion." Having found evidence, as passing along he had observed their objects of worship, that they were not thoughtless of their relations to the unseen world, he refers to it as to their honor.

The beginning is firm. It contains no trace of hesitation. It is the voice of a man who has something to say, who knows in what way it should be said, and who desires to reach his main idea without unnecessary delay. The exordium is a genuine "introduction" of this idea.

DECLARATION OF DESIGN.

Transitions are among the most difficult elements of oratorical work. One of the masters of rhetorical discourse once said that he sometimes spent as much time over the transitions as on the rest of a discourse. Transitions are the joints of the organism, and unless they are natural and flexible the movement will be constrained unavoidably. Here especially the triumph of art is to observe law as if there were no law. The naturalness and gracefulness of the transition from the exordium to the declaration of design in this address is an oratorical study of excellence seldom equaled.

In the announcement of the theme the law of simplicity is honored. Technical and abstruse terms are avoided, no figures of speech are employed, no fantastic form of statement, such as pleased the preacher who announced as his proposition, "Sinners are bad fellows;" no paradox such as "Sinners bound to do what they can't do." All is calm, lucid, serious. The address as a whole is fused in a fire glowing in the speaker's soul, but its opening recognizes the fact that hearers at the beginning are not in an impassioned state of mind and (unless excitement has been produced by other influences) are unprepared for emotional utterance.

It is direct and brief. It does not contain a wasted word. Circuitous grammatical constructions, mannerisms, synonyms, epithets, are all excluded. No personal reference is admitted, such as would have been involved in the statement, "I shall endeavor to do what an angel might shrink from undertaking—to declare unto you the God whom you worship, though you know him not." No semblance of self-praise is to be found within it, no latent claim of the possession of eminent ability.

THE DEVELOPMENT

does not in a single sentence lose sight of the end which the apostle was aiming to accomplish. It is in the spirit of "this one thing I do."

It does not stop to amuse itself with pretty conceits and taking oddities. It is intensely more than an address to the intellect merely. Back of the words stands a man in vital earnest, who has entirely forgotten himself in the effort to plainly and clearly express and impress a great thought which has taken entire possession of his mind and heart. As the sensibilities of his hearers become able to respond, he does not repress utterances fitted to enkindle emotion.

There is a variety of emotion which is of no oratorical value. Self-contained, absorbed in the enjoyment which it is experiencing, it may even *deter* from action. Oratorical discourse seeks to effect a change of some kind, and emotion of this variety gives it no aid. There is other emotion which is an impelling force. It *expresses* itself in action. It is an impulse as truly as it is an enjoyment. The orator must be able to distinguish between these two varieties of emotion, and so marshal the truth-forces at his command as to convince and please not only, but also to *move*.

The apostle expends no effort in this address to excite the emotion which corresponds to the "still life" of the artist. Recognizing the true sources of influence, he seeks through them to gain an immediate practical end. The address is full of the element which distinguishes business from holiday recreation. Some one has said of Demosthenes in one of the tragic hours of his life that "his strongly exercised soul could only hurl bolt-like ideas and not play with accents." So it was with the apostle in the hour of his life which most vividly reminds us of the great Athenian breathing "the force, the fire, the mighty vehemence, which bore down all before it like the tempest or the thunder-bolt." No effort can be detected in the address of Paul to say a thing beautifully. He was as far as possible from putting himself on exhibition for a fee of praise. He had a message to deliver and was straitened till he should have announced it with the utmost faithfulness.

A man, now in his grave, who accepted the Pauline views of truth unhesitatingly, and who was able so to grasp the conscience as to sway mightily large masses of people, was once asked by a friend: "Do you ever try to say a thing prettily?" Instantly and unhesitatingly he answered, "No." "Do you try to say a thing forcibly?" the friend next asked. The granite man, after hesitating a moment, replied: "No, I do not think I do. I try to get out the thought just as it lies in my own mind. I want the truth to be like an electric spark within me, in order to use it effectively."

The law of constant progress is honored in the address. No sentence can be classed among the "wordy waves which beat upon the ears without leaving behind them a single idea or moving a single feeling."

An eminent artist used to speak of resuming work upon a picture as a "carrying it forward." Earnestness in an orator leads to instinctive

effort to observe the law which this artist endeavored to obey. In order to success he must know "whither he is going;" that, instead of groping around his subject, he may step firmly toward the goal which it is, appropriately, his object to reach.

Of the law of energy the whole life of the apostle is an illustration, and we can hardly imagine it violated in his words. The three forms which energy may rhetorically assume are all to be found in the fragment of this address which has come down to us—the energy of strength in the logical process which it contains; the energy of vivacity in the lifelike forms in which its truth is clothed, and the energy of vigor in the directness and pointedness of its statements. It has been well called "a product full of vitality."

That the address as it lay in the apostle's mind was conformed to the law of unity, we could hardly have been more confident had he been suffered to complete it. Even as it stands it is not a sheaf unbound. That the law on adaptation was honored by the apostle, no one familiar with the Athens of his time can even question. That he, a stranger in the city, should have so quickly come to know the people so well is evidence that he was an apt student of men. An eminent teacher has defined eloquence to be "attaching a composition to the life of a people," which is impossible if the modes of thought and the habits of the people are not considered. It is not less a high attainment to be able to become all things to all men, than it is an oratorical necessity.

If this address at Athens is compared with the synagogue addresses of the apostle, it will be found like no one of them. Its adjustment to circumstances of time and place is so complete as to have led an intelligent man who was born in Athens, and whose playgrounds in childhood were the places which we delight to honor, enthusiastically to say that, circumstances being taken into account, the address could not have been other than what it is.

The apostle's reference to the works in gold and silver and stone, graven by art and device of man, with which the Acropolis (almost in the shadow of which he was standing) was covered, was not more impressive than were his words concerning the great judgment. The idea of judgment pervaded the very stones of the Areopagus. The august court, which had been accustomed for so long a time to hold its sittings there that its origin was lost in legend, had invested the place with awe. Many an Athenian charged with crime, ascending under guard the steps of stone to the summit of this hill as he was led to the prisoners' place into presence of the judges in their seats of stone, had been ready to confess that judgment was a terrible reality on Mars Hill. On the brow of the hill stood one of the most revered of Athenian temples. In a broken cleft of the rock below the judge's seat was the sanctuary of the Furies. The words of the apostle, "Because HE hath

appointed a day in which HE WILL JUDGE THE WORLD in righteousness," were aglow as they were uttered there. The sentence of which they form a part was the last to which the excited Athenians would allow themselves to listen. His words had "*found*" his hearers more searchingly than they desired. They had ascended the hill to gratify an idle curiosity, to hear something new, and they had found themselves arraigned before a bar of the existence of which they did not care to be reminded. Some mocked. But they could not efface the influences of that hour. Mars Hill has been echoing Christian truth ever since.

Quintilian's orator certainly stands before us as we listen to Paul addressing the Epicureans and Stoics at Athens—

"AN UPRIGHT MAN WHO UNDERSTANDS SPEAKING."

VI.—CLUSTERS OF GEMS.

BY REV. ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D., PHILADELPHIA.

NO. V.—DOING GOD'S WILL.

There is help even in an inimitable ideal of life. We shall never here perfectly do the will of God, fulfill all his will. But we must *aim* toward it. "Bring back the flag to the men," said some one to a standard-bearer who was pushing on toward a parapet faster than the ranks could follow. "Bring up the men to the flag!" was the heroic reply.

To go where God leads, to do what he bids and wait everywhere and always for his signal, is the grand perfection of heroism.

Gen. Elliott, governor of Gibraltar during the siege of that fortress, was making a tour of inspection to see that all under his control was in order, when he suddenly came upon a German soldier standing at his post silent and still, but he neither held his musket nor presented his arms when the general approached.

Struck with the neglect, and unable to account for it, he exclaimed, "Do you know me, sentinel, or why do you neglect your duty?"

The soldier answered respectfully: "I know you well, general, and my duty also; but within the last few minutes two of the fingers of my right hand have been shot off, and I am unable to hold my musket."

"Why do you not go and have them bound up, then?" asked the general. "Because," answered the soldier, "in Germany a man is forbidden to quit his post until he is relieved by another."

The general instantly dismounted his horse. "Now, friend," he said, "give me your musket, and I will relieve you. Go and get your wounds attended to."

The soldier obeyed, but went to the nearest guardhouse, where he told how the general stood at his post; and not till then did he go to the hospital and get his bleeding hand dressed. This injury completely unfitted him for active service; but the news of it having reached England, whither the wounded man had been sent, King George III. expressed a desire to see him, and for his bravery made him an officer.

Noble Use of Money.—A man who shall give five hundred dollars a year, say for twenty years of his life, may leave *twenty churches virtually built* by

him to bless all coming generations. He who gives five thousand dollars at once, and builds in a single year ten or twelve Christian sanctuaries in which shall perpetually be dispensed the word and ordinances by which men shall be trained for heaven, does a work the ultimate value of which only the judgment day itself will fully reveal. He who in the final disposition of his property, when life is drawing toward its close shall leave his ten or twenty or thirty thousand dollars for the building of temples of the living God for the use of those who are to fill this land in coming years, will be a blessed minister of good to men, and will be helping to elevate and save his country when he himself shall be walking with the redeemed of God and with the Lamb.—*Dr. Ray Palmer.*

Charity to the Poor.—Mr. Punshon said: “The four great principles of the theocratical government were, *worship and sacrifice*, the *institution of the family* in all its various relations, the *consecration of time*, and the *consecration of substance*. It seemed as if it were a divine ordinance that the four should be ever present with us as a check on the selfishness and an outlet for the bounty of the rich man.” May we not add, as a check on the avarice and as an outlet for the benevolence of every man?

Giving Blessed.—A merchant of St. Petersburg at his own cost supported several native missionaries in India, and gave liberally to the cause of Christ at home. On being asked how he could afford to do it he replied:

“Before my conversion, when I served the world and self, I did it on a grand scale and at the most lavish expense. And when God by his grace called me out of darkness I resolved that Christ and his cause should have more than I had ever spent for the world. And as to giving *so much*, it is God who enables me to do it; for at my conversion I solemnly promised that I would give to his cause a fixed proportion of all that my business brought in to me, and every year since I made that promise it has brought me in about double what it did the year before, so that I easily can, as I do, double my gifts for his service.” And so good old John Bunyan tells us,

“A man there was, some called him mad,
The more he gave the more he had.”

And there are truth and instruction in the inscription on the Italian tombstone, “What I gave away I saved, what I spent I used, what I kept I lost.” “Giving to the Lord,” says another, “is but transporting our goods to a higher floor.” And says Dr. Barrow, “In defiance of all the torture and malice and might of the world, the *liberal* man will ever be rich, for God’s providence is his estate, God’s wisdom and power his defence, God’s love and favor his reward, and God’s word his security.”

Richard Baxter says, “I never prospered more in my small estate than when I gave most. My rule has been, *first*, to contrive myself to need as little as may be, to lay out none on *need-nots*, but to live frugally on a little; *second*, to serve God in any place upon that competency which he allowed me to myself, that what I had myself might be as good a work for common good as that which I gave to others; and *third*, to do all the good I could with all the rest, preferring the most public and durable object and the nearest. And the more I have practiced this the more I have had to do it with, and when I gave almost all more came in, I scarce knew how, at least unexpected. But when by improvidence I have cast myself into necessities of using more upon myself or upon things in themselves of less importance, I have prospered much less than when I did otherwise or had contented myself to devote a stock I had gotten, to charitable uses *after my death* instead of laying it out at present.”

SERMONIC SECTION.

LUST.

BY MORGAN DIX, D.D., NEW YORK.

Unto the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.—Titus i. 15.

WE come this evening to that subject upon which it is at once most necessary and most difficult to speak. Fourth of the deadly sins is lust—a term which includes impurity, uncleanness, sensual passion, unhalloved love. What sin is so horrible, so hopeless? Love is the first and the last, the highest good. Love without love is death in life. God the eternal says of himself that he is love. God nowhere calls himself force, or motion, or justice, or righteousness; but God is love. And the love of God is shed abroad in the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit. Men must love God and one another. And now abideth hope, faith, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity; and charity is pure and holy love. What must it be to do what the devil does, and turn holy love into unholy lust? What plague is in that sin! What death-sickness, what fanning of black wings of night, what ascending of the smoke of their torment who are in that sin! The best, when corrupted, becomes the worst. No art, no sophistry, can relieve the simple, unmitigated horror of that state, in which impure passion usurps the place of the sacred flame which burns eternally in the bosom of God—which makes the light and glory of the angel host and assures the salvation of loyal and holy souls.

“To the pure all things are pure.” Yes, that is most true. But what of

the defiled and unbelieving? What value in any judgment on the questions now before us, given by the man who does not believe, by the woman already tainted and defiled by the spirit of the world? To such nothing is pure; and when these apologize for lust, and try to smooth down the roughness of the carnal side of life, it is a sign that even their mind and conscience is defiled.

And this is the first danger of the hour: That we be deceived by the false judgments of those who represent the spirit of the age; that a perverted public opinion may deprave our moral sense; that our mind and conscience may become so affected by the wide diffusion of the evil, by the frequency of the loathsome signs, by the familiarity with this shape of luxury and lust, that we shall no longer be able to discern the real horror of the shadow of this death.

God has set in human nature a fountain and well-spring of desire. It was at first pure as crystal, and it was intended to set perpetually toward its home and source in the ocean of the love of God. “All holy desires,” saith the collect, “O God, from whom all holy desires do proceed.” And holy desires in us are those, and those only, which proceed from God and tend to God, through any mediate object which is desired and loved in him according to his will. But desire and love which have not their object in him, and are not after his will, are unholy, and that was the doleful change which came through the fall, when for the will of God was substituted the will of the flesh, when pure love and holy desire became the foul thing which theology calls concupiscence. The fountain

[Many of the full sermons and condensations published in this Review are printed from the authors' manuscript; others are specially reported for this publication. Great care is taken to make these reports correct. The condensations are carefully made under our editorial supervision.—Ed.]

was poisoned at its source; ever since has it poured forth bitterness and pollution.

When Adam fell the first fruit of his transgression was shame; they knew that they were naked, and they knew what that meant, and they hid themselves among the trees of the garden, ashamed and conscience-smitten. That deep disgrace is what it was and ever shall be.

But men have become hardened till they feel it no more. They have come to glory in that shame, to pursue after that sorrow. Crazed and mad, they have set up the lust of the flesh as a natural and innocent desire; of this fourth of the deadly sins they have spoken as if it were a virtue; schools of poets have made the praise of the corruptible flesh their special theme. Philosophers of the Epicureans and Lucretians have honored it with their commendation; painters and sculptors have gone into unseemly raptures over the study of the nude and its incessant presentation to the sight; and when unrestrained by the fear of God or faith in God, and able to wallow freely in this mire, men have taken the final step in their madness and exalted carnal lust into a horrible cultus which they called their religion.

Nothing is so striking to the eye in those old systems of paganism which were overthrown by the religion of the cross, as their licentiousness. They were the embodiment of whatever is most corrupt and obscene, masterpieces of the devil contrived to work eternal alienation between man and God. St. Clement of Alexandria, in his "Cohortatio ad Gentes," has painted the portraits of those old systems in colors which will never fade. Awful beyond telling is that picture. I could not relate the tenth part of what he left on record without sending you from this place with horror and shame in your faces. What an age that was in which our Saviour came! He appeared among men defiled and un-

believing, to whom nothing was pure, whose mind and conscience was defiled. There, on the one side, were the skeptical inquirers with their doubts and theories, the philosophers denying God, the immortality of the soul, the existence of the spiritual world, and everything that lost man can deny; and there, on the other side, were the children of these unstable leaders whose real state was too shocking, too revolting to bear description. This was what Christ encountered; with this was the first battle joined when the cry went out along the lines of the militant church, "The whole world lieth in wickedness, and we know that the Son of God is come."

Great were the victories of that first age; but it would be a mistake to suppose that the battle is won. It goes on, it has gone on since then, with varied fortunes. The old trouble is still about us; its marks are on the bodies and the souls of men; nor up to this hour has a remedy been found for this loathsome disease of concupiscence and carnal lust, apart from the gospel of Jesus Christ.

It is an idle dream that Christ and his disciples expected as the result of their work, the speedy conversion of the whole world and the transformation of the sin-struck earth into a paradise of purity and peace. Not so. Christ came to make atonement for sin and to found the kingdom of God. But the kingdom was to have a long battle with the powers of darkness before the end; and still the war lasts.

Christ's work is incomplete. Human nature is what it was; men are what they were; still slaves to sin and lust, unwilling to take on them the yoke of the Saviour, to bow before the cross. The battle to-day is substantially the battle of the first age; the church against the world; the faith and principles of the gospel against pagan philosophy and pagan habits of thought. And the strength of the deadly sins lies in their accord

with the natural desire of the heart, and that finds its first expression in pagan principle and pagan practice.

How stands it with this sin of lust? Its ally, its basis, is a certain naturalistic and material theory of our life—that very theory which, as taught of old, made the earth a sink of corruption. And if to-day men are found going back to pagan philosophy and pagan habits of thought, to pagan arguments, principles and ideas, be certain of this, that they will also be inclined to take up pagan notions of morality, and to think as the heathen used to think about these dreadful subjects; to find a certain glamour in that awful past, to feel compelled to invent excuses and apologies for it, and even to look wistfully to many a scene in that panorama of vanity and corruption. Such is the peril of the hour in which we live, that of following the natural motions of concupiscence and lust, and justifying the action by appeal to the principles of naturalism and materialism, and setting up the claim that these things are not evil but laudable and lovely, and of profit to mankind.

Ever since the history of the human race began, that active spirit who is God's enemy and ours has maintained a double propaganda in the earth. It exists to-day, and here in our city and among ourselves—the propaganda of infidelity, and the propaganda of impurity. That these two work together and in the same direction seems too plain for any one to deny it with success. We see this in the dreadful picture of the Gentile civilization, as described by Paul the Apostle; in the state of the heathen, as found, ignorant, naked, and immoral by the missionaries of the cross; and we see it as distinctly as ever in the most logical of the great nations of modern Europe.

France is the land where people have ideas and carry them out to their consequences; and in France you see afflicting the better classes and the religious, among her sons

and daughters, a political propaganda of atheism and a literary and artistic carnival of indecency. There have we beheld the assault of the national government on religion, in its institutions, its symbols, and the persons of its ministers; the name of God erased from books of public instruction, the crucifix torn down in schools and courts of justice, the clergy and members of religious orders insulted, and, as far as possible, reduced to inaction. There also do we find a licentious literature, culminating in recent works without their equal for filthiness in any country or any age; and there too flourishes a school of art which revels in vulgarity and shame, as if to present the human body to view, in every conceivable and inconceivable attitude of shameful and disgraceful display, were the province of art at its highest and best. The double propaganda thus shows itself at work, in past and present alike; it is accentuated more sharply as we look on with amazement and disgust; and men are found apologizing first and then applauding, until with an exquisite refinement of hypocrisy, at which devils must be laughing, these defiled unbelievers venture to say, referring to themselves, "To the pure all things are pure."

What is our own society? It has almost ceased to have a national tone; the old American life and ways are overlaid and hidden; this is the land to which enormous delegations from other lands migrate; it seems a great assemblage, a conglomerate of many and strongly contrasted civilizations. Nowhere has there ever been a better field for the devil's double propaganda, and all about us are the signs of his activity. True, there are checks which still restrain the evil, but each day some barrier gives way. To keep to the straight and narrow path of settled principle, clean living, and purity of heart is harder now for our young people than it was a quarter of a century

ago, because a false sentiment, widely influential, condones their excesses and even approves of their errors. It is a well-known fact that societies have been organized among us for the suppression of vice, and it is equally well known that the violent opponents of the operations of such societies are the freethinkers and skeptics of the day. How easy would it be to spend a couple of hours in giving instances of our decadence and decline! I shall not attempt any such thing. Straws show, it is said, how the wind blows, and it will suffice to note as rapidly as possible some few matters which justify a deep and growing alarm, lest worse than this be near at hand.

Note first the execrable quality of much that the people read. To refer to the public journals is but to begin: they feed a taste for what is vulgar, coarse, and low, with copious daily supplies of stuff adapted to that unwholesome appetite. But these annals of degraded life are supplemented by fiction of the same tone; by novels whose heroes and heroines are libertines and light and fallen women, and whose plots are a network of seduction, adultery, divorce, murder, and suicide; by that special kind of poetry justly named "The Fleshly," in which this vile body of ours, with its stirring passions and their manifestation, forms the perpetual theme. Sensation novels, dashed with as much indecency as possible, and sensuous poetry, in which the ideal and the animal are one and the same thing, form a quality of mind and temper which finds further attraction in the drama, as we have it now; in large measure a repetition of the old, old story of the working of lust, and garnished with dances which gratify man's sensual appetite and attest woman's misery and shame. Such minds, such souls as these, may turn to art for a new excitement, and they find it in the imported works of foreign schools, such as we have referred to, and in

those of a home school, which follows the lead of dishonor and devotes itself, mainly if not exclusively, to the delineation of lascivious and salacious figures. To these demonstrations of immoral craving and declining taste response is made by the book-stalls and news-stands on the street and by many a shop window, where vile woodcuts and engravings meet the eye and help on the work of corrupting the public mind; and no doubt the thing would be much worse than it is but for the agency of the police, who, under the indignant protest of decent citizens, compel the dealers in obscene literature to keep within bounds, and prevent them from poisoning the atmosphere as thoroughly as the Arch Propagandist and his creatures would desire them to.

It would be painful to inquire what kind of life is developed under the influences thus at work for our ruin; to gauge, with the line and plummet of God's word and law, the demoralization of society. For some of this there may be excuse. For example, think how the lowest classes live: in tenements crowded together in such wise that it is impossible to be decent; that children cannot be brought up like Christians; that young men and women can hardly by any chance be kept honest, chaste and pure.

But what shall be said of the higher classes, for those whose sins are without justification, and denote simply carelessness, irreligion, unbelief? Look how young girls are trained—in softness and luxury, with the one idea of making a figure in society and a brilliant marriage; of making the most of their physical advantages, and alluring the other sex by the arts best adapted to that purpose. See them on the drive, through the troubled social sea; at their lunch parties, with a dozen courses and half as many kinds of wine; at the opera, immodestly attired; at the ball, giving the whole night to dissipation; at the summer haunts of

fashion, without due oversight or sense of responsibility, treated with easy familiarity by careless men, and apparently without a vestige of an idea of what is due to a gentlewoman from a man. Listen to the low gossip among these young women; to the broad speeches and unclean stories, by which they are prepared for the final surrender of the last ideas of propriety and of all faith in the honor and virtue of men.

Then pass on and let us look at the woman as married—married, perhaps, for her money, or marrying some man for his money, without love and without respect; married, but with no idea of living thereafter under bonds; resolved to be more free and to enjoy life more; eager for admiration, athirst for compliments and flattery, so that the husband early drops into a secondary position, and some other man, who does the madly devoted for the time, engrosses the larger share of her thoughts. Follow out this subject till you come to the divorce suit and the separation, and thence to the next and now adulterous marriage, when those whom Christ and the gospel forbid to marry so long as some one else liveth, snap their fingers at the attempted restriction and commence a second partnership without fear and without remorse.

We all know that these are the commonest things of the day. We see men freely moving in high places whom no respectable woman should permit to cross her threshold; notorious immorality condoned for the sake of great wealth; grave social scandals, widely known and openly canvassed, though the actors are received with open hand and made welcome as before; flirtations going on between persons, each of whom has plighted troth to some one else, and thus stands perjured before man and God; men languishing after the wives of other men, and married men running after young girls and paying them attention, with the

devil's look in the eyes and the devil's thoughts in the heart; and women, young and old, permitting these demonstrations, agreeably entertained and flattered by them, and glad to find themselves still able to make conquests.

There are, undoubtedly, persons among us who prefer vice to virtue, and the excitement of animal passion to the testimony of a good conscience and a pure heart; who like the stimulus of sin, and would deem it an awful misfortune and an unspeakable affliction to have to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. Our danger is not in the fact that there are such persons in the world, for such have there always been; but the danger line is reached when no strong public opinion is against them; when a general approval hardens their hearts; when others who would live orderly and honorable lives find it up-hill work to do so; when chastity and modesty are sneered at, and those who will not join hand in hand with these sinners are bidden to stand off and keep out of the way and hold their tongues, nor interfere with this grand business of enjoying the pleasures of the present world.

I have gone as far as I dare; and yet I have done no more than to skim the bubbling caldron and take off what comes to the top, leaving the black broth below, a thing too foul to be described. But the scum is an index to what is underneath; and if these things whereof we have spoken go on in sight, what think you goes on out of sight?

How appalling must be the record of one night only when the shadow lies black on this vast city! What crimes must that deep gloom conceal, what sights to scare good angels away! The slums and the faubourgs, the dance-halls and the ball-rooms; the theatres, high and low; the naked creatures on the stage and the naked creatures in the boxes; the men behind the scenes dallying with the

actresses; the banquets, the champagne suppers, and the sequel; the printers setting up vile stuff to flood the country with filth by morning light; the false men pretending absence on some lawful occasion and breaking plighted troth and vow; the agonized wives, keeping the long, maddened vigil of jealousy; the silly fool, dreaming of her admirers in her unchaste slumber; the young man void of understanding met in the black and dark night by the woman with the attire of a harlot, subtle of heart whose house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death; the eye of the adulterer waiting for the twilight, saying, "No man shall see me," and disguising his face; the golden youth spending the small hours from midnight to dawn in dissipation, squandering paternal fortunes and dragging honored names in the dust; the animals in the opium joints and that grimy, grewsome herd whom some one out of the upper air sometimes beholds when he goes, with a policeman to protect him, through the inmost labyrinth of metropolitan corruption. Great God of heaven and earth, and thou, Redeemer of the world! what awful sights are these and what a world it is which thou didst come to purify and save! And these are the workings of one and the self-same mortal sin, and this is the issue when holy and eternal love, the first of virtues and the last, is turned into concupiscence and unholy lust! Come and let us leave these horrible paths and look for a road whereon to walk clean and free. Each of the deadly sins has its opposite virtue. The counterpart of lust is purity, the crowning grace of the gospel. Come away from the haunts of sinners against their own souls, from those who are dead while they live, and let us refresh ourselves in the company of the pure in heart.

First, then, our blessed Lord was born of a pure virgin. Thus is it written and in those expressive words

is his nativity commemorated in the church. The purity of Mary was no doubt immaculate and absolute as that of those of whom it is written that they are "without fault before the throne of God." For this it behooved her to be of whom Christ came in substance of our flesh.

Then, secondly, the Lord was pure, a lamb without blemish and without spot; unlike us in that one thing that he was "holy, undefiled, and separate from sinners." And so, being born of a pure virgin and being himself more pure than the dews of the morning or the driven snow, he made that virtue of purity a law in his kingdom, and gave it in germ as a gift in our regeneration.

For, thirdly, the Lord testified and said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." And this he said in that vile age of the world of which we spoke some time ago, and which some would fain reproduce in its characteristic deformity in our own day. In the decadence of the old Roman Empire, in the hearing of the court and the forum, in the ears of such as Tiberius and Hellogabalus, of Felix and Festus, of the cultured epicureans at Athens, and the harlots of Corinth, unto the bloated Pharisee and the crafty Sadducee, unto people like ourselves who loved and justified their sins as we love and justify ours, did the Lord announce and declare: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." And lest that word should return unto him void he instituted a divine sacrament, a heavenly and supernatural mystery, so that every one rightly baptized became a temple of the Holy Ghost. The material body, which is the object of inordinate desire, and may be made the instrument of fornication and all other deadly sin, Christ "washed and sanctified and justified" by "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed on men abundantly," so that each baptized believer is become a temple of the Holy

Ghost, which it is destruction to defile and profane, and thus the Beatitude received its sacramental realization.

On the foundation thus laid by their Lord the apostles gladly built. They preached of discipline, of severity to the flesh, of keeping it under, and bringing it into subjection. They talked to men and women of their sins, not in smooth speech or words to plaster over the ulcer and the plague spot. They bade men flee fornication as a deadly crime which bars from heaven; they bade women be chaste and pure, and love their husbands and children, and be keepers at home, and adorn themselves with good works. And great was the joy and peace of those who heard the counsel and followed it; blessed of a truth were the pure in heart, in their lives, yea, in their heroic death. Open the annals of the martyrs, the acts of the saints, and see the courage with which men, matrons and maidens laid down their lives rather than suffer pollution in that lascivious age; glorious are the records, clear in silver light, around which the black cloud of pagan luxury surges up and glooms and rolls away like the storm drift before the stars.

Christ spoke no word in vain, least of all vainly that blessing on the pure. Nothing corrupts like carnal sin, nothing degrades like sensual passion, nothing else brings such frightful punishment. On the other side, no victory is grander than the victory over this sin; nothing more precious than uncontaminated virtue and unspotted honor; nothing lifts a soul so near to God as inner purity; a pure soul cannot be lost, its path is straight to the face of the Eternal.

O man, O woman, battling against the devil and the sinful lust of the flesh, hating that which is filthy and unclean, longing to be like the angels and never relaxing thy vigilance against thy foe, thou art not far from thy reward; some mere clouds divide thee from it; a little while

longer and those clouds will disperse, and with open eye, triumphant over the final assault, and delivered from the burden of the flesh, thou shalt receive the promise, thou shalt see God.

Beloved brethren in Christ, we have walked through dangerous places; we have had before us what it is not good to think of. But learn your duty from the very aspect of the world. It is in no hopeful spirit that the preacher bids to self-denial, to self-discipline, to brave resistance, on this perilous ground. He has against him—and full well he knows it—the voice of the heart, which is a sink of everything impure; the drift of the age, which is toward greater license and increased indulgence; the teaching of a school who know no God but nature and no law but that law which is in our members; the example, alas! of persons who ought to be on the side of God, but for some reason or other give no help and increase by their follies the demoralization of the day.

Oh, how we long for the aid of Christian women and their overwhelming influence in this day of strife and contention! What work they could do as reformers, what work for the purifying of the world! I think of some, not here; I see some before me, fitted by their social position, their gifts, their strong character, to take a position which would help others; I see hardly one, whatever her station, who could not wield some influence over some person or in some direction for good. And yet I see the wrong prevailing over the right, the impure over the pure, the altars of the heathen temples burning with perpetual fire, and the altar of the Lord in the dust.

O woman, woman! called of God, redeemed by Christ, bethink you of your duty and your power. You know how things go; what books young women read, with what bad men they talk, how they are tempted, the unclean gossip which goes on,

the jests which pass the lips, and how women allow men to talk to them in a way in which, of old, one woman could not have talked to another without blushing for shame; how they dress and how they behave, how they tolerate bad manners and undue familiarity, how they laugh at modest women and term them prudes and cowards, how one season in society will take the bloom from the flower and the modest look from the eyes. And you look on and make no protest; perhaps you encourage by your example.

What can we do without your help? And why, slaves to fashion and blinded followers of types of a most unworthy womanhood, do you let us go on speaking to the winds and hearing no response to our protests except their echoes through the empty air?

We say to one, we say to all, this is a subject of vital consequence to your own souls and to the society in which we move. It is nothing less than matter of life or death.

We say to one, we say to all, "Christ and his apostles are right, and material philosophy, be the era what it may, is wrong. Men may fall away from the faith, heathen morals and manners may be revived, art may become the ministrant to sin, and women may go dressed like harlots and say it is not wrong, and men may applaud, but it is wrong and a shame and a disgrace and a mortal sin, of which the wages is death.

We say to one, we say to all, that inordinate desire is a devil, and that you must fight it by prayer, by abstinence, by obedience to the precepts of the church, by the sign of the cross, by flight, if necessary, by self-inflicted pain, that the soul may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

These things, we say to one, to all, to high and low, to rich and poor, to men and women, and there we leave it. Perhaps some may have grace to heed the voice; probably the greater

part will go their way and do as they think best, and some will call hard names and cry out that we are behind the age and morbid and ignorant. Let them so take up their parable and so let them curse, but the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and then shall they know, if they know it not already, that God gave full warning, and that of a truth there was a prophet among them.

CHRIST'S PRAYER IN THE GARDEN.

BY HORACE C. HOVEY, D.D. [CONGREGATIONALIST], BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done. And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.—Luke xxii. 42, 43.

LET us examine closely that wonderful prayer. It is remarkable that the beloved disciple John, who gives fully the words used at the institution of the Lord's Supper, merely mentions the subsequent fact that, after the supper, Jesus and his disciples went "over the brook Cedron, where was a garden into which they entered." Matthew records the petition thus: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." Mark states the appeal in a much bolder form: "Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me; nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt." Mark was no less inspired than Matthew or Luke, and therefore his record of that pathetic and extraordinary prayer in the garden was as authentic as their record.

The congenial task is now undertaken of harmonizing these three quotations of the words of Jesus. It is a great privilege to listen to the communings of the divine Son with the divine Father. Those who best love Jesus ought to try to get the exact meaning of what he said while bowing under those aged olive trees.

It appears from an examination of the original Greek text that the expressions, "if thou be willing," "if it be possible," are identical in meaning with Mark's version, "all things are possible unto thee." That is, neither form is to be interpreted as expressing doubt, uncertainty or vacillation. The word translated "if" is here more nearly equivalent to our word "since," and we might properly read, "since thou art willing," and "since it is possible." According to Robinson's "New Testament Lexicon," the word rendered "if," both in the old version and the new, implies that, "the condition being true, that which results from it is to be regarded as real and certain." We have excellent authority therefore for discarding that strange element of embarrassment, hesitancy and perplexity which it has pleased so many to find in our Lord's last prayer. There is none of it.

Jesus in that dark hour did not doubt either the benevolence or the omnipotence of his Father. Nor was there a conflict between the wills of two persons of the godhead. Such a thing is inconceivable. Jesus, knowing clearly the will of the Father, was ready to have it done on earth as it was in heaven. And knowing God's willingness to hear and answer prayer, he knew that his prayer would be heard and answered. There is no schism in the blessed Trinity. The one Divine Person did not implore the other Divine Person to change any of those plans formed and held by the Triune God from all eternity. The Son of God was not taken by surprise. He both foreknew and foretold in the plainest terms his own sufferings and agony. He was the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and he is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." How dare we interpret the prayer in the garden as though the Redeemer himself sought for a change in God's great, blessed and eternal plan of redemption? What the Saviour in his

anguish really did was to appeal to the immutability and omnipotence of his Father. His phraseology was peculiar, it is true, yet in our own language we have at times an approach to this idiom. For instance, a weary child says to his mother, "Hold me in your arms a while, if you will." Or he may vary his request and say, "Hold me a while, if you can." Does he doubt her willingness or her ability to hold him because of that little word "if"? No! Every sick and weary little one takes it for granted that his loving mother can and will let him rest on her bosom.

But some one may say, by way of objection, "The cup was not taken away. God could not take it away without changing his plans of infinite mercy. The Saviour had to drain it to the dregs." In meeting this objection let us inquire as to what is to be understood by the figure of speech. What was the "cup" that Christ prayed the Father to take away from his lips? It was no doubt a cup of suffering, but *what* suffering? What was the bitter potion from which Jesus sought exemption?

One interpretation, as you are aware, and a very common one, is that Christ shrank from the terrible crucifixion awaiting him in the near future, and that his dread of it was so great as to lead him to ask to be spared from the very thing he came into the world to accomplish, namely, *to die for sinners*. Why this view should be so prevalent I cannot conjecture, unless it be because men find a certain consolation amid their own weakness and cowardice in thinking that Jesus was weak and cowardly too. They *assume* this interpretation to be the correct one and accordingly expatiate on it as a most touching proof of our Saviour's human nature.

Allow me to say, without any wish to give offense, that for many years this has seemed to me to be a highly objectionable interpretation, one in

which there is no comfort at all; one that is wholly at variance with Christ's uniform character and declarations, and especially opposed to the spirit of the Lord's Supper which he had instituted that very night expressly to *show forth his death* by the breaking of his body and the shedding of his precious blood. It also seems an insuperable difficulty in its way that this view involves the concession, from which, however, its advocates apparently do not shrink, that God failed or refused to answer the urgent prayer of his own Son.

These points are merely stated now, and I shall revert to them again presently.

Some years ago, in hearing a discourse on the general subject of prayer by the late Charles G. Finney, a suggestion came to me which I afterward followed out with great interest, namely, that Christ prayed to have the suffering that threatened his life there in the garden relieved in order that he might go on and finish his great sacrifice on the cross.

I find all things going to confirm this. "Remove this cup," Jesus exclaimed in his anguish of soul. The word translated "remove" (*παρεργκεν*) literally means to "pass along" to another time, rather than to remove completely and forever. Then again, consider the question of emphasis. We express emphasis by italics, but the Greeks, who had no such device, had another equally good, of fixing emphasis by the position assigned to words in the sentence. By this rule the stress should be on "this," not on "cup." "Remove THIS cup" (*τούτο ποτήριον*), not some future evil, but the present mortal agony *then* at its crisis while he was praying. He did not ask to escape some anticipated peril; he took no thought for the morrow, but his grief at that moment was insupportable. Remember also that when speaking of his death on the cross and rebuking the impetuous Peter, who had been one of those with him

in the garden, he said, "The cup that my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" That fervid inquiry implies that no thought could possibly have entered his mind at any time of shrinking from the ordeal of crucifixion. The fact is that the two cups were different and not identical in their contents; the one he sternly rebukes the overzealous Peter for trying to dash away from his lips; the other he implores his omnipotent Father to "take away" from him.

And now, to sum up results thus far, the first clause of Christ's prayer in the garden shows his confidence in God's willingness and ability to grant his petition; the second asks him to bear on, to pass along to a future time the cup of deadly sorrow at that moment before him; and now, in the third and last clause of that wonderful outcry of the Son of God, we find words of absolute submission: "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done."

It seems incredible to us that at one period of church history the religious world should have been divided by sharp controversy as to *whether Christ had one will or two wills*. Those who held that he had but one will pervading both his divine and his human nature were called Monothelites, and their opponents held that the Son of God, in his humiliation, had two wills, two natures, a double consciousness—in short, two souls in one body, *i.e.*, if the term soul can properly be applied to such a peculiar and unique being.

In support of the extreme dyothelite view, this passage figured as a proof-text. But whatever may be the merits of that famous controversy, it cannot by any fair interpretation be made out that when Christ says "my will" and "thy will," there was within himself a struggle ending in the submission of one of his wills to the other! As Dr. Schaff has well observed, "The contrast is not as between his human and his di-

vine will, but as between his will (as the God-man in the state of humiliation and intense agony) and the will of his heavenly Father."

And to this discriminating remark we may add, that contrast is not necessarily contradiction, nor is difference discord. There are those who do not seem to shrink from a dissection of the Redeemer's wonderful nature, showing with conceited precision just what elements were divine and what others were human. My soul revolts from the process! To me my Saviour is one being, blending however in mysterious union the attributes of God and the human life, including the sinless infirmities of man, and as such he is an object of adoration and worship, not of critical analysis and microscopic inspection.

His identity was entire. He was the same being when hanging on the cross that he was when lying in the manger; and that man of sorrows bowing his head in Gethsemane was the same beloved Son of God on whom the holy dove descended by Jordan's waves, while from the open sky came the voice of divine recognition from the Father-God.

Then again the word "will," as here used, evidently refers not to *ultimate purpose*, but to *choice of means*. Christ had ever the same holy purpose as the Father, and I cannot for a moment entertain the notion that he shrank from completing his atoning work; still there was that in his having taken upon him the nature of man that made him in his agony prefer to leave the details of his closing work on earth to the guidance of the Father, whose clear wisdom was not clouded by the flesh.

It was plainly Christ's *will*, as truly as the Father's will, to have his repeatedly predicted death *on the cross* actually accomplished. The agony that wrung that loving heart and excited that bloody sweat had in it no taint of selfishness. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "And the Lord hath

laid on him the iniquity of us all." He was bowed down by the burden of a lost world's transgressions. He himself said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," and that was the occasion of his prayer. The intensity of his anguish was so great as to awaken apprehension of *immediate death there in the garden*. His soul remained firm, but his physical nature was giving way. Mark says, "He prayed that, if it were possible, *the hour might pass*"—not some future hour, but *that hour* of deadly pain, when all our sins lay so heavy on his soul as to reverse the very course of nature and force from his pores blood falling in great drops to the ground. Who else ever passed alive through such agony?

Here let us remark that the Greek verb merely conveys the idea of motion in any direction. In Luke ii. 44 it is rendered "to go," while in Mark xiv. 41 it is rendered "to come." When Jesus said, "It is enough, the hour is *come*," it might with equal fidelity to the inspired original be translated as a sigh of relief: "It is enough; the hour is *gone*"—that hour which he prayed might pass had gone; that cup which he besought the Father to remove had been passed along. Yet while he believed all along that this would be the issue, he said, in closing his prayer, and perhaps as an example to his disciples and to us, "nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done;" *i. e.*, if it is thy will that I should die here in the garden instead of dying on the cross, as foretold, I submit.

You are aware, of course, that many say that the prayer in Gethsemane *was not answered*. They hold that Jesus shrank from the cross, and implored his father to release him from that covenant which had stood between them from all eternity, and that the Father wisely and firmly refused to grant this passionate prayer. I hope that those who find comfort in this view will bear

I
s
h
ti
cr
d
n
hi
ge
pr
he
st
sw
J
ing
No
for
rej
tim
rep
Chu
ing
to b
was
rior
givi
Jud
fligh
andi
too,
woe
there
Chris
ange
Being
he pr
are n
cludir

with me when I say that their theory seems to my mind to do injustice both to the Father and to the Son, and to set religion itself in a false light. I think that a better interpretation can be suggested.

The record reads: "And there appeared to him an angel from heaven strengthening him." Scarcely does the prayer ascend before the angel comes. THAT WAS GOD'S ANSWER. It was no evasion of an answer. But it was the very best answer that could be given.

When Jesus stood at the tomb of Lazarus, he "lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I *knew that thou hearest me always.*" And now can we believe that when he was drawing nigh to that other tomb, the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, his midnight prayer in the olive-garden was rejected? No, no! This prayer and every prayer of Jesus was heard, and in this case the angel's strengthening presence was the answer.

How did the angel strengthen Jesus? Certainly not by augmenting his *divine* energy or wisdom. Nor can I think that it was by reinforcing his courage and fortitude, rejecting as I do the notion that he timidly shrank from the death he had repeatedly predicted for himself. Christ did not stand, like some faltering soldier, ready to fly and needing to be rallied by his captain. No angel was ever the Saviour's moral superior. But his physical nature was giving way. Betrayal, mockery, the Judas-kiss, the denial by Peter, the flight of the other disciples—all these and it may be other sources of anguish, too, flooded his faithful heart with woe till it was ready to break right there in Gethsemane! The body of Christ was purely human, and the angel replenished his bodily vigor. Being thus answered, it is said that he prayed yet "more earnestly." We are not told the purport of this concluding prayer, but the supposition

is that he could not have made it had not added strength been given him. Rising finally from the ground, he awoke his sleeping disciples, who had succumbed to their despondency; and having thus survived the agony of Gethsemane he faced the last agony of the cross.

Should it be asked why Jesus did not strengthen himself, the divine sustaining the human nature, we reply that when Christ took our nature he took our condition too. He shared the lot of his people. How often have the servants of God been strengthened by celestial visitants! "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister unto them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Many a dying saint has testified to the reality of this blessed spiritual ministry, and it is not necessary for us to regard the angelic presence in the garden as any more miraculous than scenes occasionally to be witnessed by those who attend the deathbed of devout and faithful Christians.

Two great lessons may be learned from our Saviour's prayer in the garden, as now explained—a lesson of DUTY and a lesson of HOPE.

We should never shrink from recognized obligations.

Let no man who is "unstable as water" console himself by the reflection that the great Captain of our salvation quailed in Gethsemane! On the contrary it is expressly declared that he "endured the cross, despising the shame." Christ was "made perfect," not imperfect, "through suffering." His prayer was such as the bravest might offer—for more strength. The need of such a prayer in this case is still more clearly seen, if we accept the probably true theory that the immediate agency of our Saviour's death, physically regarded, was due to another cause than the mere torture of crucifixion. He was on the cross less than three hours before his death, whereas usually the victim is said to have lingered for several successive days. The spear

that pierced his side brought forth not only blood but "blood and water," proving, according to those who have made the physical sufferings of our Lord a special study, that the intense excitement of the nervous system had surcharged the heart with fluids until that vital organ had burst. If this be true then our Saviour literally died of a *broken heart*. He must have had premonitions of this in the garden. Hence he asked to have the cup removed, the hour pass, his strength renewed, that he might sustain the ordeal, and that his aching heart might not burst till he had endured the betrayal, the mock trial, scourging, thorny coronation and other indignities, and had been actually nailed to the bloody tree. Such a prayer evinced fortitude beyond that of heroes, fit to be emulated by martyrs and worthy of the Son of God.

God always hears prayer.

He has promised to do this, and he has kept his word. We are greatly encouraged to pray, by reason of the fact that Christ's prayers were invariably answered. We may set his own testimony, "Father, thou hearest me always," over against all the ingenious theories ever devised to show that when Jesus prayed, "being in agony," it was right for the Father not to hear him. The answer to the prayer in the garden was signal and immediate. The angel strengthened the man of sorrows, the hour passed by, the cup was removed. Thenceforward Christ was calm, tranquil, firm, until the last bitter agony on the cross, to endure which he had prayed that he might be kept alive. To this opinion additional weight is given by the language used by the Apostle Paul, referring to the agony of Christ: "Who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared." We find no other recorded instance of his praying to

be delivered from death but in the garden. And if, as is often asserted, the death from which he sought exemption was the death on the cross, and if that was the cup for whose removal he asked, then certainly his prayer was denied, for he actually did die on the cross. But if he feared lest his heart would break there in the garden and sought strength to meet the cross, then was he indeed, as Paul declares, "heard in that he feared."

And then another thought: if, as we firmly hold, Christ did not shrink from the cross, but besought his Father for strength to endure to the end, then is there new force and beauty in those words of solemn satisfaction uttered when he bowed his head and died. He had previously testified in Pilate's judgment hall, "To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." He pressed on toward his martyrdom; and when his desire was fully accomplished and he was lifted up between heaven and earth as a "witness unto the truth"—lifted up that he might draw all men unto him—lifted up to the wonder of angels, the confusion of Satan, the salvation of men and the glory of God—his only word of exultation, and his final shout of victory was simply, "IT IS FINISHED!"

THE FINAL TRIBUNAL.

BY R. S. STORRS, D.D. [CONGREGATIONALIST], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.—Rom. xiv. 10.

It is an illustration of the entirely unbiased character of those who made the recent revision of the New Testament that they have changed the word "Christ" in the text to "God," following the earliest MSS. The word "Christ" may have accidentally crept in, or it may have been inserted with the thought that it was in harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures, but unquestionably the true word is "God."

More than one of the ancient writers have noticed the fact that at the time these words were written there was a general movement toward the imperial city—from Egypt and Chaldaea, from the banks of the Danube, the cities of Africa and the coasts of Britain. Tacitus, Seneca, Juvenal and others record this tendency as from an irresistible impulse on the part of all to go to Rome. To her the earth paid tribute of men as well as of money. Rome was a microcosm, a world in miniature. Paul desired to go to Rome. At Ephesus he speaks of this strong desire. At Jerusalem, and again on the Adriatic, he was assured that he was to be permitted to enjoy this privilege. He must stand before Caesar. But there was another more majestic scene in the apostle's thought, a point toward which all the world was hastening. Before the judgment seat of God Jew and Greek, rich and poor, emperor and slave, teacher and pupil, were to stand. This became more and more distinct as he drew near death. As the traveler crosses the Tuscan plain and every hour draws nearer and nearer the seven-hilled city, and the buttressed walls and towering palaces loom up with increasing distinctness as he approaches its portals, so the awful grandeur of "that day" is continually referred to by Paul in Timothy and Thessalonians as toward the majestic tribunal his feet came every day nearer. And we too may profitably meditate on it, for "we must all stand before the judgment seat of God." We may live long or briefly, prosperously or ill, conspicuous or obscure lives, but we must at last all face our final Judge.

At the outset let us lay aside the common but erroneous impression that the function of judging is one which God might demit if he chose, and that in exercising it he invests himself with the aspect of severity. Moral judgment is inseparably connected with moral character. The

discrimination of the good or evil in character is not the province of one who is ignorant of moral distinctions, any more than is criticism in art the business of the blind. But just as fast and just as far as the conscience of a man becomes illuminated, intuitive, fine, commanding, just to that extent does he discriminate. He cannot help it if he would. The honest man must judge the cheat; the sincere soul, the hypocrite; the truthful, the liar; and the warm, loving-hearted, the cold and calculating. As the living flesh feels the fiery flame and shrinks from it, so virtue repels and is repelled by the opposite. The very affectionate properties of soul possessed by a friend we love make his disapproval of our acts harder to bear. Cultured society judges a man by his entire character as it is continuously revealed. Such sentiment as prevailed in Russia under Peter the Great or Catherine II. would have looked at success rather than at the moral quality of a man, but a truly instructed society does judge the real character of those who challenge attention. Bad men sneer at the rigid and exacting standard of religious communities as being "narrow and Puritanic," and frankly confess, as one has expressed it, that "the healthy sensuality of Greek life is to be preferred."

Now, then, it is an inevitable sequence from the perfections of God that he should judge the world. He is perfect and absolute in holiness. It is not his power or wisdom and knowledge but his immaculate purity of character that makes him a judge. His power alone would make him a tyrant if not controlled by moral qualities, but God's holiness is spotless. In medieval times men swore a royal or knightly oath by the "glory of God"—that is, his unsullied purity of being. We and all spirits are transparent and open before God. Nothing, even a diaphanous veil, separates or hides. Every scar and soilure is seen by him. He

must judge. Shall the light discriminate between varying media through which its rays pass, or by which they may be intercepted? Shall the rain discriminate between the sod and the stone? So must the moral element in the divine character act by virtue of its own essential nature.

But in view of this inevitable fact of God's judgment we may feel that a shadow rests on life. This will grow deeper and more abiding as we see ourselves out of harmony with God, unless we yield to him and are reconciled through Jesus Christ. The text, however, like the cloud that preceded Israel, has its side of beauty as well as its portentous aspect. Notice a few considerations:

1. In the establishment of this judgment seat of God we see, incidentally, the honor and dignity with which this invests individual human lives. Look at society. A few men are eminent as statesmen, philosophers, poets, orators or otherwise, but the millions lead ordinary lives. We are limited in resources, fettered by our surroundings, and we are ready to say, "What is man? A mere breath amid the unsounding ether of the universe." Yet God is to judge him; every one, great and small, is to stand before him individually. In the balances of reason we see in the light of this fact that man's spirit outmeasures the sun in dignity and value. A human court puts honor on man's nature by his very trial. A leopard leaping from his cave, a lion from his lair, to tear asunder his victim, is not a subject of arrest and trial. He is shot, and that is the end of it. In the constitution of human tribunals and in the application of law to the transgressor there is honor put upon man, inasmuch as his freedom of will, his possession of intelligence, understanding and conscience are recognized. No grander eulogy can be passed on man than that involved in the truth of the text. Man has a knowledge of God and of immortal verities. This is im-

plied. Therefore he is judged. All men are judged, however obscure. Each of us shall give an account of himself to God. All our educational, philanthropic and missionary efforts rest on this axiomatic principle.

2. We see the significance of the humblest life and of the humblest act of any life. Too often we gauge character and success by their conspicuousness as related to position, rank, wealth, and influence. We note the obsequies of the great, but think it an unimportant event when the pauper finds the potter's field. Ah! "We must all appear before the judgment seat of God." This gives a significance to the poor man's death. Again, we are apt to measure our own lives by our larger efforts and forget the little acts that, like drops, go to make up the continuous stream of life. It is these smaller actions that at once show character and shape character. Did not the Master say, "By thy *words* thou shalt be justified or condemned"? He represents the good as amazed at the final judgment because such little acts as the cup of water were remembered, and the bad as similarly surprised that their neglect of little duties was clothed with such solemn importance.

Phidias polished the back of each of the statues which he placed against the temple wall, for he said that though men saw not his work, the gods beheld it. Every deed, however secret, comes under the cognizance of God, whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do. The petty bargain, the trifling act of courtesy, the spirit of gentleness and submission in trial or sickness, fidelity in study, circumspection in speech or letter-writing—everything we do becomes significant when illumined by the truth of the text. To neglect to adjust our inward life to this truth and cultivate the merely outward exhibitions of character is as irrational as it would be to burnish and beautify the ornaments of an engine and build

the
c
a
s
fo
in
G
us
fo
sw
cis
cer
son
the
tha
me
ma
the
but
For
villa
Tho
at l
fanc
lent,
the n
appe
God,
bribe
the b
done.
5. V
cance
does n

the boiler of defective metal, or decorate the outside of an edifice while its foundations and walls were insecure.

3. We see how majestic an attribute is man's conscience, that which says "You ought, you must!" True, conscience may be mistaken, as our senses sometimes mislead us; but, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, conscience is the echo of God's voice, its remorse an echo of his rebuke and its approval an echo of his benediction on our course. We may anticipate the final tribunal. Judging ourselves now, we shall not at last be condemned.

How wicked then it is to put out this eye, to suffocate the voice of God within us! It is moral suicide to destroy this witness for the truth and abandon ourselves to passion and sense. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of God."

4. We also learn the secret of true independence from the world. If God be for us, who can be against us? Paul, Pascal, Luther, Wilberforce, and other leaders in reform, swung loose from the entangling criticisms of men, undismayed by human censure in the thought of their personal individual responsibility to God their Judge. "It is a small matter that we be judged of man's judgment;" this was their word. So may the maligned wait calmly for the final vindication. We may pity, but we should not fear the world. For a while innocence may suffer and villainy appear to be triumphant. Thoughtless men may say, "No God, at least no just God." Some have fancied that there were two, benevolent, malevolent, but the solution of the mystery is here: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of God." There there is no chance to bribe the Judge or hide the sin. There the balances swing free and justice is done.

5. We see the beauty and significance of the Saviour's work. Christ does not abolish judgment; he claims

it as his own and thus asserts his divinity. No man, no angel, can assume this function. It belongs to Omniscience alone. We learn how it is accomplished—by the self-conviction of the sinner. Before Christ on earth they who accused another stood self-convicted and went away one by one. "He told me all I ever knew," said another, lighting up the past as by one touch of an electric light. It was on the cross that atonement was completed. It is on that ground we, as believers, are saved. The luster of the cross is shed on the judgment throne. The Judge is our Redeemer, friend, and advocate. We—yes, *we* can have "boldness in that day," tranquil in the assurance that in judging us he judges himself, for we are in him. Finally we here have emphasized the duty of accepting and the privilege of proclaiming the glorious gospel of the Son of God. Before his face we must stand. We cannot postpone the day. Nearer it comes every hour. Are you ready for it? Only in Christ can you be serene and safe, contemplating its approach. Then will the judgment seat appear, not awful in wrath, but luminous with the beauty and glory of his presence, and you will go from it into the peace and vision of God forevermore! May God grant this to each one of us for Christ's sake. Amen.

THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT.

BY BISHOP E. G. ANDREWS, D.D.

[METHODIST], AT BROOKLYN.

Not of the letter, but of the spirit.—

2 Cor. iii. 6.

THIS passage is one of the rather frequent contrasts which Paul draws between the Old and New Testaments, the Mosaic and Christian systems. The former was legal, and went to deal with graven stones and literal precepts. It was exact, explicit, copious in minute directions. It hedged one's whole life with restrictions—as to house and dress, food and washings, marriage and dowry,

funeral, inheritance, loan, usury, trade, agriculture, servitude and emancipation. In the religious sphere it was even more particular—as to the place of worship, its structure, utensils, priesthood; the tribe, family and individual selected for service; his induction and duties; festivals and holy days; tithes and sacrifices.

There is almost an entire absence of precepts looking toward the inner spiritual life, helpful to what we call growth in grace. Because of this it came to be a system of condemnation and death. Christianity is spiritual. How so?

1. Because it displays to us the descent of the divine into human hearts to renew man's nature that he may shine in the glory of God. It unfolds the progressive work of the Holy Spirit, whose fruits are love, joy and peace. Therefore he misses the true intent of the New Testament who aims at justification by works of the law, the routine of prayer and vigil and sacrifice.

2. Because in the form of its commands, in tone and trend of all its teachings, it puts emphasis on the inner life rather than on the external. If one asks, "How shall I glorify God? What shall I do?" we naturally send him to the Bible. He opens the Old Testament. Rich, suggestive and instructive as it is, it is insufficient, for he finds these precepts of the Mosaic economy closely interwoven with the life of a people who lived long ago. He turns to the New Testament. Here are principles taught, broad and comprehensive, the virtues of love, truth, self-sacrifice and heavenly-mindedness. "Not of the letter, but of the spirit" is the keynote.

As to worship, instead of circumcision, water is applied to the person in the name of the Triune God; but as to the amount of water or as to who may apply the water, the age of the recipient and other questions, specific directions are not given.

The Lord's Supper takes the place

of the Passover. As to the frequency of the service, by whom and in what posture taken and the like, we are not minutely instructed. The sainted Fletcher, when a guest of Ireland, once was engaged with two other brethren under a tree in animated conversation which gradually became more serious and spiritual. Just then a servant brought bread and wine for refreshment, which that holy man at once made use of in the eucharistic rite. Was it not as acceptable to Christ as any similar service performed in some stately cathedral?

The polity of the church in any of its branches is fixed by no definite precept, but remitted to Christian judgment. Whether there be two orders, or three or more, in its officers, whether liturgy be used or not, these and many minor matters are to be determined by circumstances. The result is that there are many churches, and I am glad of it. We see the varying angles of thought and the diversities of taste and temperament. As to business, amusements and political duties we are not under the letter, but under the spirit; bound not by individual precepts but by general principles of love and loyalty to Christ. What kind of vocations, how much property to accumulate, prices, margins, interest, all the details are left to the decision of the Christian, acting under the spirit of the Master. "May I dance, play cards, go to the theatre, the race course and gaming table?" I answer by asking if you believe that these will really advance you in holy living, in Christian usefulness and in preparation for heaven.

"May I vote for the lesser of two evils? How shall I act as regards war and other political problems? In my family life, how long shall I insist upon maintaining my parental control, and how much shall I provide for the future of each child?" These and a thousand other queries find no direct answer in the New Testament. Why not?

1. No book could anticipate and meet the complex and intricate conditions of life in detail. Islamism has imposed 75,000 distinct precepts, really a small number compared with the uncounted circumstances and needs of its followers. The law of permutations shows us 360,000 ways in which the nine digits may be placed. This is but a hint of the complexity of our environment. Our statute laws fill but a few volumes. The records of decisions and the interpretation of statute and common law fill libraries. Nothing less would answer here, if we are to demand a literal and specific precept as to every possible act in life.

2. The highest culture of our moral nature demands its exercise in weighing each case and determining it under the general law of obedience. God looks at the heart and the motive; we are apt to look at the external act alone. We, like the Pharisee, say, "I fast, I pay tithes," and so on, but we fail to please God till we act on a higher and more scriptural plane of thought. He did his works to be seen of men.

3. This is really in harmony with our own method of discipline. We say to children and servants at the first, "Do this and that; refrain from this and the other thing." We fence them about with precepts till they have learned our way and will. Then the letter disappears and the spirit dominates. So in the growth of the moral nature in ordinary life and experience. The law is made for the disobedient, but when the will of God becomes our own and we are fully under grace we are no longer under law as a schoolmaster. It may be said that there is peril in encouraging youth to assume manly functions, perilous to leave them to find the right way by using their educated judgment. Yes, but there is no better way. Even when judgment is at fault and error innocently committed, there may be a truer, more exalted character at work than in

the case of one whose mechanical obedience is more exact as to the letter.

4. This method fits Christianity to be a religion for all the world. It is not for one age or one people, but for all time and all mankind. The church under Nero, or to-day formed under the political and social limitations incident to despotism, would differ in polity, work and worship from a church in this land of religious and civil liberty.

In the days of anti-slavery excitement some ardent reformers sought to find scriptural texts to enforce their views. Failing to find just the explicit language which would express their views in every particular, some were offended and lapsed into skepticism. But the Bible carries the germinal and vital elements of all reform, of all that exalts, ennobles and purifies society. It teaches that we are all brethren; that we have a common duty and destiny. In Russia and in the West Indies and in this country, slavery and serfdom have been abolished, and with extending civilization the religion of Christ is multiplying its beneficent activities. In Paul's day the church aimed to bear one another's burdens, but the channels through which its philanthropy could work were meager and few. Now the church is rich, honored and influential. It uses commerce, the arts, science, legislation and education to bless the world. Its mission is to bring all things to the feet of Immanuel.

In conclusion, two thoughts should be borne in mind:

1. The fact that the New Testament is silent as to any question you may propose is not of itself decisive. You could ask ten thousand questions and find no definite answer in exact words as to what you should do or should not do. Look at the tendency of the thing. Will it make my heart and life better? Will it be a helpful example to others?

2. Sympathy with God is indispen-

sable to the forming of a right judgment. If sin appear to us trivial, if there be no love for and longing after holiness; if gold be our god, or pleasure, our aim, our spiritual vision is practically extinguished. But if we have vivid conceptions of sin, its evil and its seductiveness, together with a sense of the weakness of our own purpose unaided of God, we shall look to him to illumine our hearts and fortify our judgment. Realizing the power of our example, we shall avoid the appearance of evil. Filled with the love of Christ and holiness, we will need no specific admonition as to this or that self-indulgence, for we will lose the desire for questionable gratifications. We are not under the letter which killeth, but under the spirit which maketh alive. Let us settle every doubt on this broad principle of loyalty to Christ. Walking in the light and led by the Spirit, we shall walk at liberty, and our feet shall not stumble.

HASTING THE DAY.

BY EDWARD BRAISLIN, D.D. [BAPTIST], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Hasting unto the coming of the day of God.—2 Peter iii. 12.

WE would fix attention on the word "hasting." Time hastes. Another year has passed. A few more marks made by feet and hands; a few more gray hairs, many sins, much good, all swiftly past. "Time flies"—a proverb as old as the race. Though to some a night may seem like a year, time hastens. A few more graves have been opened, and many a heart has bled, but the year hastened and is gone. Man hastes as well as time, never faster than now. How he jostles, pushes, struggles, hurries by his fellow on the street or crowds him on the bridge! We harness the lightnings to carry our thought or send them on swift sound-waves. We send our goods by steam, and travel thus ourselves. Slow coaches are gone. All slow coaches must go. Yet in our haste there is something

of order. See it in the ebb and flow of the tide of humanity at certain hours of the day as it pours through the thoroughfares of the city. See it in the feeding of millions in these clustered cities thrice a day. Each, as a rule, has a place to lay his head. Like ants in movement, and wiser than ants in method and aim, we hasten onward with our work.

In a sense God hastens. All movements are co-ordinate parts of nature, therefore God is in all these goings on, past, present, future, and therefore we are living. His word is "quick"—that is, living. There is a stupendous purpose in view. To accomplish it the world stands and history unfolds. Such expressions as these are suggestive: "The Lord will hasten it in its time," "The fullness of time," and "Until it be accomplished." Christ recognized this principle and urged his disciples to watch and to understand the signs of the times. The disciples taught the same, and Peter says that "God is not slack." It is clear that all things hasten—time, men, and their Maker, all hasten to a predestined end.

But the one point of the text is revealed if as in the margin we omit the preposition and read it, "Hasting the coming of the day of God." We are co-ordinating factors, colaborers with God. If this be true we should know how and in what way we are to hasten this day. There is a haste that makes waste. "They stumble who run fast," says Shakespeare. The beginner on the piano moves slowly. He must because he is a beginner. Confusion and discord would ensue did he hurry; but the skillful performer moves with wonderful celerity, yet with no waste of energy. He has speed and accuracy as well, evoking delicious harmony with movements amazingly rapid. A loom has many parts, distinct, delicate, and each contributive to the work of the whole, all parts singing in unison as the web is woven or the thread is formed.

Haste is not worry. "Be careful (anxious) for nothing." "Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." By hastening we mean a utilization of force so that there is no loss. We do not create steam and then let it have vent into the air. We bind its power to wheels and work is done. We are to hasten the day of God by not frustrating his grace, by co-operation and by loyal aid. Why does God delay his coming? Because those purposes of grace are not completed and he is not willing that any should perish. It was for the realization of this redemptive plan that Christ was born, lived, died, and ascended; that the Holy Ghost came and that the church was founded, which is the salt and the light of the world. Without light, darkness; without salt, putrefaction; so without the processes of grace carried on by the church—which is the body of Christ—there would be no hope. Our consecration hastens this day of God. Our hearty and honest employment of all the elements of our social and civil life hastens it. Over the chair of the mayor of Toronto are the words, "Except the Lord keep the city," etc. Bribery and corruption cannot live in the atmosphere where that Christian mayor moves. He is loyal to the interests of God as well as to the material interests of Toronto. It is not by church-going merely, not by Sunday-school teaching or any outward service, but rather by the carrying of a pure heart under the garment of decorous deeds that we honor God or hasten on his kingdom. It is not the quantity so much as it is the quality of our work that God regards. We may be of common stuff and our work humble, but if true, honest and ingenuous, free from the weakness and disloyalty that spoils service, we shall be honored. Car-wheels are made of paper pulp, and are serviceable if there be no flaw. No matter what or where we are if we really are "his workmanship" and helpful

in his cause. I would yield my will, my reason, my all to God's control, for it is safe to do so, as it is not intelligent or safe to do in alliances with men, such as some workmen unwisely make in banding together to resist some other authority. We can yield all to God, and wisely, too.

The day is hastening. The earth is full of sin. That is a proof of the approaching day. The church is better and its real unity becoming more apparent. That is a proof. We may ask, "What of the night?" and the answer is assuring. Though wickedness abounds, goodness abounds also. This is a missionary era and one of philanthropic activity, as seen in the establishment of hospitals and kindred institutions, and in the diffusion of Christian thought and sentiment. Our question is not to be, "What shall I do to be saved?"—that was put and answered long ago—but, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" As the ticking of the watch shows its inward life, so the acts of the believer prove that he truly is a believer and constrained by the love of Christ.

Remember, too, that the establishment of God's kingdom in the earth involves the overthrow of all that is opposed to it. The things that can be shaken will be removed to give place to the things that abide eternally. The world is to come forth from its fires of purification as the three Hebrews from the furnace.

Finally, if you are not a child of God let me say, "Flee from the wrath to come! Haste, haste for thy life!" May God make us all more unselfish and consecrated, then we shall be more diligent, trustful, hopeful and helpful in hastening the coming of the day of God!

As the winged arrow flies,
Speedily the mark to find—
As the lightning from the skies
Darts, and leaves no trace behind—
Swiftly thus our fleeting days
Bear us down life's rapid stream;
Upwards, Lord, our spirits raise:
All below is but a dream.

WHY GOD DEALS DIFFERENTLY WITH DIFFERENT SUPPLIANTS.

BY GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D.D. [PRESBYTERIAN], NORFOLK, VA.

Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me. But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs. And she said, Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.—Matt. xv. 25-28.

I. In reading the Scripture story of the miracles of healing wrought by our Lord, we cannot but notice the difference in the way in which he received and treated different applicants.

1. In the case of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, our Lord does not wait to be appealed to by the sufferer, but himself makes the first advances. "When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole?" (John v. 6). In the case of the father of a demoniac son, related in Mark ix. 14-28, he seems to hesitate, stating a condition on which alone he will put forth his healing power. "Jesus saith unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." In the case of the "woman of Canaan," whose story is told us in the text and context, he answers in such a way as seems a denial of her request, though it was not a denial, in fact, as the event proved. "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs."

2. In the instances of answered prayers recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures, we may notice the same kind of difference in God's treatment of different suppliants. When Daniel cried unto God for Israel's deliverance from captivity, "while he was yet speaking," an angel is sent to him with the mes-

sage, "At the beginning of thy supplication the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee, for thou art greatly beloved" (Dan. ix. 23). David, giving his own experience in the matter, writes: "I waited patiently (in waiting I waited much) for the Lord, and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings" (Ps. xl. 1, 2). Of Jacob's wonderful prayer which secured for him his new name, Israel, "because, as a prince, he had power with God and with men, and prevailed," we read, "And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. . . . And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me" (Gen. xxxii. 24, 26).

Our Lord Jesus Christ, during his sojourn upon earth, was "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. iii. 16). And his treatment of suppliants who came to him for healing, as recorded in the New Testament, is in perfect harmony with that of the prayer-hearing God made known to us in the Old Testament Scriptures.

II. In view of such facts as we have been considering the question arises, Why this difference on the part of God in dealing with different suppliants? Let us turn to a more particular study of the several cases in which this difference appears, and see if they will furnish an answer to this question.

1. In the case of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, it is evident from the narrative that he was prepared to receive and profit by the blessing Christ bestowed; and this, doubtless, the omniscient Christ knew. "He had been a long time in that case," and knew full well how sad a case it was. He had come to look for help to God alone; and hence all his hopes centered "on angels troubling of the waters of the

pool." He was ready to do anything and everything commanded in order to his healing. When "Jesus said unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk, immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked," and this, notwithstanding "the day was the Sabbath." So in the case of Daniel we read that, from the study of the Scriptures, he had learned that God's appointed time for the restoration of Israel had come; and moved thereto by this knowledge, he "set his face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplication, with fasting, and sackcloth and ashes" (Dan. ix. 3), the restoration.

2. In the case of the father of the demoniac son, he had already made application to "Christ's disciples that they should cast him out, and they could not." As a natural consequence of this, when he afterward brought him to Jesus, the most he could say was, "If thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us." Our Lord's reply, "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth," was evidently intended to fix his attention on the imperfect character of his faith, and to draw from him the prayer, "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief." This purpose accomplished he at once grants his request. In the opening portion of the 40th Psalm, David is giving an account of his conversion. His condition during the time God kept him praying without seeming to hear him, he describes as that of one in "a horrible pit and the miry clay." He was the son of pious parents, and doubtless had been taught God's truth from his childhood. Imperfectly comprehending the plan of salvation, however, when awakened, he sets about "fitting himself to come to Christ," by breaking off from sinful practices, reading the Bible, attending upon the public

worship of God, and trying to pray. As the result of all this, he finds himself apparently growing worse instead of better. He is in "a horrible pit and the miry clay." And God leaves him there for a season, his prayers seemingly unheard, that he may teach him to come to Christ, saying,

"Just as I am, without one plea,
But that thy blood was shed for me,
And that thou bid'st me come to thee,
O Lamb of God, I come."

3. The "woman of Canaan," whose story is told us in the text and context, was a heathen by birth and education, and although she had faith to bring her daughter's case to Jesus, that faith would naturally be a superstitious rather than an intelligent faith. She needed to have her faith purified, her conviction of unworthiness and sin deepened, and to learn to worship Jesus as God, in order that her answer to her prayer might prove to her the greatest possible blessing. And all this our Lord's treatment of her accomplished. Turning now to Jacob's case. In his life, up to the time of his return to Canaan, Jacob appears a very poor specimen of what a truly pious man ought to be, and especially blameworthy in his treatment of his brother Esau. By God's treatment of him at Penuel his sin is brought distinctly to his remembrance, and a repentance therefor awakened within him such as threw him upon God alone for pardon and help. As a consequence of having to wrestle with God "until the breaking of the day," Jacob was a better man all his life long, as his subsequent history testifies.

The general truth we gather from the study of these several cases is that God deals with his suppliants as he does with an eye to their own good; so deals with them that when the blessing comes it may prove the greatest possible blessing to them.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Vicissitudes of Life. "For with my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now am become two bands."—Gen. xxxii. 10. George A. Gordon, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
2. Dedication Sermon. "What mean ye by these stones."—Joshua iv. 6. Rev. Theo. P. Prudden, Chicago, Ill.
3. Job Among the Ashes. "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes."—Job xlii. 5, 6. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, London, Eng.
4. Divine Mercy and Human Frailty. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him," etc.—Ps. ciii. 13-18. J. H. Stuckenberg, D.D., Berlin, Germany. [Preached on the occasion of the Emperor William's death.]
5. The Tenderness of God. "Who covereth the heaven with clouds, who prepareth rain for the earth, who maketh grass to grow upon the mountains."—Ps. cxlvii. 8. A. J. F. Behrends, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
6. The Gospel About Business Men. "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before kings."—Prov. xxii. 29. James B. King, D.D., New York.
7. Is the Spirit of the Lord Straitened? "O thou that art named the house of Jacob, is the Spirit of the Lord straitened?"—Micah i. 7. Alexander MacLaren, D.D., Manchester, Eng.
8. Christ's Message to the World. "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."—Matt. iv. 17. Lyman Abbot, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
9. Religious Leading. "Thou wicked and slothful servant . . . Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness."—Matt. xxv. 26-30. J. F. Clymer, D.D., Boston, Mass.
10. The Model Young Man—Loved, yet Rejected.—"Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest; go thy way, sell," etc.—Mark x. 21. Rev. L. C. Grandison, Chattanooga, Tenn.
11. Human Sinfulness. "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man," etc.—Luke v. 8. Rev. W. E. Griffis, Boston, Mass.
12. Life's True Mission. "I have glorified thee on the earth."—John xvii. 4. T. D. Witherspoon, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
13. Cornelius the Example of a Finding Soul. "There was a certain man in Cesarea named Cornelius." Acts x. 1. Wayland Hoyt, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
14. Lesson for Moralists. "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart."—2 Chron. xxv. 2. Rev. James H. Burdison, Ph.D., Louisville, Ky.

15. The Victory of Life. "I have fought a good fight," etc.—2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. Nathan E. Wood, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
16. Life Records on the Day of Judgment. "And the books were opened . . . and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."—Rev. xx. 12. J. L. Withrow, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

SUGGESTIVE THEMES.

1. Prayer Does Not Dispense with the Use of Means. ("And the Lord said unto Moses, Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."—Ex. xiv. 15.)
2. Shaven, but not Plucked up by the Root. ("Howbeit the hair of his head began to grow again after he was shaven."—Judges xvi. 22.)
3. Man's Worthlessness and Worth. ("Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?"—Isa. ii. 22.)
4. A Guilty Conscience a Hard Pillow. ("The king went to his palace and passed the night fasting, . . . And his sleep went from him."—Dan. vi. 18.)
5. Child Labor and Child Slavery. ("For Herod will seek the young child to destroy him."—Matt. ii. 13.)
6. The Reserve Power of Prayer. ("Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall . . . give me more than twelve legions of angels."—Matt. xxvi. 53.)
7. Faithful and Faithless. ("Who then is that faithful and wise steward?" etc.—Luke xii. 42-48.)
8. The Divine Presence Revealed in the Events of the Day. ("Christ revealed in the breaking of bread."—Luke xxiv. 33, 31.)
9. The Love of Fame. ("For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God."—John xii. 43.)
10. The Nearness of the Spiritual World. ("Though he be not far from every one of us."—Acts xvii. 27.)
11. Captive Thoughts. ("Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."—2 Cor. x. . .)
12. Obedience through Suffering. ("Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."—Heb. v. 8.)
13. A Sermon to Ushers. ("Be not forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares."—Heb. xiii. 1.)
14. The Entanglement to be Avoided. ("No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please," etc.—2 Tim. ii. 4.)
15. Correspondence Inferior to Conversation. ("I would not write them with paper and ink, but hope to come unto you and to speak face to face."—2 John 12.)

PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY J. M. SHERWOOD, D.D.

April 29 to May 5.—THE UTILITY OF PRAYER.—Job xxi. 15.

Job spake these words with extreme bitterness—even as the fool speaketh. It was a day of awful

darkness with him. He lay in the dust, smitten of God, overwhelmed with calamities, seeking comfort but finding none. He seemed forsaken alike of man and of God. His friends

who came to condole with him only added to his misery. Even his faith in God, for the time being, seemed wrecked. There is a wail of mingled unbelief and hopelessness in his speech when he cries out, "What is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit should we have if we pray unto him?"

Millions of human hearts, in the Christian church and out of it, have, at times, felt just as Job felt, and put their unbelief and despair into action, whether they articulated their thoughts and feelings or not. "What is the Almighty that we should serve him?" is the basal doubt that shapes their conduct and accounts for their state of alienation from God. "What profit should we have if we pray unto him?" is the practical everyday commentary on their prayerless unchristian lives. In a word, they do not *in their hearts* believe in the utility of prayer; believe that God truly hears and grants blessed answers to prayer; and this is the reason they do not pray to him, or, if they pray, do it in a formal, heartless manner.

In showing the utility of prayer we have space only to touch upon a few salient points.

1. Prayer has its foundation in the *nature of things*. It is not an arbitrary or unreasonable thing. It is the natural outcry of dependence and want, as when the child asks the mother for bread.

2. Prayer is *God's own sovereign arrangement*, and grows out of the natural and the gracious relations he himself has constituted between us.

3. Prayer is *divinely enjoined*, and the command is as obligatory as any of God's other commands. We cannot omit prayer and not be a grievous transgressor.

4. Prayer has every *inducement held out to it* that a benignant Father and a loving Saviour can devise.

5. Prayer *in itself is an unspeakable privilege and benefit*. Its subjective influence passes all conception. A thousand precious answers

to prayer are found in the state of mind and Christian experience which the exercise of prayer itself begets.

6. But prayer receives *direct, positive, objective answers*. The experience of every praying soul will testify to this. The annals of Christendom are crowded with shining examples.

The "profit" of praying to the "Almighty," especially to the God of the everlasting covenant of redemption, is therefore sure, positive, immediate, and commensurate with our need. We cannot afford to forego this priceless blessing!

May 6-12. — THE UNREASONABLENESS AND DANGER OF INDECISION. — Acts xxvi. 28.

I. UNREASONABLENESS. Why?

Because religion is both a *personal* and a *reasonable* matter which commends itself to every man's understanding, conscience, and highest interest. (a) It is a *personal* question which nobody can ever decide for him, and which in the end he must and will decide for himself. (b) The thing urged is infinitely *reasonable in itself*, is in the direct line of duty and present and eternal well-being. (c) The matter to be decided is the *supreme* question of life and being. (d) The *present* is the most favorable time he will ever have to come to a decision. (e) To delay decision *strengthens* the habit of procrastination and *augments* the difficulty, already found so formidable, of ever bringing the mind to a decision. (f) *Not* to decide to accept Christ is to *reject* him; a decision is *made* and made *against* God and the soul and eternity every time the gospel is proffered and not embraced.

II. The DANGER of Indecision.

1. It is highly offensive to God, (a) inasmuch as it is a refusal to submit to his righteous authority. (b) It is an open and grievous slight put upon his grace. (c) It contravenes the entire scope and end of the redemptive scheme of the gospel. (d) It arrays the example and life of the non-ac-

ceptor on the side of sin and the devil.

2. It is sinful in the highest degree and absolutely ruinous on the part of the procrastinating sinner. Not only does he sin against God, and sin against the cross of Christ, and sin against the entire economy of grace, but he sins against his own soul's highest interest, against his own spiritual being, and against all the laws of Providence. (a) The God of justice may at any time take the delaying sinner at his word and say, "Ephraim is joined to his idols, let him alone." (b) Every time the word and Spirit of God are resisted and obedience refused the evil heart is confirmed, and the habit of procrastination is made stronger, and consequently the work of resistance made easier. (c) With every repetition of the act of resistance to the claims and appeals of the gospel, the means of grace and the motives to life lose some of their power, and after a while will cease to have any influence on the delaying sinner except to harden him in his evil ways and thus aggravate his final ruin.

Having begun to delay repentance, under the pressure of the Word and Spirit of God, the danger is that he will *continue* to delay till all is lost. Refusing his decision in youth, in middle life, in times of awakening, in the day of divine visitation, he will persist in the same fatal course in old age, in the time of revival, under God's chastening hand, and even in the hour and experience of death!

Such, alas! is the common experience of gospel sinners.

May 13-19.—PRIDE ABASED BY THE GOSPEL.—1 Cor. i. 29.

Pride is the very essence of sin. Pride slew the angels which kept not their first estate. Through pride the Devil gained entrance into the heart of Eve and ruined the race. Pride rules every rebellious will. Pride, in one form or another, is the last thing

in man to yield to the abasing doctrines of grace.

It is no marvel then that the axe is laid at the root of this profligate, stubborn, giant sin, in the economy of redemption. Every feature of the scheme is in direct and absolute antagonism to creature pride. It spares not a limb, not a root, not a vestige of the accursed thing.

Let us note a few of the forms in which the sin of pride develops and arrays itself against the gospel.

1. In pride of *reason*. God meets us on the threshold of moral accountability with his authoritative revelation as the rule of our faith and practice. To that revelation he demands our unquestioning obedience. We are not at liberty to go beyond it, or to add to or take from it, on penalty of damnation. Reason in man may demur, may refuse to receive it as the end of the law, the sum and substance of essential truth. But *there it is*, unchanged and unchangeable, the one law and guide, and on that line God Almighty will fight out the issue with the sinner.

2. In the pride of *philosophy*. Multitudes, after accepting the Bible as the word of God, take refuge in some human system of creed or philosophy which practically nullifies the plan of salvation as taught by God himself. Almost every man has *some sort of a philosophy* which keeps him out of the kingdom! It is the hardest thing in the world to get a sinner to throw away all his preconceived notions and false views and reliances, and just come down to the simplicity of the gospel. It is the very *last* thing he will do, and when he is brought to take this step his salvation is assured. But what a fierce, and often lifelong fight to break the hold of a false philosophy!

3. In the pride of *will*. Sooner or later it comes down to the simple question of WILL. God's will or man's will—which shall it be? One or the other must prevail, and rule. No other conflict is so fierce and stub-

born. Yield, the *sinner* must—yield unconditionally and sweetly—or he and God will never come together.

4. In the pride of *righteousness*. Man clings, as he clings to life, to the idea of personal merit in himself and in his works. It is galling to abase himself to confess that all his righteousness is as filthy rags and accept salvation as a free gift of God through Jesus Christ.

5. In the pride of *attainment*. When he has done his utmost man is but a babe in knowledge, is still an unprofitable servant, but toys with the infinite truths of God; there are still eternal heights and boundless expanses of thought and being above and around him unreached, unexplored. All he has and all he is, must be laid as a humble tribute at the feet of the Master.

6. In the pride of *means and instrumentalities*. Man depends on might, on a grand array of forces, on demonstrations of power, on means seemingly adequate to the end, on "wisdom," skill, wealth, power—"mighty things of the world"—while God, contrawise, relies upon the inward spirit, "the still small voice," the silent power of a quickened conscience, the mean and weak things of the world—"that no flesh should glory in his presence."

In all these, and still other forms, pride and the grace of God come into sharp and constant conflict, and it is only as the Omnipotent Spirit of God conquers one after another of these dreadful forms of depravity and finally wins the victory, that "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" achieves its mission.

May 20-26.—THE SINNER'S SELF-DESTRUCTION AND ONLY REMEDY.—Hosea xiii. 9.

I. HIS SELF-DESTRUCTION. "O Israel, thou hast *destroyed thyself*."

The same truth is taught, directly or by implication, on almost every page of the Bible. Every impenitent sinner is already under condemna-

tion; not because of Adam's sin, not on the ground of arbitrary decree, but because of voluntary personal demerit, transgression. The finally impenitent will perish simply because they would not be saved, chose death rather than life. This will appear more clearly if we consider,

1. That the ground of condemnation is *personal character*. The Bible puts it nowhere else. "If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin." "Ye will not come to me that ye may have eternal life," "He that believeth on me shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned," and a thousand other passages.

2. God governs every man as a *free agent*. He is left to choose between good and evil. Life and death are put before him, and he is urgently besought to choose life. But God will not force his choice, not even to save him. If he chooses Christ, life and heaven, he does it voluntarily; if he chooses the alternative, he does it under the tremendous obligation of voluntariness.

3. The *provision of grace is ample* for all who will accept it. None are excluded from its scope. "Christ tasted death for every man." "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." If you will die in your sins it will not be because no Saviour died for you. You need not have perished!

4. *Life is tendered to you* and urged upon you; the means of enlightenment, of conversion and training for heaven are all in your hands; the Holy Spirit strives with you; the ministry pleads; all day long divine mercy waits on you and intercedes with and for you. And if you *will* die in your sins, nevertheless, your blood be upon your own head! You alone will be responsible.

II. THE ONLY REMEDY—the only way to escape the eternal doom of the self-destroyer. "*In me* is thine help."

The sinner can *destroy* himself,

but he cannot *save* himself. There is in sin the power of an endless death, but there is not in human nature the development or even the germ of spiritual life and immortality.

Salvation from sin and death is all of grace. It is a supernatural provision outside of and independent of human device and human merit. Culture will not save a man. The deeds of the law will not justify him. No amount of striving and praying, or

penance or mortification will redeem the soul. There must be a re-creation—a new birth—a total transformation of character, purpose, life; old things must pass away and all things become new. The grace of God, which bringeth salvation, must strike its divine roots deep down in the soul and lift it up to take hold on Christ by faith and prayer and bring the whole being into subjection to the principles of the new life.

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

CONDUCTED BY PROF. J. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., BERLIN, GERMANY.

PROFESSOR A. H. HARNACK, D.D.

AMONG the younger theological professors of Germany, Dr. A. Harnack is the most celebrated. Although only thirty-seven years old, his works on the early Christian Church, particularly on the formation and the development of the dogmas, have put him in the front rank of church historians. He studied at Dorpat, where his father is still professor of practical theology; began his career as *privat docent* in Leipzig, went as ordinary professor of church history to Giessen, and thence to Marburg in 1886, where he is at present. An effort was made to transfer him to Leipzig instead of Marburg, but it was said that this was opposed by the orthodox professors, particularly by Luthardt. He has lately been proposed for the chair once occupied by Neander in the Berlin University, and it is reported that he has signified his willingness to accept the position.

Numerous articles and books on the early church and the church fathers preceded the publication of his learned work on the "History of Doctrine." The first volume appeared in 1886, and the first part of the second volume recently left the press. The most decided opponents of the work admit its masterly ability. It is based on the most exhaustive study of the sources, and the vast mate-

rials gathered are used for the construction of a new theory of the origin of the dogmas in the Christian church. Instead of viewing these as a development of the teachings found in the Gospels and Epistles as apprehended by the Christian consciousness, he attributes far more influence to the Old Testament in the formation of the dogmas than has usually been the case; but the chief opposition on the part of orthodox theologians was occasioned by the prominence he gives to Hellenic influence in the construction of those dogmas. Harnack says: "The dogma as well as the canon of the New Testament had preparatory stages; it was perfectly developed and received ecclesiastical recognition only in the second half of the third century; and in conception and development the dogma was a product of the Greek mind working on the basis of the gospel. The history of dogmas, of course, strikes its roots into the original Christianity, but these roots also enter a soil foreign to Christianity." That Greek thought had an influence on the development of the dogmas has repeatedly been affirmed; but Harnack claims that this influence was so potent as wholly to pervert the original teachings of Christianity. He holds that the apostolic writings were not understood, but that their teachings were so mixed

with Hellenic thoughts that the dogmas contain a decidedly heathen element. What the church held to be Paulinism is regarded by him as largely due to the influence of Plato and the Stoics; and Gnosticism, instead of being overthrown by the church, became the most potent factor in determining the final character of the dogmas. What has all along been regarded as a doctrinal development of the teachings of the New Testament, is pronounced by Harnack a process of perversion and secularization.

This radically revolutionary theory, overturning the generally accepted view of the doctrinal development in the church and of the character of those doctrines themselves, has excited much discussion. There can hardly be a doubt that the author on maturer reflection will himself find occasion to modify his views. His bold theories, stated sharply, positively, and even in a dogmatic tone, are in some respects extremes, and various points have been successfully attacked. The attacks have by no means been confined to the orthodox. Thus a philosopher familiar with Greek thought, in a review of the book, antagonized the views of Harnack on the Hellenic influence in the molding of the Christian dogmas. And Prof. Pfeleiderer of Berlin, in his new work on "Primitive Christianity, its Writings and its Doctrines," also regards Harnack's theory "that Hellenism, by means of Gnosticism, suddenly penetrated Christianity and thus subjected and secularized it," false. He adds: "I think that this theory of degeneration, as it may briefly be called, presupposes a conception of the apostolic theology which cannot stand the test of historic inquiry. "Pfeleiderer himself is decidedly negative, and a representative of the modified Tuebingen school. Another liberal theologian sees in the work the aim to promote the views of Ritschl, to whose school Harnack belongs. "Soon one discovers that the

crime of the church fathers consisted essentially in the fact that they did not understand Ritschl's theology;" and it is hinted that the author wants to show that from the time of the introduction of Christianity till the coming of Ritschl the true character of the gospel was misunderstood. Since all parties take so lively an interest in the subject there may be a revival of the discussion of primitive Christianity similar to that introduced by the labors of the Tuebingen school half a century ago.

The effort to transfer Harnack to Berlin brings to the front again the question whether the church shall have a voice in the appointment of theological professors, or whether the matter shall be left to the government. The fact that so many theological professors do not represent the prevailing views of the church has led the orthodox party to the request that the ecclesiastical authorities be consulted in the appointment of the teachers of the future preachers of the church. But this is met by the claim that scholarship must be free, and that to give the church an influence in appointing theological professors would interfere with that freedom of thought for which German universities are celebrated. As the state requires that all its preachers shall be graduates of a state university, so it claims the appointing power for the theological as for the other faculties. This idea of scientific freedom has great weight even in orthodox circles; yet the conviction is growing that the church ought to have some authority to determine who shall train its future teachers. Outside of the orthodox party there is universal opposition to ecclesiastical authority in the appointment of theological professors.

Before me lies a liberal journal which strongly advocates the call of Harnack to Berlin. It claims that he is critical, is scientific, and attracts students; therefore he should be in the metropolis, not in a provincial

city. "Nothing would justify the exclusion of the Marburg investigator from Berlin, where Otto Pflleiderer has worked with great success in the same department in which Harnack has become famous by means of valuable researches. The differences in their critical methods are very small. Both stand between the Tuebingen Baur and the Goettingen Ritschl as altogether independent investigators of the age and of the doctrines of early Christianity; and what the Tuebingen school began, Berlin is destined, judging by the researches of Pflleiderer, to continue." Germany is not rich in eminent church historians, and it is held that Berlin is the place for the most eminent, regardless of his doctrinal position.

The reasons used by the liberals and by adherents of the Ritschl school in favor of the transfer of Harnack are made grounds of opposition by the orthodox. The University of Berlin is the first in Germany, and gives a man unusual opportunities to influence students. Harnack's lectures are attractive; he has great constructive power, and thus makes the results of his researches peculiarly powerful. The number of theological students is at present about eight hundred, being more than in any other university; and to bring these under his influence is regarded as fraught with danger to the church. The fact that he belongs to Ritschl's school is also urged as a serious objection. Thus an orthodox journal says: "It almost seems as if the Goettingen theology were to receive official recognition and favor similar to that formerly bestowed on the philosophy of Hegel. The Ritschl school has in fact met with marked outward success during the brief period of its existence. Besides Goettingen, it rules wholly in Giessen and Marburg, is very influential in Bonn, Berlin and Halle, and has also gained a footing in Kiel. A number of young theologians who are not pro-

fessors, but are nevertheless influential, also belong to this school. From this it is evident that at present no other tendency is equal in numerical strength to Ritschl's school." Kaftan, the successor of Dorner in the chair of dogmatic theology, belongs to this school; and the orthodox party naturally fear that their cause will seriously suffer if the doctrinal teaching in the first university of the land is left mainly to Pflleiderer, Kaftan and Harnack.

AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS IN GERMANY.

THEIR number varies considerably. We have not the statistics, but it is probable that at present there are in the different universities somewhere between fifty and one hundred. The numbers at the different universities also varies; but as a rule Leipzig, Berlin, Bonn and Erlangen attract the most. There are now more in Berlin than for some time in the past; the city itself, aside from the university, offers many attractions and draws students. Taking into consideration all the facts, there is a likelihood that for years to come the number of theological students from America will increase.

The majority of these students are graduates of theological seminaries at home, and many of them have won prizes or scholarships. A large proportion of them are ordained ministers, and have had experience in pastoral work. Theological professors also come on leave of absence, matriculate as students, and take courses of lectures in particular lines of work. Many of the American theological students are specialists, devoting their time mainly to Hebrew, to exegesis, to church history, or some other branch of theology. Frequently philosophical lectures are heard in connection with those on theology. Much of the study in special lines is with a view to securing an appointment to a professorship.

Sometimes a particular professor is

the center of attraction and decides the choice of the university — as Weiss, Dillmann, Delitzsch, Luthardt or Christlieb. Many remain but a year, and even then spend part of the time in travel; others stay two or three years and visit different universities.

In character, ability and industry these students as a class take high rank. The spirit that brings them here is usually a guarantee of intellectual aspiration and earnestness; and adding to their attainments at home the advantages enjoyed here, there can be no doubt that as professors, preachers and authors they will exert a powerful influence in the American churches.

Among the first impressions received by the student are those due to the remarkable freedom in the teaching and life of the university. Thought is free here as nowhere else. Not only are different tendencies discussed, but their advocates represent them in the most favorable light; and thus the student learns them, not from antagonists, but from their own representatives. Bound by no creed, subject to no authority of the church, the professor is in little danger of coming in conflict with the state which appoints him, and hence he claims perfect freedom in his inquiries. The theory that every subject must be investigated purely on its own merits of course does not insure impartiality. Schools are here formed with remarkable ease, and here, as everywhere, scholars are subject to the influence of prevailing tendencies, traditions and prejudices. Nevertheless, the freedom and the variety of views tell on the student. He has entered a new world, is obliged to investigate conflicting theories and doctrines, and perhaps to reopen questions thought to have been settled long ago. Even if one is inclined to follow the strongest authority, it may be extremely difficult to decide which is the strongest. But inquiring, critical and philosophical

thinkers may be called to wrestle with doubt which tries the soul to the utmost.

In some cases the doubt itself may become a permanent state and produce only negative results; in other cases the doubts which the student brings with him are overcome, and the perfect freedom enjoyed is the very condition for solving the problems which have agitated his mind. Doubt as a ferment, rousing the mind to the greatest energy and leading to the deepest inquiries, as in the case of men like Chalmers and Tholuck, may serve to promote the highest development of the student, and to fit him for special usefulness. That the course here pursued usually promotes breadth of view and tolerance of differences is not strange.

The student returns home with a knowledge of German theology and German books, and imbued with the spirit and disciplined in the method of teaching prevalent in the German university. He understands the German language, and thus holds the key to the vast treasures of thought which have enriched so many American and English works. The vast influence thus exerted on American thought is augmented by the large libraries and scores of thousands of volumes which are going in increasing numbers across the Atlantic. That these are facts which must be carefully considered and are worthy of being thoroughly weighed, is beyond question. Here is a mighty tide which no protest and no denunciation of German theology can check. Students will come here so long as the advantages are superior.

The effect on American thought may for a time be looked upon with apprehension. A foreign leaven will be introduced into the home meal. Old faiths will in some instances be disturbed, perhaps profoundly agitated and even unsettled. Students who spend some time here do not question that this will be the case. But this does not imply that the re-

sult will necessarily be disastrous. Science, philosophy and literature are becoming cosmopolitan; and in the long run theology cannot be an exception. What a particular church or nation elaborates will become the possession of every denomination. With the lessons of tolerance lessons of thoroughness will also be learned. If an erroneous view is to be overthrown, it must be done by making the thinking deeper, broader and more correct. During the fury of a storm only destruction can be seen in its path; but afterward its purifying effects are experienced. The very depth required to meet the destructive elements in German theology will also reveal in it marvelous instructive elements, and those themselves will be most to blame who absorb the poison but close their eyes to the antidote at its very side.

It requires a weak faith indeed to believe that controversy can do otherwise than eventually bring the truth of Christianity into stronger light and make its effect greater. But aside from this unshaken confidence, we have reason to hope that our free churches, our living Christianity, and the practical character of our life generally, will help to save us from one-sided intellectualism and from wild speculations. A sound heart will often feel its way with safety where the reason becomes dizzy and begins to wander. And then is not America fast becoming the land of the best institutions and of the highest educational advantages? In the not distant future perhaps German students may come to America, as American students now come here. For freedom from traditional restraints, and for the expansion of thought, we have decided advantages; and comparing the students who come here from abroad with the German students themselves, it requires no stretch of imagination to believe that for real vigor and independence of thought the center will by and by have to be

sought across the Atlantic. In no other land are the churches more fully the receptacle of influences from all other lands; and if made the recipients of the advantages of theological training in German universities, there is no reason to question that the result will be a gain. But the influence of German thought on American theology and religion makes the most earnest demands on the American churches and institutions.

And may not the time have come when the American churches ought to manifest enough interest in their thousands of students and children abroad, to look after their spiritual interests and to provide them with churches and with the preaching of the gospel?

THROUGH DOUBT TO FAITH.

RELIGION involves the deepest interests of humanity. This explains the tenacity of religious faith, the zeal with which it is defended, and the agony of heart when the present consolation and future hopes of religion are lost. The universality, depth and earnestness of spiritual beliefs testify to the religious character of the soul. In proportion as the spirit is conscious of itself it recognizes religion as its rest and home. Thus in the very needs of our nature there is an imperative demand for religious faith, and the psychological basis of religion is one of the most conclusive arguments in its favor. Men cease to be religious in proportion as they lose themselves.

What Herbert Spencer says respecting Hume is applicable to many of the shallow and even frivolous attacks against religion: "A logical apparatus that is to overturn the deepest of human beliefs must have an extremely firm basis, must have parts rigid enough to bear any strain, and must have these parts so firmly articulated that there is no dislocating them." It may also be that there are in the heart elements beyond the

reach of a logical apparatus. The heart's energy does not ask of logic the privilege of existence and action. We live far more than our logical chains can measure.

Doubt may be a permanent state or merely a method. As the latter it is a journey toward faith. Doubt is agitation, unrest, impulse, agony; it is a painful problem demanding solution. It is critical, and is apt to forget that what is merely critical cannot have the productiveness of life. Some take the living seed, press the juice out of it, scratch and dissect the residue; this they plant, and afterward dig up daily to wonder that it does not grow. What is intended for life is treated as if made for anatomical dissection. Serious doubt wants genuine life, not death, and all its processes are for the perfection of life, not for its destruction.

Into doubt and through doubt, for the sake of attaining faith, is a process through which many are called to pass. Doubt may thus be the means of purifying and strengthening faith. It is a pruning-knife, not a living germ. Faith cannot spring from it, just as mere negation never can be the source of production. Doubt is a purifier, but that which is to be purified by the fire must continue in the heat, otherwise there will be consumption, not purification. Hence the most important thing during doubt is to cherish whatever remains of the religious life; if that is not held fast the very crown may be lost.

Doubt as method is thus inquiry, discipline, a process toward faith. Those who make a mere method the substance treat the journey as if it were the destination itself. Hence the importance of understanding the nature and mission of doubt. Instead of being merely destructive, it is to be destructive for the sake of becoming constructive. It digs deep, but for the sake of finding a firm foundation on which to build. Some, however, instead of building are intent

only on the removal of rubbish, and with the rubbish remove also the building materials.

Genuine, honest doubt is a coming to self, teaching what is needed and what should be done. Not arbitrarily to crush doubt is the minister's aim, but to direct and use it. We must learn to make all doubt the minister of religion and truth. It is not doubt, but its mistakes and perversions that are to be feared. Increased earnestness respecting all that remains is one of the most urgent demands on those called to pass through the fire. Tholuck, who dealt so wisely with doubters, tried to correct their false methods, sought to awaken the spiritual life, and to lead to the practice of such ethical and religious principles as were still admitted. He knew by experience that doubt attempts what can be done only by faith, and he saw in its deadening influence on the spiritual life its greatest dangers.

Stanley states that while Thomas Arnold was preparing for orders in the English church he was much distressed by doubt. In this state the advice of a friend proved of great service. "He was bid to pause in his inquiries, to pray earnestly for help and light from above, and turn himself more strongly than ever to the practical duties of a holy life. He did so, and through severe trials was finally blessed with perfect peace of mind and a settled conviction."

Sometimes doubt is mere affectation and vanity, and should be placed in the same category with the phylacteries of the Pharisees. It may be born of conceit rather than of the requirements of reason and the needs of the spirit. Thus Coleridge tells us in his *Table Talk* that at the age of thirteen he ran away from school to a shoemaker, desirous of learning his trade. He gave as reasons for running away his desire to become a shoemaker and his abhorrence of the idea of becoming a preacher, because he was an infidel. On being returned to school the teacher punished him

severely. Coleridge thought the punishment wise, since instead of flattering his vanity it cured him of his folly by making him ashamed of himself.

Earnest, irresistible doubt has a divine mission in leading to a faith of which men can give a full account, and which enables them to help those who are doomed to pass through struggles to peace, and through darkness to light. The profoundest and strongest souls may have the greatest conflicts. Jean Paul says that great souls attract sorrows as the mountains storms, but that mountains also break the storms. The faith that has been tried and has stood the test has not only been made conscious of itself and its precious treasures, but has also been strengthened. Not its least blessing is its sympathy and yearning for others still in the conflict. One of the deepest cries of the age is, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." The cry is itself a prayer; it is a prayer in doubt, but a prayer of faith against unbelief.

In Germany and England much doubt has become petrified in positive infidelity, but there are also numerous indications that skepticism and agnosticism have not the balm needed by the human heart. The very altar reared to the "unknown God" may be but a text for proclaiming him whose offspring we are, and in whom we live and move and have our being. Doubt is not the promised land, though it may be the desert leading to that land.

THE OLD CATHOLICS.

IF these have not become as powerful as was expected, we must attribute the cause partly to the circumstances in which they were placed. The various states reckon with numbers and favor those who make themselves felt politically, while such as struggle with adversity and can bring little or no help to the government are mostly left to take care of themselves. While the movement of

the Old Catholics has not been fostered by the governments, it has in some countries, particularly in Austria, met with decided opposition. Even in Protestant lands the desire to conciliate the Roman Catholics has been so strong that for their sakes the movement has generally been treated unfavorably. It has been found difficult to secure churches and priests for them, and the small congregations organized here and there could only be maintained amid great sacrifices. While the Ultramontanes abused them mercilessly, the Protestants stood aloof from them because they regarded the Old Catholics as not sufficiently evangelical. Of all the Protestant theologians, Professor Beyschlag of Halle has given them most attention. He claims that in Germany there are one hundred congregations, with 36,000 souls; in Switzerland, where they are called "Christian Catholics," there are probably still more; and in Austria they number 10,000 members. In all there are over 100,000 members.

The recent conference with English bishops has encouraged the hope that sympathy and aid will be given to the movement by English and American Episcopalians. At this conference it became evident that doctrinally there are many points of agreement with the English church, though on some points there seems to be a hesitation on the part of the Old Catholics in giving decided affirmations as to the doctrinal status. The first six councils are regarded as alone ecumenical; whatever has been confessed by the whole church is also accepted by the Old Catholics; the decrees of the Vatican Council are rejected, particularly that of papal infallibility; but since they are but a part of the church universal they hesitate to formulate their views on doctrines not confessed by the universal church. While rejecting the Vatican Council, they evidently want to adhere as closely as possible

to traditional Catholicism so as to avoid the appearance of being revolutionary. As Old Catholics they do not want to inaugurate doctrines which break with the Catholic traditions; and for this reason, although they do not regard the Council of Trent as authoritative, they are doctrinally farther removed from the Evangelical Church than might otherwise be the case. Expediency too seems to dictate a slow doctrinal development.

Professor Beyschlag claims that in point of doctrine they are much nearer the Protestants than is generally supposed. The very fact that they adhere so closely to the practices of the Catholic Church gives them greater influence with the members of that church, and it is hoped that in Germany they will be the means of working effectively for the evangelization of the Catholics, just as the Waldenses are doing in Italy. Among the most powerful weapons against ultramontaniam are those now wielded by the Old Catholics, particularly by scholars like Doellinger of Munich, Professor Weber of Breslau, and Bishop Reinkens of Bonn.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE glory of the papacy has reached its culmination in the Pope's Jubilee. The princes of all faiths and all nations have paid their homage to Leo XIII., and Catholics have done their utmost to make it tell for the honor, the authority, and the power of the Catholic Church. All the influences of literature and art are laid under contribution to promote the supremacy of the papacy over nations and individuals; and in proportion as the papacy is glorified the Protestant Church is degraded. The most extravagant terms seem too tame to do justice to the marvelous glory of the Church of Rome. A German bishop writes that amid the revolutions of empires and the change of opinions "the Church of God stands upon the Rock which the

gates of hell cannot overthrow. The mouth of its highest Teacher ceaselessly proclaims the word of God which outlasts heaven and earth; ceaselessly the grace of Christ streams from the anointed hands of the highest Priest; ceaselessly Christendom walks the way of salvation under the guidance of its First Shepherd. The Pope is held in high esteem by all nations. Mighty states have chosen him as Arbitrator."

What most deeply moves evangelical Christians is not the fact that thousands of Catholic pilgrims streamed to Rome, that their enthusiasm know no bounds, and that the jubilee itself was magnificent. All this was to be expected. Nor was the participation of Protestant princes strange. The fact that they have Catholic subjects made greetings and even presents natural. But evangelical Christians have been deeply moved, and their consciences have been oppressed by the fact that Protestant rulers, the recognized heads of the Protestant churches of their dominions, sent as presents objects to be used only in religious services which every evangelical Christian regards with extreme aversion and as subversive of biblical Christianity; and because these Protestant rulers in their congratulations used expressions which can only serve to promote the arrogant claims of the papacy. The feeling in many quarters is deeper than can find utterance in the press, and not a few are beginning to realize more profoundly than ever that the church of God cannot put its trust in princes.

If there is a scarcely suppressed feeling that those whose position demands that they be the staunchest defenders of Protestantism have really betrayed it, they do not find the explanation difficult. The Catholic subjects under Jesuitic dominion are ceaseless in their agitation for greater privileges. Even where largely in the minority, they insist on greater advantages than those en-

joyed by their Protestant neighbors. They have learned that agitation and turbulence will accomplish wonders, particularly when national unity is a necessity in face of a threatening external foe. Where a government is sure of the support of its good citizens it may have to make many concessions to gain the good will of the disaffected. Then, Rome is viewed as a support of the monarchical principle, and hence its influence on the nobility, the aristocracy, and on ruling families is peculiarly strong. Nor must it be forgotten that the papacy continually urges that it alone has the power to protect governments against socialistic and anarchical machinations, and that it is therefore to be sought by rulers and governments as their best ally. The Pope represents the monarchical principle, the idea of supreme authority in one individual, and it is not surprising that those who place this principle above everything else, subordinate even their religious ideas to the rank and authority of which the Pope is an embodiment.

While the Catholics are making the most of the jubilee for the power and glory of their church, Protestants are not idle spectators. They recognize the need of greater effort if the precious fruits of the Reformation are to be conserved. But it cannot be questioned that there are decided advantages on the side of Rome. In view of the unity and strength of Catholicism, the distractions and animosities among Protestants are most disastrous. Even in their efforts to oppose Rome's aggressions the Protestants of Germany are divided into different factions, and their common enemy need but fight them in detail or leave them to devour one another. There is an orthodoxy which is as narrow as it is intense, and which makes un-conditional acceptance of its dogmas the condition of fellowship; there is a liberalism which has scarcely a vestige of Christianity except the

name; and there are intermediate parties with a desire to reconcile the extremes, but they are themselves subject to the severest attacks by these extremes. Party spirit has so affected the church that the conservatives in religion even deny that a man can be a Christian and yet liberal in politics. The church can only be the loser by this bitter hostility to all who dare to be liberal and independent in politics, and many are thus repelled who might be the warmest friends and most efficient supporters of the church.

Socialism is discussed in another place. It alone, even if the church were united and had no other foes, would require the utmost efforts of believers to meet the needs of the masses. Looking below the surface of Catholic and socialistic agitations we come to the radical antagonism between Christianity and infidelity. A German writer says: "That which consumes the marrow of the people and depresses their spirits is first of all a godless science as it is taught in our universities and promoted by our popular as well as our scholarly literature. I do not refer chiefly to theology, although it has fallen largely under the dominion of the ruling spirit; I refer rather to the general tendency of the science of the day. This has been called the age of natural science, and no one questions that science has gained great victories, and by means of its discoveries has vastly promoted material welfare. But at the same time it has become usual no longer to behold divine omnipotence and wisdom in nature. . . . Laws are recognized in nature, but it is denied that they emanate from the highest wisdom; a rational connection is everywhere discerned in nature, but a supreme reason which wisely and mercifully controls all is rejected. . . . What is supersensible, beyond the reach of our hands, spirit, soul and consciousness, is regarded as purely accidental, the

chance product of the movements of matter. God and revelation, the freedom of the will and eternal life, are either denied or else declared to be beyond the limits of knowledge, and we are requested to be especially thankful if the theologians of the most modern school, whose views strike their roots wholly in this naturalism, permit us to believe in objects beyond observation, for the reason that such a faith is useful in delivering us from the great sorrows of this life."

Others take a more optimistic view, and there certainly are signs that the relation of science to religion has become more friendly, or at least less openly hostile. Speaking of the change in this relation a German journal says: "It was different twenty or thirty years ago. At that time the newly revived natural science made direct assaults on Christianity. It is only ten years since Darwinism, by means of its theory of evolution, expected to destroy the ideal view of the world, with which Christianity must stand or fall. But how calm has it become since then! Mathematics, the crown of all exact science, recognizes that even it extends to the realm of the supersensible. Eminent scientists, like Du Bois-Reymond, pause in the presence of certain elementary psychological phenomena, such as language and consciousness, and in the circles of critical natural science the law of evolution is held to be an attainable rather than an attained goal. The attacks against Christianity consequently ceased from this quarter. The last work of E. von Hartmann, 'The Self-Destruction of Christianity,' has left no impression. It was too superficial. It may also be confidently affirmed that the critical attacks of opponents have rather served to confirm than to weaken the position of the biblical Christianity of the church. At present the burning questions pertain wholly to the Old Testament." While this view

may be too optimistic it is evident that German scientists do not so often as formerly go out of their way to attack Christianity.

Perhaps less in atheistic science and in a godless literature is there reason for discouragement than in the fact that ministers, as a rule, are so little prepared to meet the attacks of infidelity. The severe examinations make strict adherence to the prescribed course in the gymnasium and the university a necessity; and the predominance of the classics in the one and the exclusive devotion to theology in the other are not calculated to make the student master of the problems presented by science and philosophy. After they once enter a pastorate the ministers may move smoothly in the grooves of the state church, by means of a formal compliance with the prescribed rules, without permitting their ecclesiastical equanimity to be seriously agitated by the intellectual currents outside of the church. It is far more easy to denounce infidelity than to gain over it an intellectual ascendancy. An extensive acquaintance with German ministers reveals the fact that they are but poorly prepared to grapple with the philosophical and scientific problems of the day.

It is less important to dwell on the signs of the times than to draw the lessons they teach. Well may the Christian scholar be appalled by the intellectual requirements made on him by the prevalent tendencies. In an ordinary congregation even, questions are continually arising which tax to the utmost the theologian, to say nothing of the attacks from the domain of science and literature. There is no doubt that theological teaching and training with a special view to meeting the peculiar needs of the day deserve serious consideration, and it is equally true that the minister who wants to meet intelligently the intellectual problems everywhere presented must be an earnest and a profound student.

Never was there more urgent demand for the unity of believers, and never was it more evident that doctrinal unity to any considerable extent, aside from a few fundamentals, is out of the question. But is not a practical co-operative union possible among evangelical Christians, an organization for work for the same ends so far as they are agreed, and tolerating differences on other points? There is urgent necessity in European Protestantism for positive and organic co-operation in meeting infidelity, socialism and Catholicism.

Pessimistic voices are heard throughout the church, and in many instances the signs of the times have a depressing influence that borders on despair. But instead of hopelessness, the lesson is rather that of greater faithfulness and a sublimer trust. The very crisis through which the church is passing is calculated to lead to spiritual depth, to an appreciation of the blessings of religion, and to the strongest efforts for their preservation.

That times so ominous as the present have often been preparations for

earnest revivals of religion and for new progressive movements is a lesson repeatedly taught by the history of the Christian church. And as we discern the signs of the times we behold in them evidences of great danger, but also assurances that the best opportunities are now afforded for the most fruitful work in the most blessed of all callings, that of the Christian ministry.

Among the lessons most effectively taught by the signs of the times is the fact that an ideal, abstract religion is not enough; religion must be thoroughly adapted to the state of the hearers. Preachers must reckon with reality—that is becoming the universal voice in Germany. That this demand will not be complied with for a long time yet is not surprising, when we remember on how abstract a model many sermons are prepared. Thus a German preacher says that large classes of society justly complain that the sermon takes the existing state of things too little into account and does not directly affect life. "The kingdom of God is indeed preached, but it remains a nebulous conception."

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

CONDUCTED BY PROF. WILLIAM C. WILKINSON, D.D.

GUIDANCE OF THE PRAYER-MEETING AFTER THE LAUNCH.

WHEN the pastor's part in the commencement of the meeting is done, and the progress of the exercises is delivered over into the hands of the assembly—then what active influence is it best for him to seek still to exert? Had he better call out participants by name? Generally, no, I answer decidedly. It is now time for the leader to disappear, lost, as it were, in the ranks of the assembly. Nothing is more barren of real fruit than a prayer-meeting *operated* by a leader. Give way, give way, my brother, to the Holy Spirit of God and let him lead the meeting. You do not know on what heart he is

moving with to an impulse speak, to sing, or to pray. You may call out the wrong voice and spoil the divinely intended harmony of the meeting. Let the ark of God alone.

We do not deny that by incessant interference you may succeed in producing a good deal of apparent liveliness in the exercises of the meeting. But it will be a liveliness produced all men can see how. There will be no question in any wise observer's mind, Is it from heaven or of men? Oh, my brethren, let us be willing to stand aside, and suffer God to work as he will.

But suppose awkward pauses occur—what then? Is the leader to sit till and do nothing? Is he not to

give the wheels a lift out of the mire? May he not at least interpose a general exhortation to the assembly to be prompt in taking part?

To these questions we will not say absolutely in reply that the leader should never come to the rescue. But on this whole subject of silences in prayer-meeting the present writer once published some suggestions that he will venture here to reproduce.

Such silences are not always and necessarily an evil. It is a great pity when they are so regarded. A space of silence in a prayer-meeting is often a gathering and a hiding of precious spiritual power. It is then a sad mistake to break it with an audible prayer, an exhortation, or that universal resource of timid leadership or of officious participation, a hymn. Let the silence be. It is God's chosen moment of working. By and by his Spirit himself will bring it to its just end with a still small voice speaking from some obedient heart inspired to the purpose. Stand in awe, and sin not. Commune with your own heart and be still. Such times and seasons knoweth no man. Wait.

But there are other silences in the prayer-meeting of a different temper, pauses likely to be felt as awkward and uncomfortable by everybody present—leader, participant, spectator. How are these balks in the progress of the meeting to be treated?

Almost everything here depends on the leadership; though there will sometimes be a person, not ostensible leader, present, who, by virtue of a singular gift of spiritual ascendancy in him, is the tacitly acknowledged centre of gravity for the meeting, no matter who occupies the leader's chair. The meeting, then, so far as human control is concerned, revolves around him for its true axis; and the nominal leader has but not to interfere, when an emergency arises, to insure that all goes well. The leader, however—the real leader—at least, holds everything in his own hands, when an interval of nothing inter-

rupts the course of the meeting. Not that the leader, whatever the measure of his power to lead, can always, on a given occasion so manage a silence in a meeting as completely to relieve its awkward effect and to rescue, without damage, the jeopardized spiritual impression of the hour. That supreme success presupposes opportunities beforehand enjoyed by the leader to educate the assembly into the true conception of the prayer-meeting. A prayer-meeting is an occasion of special divine supernatural working in human souls. If it is not this, it is nothing but barren mutual excitation on the part of simple enthusiasts. But, in whichever case, the manipulations of an adroit generalship are utterly out of relation to the matter. Astuteness, worldly wisdom, deceives itself when it imagines that it possesses the secret of a prosperous prayer-meeting. The emotions of worship are not submissive subjects for a devotional drill-sergeant. The mockery of a good prayer-meeting is possible to shrewd management. It may be a very decorous mockery, and it may even establish itself as an institution of world-wide celebrity. But the travesty imposes upon few besides the managers themselves. Genuine spiritual forces resent the affront of being treated as the experimentalist treats the chemic forces of the laboratory.

It is of the first consequence, therefore, that the leader of a prayer-meeting should be one who profoundly believes, without reserve and without esoteric interpretation, in the supernatural power of prayer, and in the validity of the special promise accorded to social prayer. Such a man will have a center of rest for himself into which he will constantly tend to return from every occasional disturbance without or within that may move him, and into which his powerful gravitation will act to draw along with himself the entire assembly. The meeting then will not at any time be greatly

moved. If a silence seems inopportune to intervene, the assembly will already have been taught, with line upon line and precept upon precept, again and again from the leader, but especially by the magnetic force of his visible example, that the silence is not necessarily an evil spirit, to be fenced with at every hazard by sound of some sort—uttered prayer, forced exhortation, or a hackneyed hymn. They will have learned that the meeting, being still more a meeting of all with Christ than a meeting of each with other, is really never in any jeopardy from whatsoever source—can never miss its aim through any mischance, save only through an intercepting forgetfulness for the moment, on their own part, of Him who yet, however forgotten, abides in the midst of them. And what means to that fatal oblivion so effective as the eclipsing recollection allowed to come between, that there is a certain external appearance of thrifty progress in the exercises of the meeting to be saved at any cost? Here is the true secret of the awkwardness felt from a pause of silence in the prayer-meeting. The silence is awkward simply and only because it is felt to be awkward. The leader thinks of himself and of the company; the company think of the leader and of themselves. They together thus lose sight of Him who is as easily to be met and as well in social silence as in social sound. Of course, from that moment the meeting is no meeting with Christ. The delightful oblivion of self and of each other in the all-superseding consciousness of Christ, is precipitated in an instant in a chill snowfall of sudden mutual recollections throughout the company. The appeal from the leader's chair, "Brethren, do not let precious moments run to waste"; the rescue prayer volunteered by the forlorn hope among the deacons; the haphazard hymn struck up by some tuneful brother—these expedients

serve only as a means of mutually confessing, what all had before been feeling, that the pause was painful.

But the leader should teach the assembly that silence, however uninteresting, may at least be sincere and honest; while such invasions of it are always transparent tricks of illusion. Above all things, the leader should have it distinctly understood that he has himself no petty personal ambition to make the meeting go off well because he is the leader. He should allow no one to fill up a gap in the exercises for the purpose of relieving his embarrassment. He should not be embarrassed. If he is thoroughly unselfish, he will not be embarrassed. He should discourage every disposition on the part of those present to offer participation simply by way of apparently improving waste time. It is vastly better, vastly more edifying, to sit in silence than it is to inflict, or to suffer, sound signifying nothing.

Suppose a prince to be visiting the towns of his realm. His subjects are desirous of doing him every honor. They offer him ceremonious receptions, at which, of course, the ostensible paramount object of those assembling is to meet their prince. He is the center of attraction, and that fact itself is the best homage they can pay. But the deputed spokesman of a city falters in his part. Which now will be the truer homage to the prince—for the whole assembly to manifest a flutter of discomposure, as if after all their chief object was to make an appearance creditable to themselves; or for the whole assembly instead to be utterly unmindful of the stumble in their ceremony in absorbed respectful attention to the person of the prince himself?

The present writer attended once a prayer-meeting among a people all save one of whom were to him personal strangers. The leader was so possessed with a terror of some pos-

sible pause in the exercises that he was perpetually interposing a hurrying summons to the company to bestir themselves. It was fairly grotesque to hear the man say, as he actually said: "Now, brethren, go right on with prayer, or exhortation, or singing, just exactly as the Spirit prompts you. Brother Smith, will you pray?" He did not give brother Smith half a chance to be obedient to the Spirit, whom he had just bidden him obey.

We plead for more place for the supernatural in that one selected spot, at least, where, if anywhere, it might be free to appear—its heavenly court upon earth—the prayer-meeting. Give us the privilege of being silent; teach us to relish silence more, at least, not to be so superstitiously afraid of silence, in the prayer-meeting. Let the prayer-meeting have time, now and then, to recollect itself and catch its breath. It were good for us who are not Quakers to be capable, like the Quakers, of social silence—to be capable, like the Quakers, of enjoying social silence in fruitful peace and rest.

We must guard ourselves against the possibility of being misunderstood to favor the idea of a prayer-meeting in which frequent intervals of silence are a characteristic feature. We are far enough from indulging any such freak of eccentricity. No, we make the suggestions that we do, not to multiply silences, but to lessen their number. The way to prevent the occurrence of embarrassing pauses in the prayer-meeting is not to be embarrassed by pauses when they occur. It is not to be expected that pauses can in any way be wholly prevented. That is, prevented in any way in which the remedy will not be worse than the evil. Accept it, then, as in the nature of things inevitable that the prayer-meeting will have occasional breaks of silence in its progress. But remember that the true way to have them least frequent, and

to have them do least harm when they come, is to be yourself, and to teach your people to be, centered in a rest of trust in Christ. Let it be understood between you and your people, and by your people among themselves, that no one shall feel discomposed by a silence, and then that understanding itself will be the best means available of making a silence unlikely to occur. You know how it is in social life. Persons that know each other well may sit together in conversation and suffer an interval of complete silence now and then to intervene without their experiencing the least embarrassment. Embarrassment would, however, arise from a sense of obligation on their part to keep conversation proceeding. Such sense of obligation is what makes it fatiguing to meet people in society whom you do not know well. The mutual understanding, tacit or expressed, is not established that neither party shall feel bound to say anything, if nothing of interest is suggested to say. But this mutual understanding is the condition of all really restful and familiar intercourse. Silences, on this condition, not being awkward, are not likely to occur; or, if they do occur, they do not hurt the profit or the pleasure of the intercourse. If we recommend the plan of indulging occasional silences in the prayer-meeting, it is not because silences are good, but rather because they are bad, and because indulging them is the surest course to prevent them. That is, silences resulting from a momentary lull in the interest of the occasion. We add that now and then it may be best to cut the meeting short before the hour has passed. It is not absolutely necessary that the meeting continue after the interest of the meeting has ceased. It is better to stop the meeting, while people are wanting it to go on than it is to keep it going on, while people are wanting it to stop.

II.

LEARNING TO INVENT FOR THE PULPIT.

THE word "invent" in our title we use in a somewhat technical sense. This technical sense is an old one, much older than the English language, as old, indeed, or nearly as old, as that Latin language itself to which the word invent properly belongs. It is a sense peculiar to writers on rhetoric. We shall do well to begin with a definition. We define indirectly the verb "invent" by defining the noun invention.

Invention, then, in oratory is the process of discovering in things that you know adaptations for the effecting of things that you purpose.

Invention in homiletics is the same, with the simple difference that the thing purposed is limited by the definition of preaching.

Oratorical invention, observe, is by its definition confined to dealing with the possible relations to a given idea of knowledge already acquired. It does not concern itself to make new acquisitions of knowledge. That is the business of investigation. Invention employs the knowledge that investigation has previously accumulated. The two processes, that of invention and that of investigation, may possibly seem sometimes to advance together. But they are never actually quite simultaneous. The order is, always, and necessarily, investigation first, and invention second. Oratorical invention may be compared to the kaleidoscope. It effects new combinations with the same materials almost without end. But there is nothing new in its results, except the new relations in which the familiar ideas are arranged.

Invention in homiletics has thus for its object the synthesis of two terms in a relation of adaptation as cause and effect. The effect is given, or chosen, and the cause, or means to the effect, is to be sought. The seeking and finding is *Invention*. Given the effect, required the means. This is the problem of Invention.

Manifestly there are two, and manifestly there are but two, necessary conditions of invention. The effect supposed given, in the form of a chosen purpose on the part of the orator, first, there must be an inventive faculty, and second, there must be material of knowledge. No matter how much a man knows, and no matter how full of adaptations to his purpose the knowledge, invention of course cannot proceed without the inventive faculty to carry it on. On the other hand, the man may possess extraordinary natural powers of oratorical invention, but, for all that, he is helpless to find adaptations to his purpose, unless he possesses besides the knowledge that contains the adaptations.

We enter upon a brief consideration of the two conditions named as necessary to oratorical invention. We shall consider these with a view to some practical suggestions to be offered for securing their presence to the preacher.

The first condition of invention, the inventive faculty, is an original gift from God. The man who does not possess *some* endowment in this kind may be very useful in many other callings, but he cannot be useful as a preacher. Total lack of the inventive faculty admits of no remedy. Such a lack must simply be accepted as the unmistakable indication of Providence that its subject is not called to be a preacher. A partial deficiency, however, may be remedied, to a considerable extent, and a good original endowment may be indefinitely improved by certain practical methods. These methods may, for purposes of use, if not of philosophy, be regarded as reducible to three, viz.:

1. Exercising the inventive faculty.
2. Criticising the products of the inventive faculty in others.
3. Being criticised in the products of one's own inventive faculty.

These three methods, all of them perhaps reciprocally blend with one

another. It is hardly possible to exercise the inventive faculty without at the same time criticizing one's own exercise of it to a greater or less degree. Again, in the course of applying criticism, whether in the case of one's own self or in the case of others, to the products of the inventive faculty, it is entirely natural, indeed unavoidable, that the inventive faculty itself should be stimulated to exercise. Yet again, self-criticizing is evidently a combination of the two last of the methods named. In criticizing yourself you are at once the object and subject of the criticism. You apply criticism and you receive criticism. You criticize and you are criticized. This communication from one to the other among the methods thus mentioned for improving the inventive faculty, may affect the speculative, but it does not impair the practical, value of our enumeration. As a matter of fact the three processes are distinct enough to be prosecuted separately and to be separately considered.

That exercise should improve the inventive faculty is simply an instance of the general law which decrees that every natural power, whether of body or of mind, strengthens with use. The inventive faculty is simply a capacity of the mind to exert itself in a certain way. The exerting of itself in such a way creates in addition a corresponding habit of the mind, and the habit itself may perhaps justly be regarded as supplying a farther facility of its own.

The critical study of eloquence in books, and in living examples, is a very fruitful means of improvement to the inventive faculty of the orator. Criticism of this sort engages itself not so much with the thoughts of the orator studied, considered by themselves, as with those thoughts considered in reference to the end proposed by him to be secured. It is a study less of matter, than of method.

It is not, however, the knowledge itself thus obtained of a particular

orator's method so much as it is the critical process of obtaining the knowledge, that produces the beneficial effect. Such criticism as I describe is in fact a kind of secondary or imitative invention. The critic joins himself in sympathy of aim to the orator that he criticizes, and along with him engages in the creative work of production. He does this assisted by the example and stimulus of his original, and thence receiving that indefinable impulse which is the gift of mind to mind brought thus together in such a fellowship of movement and life. It is often the case, by a certain inexplicable law of communication in the world of minds, that when the inventive faculty has fallen into a mood of sluggishness, it will experience a magical quickening to life and activity from the preacher's simply reading a powerful passage of eloquence or a noble strain of poetry. The movement of another mind involves you in its own orbital sweep and imparts to you a secondary momentum sufficient to overcome the inertia of your transient mental condition.

It is thus seen to be invaluable to the preacher to devote himself much to the critical study of eloquence. He should master any propensity of which he may be conscious, to read, or hear, passively and receptively. He should form the habit of girding himself for an active critical participation in the work of oratorical production. He should be more than merely a listener. He should assist in the discourse. The devotion which the orator has made of his life forbids to him the self-indulgence of enjoying eloquence simply as a refined pleasure. He must make arduous work of what may innocently perhaps to other men be a rational gratification merely. He must deny himself the luxury of receiving indolently *what* is said, in order the more sharply to understand *how* it is said. This of course must not be held to

apply to occasions on which the preacher has a paramount duty to merge his ministerial, in his individual, character. There are times, alas too few! when the habitual preacher ought simply to sit and receive the word preached with docility as an ordinary hearer. At all other times, however, he should arouse himself to a mental attitude of active criticism akin to the effort of positive creation.

It need hardly be added that such critical study of oratorical method as we here propose, involves in every case a careful meditation of two points, namely:

1. What is the orator's object?
2. How does he tend to his object?

In the case, therefore, of orations studied in books the particular circumstances of the occasion ought to be investigated, including such points as the actual state of the question at issue, the time, the place, the auditory, the relation to them, and to the question of the orator, and in short everything that enters as a condition into the problem which eloquence undertakes to solve. With the conditions of the problem thus as fully as possible in mind, one may enter together with the orator upon the solution of the problem which his eloquence attempts, in a spirit of sympathy with him that allies the office of criticism very nearly to the fruitful effort of creation itself. Philosophical readers may observe that the method of improving the inventive faculty by the critical study of eloquence is thus reduced to the same principle at last as that which under-

lies the method by exercise in actual invention.

The third method of improving the inventive faculty, that of subjecting our own products in invention to criticism, supplied either from ourselves or from others, must await its turn to be discussed in some future number of THE REVIEW.

III.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

1. "Give me a simple and practical rule for acquiring a distinct articulation."

Practice phonetic spelling *vigorously* fifteen minutes every day.

2. "How shall I make sure that people actually hear me well when I preach?"

Preach so interestingly that, if any do *not* hear you well, such will strain forward toward you and hollow their hands against their ears to catch every word. Then note this and improve your enunciation accordingly.

3. "Which sounds, vowels or consonants, are more important to be well given?"

For melody, perhaps the vowels; but for intelligibility, the consonants.

4. "Is there any law governing gesture with the hands that will teach me when I should turn the palms toward the audience and when toward myself?"

The general principle is that motion as if to push repels, and motion as if to draw invites. Do not say "Come!" with a gesture as if pushing off from you; and do not say "Be-gone!" with a gesture as if drawing toward you. And remember that you *push* with your palms turned away from yourself, and that you *pull* with your palms turned toward yourself.

THE STUDY TABLE.

CONDUCTED BY JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

Pastor's Drawer.

J. A. C. writes: "*It has not seemed to me that the 'Golden Rule,' Matt. vii. 12, is placed in the true connection. It is a conclusion—'therefore'—to something, and I feel sure not to the doctrine of prayer given from verse 7 to 11. . . . My desire*

is to place verse 12 just after verse 5. . . . The sermon is clear and logical. It is made of points and illustrative matter. . . . Do I do violence to transpose verse 12 to place of verse 6?"

We cannot occupy space to deal with the textual criticism involved

in the question; the commentaries discuss the setting of this verse quite fully. A general remark or two may, however, be made.

The propriety of the preacher's reading this verse in other connection than that which appears in the current text depends entirely upon his ability to make his hearers see the reasonableness of so doing. As a rule it is not well for the pulpit to "sit in judgment" upon the language of Scripture, the rhetorical defects of the writers, the possible errors of transcription, etc. Frequent criticisms of that kind tend to destroy reverence for the Word in the common mind. While such points are still in debate it is well to leave them to scholars. But where, however, scholarship is satisfied that such errors or defects occur, we should not hesitate to state the fact freely; for it is due to the people that preachers give them the best approved interpretations. But as to this verse, Matt. vii. 12, scholars are not agreed that it is out of its original connection. Chrysostom saw a marvelous significance and the closest analogy with Jesus' teaching elsewhere in having the Golden Rule prescribed as one of the conditions of acceptable prayer. Dean Alford saw the glowing nexus between verses 12 and 11 and their closest connection also with the preceding verses, "thus closing this section of the sermon with a lesson similar to the last verse of chapter v., which is, indeed, the groundwork of the whole sermon, 'Be ye like unto God.'" Luther found no difficulty with the present order: "With these words Jesus concludes the exposition of his doctrine set forth in these three chapters, and gathers them up in a little bundle that each man may take and put in his bosom and keep easily." In the estimate of many the report of the sermon would lose rather than gain if it could be demonstrated that verse 12 belonged to verse 5. While it would read more naturally there, it

would be without the suggestiveness it has in its present position. That our Lord intended the spirit of the Golden Rule to be associated with prayer is evident from chap. vi. 14, 15.

The brother speaks of the Sermon on the Mount as being "clear and logical." True; yet the logic is not always exposed. Even Tholuck is unable to trace it. He says [Introduction, p. 22]: "The completeness of the discourse, the accuracy of the connection, the correctness of the arrangement of the sayings, are points on which we may well entertain some doubts. Although in a large part of the discourse a connected train of thought is discernible, yet there are passages where it is difficult to trace one, and others where there is none at all." Of specimens of this latter character he instances the very verses just before verse 12, viz., 1-11. But we are inclined to see more connection than Tholuck admits. The language has the sequence of inner sentiment rather than of exact ideas. In reading certain passages we are made to feel more than the Master fully said, and then we observe that the passages that follow are based upon the sentiment produced in our minds rather than upon the exact words which have preceded. Jesus made what Horace calls the "callida junctura" in our hearts. In this respect He was like, though infinitely surpassing, our great orators, whose speeches as recorded often seem disconnected. This is because the orator has supplied much by means of his elocution; and seeing that he has gained his hearers' assent, or awakened in them the intended feeling, he does not delay to express all the details of his thought in words. We should expect such "gaps" in the discourse of the greatest of all speakers who extemporized before the multitude, and in this brief sermon crowded the seed thoughts for a moral revolution among men. To study the sermon merely with the logical eye is like

studying a landscape with a field-glass. We may thus get clearer views of certain points, but at the same time miss much of the beauty which lies in the shading of forest into meadow, of hilltop into sky, and the "dim glory" that enrobes the whole.

S. C. asks if *in the great image* [Dan. ii. 31] *the gold, silver, brass and iron may not be taken to "represent the moral character of the idolatry of these nations, and not their political or military greatness?"*

We know of no reasons for such an interpretation. On the other hand, the relative value of the various metals does not tally with what we know of the relative morality of the various systems of idolatry. The Persians were almost free from idolatry, their sensuous worship being addressed to the grandest objects in nature, and much of their worship being supersensuous, indeed an approximation to the spiritual monotheism of the Jews, so that some scholars contend that Zoroaster must have been in personal communication with Daniel, or, if he lived at an earlier age, with Abraham. At any rate the Persian religion was not inferior to that of Babylon, and could hardly be designated by silver as compared with gold. A similar remark might be made regarding the religions of Greeks and Romans, which were not as brass and iron mixed with clay when compared with the golden system of Nebuchadnezzar's day.

There is, however, great rhetorical propriety in designating the successive political and military systems which dominated the world by these metals. Babylon had already acquired the title of "the golden;" Isaiah calls it the "golden city" [Isaiah xiv. 4]; and in secular history it retained the appellation, Æschylus the Greek speaking of it as "Babylon abounding in gold." The

appropriateness of the other metals as representing the subsequent empires is evinced by the fact that Gibbon rounds off his description of them by borrowing the very phraseology of Daniel.

In response to the inquiry for the best work on the character of the religions of these successive empires, we can mention nothing which fills the place of Rawlinson's "Oriental Monarchies."

People's Drawer.

ADOPTION.—Many real Christians hesitate to regard themselves as the children of God because they do not find in their lives or experience the marks of divine heredity. Their characters are surely devoid of the lineaments of the divine holiness; they would not call their vague sentiment of religious gratitude a true filial love, etc.

Now to such the doctrine of adoption must seem a very gracious one. A foster-child need not expect to find these traits of natural descent; his confidence is not from anything in himself, but solely in the adopting act on the part of the one calling himself father. In almost all nations such adoption carries with it all the privileges of natural generation. The law we quote from the statutes of New Jersey is not peculiar in this respect: "The rights, duties, privileges, and relations between the child and his or her parents by adoption shall henceforth in all respects be the same, including the right of inheritance, as if the child had been born to said adopted parents in lawful wedlock."

In Galatians iv. 5, 6, 7, Paul distinguishes the fact of adoption from the sense of it, showing that the latter is a subsequent gift of God, based upon the former, "that we might receive the adoption of sons, and because ye are sons (*i. e.* having received the adoption which makes ye sons indeed), God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father, so that thou art no

longer a bondservant, but a son, and if a son, then an heir through God."

Observe, too, how Paul in the ninth verse insists upon the divine recognition of us as children, rather than any sense of it on our part, as the basis of our confidence: "Now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God."

Some Illuminated Texts.

EPHESIANS ii. 20, 21: "*Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.*"

The walls of Jerusalem, though all impressive for age and well worn by the passing centuries, show plainly the different periods of their construction. The upper work is in some places evidently not more than three hundred years old, perhaps the reconstruction ordered by Sultan Suleiman I., though the stones were originally cut long before, and have been gathered from the débris of other walls which once stood near. Some parts, for example of the so-called Golden Gate, belong somewhere to the period between the second and sixth Christian centuries, probably to the reign of Constantine. Near the Double Gate, in the south wall, is an inscription proving that the work there was done nearly two centuries earlier, in the time of Antoninus, the successor of Hadrian. Some courses of masonry are as clearly the work of the rebuilders of Herod's temple, about the time of Christ. Other parts were constructed at the return from captivity, nearly half a millennium earlier yet. These various structures illustrate the growth of the church during the ages. In one respect this analogy is sadly suggestive, for parts of the wall are imperfectly laid and would not endure the erection upon them of heavy modern works; just as we detect in the historic church much that is not built according to the line of truth and the plummet of righteousness.

But the engineers of the British

Palestine Exploration Fund have sunk shafts and opened galleries along the face of still older work, the original foundations laid at the time of the building of Solomon's temple. These are courses of enormous stones, the lower course resting upon the sloping sides of the native rock of Mount Moriah. They are buried in some places seventy feet beneath the present surface, and sustain the incalculable weight of all that has accumulated upon them through the art and necessities of subsequent ages. These remind us that the apostles and prophets rest down upon the eternal rock of truth, touching God by inspiration.

The most interesting of recent discoveries is, however, that of the lowest stone at the southeast angle of the Temple Area — the corner stone. It is three feet eight inches thick and fourteen feet broad. It keys the corner and thus binds together securely the two walls, even as Christ binds together the old and new covenants. It does not merely rest upon the native rock, but is partly imbedded in it, like a supplemental shaping of the natural stratum to hold plumb what men should build upon it; even as Christ is in God, and is such an expression of him as men can appreciate and rest upon. The stone is polished, with a finely-dressed face, suggesting to us Isaiah's prophecy of Christ, which the stone doubtless suggested to him: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation."

JOHN i. 32: "*The spirit descending from heaven like a dove.*"

The signet of the Phœnician king, at Tyre, was a dove with outstretched wings, and was recognized in all lands as the symbol of earthly power. Many Oriental scholars regard the winged sun, the symbol of the chief deity of the Phœnicians and other peoples, as an adaptation of the secular to the religious emblem; the

dove's wings suggesting the divine kingship among men, while the solar body suggests the divine energy operative in the natural world. The descent of the Spirit as dove-winged light resting upon Jesus would thus have a peculiar significance in some minds. Though we have no reason to believe that the apparition at the Jordan was so intended, the coincidence furnishes a rhetorical illustration of the endowment of Jesus with power over men and nature.

HAGGAI ii. 23. The prophet Haggai is bidden to declare to Zerubbabel, "*I will take thee, saith the Lord, and will make thee as a signet.*" etc.

In digging through a stratum of pre-Christian débris near the temple site at Jerusalem, the workmen found a *signet stone* inscribed in old Hebrew characters, "Haggai, son of Shebaniah." The form of the letters is that which ceased to be used soon after the return from captivity, but was in vogue at the time of Haggai and Zerubbabel when the second temple was constructed. Have we here the identical signet of the signet-prophet!!!

PSALM ii. 9: "*Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.*"

Recent explorations have discovered, near to the great corner stone at the southeast angle of the Temple Area, a mass of broken pottery, evidently of Phœnician make. That the fragments were not accidentally deposited there is evident from the

uniform way in which they are placed, making a bed two inches thick. For some reason the shattered vessels were put in close proximity to the enormous cut rock which keyed the corner of the temple substructure. If the psalm was written by Solomon, as some suppose, it is not improbable that as he saw this corner stone laid and the fragile fragments placed near it, he thought of the contrast it symbolized between the permanence of the Jehovah faith and the perishable conceits of other religions. But whether intended or not, how ominous of the fact which history reveals! The Phœnician Baalism has perished as their broken potter's vessels, while the central truth of Judaism is the great rock foundation of the dominant religion of the world.

CANTICLES iv. 12: "*My spouse is a spring shut up, a fountain sealed.*"

Solomon's Pools, six miles from Jerusalem, used to supply the royal palace with water. The spring which fed the pools is remarkable for the abundance of its flow, especially when other springs fail, as in the drought of 1870. It is called the Sealed Fountain from the tradition that the king shut it up and sealed the door of access to it with his royal signet, that nothing might defile the water. It is thus a beautiful figure of the refreshment of Christ, which comes more abundantly when other springs are dry, and is kept pure as under the signet of God.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Young People and the Prayer-Meeting.

How to interest young people in the prayer-meeting is an important question. Various methods have been devised for this end. They all belong to one of two classes. One class of methods is to attract the young peo-

ple by doing something *for* them; the other is in doing something *by* them. One entertains and instructs them; the other sets them at work in some agreeable service: and none surpass children and young people in the interest they take in what

they do themselves. Indeed, it helps us all in developing interest if we have something to do.

I have a little experience growing out of my necessity. It seemed indispensable that the young people should become interested in the prayer-meeting; not for their sakes alone, but for its sake. Taking a hint from a brother pastor, I devised a plan which has proved a delightful success, although it hardly has any novel features. After securing a good leader of the singing and a quick organist, I announced in Sunday school my desire to form a Y. P. S. C.—and interpreted the cabalistic announcement as a Young People's Singing Circle. The teachers were requested to select from older scholars those who had voices and invite them to join the circle.

Several members of the choir and others in the congregation consented to join as helpers. Then, to make the organization more reliable and permanent, the following card with coupon was distributed for signers, and the number of coupons returned was a surprise to all.

Y. P. S. C.—You are respectfully invited to join the Young People's Singing Circle of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Port Richmond, N. Y.

Members are expected to—

1. Attend the special meetings and the prayer meetings and rehearsals, whenever it is practicable to do so.
2. To sit in a body near the choir.
3. To assist in the singing.

If you accept this invitation please sign your name to the coupon and return same to the pastor.

I accept the invitation to become a member of the Y. P. S. C. of Grace Church.

I need hardly add, the singing wonderfully improved. A revival followed, and many of the young people are now members of the church.

C. E. L.

Is a Harmony Possible?

"AND when they were departed, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise and take the young child and his mother and flee into Egypt, and be there until I tell thee; for Herod will seek the young child to destroy it" (R. V. Matt. ii. 13). I suggest

the following rendering of the last clause of this verse: "For Herod is about to seek the young child to destroy it." To me it seems that the text not only will allow of this rendering, but that it demands it.

"And when they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth, . . . And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover" (R. V. Luke ii. 39-41).

The various attempts to harmonize these two accounts, and the confessed failure to find a harmony that answers all the conditions, need not here be given. Meyer (Mark and Luke, p. 282) affirms the impossibility of a reconciliation. "Reconciliation is impossible. A preference for Luke, however, at the expense of Matthew is at least in so far well founded as Bethlehem was not the original dwelling-place of the parents of Jesus. . . . The visit of the Magi, the slaughter of the innocents, and the flight, are legends." This, of course, is only the opinion of Meyer.

There is an apparent twofold conflict. 1. Matthew's account of the flight into Egypt seems to conflict with Luke's statement of the visit to Jerusalem and the return to Galilee. 2. The stay in Egypt also seems to antagonize the fact that the parents went every year to Jerusalem to the feast of the passover.

Is there objection to regarding both accounts as literally and exactly true? According to Luke, the holy family went from Bethlehem to Jerusalem, and from thence to Nazareth. Now let Matthew's account of the flight come in, and the holy family can go into Egypt and remain until the death of Herod, and then return to Nazareth. This will answer all the conditions of the two narratives, so far as appears.

1. Herod's purpose to slay the children was formed when Jesus was about two years old, because he slew the children "two years old and un-

der, according to the time which he had carefully inquired of the wise men" (R. V.). 2. Joseph's dream and Herod's purpose were coincident, since the angel said, "Herod is about to seek the young child to destroy it." 3. As Herod died when Jesus was two years old, the flight into Egypt and the return to Nazareth occurred within a short time, so that his parents could go every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the pass-over. 4. As Herod's purpose to slay the children was formed when Jesus was near two years old, and as the dream was coincident with this purpose, the flight was when Jesus was near two years old, and hence from Nazareth instead of from Bethlehem. 5. There is nothing in the *text* describing the departure of the Magi and the appearance of the angel to Joseph to necessitate their coincidence. 6. But after the purification of Mary, "according to the law of the Lord," the *text* requires an immediate return to Nazareth.

A. J. MERCHANT.

FRANKLIN, PA.

An Ideal Prayer-Meeting.

AN "Ex-Pastor," in criticising the conduct of the prayer-meeting in his own church, in the April HOMILETIC, (p. 374), promised to give "briefly his ideal of how a prayer-meeting *should* be conducted to make it of general interest and a mighty power in the church." My space permits only a few leading hints.

1. The first essential is a *definite subject*, pre-announced, with the Scripture which suggests it and upon which it is based. The prayer-meeting topics should be carefully chosen at the beginning of the year for the entire year, printed, and put into the hands of the entire congregation. Then the topic is known beforehand, and the people will come together with more or less preparation to talk and pray with special reference to it. *Nothing can make up for the omission of this forethought.*

Very many pastors prepare these topics for themselves. But many thousand pastors, we happen to know, adopt and use the "Prayer-Meeting Topics" yearly prepared for and published in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

2. No less an essential is a *good leader*. Here is where our system breaks down. Custom makes the *pastor*, wherever there is one, the permanent leader. As a rule this is unfortunate, both for him and for the meeting. The people hear him talk and pray every Sabbath, and get thoroughly used to his ways and thoughts and the very tones of his voice. A new face, new ways of thinking and expression, a change of voice and manner, is desirable, is often refreshing and rousing. Let the pastor take his turn, but usually let him take the pew.

The *requisites* of a good leader are:

1. A careful, thorough preparation.
2. Promptness; begin and close on time.
3. Power or tact to hold the meeting steadily in hand and suffer no diversion, no long, rambling prayers or wearisome talks, or painful silences.
4. Liveliness, quick in action, prompt in every part of the service, on fire when he speaks, and direct and in earnest in his brief prayer and opening remarks.
5. Wisdom in proportioning the singing, praying, and talking, and in calling out the talent of the members. Such a leader will almost insure an attentive, interested audience and a lively and blessed meeting.

3. The *singing* is an important element, and, as a rule, is wretchedly managed. Singing several long hymns (often reading them) will kill the life of almost any prayer-meeting. Two verses at a time are enough. A single verse frequently interjected between the prayers and remarks by the leader or by some member is an admirable thing. Too little attention is paid to this part of the service.

Finally, the thing to be aimed at is LIFE—spiritual quickening and uplifting—simplicity, directness, fervor,

and brevity in prayer; the mingling and commingling of pious thought and Christian feeling in prayer and song and conference and meditation on some part of God's Word. A perfunctory, stereotyped prayer-meeting is a very dull place, and too many of such we have; while a well-regulated, live, and stirring meeting for conference and prayer is a thing of power. Some of the most precious and powerful revivals of religion the writer has ever witnessed originated in the prayer-meeting of his church, and was largely sustained and carried forward by means of it.

AN EX-PASTOR.
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Misapplied Scripture.

1 COR. ii. 9 is an instance. "*Eye hath not seen nor ear heard,*" etc. This verse by many is used as referring directly to the glory of heaven. It is so applied by Dr. Talmage in a recent sermon. The obvious and direct reference is certainly not to what we shall know when we get to heaven, but to the things God's children may *now* know by the revelation of the Spirit. "*Eye hath not seen the things which God hath prepared for those who love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.*" "*The natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God . . . neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*"

DAYTON, O. A. C. RUFF.

Sermons of Dr. Alex. Maclaren.

In an admirable sketch of Alexander Maclaren, D.D., of Manchester, in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW (Feb. p. 182), there is a sentence in reference to the publication of his current sermons which is somewhat misleading to Americans. Up till the close of last year (1887) his Sabbath evening sermons appeared regularly in *The Christian Worker*, a weekly published in Manchester. Since that time *The Freeman*, organ of the Baptist denomination, has obtained the

exclusive right of publication. *The Freeman* is published by Alexander & Shepherd, Holborn, London, for 6s. 6d. per annum.

I. ALEXANDER ANDERSON.

The Small Coin of Literature.

THE metal in it is as good as in pieces of larger mintage. I refer to the newspaper articles which are read with eagerness and then thrown aside as worthless. Save the newspaper articles, which in these days contain the gold which their writers afterward melt over with a lot of alloy and mould into ponderous books. If the young preachers could realize the treasures to be had from the newspapers of the day their libraries would be richer in a few years than simple book-buying from meager salaries is likely to make them.

But how shall the newspaper clippings be saved so as to be of use? I have tried several schemes—repositories, scrap-cabinets, and the like—and have concluded that none of them are much of an improvement on a set of scrap-books well indexed. Ordinary ingenuity will suggest half a dozen ways in which the books themselves can be provided, with little or much expense, according to the length of one's purse. A substantial blank book, strongly bound, not too large, with lettered margins like a a ledger, so that a subject can be turned to by putting the thumb on the proper letter, will furnish an index for all the scrap-books, and can be made to cover also other parts of the library. When a volume on temperance, for instance, is completely filled it becomes a fixture in the library, and the saved clippings are as permanent a literary possession as any volume on the shelves. It has a life of its own, and is not subject to the vicissitudes which always threaten the big envelope stuffed with clippings—liable to confusion. The only advantage of other devices, viz., that articles can be eliminated when out of date, amounts to little.

As a rule, a newspaper clipping worth saving a year will be worth saving a lifetime. We are not making such rapid strides in knowledge as to render a new library necessary every few years.

R. G. HOBBS.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Paul's Infirmary.

A RECENT sermon by T. De Witt Talmage, D.D. (as reported by the press), contains the following paragraph: "Bartimeus will thank God that he was blind, Lazarus that he was covered with sores, Joseph that he was cast into the pit, and Paul that he was humpbacked." The italics are ours. Is such a view of Paul's "thorn in the flesh" adopted by any commentators of repute, or is it in keeping with the context? Would the apostle, if a hunchback, have been likely to thrice ask the Lord to straighten his body? Is not the commonly received theory, held by Meyer and others equally reliable, a more satisfactory explanation; viz., that Paul's affliction was a "painful, chronic bodily evil," which to him seemed an infliction of Satan? The Greek word for thorn, it would appear, is too indefinite to enable one to decide with accuracy either the nature or location of the apostle's infirmity. Would like to hear the opinions of the many readers of THE REVIEW.

G. M. D. SLOCUM.

ROCKFORD, IA.

The Down Grade.

SAD it is to reflect on the unquestionable truthfulness of the remarks made recently on the above subject. No Christian can look around on the various denominations and schools of (what is termed) modern thought but must lament on the unscriptural tendency of the so-called modern theology, eating away, as it were, the vitals of the faith once delivered to the saints. The Bible among many is sadly misrepresented, and made to teach the most extravagant specula-

tions. The champions of the faith, or those who would, like our own dear forefathers, adhere to the old truths, are set upon by those from whom we expected better things. Many of our teachers in the school of Christ, as they were considered, have placed themselves openly at a fearful discount, and have taken a downward course in their Christian profession, and have not honored God and his word as becometh the ambassadors of Christ. The down grade is demonstrated in a variety of ways in our churches in the present day. The church is becoming secularized far too much by the introduction of many innovations and heterodox theology. Oh, let us, who have been taught better, hold to the old paths. The Bible never can mean one thing to-day and another to-morrow. God's word stands secure, steadfast; rather heaven and earth shall pass away, but not his word.

PLYMOUTH, ENG. THOMAS HEATH.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

NO. II.—A SLEEPING CHURCH.

BY J. E. TWITCHELL, D.D., NEW HAVEN, CONN.

WE consider here, and in the following articles on the general subject of "THE CHURCH OF CHRIST," the *local organization*, rather than the great body of Christian believers who constitute the visible kingdom of our Lord on earth. A most interesting and impressive field of investigation would open up before us were we to study the different epochs of church activity and advancement among the nations, seeking for the causes of decline or development of the church universal. In such outlook, however, we cannot now indulge. This *universal church* is made up of an almost innumerable multitude of local organizations—above a *hundred thousand* in America alone. Each one of these local organizations has a membership of its own, a field of its own,

and, in some large sense, lives an independent life. No church can exist wholly apart from others of its kind or be unaffected by the spirit and life of its near neighbors. It nevertheless holds true that every organized body of believers in mutual covenant, and collectively responsible for the maintenance of the ordinances of Christian worship, *has a life of its own*, whose pulse-beat can be counted with considerable accuracy, and whose power is waxing or waning in the community where it is set.

In looking now at a *sleeping church* we must be careful of our diagnosis of the case in hand and in our conclusions of condition.

(a) A church *may not be asleep if it is not growing*. Men and women are not always increasing in size and strength. For all living bodies there seems to be a period of growth, also a period for the hardening and strengthening process. Human growth may cease, but the functions of the body may be in full, vigorous play and the highest mission be wrought out.

Many a church cannot be expected to *hold its own in numbers*, to say nothing of an increase. In various parts of New England our country towns are being invaded with foreigners of the Papal faith, and in some cases are being comparatively depopulated, so that a Protestant church of the Pilgrim order has not within its reach from which to gain recruits a number large enough to make up for its losses by death and removal.

Then there are churches in the old centers of city population at present surrounded with few who can be reached so as to build up the organization. Families have drifted away from their locality, and business blocks have risen until scarce any constituency is left. Mission work may remain for these old churches. It may be of exceeding importance to "hold the fort" for the sake of the restraining influence of Christian worship, but there is no hope of enlargement. The period of growth in-

evitably has passed. The few who remain, however, may be wide awake.

(b) With this *impossibility of growth* in some cases there may be *utter inability to serve and give as in other days*. The active enterprise has gone, adding force and vitality to the churches in cities and in larger towns. Only the aged fathers and mothers are left to watch on the towers and work in the midst of a people who have no welcome for the Word of God. My judgment, however, is that not a few of these very churches, from which no large offerings are ever reported, and from which we hear comparatively nothing, *do serve and give*, in proportion to their means, vastly more than many a large and wealthy church in the great metropolis! And let it never be forgotten that these country churches are *feeders* for all our churches in centers of population, and that from them have come many of our most prominent and most successful church workers!

(c) A church is not necessarily *asleep which makes little noise in the world*. Its calm, peaceful and joyful years may have come when the graces of the Spirit are attractively in exercise; when the grand old gospel truths are being held and lived for the *steadying of other churches*, which are caught and carried about with divers winds of doctrine, and are drifting they know not whither! Taking it all in all, my profoundest sympathies are with the churches which are circumscribed by their condition and surroundings, and they have my congratulations when they hold forth the Word of Life on the lonely hilltops or in the quiet valleys of the land. God bless them all, and bless the faithful, earnest, self-sacrificing ministers who abide with their flocks and feed them with the meat and milk of the Word. When church history is finally written there shall be many surprises.

There is, however, the *sleeping*

church. What are some of its characteristics?

1. *A sleeping church is UNAPPRECIATIVE.*

It is a great privilege, as well as a great honor, for a body of believers to have Christian sacraments and ordinances lodged in their keeping.

As no *soul*, however, has ever yet fully compassed the glory of adoption, so no *church* ever yet has fully measured its privileges in *possessing* the sacraments and ordinances for personal use and for redeeming agency. The Sabbath, the meeting-house, the preached word, the pastoral work, the kindly sympathies and sacred ministries of a Christian organization—*these are above all price*. Yet they may be and often are lightly esteemed, their *cost* considered far greater than their *real worth*!

Whenever a church comes to regard Sabbath worship as a matter of convenience or of preference, the preacher as a kind of respectable appendage to society, the prayer-meeting as a gathering good enough for old men and women but of little consequence for such as are in active business or have social connections of a satisfying kind, souls around as not of sufficient concern to command personal appeal or attention, the whole matter of Christian worship and work as of minor importance—when this condition of things exists, *then the church may be said to be ASLEEP*, if not in the actual *embrace of death*.

There may be a few earnest, anxious ones among the membership, but they are weary and hopeless. The stupefying process has gone on until religion seems of comparatively small account, until public worship is irregularly and unfeelingly attended, until the Christian hope has little power to inspire or cheer, until sermon and song are gauged by their pleasurable excitings, and few, if any, ever speak of their inheritance as heirs of glory.

There may be frequent and heated

discussion in the church regarding politics, temperance, town affairs and forms of worship, but no prayerful planning for spiritual prosperity, no large estimate of heirship in the kingdom. Divided in affection and dead to all these things of Christ, the privileges of the gospel are unprized and unappreciated.

2. *A sleeping church is UNCONCERNED.*

By this I mean has little sense of responsibility for the fulfilling of its mission as an illustration of godliness or as an evangelizing agency in the earth. It may be considered respectable and indeed essential for the church to exist, and for the public worship of God to be maintained. There may be a commendable and even conspicuous pride in such preaching and singing and surroundings as shall attract. There may be worldly wisdom in the management of all business affairs. The church may become a "mutual admiration society," may give liberally for Sabbath entertainment, may make much of suppers and social gatherings, yet may have small concern for the growth in grace and the sanctification of its members, and put forth little effort for the salvation of unsaved souls around.

These are symptoms of a *sleeping church*; and they are the result either of a low conception of the danger of souls out of Christ, or of a low estimate of the advantages of being born again, or may have developed because of a type of religion so intellectual as to make little impression on the heart. We may attach small importance to experiences which are merely emotional, but any true conception of the condition from which Christ delivers, and to which he exalts, will *move* men to testimonies and endeavors which cannot escape observation.

One great need of this land and age with Christians is a vital conception of man's *lost condition* out of Christ, and a larger conception of the glory

of adoption. We are living in an age of *intellectuality*. Investigations and speculations are rife all around us. We would not deery these. The truth never suffers by being scanned. *Souls*, however, may suffer by microscopic searchings, and the peril of souls may be forgotten in effort to be wise above what is written. The great business of the preacher is to *preach the gospel*. The great business of the church is to *win souls to Christ*. *Unconcern* along these lines is an evidence of *sleep*.

3. A *sleeping church is UNRESPONSIVE*.

God has many ways of making his will known to his children, such as in the preaching of the Word, in the movings of his providence, and in the impressions of his Spirit. In these ways, and in many others, the divine summons comes to be and endure and do—sometimes in effort for self, and sometimes in effort for others. The summons is heard; but, half asleep and half awake, it comes as only some strange sound in a troubled dream: does not *move men* or arouse them to a full consciousness of personal or church responsibility. There is more or less of conviction as to privilege and duty. It is not possible to be utterly indifferent; but few, if any, in this *sleeping church really wake up* so as to recognize the voice of God or see things as they are in their significance and value. Hence there is no quick and resolute response.

The word may be preached in all earnestness and fidelity. The great issues of life and death may be plainly set forth by him who ministers in holy things. Providences may be impressive and even alarming. The divine Spirit may at times so deal with duty and destiny as to awaken in the soul a sense of uneasiness, but the pleading, the providence, and the Spirit's power may pass unheeded.

There is never sufficient waking to arouse and entuse. Things are allowed to "take their course." If godliness results, all well; if not, then

equally well! If souls are converted, all well; if not, no special responsibility is felt. The church falls back upon the doctrine of divine sovereignty or on the decrees, or on the often misinterpreted passage about God having "set times to favor Sion." Thus the months and often the years go by with no advance for the cause of truth and righteousness, as committed to the care of this *unresponsive church*.

I merely suggest,

4. That a *sleeping church is INACTIVE*. This condition is the natural and inevitable result of characteristics already considered. When a church is *unappreciative, unconcerned, and unresponsive*, it cannot be other than *inactive* along distinctively Christian lines. It may make a great noise, may thrust itself on the attention of the community, may pay its preacher a large salary, may be extravagant in its provision for music, and may keep things in a general stirred-up condition, but it will not engage in thoroughly Christian activities; will undertake no really self-sacrificing work for the poor and the neglected, will exercise little watch-care over its members, and will scarcely interest itself at all in the evangelization of this lost world.

Sleep sometimes can be overcome only by exertion. The whip and spur are often in demand. Work will wake up and keep awake. Sleep leaves men motionless only as there is involuntary movement. We keep our eyes open by keeping on the wing. We warm our hearts by seeking to warm other hearts. No better counsel could be given a *sleeping church* than to be *up and doing*. Brave exertion will aid in overcoming lethargy.

Am I as a pastor *asleep*?

Am I as a church member *asleep*?

Is the church to which I belong *asleep*?

The world around is *awake*. The years fly. The end is fast approaching. Souls are going down to death because neglected by the church. Per-

sonal responsibility cannot be thrown on the organized body. "It is high time to awake out of sleep."

Rub thine eyes, O drowsy man! Look out on the work and rouse thyself for battle in this imperial hour.

REV. GEORGE MATHESON, D.D.

BY REV. CHARLES PARKHURST.

EDINBURGH has been called the Washington of Scotland, and to the American this very fittingly describes it. It is a delightful city of spacious streets, magnificent buildings and memorable monuments, statuary and art; it is more classic than Washington, however—of course has more of the antique and has always been the city of churches and eminent preachers for this far-famed religious land. Knox, Chalmers, Guthrie are representatives of the caliber of the Scottish pulpit. The tourist should plan his Sabbath in Scotland for Edinburgh. It should be borne in mind that the Established Church in Scotland is Presbyterian. Our party had a very genial and profitable Sabbath in this cultured city. Scotland is impressively religious. Perhaps in no place is this more distinctively seen than in the famous city of Edinburgh. The Sabbath is devoutly observed by the people as a whole. All saloons and victualing places are closed on the Sabbath, except hotels, and all business ceases except such as is necessary to sustain life and to be comfortable.

These words are penned on the continent, in Germany, and one would hardly know that the Sabbath had come by the din and whirl of active life all about him. We attended four services on the Sabbath in Edinburgh, covering nearly the entire day, and we never saw, in any American city, so many people of thoughtful mien and devout manner wending their way to and from the churches. Moody's great work in Edinburgh left a most deep and aggressive religious impulse upon the people. On the street corners,

in the least hopeful parts of the city, devout and earnest men and women were holding religious services, singing out and preaching impressively the simple gospel of our Lord Jesus. In "Newsome's Circus," a structure holding five thousand people, in the evening Rev. John McNeil of the Free Presbyterian Church preached to an audience of working people only limited in size by the capacity of the building. Many were turned away for want of room. It is therefore an era of religious life and activity in this city, as I doubt not in all Scotland. Our first inquiry for the Sabbath was for Dr. George Matheson. This was occasioned by the fact that his book, "Moments on the Mount," had fallen accidentally into our hands a year ago. We were greatly charmed and helped by the book, it was so devout, original and fresh in its exegesis. To our inquiry, Who is Dr. Matheson? we could get no answer. We could only learn that he preached at Edinburgh. Great was our surprise to learn that he was totally blind, and had been during all his ministry. This excited our curiosity and desire to hear him. He is pastor of St. Bernard's Church, Established, which is therefore Presbyterian. He was ordained to the ministry in Tunellan, Scotland, eighteen years ago, and was at that time blind; his blindness was the result of too assiduous use of his eyes in his preparatory studies. In the eighteen years of his first pastorate he was most successful, and the church greatly prospered under his care. A sister, into whose sweet and attractive face we were privileged to look, has always lived with him—been eyes for him, and indeed taught him all of what is known as the "dead languages." At an early hour, therefore, with unwonted curiosity and expectation, we are in his church. Of the intelligent usher we make many inquiries, which are most cordially answered. Dr. Matheson has been with them one year. The church

had taken on new life and activity in his pastorate. It was with difficulty now that seats could be secured on the Sabbath for those who pressed to hear. He was a most excellent pastor, spending the greater part of each afternoon calling throughout his parish; this he does with the aid of a young theological student who accompanies him to direct him. He is, however, a most indefatigable worker in his study, and demands a reader or dictates for the press each forenoon.

We are anxiously awaiting the coming of the preacher. What a quaint church is this! It is the old box pew, very poorly cushioned, and if the architect had planned to make the seats as uncomfortable as possible he could not have succeeded better. There must be some unusual attraction to bring people to such seats as these. We should never come but once unless the pulpit had so much of intellectual and spiritual vitality as to make us forget where we were. A high gallery runs clear round the church. The bell has ceased to toll, but the people are still coming, and we are compelled to sit closer together to make room for those who desire seats. On a greatly elevated position in front is a small pulpit, not larger than a flour-barrel, with only room for one person. Above it is the sounding-board, the like of which we have once seen in America. Behold! a rear door opens, and in comes our long-looked-for preacher. Have we been a long time in introducing him? Well, it seemed a long time before he came; perhaps because we were so anxious to see him. We have desired that you should be thus anxious; but he does not look as we had fancied. We thought at first it could not be he, but an unfortunate exchange; but we are assured by the stranger at our side that it is indeed Dr. Matheson. We confess to strong likes and dislikes. We rather enjoy having our favorites in the pulpit. We had created Dr. Matheson into

such a one. That he? Why, we had cast his face into that of the typical Scotch student, a Dr. McCosh in earlier years, but he is not that at all. I should not look for him in the pulpit, but on the farm. Forty-two years of age, he looks ten years older. He has the face and form of General Grant when the hero of Vicksburg was most stout. Taller, however, rather more muscular, yet he makes you think most of the man the American people loved so much. With full beard and natural open eye, you would have no thought that he was blind had you not been so informed. He has a remarkable congregation in members, in an indication of intelligence and spiritual sympathy and anticipation; but he does not know it. Can a blind man preach with enthusiasm when he must lack the responsive help and inspiration which the seeing eye could get from such an unusual audience? Are we to be disappointed? Have we expected too much? We do not believe it. The man who can write such a book must have it in him to preach. Now he rises, his body swaying a little until he gets his equilibrium. Announcing a psalm for alternate reading, he takes his verses without the mistake of a word, and throughout the whole service calling for several hymns and Scripture references with chapter and verse, he never made an error. Of course it was all memorized. Then he prays; and such a prayer! It seems profane to write about it. Two things are evident, however: though his visual sight is entirely eclipsed he does "see God," and he does see into the souls of his hearers. Like a skilled harper, he has touched every string of the human soul and made it chime into the ear of God. In that prayer we have been to the mount of worship, and we could go away content even if we heard no more. It was wonderful the way in which that blind preacher talked with God and uttered the aspirations of the people.

In the afternoon of the same day

we heard one of the most scholarly of the faculty of the Presbyterian College preach and pray, but it was all cold, inapt, unresponsive. The thoroughness with which Dr. Matheson apprehended the life of his people, their struggles, sorrows, defeats, victories, and his almost superhuman sympathy with such actual life, was the most remarkable characteristic of the man. For forty minutes he preached on the text, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Though we undertook to make a full abstract of the sermon, and it lies before us, yet so faint and imperfect is our *negative* of that discourse that we will not do this great man, so little known as yet in America, the injustice here to produce it. Such a sermon is never forgotten. Much that we had often vaguely felt he expressed. It was not metaphysical nor controversial. He never said anything about different theories of inspiration. He just showed how natural it was for God to reveal himself in his word just as he has done, and how each personality through which it came, like David, John, James, Paul, retained his identity and peculiarity. The whole range of il-

lustration in art, science, history and in practical life was touched with the familiarity of a master in each department. We were instructed, refreshed, inspired. God has given that faithful man, with his studious habits, his pastoral nurture and sympathy, an immense equivalent for the loss of physical vision. Dr. Matheson is to become a special favorite to tourists, who long to have the Sabbaths come that they may hear instructive and inspiring preaching. His works, of which two other volumes besides the one named are already published, "Aspirations" and "New and Old Faith," are to be great favorites also with American readers who love the fresh, sharp and classic in religious literature. But Dr. Matheson is perhaps best known in America by his book entitled "Can the Old Faith Live with the New?" The best work of his life is yet to be done.

We have thought it fitting to introduce him to the American public, thus to answer some of the inquiries which we have been asking about this eminent preacher and writer. May many others have the privilege of listening to him, which will remain an epochal event in our experience.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

Christian Culture.

The House Beautiful.

Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?—1 Cor. iii. 16.

SCIENTISTS and philosophers are warring and jangling respecting their theories of phenomena, and especially regarding man. The Christian can listen undisturbed to their conflicting statements, while he accepts the declaration that "the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost."

Taking the idea of the text and looking upon the "human form divine" as the "house beautiful," we would remark that,

1. *The house should give signs of*

its superior occupant. We judge of the inmate by the residence. If everything around is disorderly, we attribute it to the character of the tenant. If the paths are clean and the flower-beds are trimmed, we know that there is taste and the cultivation of the spirit of beauty on the part of the occupier. So we judge regarding the human house. Sin makes its marks upon the countenance. Care traces its wrinkles on the face.

2. *The house should be kept clean.* Health is defined as internal and external cleanliness. Sanctification is spiritual cleanliness. Christ will cleanse. And the soul made pure will manifest that purity in the outer

life. The light of God in the soul will illumine the darkness around.

3. It should be well *furnished*. The Christian needs to be ready to account for his faith. He must be furnished for every good word and work. His mind should be stored only with remembrance-pictures upon which he can look with tranquillity and delight.

4. We must remember that we are not *freeholders* or *absolute possessors of that house—we only have it on lease*. We have it only on conditions, and must surrender it at the discretion of the owner. Nor must we look upon it as being our "everlasting home." It is but a temporary temple. The beams and rafters will be taken down, and the tenant will depart. This is beautifully set forth in Tennyson's poem of "The Empty House," beginning,

"Life and Thought have gone away
Side by side,
Leaving doors and windows wide;
Careless tenants they."

5. *The tenant is more precious than the house he lives in*. The soul is of infinitely more worth than the body. What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Fair though the house may be, fairer, more beautiful still, is the tenant, radiant with the love that God bestows. And when this "house of our earthly tabernacle" is vacated, there is a place prepared by the Saviour for those who love him. The house may be vacated and look deserted, but the tenant is in a sunnier land enjoying the higher conditions of eternal life. J. P. H.

Lawlessness.

[Suggested by a sermon by George Dana Boardman, D.D.]

In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes.—Judges xxi. 25.

Why detain an audience of Christian patriots with the theme of Israel's anarchy? Because there is a tendency to lawlessness—a tendency

so universal and powerful as to be almost irresistible. This spirit of lawlessness is seen in our own land and time under the form of

1. Avowed anarchy.
2. A human sovereignty declaring itself supreme. Failing to recognize God.
3. Selfishness, in the form of avarice, ambition and monopoly.
4. Intemperance.
5. Irreligion.
6. Individualism.

The Christian's Confidence.

[Suggested by a sermon by Dr. A. J. F. Behrends.]

Fret not thyself . . . Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.
—Ps. xxxvii. 1-7.

Fret not. Beat not like a bird against the wires of its cage; complain not fretfully against your environments.

Rest in the Lord—better, be *dumb before the Lord*; not the silence of paralysis, nor of doubt, but the silence of confidence.

Wait patiently. Not for God only, but *upon him*, by his side—an *active* waiting.

The Cross of Christ.

1. The cross *typified*. Num. xxi. 8; John iii. 14, 15.
2. The cross borne *by* Jesus. John xix. 17.
3. The cross borne *for* Jesus. Luke xxiii. 26.
4. Christ took the cross even unto *death*. Phil. ii. 8.

He Leadeth Us.

1. Into a storm. Matt. vii. 23.
2. Into green pastures. Ps. xxiii.
3. Safely. Ps. lxxviii.
4. Through depths. Ps. cvi. 9.
5. In the right way. Ps. cvii. 7.
6. In paths not known. Isa. xl. 11.
7. Up into the Father's house. John xxiv. 23.

Revival Service.

The Opportune Present.

For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of

salvation have I succored thee : behold, now is the accepted time ; behold, now is the day of salvation.—2 Cor. vi. 2.

The present is—

I. "THE DAY OF SALVATION." "Acceptable year of the Lord."

1. The grace of atonement.
2. Suitably revealed.
3. Urgently pressed, as in "be-seech," "behold."

II. "THE ACCEPTED TIME."

1. Divinely "accepted."
2. Opportune for development, growth, fruit.
3. The season is short.

III. THE SEASON FOR DIVINE SUCCOR.

1. Temptation and trial.
 2. Cry of need—"heard."
 3. Perishing souls "succored."
- "He is able to succor them that are tempted."

FINALLY, the Omnipotent "I"—Jehovah-Jesus—comes near to you in the grace of his love, in "the opportune present," and if you will, "NOW," "BEHOLD" him by a living faith, you shall be presently and eternally saved. Who will embrace the opportunity? Will you? I. A. B.

Consider.

Consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver.—Ps. l. 22.

God has endowed man with a rational and reflective nature for this very purpose; and he governs him by motives, and not by force, in order to call his reasoning and reflective faculty into full exercise.

CONSIDER—what?

1. His relations and duties to the Author of his being and the Arbiter of his eternal destiny.

2. The chief end of man—why and for what he exists.

3. The kind of life he is really living—the trend of his desires, hopes, strivings—is it Godward, heavenward?

4. His preparation and prospects for eternity in the light of Bible-teaching.

5. Consider the uncertainty of life—the constant proximity of death, eternity, judgment; the "vanity" of all earthly gains and pleasures; how soon death will end all and usher the soul into the presence of the great and holy God.

6. Whether you are a Christian, and if not, when you expect to become one, and whether your expectation is sure of realization; or whether it is not a spider's web—a "snare and a delusion"—to lure you on to a lost eternity—as it has done millions of others as confident once as you.

Funeral Service.

Room in the Father's House.

In my father's house are many mansions . . . I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go, etc.—John xiv. 2, 3.

1. Christ here counsels his disciples in regard to their speedy but temporary separation. The consolation he affords them is the joyful fact that they shall soon be permanently blessed with his companionship in the heavenly mansions.

2. He teaches, in other portions of these last words, that all believers have the same divine promise.

3. There is abundant room in his eternal home for all the redeemed. "In my father's house are many mansions." How tenderly he rebukes our fear: "If it were not so, I would have told you."

4. Christian dying is simply Jesus "coming again" to "receive unto himself," to take home his brethren on the earth.

5. We need not trouble ourselves because of this mysterious journey—this going home—because we know not the road. He will come for us. He will pilot us all the way. He himself is the way, and he will illumine every step of the path and guide us into the "Father's house."

The Life Eternal.

No man is sure of life.—Job xxiv. 22.

1. Then let him set lightly by it.

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." "This is not our rest." Life may slip from our grasp in a moment.

2. Let him make the most of it while it lasts. Up and be doing; the night may shut down in the twinkling of an eye. "Redeem the time."

"Life is short, and time is fleeting,
And our hearts, though strong and brave,
Still like muffled drums are beating
Funeral marches to the grave."

3. Let him make sure of life eternal. (a) That is real. (b) That is abiding. (c) That is attainable, if sought aright. (d) That is glorious—the consummation of all hope and desire.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

The Chaotic Condition of Marriage and Divorce Laws Illustrated by those of New York.

POLYGAMY AND POLYANDRY MADE LEGAL.
What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.—Matt. xix. 6.

THE State of New York not only permits but invites both polygamy and polyandry. While Mohammedan countries limit a man's lawful wives to four, and a woman's lawful husbands to one, the Empire State encourages every man who can afford it to set up a harem with an unlimited number of lawful wives, and every woman who can afford it to set up an andron with an unlimited number of lawful husbands. No woman knows how many lawful wives her husband may have; no man knows how many lawful husbands his wife may have. The married man may lawfully, and therefore properly, court not only the unmarried sister but the wife of his friend. The married woman is as open to courtship by married men and bachelors after as she was before she became in name only *femme couvert*. All the sweet and pleasant relations of social life are poisoned. And as uncle may lawfully marry niece and aunt may lawfully marry nephew, not even the closest ties of collateral kinship are free from suspicion. Free Love can ask no more than the Legislature and Court of Appeals have granted its advocates in this State.

This condition has come about slowly. In 1878 the Legislature added to the Revised Statutes this section:

SECTION 6. If any person, whose husband or wife shall have absented himself or herself for the space of five successive years, without being known to such person to be living at that time, shall marry during the lifetime of such absent husband or wife, the marriage shall be void only from the time that its nullity shall be pronounced by a court of competent authority.

It was in the wording of this statute that the first step was successfully taken by the anti-divorce free lovers to convert New York into a polygamous and polyandrous State. The first marriage, it declares, must stand good during the lifetime of the parties. No application to dissolve it will be entertained from either. The second marriage must also remain valid unless application is made to void it. No divorce will be permitted. How that application to void it may be made was left to the courts to determine, and under the common-sense ruling of the law they decided that only the innocent third party could move in the matter. The deserter cannot take advantage of his or her own wrong-doing. The deserted may not be permitted to cast off the new obligations at will. Only the innocent victim can take action.

If John Smith's wife Jane deserts him, and five years after he marries Susan, Jane may return and he will then have two legal wives, both of whom he must support (or go to prison for a year) and with both of whom he may live in lawful wedlock. No divorce is permitted any of the parties. Jane is barred by her own wrong-doing from objecting to the polygamy, and Smith is barred by the public regard for the rights of both women from casting either off. Susan only may have relief.

But what relief is offered her? May

she get an honest divorce and have her marriage decently dissolved? No. If she wishes to escape from polygamy she must submit to have her marriage *voided*. She must relinquish all past rights as a wife. She must surrender all claim for support or for dower. She must accept the social position—for few understand why no divorce will be granted her—of one who has lived in concubinage with a man and borne him children. So long as she lives with him in polygamy she is a lawful wife, her rights as a wife remain intact, she must be supported, and she is entitled to dower. She is released only upon condition that she will accept social shame and disgrace.

The opponents of divorce, champions of free love, next proceeded by innocent looking amendments (Chap. 321, Laws of 1879) to shut out all divorce, and while granting relief to the injured party to keep every marriage in full force and effect during the lifetime of the parties. The word "divorce" was retained, but it was gelded of meaning. Under this statute a Mrs. Faber obtained a divorce, and in due course married again. Then Faber married again. He was indicted for bigamy, and the court of last resort decided (1883) that the decree of divorce did not, under the amendments of 1879, dissolve his marriage to his first wife; that so far as he was concerned it remained in full force and effect.

"A person against whom a decree of divorce has been granted by the courts of this State," said the Court of Appeals, "who during the lifetime of the plaintiff marries again within this State, is guilty of bigamy. *He is a person having 'a husband or wife living'* within 2 R. S. 687, § 8." For the full text see 92 N. Y. 146.

The marriage bond had not been dissolved by the "divorce," but remained in full force and effect; Faber was still "a married man."

In 1880 the Court of Appeals declared, *People vs. Baker*, 76 N. Y. p. 78:

"A court of another State has no jurisdiction to dissolve the marriage of a citizen of this State domiciled here, who is not served with process in the foreign State and who does not appear in the action."

And again in 1883, *Moore vs. Hegeman*, 92 N. Y. p. 526:

"Where a marriage is valid by the laws of another State, its validity cannot be questioned in this State. Thus, even if persons who cannot legally marry in this State (married persons) go to another State the laws of which permit them to marry, and marry there, such marriage is valid in this State."

Since 1883, under the law as thus declared, not less than one thousand men—perhaps five times that number—have married two, three, and even four wives; hundreds of women have each married two or more men. Polygamy has come to stay, for no divorce is permitted.

The next number of THE REVIEW will contain some striking illustrations of the wrong and immorality fostered and protected by our present marriage and divorce system.

Illiteracy in the United States.

That the soul be without knowledge, it is not good.—Prov. xix. 2.

THE words of the New York State Superintendent of Public Instruction, who in his last report declares that "the large uneducated class of the State is growing larger," and that "the attendance upon our schools does not keep pace with the increase of population," reveal a condition of affairs which calls loudly that the facts with reference to illiteracy among our people be made known. A greater danger to a republic than even ignorance among its citizens is, not to know that such ignorance and debasement prevails.

According to the census of 1880 nearly five and a quarter millions of our citizens, now of voting age, are unable to write. Over 2,350,000 of these already have their hand upon "the helm which guides the ship of state," constituting some fifteen per cent. of our voting population. More than eighteen per cent. of our adult female population cannot write, and in each of twelve States—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia—more than one-

fourth of the voters are in the same deplorable condition. Thirty-nine per cent. of the voting population of Florida and Virginia cannot write, forty-three per cent. in North Carolina, forty-six per cent. in Georgia and Mississippi, and forty-seven per cent. in Alabama and Louisiana. The same report shows that in 1880 6,240,958 persons, in a total population of 36,761,607, ten years of age and upward in the United States, could not write.

What is being done to enlighten this vast mass of ignorance, hanging like a cloud over the destiny of the republic?

According to the report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education for 1885-6, ten States, and those in which illiteracy is most prevalent—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia—spend annually *less than one dollar per capita of their population for all educational purposes*. Five of these States—Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina—spend less than

half a dollar per capita for education. In these ten States the average monthly salaries of teachers is less than \$30.

According to this report the nation at large spends annually for all educational purposes less than two dollars (\$1.97) per capita of its population for education, and the whole expenses of the public for teaching, building school-houses, providing books, school libraries and apparatus is but \$9.72 for each enrolled pupil. Yet we do not hesitate to spend every year \$12.42 for every man, woman and child in the republic in strong drink.

In the enlightened State of Connecticut, with her Puritan ancestry, there are, according to the report of the Commissioner, 153 teachers whose monthly salaries average less than \$20, 508 which average less than \$25, and 500 whose monthly earnings while they work average less than \$30. The deterioration of the common schools of New York and New England is a fact which has for some time been recognized.

What are we going to do about it?

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Sacredness of the Sick-chamber.

ONE of our dailies remarks that if "Matthew Arnold reads some of the scenes and incidents in the sick-room of Mr. Conkling, he will have occasion for a severe arraignment of American taste. That the proudest man in these States should have his deliriums, mutterings, fancies, his conversations with his physicians, the minutest details of his treatment and condition all reported and bulletined at length, is a curious freak of irony." This is a merited rebuke. This evil is the outgrowth of a vulgar taste and is becoming widely prevalent. There is a morbid desire to learn all the secrets of the sick-room, and reporters and newsmongers are on the alert continually to gather information and spread it out in all its details, and often in a greatly exagger-

ated form. And it is to be regretted that physicians are quite willing, too frequently, to minister to this prurient taste, instead of rebuking and trying to check it. The sick-chamber, which any day may be the death-chamber, of distinguished personages, is no longer private or privileged; the public is admitted to it by means of the press, and all that is going on there, day and night, is seen and discussed by the outside world. It does seem to us that attending physicians are greatly at fault in this matter. They should certainly regard their relations to the sick one and his friends as confidential and sacred, and do and say nothing to betray the confidence of the sick-chamber. The lawyer in his relations to his client would be considered guilty of a breach of confidence if he should give away

any of the secrets of this privileged intercourse. And why is not the same law of honor binding upon the physician?

And the same also upon the clergyman. His position and office in the sick-room and by the bed of death are confidential, often, and always of a privileged character. It becomes him to be exceedingly discreet. Delicate matters of a personal and family nature are frequently confided to him; secrets, confessions, statements are made to him, which ought not to be divulged publicly, or told to those who have no claims to know them. A world of mischief is done by "confidential" disclosures on the part of clergymen. Let them scrupulously honor the trust reposed in them as a minister of Christ and a spiritual adviser.

Talking Down to the People.

"SAM" JONES and "Sam" Small are not uneducated men, as generally supposed. Mr. Small was for a long while before his conversion a newspaper writer of some fame. Both talk *down* to the people. We asked Mr. Jones some time since why he indulged in common, slangy talk in the pulpit. Said he, "I do it to reach the people. I talk to be understood. A preacher must be understood easily if he is to do good. He must use the language his auditors think in. The other evening I was talking to a great congregation. I said, 'It is objected that I talk slang. Well, now when I begin to talk slang here, just remember that I am trying to get down on your level.'"

There are some pretty large grains of common sense in that.

Was It Kind?

In the absence of any authorized manual of ministerial etiquette, I must fall back upon *THE HOMILETIC REVIEW* for a ruling. Given the following circumstances, what, in your opinion, should have been the conduct of the pastor? Is it not possible for a clergyman to be "too civil by half"?

The circumstances were these: A rousing missionary service in a leading metropolitan

church was about over. Two celebrated speakers from abroad, together with the pastor, occupied the pulpit. The last hymn was being sung when one of the speakers informed the pastor that the Rev. Dr. — of — church was present. Now the pastor is exceedingly near-sighted; nevertheless, with necessarily very meager information as to the whereabouts of the Rev. Dr. —, and handicapped by impaired vision, he left the pulpit, hastened down the aisle and began a vain search for the reverend victim. It is needless to say that the congregation was first curious, then amused, and finally smiled expansively as the pastor gave up in despair and turned toward the informer in the pulpit for help. The informer descended into the aisle, and the two renewed the search. Finally, just as the choir was beginning to sing the last stanza, the victim was discovered. A parley followed, then capitulation, and the two clergymen going up one aisle and the victim up the other, the pulpit was reached just in time for the pastor to announce that the Rev. Dr. — would pronounce the benediction, which he did, although I venture to assert that he mentally excepted the two clergymen who had brought him into such uncalled-for publicity. To me it seems that this is a good illustration of the lack of consideration which clergymen at times show for one another. When in the pulpit they seem to forget what a positive delight it is for a minister to now and then settle back in a pew and feel his non-responsibility for any portion of the service. What do you think about it? M.

N. Y. CITY.

We agree in the opinion that much of the "snap" enlisting of clergymen in worship is far from being courteous or in accord with the Golden Rule. Undoubtedly the case cited by M. is rather extreme, and yet something of that kind is likely to happen again and again.

Content to be a Pastor.

ONE of the most famous clergymen in the East said but a few days since: "I have a growing disinclination to appear before the public at mass meetings and on other public occasions. The older I grow the more content I am to be a pastor, to drop out of the eye of the general public."

It is perhaps well that this is true of the great majority of preachers, but it would be a sad day for the church and for the world were it true of all.

A CLERICAL BELL.—"Now a few words before I begin."

THERE is great appearance in certain quarters of driving the saloon out of politics, but a solicitous care equally great to leave the politics in the saloon. Down with the rookeries; that is the only sure way of getting rid of the rooks.