

12827

THE
HOMILETIC REVIEW

VOL. XXIV.

FROM JULY TO DECEMBER.

1892.

EDITORS:

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

PUBLISHERS:

FUNK & WAGNALLS CO.,

NEW YORK:

18 AND 20 ASTOR PLACE.

LONDON:

44 FLEET STREET.

TORONTO, CANADA: 86 BAY STREET.

Copyright, 1892, by the
FUNK & WAGNALLS CO.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—JULY, 1892.—NO. I.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—THE MINISTRY'S DUTY TO THE CHURCH AT THE PRESENT DAY.

BY PROFESSOR FREDERIC GODET, D.D., NEUCHÂTEL, SWITZERLAND.

FIFTY years ago, when I entered the ministry, a revival of religion was bringing life to Christendom in Western Europe; its powerful breath touched all the churches in succession; everywhere souls became convicted and came to the knowledge of grace, the enjoyment of peace, and the possession of spiritual life. According to the fine expression of the psalmist, "From the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth." Like yonder fruit-laden trees which the prophet beholds, rising from the banks of the wonderful river, a number of Christian institutions sprang up from the fertile soil of this new life; evangelical societies, foreign missions, Bible and religious tract societies, Sunday-schools, and many other kindred departures made their appearance and developed; philanthropic agencies of different kinds were added to the recent religious creations. Then, on a new Palm Sunday as it were, the disciples testified by word and deed to the Saviour who manifested His presence in the midst of them; and Jesus Himself could have said, "If in such days of grace these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out."

We are still in many respects under the salutary influence of that revival. Religious and philanthropic work, by which the Church of the present day is distinguished, is partly the offspring of yonder movement. For that reason the prosperity itself of the Church must not deceive us, lest we should bear a judgment on her present state which would be too favorable. The engine may roll for some time on the rails, and the train with it, even after its fire has begun to go out. The all-important point is whether the motive power is properly kept up inside of the motor.

Serious doubts as to its soundness may be held with regard to the present state of the Church. What power was it which gave, at the time of the revival, the memory of which I just now recalled, such a wonderful impulse to the Christian society? It was a living faith in the Divine facts

revealed in the Gospels : the eternal plan of salvation ; the gift of His only-begotten Son made by the Father to the world ; His death, freely undergone for the remission of sins ; justification by faith freely granted ; sanctification of believers through the Holy Spirit ; the coming of Christ, when He will make believers partakers of His glory by a resurrection similar in kind to His own.

This vast plan of God's love to us ; this mass, not of truths, but of Divine *acts*, past, present, and future, attested by revelations contained in the Scriptures, was the steadfast object of faith. If there was ever any doubt about anything, it never was about the reality of this great salvation and of its all-powerful efficiency. The object of faith appeared as sure and as fixed as God Himself. The doubts which could arise in a believer's heart would bear solely on his own sincerity and on the efficiency of his own faith. People would sometimes hesitate before they accepted for themselves favors of which they not only felt themselves unworthy, but for the experience of which they thought they lacked the necessary conditions. However, when the step was taken, when free salvation had been accepted, then the truth was at once spoken and acted upon—because they had believed “the Word.”

These wonders of Divine salvation, revealed to mankind not only by Holy Writ, but also to the soul of every believer by the Holy Spirit, lifted up the believer above himself. The assurance of his personal salvation became the anchor of his soul, “which entereth into that within the veil.” Hence he felt himself inseparably linked to the throne of grace for life and death. This has been the experience of thousands of souls embosomed in the Church.

What do we see now ? A great change has modified the spiritual atmosphere. If we have left a Palm Sunday behind us, many symptoms may cause us to anticipate the coming of a *Good Friday*. I will not express the dread of coming persecutions, although there is no lack of forerunning signs that such might occur. If the materialist tendency spreads more and more, if the claims of socialism grow harsher, the Church, which stands in the way of the dangerous exaggerations of this tendency—the Church will have to bear the brunt of its most violent attacks.

However, persecution is not the most dangerous enemy of the Church ; it may even happen that persecution becomes a quickening agent. Christianity's greatest peril grows out of its own bosom ; this danger consists in the slow and gradual neglect of the faith in the facts which have caused its birth and sustained it—that faith which, after periods of depression, produces sudden revivals of religion, such as the Reformation or the revival at the beginning of this century.

How has this change been brought about ? The revival and its religious outgrowth have undergone sharp and not unmerited criticism. Conversion was too often identified with intellectual belief ; the ethical influence of the professed doctrines was sometimes wanting, and the death-blow to self-love

had not been struck. The conduct of the converts would not always harmonize with their profession. People believed firmly in the Scriptures ; but the letter of the Book was made the object of faith, instead of the Book being looked upon as the instrument by which the object of faith is brought close to us. For the Book is the medium through which we obtain and retain fellowship with Jesus Christ—a vehicle by which Jesus Christ is brought near unto us as our “ wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.”

Shams and errors of that kind have been pointed out and corrected nowadays. It is true that on some points we enjoy more correct and clearer views. Be it admitted that we understand better the true nature of faith and its deeply moral character ; that we can delineate its object with greater precision ; is there no danger that we dissolve that object and lose it by substituting for the essence of faith revealed from above the effort of our own faith, presuming to draw its object from its own bosom ? It is not persecution which threatens the Church to-day, but suicide.

Associating, as it is her duty to do, with the tendencies of the age, the Church is constantly exposed to foreign influences ; the duty, therefore, of the ministry, which Jesus at first established in her midst through the apostles, and which the apostles themselves perpetuated by establishing the pastorate—the duty of the ministry, we say, is to oppose constantly that invasion of forensic elements, and to make the light, which Christ Himself has lit, to shine.

I wish to call attention to three points on which the ministers of the Gospel must at the present day give solid teaching and serious warning to their flocks :

Authority in religious matters is the first point—an authority to which the Church of Christ must forever remain submissive. In matters relating to the earthly life, or to arts and sciences, no authority is necessary. Reason is a sufficient guide in such matters. If we can dispense with absolute certainty in secular matters, we cannot do so when personal salvation in matters concerning our relationship with God are at issue. Positive certainty is required here ; and in order to insure it we need authority on which to lean with fulness of faith. Positive certainty cannot rest with the variable and insufficient utterances of the individual conscience, or with the teachings of any human society or institution whatsoever. In order to insure to our relationship with God absolute certainty—such as will enable our faith, as it were, to have faith in itself—it is necessary that the object of faith be presented to us with a Divine authority, and that it be received by us with absolute confidence. Thus only will faith bestow upon man that moral energy by which he becomes victorious over the world ; by which self is sacrificed and freely consecrated to God ; by which, according to the Scripture, “ *he could remove mountains.*”

It is because such a faith supposes as the condition of its existence a Divine testimony, and, therefore, a revealing act, that the ideas of faith

and testimony are so often presented in the Scriptures as two correlative ideas. "He came for a witness," it is said of John the Baptist, "to bear witness to the light, that all men through him might believe" (John i. 7). "The Father Himself hath borne witness of Me," says Jesus; . . . "ye have not His Word abiding in you" (John v. 37, 38). Hence the supreme position given to the Holy Scripture by the Reformation, and the modern revival in the religious life of society and of individuals. It is true that this ruling position has been often somewhat strained by the revival. The act of faith has been made to bear not directly on the person of Jesus and on the Divine facts connected with His person, but on the record which contains the testimony which is borne to these facts. The letter of the Scriptures has thus been deified; and it has been overlooked that these Divine facts had been transmitted through the agency of human mouth or pen. Under a deep impression that the breath of a higher life, wholly consecrated to the glory of God, inspires every line of the sacred records, it was thought that these pages contained a continuous revelation, a constant dictation of God Himself, who spoke in the same manner from one end of the sacred volume to the other. It was the confusion of two things which can easily be kept distinct from each other—namely, *revelation* and *inspiration*.

Revelation is accomplished by a series of momentary acts; but *inspiration*, like a breath of life renewed, goes through the whole Scripture. The Divine facts of salvation were *revealed* to God's agents in the measure according to which they were called upon to execute His plan. But *inspiration* is found in a certain measure with every true member of the body of Christ; it is found in the highest degree with the chosen instruments of revelation—the prophets and the apostles—not to mention Jesus Himself, who occupies, here as everywhere, a place of His own. Speaking of *revelation*, it is right to say that the Word of God is *in* the Scripture; speaking of *inspiration*, it is right to say that the whole Scripture is the Word of God, for it describes altogether a moral state superior to natural humanity, to which Divine salvation has lifted up mankind. From one end to the other of the Book we recognize in it the language of the godly man who in some degree or other has appropriated to himself this salvation.

In this respect we find in the Scripture generally that which we also observe in the teaching of Jesus Himself. When He speaks of the sparrows, which are sold on the market at a penny apiece, or of old clothes, which are not to be mended in a certain manner, such utterances evidently do not contain Divine revelations. They are, as He Himself calls them, "earthly things." Yet in this circumstance each of His words is none the less filled with the same breath of everlasting life as when He proclaims the most sublime revelations. The same with the apostles. When Paul advises his disciple to mix a little wine with the water which he drinks, or when he requests him to bring the cloak or the books which he has left with Carpus,

no revelation is to be found there ; yet the breath of spiritual life is the same as that which pervades the deepest passages of the Epistle to the Romans.

It is needful, therefore, to distinguish inspiration, which is a continuous and general fact, from yonder beam of light, which falls from above at certain times, enlightens the agents of the Divine Will with regard to the facts of salvation, and gives them a right to witness with authority, as Jesus Himself did, saying, " We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." This is the Word Divine in the highest meaning of the word—the kernel of the scriptural body, which every one of us can make his own with full assurance of faith, so as to participate in his turn in the celestial life which inspires the entire Scriptures.

The salvation of God, therefore, divinely accomplished in the person of Jesus, and revealed divinely by the testimony of the apostles, is authority in the Church. This testimony brings forth faith, and the believer draws from it life, which cannot spring up or grow by any other agency. John, therefore, closes his Gospel by saying, " These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ; and that, believing, ye might have life through His name."

Here is the infallible authority, which it is our duty to establish and to vindicate in the Church. Our first duty is to submit to it ourselves. Our second duty is to bring our preaching and all our teachings under its subjection. Apart from submission to this Divine authority, what would become of the religious instruction which the Church requires her ministers to give to the children of its members ? Shall every minister be delivered unto the promptings of his own thoughts and of his own judgment ? If such were the case, no church could be any longer possible. On the other hand, I know of one church which is possible and real, which is ever ready to pick up the wrecks of our Church ; it is the church which calls, not in the name of Jesus, but in the name of the Holy Father, " Come to me ; I have warned you for a long time that your structure was rotten ; now you see it. Come to Rome, and you will find rest for your souls and full security as to your belief."

The second point is the *divinity of Jesus Christ*. On the greatness of the head depends the greatness of the body and the consciousness which the latter has of its dignity. The Divine nature of Christ is denied to-day not only outside of the pale of the Church by the adversaries of the Gospel, but in the bosom of the Church itself, whether some reduce the person of Christ to that of a prophet, even of the greatest of all prophets, or others make out that His divinity consists solely in His perfect holiness, by which He distinguishes Himself from all other men ; others again that His divinity consists in the establishing of the kingdom of God on earth ; while others explain that divinity by His resurrection and accession to the sovereignty over the whole universe. These different conceptions, which all do away, in some way or other, with the essential divinity of Christ,

because His pre-existence is denied, have doubtless been brought on by the incomplete way in which the orthodoxy of times past had understood the important fact of the appearance of Jesus Christ. The person of the Man-God was described in such a manner that the Divine attributes which He was supposed to have retained as a man interfered every instant with the free expansion and the full exercise of His humanity. Now the tendency of this age is directed in all spheres toward the human. Humanism is somewhat the religion of our time. This watchword has its good and its evil side. It is not surprising that many thinkers, reduced by incomplete formulas either to accept the God in Jesus and to reject the man, or to accept the man and to deny the God, have preferred the latter.

This problem is of a scientific rather than of a religious kind; it is, perhaps, the most difficult of all theological problems, for it aims to reconcile the two characteristic elements of the person of Christ, which seem to exclude each other. However, it is not lawful for the Church which Christ has established to sacrifice His humanity to His divinity, as the old school unwittingly did; or His divinity to His humanity, as the new school knowingly does. Why, the reality of His humanity is proved by the whole history of Jesus and by His own words, "Now you seek to kill Me, a man that hath told you the truth" (John viii. 40). "Go to My brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father" (John xx. 17). From similar utterances the beloved disciple has drawn this sublime expression, "And the Word was made flesh" (John i. 14). In pursuance of such testimonies Paul has been able to say, ". . . much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by *one man*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many" (Rom. v. 15). Hence the Docetæ of the early centuries were mistaken who made out that the humanity of Jesus was a mere appearance; but they are not less in error—the modern thinkers—who teach that the human person of Jesus, in nowise different from ours, had no pre-existence. He who said, "Before Abraham was, I am," has attributed to Himself a superiority over us which differs from His holiness or His mission, and a divinity different from that which He is thought to have obtained after His resurrection. One cannot become God; or, if it is possible in mythology, it is not so in Bible monotheism. When John said, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," he said it as one who had himself been a hearer of Jesus, and not as a disciple of Plato; and when Paul wrote, "Who, being in the form of God, . . . made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," he wrote it after he had received "the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6), when he was caught up into paradise, and "heard unspeakable words, which it is not possible for a man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 4).

What does it matter if our formulas are nothing but stammering in the presence of these facts of salvation? Our duty, in facing negations of the

right and of the left, is to proclaim manfully and joyfully to the Church the Divine greatness and the humble lowliness of its Head, who has condescended to become our brother. Here lies before us that *mystery of godliness* which builds up the Church. A sainted woman has said, "If the Christ is not God, the love of God for mankind loses the character of the Infinite." Thus weakened, the love of God is powerless to root out of our hearts the love of self and of the world. "Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" exclaims St. John in his advanced years (1 John v. 5). If Christ is not God before being a man, how could He have stripped Himself, and how could He carry us by His example away into the annihilation of ourselves, which is the only fitting remedy to our pride? If such be the case, I can see nothing in His career but an ascending movement, in which I am nothing loath to engage after Him; while, on the contrary, a descent must first be submitted to, after which the ascent is sure to follow.

In the Acts and the Epistles the early Christians are often called "those who call upon the Lord." The same expression is used in the Old Testament to designate the worshippers of Jehovah. To *call upon the Lord*, to worship Him as Lord of all, such was the religion of the early Church; that religion before which Judaism and paganism have given way, and which has opened to mankind a new existence. It would be a dangerous experiment, and one which would cost too much to the Church and the world, to substitute to the old religion a new one of modern invention. Let us beware of such a responsibility; and should we ever take it, let us mind we do not do it in the capacity of servants of Jesus Christ and of ministers of His Church. A man who speaks in the name of Christ has no right to deny to Him the supreme dignity which He has claimed for Himself.

The third point is the *expiatory sacrifice* offered by Jesus Christ, from which depends the tragical character of the Gospel—I mean sin's damnable character and man's serious need of salvation. With reference to this point also the old orthodoxy may have sanctioned the use of certain formulas which are not in accordance with the scriptural passages in which the origin of redemption is attributed to God Himself. I will not venture to substitute at the present moment a formula superior to another which assuredly was imperfect. I consider the fact of the sacrifice of Christ not as theology has moulded it or moulds it, but as it is revealed to me in the Scripture. Contemplating the cross, I open my heart to that word of Jesus, "This is My blood, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins," and again, "The Son of man is come to give His blood for the remission of sins." I listen to His beloved disciple commenting on His death in this way, "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world," and to the most ancient confessor of Christ, "Christ once died for our sins, the just for the unjust," and to the founder of the Church in heathen

lands, "Whom God hath foreordained to be a propitiation. . . . God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." I ask now if, after such declarations, it is lawful for a minister of Jesus Christ to preach the cross as if it had simply been the result of a conflict which arose between the holiness of Jesus and Jewish wickedness, or merely as the exhibition of the love of God, who intended to make a display of His goodness by the magnitude of the sufferings which His envoy was able to bear for the sake of mankind? For the sake of mankind? But why? True love does not submit to suffering merely to make a display of love, much less to display another's love. In his vigorous language Paul would have called such an interpretation the "emptying" of the cross; to the Divine foolishness of the cross, which has renovated the world, and has healed thousands of hearts, it substitutes a thoroughly inefficacious human foolishness, which lacks the solemn vindication of Divine justice. To strip rashly the cross of Christ of the "great demonstration" of justice, which Paul, divinely enlightened, had recognized in it—a demonstration which has been the starting-point of a conversion to God of the intelligent universe, a conversion which it must finally make perfect—to do that is to make nothing of the only thing in which the apostle declared that he would glory (Gal. v. 14). We have no right to remodel that central fact of history so as to suit it to our taste, or to fit it to our size. Our duty is to unfold it to the world as it is unfolded to us by the Divine testimony. Granted that our reason is set at naught, it remains, nevertheless, a fact that it is by the foolishness of the cross that the Gospel takes hold of the souls. In these words, "*The Son of God, sacrificed for me,*" "*dead for me,*" lies the secret of my peace, for, being identified with Him, after that He has Himself been identified with me, I discover at last how I can be dead unto sin and living unto God. "I looked at the heavens," says the poet, "and with the astronomer's eye gazed at its wandering worlds. I went back to the past and followed, on the historian's footsteps, mankind on its march through the centuries; but not before I came to Golgotha was my heart enraptured."

What would practically remain to us after we had despoiled Christianity of the authority of the Word of Christ, and of the great facts of the incarnation and of the cross? Well, some affecting words on Divine Fatherhood and Divine Providence, words which we would accept or modify *ad libitum*, for it must be admitted that through the bitter experiences of life they too often meet with apparent denials. A beautiful example of charity, meekness, patience, and gentleness would remain to us—an example which, unfortunately, it is easier to admire than to imitate.

Would this suffice to lift up the world and to renew mankind? Will it help us to give up self and to consecrate ourselves to God? No, it requires a more powerful agency. The heart of mankind is vast. It takes a power greater than mankind to lift it up above its own nature. For its salvation God has conceived wonders of love which transcend our most

sublime aspirations, humiliation as deep as that of the incarnation, a sacrifice as great as that of the cross. Of a truth, God has proved that He is "greater than our heart," and that is how He reconquered it.

When God entrusted us with the ministry in His Church He placed in our hands a Divine net. This net from Golgotha has been spread toward the poles, and toward the West, and toward the East; its progress encompasses the world more and more. We who are at present entrusted with it must be careful not to lose a stitch of it, not a single stitch! Above all, we have to discard the pretension to substitute for that net one of our own make. The truth which it is our duty to preach is not our truth, it is God's truth; we owe it to the Church, and we owe it to her unsullied. For neither does the Church belong to us—it is the Church of Him who is not only its Founder, its Model, its Teacher, but who is its Chief—namely, its Head; a glorified Head, who without ceasing imparts Divine life to the body and to its limbs. Let us therefore remain in Him, let us live in Him, work in Him. Such is our highest duty toward the Church and toward ourselves. "And now, little children," said the beloved disciple to the pastors and believers who surrounded him, "abide in Him; that when He shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before Him at His coming." May it be so, with God's help, for every one of us.

II.—THE SEPTUAGINT AND OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D., EAST ORANGE, N. J.

THE Septuagint is a translation of the Old Testament made by Alexandrian Jews, either as a whole or in part, about the third century B.C. Its influence was vast and various.

1. It preserved among the Jews who were scattered abroad, and who had largely lost the use of the Hebrew tongue, a knowledge of the doctrines contained in their Sacred Scriptures which would have been forgotten or perverted if left to oral repetition or to the prejudiced paraphrasing of their rabbis.

2. It brought to the Gentiles some information of the Jewish faith. There is evidence that much of the higher philosophy and morality of the better sort of minds throughout the Roman world just before the time of Christ was due to a seasoning of Hebrew thought. A little before the Septuagint appeared Aristotle, and later Hecateus, of Abdera, had referred to the lofty ideas of the Jews; and, very naturally, inquiring spirits sought the Septuagint for further information. Some have traced expressions in the Greek of Callimachus and other classic writers directly to the Septuagint. As Ewald says, "It helped the higher minds of all nations to meet freely on the pure heights of truth."

3. Thus indirectly, if not through a definite knowledge of the Jewish Messianic hopes, it prepared the Gentiles to hear the Christ when He came.

4. It enabled the world to see the unity of the Old Testament with the New, by presenting both in a common tongue, in which prophecy and fulfilment could be studied in the same diction, and Jewish germ of doctrine and Christian efflorescence could be watched by the same eyes.

5. But the crowning significance of the Septuagint is in the fact that it became practically the Bible of Christ and His apostles.

Without going into details, it is sufficient to note that our Lord made but little use of the Hebrew Bible. While a few of His quotations follow it closely, the bulk of them do not. In some instances they were taken from the now lost Aramaic version, or were mere oral paraphrases, in which He has no purpose to quote literally from any script. But to the Septuagint more than to any other document we must look for the exact form of His quotations.

His replies to Satan at the time of the Temptation will fairly illustrate our Lord's habit in this respect. The first quotation follows the Septuagint closely, "Man doth not live by bread alone, but by *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The Hebrew has it thus: "Man doth not live by bread only, but by *everything* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."

The second quotation is identical in the Hebrew and Septuagint, so that the citation might have been from either of them—viz., "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

The third quotation, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve," follows exactly neither copy. The Hebrew leaves out the word "only." The Septuagint retains that word, but, like the Hebrew, has "fear" instead of "worship."

Another example for study is the text of our Lord's sermon at Nazareth. It is not found as a whole in our Hebrew Bibles. One clause can be found only in the Septuagint, while the remainder cannot be traced to any now known source.

The apostles, taking license doubtless from the example of Christ, or led by their own inspiration, practically ignored the Old Testament Hebrew altogether. Dr. Toy says that "it is not likely that the New Testament writers used the Hebrew text at all." All the Old Testament quotations in the Book of Acts except one (xiii. 4) are from the Septuagint. The Epistle to the Hebrews—a book which, if any stress were to be laid upon exact Hebrew quotation, would assuredly have shown it—is remarkable for utterly ignoring that text and following the Septuagint. Paul was a Hebrew scholar with intense fondness for the heirlooms of Israel, but for some reason or other he also closes the Hebrew roll when he quotes, and opens the Septuagint.

It is very significant that nearly all the New Testament references to the sacredness of the inspired writings occur in Paul's letters to Timothy.

Timothy was the son of a Greek father. His Bible was undoubtedly the Septuagint; this was to him what our King James' version has been to us—our text-book in the nursery. Yet in speaking to Timothy of the Scriptures which he had, the apostle reminds him (1 Tim. iv. 6) that he had been “nourished up in the *words of faith* and of good doctrine” (2 Tim. iii. 15); “from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation” (2 Tim. iv. 15); “Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.”

It may be said in explanation of this use of the Septuagint in preference to the Hebrew text that the people could not understand the Hebrew; that even in Palestine the once sacred tongue was nearly forgotten. This is true, but not to such an extent as to account for the fact noted. The Hebrew was read in many of the synagogues of Palestine; the rabbis were familiar with it. Indeed, they insisted loudly upon its restoration, going so far as to commemorate the translation of the Old Testament into Greek by a day of fasting and humiliation.

But even if the people had entirely lost the Hebrew text, surely our Lord and the apostles could have literally translated from it. There is but one satisfactory explanation of their not doing so—viz., that they saw no reason for supplanting the accepted Septuagint version. For three hundred years after Christ the Christian Church saw no reason for reverting to the Hebrew. It was not until Jerome's day that the attempt was made, and even then it was opposed by such men as Augustine on the ground that the example of Christ and the apostles had made the Septuagint to be virtually the inspired Word.

Now the fact that the Septuagint was practically the Bible of Jesus, the apostles, and of the Church during all the ages of its planting, raises the question whether any features in which the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew can be essential to real inspiration.

There are several respects in which the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew. We limit the discussion in this article to one—viz., it is *not a literal* or *verbal* translation; it is a rendering only of the general thoughts, and not even then in rhetorical details.

We select almost at random. Take Psalm xxiii. We read in our Bibles, “The Lord is my Shepherd.”

The Septuagint has it, “The Lord shepherds me.” Here the noun is changed to a verb.

Hebrew: “He maketh me to *lie down* in green pastures.”

Septuagint: “He makes me *dwell* (literally, encamp, pitch my tent) in a place of verdure.”

Hebrew: “My cup runneth over.”

Septuagint: “*Thy* cup *cheereth* me like the best (of the wine.)”

The translators have not only made free with the language, but have

even introduced different tropes, so that the Psalm retains not much more than the idea of God as a Shepherd, King, and Host.

Such examples might be quoted by hundreds.

We cannot avoid the question, "Did Christ and the apostles, who chose to draw their quotations from this version rather than from the Hebrew, believe in what some moderns are insisting upon—viz., the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament? If they did, their ignoring of the Hebrew verbiage is simply amazing. Indeed, to my mind, their silence regarding the original books is a great gulf in which the verbal theory is swallowed up as effectually as were Korah, Dathan and Abiram.

It is interesting to note the arguments with which the advocates of the verbal theory endeavor to meet the inference from the apostolic use of the Septuagint.

That I may deal fairly with them I will quote from recent statements.

In a letter to one of our papers denunciatory of those who cannot accept the verbal theory, the writer says: "Where our Lord used this version (Septuagint) He set the seal of inspiration on it." To which we reply, then, we have two reports of what an Old Testament writer said, both claiming to be verbally accurate, yet differing in their verbiage, which is an absurdity. We do not dispute the statement that our Lord gave the authority of inspiration to whatever he quoted; but when he represents a previous writer as saying a certain thing, and we find that said writer did not use the identical words that Christ puts upon his pen, but only the general thought, it seems to us to be the extreme folly of bigotry to assert that He set the seal of His inspiration on more than He quoted. Indeed, such an assertion is virtually a charge of untruthfulness against the Master. We cannot wonder that the reverence and candor of Bible scholars is offended at such claim.

Another method of avoiding our inference from the New Testament use of the Old was recently proposed by a prominent controversialist—viz., there may have been an old Hebrew text differing from that we now possess which both the New Testament and the Septuagint writers followed. If we should grant this, the inference would be more disastrous to the verbal theory, for then we would have *two original* documents which are verbally diverse, unless we assume that our received Hebrew text is erroneous—an assumption which the verbalist would of course deny. It is the habit of some critics when pressed with a present difficulty to take refuge in something which they imagine may have been in remote antiquity; but it is only losing themselves deeper in the woods.

The most plausible expedient of the verbal theorists is to fall back upon what they claim to be the explicit declaration of the apostle in 1 Cor. ii. 13, "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." But this has weight only with the reader of the English Bible. Liddell and Scott's lexicon says of the word *logos*, the plural of which is used in this passage, "It never

means a *word* in the grammatical sense, but rather the thing referred to—not the formal part.” The Greek equivalent of *words* would be the plural of either *rama* or *epos*. Dr. Lange remarks on this passage: “We are not to suppose that any actual dictation of the language is intended, but only an operation of the Spirit upon the mind, which strongly pervades and controls even the speech and modes of exhibition—in short, a simple discourse which proceeds directly from a heart possessed by the Spirit of God.”

But we must not be led away from the point at issue. Christ and His apostles, with the Hebrew text at hand, prefer to use the diverse Septuagint or the Aramaic. They make no reference to any original writing as any better. The common mind asks this question: Is not a method of dealing with Scripture which was satisfactory to the founders of the Church in teaching religious doctrine good enough for us who sit at their feet as learners? And what the alleged necessity of vexing the modern Church with another theory which is fraught with such logical and scriptural difficulties that it is, perhaps, the most prolific source of sceptical suggestions?

III.—MODERN EVANGELISTIC MOVEMENTS; THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE ORGANIC LIFE OF THE CHURCH.

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

CICERO's favorite maxim was that every orator should at an early stage of his address make himself to be understood by his auditor, and thus come with the hearer upon a common ground. We think the same principle obtains between a writer and his readers. And so we begin by a definition of terms. Of course it is understood that evangelism is nothing more nor less than the proclamation of good tidings. An evangelistic movement, therefore, is a movement which has the spreading of Gospel good news as its great object. We are not, then, discussing edification, but evangelization.

There are certain peculiarities of the modern evangelistic movements which ought to be kept at the front in the discussion of this subject. First, there is a distinct class of professed evangelists now working in connection with our organized church life. This class is somewhat numerous, and somewhat varied in the character of those who assume these functions. Many of these evangelists are not educated men. They have never been through colleges or theological schools, they have never been ordained by Methodist Conference, Baptist Association, Presbytery, or Congregational body. Sometimes they are not responsible men, in the sense that they have no regular ecclesiastical connection, and they are not infrequently peculiar and erratic, to say the least. In writing thus we do not mean to intimate that there are not among them many men of true education,

refinement, doctrinal soundness, and fitness for the work of an evangelist. We are speaking only in general terms, and of modern evangelists as a class.

Secondly, the sphere of their labor is generally found in connection with our organized churches, and even among the most intelligent, active, and highly developed church organizations. It is not infrequent that an evangelist will not consent to undertake work in connection with any single church, but that he demands, as a requisite and condition of his coming, that a larger or smaller number of churches should be united in the effort. We have known a prominent modern evangelist to stipulate that twenty churches should be associated in the meetings which he conducted. As a consequence, the evangelists frequently bestow their labors for the most part upon habitual hearers of the Gospel. Their audiences are often almost exclusively composed of persons who are accustomed to attend places of worship. They reach but few of the non-church-goers, the neglected and lapsed masses of our great communities. In other words, they oftentimes go over the same ground that the pastor has trodden for many years.

Thirdly, the methods of evangelists are oftentimes peculiar and even questionable. The work they do is sometimes amazingly superficial. The great temptation is before them and before the churches with which they are associated to magnify results on a numerical scale; and the numbering of the people, as in the days of David, brings the combined evils of war, pestilence, and famine. There is a tendency to superficial methods of getting and numbering converts, who are sometimes received into the Church on the impulse of the moment without proper investigation as to credible evidence of a regenerate character. They are swept in on the wave of a popular excitement, and become mere driftwood to lie along the shore, an obstacle to progress, having no vital relation to the Church of God. We need not refer to the innovations which are oftentimes introduced into our church life, and to the unpleasant memorials of evangelistic visits which sometimes confront the pastor for months or even years after the evangelist withdraws. That much good is done, and that, in the hands of a wise and holy man, great results for good are often reaped we would not for a moment question; yet we have candidly touched upon some of the objectionable features of modern evangelistic work to which none of us is blind, and the full force of which some of us have felt when such movements have been conducted within our own churches.

A second part of our theme demands at least a rapid glance at the organic life of the Church. We raise simply two or three questions which seem to us to demand a thorough investigation. First, what is the effect of such evangelistic movements upon the ordinary pulpit ministrations? Is it not their tendency to create dissatisfaction, or at least discouragement, as to the ordinary work of the minister and pastor, so that but little fruit will be expected from the regular ministrations of the man of God?

Secondly, is the proper normal sphere of an evangelist to be found within ordinary churches of Christ properly organized and supplied with the means of grace? The object of an evangelist would seem to be the reaching of non-church-goers. Apostolic evangelists pushed, like Philip and Paul, for the regions beyond; they did not preach the Gospel where Christ had been named, or build upon another man's foundation, but they pressed for territory yet unoccupied for Christ. They sought to herald the Gospel in parts where as yet the voice of the Gospel herald had not been heard; and we cannot persuade ourselves that this is not the normal sphere for evangelists.

Let us stop to consider that, in our Lord's last commission, there are three distinct departments of church life indicated. First, "Go ye into all the world and *preach the Gospel* to every creature; second, "*baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" third, "*teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

There are, then, three things to be done: First, far and wide to proclaim the Gospel message. That is *evangelizing* in its proper sense. Secondly, to administer the sacraments, engrafting believers into Christ, leading them to a confession of their faith, and providing for their edification; and thirdly, a larger work of instruction in all things comprehended within the teachings of the Lord Jesus. Now if we are correct in our interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles, the work of the evangelist was in primitive times heralding the Gospel especially to those unacquainted with the good tidings; and the work of the pastor or bishop was to edify and educate believers in a fuller knowledge of the things of God, administering the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and systematically training the children of God in the knowledge and the practice of godliness. Whenever the evangelist invades the sphere of the pastor he seems to us out of place, and his misplacement must be vindicated, if at all, by some change in the conditions of church life and of society at large. We do not say that evangelists have no place in our church economy and within our ordinary congregations. We simply raise the question for candid consideration.

Now, thirdly, as to the results in our own congregations. There is always a liability or possibility of erroneous teaching when a stranger comes into our pulpits to preach for any length of time who does not come by authority of the ecclesiastical body with which we are connected, and whose views are not known to be in accord with the views entertained and promulgated by the pastor himself. We have heard one of the most prominent modern evangelists preach a doctrine of forgiveness which we believe to be directly and diametrically opposed to Scripture teaching—that forgiveness represented a declarative act on the part of God; that it was final and unconditional, and therefore, as this evangelist himself expressed it, "a forgiven sinner may ultimately drop into hell!" It is

oftentimes out of the power of the minister of Christ to protest against these erroneous views without interfering with the success of the evangelist, while at the same time the minister may thoroughly disapprove of that to which he feels compelled tacitly to submit. It may also be a question whether there be not, after prolonged evangelistic services, a tendency to relapse into an abnormal condition of discouragement and idleness. The excitement passes away, the special services come to an end, the visible results begin decidedly to diminish, and the tendency is to create and foster a distrust as to the efficiency of the means of grace as ordinarily carried forward. We have heard a godly and aged minister of Christ affirm that he had taken particular notice of the fact that the churches whose growth during fifty years was largest and most steady were those which never had an evangelist within their walls, whose pastor was an evangelist and an educator at the same time.

Now, having raised these questions, we venture a few closing suggestions on a general subject. First, that evangelists shall be encouraged to bestow their labors for the most part among those who do not now attend any house of God, to go into the neglected quarters of our great cities or rural districts and undertake to bring under the power of the Gospel those who are ignorant and indifferent. In southern New York City alone sixteen churches have moved out while 360,000 people have moved in. There are districts within a mile of the established churches in our great metropolitan centres where virtually heathen abound, and into which overworked pastors cannot be expected largely to go. We need especially a class of men and women who will make these neglected districts the spheres of their labors; and here evangelists might carry on their activities with the hearty consent and co-operation of Christian churches, without any reasonable objection ever being raised to their labors; and untold blessings might follow in the train of such efforts.

Secondly, we have long felt that, if pastors need occasionally in their churches the assistance of evangelists in times of special religious interest, it might be well if *other pastors*, having decidedly evangelistic qualifications, might come to the aid of their brethren at such times, and thus fill up the gap, leaving the professed evangelist free for this other and larger work among the neglectors of Christ and the Gospel. Such methods are largely followed in the Anglican churches to-day. Such pastors might be known as "pastoral evangelists," coming to stand by the side of their brethren in the ministry, in full sympathy with all the toils and trials of a pastor's life, amenable to the same ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and in assured sympathy as to doctrinal views and practical methods. In such cases also the reins would not be passed out of the pastor's hand. He would still be in the conduct of the affairs of his own church, having another pastor at his side as a temporary helper.

Thirdly, personally we have a strong conservative feeling with respect to

what are called "revivals." In our own ministerial life we have had many proofs of the sovereignty of grace, that revivals cannot be gotten up but must come down, and that the true method is to follow the leadership of the Holy Spirit; and when a state of things in a congregation seems to demand some special effort, to be ready promptly to fall in with the leadings of Divine Providence and grace. It is to be feared that oftentimes we invert this order by seeking to produce a higher state of religious feeling simply by the multiplication of religious services. We remember seeing an entire Sunday-school bowed before Almighty God in tears under the simplest ordinary presentation of the truth in Christ; but that awakening had been preceded by much prayer to Almighty God, and resulted in the conversion of nearly every Sunday-school scholar in the school. We are confident that, if the ordinary means of grace were more diligently and prayerfully pursued, if pastors themselves expected and taught their people to expect a perpetual blessing on the means of grace, there would very few religious services be held, or sermons be preached, or Sunday-school lessons be taught that would not, properly followed up, be found to be fruitful in the conversion of souls.

We add one last consideration, which is, perhaps, the most emphatic of all. We must teach our people that a part, a necessary part, of our organic life is the exhibition of an evangelistic activity by every true disciple of Jesus Christ; that the minister is but the leader of a church *force* for which the whole world is the *field*; that preaching the Gospel in its scriptural sense is the announcement of the good tidings of redemption backed by a personal witness to their power in the individual soul of the believer. We must seek to abolish all rigid lines of distinction between the clergy and the laity in the promulgation of these good tidings. We must educate our people that they are not to be simply receivers but distributors of the grace of God; not sponges put asoak in Gospel doctrine, but means to illumine the darkness that has overspread the world. When church-members learn this fundamental truth that every believer is a herald and a witness for Christ, church-members will cease to regard themselves as the objects of labor, and become themselves laborers for others. We believe that the tendency in some quarters is toward too much preaching and teaching in our churches, in the presence of habitual church-goers, and especially church-members, and toward a lack of personal work; and this is a sort of overfeeding which breeds a kind of spiritual sloth and dyspepsia. God's will is that, so soon as we learn sufficient of the truth to become teachers of those more ignorant than ourselves, we shall cease simply to be as those who hear, and become those who speak that others may hear. Such a return to apostolic methods of universal Christian activity would settle not only all the practical questions raised in this paper, but many more besides, having a vital relation to progressive and aggressive church life.

IV.—APPEALING TO CONSCIOUSNESS.

BY SAMUEL Z. BATTEN, D.D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PHILOSOPHY is confined to the few ; Christianity is meant for all mankind. Philosophers are rare ; habits of scientific investigation are not common. The great majority of mankind have neither the training nor the time to enter upon a philosophic examination of Christian evidences. If Christianity made its appeal to man's logical and analytic faculty alone, the great mass of human kind would be shut out from Christianity, or would be obliged to accept it on the mere authority of philosophers. Such acceptance would be both un-Christian in principle and vicious in result.

Christianity addresses the whole nature of man. It makes its appeal to his intellect, his affections, his will ; it makes demands upon his moral and spiritual being. A religion appealing wholly to one part of man's nature stands convicted of incompleteness, and hence of inadequacy. Christian truth which makes demands upon man's entire being must make its appeal to his entire being. Christianity is designed for all men ; hence it must make its appeal to those primary needs, intuitions, and judgments which are common to all men as men.

If God has made a revelation of Himself for all His children, He has made it possible for every child to recognize the Father's word. It would be a strange revelation that could not be recognized and authenticated by man. To be of value truth must come within man's horizon. Truth to which the mind of man is not adequate is no revelation. But when men tell us that they speak what they do know, and testify of what they have seen, their words come with an authority from which there is no appeal. The only way to question the authority of their words is to throw doubt upon the validity of their consciousness. To all that such men affirm my consciousness may not respond, but if I have confidence in their ability and integrity I dare not deny or reject their words. A revelation to men must come through the consciousness of men. It must make its appeal to man's consciousness to enable its recognition and comprehension. The individual consciousness is not suspended at any stage of the process ; it is employed and becomes the vehicle of the truth. Of course a message to the men of any age must come to them in the language of that age. The story of Creation if told in the language of modern science would have defeated its own purpose. It would have been utterly meaningless to the men of old. The message would have been thirty-five centuries ahead of men's understanding. God addresses men through the avenue of their own conceptions. There is no other way in which a message could be given. Their conceptions are often faulty, often erroneous, but such as they are must be used. Better half truths, false in form, yet useful to men, than a whole truth which is utterly incomprehensible. Christ found certain ideas and terms among the people of His time. To make Himself

understood by the people, He must use the terms with which they were familiar. To have done otherwise would have been to block His way at the very beginning. The message He brings must come down to the level of the men He addressed. All education is twofold : there is an implanting, an unfolding of conceptions in the mind of the pupils ; then there is the classifying of those conceptions, giving them a " local habitation and a name," showing their true import, in a sense localizing them with respect to the other furniture of the mind. A fact is of little value until it is known in its relations with other facts. This is the work that the Master was all the time doing in those who came under His tuition. " I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth ; for He shall not speak of Himself ; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak. And He will shew you things to come. He shall glorify Me ; for He shall receive of Mine and shall shew it unto you." The years went by, full of earnest work ; to the apostles marked by deepening experiences of life ; events became God's interpreters. The words treasured in memory took on a newer and deeper meaning. Every day some word uttered by the Master years before burned with a new light. Words that once had a meaning, a surface meaning, now disclosed unfathomable depths. The words were always true and vital, but under the tuition of the Spirit they took on a wider and greater meaning. The words were always with them, giving them light and joy and strength, yet always beyond them, luring them on to a closer study and an enlarging experience. The " Golden Rule" is as true to the obedient child as to the ripening saint, yet the one sees a far deeper meaning, a diviner beauty, a wider reach in those words than is possible to the other. The words are vital to both ; they are recognized as of Divine authority, yet one sees more truth in them than does the other.

Christ appealed continually to the consciousness of His hearers. He never made use of abstract arguments to establish His claims or to secure men's allegiance. He assumes that every man who hears Him has the power of recognizing His words as true. Tremendous issues are involved in the acceptance or rejection of Him, even the everlasting destiny of the soul. It must then be possible for every man so inclined to recognize Him as the Son of God. The man who had once seen and heard Him had no excuse for his unbelief or rejection. Thus the Master Himself said : " He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Faith in Him did not originate in any outside demonstrations of His divinity ; it did not need the support of any outside evidence to enable His recognition. Jesus Christ is His own surpassing evidence. He Himself has fixed the place of miracles in apologetics. To the eleven wavering between doubt and faith He said : " Believe Me, because I am in the Father, and the Father in Me ; or else believe Me for the very work's sake." Christ did not

count upon miracles to prove His divinity. Miracles could not prove this great fact. Many times He was challenged to work a miracle in proof of His claims, but He always refused. Miracles *per se* could not establish Christ's divinity. For "He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto My Father." A prophet or an apostle performed as great miracles as any that the Son did. The evidence of His Sonship must be sought elsewhere; it must be found in the quality of His life and the essence of His teaching. "I am the Truth," He said; "every one that is of the Truth heareth my voice." A man "of the truth" is something more than one who has a theoretical knowledge of logical relations. A man "of the truth" is one whose heart and mind are exercised upon truth, in finding it and doing it. The Master tells of a man who after death awakes to find himself in a place of torment. He begins to think of his five brothers who are yet in the land of the living. Abraham is importuned to send Lazarus back from the dead to warn them of their danger and to persuade them to repent. But the Master teaches that such a visit of one from the dead would be fruitless. There could be nothing in such a wonder to work repentance in a man's heart. The five brothers were in danger not because they were ignorant, but because they were perverse.

Three years the Lord Jesus went up and down the land teaching, healing, and arousing men. All the time He was finding men out and causing them to find out themselves. One day a lawyer, cool-headed, blind-hearted, tried to entangle the Master. Jesus wants to set forth the meaning and duty of neighborliness. So He tells the touching story of the Good Samaritan. "Which of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor to him that had fallen among thieves?" The lawyer's own consciousness gave the answer. "Well, go thou and do likewise." One day the Pharisees were cavilling at Him for receiving sinners. He at once appeals to the common instinct of every man in justification of His course. "When a man loses one sheep from his flock, what does he do?" And every man in that crowd felt himself saying with the Master, "He leaves the ninety-and-nine and goes out after the lost one until he finds it." Does He want to set forth God's care of His children? Then He points men to the sparrows of the air, the lilies of the field, the child in the father's house. These are more than illustrations happily chosen; to His hearers they were proof in illustration.

In the apostle's speaking and writing we find that a constant appeal is made to the consciousness. Writing to the Corinthians in justification of his course, Paul says that he and his fellow-laborers had not handled the Word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. This is the explanation of that other statement of his—that to the Jew he became as a Jew, to them that are without law as himself without law, to them that are under the law as himself under law. He must bring the

truth of the Gospel within the comprehension of every man. An analysis of Peter's great sermon on the Day of Pentecost is instructive. His auditors were Jews ; hence he appealed to their Jewish ideas, sentiments, and convictions. He began by quoting those Scriptures with which all were familiar and to which all assented. Peter found all the data of his argument in the consciousness of his hearers. There was no escape from his conclusion. As a consequence many were pricked in their hearts, and began anxiously to inquire the way of salvation. Henry Ward Beecher has left on record his testimony on this question. In his first lecture to the Yale students he says that, after preaching some time, he became discouraged. Men were not converted under his ministry. In thinking the matter over he concluded that there was some reason why when the apostles preached men were converted. He determined to find out the reason. So he took every sermon in the record and analyzed it. He asked himself, "What were the circumstances? Who were the people? What did the preacher do?" He studied these sermons until he came to this conclusion: The apostles were accustomed to feel for a ground on which they and the people stood together—a common ground where they could meet. Then when they had got that knowledge which everybody admitted placed in proper form before the minds of the people, they brought this knowledge to bear upon the hearers with all their aroused heart and feeling. So he prepared a sermon on this plan. He set forth some forty things that all his people knew. This sermon, made up of things well known to all, he brought to bear upon his congregation with all his power. Seventeen men were awakened under that one sermon. He tells us that he cried all the way home ; but he had learned how to preach. One day Paul stood before the mocking, sceptical, profligate Agrippa. "The king knoweth of these things whereof I speak." Then he makes one grand appeal to the Jewish consciousness of the man. "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." The shot told, the dart struck, the king was touched. But he rallied himself, resisted his inmost conviction, and, half in earnest, half in scorn, replied, "Now, Paul, with a little more such talk you will soon make a Christian out of me." Agrippa was not converted ; but Paul's effort had not wholly failed. He had touched the heart, and Agrippa saw and felt the truth. The preacher of to-day is one of the channels through which the Holy Spirit convicts men of sin. Men may remain unmoved under our preaching and reasonings ; but the words which the Holy Spirit has caused to be written for our instruction and use will be the Ithuriel's spear that finds the conscience. A man may encase his head in the brazen helmet of scepticism ; he may cover his heart with the steel plate of indifference ; he may enfold himself in the chain mail of evil habit ; but the sword of the Spirit, when wielded by a loving hand, will find out the joints in his harness. "The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a

discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Our congregations are full of convicted men. The truth of the Gospel has an ally in every man's bosom. So long as you are uttering Divine truth some part of your hearer is on your side and verifies your words. Truth is its own sufficient and surpassing evidence. Let the preacher be sure that he has the truth in his heart, then let him speak out of the fulness of his own conviction. Some one will surely be reached and go away pricked in heart. Let him preach the truth and trust that truth to find its way into the heart. Some men are everlastingly trying to prove that the Gospel is the truth of God. No wise man attempts to prove that the sun in the midday heavens is shining.

The preacher must know man—what he is, his nature, his greatness, his littleness. He must know the human heart in all its ins and outs; he must be able to follow the man to his very inmost being. There is no man whom we can pronounce beyond reach of the Gospel. However sinful and degraded a man may be, no one can say of him that every human trait and trace has been obliterated. A person stands before a piano and sounds a certain tone. At once the corresponding chord in the instrument answers back, faintly it may be, but yet an answer. So, when the preacher stands before men he must feel that in every man's breast there is some chord ready to vibrate to its appropriate tone. His work is to find that chord and appeal to it. The man of course may resist the appeal, but with this the preacher has nothing to do. Jesus Christ went among the downtrodden, the outcast, the lost. With a Master's hand He swept the whole range of human hearts. And from many hearts, long stubborn and rebellious, came some answering tone of heaven's own melody. The Lord Jesus honored the nature to which He appealed. He knew that somewhere within every man there was a chord capable of responding to the Divine truth. Christ never lost hope of any man. He knew what was in man. He knew the height from which man had fallen. Only too well He knew the bitterness, hatred, and sinfulness of the men He met. To lose hope of any man is faithless; to lose faith in the Gospel is sinful. "Man looketh on the outward appearance." And often the outward appearance is bad enough and sad enough. Below a sneering face and a defiant look may be a struggling, yearning heart. By day men's lives may be shameless and reckless; but through all the night their hearts may be restless, hoping, fearing, agonizing, doubting, aspiring. Only He who seeth in secret hears the inarticulate and unuttered cries that come from the most sinful hearts. Could we see into the inner lives of some of our wretched, hopeless followers, the vision would almost break our hearts. Hell might become endurable if the lost could lose all memory of the heaven they had missed. It is the heaven that men are daily losing that makes the bitterness of the hell they are daily entering. Men have tasted of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. We know evil because we also know good. Evil has indeed been admitted to a place in human life.

But God has not abandoned man. Between man and evil there can be no real friendship. Man may give his hands to be fettered by sin, but always a part of the soul rises up in protest. In the eternal and innermost verities of their natures all men have much in common. "Every human heart is human." Some word of hope, some act of kindness, some expression of interest, some taken of love, has often been God's messenger to the human heart.

Argument has its place and its work. It may clear a standing-room for faith, it may show that faith is not presumption; it never can create faith. "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." A man may live along for years in unbelief and indifference; but some day a new argument startles him out of his indifference; his unbelief is shown to be weak. The man listens with a new attention to the truth; it finds him, he yields to it. The argument does its work. But nothing is more vain than the attempt to work a moral and spiritual change by rhetorical reasonings. The noble words of Martineau, speaking of moral appeals, are apposite: "If you cannot speak home to the conscience at once, condescend to no lower plea to reach the throne-room of the soul; Divine and holy things must pass by her grand and royal entry, and will refuse to creep up the back stairs of greediness and gain. Notwithstanding all that philosophers have said about the agreement of virtue with rational self-interest, it may be doubted whether their reasonings ever recalled by a single step any wandering will; while it is notorious that the rugged earnestness of many a preacher, assuming a consciousness of sin, and speaking to nothing else, has awakened multitudes to a new life, and carried them out of their former nature" ("Types of Ethical Theory," Vol. II., p. 77). Arguments and doctrines have their place. Men must have the strong meat of the Word. Milk-fed Christians never get beyond the infant stage. The great primary, essential, and fundamental facts of Christianity must be set forth with all the force and variety of which the preacher is capable. They must be enforced by exposition, argument, illumination, illustration. The work of the preacher is to decompose a doctrine, analyze it to its elements, throw illumination upon its details. The preacher must lay siege to the heart, conscience, and will of his hearers. He may resort to a Divine strategy to win them for the Master. He must believe in the Gospel, he must have hope of man. Men need the truth which he has to communicate. The Gospel is adapted by its Divine Founder to man's nature. Faith that unites to Christ and saves the soul is possible to all; correct opinions on all doctrines is the peculiar privilege of the few. After all, a correct theology is not synonymous with Christian faith. The devils have excellent opinions on many topics; they are far in advance of many men in their ideas of God, the divinity of Christ, the glories of heaven and the horrors of hell; yet they are devils still.

The great vital, primary, and essential truths of Christianity shine by their own light and authenticate themselves. What is true to the preacher

may also be true to the hearer. Divine truth is no isolated, impersonal thing. The Gospel to be effective must have a continuous incarnation. The truth must come through a personality. The preacher must know in himself whereof he speaks to men. To go forth with power, his words must be the utterance of his own experience; they must come through his affections, his intellect, his will, through his whole being. What he has verified in his own consciousness he can commend to others. A prophet is needed in every pulpit in our land. The prophet is one who witnesses for God and His truth. The Church also has the prophetic function. The world needs men who can speak upon all the great questions of life at first hand; men who see with their own eyes, hear with their own ears, understand with their own hearts; men who have a new and fresh intuition of Christ; men who can speak of what they do know and testify of what they have seen. The presence of even a few such souls would mean the coming again of an apostolic age.

V.—THE PRAYER OF ASENETH.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH.D., ALLEGHENY, PA.

IN the Book of Genesis the history of Asenath (or Aseneth, according to the Septuagint) is given in a few words. She is said to have been the daughter of Potiphar, priest of On, and became the wife of Joseph. It is remarkable that Joseph, who adhered to the faith of his father, should have married a strange woman. Jewish legend no doubt felt this difficulty, and removed it by stating that Aseneth was the daughter of Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, and was brought up by Potiphar's wife, who was childless. Be this as it may, we have now a more complete history of Aseneth. In his *Speculum Historiale*, Vincent of Beauvais (thirteenth century) gives us a narrative of Joseph's marriage with Aseneth. The Latin text was no doubt taken from a Greek original. The Latin text was reprinted by Fabricius (*Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, I., pp. 774 seq.), who also published a fragment of the Greek in the second volume of his *Codex* (II., p. 85 seq.). Other Latin manuscripts are in England. In 1885 an Armenian version was published at Venice, and part of it was translated into French by Carrière (*Nouveaux Mélanges Orientaux*, 1886). An Ethiopic version, as well as an Arabic, made from a Syriac of the sixth century, is also mentioned. In Persia our Apocrypha must have already been known in the fifteenth century, because it inspired that famous Persian legend of *Yussuf and Suleika*, by Firdussi (translated for the first time into German by Schlechta-Wssehrd, Vienna, Gerold, 1889).

Very recently the complete Greek text of our Apocrypha was published by the French scholar Abbé Batiffol, according to four manuscripts in *Studia Patristica*, "Études d'ancienne littérature chrétienne" (Part I., II., Paris, 1889-90), under the title the "Prayer of Aseneth." This title,

however, is misleading, because it does not fully express the real contents of our book. A more proper title is "The Story of Aseneth and Joseph," for the "prayer" only commences with the twelfth chapter, and is the connecting link which leads to the marriage of Joseph with Aseneth. It seems that this religious romance was once widely known in the East, for in the Syriac catalogue of ecclesiastical books by Ebed Jesu, at the end of the thirteenth century, "the book of Asiatha, the wife of Joseph the Just, the son of Jacob," stands before "the book of Tobias and Tobith, the just Israelites" (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III., 4) and "Asseneth" likewise occurs between Judith and Esther in an Ethiopic list of canonical books (*Brit. Mus. Add.* 16,188; see Dillmann's Catalogue, p. 4).

Time of composition. We can infer the date of composition from the Syriac version. This version was made by Moses of Aggel, the same who made a Syriac translation of the "Glaphyra," or polished comments on the Pentateuch by Cyril of Alexandria. Since Moses of Aggel lived according to Wright (*art. Syriac Literature* in *Encyclop. Brit.*, p. 836) in the sixth century, we may presume that our romance belongs to the fifth.

Author. It is difficult to tell who and what the author was. No doubt he was a Christian, but made use of Jewish traditional matter; perhaps he was a Jewish-Christian, and belonged to the school from which emanated *The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs.*

Contents of the book according to Batiffol's edition. In the first year of plenty, in the fourth month and on the eighteenth day of the month, Joseph came to Heliopolis to gather the corn there. In that city lived one of Pharaoh's satraps and chief named Pentephres (in the Septuagint Petephres), a priest of that place. He had a very beautiful daughter eighteen years of age, who had nothing of the daughters of the Egyptians, but was in all respects like the daughters of the Hebrews—tall like Sarah, comely like Rebecca, and beautiful as Rachel. The fame of Aseneth's beauty spread all over the country, and reached the ear of Pharaoh's first-born son, who asked his father to give her to him for a wife, but was refused on the plea of her being not his equal (ch. 1). The second chapter describes her place of residence in the splendid upper story of a tower in her father's house, where she lived with her seven virgin attendants. Here she also worshipped the different Egyptian gods of silver and gold, of which she had a great many. In this tower Aseneth spent her time, disdaining all lovers.

On the very day on which Joseph had come to Heliopolis, he sent word to Pentephres that he would come and refresh himself at his house. Aseneth, having dressed herself most elegantly, went down to meet her parents who came from the field. When she was informed of Joseph's arrival and of her father's wish that she should marry Joseph, she became excited, and said: "Why dost thou, my lord father, speak these words? Wilt thou give me for a slave to a stranger and fugitive and purchased person? Is he not the shepherd's son from the land of Canaan? Is he

not the one who wished to lie with his mistress, and his master put him in the dark prison, and Pharaoh took him out from there, as he interpreted his dreams in the same manner as also the elder women of the Egyptians interpret? Nay, but I will become the wife of the king's first-born son, because he is the king of all the land" (ch. 3, 4).

While Aseneth was thus expostulating, Joseph's arrival was announced. All went out to meet Joseph excepting Aseneth, who had gone to her room, where from her window she watched the entrance of Joseph. When she beheld him entering, she declared that by his beauty he must be "the Son of God;" she became greatly troubled in her heart, and repented the bitter words she had spoken to her father concerning him. Yea, she wished she could become Joseph's slave to serve him forever (ch. 5, 6).

Having been seated at a separate table, since Joseph regarded it as an abomination to eat with the Egyptians, he lifted up his eyes and saw Aseneth at the window. Being weary of the advances made to him by the daughters of Egypt, he requested that she be sent away. But upon being informed that it was Aseneth, a hater of man, whom no male had ever seen yet, Joseph grants her father's request that she should come and salute Joseph. Having been brought before Joseph, she salutes him: "Hail, O lord, blessed of the most high God!" To which Joseph replied: "May the God who vivifies all bless thee, O maid!" But when at her father's bidding she went forward to kiss Joseph, he repelled her, saying: "It is not proper for a God-fearing man, who blesses with his mouth the living God, and eats the blessed bread of life, and drinks the blessed cup of immortality, to kiss a strange woman who blesses with her mouth dead and dumb idols," etc. When Aseneth heard these words, she became very sad and dejected. Joseph seeing her tears, laid his right hand on her head and said: "O Lord, the God of my father Israel, the most high and powerful God, who makest alive all things, and callest from darkness to light, and from error to truth, and from death to life, bless Thou also this virgin, and quicken and renew her with Thy holy spirit, that she might eat the bread of life and drink the cup of Thy blessing, and number her with Thy people whom Thou hast chosen before the world was, and that she might enter into Thy rest which Thou hast prepared for Thy elect, and live in Thy eternal life unto eternity" (ch. 7, 8)!

When Joseph had departed, Aseneth returned to her room, rejoicing at his blessing, but full of grief and fear. Having flung her idols and her meats out of the window, she sat seven days in sackcloth and ashes, neither eating nor drinking anything, nor opening her mouth. On the eighth day she poured out her heart before God in a most humble and childlike prayer and confession (ch. 9-13).

When she had ceased making a confession, behold, the sky was rent with a great light near the morning star, and an angel appeared before her,

introducing himself as the commander-in-chief of the Lord God, and the general of the army of the Most High. He tells her to arise and to take off her mourning dress and to put on a white new dress, for the Lord God has heard all the words of her confession and prayer, and that her name is written in the book of life, and shall not be blotted out forever. "From this day thou art renewed and quickened, and thou shalt eat the blessed bread of life and the cup filled with incorruption, and shall be anointed with the blessed chrism of immortality. To-day thou shalt be a spouse to Joseph, and he shall be thy bridegroom forever. And thy name shall be no more Aseneth, but thy name shall be City of Refuge, for unto thee shall many nations flee and rest under thy wings, and many nations shall be protected by thee, and upon thy walls shall those be defended who entreat the most high God in repentance, because repentance is the daughter of the Most High, and she moves the highest God for all those who repent," etc. Invited by Aseneth to refresh himself, the angel bids her to bring a honeycomb. Being perplexed, because she had none in her room, she intends to send a little boy to a neighboring place to get one; but he causes one to appear miraculously, which she is bidden to bring from her other room. When she had brought the comb the angel said: "Blessed art thou, Aseneth, for unto thee were revealed the secret mysteries of God, and blessed are all who entreat the Lord in repentance, for they shall eat of this comb which is the spirit of life and made by the bees of the paradise of delight from the dew of the roses of life which are in the paradise of God, and from every blossom, and of it eat the angels and all the chosen ones of God, and all the sons of the Most High, and whosoever eats of it shall never die." Having taken a small piece, the angel ate of it, and the rest he put into Aseneth's mouth, saying, "Eat." Out of the comb came numberless white bees with purple wings, and made and ate of fresh comb on Aseneth's mouth till the angel bade them to go to their place. Once more the angel touched the comb, when a fire came out from the table, which ate the comb, but injured not the table. Being asked by Aseneth to bless her seven virgin attendants, the angel did so. This done, the angel bade her to remove the table; and as she turned around to do so the angel disappeared before her eyes, going up in a chariot toward heaven (ch. 14-17).

As soon as the angel had departed Joseph arrived. Aseneth met him and told him the words of the angel. When Joseph heard them he embraced Aseneth. She then led him into the house, and having seated him on her father's throne, she washed his feet. When her parents came from the field they all rejoiced, and praised God. When the meal was over, Pentephres said to Joseph: "To-morrow I will make a wedding for you." But Joseph replied: "I will go to-morrow to Pharaoh, the king, for he is my father and made me ruler, and will ask him to give Aseneth to me for a wife." And thus it came about. Pharaoh made a great banquet for Joseph, which lasted seven days, and during this time no one

was allowed to labor under penalty of death. Aseneth conceived, and brought forth Manasseh and Ephraim (ch. 18-21).

In the second year of the famine Jacob and his family had settled at Goshen. Aseneth and Joseph went to see him, and were met by Joseph's brothers. Jacob, upon seeing Aseneth, was surprised at her beauty, as she was surprised at his beautiful appearance. After having exchanged the mutual salutations, Joseph and Aseneth returned to their home, being accompanied by Simeon and Levi, whereas the sons of Balla and Zelpha, Leah's and Rachel's maidens, hated them. Aseneth took an especial likening to Levi because he was a prophet and revealed unto her the secret letters written in heaven. On the way to Jacob, however, Aseneth was seen by Pharaoh's first-born son, who, enamored of her, tried to bribe Simeon and Levi to slay Joseph. The brothers were indignant at the proposal, and Simeon would have killed him had Levi not interfered. The brothers left him, advising him at the same time never to say aught against Joseph. Having failed with them, Pharaoh's son tried the sons of Leah's and Rachel's maidens. He told them of an interview Joseph had with Pharaoh his father, in which Joseph stated that Dan, and Gad, and Naphthalim, and Aser were not his brothers, and as soon as his father were dead he would kill them because they sold him unto the Ishmaelites. Hearing this, they agreed to the murder of Joseph, whereas he himself set about killing his father. In this he was baffled by Pharaoh's guard, who refused him to enter the king's room. He then joined the ambuscade of Joseph's brethren and their armed men, who were covered by the thicket of the reed. Aseneth, accompanied by Benjamin and a retinue, was on her way to the fields when she was overtaken by the men, who rushed from the ambush. A fight ensued, and she would have certainly fallen into the hands of Pharaoh's son had not Levi in the spirit perceived the danger and told his brethren of it, who hastened to Aseneth's rescue. In the mean time Benjamin had lifted up a heavy stone, with which he hit the head of Pharaoh's son, that he fell from the horse. When the brothers had arrived on the battle-ground Aseneth interceded in behalf of the treacherous ones. When Benjamin was about to kill Pharaoh's son, Levi prevented the deed not only, but also tended the wounded man and brought him home to his father, who blessed Levi for his action. But on the third day the wounded son died, and Pharaoh's grief was so great that he soon afterward became sick and died, one hundred and nine years old, leaving the crown to Joseph, who acted as regent forty-eight years in Egypt. Joseph then gave the crown to Pharaoh's youngest son, to whom he was like a father during his minority (ch. 22-29).

Such are the contents of the "Prayer of Aseneth." One manuscript adds yet at the end besides the words found in Genesis i. 22-26: "And Aseneth died also after the burial of Joseph her suitor. For all this let us praise the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit now, and always, and forever and ever. Amen."

SERMONIC SECTION.

SONSHIP IN THE FAMILY OF GOD.

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR JAMES F. LATIMER, D.D., LL.D. [PRESBYTERIAN], HAMPDEN SIDNEY, VA.

But as many as received Him, to them gave He power (margin, the right or privilege) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.—John i. 12, 13.

THERE is a sense in which all men are the children of God; and this is a truth which may be discovered independently of revelation. When Paul addressed that throng of doubting philosophers on Mars Hill, he could appeal to certain of the Greek poets who had declared that they were the offspring of God.

Every human being is a son of God in this sense of the term, because he owes to God the origin of his life and the preservation of his existence, "for in Him we live, and move, and have our being." Again, he is a son of God because he has been endowed by his Maker with certain attributes which constitute the ineffaceable image of the Deity. Like God, he is an intelligent being capable of knowing the truth; he possesses a will and the power of choice; he is able to discern good and evil, and feels the obligation to do right and abstain from wrong. However men differ from one another in other things, they are all alike in these respects; and however wide the gulf between them and God in other regards, they bear His image in these, and may on that account be called His sons.

But that is a sense far higher than this in which the sacred writer employs the word in our text. It includes, in fact, much more than could be affirmed of our first parent even before the fall, although, in addition to being endowed with the faculties already mentioned, he was made capable of spiritual knowledge, and had the law of God written upon his heart. Notwithstanding the

fact that he was possessed of righteousness and true holiness after the image of God, he was not a son, in the highest sense, but only placed in position to become one. By creation he was holy, but only a holy *servant*. He had and could have while he continued in that original estate no rights beyond the moment. He could not justly have been a sufferer while he obeyed, but he had no vested claims for the future. In this estate his Sovereign Creator would not leave him. He would lift him to a place nearer to Himself, He would confer upon him, together with all his posterity, the rights of an heir in the family of a Divine Father.

You are familiar with God's gracious scheme for the accomplishment of this beneficent purpose, whereby through the faithfulness of our Federal Head He would transfer the entire human race from the sphere of perpetual probation to that of everlasting security and blessedness. You are no less familiar with the story of our first parent's unfaithfulness, and his far-reaching sin which brought with it ruin for himself and for all those who through him were to become the sons of God.

Now, my friends, it was this same task of introducing us into the family of God that Jesus of Nazareth undertook, but that task complicated with a difficulty most appalling in its character. Those who were to be elevated to sonship stood no longer in the place of servants, but of condemned criminals. No steps toward the accomplishment of the Divine purpose could be taken before the curse should be removed, for that curse meant separation of every soul upon whom it rested from God. Therefore Jesus abolished that curse, for as many as receive Him—namely, for those who are to become the sons of God.

But it must be evident to you that the removal of guilt is not all that is necessary; for when that has been done, if nothing else is done, we stand

just where Adam stood. We are not condemned, but we have nothing to offer on the basis of which rights may be conferred. Jesus Christ, our Federal Head, does not leave us there. By the provisions of the covenant under which He stands for us, His holy obedience is ours, and as for His sufferings we are pardoned, so for His obedience are we accepted. He who receives Jesus—that is, exercises faith in Him, becomes righteous in Him. This you recognize as the doctrine of justification by faith.

At that same moment, being accepted of God, the believer is recognized as one entitled to the rights and privileges of a son of God. This is *adoption*, a transaction inseparable from justification, and one which is grounded upon the same great facts. It is of this that the apostle speaks in our text: "As many as received Him, to them gave He power (the right or privilege) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." The first truth, then, presented to us here is, that *believers acquire through Jesus Christ legal status as veritable members of God's family, and become possessed by an indefeasible title of all the rights of sons.*

You observe that, thus far, we have been dealing with legal relations and with these alone. Now we all know that it is very important that we should sustain correct legal relations with our fellow-men. When God is a party, it is of supreme importance that they should be right. These legal relations which we have been considering lie at the basis of all those hopes that reach beyond this present life; but for all that they, like all other mere legal relations, are external in their character, and, like all external relations, take on their highest significance only when there is that within which answers to that which is without.

Nowhere is this correspondence more important than in the case of the family. That family is one in name but not in reality of which it cannot be said that the outward bond is signifi-

cant of a tie which binds heart to heart. That son is not one in the truest sense between whom and his father there is not the closest sympathy and fellowship. Sonship in the family of God, then, involves *God-likeness*. The Holy Spirit forms in every one upon whom is conferred the right to become a son of God "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

Thus is realized the second element involved in the sonship of which the text speaks, when it declares that the sons of God are "*born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*" There is *birth from above*; birth which establishes true kinship with God; the implantation of a nature which brings the soul into sympathy with God as a father, and makes it a joy to serve Him and hold fellowship with Him.

It need scarcely be mentioned that both these transactions, of which I have been speaking—that by which the rights of sonship are conferred, as well as that by which the new nature is implanted—are acts of God, completed at once. He who is made a son is, in the first moment of his sonship, as fully entitled to all the rights which ever shall attach to that estate as he ever will be. Again, he acquires instantaneously, by the almighty operation of the Spirit, that life which characterizes the new creature.

But just here we must note a difference. The new creature, though instantly brought into existence, is infantile. Its powers are instinct with vitality, but it is the vitality of the newborn babe. There must be growth and development through many stages till the vigor and perfection of manhood is attained.

A moment's consideration must convince you that it is necessary there should be outward favoring conditions in order to this growth. Such outward conditions are necessary to the expansion of any and all forms of life. So it is here. When the appropriate conditions for the growth of the child of

God are realized, he advances constantly toward perfect likeness to his Father, and finally develops every grace which belonged to Jesus Christ, who, as "Son of man," realized the ideal which is the destined goal of every son of God.

Now one of these conditions of growth is the constant favor of God; and this becomes possible only because the outward legal relations which belong to sonship exist, only because the right to become a son of God has been conferred.

This is true because it is only by becoming possessed of the rights of sonship, through union with Jesus Christ, that the sinner's *guilt* is removed and the way is opened for his acceptance by God. There can be no favor of God toward him upon whom guilt rests; but it is the right of the son to have no guilt, and to be accepted of God as worthy—just as worthy as Jesus Christ. More than that, it is the right of the son to be secure against the possibility of ever contracting guilt again, or of ever losing, for one moment, the favor of God.

You will not, I am sure, misunderstand me. You will not suppose that I mean to assert that those who have been adopted into the family of God never commit sin nor ever fall under the displeasure of God. Of no living man can it be truthfully said that he never breaks the law of God. "If we say we have no sin," says John, "we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." The ripest saint, as well as the most immature Christian, has occasion to lament his shortcomings and positive transgressions every day; but to say this is very different from saying that he has forfeited his sonship and is no longer accepted by God as His child, which must be the result if he become guilty—that is, fall again under the curse. How is it with one of you who is a father when your son disobeys you? You are displeased. You may chastise your child. It is your duty to correct him by discipline, and you do that; but does it ever enter your head to cut him off and repudiate him as

your son? Such a thought could be entertained only by one unworthy of the name of father; and surely God is not less truly a father than an earthly parent.

I am not sure that the interpretation ordinarily given of the parable of the prodigal son brings out the point the Divine teacher intended to illustrate. The usual application of that parable to the natural man made to see his guilt, for the first time, and driven by his wretchedness to seek peace with God, disregards utterly the context. You recollect the occasion of our Saviour's speaking this parable together with two which precede it. When the publicans and sinners drew near to Him to hear Him, the scribes and Pharisees murmured because He received these Jews who had disregarded the traditions of the fathers and had ceased to observe the customs of the chosen people. His answer is, in effect, that these persons, being of the seed of Abraham, are still properly regarded as members of the commonwealth of Israel. They belonged to the chosen people, and that God who still claimed this people as, in an especial sense, His own, would not repudiate those of them who had acted unworthily. The fact that they had wandered only made it the more imperative that He should care for them. He was to Israel according to the flesh still a father, and as a father He would not forget His erring children.

Now, brethren, as Israel chosen of God to be His people, in their outward relation to Him, was the type of the body made up of those who are His children by the inward call of the Spirit, so the Israelite who wandered away and acted unworthily of the hopes of his people was the type of the true son of God backslidden into sin. As the extreme degradation of the publicans and sinners did not cause God to repudiate them as Israelites while Israel was His son, so the sins of the true child of God do not bring with them forfeiture of his place among those accepted as members of His family.

Do you say that the picture of the prodigal's wanderings is too dark to admit of its being applied to the case of any true child of God who has fallen into sin? Did you ever read the story of Jerry McAuley, the sainted evangelist of the Water Street Mission of New York? No man ever gave more certain evidences of being a child of God than did he after his conversion in Sing Sing Prison, and yet when he came out from the society of criminals into the cold Christian world, and found no sympathy or help, he wandered away and fell into his old ways of sin. Read the story of the man once more a river-thief, a drunkard, a debauchee, carrying with him always, however, unrest and longing for his Father's house, and tell me if he is not the counterpart of the prodigal. Tell me if one spent all in more riotous living than the other. No! There are those who have known a heavenly Father's love, and yet have gone as far astray as did the prodigal; and our Saviour has drawn that picture that none such should ever despair.

Have you sinned, my brother? Have you offended grievously against that Father who sought you in your ruin and redeemed you with the precious blood of His Son, and gave you right to call Him "Father"? Oh, deplore it with bitter tears, but do not wound Him further by doubting His love! Do not forget that when the forlorn, ragged, limping beggar, who had spent all in riotous living, came in sight of his home, it was the father who first espied him. Do not forget that when the son began to stammer out his request to be consigned to the place of a hired servant, the father would not hear him, but fell upon his neck and kissed him, and had him clothed in a manner befitting his sonship: "Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet. . . . For this *my son* was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." Ah! that father represents the heavenly Father, when we, having wandered away, return with

our legal spirit and want to do something to merit our being taken into favor again. He desires nothing but evidence that we are truly repentant; for our rights as sons can never be forfeited. Whatever estrangement exists is upon our part, not upon God's. Once accepted in Christ, accepted forever; nothing less than that is involved in sonship.

In order that the Christian may be assured of this at all times, the Father provides for constant witness within the bosom: "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." It is the duty of every child to hear that voice *at all times*, for that witness never ceases; and it never ceases because the assurance of God's favor and love is essential to the growth of the new creature in filial confidence and every grace. You remember the exhortation, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God" (Eph. iv. 30). Are you accustomed to regard that as addressed to unconverted persons who resist the wooing of the Spirit? It is addressed to "the *saints* which are at Ephesus." Read the entire verse: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, *whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.*" This latter clause limits the application to the Christian. How may he more flagrantly grieve the Spirit than by refusing to hear His testimony? In the ear He is ever crying with a still, small voice though it be, "Thou art a child of God." Will you say, No; I have sinned and He has cast me out and will have me for His son no longer? Oh, why thus despise your privilege! Grieve the Holy Spirit of God, whereby thou art sealed unto the day of redemption, no more.

The endearing relation which exists between God and those who receive the right to become His sons is most appropriately indicated by a word used by the apostle in the text. It is the term used in the Greek language for a little

child. It is the form a father would use in addressing his children gathered around his knees at the family hearthstone. He would employ it as he pressed to his bosom his little boy running to him to be shielded from danger, or sobbing with the grief of some childish sorrow.

What a picture does it call up before some of us of days long since past and gone! Oh, the halcyon days of our childhood, when we knew the tender care of a father whose voice has now long since been silent! As we think of it we can almost feel the gentle touch upon our heads of that hand long since palsied in death. Oh, the confidence with which we trusted him for the supply of all our wants, for protection from every danger! Oh, the delicious sense of freedom from care of those happy days now gone forever! Gone forever? No, *not* gone forever. Our heavenly Father is far gentler than any earthly parent; more able to care for us and protect us than any father according to the flesh; more faithful to discipline us and bring us back from our wanderings to His bosom. We are His little children, and can rest in Him with a confidence such as was never justified by our relation to those in whom we trusted in the days of our childhood. His eye never slumbers; His hand is never empty; His arm is never shortened that it cannot save; He never forgets to love; He never leaves one real want unsupplied.

Again, this word contains in it a prophecy; for to be a little child means that in the future there is the maturity of manhood—that is, if the development of what is in the child be not arrested. Alas! no earthly parent can avert the causes which often cut short that progress; but our heavenly Father can and will ward off every danger which threatens to arrest the growth of His child to maturity. This is one of the rights which belong to all His children, that they shall grow to the stature of perfect men in Jesus Christ. "Now are we sons of God, and it doth

not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, *we shall be like Him*; for we shall see Him as He is."

Brethren, what a family is this which we have been contemplating this evening!

It numbers among its members all the truly great and noble of all the ages. Abel, the first sinner saved by grace, belongs to this family; and Enock, who walked with God and was translated that he should not see death; and Abraham, the friend of God; and Moses, the man of God; and David, the man after God's own heart; and Elijah, with the prophets who lifted their flaming beacons all along through the darkness of the old dispensation. Upon the records of this family are written the names of the apostles, and of the holy company of martyrs, and of those in the times which followed who did not count their lives dear unto themselves so that they might serve the Lord Christ; and this family shall grow until all the *élite* of earth shall be gathered into it. What patent of nobility can compare with being invested with the rights of a son of God?

Again, it is a family which shall never be broken up. How many families are there represented here this evening which have never suffered the rupture of any tie? Is there one person here who has never followed to the grave a loved one who has left a vacant place in his home? But here is a family whose ties shall outlast every catastrophe. The Elder Brother of that family is united with the Father in indissoluble unity, and every other member of it is united to the Elder Brother by a tie which the Holy Spirit has created and conserves. It can never be severed. Who does not, in this world of instability and dissolution, long for something which is not subject to change? The family of God shall last as long as the throne of God, and, once a member of it, you are a member of it forever.

Once more, let me say concerning this family of God that none is excluded

from it who does not exclude himself by failure to receive Jesus Christ and believe on His name. "As many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." There it stands, and it is the Word of God. Ample provision has been made for your becoming a son of God, if you are not already one. There needs nothing but your consent to your investiture with the rights which belong to that estate. The invitation has gone forth, and has been borne on the winds of heaven for these millenniums since the Word was made flesh. Have you never recognized it as an invitation sent to you as an individual? It was meant for you as truly as if you had been the only sinner on the face of the earth. I come as the ambassador of Jesus Christ, to-night, to persuade you to receive Him. I beseech you in His stead be reconciled to God, and allow your name to be inscribed upon the roll of the sons of God. Will you turn away and say, "I will not be a son of God"?

WHO IS JESUS CHRIST ?

By REV. HENRY VARLEY, B.A. [CONGREGATIONALIST], CHELTENHAM.

What think ye of Christ? whose son is He?—Matt. xxii. 42.

WHAT we think of Christ creatively determines our attitude toward the entire range of Christian doctrine. Where you place your centre in describing a circle decides the relative position of every point of the circumference. And Christ is the centre of the Christian faith. He is the living heart of it. If you take Him away, its life is gone. Just as in the days of the Roman Empire the most distant provinces were in connection with the Eternal City by means of the great paved roads along which legions marched and travellers journeyed and commerce rolled its ceaseless tide, so it is here. What we may call the outlying regions of Christian truth are still in direct communica-

tion with Christ; and what we think of Him, what account we give of Him, will inevitably influence for better or worse the position we assume in thought and practice toward them.

The reason of this I have already hinted at. It is the immense importance of the part played in Christianity by the person of Jesus Christ. Christ Himself recognized this fact, and constantly gave to it the whole weight of His emphasis. When He called men to be His disciples, the call He gave them was not a call to the acceptance of a theological system or a doctrinal scheme—it was to faith in *Himself*. The apostles, following His lead, took precisely the same view of the matter. St. Paul, for example, defines his Christian life as the life of Christ in him, and when the Philippian jailer asked what he should do to be saved, the answer came swift and straight from the apostle's lips: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." The enemies and critics of the early Church perceived very soon the same great fact of the importance of the person of Christ to Christianity. A striking proof of this is furnished us by the name which the Gentile mob of Antioch gave to the disciples of Jesus when they called them *Christians*. And from those days down to our own there has ever been, both in the Church and outside it, full recognition of the significant and central place held by Christ in the Christian faith. We, today, amid all that is taking place in the world of Christian thought, and even, perhaps, just because of it, are finding out with the utmost certainty how everything stands or falls with the answer we give to the question, "What think ye of Christ?"

The importance of Christ to Christianity may, perhaps, come more closely home to us if we glance for a moment at the position held in two other great religions by their respective founders. The difference between the relation of Buddha to Buddhism, or of Mohammed to Mohammedanism, and the relation of Christ to Christianity, has been well

pointed out by the latest Bampton lecturer. It is "the *method* of Buddha," and not the *person* of Buddha, to which his disciples were to look for salvation. So, too, with Mohammed. All that Mohammed claimed was that he had been divinely commissioned to speak to men the Divine word. It is the book, the Koran, which is the chief thing in Mohammedanism—the message, not the messenger. But how different from this is the case of Christianity! There it is not the method of Jesus that saves us, nor the message of Jesus. No; it is Jesus Himself. Everywhere in Christianity it is the person of Christ that is supreme.

And it deserves notice, I think, that those whose position toward Christianity is not yours and mine, nevertheless recognize as clearly as we do this importance and supremacy in the Christian faith of the person of Christ. In other words, if you abide by the teaching of the New Testament, you must believe Christ to be what Evangelical Christians believe Him to be—the Incarnate Son of God. But this is just what Unitarians do not and will not believe. Take one instance in support of this momentous point. It shall be one drawn from the confessions of a man whose name stands among the very foremost of the leaders of the world of thought. I mean John Stuart Mill. What does he say? In the "Essays on Religion," published after his death, he says: "Whatever else may be taken away from us by rational criticism, Christ is still left—a unique figure, not more unlike all His precursors than all His followers, even those who had the direct benefit of His personal teaching." There can be no doubt as to what Mill meant by these words. He meant what we mean, though, of course, he meant it in far less deep and full a way, when we acknowledge that it is the person of Christ which is the central thing in Christianity.

With this fact fully in view, then, we must all admit the cardinal importance of the question, Who is Jesus Christ?

What account are we to give of Him? Whose son is He? What was His origin? There are only two views which can possibly be held concerning Him. One is that He was simply a man, of purely human parentage, of merely earthly origin—a man whose life, no doubt, displayed many marks of goodness and moral excellence, and yet simply a man after all. The other is that, in some mysterious way, He was more than a man; that His origin, if human on one side, was directly Divine on the other. The first of these views is what is called the naturalistic view; the second is the supernaturalistic view. They are as wide asunder as the Poles. They are absolutely irreconcilable. A great gulf stretches between them, which no ingenuity, no sophistry, can ever fill up. Which view is right?

If there be a God in the universe—a God of power and wisdom and holiness and love—then it cannot be beyond belief that He will make Himself known to us in some special way for the fulfilment of so magnificent a moral purpose as Christ confessedly came to carry out. And this special revelation of God is what Christians claim to have received in the person of Jesus Christ. Then, further, if the Gospels are authentic we must accept the account they give of the origin and nature of Him whose earthly history they record. And further still, if miracles are credible there is nothing to hinder us from considering Jesus Christ as not at all the child of His age, but as an absolutely new factor, introduced for special ends, in the spiritual course and history of the human race. All these circumstances taken together make it at least very probable that that view of the person of Christ is wrong which regards Him as simply a man, and that that view is right which regards Him as more than man—yes, as none other than the Incarnate Son of God Himself.

And this probability becomes a certainty when we lay stress upon the *sinlessness* of Jesus Christ. Sin is so characteristically human that sinlessness

must be Divine. He who manifested this sinlessness must have come from a higher realm of life, which is just what Christians profess when they acknowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

This sinlessness of Jesus, moreover, is attested by the strongest proofs. His enemies admitted it, their sleepless and suspicious watchfulness could find nothing in Him to condemn. His betrayer, in an agony of remorse, so powerful that he killed himself under the pressure of it, confessed that it was innocent blood which he had been the guilty means of shedding. The friends of Jesus, who lived in close intimacy with Him, and saw Him under a great variety of circumstances, recognized in Him One who did no sin ; who was, in every respect, fitted to be the perfect example for the whole race of man ; who was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners ; who was the Lamb of God, without blemish and without spot. And, what is still more wonderful, Jesus Himself, though exposed to fierce temptations no less than we are, was utterly without the consciousness of sin. This sense of sinlessness is not the portion of other men, let them be as holy as they will. Nay, in exact proportion to their holiness is the strength of their feeling of imperfection in the searching light of the eye of God. The holier we grow, the more do we find in heart and life which needs correction ; the further off seems the ineffable purity to which we aspire. Yet here is a Holy One who knows nothing of all this. Here is a man of exquisite moral sensibility who finds in Himself no sins to confess, no failures to deplore. What shall we say of Him ? What can we say but that He is more than man ; that He is the Eternal Son of God manifest in human flesh within the limits of historic time ?

Yes, the Eternal Son of God. In other words, Christ had a personal existence before He came and tabernacled in human flesh. His three-and-thirty years of earthly life were but an episode, a chapter, in a life that reached

back into eternity. " In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." This is indeed a great mystery, and yet it is equally a great fact. Still, the pre-existence of Christ is not an enigma wholly dark. A ray of elucidating light falls upon it from the Christian doctrine that God is Love. But love cannot exist without an object to love. So the Eternal Love must have had an eternal object of love. And what was that object but the Beloved Son ? Nor, again, is the credibility of the incarnation of the Son of God in a true, human, finite personality a thing beyond our reason. Why should it be ? It is sometimes said, I know, that the finite cannot adequately express the Infinite. But the difficulty vanishes as soon as we clearly understand the terms. What do you mean when you speak of Infinite Love and Infinite Holiness, such as Christians claim to have been revealed in Jesus Christ ? Do you mean anything more than holiness without a stain and love without a flaw ? What else can you mean than that ? What is there, then, contrary either to reason or to faith in the assertion that once, within the limits of a truly human life, there appeared on this earth a Being of stainless holiness and flawless love ? And, further, if we remember the Bible doctrine of man, we get still more light on the great mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God. What is that doctrine ? It is that God has made man in His own image, that we are akin with God, that we are the children of God. Our bodies, indeed, are but dust, but our souls are a spark of the living fire of Deity. There could never be any true and real indwelling of the Divine nature in a star or a plant or an animal. They can offer it no vital point of contact. But that is just what we can do. We have a moral element in our being. We are capable of the life of righteousness and love. And so the perfect righteousness and the perfect love can reveal itself in a human nature like our own. God can become one with man.

The Son of God is the proof that this is what has taken place. "Conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary." He was true man no less than He was very God. He grew in stature and increased in knowledge, just as the children did with whom He played in the streets and fields of Nazareth. His moral development was as natural as ours, the presence of sin in Him always excepted. His humanity was no illusion. He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. He accepted the limitations of human life, and amid them He lived and wrought out that wondrous history which the Gospels in part record. And yet while being all this and doing all this, He was the Eternal Son of God. This is the answer to our question, Who is Jesus Christ?

And now let us pass on to notice what was the great purpose of the Incarnation of which I have just spoken. Taking the New Testament as our guide, we may say, I think, that that purpose was threefold. First of all, in the Incarnation we have the revelation of God. If we are the offspring of the Divine nature, it is needful for our true and highest life that we should know that Divine nature.

But, secondly, the revelation of God was not the only purpose of the Incarnation. There is a further purpose—the removal of sin. Christ was not merely born into the world, nor did He merely live here "the sinless years that breathed beneath the Syrian blue." He died. The cradle was but a stepping-stone to the cross. To know God is much, but it is far from being all. We need not only the revelation of Him, but reconciliation to Him—the closing up of the dark, yawning gulf which sin has split open between us and Him; the gulf in whose abysmal depths sits the grim shadow of spiritual despair.

Yet this is not all; for in the third place, we see in the Incarnate Son of God the perfect Son of man. We see the founder and first-fruits of the new

humanity. We see the seed-corn, pregnant with possibilities of infinite grace, out of which is by and by to come the harvest of a regenerated world. "What one is, why may not millions be?" asked Wordsworth. We echo his question, and find the answer to it in Jesus Christ.

And now, let me ask you, as I conclude, "What think ye of Christ?" You see, I hope, how momentous and full of meaning the question is. You see, also, I hope, the real answer to be given to it. But remember that it is quite possible to think rightly of Christ, and yet to have none of that personal union with Him which is the one source of our Christian life. You must not make the mistake of trying to make theological opinions do duty for a living faith. You may call Him "Lord, Lord," and yet not do the things which He says. Oh, be wiser than that, be more consistent! Take Him for your Lord in deed and in truth. So shall He conform you by His Spirit to His own image, and incorporate you as a living member of the new humanity, of which He is at once the fountain and the goal, of which He will be the consummation, as He is even now the prophecy.

GOOD TIDINGS TO THE POOR.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BROOKE FOSS
WESTCOTT, D.D., LORD BISHOP OF
DURHAM, SUNDERLAND, ENG.

The poor have good tidings preached to them.—Matt. xi. 5.

THE words, as you will remember, occur in the answer which the Lord returned to John the Baptist, who from his lonely prison had sent disciples to Him to inquire whether He was, indeed, the promised Deliverer. "Art Thou," he asked, "He that cometh, or look we for another?" The Lord replied by recounting what He did. His works were His answer. "Go your way," He said, "and tell John the things which you do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and

the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them." The poor have good tidings preached to them—greater than the restoration of physical powers, greater than the removal of bodily disease, greater even than the immediate conquest of the grave was the last miracle of Divine power and love, greater, more persuasive, more enduring, the message of a universal Gospel. It is clear why this must always be the decisive sign of Christ, the Saviour of the world. Difficulties may arise as to the reality and significance of isolated phenomena which no evidence can wholly meet. But the truth which makes itself known to man as man, the truth which finds us in the changeful labors and sorrows of life, in solitude and in conflict, the truth, which enriches us however poor we are, however slender may be our natural store of moral, intellectual, or material endowments, this is its own witness. No time, no distance, no peculiarities of national character, no revolutions of speculative thought, can affect its claims. It appeals to the individual soul, it appeals to the soul of humanity. Thus the sign by which the Divine authority of the Master was to be recognized is the sign by which His Church must indicate its claims. A great leader—not, alas! one of us—wrote forty years ago, "When any one says to me, 'Behold a good man,' I ask, How many souls has he saved? When any one says to me, 'Behold a religious people,' I inquire what it has done and suffered to bring humanity to its belief." In like manner we may justly require that a church when it claims our devotion shall establish in living evidence that it has a gospel for the poor.

The Poor in Soul.

But before we apply the text, we must take care not to misunderstand or limit its scope. We must not confine the application of the witnesses to which the Lord appealed to the scriptural and

most obvious sense of the words; to the poor, as the world counts poverty. Indeed, the interpretation which by common consent we give to the term "poor" reveals and condemns the shallowness of the popular idea. We speak and think as if they only were poor who are straitened in material resources, who find it hard to provide food and shelter from day to day, who can make but the scantiest provision for times of yet sharper need. But the life is more than meat, and man liveth not by bread alone. There is a poverty of heart and soul sadder and more desolating than poverty of body. There is a poverty which makes itself felt as a crushing load in the palaces of the wealthy and in the schools of the wise. The least reflection will show how this is so, and how sorely we need to reflect upon the truth. For is it not the fact that we ourselves create in a large degree the world in which we live? We give its real value to the abundance or to the penury by which we are surrounded. "We can," it has been well said, "make much of life if we have much soul, but if we have little soul life is dwarfed to our proportions." We see or feel no more than we have trained faculties for seeing or feeling. We enjoy that with which we are able to sympathize, and our enjoyment is measured by our sympathy. Thus the soul rich in mental wealth moves about as in a poet's paradise. To such a soul

"The meanest flower that blows can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."
Such a soul in the commonest things, conscious of harmonies of sound and color, enters into the fulness of being, fertile in unceasing variety of beauty. It peoples each familiar scene with heroes of the past. It holds friendly converse with the greatest of all time. The brook becomes for it a living voice, the work of art a revelation, a confession of a kindred nature.

The soul, again, which is rich in moral wealth opens streams of feeling on every side. It is quickened by the response of hearts touched by its natu-

ral warmth. It calls out powers which wait for its bidding to display their activity. It is strong with the strength of multitudes who recognize its sovereignty. If, as we have been taught, love is the measure of life, then no life can be ampler than that which such a soul commands. Gold and silver, purple and fine linen, and sumptuous fare add nothing to the wealth of the soul which makes the whole world its minister.

And what shall we say, then, on the other hand, of the poor dull soul? Of the soul which spells out with difficulty the simplest lessons of nature or life, for which the waters have no music and the sky no imagery, for which

"The primrose by the river's brim
A yellow primrose is to him,
And it is nothing more ;"

for which our great cathedral has no lessons in its subtleties of proportion, in its faithfulness to type, in its harmonious combinations, or in its relics honored for a thousand years? Of the soul which is fast confined in its narrow cell, neither understanding nor understood; alone, apart, in the course of men, the soul which cannot touch its own impulses and cannot interpret them, but who can perhaps feel sadly that it chills and checks the ardor of those with whom it is brought into contact?

Can any outward poverty compare with this inner poverty, which touches not the circumstances of life but the powers of life; which leaves the wealthiest beggared in thought in the midst of his splendor, and the wisest destitute of sympathy in the midst of his intellectual triumphs? When once we feel what life is we feel, and not till then, what poverty is. And so the power of the Gospel rises before us in its fullest extent, for in that, and in that alone, the poor—the poor in means and the poor in faculties, the poor in body and the poor in soul—have good tidings preached to them, and our Church is the faithful herald of the Gospel. I say, then, that in the deepest, largest

sense the poor have good tidings preached to them. The power of our faith is measured only by the wants and weaknesses of men. In this boundless capacity it stands alone.

A Purer Ideal of Life.

As in old times men seemed to find for themselves a theory of the universe able to bring peace to a select band of privileged philosophers—but it was peace at the price of isolation—so there are those in our own times who seem to find adequate satisfaction in the multitudinous experiences which they can crowd into the brief space of threescore years and ten. But such men have no gospel for the great multitude whose thoughts move in a narrow circle, and whose days are filled with momentous duties. And if others, again, dazzled by the sight of pleasures which can only be purchased by opulence, are not afraid to offer the luxury of the few as a prize for the labor or the violence of the many, they seem to me to display to a criminal ambition an aim equally illusory and unattainable, for I can see no enduring hope for men in any change of circumstances effected from without. Physical pleasure brings no discipline and no unwearied satisfaction. Power carries with it no true sense of dignity, and indulgence leaves no sense of rest. What we need more than any readjustment of the conditions of life is a purer ideal of life, a more prevailing motive of service, a more elevating view of the end of labor. We all of us require to learn, each in the fulfilment of his least office, that we have no right but duties, and no solitary joy. This Christ teaches still, while He proclaims glad tidings to the poor.

Therefore the soul naturally Christian refuses to rest in the partial gospels of man's invention, which guard their blessings as the possession of men of letters or of men of science; as the possession of the rich or of the strong. It turns to the Gospel of the Word Incarnate, and it does not turn in vain, for

by this Gospel it is open to the meanest and the feeblest in our eyes to have a share in that glorified manhood which Christ has borne to the right hand of God. In this the poor have the Gospel preached to them. Here is the truth which the most ignorant can grasp for the hallowing of his simplest ordinary work, as he feels that he is an object of the love of God, called to fulfil the purposes of God; the truth which the wisest can see, and which has the power to enlarge every phase of human thought; the truth which, resting in our love, teaches us to know that we were made for love, and to find in its exercise our own selves—losing our souls that we may find them—for

“Life with all it brings of joy or woe
Is just our chance o’ the prize of learning love.”

The Gospel of Christ, the Word Incarnate, gives back to every child of earth, through the atonement, his spiritual sovereignty over the world, and shows him how the kingdom over which he is set becomes one great sacrament of the Heavenly Father. Here, then, is the truth which establishes on an immovable foundation that devout reverence for the least phenomena of the outward world which is the glory of physical science; the truth which witnesses to the reality of a Divine presence in things visible; the truth which brings the conviction that the world is the reflection of the Divine mind which our minds can interpret. The Gospel of Christ, the Word Incarnate, declares with irresistible power the unity of mankind, so that we cannot for one moment separate ourselves from any who share with us that nature which He has taken to Himself. Here, then, is the truth which consecrates the largest and the least heritage or accumulation of wealth with a social blessing, and constrains each believer to recognize in every gift a talent to be administered for the common good; the truth which fills the poorest with sympathy for those who have the awful responsibility of great possessions; the truth which makes it clear—clear in

thought as it is clear in experience—that he who would monopolize enjoyment destroys it for himself.

The Divine Foundation of the Human.

The Gospel of Christ, the Word Incarnate of God, entering into our life is indeed good tidings—good tidings to the poor—as reaching down to the lowest depths where humanity still lingers, and growing with man’s growth to the utmost bounds of his possible attainments, reaching and growing without limit, for if it could be shown that any human powers lie without the range of its benediction; that any form of man’s distress and perplexity are inaccessible to its consolation; that any parts of nature or history are in conflict with its premises, then I should feel compelled to write against this also the sentence of dreariness and desolation, and look for another. But the Gospel of Christ is subject to no such condemnation. It shows us that the Divine is the foundation of the human and (most overwhelming wonder) that the human is the fulfilment of the Divine. It turns our thoughts from what we can do to what God has done and is doing. It discloses in the idea of creation a splendor which communicates its light to all created things. It pierces to the depths of misery, and brings back even from their darkness a promise of hope. It transfigures all personal suffering by the thought of a fellowship with God in Christ. It is a new, an eternal commandment in which all things, our utmost hopes and efforts, are shown to be of Him, and through Him, and unto Him.

This, then, is the Gospel which all have to hold and to publish, to hold with a firmer grasp by publishing with a more personal devotion. Here is the joy which we all are charged to make our own by extending it to others. Here in times of perplexity we can find the surest sign that Christ has come; for if in these days of trial—and what days are not days of trial if life is vigorous and sincere?—doubts or question-

ings as to the faith mix in the still loneliness of our hearts, we may be led to ask in the words of John the Baptist, as our eyes fall on some familiar portraiture of the Light of the World in a dark, unlovely setting—"Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?" We, too, as the Baptist did, may receive tidings sufficient to reassure us, brought directly from the stirring scenes of human activity. We shall not ask in vain. From the foreign mission field, and from the home mission field, the same reply comes, that the vision of life has been brightened, the work of life has been quickened, the wounds of sin have been healed by the old—and ever new—tidings of Jesus and the resurrection, and above all that this Gospel has been found to be a Gospel powerful to transform the nature and the circumstances of men. And you have learned, also, by the testimony of writers in foreign lands that this Gospel of Christ is able to reach those whom the ordinary forces of civilization leave on one side, forlorn and unaided, and able to open the dulled eye to the vision of a Father in heaven; able to stir to noble activity classes paralyzed by hereditary bondage; able to recover and to reveal the true humanity of the outcast and the savage disguised and deformed through generations of corruption and violence. What witness to the apostolic nature of our Church can be more eloquent than this transfiguration of men before our eyes wrought through the ministry of the Gospel, whereby the Divine image is seen to flash forth in answer to the Divine call? Here, then, is the sign that Christ is indeed with us.

Once again the heavens and the earth are being shaken that things eternal may be seen in perfect beauty. Once again we are learning, even through strange teachers that our faith must extend the limits within which we have been tempted to confine it. Once again we are coming to understand that the message of Christ born, crucified, ascended, brings victorious patience in

the stress of conflict. Once again it is witnessed to our souls, and not the less powerfully through strife and pain, through the bitterness of controversy and the discipline of failure, that in the Gospel of the Word Incarnate, *the poor*—the poor who feel their poverty, who feel their loneliness in the turmoil of life, and their littleness before the immensity of nature—have good tidings preached to them.

THE GLORY OF THE KING.

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

Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen.—
1 Tim. i. 17.

WITH this burst of irrepressible praise the apostle ends his reference to his own conversion as a transcendent, standing instance of the infinite love and transforming power of God. Similar doxologies accompany almost all his references to the same fact. This one comes from the lips of "Paul the aged," looking back from almost the close of a life which owed many sorrows and troubles to that day on the road to Damascus. His heart fills with thankfulness that overflows into the great words of my text. He had little to be thankful for, judged according to the rules of sense; but, though weighed down with care, having made but a poor thing of the world because of that vision which he saw that day, and now near martyrdom, he turns with a full heart to God, and breaks into this song of thanksgiving. There are lives which bear to be looked back upon. Are ours of that kind?

But my object this morning is mainly to draw your attention to what seems to me a remarkable feature in this burst of thanksgiving. And perhaps I shall best impress the thought which it has given to me if I ask you to look, first, at the character of the God who is glorified

by Paul's salvation; second, at the facts which glorify such a God; and, last, at the praise which should fill the lives of those who know the facts.

I. First, then, notice the God who is glorified by Paul's salvation.

Now what strikes me as singular about this great doxology is the characteristics, or, to use a technical word, the attributes of the Divine nature which the apostle selects. They are all those which separate God from man; all those which present Him as arrayed in majesty, apart from human weaknesses, unapproachable by human sense, and filling a solitary throne. These are the characteristics which the apostle thinks receive added lustre, and are lifted to a loftier height of "honor and glory," by the small fact that he, Paul, was saved from sins as he journeyed to Damascus.

It would be easy to roll out oratorical platitudes about these specific characteristics of the Divine nature, but that would be as unprofitable as it would be easy. All that I want to do now is just to note the force of the epithets; and, if I can, to deepen the impression of the remarkableness of their selection.

With regard, then, to the first of them, we at once feel that the designation of "the King" is unfamiliar to the New Testament. It brings with it lofty ideas, no doubt; but it is not a name which the writers of the New Testament, who had been taught in the school of love, and led by a Son to the knowledge of God, are most fond of using. "The King" has melted into "the Father." But here Paul selects that more remote and less tender name for a specific purpose. He is "the King"—not "eternal," as our Bible renders it, but more correctly "the King of the Ages." The idea intended is not so much that of unending existence as that He moulds the epochs of the world's history, and directs the evolution of its progress. It is the thought of an overruling Providence, with the additional thought that all the moments are a linked chain, through which He

flashes the electric force of His will. He is "King of the Ages."

The other epithets are more appropriately to be connected with the word "God" which follows than with the word "King" which precedes. The apostle's meaning is this: "The King of the ages, even the God who is," etc. And the epithets thus selected all tend in the same direction. "Incorruptible." That at once parts that mystic and majestic Being from all of which the law is *decay*. There may be in it some hint of moral purity, but more probably it is simply what I may call a physical attribute, that that immortal nature not only *does* not, but *cannot*, pass into any less noble forms. Corruption has no share in His immortal being.

As to the "invisible," no word need be said to illustrate that. It too points solely to the separation of God from all approach by human sense.

And then the last of the epithets, which, according to the more accurate reading of the text, should be not as our Bible has it, "the only *wise* God," but "the *only* God," lifts Him still further above all comparison and contact with other beings.

So the whole set forth the remote attributes which make a man feel, "The gulf between Him and me is so great that thought cannot pass across it, and I doubt whether love can live half-way across that flight, or will not rather, like some poor land bird with tiny wings, drop exhausted, and be drowned in the abyss before it reaches the other side." We expect to find a hymn to the infinite love. Instead of that we get praise, which might be upon the lips of many a thinker of Paul's day and of ours, who would laugh the idea of revelation, and especially of a revelation such as Paul believed in, to absolute scorn. And yet he knew what he was saying when he did not lift up his praise to the God of tenderness, of pity, of forgiveness, of pardoning love, but to "the King of the ages; the incorruptible, invisible, only God;" the God whose honor and glory were magnified

by the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ.

II. And so that brings me, in the second place, to ask you to look at the facts which glorify even such a God.

Paul was primarily thinking of his own individual experience; of what passed when the voice spoke to him, "Why persecutest thou Me?" and of the transforming power which had changed him, the wolf with teeth red with the blood of the saints, into a lamb. But, as he is careful to point out, the personal allusion is lost in his contemplation of his own history, as being a specimen and test-case for the blessing and encouragement of all who "should hereafter believe upon Him unto life everlasting." So what we come to is this—that the work of Jesus Christ is that which paints the lily and gilds the refined gold of the Divine loftinesses and magnificence, and which brings honor and glory even to that remote and inaccessible majesty. For, in that revelation of God in Jesus Christ, there is added to all these magnificent and all but inconceivable attributes and excellences, something that is far Diviner and nobler than themselves.

There be two great conceptions smelted together in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, of which neither attains its supremest beauty except by the juxtaposition of the other. Power is harsh, and scarcely worthy to be called Divine, unless it be linked with love. Love is not glorious unless it be braced and energized by power. And, says Paul, these two are brought together in Jesus; and therefore each is heightened by the other. It is the love of God that lifts His power to its highest height; it is the revelation of Him as stooping that teaches us His loftiness. It is because He has come within the grasp of our humanity in Jesus Christ that we can hymn our highest and noblest praises to "the King eternal, the invisible God."

The sunshine falls upon the snow-clad peaks of the great mountains and flushes them with a tender pink that makes

them nobler and fairer by far than when they were veiled in clouds. And so all the Divine majesty towers higher when we believe in the Divine condescension, and there is no god that men have ever dreamed of so great as the God who stoops to sinners and is manifest in the flesh and Cross of the Man of Sorrows.

Take these characteristics of the Divine nature as set forth in the text one by one, and consider how the Revelation in Jesus Christ, and its power on sinful men, raises our conceptions of them. "The King of the ages"—and do we ever penetrate so deeply into the purpose which has guided His hand, as it moulded and moved the ages, as when we can say with Paul that His "good pleasure" is that, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times, He might gather together in one all things in Christ." The intention of the epochs as they emerge, the purpose of all their linked intricacies and apparently diverse movements, is this one thing, that God in Christ may be manifest to men, and that humanity may be gathered, like sheep round the Shepherd, into the one fold of the one Lord. For that the world stands; for that the ages roll, and He who is the King of the epochs hath put into the hands of the Lamb that was slain the Book that contains all their events; and only His hand, pierced upon Calvary, is able to open the seals, to read the Book. The King of the ages is the Father of Christ.

And in like manner, that incorruptible God, far away from us because He is so, and to whom we look up here doubtfully and despairingly and often complainingly and ask, "Why hast Thou made us thus, to be weighed upon with the decay of all things and of ourselves?" comes near to us all in the Christ who knows the mystery of death, and thereby makes us partakers of an inheritance incorruptible. Brethren, we shall never adore, or even dimly understand, the blessedness of believing in a God that cannot decay nor change, unless from the midst of graves and griefs we lift our hearts to Him as re-

vealed in the face of the dying Christ. He, though He died, did not see corruption, and we through Him shall pass into the same blessed immunity.

"The King . . . the God invisible." No man hath seen God "at any time, nor can see Him." Who will honor and glorify that attribute which parts Him wholly from our sense, and so largely from our apprehension, as will he who can go on to say, "the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." We look up into a waste heaven; thought and fear, and sometimes desire, travel into its tenantless spaces. We say the blue is an illusion; there is nothing there but blackness. But "he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." And we can lift thankful praise to Him, the King invisible, when we hear Jesus saying, "Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee."

"The only God." How that repels men from His throne! And yet, if we apprehend the meaning of Christ's Cross and work, we understand that the solitary God welcomes my solitary soul into such mysteries and sacred sweetnesses of fellowship with Himself that, the humanity remaining undisturbed, and the Divinity remaining unintruded upon, we yet are one in Him, and partakers of a Divine nature. Unless we come to God through Jesus Christ, the awful attributes in the text spurn a man from His throne, and make all true fellowship impossible.

So let me remind you that the religion which does not blend together in indissoluble union these two, the majesty and the lowliness, the power and the love, the God inaccessible and the God who has tabernacled with us in Jesus Christ, is sure to be almost an impotent religion. Deism in all its forms, the religion which admits a God and denies a revelation; the religion which, in some vague sense, admits a revelation and denies an incarnation; the religion which admits an incarnation and denies a sacrifice; all these have little to say to man as a sinner; little to say to man

as a mourner; little power to move his heart, little power to infuse strength into his weakness. If once you strike out the thought of a redeeming Christ from your religion, the temperature will go down alarmingly, and all will soon be frost-bound.

Brethren, there is no real adoration of the loftiness of the King of the ages, no true apprehension of the majesty of the God incorruptible, invisible, eternal, until we see Him in the face and in the Cross of Jesus Christ. The truths of this Gospel of our salvation do not in the smallest degree impinge upon or weaken, but rather heighten, the glory of God. The brightest glory streams from the Cross. It was when He was standing within a few hours of it, and had it full in view, that Jesus Christ broke out into that strange strain of triumph, "Now is God glorified." "The King of the ages, incorruptible, invisible, the only God," is more honored and glorified in the forgiveness that comes through Jesus Christ, and in the transforming power which He puts forth in the Gospel, than in all besides.

III. Lastly, let me draw your attention to the praise which should fill the lives of those who know these facts.

I said that this apostle seems always, when he refers to his own individual conversion, to have been melted into fresh outpourings of thankfulness and of praise. And that is what ought to be the life of all of you who call yourselves Christians; a continual warmth of thankfulness welling up in the heart, and not seldom finding utterance in the words, but always filling the life.

Not seldom, I say, finding utterance in the words. It is a delicate thing for a man to speak about himself and his own religious experience. Our English reticence, our social habits, and many other even less worthy hindrances rise in the way; and I should be the last man to urge Christian people to cast their pearls before swine, or too fully to

"Open wide the bridal chamber of the heart,"

to let in the day. There is a wholesome

fear of men who are always talking about their own religious experiences. But there are times and people to whom it is treason to the Master for us not to be frank in the confession of what we have found in Him. And I think there would be less complaining of the want of power in the public preaching of the Word if more professing Christians more frequently and more simply said to those to whom their words are weighty, "Come and hear, and I will tell you what God hath done for my soul." "Ye are my witnesses," saith the Lord. It is a strange way that Christian people in this generation have of discharging their obligations that they should go, as so many of them do, from the cradle of their Christian lives to their graves, never having opened their lips for the Master who has done all for them.

Only remember, if you venture to speak you will have to live your preaching. "There is no speech nor language, their voice is not heard, their sound is gone out through all the earth." "The silent witness of life must always accompany the audible proclamation, and in many cases is far more eloquent than it. Your consistent thankfulness manifested in your daily obedience, and in the transformation of your character, will do far more than all my preaching, or the preaching of thousands like me, to commend the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

One last word, brethren. This revelation is made to us all. What is God to you, friend? Is He a remote, majestic, unsympathizing, terrible Deity? Is He dim, shadowy, unwelcome; or is He God whose love softens His power, whose power magnifies His love? Oh, I beseech you, open your eyes and your hearts to see that that remote Deity is of no use to you, will do nothing for you, cannot help you, may probably judge you, but will never heal you. And open your hearts to see that "the only God" whom men can love is God in Christ. If here we lift up grateful praise "unto Him that loveth us and hath loosed us from our sins in His

blood," we, too, shall one day join in that great chorus which at last will be heard saying, "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

WHY DID HE DO IT ?

BY THE REV. CANON R. G. SUTHERLAND, M.A., HAMILTON, ONT.

So the last shall be first, and the first last.

—Matt. xx. 16.

A LITTLE group, Jesus and His disciples, stood looking at the retreating figure of the rich young ruler. Our Lord looked after him sadly, for He loved him; the disciples looked with a very different feeling. They had stood the test under which he had broken down. They had "forsaken all and followed Him." Turning to the Master Peter said, with hardly disguised self-complacency: "Behold, we have left all and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?" Our Lord assured him that a hundredfold reward should be theirs who deny themselves for His name's sake; "but," He adds, "many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." Many, though they have forsaken all, shall be last instead of first, if they have been actuated by a mercenary spirit; for it is not the work, it is not the sacrifice of home or wealth or friends that counts in the heavenly reckoning—it is the motive. The kingdom of God is not conducted upon business principles. The King of heaven is no merchant.

To unfold His meaning Jesus told them the story of the "laborers in the vineyard." The point of the parable is brought out by the murmuring of the men who had worked all day in the vineyard. They had entered into a contract with the householder. Like Peter, they had asked, "What shall we have therefore?" Yet, though they had received all that was promised, they "murmured against the good man of the house," because those who had

worked but one hour received as much as they. The householder replies, "We made a contract; a day's pay for a day's work; your part of the contract is finished, so is mine; take your wages and go! If I choose to give these others a day's pay for an hour's work it is no concern of yours; I may do as I will with my own."

So will God do with the rewards of heaven. "Is it not lawful for Me to do what I will with Mine own?" Who disputes that heaven is His? Who disputes that He can do what He wills with His own? Heaven is not for sale. No man can buy it. He gives it to whomsoever He wills. Yet that will of God is no arbitrary will. Freely He gives, but not blindly, not without discrimination. Accordingly, to prevent both misunderstanding here and discussion hereafter, He announces deliberately that it is not the amount of work that counts with Him; it is the spirit in which the work is done. If selfish ambition, the desire to be first in the kingdom, is the motive, then, however noble the work looks, however self-denying the work was, it will be treated as selfishness, not self-sacrifice. If to obtain the esteem of men was the motive, then by that will the man be judged. Though the work may have been charitable, though the man may have built a hospital, or endowed a college, though he may have turned many to righteousness by his eloquence, yet if self were his motive, the work has lost its savor, the man has lost his labor. The motive is the soul of the work, and if the motive be bad, the work is bad; if the motive be merely selfish, the work is selfish, corrupt, and worthless.

See how this great principle comes out in the parable of "the laborers in the vineyard." The men who were sent into the vineyard at the eleventh hour were men who could get no employment elsewhere. They were idle, not because they would not work, but because they could not. "No man hath hired us." From a sharp business

point of view, they were not worth hiring. They were poor hands, failures, men who would never make their way in the world. Yet these men were paid as much as those who had borne the burden and heat of the day. Why? God says, "Because I choose; is it not lawful for Me to do what I will with Mine own?" But behind the will of God there is always a reason, and a good and satisfying reason. That reason evidently is to be found in the *spirit* in which these poor fellows worked. When they entered the vineyard there was but one hour left of the day; you may be sure, then, that they worked with a will. They just threw themselves into their task; and they worked with a keen sense of their own underserving; they did not expect much for their labor. Whatever the householder would give them they would receive with humble, grateful hearts. This spirit of theirs so pleased the good man that he paid them first, and gave them a full day's wages; and home, we may be sure, they went with happy songs; as it is written, "The redeemed of the Lord shall return and come with singing unto Zion, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

This, I say, is the principle Jesus lays down. Heaven is not wages for work done. It is not a debt due to the laborer. It is a gift, a reward freely given to the man who, whether he has done little or much, has done that little or that much with a good motive; for the glory of God, for the good of others as well as himself.

It is on this principle that we judge ourselves. It is by the answer that conscience gives to the question "*Why*" that we approve or condemn our own actions. The question that is all-important is, not "What did I do?" but "Why did I do what I did?" Not, "What did I eat or drink to-day?" but "Why did I eat or drink? Was it for the pleasure of the table, or was it for the glory of God; to sustain health and

strength, so that I might do the work God has given me to do?" That is partly what we mean when we say "grace." We thank God for His gifts, and ask that by them we may be strengthened for His service, that "whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we may do all to the glory of God."

"Why?" That is the question that conscience has been taught by the Holy Ghost to ask after all our actions; and on the answer depends that approval or disapproval of the "Nathan within" which makes our happiness or our misery here. So we ask of our work, "Why did I labor with hand or brain? Was it to acquire a fortune, to become rich, influential, independent; independent of the chances of life; independent of God? Or was it to provide for my own family, as the Scriptures bid me, since 'he that provideth not for his own hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel'? Did I think of the wants of others, for that, too, is one of the divinely approved motives for work—that we may have to give to him that needeth'?"

I gave money to-day to the church, to the poor; why was it, conscience asks? Was it to promote my own interests, to win the praise of men? Or was it because the Church is the mystical body of Christ, the poor man is my brother in Christ? According to the answer given, conscience blames or approves.

Or it may be that, on reviewing your day, you find that you refused money to the Church or for the poor. Why? is the question still. Was it from a false economy, from a spirit of avarice, or for a reason which will stand the test of the day of judgment? Conscience demands an answer, and by the feeling of pleasure or of pain you will know what God thinks of you, unless conscience is dead within you.

Or, again, you said something hard about a neighbor to-day; was it true? If true were you called upon to say it? Why? What was your object? Was

it to help the man of whom you spoke; was it to warn the man to whom you spoke; was it to protect some one from temptation? If not, it must have been from dislike, or anger, or envy that you spoke, and the action was bad; for, says Paul, "though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels; though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor; though I give my body to be burned," yet if my motive be not a good one, "if I have not charity, I am nothing."

It is by the motive, not the act, that we judge ourselves, and it is by the motive, not the act, that we judge others. Two persons may do the same thing, yet we may despise the one and honor the other. Last year a man published a book in which he described how in two years he had squandered, upon dressing, racing, gambling, his whole fortune. Lady Franklin did the same thing exactly; she spent her whole fortune and left herself penniless; but she spent it in fitting out an expedition to search for her lost husband. The result was the same in both cases: the motive in each case was different; and by the motive we judge. We condemn the foolish and self-indulgent spendthrift; we honor the self-sacrifice of the widow of the intrepid Arctic explorer.

Take another example: the surgeon, in hope of saving life, as a last resource ventures upon an operation; the patient dies. The assassin, to glut his vengeance, stabs his victim; and he dies. In each case death follows the act. The motive makes the difference. We hang the murderer; we honor the surgeon.

A distinction, however, is to be drawn, and that carefully, between our judgment upon ourselves and our judgment upon others. Where conscience is enlightened and awake our judgment of ourselves is the anticipation of the sentence of God; but our judgment of others may be, and often is, erroneous. We can read our own hearts, we cannot read the hearts of others. In our ignorance we may applaud the hypocrite while we condemn the true man.

I remember the story of a man who dwelt in a large city in the south of France. He lived on the barest necessities; he denied himself every indulgence; he wore rags for clothes, and gathered scraps for food. Even the children jeered at him as a miser; but he was no miser. The poor of the city suffered for lack of pure water; he had suffered with them; and all his life he had been saving to build an aqueduct to convey water from the near hills to the city. At his death he had amassed a large sum, and this he left to supply the poor with one of the greatest luxuries of life, plenty of pure, sweet water. Our judgments of others, then, are not always just, because we cannot always discern the motive; but, rightly or wrongly, we judge others by the same test that we apply to ourselves; we judge not by the action, but by the motive that lies behind the action.

Nay, we must go further still, and say with reverence, it is by the motive, not the action, that we judge Almighty God's dealings with the world and with ourselves.

Geologists tell us that the strata of the earth bear witness to tremendous upheavals; they read on the rocks the story of awful catastrophes, outbursts of volcanic fury that must have laid waste the fair face of nature. And the history of the world is as full of catastrophes as are the records on the rocks beneath our feet. The chronicles of the past, what are they but the register of

"wasted lands,
Blight and famine, plague and earthquake, roaring
deeps, and fiery sands,
Clanging fights, and flaming towns and sinking
ships and praying hands."

But we need not turn the pages of ancient history; glance at the columns of your newspaper, and you will find enough to make the heart sick with pity and compassion. Oh, if we knew not God, if He had not graciously revealed Himself to us, with what blank despair we should listen to

"every day's report
Of wrong and outrage with which earth is filled."

If we did not know that

"Behind a frowning Providence
God hides a smiling face,"

we should find it impossible to believe that the Maker of heaven and earth loved the frail creatures of His hand. Apart from the revelation given to us by His Son, we cannot show that God is love. If we refuse to credit the Bible and the Church we are like a ship on a stormy sea, with neither stars nor compass for a guide.

But God has revealed the motive of all His doings, and that motive is love. He assures us, by one who had lived through persecutions and trials that would have killed any less resolved soul, that "all things work together for good to them that love God," that "our light affliction, which is for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." The Christian can say, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." In the very furnace of affliction Faith sings with unfaltering voice, "I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me."

Since, then, as we have seen, we judge ourselves by the motive of our actions rather than by the actions themselves, since it is on this principle that we judge of the actions of our fellow-men, and even of the dealings of Providence, it is natural to expect that it is on this principle that God will judge us. But we are not left to infer this by the unaided light of reason; God has declared to us that the principle of the dread and final judgment will be the very principle by which we are guided in our estimate of ourselves and of others. By His holy apostle, Paul, He tells us: "If there be first a willing mind it is accepted." All our service and all our charity must be consecrated by the motive, the "willing mind." If there be the "willing mind," that is enough, for that is everything. If there be not the "willing mind," then, though you spent your nights and days on a pillar or in a cell; though you lavished millions for the sick or for the

spread of the Gospel, it would avail you nothing in the dreadful day of judgment, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed. What does God need of our work or labor, of our gifts or alms? He needs nothing. What can we give Him that is not already His? Let no man think that he can put God under obligation. "Behold, we have left all and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?" is the argument of one who has much yet to learn in the school of Christ. The mere fact that he had left all and followed Christ might mean nothing. Judas had done the same; what shall he have in the day of judgment?

It is the motive, then, the purpose, the aim, the *why* that underlies the forsaking all and following Christ that counts. It is that which shall decide your fate and mine at the last; and, therefore, it is to that we should look with the keenest scrutiny. "My son, give Me thy heart." If that is His, all is His. If that is right, all else is right. If the heart goes with it the cup of cold water shall not lose its reward, when millions, given for ostentation, shall burn up with the burning world.

"My son, give Me thy heart." It is the one thing that is ours: all else is God's. If the "heart," the will—the permanent desire—be given to God, then, whether your life be spent in a back street or on the steps of a throne, it matters not. Yet a little while, and this world of ours, that seems so fixed and stable, shall tremble at the look of Him that comes to judge. Yet a little while, and the

"loud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all that it inherit, shall dissolve,
And, like an unsubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind."

But one thing shall not dissolve; one thing shall abide—character. Character, the result, the creation, the embodiment of our will, obedient to, or defiant of the will of God. Then "many that are first shall be last." Many who have worn crowns, aye, or mitres here, shall

"begin with shame to take the lowest room" there. Some, it may be, whose names are on the calendar of saints, shall give place to humble men and women who lived unknown, who never dared "to lift up so much as their eyes unto heaven." Oh, the great reversal of human judgments! "Many that are last shall be first!" Now the elder brother looks with scorn upon poor prodigal; but "the last," even the despised prodigal, may be "first" in the judgment of the Lord of all the earth.

"Be ye wise as serpents," said our Lord. What did He mean? He meant that, as the serpent, when attacked, coils itself to guard and protect its head, so let us guard the heart.

Guard the heart, for out of it are the issues of life. Watch the motives of your actions. Set steadily before you the glory of God as the ruling desire of your life. That is the surest, that is the readiest, that is the only path to earthly peace and to everlasting felicity.

DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH.

BY W. HANSOM, B.D., LL.D. [METHODIST EPISCOPAL], GRANITE FALLS, MINN.

Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to . . . exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.—Jude i. 3.

THIS exhortation applies to our circumstances in this period of unsettledness in religious beliefs. It is claimed that the old "faith" has served its day, and some new faith must take its place. Our opinion is that instead of finding a new faith, we are on the way to a *better understanding of the old one*. We are concerned about the *essential truths of Christianity*, and willingly renounce the accretions and interpretations by which those truths have been overlaid and obscured.

The indications of our modern unrest point to a change for the better.

Our interpretations, our peculiar views and opinions may suffer, but truth will abide in undiminished force and splendor.

I. WHAT ARE WE TO UNDERSTAND BY THE FAITH which was once delivered to the saints?

It is defined as "the common salvation." Not the *doctrine* of salvation, but the *salvation itself*; it is not a *theory*, but an *experience*. Faith is the means, salvation is the end. "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls" (1 Pet. i. 9). It was common to all the apostles. They might have particular methods, but they certainly had a general result in view. Salvation was the aim in their teaching. They became all things to all men, that by all means they might save some.

This salvation is common to all men and not a matter pertaining to a particular class. It is available for Jew and Gentile. It is for every one that believeth.

The essential truths of Christianity, as contained in the New Testament, constitute the faith once delivered to the saints.

1. *The faith is Divine in its origin.* It is not a production of human philosophy, but the substance of a Divine revelation.

The necessity for a Divine revelation appears in the fact that human opinions are so varied and contradictory. When my heart is burdened with the consciousness of guilt, and my soul cries out in its agony, "Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" I must have a Divine answer. I need to know God's thought and purpose concerning a penitent soul. The Gospel is the Divine answer to human need.

2. *The faith is adapted to man's moral needs.*

Three truths force themselves upon our notice when we study man in his moral relations: 1. The sense of guilt and moral weakness; 2. The liability to temptation and trouble; 3. The cer-

tainty of death and a future state. These exist in all men everywhere. These are the bases of moral needs, and to these needs the Gospel responds.

The faith responds to the sense of guilt and moral weakness. The fact and experience of sin are common to all men. In every land men are wrestling with the great problem, "What shall we do to be saved?" The Gospel is the specific. "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." This "common salvation" includes two things: *deliverance* and *safety*. It delivers from impending danger by a perfect pardon. It fortifies and strengthens the soul against the temptations of all evil agencies, so that it is enabled to stand in the glorious liberty of the Gospel.

The faith responds to the liability to temptation and trouble. All irrespective of position or rank are exposed to them. The only remedy philosophy offers is *stoicism*. The Gospel discovers One who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. "Let us, therefore, come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Apart from this living Christ, one of the deepest needs of human nature is left unsatisfied.

The certainty of death is also answered by this faith. Death and the problem of the future hang like a heavy pall over all heathendom. The religious and philosophical systems of paganism throw no light upon the darkness of the grave.

But the Gospel of Christ tells of Him who died and rose again as the first-fruits of those who slept, who has abolished death and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers. It inspires men with hope of immortality. It alleviates human bereavement and gilds the future with radiant hope. Blessed Gospel! It meets the deepest needs of the human soul.

3. *The faith is complete in its contents* "once delivered"—*i. e.*, complete.

To it nothing can be added. New light, hidden riches, sweetest harmonies may be found in it.

Astronomy may discover worlds of light in the heavens, but it does not add to the universe. Every star was there before astronomers lifted their telescopes skyward. Astronomy may enlarge our knowledge of the heavens and thrill us with new views of heavenly beauty, but it cannot create a new star.

Music cannot add a new tone to the scale. The octave is the final measure of possible tones. Gifted musicians may combine the tones in new relations, and thus give the world sweeter song and more thrilling melody, but in all the witchery of music they will never reach beyond the octave of tones.

So with the faith. Theology cannot add to it. The Bible will gain in interpretation, but no new principles can be added to its contents. The foundation of our faith is laid in final power away from frost and wave and storm.

II. TO WHOM WAS THE FAITH DELIVERED? "To the saints." The term refers to *character*, not to official position.

1. *Saints are the depositaries of the faith.* Not councils, priests or popes, but holy men are the trustees of this precious gift.

The power and the safety of the faith are not in organization or popular favor or political power, desirable as these may be, but primarily in the character of individual Christians.

2. *Saints are the disseminators of the faith.* Dissemination is the purpose for which the deposit has been made. Saints hold it in trust for the use and benefit of mankind. Truth must be incarnated before it can become an available factor in the world's evangelization. God incarnates the Gospel in His saints. *This incarnation is the secret of successful evangelism.* The old prophets were mighty because their hearts were burdened with the "Word of the Lord." God put His great truths in their hearts, and they were transfigured by the glory of inward truth and flamed and burned among men.

The apostles were resistless evangelists because their souls were thrilled and dominated by the great revelations of Christ, and they could not but speak the things commanded them.

The disciples, scattered by persecution, went everywhere. In all their flight they were flaming evangelists. So grew the Word of the Lord mightily and prevailed.

III. WHAT IS OUR DUTY IN REFERENCE TO THE FAITH? "Contend earnestly," etc.

1. *We must hold to it experimentally and consistently.* Not to the theory, but to the practice; not to doctrine merely, but to salvation as a blessed reality. The faith needs not swords to fight for it, but saints to live it. A holy life is the noblest defence of the Gospel.

2. *We must hold it with courage and resolution.* The faith has had to contend for recognition in the world. In the beginning the Jew denied it, the Greek ridiculed it, and the Roman denounced it; but the saints contended for it in spite of all. So now it comes into conflict with the prejudices, selfish interests, and wrath of men. It requires brave, true men to stand by it. The age of chivalry is not yet past. Valiant knights of the Order of the Cross are needed now in defence of the old faith.

3. *We must contend for it with simplicity and sincerity.* "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal," etc. Not the weapons of the flesh, not the mere external aids that men are wont to use, not eloquence, learning, wealth, or beauty—these, though highly desirable, are not essential. Simple, sincere Christian lives are the irresistible argument for the faith. I do not undervalue apologetics. Its function is to defend the Bible and set forth the evidences of the Divine authority of the Scriptures. All honor to our "great apologists" for their literary work in defence of our precious faith; but I do insist that an earnest Christian, sincere in heart, true in conduct, pure in speech and gentle

in spirit, is the one unanswerable argument for Christianity. He is the "people's Bible," needing neither commentary nor apology.

We are to be "defenders of the faith." Paul's saying ought to be the conviction of our heart: "I am set for the defence of the Gospel" (1 Phil. i. 17).

INADEQUACY OF REASON.

BY STEPHEN R. DENNEN, D.D. [CONGREGATIONALIST], BOSTON, MASS.

Lean not to thine own understanding.—
Prov. iii. 5.

CANNING, in his life of William Pitt, tells us that the great statesman never allowed the pressure of public or private cares to prevent him from improving seasons of retirement wherein he meditated on the soul's destiny, and there found virtue's highest incentive and reward. Edmund Burke, the high-priest of rhetoric and logic, accepted the Christian doctrine, truths which he could neither fathom nor explain. So Gladstone and other of the ripest scholars and thinkers in all ages. Yet there are those who traduce Christianity as something not verified by reason, and attribute mental imbecility to its followers. Never more generally than now have the relations of criticism and religion been discussed. Not a few utterances in the debate have proved most disastrous in their influence. We do not advise a blind acceptance of dogmas simply because our fathers received them. We ought to be able to answer questions concerning the hope which is in us. Nobody denies this. But the point is here, Reason is to know her limit and her place. Shall we set aside everything which does not quadrate with your logic and mine? Is our knowledge to set bounds to our faith? Scripture, history, and experience contradict these assumptions.

Take the sphere of common life. Examine all the relations of men in which

the elements of time and trust are involved. The principles of mechanical science assume confidence in the stability and continuity of natural forces; those of agriculture, faith in order of the seasons; those of commerce and finance, confidence in human character and social order. We build on the probable and accept contingencies. We do not assume to know everything to a certainty. The growth of these bodies we cannot explain, or how food and blood are changed to brain and nerve and muscle. There is a tinge of irony in that ancient aphorism, "Know thyself," for who can tell the mystery of his being? Are you material, or immaterial, or both? Where is the seat of your soul and are you a unity, duality, or trinity? Why is one an angel and another a fiend? How little we know, yet we put on airs and affect a knowledge of the Infinite! We talk as if we knew what He had done, will do, especially what He *ought* to do. Let reason be modest and not tyrannize. Let faith have its place and function. This has been the attitude of all truly wise men.

Guizot says that he was born a Protestant and used his liberty of inquiry, thinking, at first, that reason would solve the great problems of existence. But he found the inadequacy of reason and accepted in all humility the truths of revelation, some of which he could not comprehend. He declared himself a Christian, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Take the realm of biblical theology. Can reason solve the problem of sin? What is its origin and what its outcome? Plato speaks of inborn sin and of the impotence of the soul, torn in pieces by its power; of those persons "incurable by reason of their crimes, made examples, forever enduring the most fearful sufferings as the penalty of their sins." Seneca writes in a similar strain. Their statements would befit any old-school catechism. Had they seen the pierced hand which so many to-day reject, how gladly would they have grasped it and

been led out of the darkness in which they groped. Said Ovid,

"Video meliora proboque
Deteriora sequor."

He saw and approved the good, but followed the bad. Pliny and Zeno saw no relief but in suicide. Reason alone was insufficient. Even if reason beholds Christ, it cannot answer the query, who is He, Divine, human, a vicarious sufferer or not? How does His suffering stand related to God's government? We are driven back to the simple scriptural assertion that "He must needs suffer." At His dear feet we sit, clasping His cross, saying, trustfully, joyfully, "I believe, help Thou my unbelief." This we must do, or sink in the mire of our own speculations and unbelief. He alone can bring us out from the darkness. A ship finely equipped is befogged at sea. Her equipment cannot save her; but if through the gloom the welcome brightness of a lighthouse appears, the uncertainty is solved. Christ is the Light of the world, and he who believeth on Him hath eternal life. Much which we cannot explain we must believe. We behold Him by faith who is invisible, we love Him whom we have not yet seen, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Much, of course, we can know and learn, but much will be forever beyond our ken.

The Bible is not given us for mere critical study, for the head alone, but for the heart, to be received with faith and love. With the heart man believeth unto salvation. Its truths are spiritually discerned. As Pascal aptly says, there is light enough for those to see who wish to see, and darkness enough to confound those who trust themselves. The three golden keys to the regal treasures of truth are PRAYER, FAITH AND OBEDIENCE. "Lean not to thine own understanding." Hear and heed the still, small voice of the Holy Spirit. Avoid a disputatious and coldly critical spirit. Fed on the carob-pod diet you will grow weak and wizen. Nourished by the sincere milk and the

strong meat of the Word you will renew your strength, become fat and flourishing, and bring forth fruit. Climbing the high hills of revealed truth, clear-eyed faith will see "the land of far distances;" yea, "the King in His beauty."

We find that pride of intellect marks the headwaters of modern scepticism. The self-sufficiency of current thought is working mischief. Instead of bringing up reason to a higher level, illumined and enlarged by Christian revelation, too many would seem to be bringing down the objects of revealed truth to the narrow range of human reason. This is as wise as to try to get the sweep of the Rocky Mountains by looking at them through a key-hole. The mischief wrought is direct and immediate, for it is undermining moral character, civic honor, social purity, public trusts, and it is making anarchists!

In closing we are to emphasize the failure of infidelity to build up character and renew society, and we are to show to the world that in Christianity alone, revealed to us through faith in Christ, are found the truly conservative and constructive forces that are to lift the race. "By their fruits ye shall know them." An American scholar who had spent years of study in Germany came home and shocked his pious father by his avowal of infidelity and contempt of the religion of his parents. Not one word of reply came from his father's lips. He took up his lamp silently and went to his room, which he paced all night in anguish. The heavy tread of his father's feet was heard by the uneasy son. The next morning the father took a well-worn, tear-stained Bible and handed it to his son, and begged him to read a book that had been such a light and solace to one who had passed through trial, loss, pain, temptation, and death itself to the rest of eternal felicity. He took it and was left alone. The first verse on which his eyes rested was heavily underscored by the hands of his loved and honored and sainted mother, "By their

fruits ye shall know them." His proud disdain, his captious unbelief, and his wilful opposition yielded. He cast off the serpent toils and entered humbly and joyfully the service of the Crucified, and in subsequent years became the honored president of one of our American colleges. Are you thus ensnared? Behold the way, the truth, the life in Christ alone. Honor and use your reason, but realize its insufficiency without true, hearty, obedient faith in Jesus Christ.

One Sunday evening at sunset Thackeray with two friends was walking along the slopes of the Corstorphine Hill, Edinburgh, watching the close of the day, one of exceptional beauty. The Highlands were bathed in amethystine bloom, and the western sky was clear as sapphire. Dr. John Brown, author of "Rab and his Friends," was one of the three companions. As they walked along they saw, he says, "a wooden crane, used in the granary below, so placed as to assume the figure of a cross. There it was, unmistakably, lifted up against the crystalline sky. All three gazed at it silently. As they gazed Thackeray gave utterance in a tremulous, gentle, and rapid voice to what all were feeling, in the word 'CALVARY!' The friends walked on in silence and then turned to other things. All that evening he was very gentle and serious, speaking, as he seldom did, of Divine things, of sin, death, salvation, eternity, expressing his simple faith in God and in his Saviour."

Let your lips and your lives, Christian friends, show to men that you are ever walking under the shadow of these unjust realities, and that you are determined in the cross of Christ to glory, having seen its beauty and personally felt its power.

TENDENCIES proved false do not at once stop. They are like the vessel which still moves forward when the propeller breaks. All the force of some movements is in the past.—*Stuckenberg.*

A NEW HEART.

BY REV. CANON FLEMING, LONDON,
ENG.

A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh.—Ezek. xxxvi. 26.

EZEKIEL had been carried away along with his people captive to Babylon, and there he proved a great comfort and a great blessing to many. God inspired him, and, so inspired, he promised from God deliverance to the Israelites, a return to their land, the restoration of many temporal blessings as a nation; but better even than these, the promise of spiritual blessings; because it is not too much to say here, in the very centre of the city of London, that the best of all blessings are spiritual blessings. We may have to work hard for temporal blessings, and they come from the hand of God in answer to integrity and perseverance; nevertheless the best of all are our spiritual blessings. Besides which, spiritual blessings sanctify all our temporal blessings. They make them sweeter to us, because we acknowledge a Giver. They teach us to value and keep them in the right place; and also when temporal blessings are lost, and lost they will be, we have still left the more enduring ones. Of all the spiritual blessings promised here and elsewhere to the people of God, there are none more valuable than "a new heart and a new spirit." Their price is above rubies; no arithmetic can calculate, no rhetoric state, their worth. There could be no better subject for our meditation here than this promise to give "a new heart and take away the heart of stone." For remember that God is the same to-day that He was then—He never alters. Although it was made to Israel in those early times, it is just as appropriate to us as if made for the first time.

There are three thoughts which seem to be contained in this verse: First, it is called "a stony heart;" secondly,

the new principle promised to be given, and it is called "a new heart;" and, thirdly, the giver, "I will give," "I will take away," and "I will give."

First, we have *the old principle which must be got rid of*, which must be removed, and it is described as "a stony heart." Of course this is a figure when you speak of a man's heart, because you do not speak of that which beats in a man's frame, but of his will and affections. Likewise a stony heart is a figure used to describe one who knows not Christ, and cannot until it is removed. What is a stone? A stone is a thing upon which you can make no impression. You may strike it with a hammer, or a sword, or any other weapon, but you can make no impression upon it; so with a stony human heart, no arguments or anything we can do will influence it. There are some hearts we cannot reach, they seem harder than the nether millstone. This is very discouraging, and we sometimes come home and say: "The message we have delivered to our congregation seems to have had no effect." It was so in the days of Ezekiel, for he came back to God and said: "They hear my words, and do them not." Isaiah also experienced the same when he said: "Lord, who hath believed our report?" If you come to our Lord's day, you will find it again in the stony hearts of the Jews. Although He wrought miracles, and spake with such pathos and power, while angels came and ministered unto Him, and multitudes hung upon His lips, saying, "Never man spake as this man," their hearts were not touched by our Lord's message; and we hear him saying, "They have closed their ears lest they should hear." This hardness, however, was not brought about by Christ, for there is no greater mistake than to say God makes our hearts hard. We are doing it ourselves. I say it was the stony, flinty hearts of these Jews which wrung from our Lord the words that "their hearts, eyes, and ears they had closed to Him." Until God touches the hard heart, it has

no feeling; and there are men and women now in this enlightened nineteenth century who figuratively go to that stony rock of Calvary, whereon Christ died for our sins, and even come to services like these in which we literally go there with Him, and yet do not feel touched in their hearts.

Secondly, we have *a new principle which is to be given us*. There are two ways in which people may be said to have anything new. First, when it is *absolutely* new. When the Ark of God was to be brought back, a cart was to be made by the Divine Will, and it was to be a new cart, entirely out of new materials. So in the New Testament we are told Joseph of Arimathea laid our Lord in a new tomb, wherein yet never any one had lain. There is another sense in which a thing is made new, that is when it is renewed, for that comes to the same thing. For instance, when the Holy Spirit came down upon the apostles, and sat and rested upon them, we are told they spake with tongues they had never known before. It was the same old tongues which spake, not new ones. So in this promise it seems that God renews the heart. It is the same old heart, but it is renewed and recreated, and so it may be said to become new. This is what happens when a man's heart is renewed and turned to God. You may meet a man, and say, "I see no change in him," and yet that man has been renewed by the Spirit of God. This, then, is the new principle, that God will give; and it is "a new heart," and when that happens the whole man is changed. Again, when a man's will is renewed he is made to say, "Not my will but Thine be done." And a man's affections are renewed, and even his memory is renewed. That memory, that used to be running off on other things, now returns to God. Paul says, "Ye shall be saved, if ye keep in memory the things we spake unto you." It is now no longer like a stone without feeling, for the stone resists and yields not; but the heart yields and resists

not. It has become a tender, a divinely recreated and renewed heart. Now every one cannot do better this Lenten season than ask God to give us this "new heart, and put this right spirit within me."

That brings us to the last point—the *Divine Giver*. "I will give," "I will put," "I will take away," "I will give." Four times, you see, we are told in this verse who is the Giver. It is none other than God. A great many plans have been tried, as you know, to reform mankind, but they have not answered. Punishment has been tried both by God and man, and without it there would be no safety to life and property or anything else. They say, then, let us try philanthropy and benevolence, and see if this will not avail, for penal servitude will not do, although I do not see how society is to be held together if you do away with it. We are trying education, and it is telling. In this age of revolution our great hope to meet this spirit is that our people are better educated. Then they will see that there are two sides to a question. We are also giving the people art in the most popular and cheap forms. Science also is doing that which, when we were boys at school, we never thought of ; but although we are trying all these things they won't change the heart. We are, however, distinctly told here who is the Giver of this new heart, and it is to Him we have to look. You see, then, it is the work of Omnipotence. He can make the heart love and glow with life. When He does this work it is done in an instant. A man at the receipt of custom, who was as busy as any of you, was called by Christ, and Matthew arose and followed Him in a moment. He said also to Zacchæus, "Make haste and come down," "and he made haste and came down." It was done in a moment. And when Lydia sat listening to Paul's address (which she had heard over and over again), we are told that "the Lord opened her heart," and then she attended to the words spoken by Paul.

And when Saul was entering into Damascus to persecute the Christians in that city, carrying with him letters from the high-priest at Jerusalem, a voice asked him : "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" God touched his heart, and it was done in a moment.

Finally, *it brings great glory to God*. It is greater than creating a world. Some one has said, "It was great to speak a world from naught ;" but it is a greater work when He comes down to that heart which He first made in His own image, and which sin has marred and ruined, and promises to dwell there, than the work of creation. There is an expression in the Bible to this effect, "All Thy works praise Thee, and Thy saints bless Thee." All His works do this, along with the angels ; but only sinners can bless Him, for they have a different song to sing than the others. It is what we call the new song, and we may sing it down here if God has given us the new spirit, and we shall also sing it in that other world of His, where all is new, for we shall then remember that love which redeemed us through Christ. We cannot, therefore, utter any better prayer than that which David uttered from his heart, and not only by his lips—I wonder whether our prayers are only lip prayers—"Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." God's answer to that prayer will be : "A new spirit will I give you." I think it was Augustine who said : "These hearts of ours were created by God, and created for God, and they are always restless until they have their rest in God."

SEPARATING OUT THE WICKED ; OR, THE PROCESS OF PROHIBITION.

BY REV. L. D. TEMPLE [BAPTIST],
NEW YORK.

Zech. v. 5-11.

I. WICKEDNESS ought to be restrained.

The woman who represents it is caged in the ephah.

II. The influence for evil of wicked people is to cease.

The ephah was covered up when wickedness was caged. Saloon-keepers and harlots are to be removed from our borders if they will persist in their vicious courses.

III. The progress of Christ's cause is to be marked by the carrying away of the ephah.

1. Corrupters of morals are to be driven out. Scripture is both warrant for it and assurance of it.

2. In doing this their personal liberty will not be interfered with. A place is prepared for them, and they are to be carried to their own place. This is God's way of dealing with incorrigibles. Jesus said to His disciples: "I go to prepare a place for you." But what kind of a place is suited to be the permanent abode of wicked people? It is Shinar, the unclean land, where the bad may grow worse. If they will persist in doing wrong, they must be driven out and confined where their courses will not infringe the rights of those who wish to do better.

Moral suasion is not an adequate remedy in dealing with wickedness and corrupt people.

IV. As agents in moral reform women are destined in the progress of redemption, to be pre-eminent.

1. They possess strong qualities. "Their wings are the wings of a stork." Decision, patience, hope.

2. They freely yield themselves to the movings of God. "The wind was in their wings."

STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

THE only life that will permanently hold men together, and that will make a true body of human society, giving to each member its fit place, and enabling it to discharge its proper function is, whatever men may say or think, the Spirit of Christ—that and that alone. This, then, in the first place—outward authority, the invocation of State legislation—may at times be needful, and may be a useful instrument, but the one sole hope for permanent adjustment of the relations of man to man lies in the Spirit of Christ. That Spirit alone can bring society into its ideal condition; other means and aids are mere temporary makeshifts.—*Dods*.

THERE is a great current running, and if you try to go against it you will only be swept away by it. Think of some little fishing cobbles coming across the bow of a great ocean-going steamer. What will be the end of that? Think of a pony-chaise joggling up the line, and an express train thundering down it. What will be the end of that? Think of a man lifting himself up and saying to God, "I will not!" when God says, "Do thou this!" or "Be thou this!" What will be the end of that? "The world passeth away, and the lusts thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks"—hard in regard of breaches of common morality, as some of my friends siting quietly in these pews to-night very well know. It is hard to indulge in sensual sin. You cannot altogether dodge what people call the "natural consequences"; but it was God who made nature; and so I call them God-inflicted penalties.—*Maclaren*. (Acts xxvi. 14.)

If there is nothing in the Bible that inspires you to usefulness, go out and study the world around you this springtime and learn the great lesson of usefulness. Notice that it was a beautiful and lawful robbery of the palm-tree that helped make up Christ's triumph on the road to Jerusalem that Palm Sunday. The long, broad green leaves that were strewn under the feet of the colt and in the way of Christ were torn off from the trees. What a pity, some one might say, that those stately and graceful trees should be despoiled. The sap oozed out at the places where the branches broke. The glory of the palm-tree was appropriately sacrificed for the Saviour's triumphal procession. So it always was, so it always will be in this world—no worthy triumph of any sort without the tearing down of something else. Brooklyn Bridge, the glory of our continent, must have two architects prostrated, the one slain by his toil and the other for a lifetime invalidated. The greatest pictures of the world had, in their richest coloring, the blood of the artists who made them. The mightiest oratorios that ever rolled through the churches had, in their pathos, the sighs and groans of the composers who wore their lives out in writing the harmony. American independence was triumphant, but it moved on over the lifeless forms of tens of thousands of men who fell at Bunker Hill and Yorktown and the battles between, which were the hemorrhages of the nation. The kingdom of God advances in all the earth, but it must be over the lives of missionaries who die of malaria in the jungles, or Christian workers who preach and pray and toil and die in the service. The Saviour triumphs in all directions—but beauty and strength must be torn down from the palm-trees of Christian heroism and consecration and thrown in His pathway.—*Talmage*. (John xii. 13.)

QUESTIONS of the great hereafter have laid leaden on our hearts, and, as we have visited their graves, hope itself seemed to lie beneath the slabs that marked their resting places. "If a man die shall he live again?" asked the patriarch of Uz, and our poor humanity, groping in the twilight, has had, perhaps, no better response than his: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come." The instincts of our nature have vehemently declared to us that death is but a change. But our intuitions do not satisfy. The fulness of satisfaction comes alone from "the infallible testimony—the testimony of Him who 'liveth and was dead, and behold he is alive forevermore.'" Listen as He speaks by the tomb of Lazarus: "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." They are the words of One who hath the keys of death and of hell. And, lo, all Nature with her myriad voices joins in a confirmation hymn, and Spring, exulting, waves her resurrection trophies as she echoes the chorus of the redeemed, "Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"

Because He liveth we know that we shall live also.—*Nelson*. (Cant. ii. 12.)

You may go this fall and find under the trees the burrs that have been blown off, and the nuts have dropped out; and you may find that the meat has been taken out and the shell is there and the burr is there. And to-day men are handed these prickly burrs of the past, out of which all the meat has been taken; and because they say, "We do not find these burrs succulent and juicy, but they prick our fingers and hurt us"—they are called skeptics and infidels. Faith is faith in God, not in a creed. Faith is faith in Christ, not in a Westminster divine. Faith is faith in the life that is revealed in the Bible, not in the teaching of the nineteenth century concerning the teaching of the sixteenth century about the Bible. I indict this spirit of traditionalism because it engenders the spirit of hypocrisy; because it demands that men shall believe; because it throws them from the pulpit and from the church if they do not believe; because it bids them believe that they believe; because it offers them creeds and symbols and signs to believe, though those creeds and symbols do not exactly represent their belief; because it asks them to say words in a double sense. The result in the community is that men have almost come to believe that the minister does not preach what he thinks, but what it is proper to believe or what he thinks it proper to believe or what his people think it proper for him to believe.—*Abbott*. (Mk. vii. 1-9.)

The late Matthew Arnold, an opponent of miracles, who proved his ignorance of science by discussing miracles with his mind already made up that they never happen, has said in his most famous book that if he were to change the pen with which he was writing into a pen-wiper, he would, in the common opinion of mankind, "be entitled to affirm and to be believed in affirming, propositions the most palpably at war with ordinary fact and experience." It is hard to take Matthew Arnold seriously. It is hard to imagine that he ever meant us to accept the change of a pen into a pen-wiper as a type of the Bible miracles. That would not be a miracle. It would be a simple marvel. It is utterly destitute of any moral purpose or spiritual significance. But that is just what the Bible miracles possess. Hence their credibility. Grant the fact, which no one can well dispute, that sin is in the world. Grant also the fact that a just and loving God desires to redeem us from sin, and has actually set on foot a great movement of redemption, and miracles are precisely what we should expect as the heralds and attendants of this movement.—*Varley*. (John xiv. ii.)

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Efficacy of Prayer in the Name of Christ. "Whosoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you."—John xvi. 23. Bishop Isaac W. Joyce, D.D., Omaha, Neb.
2. The Gospel of the Church of the Good Shepherd. "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep."—John x. 11. Bishop Willard F. Mallalien, D.D., Omaha, Neb.
3. The Triumphal Entry. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy King cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass."—Zech. ix. 9. R. R. Meredith, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

4. Dying and Living with Christ. "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him."—Rom. vi. 8. Bishop J. N. Fitzgerald, D.D., Minneapolis, Minn.
5. The Resurrection Life of the Believer. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."—Col. iii. 1. W. A. Snively, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.
6. The Gospel the Power of God. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."—Rom. i. 16. Rev. J. P. Moffatt, Indianapolis, Ind.
7. The Spirit of Traditionalism. "Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen hands, they found fault." etc.—Mark. vii. 1-9. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
8. Christian Fidelity. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."—Rev. ii. 10. D. C. Eddy, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
9. The Sabbath a Day of Rejoicing. "This is the day the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."—Ps. cxviii. 24. Bishop Nelson, Atlanta, Ga.
10. The Divine Pity. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him."—Ps. ciii. 13. Rev. James Ross, Glasgow, Scot.
11. The World for God. "And he called the twelve together, and he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God."—Luke ix. 12. Ven. F. W. Farrar, D.D., London, Eng.
12. How Men are Made. "And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building."—1 Kings vi. 7. Rev. Myron Reed, Denver, Col.
13. The Evils of the Sweating System. "The laborer is worthy of his hire."—Rt. Rev. Samuel Fallows, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
14. Scripture Cutting and Scripture Cutters. "And it came to pass, that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth."—Jer. xxxvi. 23. Chaplain C. O. Bateman, Fort Assiniboine, Mont.

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. The Lavishness of the Divine Bounty. ("Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things."—Gen. ix. 3.)
2. The Scriptural Doctrine of Unpardoned Sin. ("Surely at the commandment of the Lord came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did; and also for the innocent blood that he shed; for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood; which the Lord would not pardon."—2 Kings xxiv. 3, 4.)

3. Consecration and Personal Influence. ("And Moses said before the Lord, Behold, I am of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me?"—Ex. vi. 30.)
4. The Antagonism of Legalism and Spirituality. ("I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."—Matt. v. 20.)
5. The Prohibition of Emptyhandedness. ("They shall not appear before the Lord empty: every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee."—Deut. xvi. 16, 17.)
6. The Relation of Christ to Prophecy. ("Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."—Matt. v. 17.)
7. The Genesis of Patience. ("If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it."—Rom. viii. 25.)
8. Sorrow, the School of Humility. ("It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart."—Eccl. vii. 2.)
9. Limits of Hospitality. ("If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."—2 John 10, 11.)
10. A Forgotten Law for Socialism. ("Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark, which they of old times have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it."—Deut. xix. 14.)
11. The Philosophy of Lowliness. ("And his servant came near, and spake unto him, and said, My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? how much rather then, when he saith to thee, Wash and be clean?"—2 Kings v. 13.)
12. Infallible Signs of a State of Grace. ("By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting, and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand."—1 Pet. v. 12.)

INDEPENDENCE DAY THEMES.

13. Prayer for National Gladness. ("Remember me, O Lord, with the favor that thou bearest unto thy people; oh, visit me with thy salvation; that I may see the good of thy chosen, that I may rejoice in the gladness of thy nation, that I may glory with thine inheritance."—Psalm cvi. 4, 5.)
14. The Essential Liberty. ("Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."—2 Cor. iii. 17.)
15. A Divine Warning against the Perversion of Liberty. ("Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth."—Jer. xxxiv. 17.)

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

The Glory of Divine Forgiveness.

If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.—1 John i. 9.

So arranged we see the parallelism here.

This passage should be compared with Psalm xxxii., to which possibly it refers.

The Word of God proves its Divine origin by the celestial plants which bloom in its gardens. Such conceptions, for example, of forgiveness are found only within these pages.

Here *forgiveness* is the emphatic word.

No subject is presented in Scripture in a greater variety of forms and figures. Like the alphabetical Psalms,

the whole alphabet is used to exhaust the subject. More than forty words are used to express the fulness and freedom of pardoning grace. For example, Isa. i. 18, Psalm ciii. 11, Heb. x. 17. In the first we are assured that no deep dye of guilt is beyond God's power to remove out of the soul. In the second, that our sins shall be removed out of His sight, and, in the third, out of His mind. Manifestly this is more than pardon—it is reconciliation, restoration.

2. This text hints the *terms* of forgiveness. We are to confess our sins. In Psalm xxxii. three terms are used, one of which probably refers to our confession of sin to *ourselves* (Luke xviii. 13); another (not hide) refers to our confession to those we have wronged (Matt.

v. 24); and a third one, confession to God (Psalm li. 4, Luke xv. 21). He who thus confesses will pray also.

3. This forgiveness is abundant; it includes absolute restoration (Luke xv.); reconciliation (2 Cor. v. 19, 20); cancelled debt (Col. ii. 4); and even cleansing—the renewal of character.

God is faithful to forgive (Heb. x. 23), and just to forgive. Sin having been atoned for, it would be unjust *not* to forgive the penitent believer.

“The Present Truth.”

2 Pet. i. 12.

THIS is a suggestive phrase. There is a present truth for every age—that which God emphasizes by His providence, which history emphasizes by human need, and which doctrine emphasizes by the extremes of error.

In this day the present truth which is of supreme importance is the *supernatural*. The drift is toward naturalism in philosophy and materialism in practice. We must lay stress on the Divine and supernatural element in the Word of God, the nature of man, the history of the race, and the work of the Spirit.

1. As to the Word of God. We must assert its inspiration and infallibility. Inspiration must be more than genius, or illumination which depends on internal consciousness, while inspiration has external attestation of prophecy and miracle. Any theory of inspiration that leaves out infallibility destroys the value of the Bible as God's book, for it takes away the court of final appeal. Reason and conscience are ordinarily safe guides, but when they err we need an infallible standard by which to correct their variations, as the best watch needs to be adjusted by God's celestial clock.

2. As to the Divine Image in man. It is defaced, but not effaced, like a shattered mirror whose fragments still reflect your image. Development is at bottom a denial of the descent of man

from God, and substitutes his ascent from the oyster. To make a man a mere animal leaves gaps unfulfilled—the beginnings of life, consciousness, intelligence, conscience. Moreover, it leads to the *caste* spirit, to the undervaluation of man as man, and the erection of barriers to human progress, and begets carelessness of his condition. It classes dogs and Hottentots together, and led the French governor of the isle of Bourbon to rank the Malagasy with asses.

3. As to the hand of God in history. To make history atheistic is to make humanity anarchistic. If human history is but an accident or a fate, then as there is no God in it to rectify it, man's only hope is to *right his own wrongs*. To believe in a Providence behind human affairs leads to patience and long-suffering; but if there be no adjusting power, why consent to injustice? The alarming developments of society to-day which threaten all government with ruin are direct results of infidel teaching.

4. As to the Spirit of God. Reformation is not regeneration. Transformations of character and communities which are radical and permanent are the fruits of the Holy Spirit. Nothing less than creative power can be equal to a new creation; and for the highest success in any true work for God and man, the Spirit of God is a necessity. Genius, learning and philanthropy come to their limits. The moral and spiritual nature of man refuse to yield until some mightier force is at work than man can bring to bear.

Isaiah xlii. 9, 16.

I. *The Lesson of the Past.*

Archdeacon Wilson: “Look in your past for guidance, for hope, for humiliation, for deep sorrow and shame, but never for materials for self-satisfied ease.”

Dr. Phillips Brooks: “Just in proportion to the purity and absoluteness

of your confidence that it is really God who has helped you . . . will be the courage with which you see the dawn of the new day."

The text: "Behold, the former things are come to pass."

Older promises God has most gloriously and thoroughly fulfilled. Hitherto hath the Lord blessed us.

Then immediately the promise for the future, as if the necessary foundations for faith had all been given.

II. *The Promise for the Future.*

This is all bound up with the great personality of the servant of Jehovah.

It is a Messianic promise.

There is no uncertainty of its tenor. God at once in promising calls a whole world to break forth into a new song of praise for the new blessings.

Verse 16 names in detail three:

1. Leading the blind. Nothing can express more completely the great undertaking of God for our future than this promise to lead us like blind people travelling a road that has never been passed before.

2. Lighting up the darkness. No longer to be deprived of all the glorious beauty of the path and of the prospect, but enriched with all as God can show it.

3. Making straight and plain the rugged and crooked path.

Safety in all Events that may Come.

Acts ii. 21.

I. *We have a Promise of Safety, whatever betides.*

1. We know not what the future may bring to us,

Public catastrophes, personal calamities (vs. 19, 20).

2. We may have assurance of being saved through all.

Not a hair of Christ's people's heads shall perish (Luke xxi. 18).

None can pluck them out of the Father's hand (John x. 28).

They shall never perish, even dying (John xi. 25).

3. He assures spiritual safety, which alone is important.

Though their foes be many and strong (Eph. vi. 12),

Their support and Deliverer is greater still.

II. *The Means of Safety is, Calling upon God.*

1. As He has revealed Himself in Christ

To be the Saviour of all who trust in Him (1 Tim. iv. 10),

2. They are joined to Christ, one with Him (Col. i. 27).

He has survived all opposition and peril;

His own in Him are above all attacks.

3. The Holy Spirit joins them to Him (Eph. iii. 16, 17).

He came on the Apostolic believers (v. 3),

And inspires all believers unto holiness.

4. He raises those in whom He dwells (Rom. viii. 11).

III. *Calling on God in Christ involves—*

1. Repentance, turning from rebellious neglect (v. 38),

Having been baptized, to renounce all evil.

2. Trust in Christ, felt and expressed (v. 38),

For pardon and acceptance with God.

3. Obedience, yielding to the Spirit's leading,

He works in us, as promised (v. 39),

And is ready to lead as we yield our hearts to Him.

Sydney Smith sneered at the early advocates of missions as "apostates of the loom and the anvil." He put Carey and such as he in the pillory and then hurled at them the mockery of a pitiless ridicule. To-day the Church, and the world, too, bows in homage before the name and memory of these humble workingmen who left the shoemaker's

bench, the weaver's loom, the blacksmith's forge, the shepherd's calling, like the primitive apostles called from the lake-side and the tax collector's bench to undertake a world's evangelization. The apostates of the anvil and the loom have become the apostles of a new and grand era of world-wide missions, and Sydney Smith is now in the pillory! The retributions of history are sometimes very rapid, and the Nemesis of Providence has a scourge of scorpion stings!

IN Heb. v. 12-vi. 1 Paul speaks of first principles of the doctrine of Christ. For convenience and symmetry may we not arrange them in three great pairs of truths?

I. 1. Revelation of God through the written Word; 2. Incarnation of God in the living Word.

II. 1. Expiation of sin by blood of Christ; 2. Justification of sinner by faith in Christ.

III. 1. Regeneration of heart by the Holy Spirit; 2. Resurrection of body by the same Spirit.

Now observe the first two concern God the Father; the second pair, God the Son; the third pair, God the Holy Ghost.

Observe also that there is a threefold mediation:

1. The mediation of the Word of God between God and human ignorance.

2. The mediation of the Christ between God and human guilt.

3. The mediation of the Spirit between God and human inability.

The drift of the age is toward naturalism and materialism. To drop out the Divine factor from history is to imperil the very existence of the community. Atheism in philosophy begets anarchism in society. So long as men believe God is in history, they have a motive to bear patiently wrongs that He will right either here or hereafter; but if human history is the result of purely human forces, then the only hope of the oppressed is to undertake revolu-

tion. Men must right their own wrongs. Hence, come Anarchists, Communists, Nihilist as the legitimate fruit of denying God. Why should right be forever on the scaffold and wrong forever on the throne, unless we believe that that scaffold does sway the future and that God is keeping watch above all things, and will adjust conflicting elements and bring cosmos out of chaos. If God is not going to rectify matters, man must undertake for himself.

A Beautiful Story Illustrating Release of Pardon.

AN Irish lad brought before the petty sessions for a misdemeanor was fined thirty shillings, and in default sentenced to thirty days in jail. His brother sold his farm implements and raised the money and went to the judge, paid the money, and got a release. He then ran after the officer and put the writing in his hands and rescued his brother at the very *door of the jail*.

Duty and Delight.

PSALM li. has in it four conspicuous words, in a conspicuous order: clean, right, holy, free—and they serve to indicate four levels of life—first the merely *clean*, when sin is put away; secondly, the *right*, where conscience has sway; thirdly, the *holy*, where the renewed heart controls; and last the *free*, where the soul reaches the summit of conscious liberty in God, and not only the slavery of sin, but the yoke of duty are lost in the joy and privilege of serving God.

The Hidden Foe.

AN Indian prince one day unbuttoned his coat and a huge cobra dropped out on the ground. It had been coiled in his very bosom unknown to him. Mr. Spurgeon compared that reptile to the depravity of heart from which he had been graciously delivered by the power of the grace of God, which had caused the deadly serpent to uncoil itself from his very heart.

"SALVATION" is used in the New Testament in two senses, a larger and smaller one. It is used of a deliverance from penalty, immediate and complete; but also of a fuller deliverance from the power and presence of sin, and a complete attainment of the whole will of God, which are gradual and alternate (compare Philip. ii. 12, 1 Peter i. 5, 9, ii. 2, Rom. x. 10). In this last passage "justification" is distinguished from "salvation." Man, by a heart-belief, attains justification, but confession with the mouth is necessary to a full salvation. The burning *brand* is not simply plucked from the fire, but changed to a *branch*. The soul saved from sin must be saved for heaven. Salvation is a work in which man co-operates with God, to be "worked out"—*i.e.*, to completion. Salvation in its fullness is reserved, ready to be revealed in the last time. It includes full and final deliverance from sin's power, which is sanctification, and from selfishness, which hinders service. No salvation is complete until the believing heart prompts the confessing mouth and witnessing life of service. Rom. x. also has a lesson on *missions*.

In order to a world's evangelization God ordains a true apostolic succession. You hear, believe, confess; your confession reaches the ear of another hearer; he believes, he confesses; the message thus goes from ear to heart, heart to mouth, mouth to ear, and again from ear to heart and heart to mouth. Now if you are a believer but not a confessor, you are, so far as you are concerned, breaking up the blessed chain of succession. If every one who hears and believes confesses and witnesses, how simply and naturally the message reaches every unsaved soul!

Dr. Robert Moffat and the Hottentots.

WHEN this pioneer advanced toward the heart of Africa, among those who had never seen a cart-wheel or a steam-engine, his ox-wagon and tea-kettle attracted no little attention. Dr. Moffat

told them that in his country long pieces of iron were laid down and on them many ox-wagons were drawn by a big tea-kettle; and when he set up his magic lantern screen and showed them the train of cars on the lantern slide, they cried out: "Oh, the ox-wagons and tea-kettle!" When Dr. Moffat brought to England the son of a chief, and he first rode in a steam-carriage on a railway, he said: "Doctor, this is the ox-wagon and big tea-kettle." What a fine illustration of the fact that where God seeks to convey to us a knowledge of things beyond our experience or present capacity to understand, He must draw His terms from our limited experience; but we must not suppose those terms to express the exact facts, but only so much as our imperfect language can convey or our limited intelligence receive.

REV. JAMES A. SPURGEON.

What we do not Know.

IT is well to ascertain its limits and boundaries. A man had a blind horse which he put into a pasture lot bounded by a brick wall and a ditch. The horse walked one way till he hit the stone wall with his head, then the other way, till he found himself in the ditch; but, henceforth, while he was in that pasture lot he understood his own limitations, and never again did he butt his head against the wall or flounder in the mire of the ditch.

REV. JAMES A. SPURGEON.

I WAS CALLED once to see a very old and rich and self-righteous woman. I said to her: "I hope you are on the road to heaven." "Certainly, never been off it!" she replied. "Well, you must have been better than the rest of mankind," I replied. "I have always done my duty, and something more, for I have done good unto others that were in need." My reply was short and blunt: "You may *do* and *do* and *do*, and yet be *darned* after all." She was

angry, but I offered a short prayer and left. Next day I was sent for again, and I found an awakened sinner, asking, "What must I do to be saved?" She was not only converted, but grew rapidly in grace and knowledge, and her own explanation was that she had known her Bible all her life, and that it was as a great accumulation of fuel, only waiting for the Spirit to apply His torch and set it all ablaze.

REV. JAMES A. SPURGEON.

SELFISHNESS seeks inlets and limits, but never outlets. Love seeks outlets, but is strangely indifferent to inlets and limits; it is self-abandoning, more eager to give than to receive, and knowing no limits but opportunity and capacity.

THERE are *three stages of salvation*: 1. The past, "By His mercy He saved us." 2. The present, "are being saved." 3. A final and complete salvation (Rom. x. 9, 10, 1 Peter i. 5, 9). Justification is an act instantly complete; but salvation is progressive, gradual, and all-inclusive of the penalty, power, and presence of sin.

Blameless and faultless (compare 1 Thess. v. 23 and Jude 24). We are to be blameless this side of the coming of Christ, faultless after His coming; redeems us fully.

WHEN we surrender ourselves to God He demands full surrender. To retain one room in a house vitiates the transfer to the new purchaser.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

JUNE 26-30; JULY 1-2.—NOBLE DISCONTENT.—Josh. xv. 19.

An old story, glimmering out of the dimmest and most distant past, yet vital with a principle as modern as the breaths we draw in this last decade of the nineteenth century.

It is an incident of the time of the parcelling of the Holy Land among the tribes and families of the Israelites.

Caleb was, together with Joshua, the faithful among the faithless. It was Caleb, who, sent to spy out the promised land, when at last the Israelites stood upon the borders of it, came back with heart and hope for its conquest, notwithstanding Amalekites and walled towns and towering giants.

Of all that faithless generation only Joshua and Caleb were permitted to set foot within that land of promise.

Now at last the forty years and more are sped; a nobler generation has crossed the Jordan; the promised heritage is in process of subjugation and partition; and Caleb has received his portion, Hebron and the country sur-

rounding it, there to the southward of Jerusalem.

But within or near to Caleb's portion was Kirjath-Sepher, a walled fortress of the Anakim, set upon a hill.

To any Hebrew warrior who would capture it Caleb makes promise of his daughter Ascha for a wife. A young nephew of Caleb's, Othniel, the son of Kenaz, the brother of Caleb, turns out to be the vanquishing warrior.

We may be sure that Ascha's heart accepts her wifehood to such a man.

The portion she brings her husband is a patch of the south land her father had already given her; but it is south land; the Hebrew for it is Negeb, which means a land of the dry region, only partially fertile and for but a short season flushing into the beauty of various verdure.

But six miles and a half to the north of Ascha's portion is an exquisite and grassy amphitheatre, set about with as many as fourteen springs or pools at different levels.

And Ascha would bring this better

portion to her husband. Since it is her father's and he has right to give it, and she has right to ask it, she will dare request. This is what the young wife is bold enough to pray: "Give me a blessing; for thou hast given me a south land; give me also springs of water. And he gave her the upper springs and the nether springs."

As we study the story, surely it is suggestive of a *noble discontent*, and such noble discontent we, every one of us, steadily need.

(A) Such noble discontent, such aspiration for higher and better things should urge us on *in the realm of the daily duty*. Simply the south land of a measurable and merely respectable discharge of the daily duty should never satisfy us. We should be stirred with a noble discontent for the water springs of the best possible doing it. Thus we transform ourselves from drudges into artists. The drudge is one who does because he must. The artist is one who does because he loves to. Thus, too, we compact ourselves in noble character.

(B) In the realm of *intellectual advance* we should be stirred with this noble discontent; we should turn from a merely general and surface and newspaper information, toward the springs of water of a thorough and accurate knowledge.

(C) In the realm of *the best good of the community in which we dwell*, we should be stirred with a noble discontent. The south land of a merely usual municipal security and order ought not to satisfy us; we should be restless with discontent until the springs of water of a high moral atmosphere and action are predominant.

(D) In the realm of *Christian experience* we ought to be stirred with such noble discontent; we ought to leave behind us the south land of a merely usual and routine experience, and seek the springs of water of the peace and joy and strength of a transfiguring likeness to our Lord (1 Cor. iii. 10, 16).

JULY 3-9.—THE SOUL AND ITS SIN.—
Luke xv. 11, 13.

First. Discover whence the soul's sin springs. That is easy enough to see. The soul's sin springs out of a *desire for bad freedom*. Here, for this young man, was the seed whence the whole process of his sin pushed to bloom and fruitage. This young man had much—life, friends, wealth, prospects; as crown of all his blessings, he had home. But a true home means organization, rule, law, restraint; freedom within the bounds of a reasonable law.

But against the right restraints of home the young man chafed; law was hateful to him. So he came with a demand at once unlawful and unfilial—give *me* the portion of goods, etc. *Me*—that is the emphatic word. He had no real right to this portion of goods as yet. His use of them ought plainly to be a use under the eye and care of his father. But thus he would not have it. This "Me" was determined on a bad freedom. Just here is the source and seed of sin.

(a) It was precisely thus with the initial sin.

(b) The "portion of goods" finds parallel in everybody's life. Every one comes into this life dowered, in some degree, by the Heavenly Father. And you are to use this as the young man of the parable ought to have been willing to use his, under the eye and care of and with reference to the Father. There is no way of right life possible which does not recognize the fact of a controlling God and of a conscience amenable to God, and of all the parts and powers of the life under the jurisdiction of the conscience, and so of God. If a man is bound to dash out in bad freedom from these, then that seizure of bad freedom is the source and door of sin for him.

(c) But why will the Father give the portion of goods when it may be so badly used? Though the son may be lawless, the Father will never be. The Father will be true to Himself. The Father will keep and honor his own law. And that law is that His sons and

daughters are not mere things, sticks and stones, but are powers in whom there is the ability of moral choices; and, therefore, if they choose to have bad freedom, as the Father is true, He will let them have it. They may dash out if they will. They may misuse their portion if they choose. And the source and seed of sin is exactly here—in their choice of such unholy freedom.

Second. Discover where sin places the soul. "Took his journey into a far country;" there is where the soul's sin necessarily places it. Sin puts the soul in the place of distance from the Father. When a man refuses God's will and law and chooses instead his own, he cannot cry with any consciousness of deep, sweet intimacy, "My Father!" The man flees from God. This is a structural fact of human nature. Consciously sinful man cannot desire or be happy in the intimate and communing presence of the Father.

Third. Discover that to which sin dooms. The young man "wasted" his substance. Waste—to that sin dooms, since sin throws the soul out of the peaceful and ordered groove of the Divine law, causes the soul to miss its highest end, and necessarily brings the soul to moral wreck.

JULY 10-16.—THE SOUL AND ITS SUFFERING.—LUKE XV. 14, 16.

The soul in sin must, sooner or later, get to be a soul in suffering. A poet has sung,

"The coils of those twin serpents,
Sin and suffering."

They are serpents always twinned and never single. If for a little time sin seems to squirm alone, at last it always spawns the other.

"Sorrow tracketh wrong,
As echo follows song,
On, on, on, on."

That the soul in sin must, sooner or later, be a soul in suffering is plain, because

(A) *God is what He is.* We often say, God can do all things. We mistake. On certain sides even God is limited.

God cannot make sin blessed: for to do this would cause God to become false to His own nature, and He cannot deny Himself.

God is holy. Holiness must mean two things: (a) An internal cleanness and whiteness and pureness; an absolute freedom from the faintest shadow of personal moral sin. (b) An external and active going forth against everything that would seek to stain. Heat is not simply warmth in itself, but it is also enmity to cold. Light is not simply radiance in itself, but it is also enmity to darkness. Life is not simply vigor of existence in itself, it is also enmity to death. Opposites exclude each other. So holiness cannot be simply pureness in itself, but it must also be purity in antagonism with defilement. The one opposite likeness must exclude the other, sin. Toward sin, therefore, holiness cannot be complacent. It must be displacent. Such suffering as must result from a Holy God's infinite opposition to it is the necessary concomitant of sin. Sin cannot result in any other than suffering. Even God cannot make it come to any other bloom, since He is the God He is.

(B) The soul in sin must, sooner or later, be a soul in suffering, because *man is what he is.*

Conscience includes three things:

(a) Distinguishing as to right or wrong in motives.

(b) Impulse toward the choice of the right and from the choice of the wrong.

(c) Peace, when the right is chosen; remorse, when the wrong is. The Bible is not to blame for this. Ministers have not made it so. Not all of Mr. Ingersoll's lecturing can change it. It is as sure as destiny. It is part of the soul's organic constitution. Sin is an affront to conscience, and conscience, because of it, does bite back in suffering than which there is no anguish more anguishing.

(C) Also the soul in sin must be, sooner or later, a soul in suffering from the *necessity of law.* Law is righteous demand sanctioned by penalty. Pen-

alty cannot be blessing ; it must be suffering. If the law be disobeyed there is nothing left but that the penalty fall, or law is no longer law.

(D) Also, that the soul in sin, sooner or later, must be a soul in suffering is certain from the *common experience of men*.

Think of a young man of thirty-six feeling and wailing in this way ! But Byron's sort of life explains it—

" My days are in the yellow leaf,
The flowers and fruits of love are gone,
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone."

" The fire that in my bosom preys
Is like to some volcanic isle ;
No torch is kindled at its blaze,
A funeral pile."

Look into the story now and see the sort of suffering the soul in sin is apt to gather to itself.

(a) The suffering of *want*—" he began to be in want." Sin always spreads a famine of some sort. Listen again to Byron—

" Through life's drear road, so dim and dirty,
I have dragged on to three-and-thirty ;
What have these years brought to me ?
Nothing except thirty-three."

(b) The suffering of *friendlessness*. How many friends the young man had while his portion lasted ! Yes ; but they were tempters, accomplices. But now—no friends ; nobody seeking for him ; nobody caring for him. He had to *join himself* to a citizen of that country. " Observe that in this far-off land the prodigal, with all his banquets and his lavishness, has not gained a single friend. Sin never joins a real bond of sympathy and pity."

(c) The suffering of *slavery*. And this citizen of that country "*sent* him." The young man was no longer able to wander at his own sweet will. Into some sort of slavery and the suffering of it sin always issues.

(d) The suffering of *degradation*. The young man was set at *feeding swine* and feeding *with them*.

(e) The suffering of an utter *loneliness*. " And no man gave unto him."

And who shall tell the various *mental* suffering of this young man, whose sin had brought him to such suffering plight !

JULY 17-23.—THE SOUL AND ITS REPENTANCE.—Luke xv. 17, 20.

First. Repentance is *calm and right-minded thought about one's self*. " And when the prodigal came to himself, he said," etc. *Came to himself*—that is a phrase most significant and suggestive. It means self-recollection ; thought turned in upon one's self ; a fresh waking up within the self to the self's real state and sins and duties. For sin is the attempt to become morally unconscious. It is the living *without thought of God*, and moral law, and moral responsibility. And this is always the first step in a real repentance—this coming to one's self ; this beginning to think rightly about one's self. It is in the avoiding of this thought about one's self that men avoid repentance. They will not let themselves come to themselves ; they will not think. And to prevent calm, right-minded thinking, they plunge into all sorts of things ; they welcome the " temporary moral giddiness" of appetite and pleasure ; they thrust themselves into business ; they increase engagements ; they read, travel, work, talk ; they circle through the pleasures of the season ; they tire themselves ; they do anything and everything that they may not think.

Second. Repentance is *dissatisfaction and regret*. " How many hired servants of my father," etc. The moment the prodigal began to let himself calmly see, the moment he began to let himself front the real facts, that moment he began to be filled with dissatisfaction and regret. There are servants in my father's house, he thought, and I too am a servant ; I am "*sent*" here into this swine-herding ; but how much better their servanthood than mine ! They clothed, I ragged. They fed, I hungry. " I perish with hunger"—*i. e.*, " I am destroying myself." What chance for me here ? What future for

me here? Oh, to be what I once was! to front again such future as I once did; to have life open toward the brightness as it once did, instead of having it open toward the darker darkness as it now does.

Third. Repentance is *confession of sin*. "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, 'I have sinned,'" etc. That is a great step along the path of repentance when a man comes to the real and radical confession of real and radical sin. Notice also here was a confession of sin without any *self-excusings*.

Fourth. Repentance is also *humility*. "And am no more worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants." Repentance is the humble recognition of the deserved results of sin.

Fifth. Repentance is also *resolution* toward the Father. "I will arise and go," etc. Useless coming to one's self, useless dissatisfaction and regret, useless clean confession of sin, useless recognition of the deserved results of sin, unless all these are gathered up and crystallized in resolution to seek, with confession and with prayer, and with abandonment of the far country, the Father's face. "As departure from God is the essence of all sin, so returning to God is the essence of all repentance."

Sixth. Behold that in which a real repentance culminates; the finishing and value-giving touch to all preceding. "And he arose and came to his father." A real repentance is really carrying out the resolution. It is *actually* quitting the far country and everything in it. And so it is the actual *movement* of the soul toward the Father. "Soul-sick was I," says the great Augustine, "and tormented, accusing myself much more severely than my wont, rolling and turning in my chain till that were wholly broken, whereby I was *but just*, but still *was* held. For I said within myself, 'Be it done now; be it done now; and as I spake I all but performed it; I all but did it; and did it

not.'" But until Augustine did it, until he cut the last tie binding him to the far country, and actually went with the whole movement of the soul toward the father's house, he had not repented.

So then this is repentance—recognition of sin, sorrow for sin, and *forsaking* of sin.

JULY 24-30.—THE SOUL AND ITS RECEPTION.—LUKE XV. 20, 24.

Having sinned, and having gone into the far country, and having eaten of the sad harvests the far country is sure to grow, and having repented, then we are confronted with this awfully momentous question, Have we not, after all, finished with ourselves; is there any chance for us; is there any hope for us; will the Father whom we have so affronted grant even a servant's place; will He not shut the door of the forfeited home against us and leave us to the bitter fruitage of the bitter seeds we have so wilfully been sowing?

I am sure this was *the* question the prodigal must have kept asking himself all along that weary way back from the far country.

But of what sort of reception the father gives the returning soul the wonderful story affluently tells.

(A) The reception of a *longing and watching love*. "But when he was yet a *great way off* his father *saw* him and had compassion." That phrase, "When he was a *great way off*," is capable of another translation exquisitely pathetic—but while *he yet held himself* a *great way off*. Just as though the prodigal's courage had all but failed him; as though, having now gotten within sight of home, he did not dare go on; while he was waiting there, firm in his resolve of going, but tormented and baffled by the terrific fear that his father would have nothing to do with him, then it was as though his father had all the time been on the lookout for him. He saw him. The holding back was on the son's side, not on the father's. Only, and mark the distinc-

tion, it was not with a love *approving* and *complacent* the father regarded the prodigal in the far country; the father's love could not approve the sinning and the rioting. *Complacently* the father could not love the wayward boy; but *benevolently*, longingly, wistfully, with a love ready to receive if he would but turn, the father did love and had been loving. This is God's heart. While it never can approve sin, it is yet full of a longing, self-sacrificing love toward men being yet sinners. It poured out its best treasure for such. It hung the Christ upon the sacrificial cross for such. This benevolent love will see the sinner long before the sinner sees it. Turning Godward in repentance, the sinner turns toward such reception of illimitable, alert love.

(B) A *quick* reception. The father "ran" toward him. No anguished, trembling waiting for this prodigal; no long delay of ceremonial etiquette; no lofty standing on an injured dignity on the father's part. Rather swift, bounding, hastening love, longing to clasp the poor boy to its heart again.

What a rebuke does that word "ran" furnish to those who think that a sinner can come to Christ too soon; can be reconciled too quickly. God runs, sinner, to you; will you not run to God? He makes haste. Oh, shall you not?

(C) A reception of *utmost welcome*. "And his father ran and fell upon his neck and kissed him." How the prodigal's fears must have fled instantly as he became sure of the sincerity of that

loving welcome! That father's kiss upon his face was like the touch of the sun on the long-chilled Alpine flower, stirring new life in the heart long "dead." Despair made way for hope; and the indifference that had prompted the heartless demand, "Give me the portion of goods," now melted into the loving humility, "Father, . . . I am no more worthy to be called thy son."

(D) A reception of *larger answer to prayer than one dare pray for*. And with his father's kiss yet warm upon his cheek, and with his father's arms around him, and with his tired head pillowed on his father's shoulder, the son whispered to him, "Father, I have sinned," etc. And then I am sure that interpretation is right which declares that the father will not let the son go on to say his meagre prayer, craving but a hired servant's place; rather the father breaks in upon him and interrupts him, to call out to the servants, "Bring forth the best robe and put it on him;" and so will at once confer upon the son immensely more than he had dared to ask or think.

(E) A reception of *perfect reinstatement*. Always the reception is back to a *son's* place, never merely to a servant's place. A reception including (a) honor—the best robe; (b) authority—the ring; (c) the freedom of sonship—the sandals. Slaves went barefoot, the son had sandals; (d) gladness, the full and intimate communion of the father's presence—the feast of the fatted calf. Again is the prodigal standing in his *sonship*.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

Exegetical Notes on Jer. xxxi. 22.

By PROFESSOR W. W. DAVIES, PH.D.,
COLUMBUS, O.

*How long wilt thou go hither and thither,
O thou backsliding daughter? For the
Lord hath created a new thing in the
earth, A woman shall encompass a
man.*

THE portion of Jeremiah in which this passage is found contains glorious

promises of the restoration of Israel from captivity and glowing pictures of the peace and prosperity to be enjoyed by the people of God on their return to the promised land. The two kingdoms, long separated and in subjection to foreign powers, will be again united, and, as of yore, the tribes of Israel will worship Jehovah in rapturous strains upon Mount Zion. The scattered remnant of Israel is to be gathered, from

the north as well as from the uttermost parts of the earth; yea, the blind, the lame, and even the defenceless women are to form a part of this happy throng in joyful procession to the land of their fathers, where the Lord will satisfy them, and where young and old will rejoice together in the fear and favor of Jehovah.

A dark cloud passes over the brilliant sky, for while the prophet is still dazzled by the vision, and filled with gratitude at the glorious future opening up before his countrymen, he is suddenly shocked at their inexplicable unconcern; for instead of commencing their homeward journey they deliberately linger in the land of their captors. Amazed at such inaction Jeremiah impatiently cries out: "How long wilt thou go hither and thither, O thou backsliding daughter?" No sooner, however, has he uttered these harsh words than he catches again a fresh glimpse of the promises of God, and proceeds at once to encourage the people by assuring them that "Jehovah has created a new thing in the earth."

The word rendered backsliding, derived from *shuv*, to turn away or back, is a favorite expression of Jeremiah. He applies it to the Jews frequently. The phrase backsliding daughter is not found outside of this book; Jeremiah uses it twice, once of Israel (in this verse) and once of Ammon (cap. xlix. 4). The employment of the word created is quite remarkable. It is the same verb that is used in Gen. i. where the work of creation is described. Without doubt the prophet selected it intentionally in order to show the novelty of the work done by Jehovah on the restoration and further preservation of the Jewish people. Something unusual, unheard-of is to take place. A new sign is to be given, something that will prove conclusively that Jehovah and no one else is the author of it; something that will inspire the Jews with fresh faith to commence their journey homeward. The new thing which is to produce such change in the

attitude and conduct of the people is the assurance by the prophet that, "A woman shall encompass a man." The clause, though only three words in the original, is full of difficulties. In proof of this we need only remind the reader of the great variety of explanations which have been proposed by expositors, ancient and modern.

Let us, first of all, briefly examine these three Hebrew words:

n'kēvāh, rendered woman, is a generic term signifying a female; applied not only to human beings, but also to animals of all kinds. *ish-shah*, the ordinary word for woman, occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, while *n'kēvāh* is translated woman only in three places.

gēver, rendered man in this passage, is not the usual word for man. Its proper meaning is a mighty or a brave man, a warrior.

But the two nouns, rendered woman and man, present no great difficulties. There is but little disagreement as to their proper signification; not so, however, with the verb *t'sovev*, translated encompass, for it must be admitted that there is no general unanimity among exegetes concerning its true signification.

It is, however, generally conceded that the phrase, "A woman shall encompass a man," is a proverbial expression, which was well understood at the time when this book was written. This is made the more probable by the paronomasia so clear in the original. There is evidently a play upon the words *shovev* and *t'sovev*, though it defies imitation in English. Proverbs are most always difficult to translate, and often utterly unintelligible without circumlocution or explanatory paraphrase.

We shall mention only a few of the more common expositions of this difficult clause.

The ancient patristic writers saw in this verse not only a Messianic prophecy, but an unmistakable reference to the conception and birth of our Lord from the Virgin Mary. It is well known that many of the fathers loved

the allegorical interpretation. They delighted in spiritualizing every difficult passage, no matter whether or not capable of such exegesis. The motto of many of them seemed to have been, "*Credo quia absurdum est.*" Among modern commentators, Wordsworth, who reveres the ancient church fathers much more than the modern critics, is inclined to this interpretation. That was also the view of Bishop Pearson (see "Exposition of the Creed," Art. III., cap. iii. 7), who quotes this verse as one of the Messianic prophecies. He speaks with the authority of an oracle. His words are: "That new creation of a man is therefore *new*, and therefore a *creation*, because wrought in a woman only, without a man compassing a man. Which interpretation of the prophet is ancient, literal and clear; and whatsoever the Jews have invented to elude it is frivolous and forced; for while they force the phrase of '*compassing a man*' in the latter part of the prediction to anything else than a conception, they do not only wrest the Scripture, but contradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easy to perform." The one great and sufficient objection to this view is that it puts a meaning into the passage which it cannot legitimately have; for the Hebrew word *n'kēvāh* is nowhere rendered virgin in the sense used by Pearson.

The woman according to others is weak, defenceless Israel, now in subjection to her enemies; the strong or powerful man is the mighty Chaldean nation. The new thing which is to take place is the wonderful fact that the Jews, represented as a female, are soon to encompass—that is, overthrow the strong man or the powerful Chaldeans.

There are, again, others who take the words man and woman to denote respectively God and Israel. Jehovah is often represented in the Bible as married to His people Israel. Thus we read in cap. iii. 14, "Return, O back-

sliding child, saith the Lord, for I am an husband unto you." They make the verb translated encompass to mean to solicit or to woo. Thus the passage is made to signify that Israel (the woman) will again return to God (her husband). The Jewish nation will no longer wantonly stray from the truth and offer incense at other altars, but will confess her infidelity and will seek the face and love of Jehovah.

This, on the whole, is not so very different from Hengstenberg's explanation, who takes the word "encompass" in the sense of "to rally around for protection." But whether Israel flocked around the banners of Jehovah for mere protection or out of love for Him, or whether impelled by both motives is immaterial, for there are several objections to both these interpretations. In the first place, this would not be a *new thing* for Israel. Again, the verb (Piel form) does not mean "to solicit."

Ewald translates "woman shall be changed unto a man," and cites in support of this rendering the idiomatic use of the verb "to turn," in English—*e.g.*, he "turns" monk (see Grammar, p. 753). According to him, the passage would then mean, that from dejected Israel, a mere woman in courage and strength shall become a powerful nation, able to resist her cruel oppressors. Ewald, however, fails to cite another such use of the verb *t'sovev*.

Nagelsbach's solution in Lange's Commentary is novel, and that is all. He proposes this translation, "The woman shall turn the man." The woman (Israel) shall possess irresistible attraction, so that the man (Jehovah) is overpowered by it. "This power," says he, "to bring back proceeds from the weak, so that the strong succumbs to the weak." According to him, the real meaning is this, that Israel shall turn God around, or, "cause Him to turn back to her."

All the above are fanciful; every one has to resort to a new meaning for the verb; we therefore propose another, held by many distinguished exegetes,

a woman shall protect a man. The word *t'sovev*, translated "encompass," is used in this sense in Deut. xxxii. 10 and also in Ps. xxxii. 7, 10. What the prophet predicts is that there is to be a new era of prosperity and peace, that even women might take the place of standing armies. This interpretation, though not free from objections, does yet present an intelligible and a reasonable exposition of this difficult phrase.

THE HIGH PRIEST OF THE GREATER TABERNACLE.

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM MILLIGAN,
D.D., THE UNIVERSITY, ABERDEEN,
SCOTLAND.

But Christ being come a high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.—Heb. ix. 11, 12.

(Concluded from Vol. xxiii., p. 500.)

(2) Such being the "tabernacle" here referred to, we have now to call to mind for a moment the idea represented or symbolized by it. Upon this point there is fortunately no dubiety. The tabernacle of old was the dwelling of God in the midst of His people: "Let them make Me a sanctuary where I may dwell among them;" "I will set My tabernacle among you, and My soul shall not abhor you. And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be My people" (Ex. xxv. 8, Lev. xxvi. 11, 12). Whatever other thoughts, therefore, the tabernacle may have suggested, this was its first and most important aspect; and it need only further be observed that, when it is spoken of as the dwelling-place of God, it is of God, not in His abstract Being, but as He makes Himself known to, as He comes into contact with us. It is not a model upon a small scale of the universe, as if He of whom Solomon at the dedication of the temple sublimely

said, "Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee," desired an earthly representation of His boundless abode. We have to do with God in the relation in which He stands to man. Of that relation as it existed toward Israel the *σκηνή* was a type. Yet, further, the other name by which the structure was known, and which is even more frequently given it than that of tabernacle, has to be taken into account. It was the "tent of meeting," words unhappily rendered in the A. V., though corrected in the R. V., the "tabernacle of the congregation;" and it received this name because there God met with Israel. "This," it is said, "shall be a continual burnt-offering throughout your generations at the door of the tent of meeting before the Lord, where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee. And there I will meet with the children of Israel" (Ex. xxix. 42, 43).

This, then, was the meaning of the tabernacle. It was the place in which God dwelt, and at which He met with His people and they with Him. It had relation to the Almighty, not as the Ruler of the universe, but as One who desired to bring His children nearer to Himself, that they might be sanctified for His service and be made to rejoice in His favor. It spoke to man, not as a creature to be bowed down beneath the thought of infinite power, but to be elevated to communion and fellowship with that holy yet merciful Being who had formed him to show forth His praise, and to find in doing so his true dignity and joy.

If this was the meaning of the tabernacle to Israel, there can be no doubt as to what is expressed by the word when filled with Christian thought. Christ Himself is the Christian tabernacle. In Him the Father dwells with men, meets with them, and makes Himself in ever-increasing measure known to them. "He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father;" "When we know Him we know the Father also" (John xiv. 9, viii. 19). It ought to be unnecessary to remind the reader that this

idea of meeting God, of His drawing nigh on His side to us and of our drawing nigh to Him, is the distinguishing feature of the Christian dispensation, and that it is dwelt upon with remarkable frequency and emphasis in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Putting these considerations together, we appear to be justified in coming to the conclusion that by "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" we are to understand the human nature of our Lord, or our Lord in His incarnate state; and the only question comes to be, whether we are to think simply of His humanity, as it was on earth, or (with Hofmann) of that humanity as it exists in its glorified state in heaven.

There is little room for hesitation as to the answer. That the writer of this Epistle could never have spoken of the *earthly* body of Christ as "not made with hands—that is to say, not of this creation," is clear from the statement of chapter x. 20, where he refers to "the new and living way which Jesus has dedicated for us through the veil—that is to say, His flesh"—words founded upon that rending asunder of the veil of the temple at the crucifixion, by which the veil was not so much *opened* as *abrogated and thrown aside*—words also in which it is not without interest to notice that the human name "Jesus" is used, not, as now, the higher name "Christ." The "flesh" of our Lord, then, *i.e.*, His humanity under its earthly conditions and limitations, was in like manner something, so far at least as these conditions were concerned, which needed to be thrown aside, something not spiritual, heavenly, and unlimited, and of which we gave a true description when we say that it was "of this creation." * It was a body of flesh, and what the writer

understands by that word we see from his use, in chapter vii. 16, of the word *σάρκινος*, made of flesh (not *σαρκικός*, fleshly), when he employs it to express the character of that whole Old Testament dispensation which had been superseded by the higher, to which Christ belonged. Nor is this all; for throughout his Epistle the redeeming work of our Lord is conceived of as that not of an earthly, but of a heavenly High-Priest, and the writer would certainly not depart from that conception at the moment when he is contrasting the very essence of Christ's work with that of the high-priest of Israel. Once admit, therefore, that the "greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—that is to say, not of this creation," is the Incarnate Lord, and it is impossible to pause there. We must also admit that it is that Lord in His human nature exalted and glorified. In the nature which He possessed, when He returned after His resurrection and ascension, to His Father in heaven, He carries out the great work of bringing God and man into perfect union and communion with one another. In the *glorified* Redeemer God and man have their true and everlasting meeting-place.

We are now in a position to determine the meaning of *διὰ* in the first of the two clauses of which we have been speaking. We have seen that it cannot possibly be interpreted as a local "through" in the second clause. We now see that it is not to be so interpreted in the first. As might be expected, it has the same signification, "by means of," "by virtue of," in both, denoting "that with which some one is furnished, the circumstances and conditions amid which he does something" (Moulton's *Winer*, p. 474, referring to this very passage). Two circumstances had been pointed out in the preceding verses (1-10) which showed that perfection could not be by the Levitical priesthood—the imperfection of the earthly tabernacle, the seat and centre of Israel's religion, and the imperfec-

* With the view here taken of the meaning of these expressions, "Not made with hands," etc. Delitzsch (*in loc.*), even when arguing against Hofmann, is compelled to agree. "That heavenly tabernacle," he says, "forms no part of the present material cosmos in which we are now placed, but appertains to the future age, and to the world of glory that is yet to come."

tion of the animal offerings presented there. Now comes the contrast. Christians have a perfect tabernacle in which to present their offering, and they have a perfect offering in which they do so. Each is Christ. Both are Christ. The glorified Christ is viewed in two different aspects of His person and work. He, not the tabernacle, not the temple, not Jerusalem, not Gerizim, but He Himself, in His exalted spiritual and heavenly state, is the perfect tabernacle in which we worship, is the perfect offering, that of His blood, His life, in which we are presented with acceptance to the Father. We need no more. The spiritual and heavenly ideas shadowed forth in the Old Covenant have been fulfilled, have reached their culmination in the New.

In these considerations also we have the answer to what may at first sight seem an important objection of Keil's to the view now taken—that, as the tabernacle in the wilderness did not make Aaron high-priest, so “the higher and more perfect tabernacle” could not make our Lord High-Priest. The objection rests upon a misconception of the true force of the rendering given to *διὰ*, “by means of” or “in virtue of.” Certainly the ancient tabernacle did not make Aaron high-priest, neither does the New Testament tabernacle make Christ High-Priest. He is High-Priest because He is the Son Divine and human, by the constitution of His person the one Mediator between God and man. But the “greater and more perfect tabernacle”—*i. e.*, His glorified humanity, is the sphere in which He ministers, is that in which He is enabled to carry out His purposes of grace, is that spiritual condition in which He can attain the end of His priesthood, uniting us to Him who is Spirit, and who must be worshipped in spirit and truth.

Finally, we may be reminded that in chapter viii. 2 our Lord is said to be “a Minister, *τῶν ἁγίων*, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man.” In other words, He is a Minister of the same “tabernacle” as that

which is here described. How, then, it may be asked, can our Lord be spoken of as a “Minister” of His own glorified humanity? The answer is, (1) that the words of the passage before us do not mean that Christ ministers to His own humanity thus glorified, but that that humanity is the sphere of His ministration; and (2) that the language is not more difficult to understand than the language in which He is elsewhere referred to as at once Priest and Victim. We need not only Priest and Victim, but a sphere in which the one may offer and the other be offered; and all this, all that we need, we find in Christ. Out of Him no spiritual privilege is bestowed on us; and there is, therefore, nothing incongruous in speaking of Him as Minister, and of His glorified humanity as the sphere of His ministry. Once more, it has been objected that, as we ought to understand the *τὰ ἅγια* of chapter ix. 12 in the same sense as the *τῶν ἁγίων* in chapter viii. 2, it is not possible to say that our Lord entered into the latter in virtue of His being the “greater and more perfect tabernacle.” The objection springs from failing to mark the precise difference between the two forms of speech. With the *τὰ ἅγια* is connected the thought of the innermost holy place, *viewed as that where the glory of God in itself is seen*; it is the same as that spoken of in chapter viii. 1 as “the right hand of the majesty in the heavens.” With the *σκηνή* again, in the imposing characteristics with which it is here associated, is connected the thought of the place at which *the manifestation of God's glory is made to man*. Thus starting at chapter viii. 2 from the thought of our Lord in heaven we have the *τὰ ἅγια* first, the *σκηνή* second. In chapter ix. 11, 12, starting from the thought of the means by which the Christian Church on earth is introduced to the enjoyment of her heavenly privileges, we have the *σκηνή* first, the *τὰ ἅγια* second; but in both passages the two expressions are used in precisely the same sense. It was in virtue of what He was as the spiritual, the

heavenly Redeemer of men that our Lord was able to appear before that God who is Spirit and Heaven in the deepest acceptance of these words, and that He was also able to complete our union with Him. Had the effecting of that union been dependent upon a tabernacle "of this world," and upon animal sacrifices such as those of Israel, it could no more have been accomplished now than under the earlier economy. But we have in Christ another tabernacle and another offering, both belong-

ing to "the world to come," to the spiritual, the heavenly, the unchangeable, the everlasting, so that in Him we have "an eternal redemption."

We have examined the exegetical meaning of the passage before us. On the supposition that our exegesis is correct, every one will at once acknowledge the high dogmatic importance of the sacred writer's words. To work that out, however, is the province of the dogmatic theologian, and not of the exegete.

SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

The Ethics of Politics.

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, S. T. D., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

II. *The Ethics of Party.*

THE small minority of the human race which believes in progress has achieved it mostly by antagonism. Human nature, in its present imperfect development, shows a curious affinity for half-truths, which fit the half-minds we are. But each half-truth is sure to be treated with exaggeration as to its scope and reach, which is sure to evoke a reaction toward the opposite and complementary half, while progress comes finally in the reconciliation of the two in a higher view, to the elimination of

"the falsehood of extremes."

It is this process which, in the field of politics, leads to the organization of parties. Generally the line of cleavage is that between conservative and progressive—between those who have fastened attention and affection upon the results already attained, and those who press toward an ideal state of things which lies in the future. Our own country, for instance, has been undergoing for more than a century a great process of naturalization, by which a group of isolated communities, jealous of their political distinctness and their local initia-

tive, has been transformed into a compact nation. Our conservative party, therefore, always has been careful of the local rights of the States and of the restrictions imposed by the Constitution upon national initiative; and our progressives have been those who labored for the consolidation of national power by its development in some specific direction. This, in spite of temporary confusions and obscurations, has been the main drift of our political currents.

There is, therefore, a relative justification for party. It saves us from stagnation on the one hand, and from hasty change on the other. In the present condition of things it serves uses which cannot be attained otherwise; but it is not in harmony with the highest political ethics, because it tends constantly to a breach of national brotherhood. For this reason, while the ethics of patriotism are positive, those of party are negative mainly. Their aim is to keep partisan feeling and activity within the bounds of reason and good morals, and to keep in view that party is but a makeshift means to an end, never an end in itself. While the nation, the family, and the Church are permanent parts of the social order, party is but a temporary phase of social development, which will come to an end with the larger ethical growth of mankind.

From its very nature, the spirit of party is hard to reconcile with the spirit

of truth. Party derives its vitality from just so much of the truth as it confesses, but its individuality and limitations from its denial, or at least its ignoring, of whatever truth does not fall within the party lines. The party habit of reading only those newspapers and hearing only those speakers which belong to the party fosters this. Yet men are made for the whole truth; it is their birthright. Party spirit converts them into Esaus, who despise their birthright.

Even more directly evil is the partisan spirit which puts forward falsehood as truth, and thus undermines that mutual confidence which is the very basis of social order in Teutonic society. In Teutonic nations the social instinct is not, as in Romance countries, strong enough of itself to hold society together. We need, besides, the assurance of mutual truth-speaking between man and man, between rulers and ruled. We are kept in the sense of being members of one body, because we speak every man truth to his neighbor. Luther, who committed our Teutonic Protestantism to the principle that the truth is always edifying and a lie always the instrument of moral and social death, has well said:

"We Germans have no repute for any other virtue so high and, I believe, hitherto so well deserved, as for being faithful, truthful and stanch folk, whose yea is yea and whose nay is nay, as is shown by a host of histories and books. We Germans have still a spark (may God keep it alive and blow it into a flame) of this old virtue—namely, that we are still ashamed and will not gladly be called liars, nor laugh at it like the Italians or Greeks, or make a jest of it. And although Italian and Greek fashions are making inroads on us, yet we are still so far unchanged that there is no more serious or more shameful word of reproach among us than to call or be called a liar. And I verily think (if I may call it thinking) that there is no more abusive reproach upon earth than this of lying and unfaithfulness; for

there is none that so breaks up all fellowship among men. For lying and unfaithfulness begin the division of men at the inmost heart, and that once effected, hand parts from hand; and when that happens what can men do or make? Hence come the divisions, the party work and the unhappiness of Italy. When truthfulness and good faith are gone, then must all government come to an end also. God help us Germans."

The partisan spirit, when it reaches a certain intensity, is sure to undermine the habit of veracity. This is true not only of one party, but of all parties; not only of political parties, of all sorts of parties—religious, literary, artistic, educational, and all the rest. First by suppression of fact, then by suggestion of falsehood, and at last by open and shameless lying the party spirit accomplishes the *facilis descensus Averni*, the down-grade march to hell. The effect of this on the political life of a nation is manifested in the want of a manly stability and loyalty to principle in its public men. Apart from truthfulness there is no foundation for manliness.

In republican countries like our own, this foul spirit of lying appears especially in partisan attacks on the characters of public men. Envy is a vice of democracies. The Athenian who asked Aristides to write his own name on the oyster-shell, because he was "tired of hearing the fellow called 'just,'" was not an exceptional Athenian. He was just like any of the crowd that supported Cleon, because the demagogue-butcher bespattered the best in Athens with his abuse, and who thus helped the city to its ruin by driving good men to retirement. As Wendell Phillips said, "The devil's democracy is, 'I'm as good as you are!'" It is impatient of distinction and disbelieves in the supereminence of virtue and ability. It loves to hear dignities evil-spoken of, and to see greatness dragged down to its own level.

In America it seems to be the accepted rule that a candidate for office, and still

more the incumbent of an office, has forfeited what we used to call "the right of reputation." It seems to matter but little to the reading public whether the charges flung are true or false. Nor is this any recent or fresh abuse of our politics. Washington was libelled and abused as bitterly as any modern politician because he signed the Jay Treaty, and tens of thousands of Americans applauded Thomas Paine for addressing him publicly in this style: "As for you, sir, treacherous in private friendship and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an impostor; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any."

To counteract this partisan tendency we need that a hatred of lies—of the lies that make for our side equally with those against it—should become not only a sentiment, but a passion in our whole society—such a hatred of them as is seen in the strongest characters of history—in Socrates, in Dante, in Savonarola, in Luther, in Knox, in Carlyle, and in every man who was brave enough to refuse to bow to either tyrants or mobs. The Hebrew prophets mourned over their people as having sunk so low that they loved a pleasant lie more than an unpalatable truth, so that no trade throve so well as that of the false prophet, whose business it was to invent such lies. In that base preference they saw a paralysis of heart and conscience. In Christ's view lying and murder are in their root the same. The liar may not strike at the single life, but he does at the collective life of the community, since on speech, and mutual good faith in its use, is based all fellowship between man and man.

To be absorbed into the life of a party, to "belong to" a party—as the phrase is—is, therefore, a moral danger. It is lawful to act for the time with the party we think in possession of what the Puritans called "the present truth"—*i. e.*, the side of the truth the situation of affairs most calls for. But we have

no right to "belong to" a party, because we belong to the truth and to our country. Party, however, loves to put itself into the place of country, and to claim a loyalty due to one's country alone. It exalts party fealty to a level with patriotism. In view of this we need to "make a conscience" of our liberty, and to display a social courage which is only too rare in our free country; for independence of party has its risks. Arthur Tappan, Benjamin Hallowell and other brave men were bankrupted for their anti-slavery opinions before the war. Is the spirit which proscribed them dead now, or less cruel? Would that we all had the courage with which Hallowell replied to an angry Southern correspondent: "My silks are for sale; not my opinions!"

Besides the danger to individual integrity, party spirit is a peril to the nation when it is allowed to pass strict bounds of reason. In this respect the contrast of France and England is instructive to us. In English public life it is assumed of every man that he is, first of all, an Englishman and aims at the greatness of England; and that all English questions are to be settled in a lawful English fashion. As Burns says:

"The kettle o' the Kirk and State,
What though a clout may fall in't;
Dell the foreign tinkler loon
Will ever ca' a nail in't!"

In France, on the contrary, party bitterness goes so far that since 1789 every party in opposition has been in the mood to welcome a foreign invasion, if that would bring it back to power. French politics tend toward the old Greek method of turning the beaten party out of the city, and thus simplifying the next elections. At one time it really seemed as if France and not England was to furnish the type of our own political life. It was the time when the passionate sympathies evoked by the French Revolution and by England's war on France had brought feeling to such a height, that a traveller in Ameri-

ca said he found here many Frenchmen and many Englishmen, but no Americans! It is this that led Washington, in his farewell address, to warn his countrymen against partisan heats, and especially against meddling with European quarrels. The burden of his solemn appeal in behalf of our national integrity rests on this very point; and while experience has abated the fear of this, we still need to remember that this is a precipice along whose edge our national progress moves. Statesmanship like that of Washington will not only discourage the spirit of dissension, but will strive to foresee and to remove the occasion for it.

But what can we expect of our public men, absorbed as they are in the partisan activities of our present system, and obliged by its exactions to "give up to party what was meant for" their country? When President Grant most infelicitously described himself as "the president of the Republican party," he but confirmed the Greek proverb that "the blundering tongue lets out the truth." I well remember how that slip moved the late Henry C. Carey, my dear friend and teacher. "The English," he said, "show more sense than we do. They put at the head of the nation a man whose business it is to get them all to pull together; and if he have a morsel of sense he will so use the immense influence of his position. We put into that place a man whose interest we make it that we should pull in opposite directions."

The spoils system, which has done so much to make the rulers of the nation the servants of party, is not an inevitable evil of our method of government. It had no existence in national politics until Mr. Monroe's second administration, when the law was passed terminating the commissions of officials at the end of four years. For the first quarter century the rule of service for life or good behavior was in force. "Few die; none resign," Jefferson said, when asked to put his friends into the places held by his Federalist unfrinds. Presi-

dent Jackson improved on the new law by removing without waiting till commissions expired. It is this power to remove from office without giving a reason which has driven the office-holders to organize themselves into a compact "machine" to keep their party in power. It is this that has given them into the hands of political "bosses," by putting a premium on the qualities required for the control of conventions and the carrying of elections. It is this that has added so much to the fierceness and the unscrupulousness of political contests, since the living of myriads of office-holders is staked on the result. It is both unfair and useless to declaim against the "machines" and their bosses, since both are the inevitable outcome of a situation created by law and acquiesced in by our people generally. What we should do is to repeal the law of seventy years ago, and pass whatever others may be needed to give office-holders security against causeless removal. That will break up the machine as the sun of spring breaks up the ice on our rivers.

What is called civil service reform has not accomplished this, because it has begun at the wrong end. It has tried to take the second step before taking the first. Under the attraction of English example, it has adopted the method of competitive examinations, which can be applied to the candidates for a part only of the civil service, and which is sure to be circumvented by the "machine," if the motive for evading it is left untouched. In Philadelphia examinations were so manipulated in one case as to secure 92 per cent of successful candidates to the party then in power. In New York a professor of national reputation presented himself as a candidate, passed the examinations easily to his own satisfaction, but was scheduled as unsuccessful!

The direct corruption of voters by party-workers is an evil which universal suffrage was expected to remedy; but the value of a few votes in a closely contested district or State makes bribery

as feasible as it ever was ; and the evil of purchasing "floating" votes is a very grave one, although, I think, not so extensive as has been assumed. Not all nor even the greater part of the money paid to voters is in the form of bribes. Most of it goes to laggard or discontented voters to induce them to cast their ballots for their own party. This bad practice grew out of the fact that each party had a number of small election-offices to bestow at each voting place ; and of course for each office there were a score of candidates before it was given, and nearly as many "sore-heads" afterward. To conciliate these a trifle in money was given them for supposed or alleged services in electioneering ; and then other scores of voters, frequently men of some means, acted on the pauper's maxim : "If there is anything to be had, I may as well have it as anybody else." People who boast that they never voted for any but one party will hang round the polls and adorn the neighboring fences for hours, waiting for the trifle that is to reward them for the trouble of voting for that.

It also is to be said that both this kind of payment and that of a directly corrupting kind is the work of local committees, the larger national and State bodies generally having no money for these bad uses. These abuses exist in very different degrees in different parts of the country, being worst generally in "close" States and districts. I am satisfied that the politicians who are directly responsible for them would be glad to abolish the practice, if they only could be sure that both sides would agree to that and abide by it. Just as military men never have offered resistance to any international agreement which would restrict the scope and abate the horrors of war, so, I am convinced, the politicians would be glad of any agreement between parties which would eliminate the paying for votes under any conditions.

I have no such hopes from the introduction of the Australian ballot. It

will not touch the first kind of payments at all ; nor is it certain that it will diminish actual bribery. It is a shallow assumption that the man who is mean enough to take a bribe will not vote as he has been paid to do. Human nature is never so consistent, even in its rascalities, as this assumes, and the politicians know it. The secret ballot may put an obstacle in the way of terrorizing voters by threats of dismissal ; but how far is this a crying evil in our politics. A study of the vote in the last presidential election goes far to show that the American workman votes as he pleases, without the help of the secret ballot, while a Montana case proves that terrorism may exist in connection with it. The true remedy for terrorism must be found in the development of social courage in the workmen individually and in their associations collectively. Without that no method of voting can prevent a bullying employer from dismissing or "black-listing" those of his workmen who do not assure him that they voted as he wished. From that they can escape only by lying ; and *The Spectator* says that the Australian ballot "has sown England broadcast with liars."

The lack of social courage is a crying want of our political life. Only those who have tried to organize any independent movement to resist the domination of the "machine" or the "bosses" can realize how little political pluck the average voter possesses. There are plenty of Nicodemuses, who will come under the cover of the dark to say what they fear to utter in open day ; but there is a sad lack of men who will stand on the public platform and say to their fellow-citizens, "I for one will wear no man's collar and vote no man's 'slated' ticket." It is my own conviction that the ballot method of voting is the cause of this. You cannot train a man to do his shooting from behind a stone wall without tending to make a coward of him. A more open and manly method of voting would make the voter more frank and outspoken in

the weeks and months before the election; and it thus would advertise public men more exactly of the movement of public opinion. And if "the Sermon on the Mount has anything to do with politics," the kingdom of peace and righteousness is not going to be advanced by the methods of darkness and secrecy it emphatically condemns.

Lastly, we need to guard against the spirit of party because of the check it puts to social sympathy. It teaches us to assume that the baser motive is always uppermost in those who differ from us. There are those who reject the conception of total depravity from their theology, who retain it in their estimate of their political opponents. One politician even improved upon it, by declaring that the sudden elevation of his political enemies to the level of total depravity would be attended with a fearful sense of giddiness!

This habit of suspicion and dislike has become so deeply settled, that it clings to us in the treatment of social problems which are not party questions. It is rare to find in our newspapers—though not so rare as it once was—a candid and fair-minded treatment of any notable collision between capital and labor. Lord Derby's advice to make a ring in such cases and see fair play, while not the highest, is much above the usual practice. So when the American farmer had borrowed on mortgage-paper money that was worth from fifty-seven to seventy cents on the dollar, and was obliged by the Resumption policy to repay it in gold, with how little sympathy his situ-

ation was discussed on all hands! Nor has he had much more in recent years, when his exclusion from the credit system of the country obliges him to sell his crop nearly as soon as it is harvested, to the benefit chiefly of the speculators in grain. "Put yourself in his place!" is a wise maxim in such cases. Its use was finely illustrated when the Sheffield outrages in 1867 had horrified the English people, and Parliament was required to find a remedy. Instead of asking what measures of severity would terrorize the authors of these outrages, English statesmen asked what were the wrongs which had made Englishmen fall back on so unEnglish a practice as assassination. By legislation they removed those wrongs, and the outrages ceased forever. So it is safe to assume that when some millions of the American people make a great demonstration of dissatisfaction and discontent, they have a substantial grievance, even although the remedy they propose may be a mistake; but this is not a lesson that is learned in the school of partisanship.

In fine, the remedies for our political evils are moral remedies. It is not by skilful mechanical contrivances, but by a purer public opinion, that permanent and thorough reforms will be secured. For my own part, I am impressed with the need of a more earnest and sleepless loyalty to the nation, a more passionate love of truth, a nobler personal independence, a finer social courage, and a livelier sympathy with our fellow-citizens as remedies for the present evils of our political life.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

My Experience in the Cultivation of the Missionary Spirit.

BY REV. JAMES MUDGE, D.D., CLINTON, MASS.

I HAVE served two churches in the last seven years—three years at W—and four years at P—. At the former

place the total sum raised for missions the year before my going was \$62, and this was a decided advance on anything previously accomplished. At the close of my first year \$100 was reported; at the close of the second, \$160; and at the close of the third, \$188. On going to P— I found that \$61 had been

raised the previous year for missions, and this was the high-water mark, the amount raised during most of the previous years having been insignificant—sometimes \$10 or less; sometimes \$20; sometimes \$30—according to the zeal of the pastor. Applying the methods which had been gradually taking shape and were now fully matured, the end of the first year showed the sum of \$194 to have been contributed; the second year \$210 was given; the third year \$250, and the fourth year, in spite of a devastating fire which swept the village, and some other calamities, which materially reduced the financial ability of the people, \$260 was sent to the treasurer of the missionary society.

How was this done? The advance was not due to any increase in numbers or in wealth. There was none. Nor were there any extraordinary temporary inducements held out such as could not be steadily maintained. The progress was not of the nature of a special spurt, sure to disappear when the pressure was removed. The W— church gave \$173 the year after I left it. It was in both cases simply the normal result of a greatly increased missionary spirit.

What were the measures used to effect this?

First in importance I put the establishment and maintenance of a meeting wholly devoted to the subject of missions, held on the first Sunday night of each month. It will at once be seen what an opportunity this gives, through prayer and song, through essay and address, of reaching both the minds and hearts of the people. Vast amounts of information can be imparted. The glowing facts, which are the indispensable fuel for the fire of zeal, can be attractively and systematically presented. As a result of the instruction will come inspiration, and from that funds will flow in copious flood. The absence of such meetings from most of the churches is of itself sufficient to explain why such vast numbers of Christian people have little or no knowledge of Christian missions, and hence, of course, little or

no interest in them. Not having had the matter brought steadily before them, it is not surprising that they have utterly failed to apprehend either man's extremity or the Church's opportunity, and hence have made no response to man's wail or God's will. Just here lies very largely the explanation why this noblest enterprise, not of the nineteenth century only, but of all the centuries, so painfully lags. Let it not be said that people will not attend such meetings. It is the writer's experience that they are better attended than any other kind, for the simple reason that they are made intensely interesting. Facilities for so making them are now most plentiful; and the excuse for dull missionary meetings, if it ever existed, has long since passed away.

In the second place, great attention was paid to bringing the children in the Sunday-school face to face with the thrilling incidents and touching narratives from the mission fields. A part of the regular session on the first Sunday of every month was sacredly devoted to arousing their sympathies for those destitute of the Gospel, and calling out their benevolence in this direction. To this end a special organization of the school into a missionary society was effected, with a constitution and officers whose duty it was to devise and set in vigorous operation all possible means for increasing the missionary contributions of the school. Cheap illustrated missionary papers were circulated, mite-boxes were distributed, Easter offerings were solicited, class collections were manipulated, and in all other suitable ways the cause was magnified. As a result the amount raised by the W— school went up from \$20 to \$108, reaching, in the latter case, an average of \$1 from every member of the school; and the amount raised by the P— school rose from \$21 to \$137. This can be done anywhere, and with benefit rather than harm to the other collections of the school; while the characters of the children will be greatly ennobled by the broadening of their minds and the in-

terest awakened in the world-wide work of the Lord.

A special effort was made in sermons, and prayers, and casual references while expounding Scripture, to lay the matter closely upon the conscience of the church. The pastor's position was not suffered to be in any respect ambiguous. Everybody was compelled clearly to understand that if he wished to be considered loyal to Christ and worthy of the name of a disciple he must take an active part in carrying out the Saviour's last command. No pains were spared to make it plain that the cry of the heathen could not be neglected without sin, and that the extension of the Gospel throughout the world was not an unimportant side issue which might be flippantly dismissed with a few minutes' consideration, but was the main work of the Church, to be steadily followed up throughout the year.

The pastor, of course, also set an example of generosity and zeal in the matter by making a considerable contribution himself, seeing no reason that should except or excuse him from being one of the largest givers to the cause. He did not say "Go," but "Come;" nor did he permit himself to be deterred by any false modesty from letting his light in this particular so shine before his parishioners that they, seeing his good works, might glorify God by following in his steps.

Wide observation, as well as experience, has convinced the present writer that any pastor who so wills can have a missionary church. When there is a man in the pulpit full of longing to see the dark lands lighted, they who fill the pews will in most cases be found ready to take their share in the grand crusade. A few, no doubt, will oppose, and others will present a dogged immobility. But almost all will show some effect from the steady pressure which a pastor can bring to bear, and some will show great effects. They will awaken as to a new life; they will realize for the first time what the Church is for,

and what may be accomplished with a little money properly directed in this channel. Old prejudices will disappear; the old indifference will melt away. A few in every community may thus be induced to become lifelong friends of the cause, and liberal givers in proportion to their means.

If some such process as has been here outlined could be put in operation in all the churches, the donations to the missionary treasury would be at once trebled and quadrupled. Instead of all Protestant Christendom giving the paltry sum of twelve million dollars annually for foreign missions, it would at once give fifty, and a like sum for home missions.

The responsibility is with the pastors, the natural and appointed leaders of the flock. They hold the key to the situation. If they will but make the cause their own, the work of evangelizing the earth, which now, after eighteen Christian centuries, so sadly lingers, will leap forward to a glad and glorious conclusion.

What Attitude Should the Church Take Toward Amusements?

BY REV. WALCOTT FAY, WESTBOROUGH, MASS.

EDWARD EGGLESTON says in "Roxy": "The Puritan preachers, the brave cobblers and tinkers whom the seventeenth century stuck in the stocks and prison-houses, and the fervent Wesleyan village blacksmiths and Yorkshire farmers of the eighteenth century, are yet masters of the nineteenth. To this day we take our most innocent amusements in a guilty and apologetic fashion, bowing to the venerable prejudice, and saying, 'By your leave, sir.'"

Professor Park, of Andover, is fond of telling a story which illustrates the truth of Mr. Eggleston's remark. He was at Paris in feeble health, and found it necessary to consult the most eminent physician of the city. The great doctor looked him over, felt of him, asked a question or two, and then said,

"What you need, monsieur, is not pills, but play. You must be amused. When you get back to the United States make a practice of going to the theatre at least once a week."

"But, doctor," Professor Park replied, "there is no theatre where I live." "No theatre? How strange! Well, then, you must go to the opera." "But, doctor, there is no opera where I live." "No opera! Then go to the circus." "But there is no circus where I live." "No circus! Well, go to the dances." "But there are no dances where I live." "*Merci, monsieur!* No theatre, no opera, no circus, no dances—where do you live?" "Next station to Ballardvale." "Next station to Ballardvale! And what do you have for amusement next station to Ballardvale?" "We have," replied the old theologian, with a twinkle in his eyes—"we have the sewing circle."

But in these days even the average New England village has something besides the sewing circle, and probably there is no question on which Christians differ more than the question of amusements. All sorts of views prevail. Some hold that the theatre is the gate of perdition and cards the invention of the devil. Others, apparently no less devoted to Christ, are in the habit of attending the theatre occasionally, and a game of cards is as common in their family as a game of checkers. Some stand aloof in holy horror from the dance. Others see in it an innocent recreation, calculated not only to amuse the young people, but to give their bodies grace and their manners ease. Some would rather lose their right arm than handle a billiard cue. Others have in their own house a billiard-table, where father plays with son and sister with brother. If I am not mistaken, this was the case in the home of America's greatest preacher, Mr. Beecher.

But however we differ, no one, I suppose, is for a moment inclined to doubt that some kind of recreation is permissible to the Christian—nay, that it is obligatory. Our first duty surely is

to keep body and mind in such condition that both can do their best for God and man. All work and no play makes a dull disciple. We should at proper seasons indulge in amusements, not for amusement's sake, but because they are the oil our machinery needs and cannot do without. Why, then, should the Church put them under its ban? Why this wholesale condemnation? Is it not time that its attitude change? Is it in accord with the example of our Master, who, while His life embraced the rigorous fast, the long night-watch of prayer on the cold hill top and sternest self-denial, took also an active part in the innocent festivities and joys and amusements of the men and women among whom He lived, that the Church persists in frowning upon all those modes of recreation which are commonly called amusements?

Real recreation is re-creation. We become exhausted by toil, whether of body or brain. We become fretted by a thousand cares. We become weighted by anxiety. We need for a time to forget our troubles, rest from our labor, be cheered in our despondency—to be re-created. What will do this for us? Surely, not dancing till daybreak in a heated ball room, nor shuffling cards all night, nor worse than wasting three hours in the impure atmosphere of a crowded theatre applauding profanity, obscenity, and ribald wit.

I regard it as one of the encouraging signs of the times that out-door amusements for both sexes are growing in popular favor. Of all amusements, these are the healthiest and best. Croquet, in its Eden-like simplicity, notwithstanding its peculiar temptations to cheat or squabble, has long been recognized as the ministers' game, and the best croquet players at Saratoga every summer are doctors of divinity from the foremost pulpits of the land. Cricket, tennis, base-ball, sailing, fishing, skating—toward these and kindred recreations the attitude of the Church, I rejoice to say, has come to be unequivocally friendly.

But what attitude shall the Church assume toward those amusements about which there is more doubt? Is it right for the Christian to attend the theatre? Is it right for the Christian to play cards? Is it right for the Christian to dance? Yes, if it is right for anybody. If it is wrong for the Christian it is wrong for everybody. Let us have done with the fallacy that one set of things is right for one set of people and wrong for another set. If it is right for the worldling to attend places of amusement it is right for the minister, and if it is not right for the minister it is not right for the worldling. Right is right and wrong is wrong the world around.

Where doctors differ, who shall decide? The patient must decide. Not the doctors of the Church. The Church should issue no bull, adopt no by-law, regarding it, nor presume by council or conference to dictate what course in a thing so purely personal its members must pursue. It should frankly admit that there are theatres and theatres; plays and plays; actors and actors. All are not alike. There are theatres careful to admit nothing indecent. There are plays pure, elevating, healthfully stimulating, whose every influence is for good—plays that vividly impress the nobility of honesty, the value of chastity, the beauty of domestic graces, the charm and sacredness of the fireside, the folly, curse, and punishment of sin. Such plays never degrade. They are sermons, and they preach to some who seldom or never enter the sanctuary. What a preacher Shakespeare was, and how his sermons help out ours! There is as great a distance between a play like *Hamlet* or *Macbeth* and such a play as the *Black Crook* as there is between a work of Thackeray or Dickens and the poisonous sensationalism of the lowest French novels. Because we would not corrupt the imagination with the rottenness of bad novels, do we argue that it is a sin to read good novels? Our grandfathers did. My father when a boy used to steal away

to the hay-mow to read in trembling secrecy *Robinson Crusoe*. Perhaps the next generation will witness as sensible a change in regard to amusements.

But the stock objection against the theatre is that actors are immoral. This once had force. It has little now. Who that has read the delightful autobiography of Joseph Jefferson would conclude from its records, pure and sparkling as a crystalline spring, that the actors of the present day are more immoral than other people? There was a time when there was no class more corrupt than the clergy, but we do not on that account avoid the clergy now. Actors are morally improved, and one reason is that they are treated with less suspicion than formerly. Now that the Queen of Great Britain visits an opera singer, and the President of the United States becomes the guest of a comedian, actors have acquired a self-respect socially which does much to keep them where they ought to be ethically. There are actors like Edwin Booth and opera singers like Emma Abbott of unsullied reputation. There are actors who are Christians. There are also good actors who are bad men, and the same may be said of doctors, lawyers, and ministers. Shall we never attend a lecture because some lecturers are infidels?

As to dancing, very curious arguments have been adduced. In a former pastorate I well remember the favorite prayer-meeting argument of a worthy brother: That the daughter of Herodias danced and pleased Herod; that because the dancing pleased Herod he granted her petition; that said petition was for the head of John the Baptist; *ergo*, John the Baptist lost his head through dancing, and therefore dancing is a sin.

But perhaps this is as logical as the plea occasionally made in defence of dancing, that David danced before the Lord! We forget that David danced without a partner. I am perfectly willing my young people should dance that way.

Seriously, the Church should clearly perceive and candidly point out the difference between dancing all night and dancing an hour or two; the difference between the promiscuous dance of the public ball-room, where a pure young girl may be whirled around the room in the arms of a libertine, and the quiet square dance of the home circle or private party.

In my humble opinion the Church should take fairly and squarely this attitude: to innocent recreation friendly encouragement instead of suspicious hostility; toward all amusements conscientious discrimination instead of wholesale condemnation. Every amusement that is really a benefit to weary, sad, careworn humanity the Church should seek not to suppress, but cherish. I trust even we shall see the dawning of the day when the devil will no longer monopolize the grand opportunities in recreation which the Church should control.

Army Chaplains and their Work.

BY CHAPLAIN CEPHAS C. BATEMAN,
U. S. ARMY, FORT ASSINNIBOINE,
MONTANA.

THE army regulations now in force provide for the maintenance of thirty-four chaplaincies. This provision is apart from the chaplaincy of the West Point Military Academy, which is in fact a professorship of history and ethics with the rank of lieutenant-colonel. There are also at a few posts special arrangements made by which local clergymen act as chaplains. These acting chaplains are not officially attached to the military establishment, but serve at the pleasure of the respective commanding officers engaging them.

Army chaplains proper are divided into two classes—namely, regimental and post chaplains. Both classes have the same rank, that of the *infantry captain* "without command."

Of regimental chaplaincies there are four; of post chaplaincies there are thirty. The regimental chaplains are

permanently attached to the Ninth and Tenth regiments of Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth regiments of Infantry. These four regiments are made up of regularly enlisted Afro-American citizens, sons largely of former slaves. The three chaplains of color are gentlemen of education and refinement and second to none in zeal and efficiency. Denominationally the four are divided thus: two are Baptists, one a Methodist, and one, I believe, is a Lutheran clergyman. Of the thirty post chaplaincies, we may find by consulting the current register of army officers, that twenty-nine are reported therein occupied, leaving but one vacancy. But since the chaplains' section of the book came from the printer's hand, there has been one retirement for age, two have been ordered to await retirement because of permanent disability in line of duty, and one other has been on "sick leave" for several months. Hence, there are at this writing (March) two actual vacancies, two in immediate prospect, with the possibility of a fifth. Or, in other words, there are twenty-five post chaplains doing duty.

Vacancies are filled by Presidential appointment, "by and with the consent of the Senate." Blank applications are furnished by the War Department at request. As there are literally hundreds of applications on file at all times in anticipation of vacancies, and other hundreds placed on file when vacancies really occur, it is clear that the chance of any one succeeding without powerful support in the "Upper House" is distressingly small. It is devoutly hoped that the day is near when the appointment of chaplains may not be considered as so much political patronage. So-called ministers have, it is said, been appointed to the Chaplains' Corps seemingly on the theory that they should make good chaplains, because forsooth it was known positively that they were good for nothing else. Let it here be observed that a ministerial failure in civil life is not the man to

direct successfully the affairs of a military parish. The following Christian bodies are represented by the twenty-five chaplains mentioned above: Protestant Episcopal, 8; Methodist Episcopal, 7; Baptist, 5; Presbyterian, 2; Roman Catholic, 2; Disciple, 1. Of those on sick leave or awaiting retirement, Congregational, 1; Methodist, 2. The corps has lost recently by retirement a Catholic and a United Presbyterian.

Now there are some ninety-four garrisoned posts in the country. Not one third of them are supplied with chaplains nor can they be supplied from the slender existing corps. There will never probably be less than seventy-five or eighty garrisons. The present corps has been and must be as now constituted totally inadequate to the moral and spiritual needs of the army. The modern policy of the military authorities is to concentrate troops by massing large bodies together. This is believed to be desirable for economical and disciplinary considerations. It will certainly further the work of the chaplains. Fortunately for my own part I have so far only known the work at large posts.

An era of education has, moreover, dawned upon our army. This accentuates the need of a large re-enforcement to our corps. Chaplains are not required to be school-teachers, but superintendents of post schools, and as such are expected to be competent to direct intelligently the studies pursued in these schools; and right here is often the chaplain's best opportunity to influence the men for good. If he be a true shepherd and assiduous himself in the acquisition of knowledge—"a fellow-student"—he may go into a school-room filled with men in uniform who are probably just beginning the rudiments of an English education and relieving them of their evident embarrassment, at once invite and command an enthusiastic attention to the simple but earnest work in hand. Men who cannot read and write English are required

to attend school; volunteers may pursue their studies well up into a high school course if they choose to do so, provided always such extra work does not take them from regular military duties. Again, the old practice of recruiting men for the ranks from the slums of great cities, "thugs," thieves, and ruffians generally, trusting to the unyielding force of a wrought-iron discipline to reduce and make soldiers of them, has happily become a thing of the past. Very few such characters get into the army nowadays, and the occasional one is quickly discovered. Men must now, for the most part, give a good account of themselves, and produce certificates of character for the inspection and approval of the exacting recruiting officer. The result is already evinced in the improved quality of soldier material. This means that we are now and then finding an active Christian man occupying the honorable position of high private. We are getting young men from the country villages and the farms, and one of these days we shall have an American army made up of American soldiers instead of foreign mercenaries, as too large a percentage are to-day. Here is a sign of the times which the chaplains are hailing with hopeful hearts. Furthermore, the Sunday inspections have been greatly abbreviated and Sunday dress parades altogether abolished. Formerly it was practically impossible to gather a congregation for Divine services during the hours of the day on Sunday. The influence of these practices still affect church attendance. This is a source of discouragement to ministers entering the army who in civil life could command a congregation of hundreds. The minister who gave up the pastorate of a church which enrolled hundreds of names, and a congregation which filled usually the seating capacity of the house of worship, will often find himself sorely pressed in accommodating his ministrations to the little group of faithful ones who gather in the post chapel on a "stormy Sunday

morning." The depression of spirit will somewhat depart when the chapel fills in the evening for the praise service and practical Gospel address. The hymns of Messrs. Moody and Sankey do good service in the army as elsewhere.

Military men are not interested, as a class, in the subject of religion. This is not criticism, it is a fact. The army officer who is interested in religious matters is the notable exception—not the rule by any means. Officers are usually indifferent. They often half jestingly acknowledge it. Of scoffers and out-and-out infidels I have yet to find one among the officers. I have only so far to record the kindest consideration and profoundest respect for my profession and faith. It is not true, as some suppose, that officers are intemperate or otherwise immoral. The moral tone of the army was never so high as now. There is less drinking and gambling among army officers than at any previous period in our history; but there is still present the spirit of intense worldliness. The "hops" are of more consequence than religious observances or meetings; the former are so faithfully attended indeed during the week that frequently Sunday must needs be a day of "complete rest." Some believe that the young officers fresh from West Point are no great improvement on their predecessors. Anxious, prayerfully anxious to know what had turned so many of these splendid young gentlemen away from all church-going, I have made inquiry and always with the same result: "Oh! we are tired of going to church—no disrespect intended—but you see we are compelled to attend church while at 'The Point;' and four years of compulsory religious observance has worn us out. We are tired, that's all." It might be well, perhaps, to remove this awful pressure for a few years, and until the army could have the benefit of a few generations of officers who are not such sufferers from religious weariness. I have concluded that religious fatigue in the

army is a serious matter. It is but just to say, however, that some of the young lieutenants do actually get rested after their four years' chapel toil and set their men a fine example of churchgoing. There ought not to be any reason why cadets should lose interest in religious work. At the Academy there is kept up from year to year an effective Young Men's Christian Association. Our greatest soldiers have been profoundly religious men. This widespread indifference to much of a chaplain's work has led some of the best men in the corps to conclude that many do not wish to see the chaplains succeed. I have before me as I write a letter from one of the most conscientious and faithful workers in the corps of chaplains. I quote the following from this letter: "Of course equally conscientious men will meet with varying degrees of success in this as in other fields, but they can all command the respect of all the decent people with whom they are brought in contact. Still I am satisfied there is an element in the army which does not care to have our work succeed." This chaplain has written out of an experience much wider than my own.

An almost insuperable obstacle to a chaplain's work is the authorized sale of intoxicating drink (beer) in the post canteen, or, as the new name has it, "post exchange." Particularly does this traffic stand in the way of temperance or, strictly speaking, total abstinence work among the men.

The profits from the sale of beer are divided at stated times among the respective companies stationed at the post, to be expended in luxuries or extras for the companies' mess or tables. Hence, the more beer sold and drank the more luxuries on the tables. This is a powerful inducement to young men to drink beer. It is, in fact, an invitation to vice held out by the Government itself. But this is not all; a credit system prevails at the post exchange, whereby the rawest recruit may drink a certain amount, the value (?) of which

will be deducted from his first month's pay. Older soldiers are permitted a larger credit at the exchange. I have from the first believed the system a ruinous one. I have said so at all times, in season and out of season. It is said to be better than the post tradership, which in many places was absolute rottenness. I believe the post exchange system to be an appalling national disgrace. Military law is strong enough to stop the whole liquor business on reservations. The best army in the world would be a cold-water army. If men had not come to me after making heroic efforts to lead sober lives, but tempted to their fall, with tears and almost in despair at their own weakness, I should not feel so deeply on this subject.

But the system is proving destructive of discipline. In an able paper read recently before the officers' lyceum at Fort Leavenworth, Lieutenant M. T. Jamar, of the Thirtieth U. S. Infantry, said: "The Canteen (Exchange) seems hardly to have achieved its desired result—that is, to reduce drunkenness. In 1880 there were 111 convictions; in 1890, 223, and in 1891, 201; and for drunkenness on duty 157 in 1880, 200 in 1890, and 206 in 1891." The most efficient member of a Good Templars Lodge or of the Loyal Temperance League may be detailed to service in the post exchange, there to deal out beer to his fellows—as a military (?) duty. Officers may and do exercise care in making details for such duty, but any man is liable to such repugnant service.

Another hindrance to effective moral and religious work among the soldiers is the present arrangement of dormitories—long wards with no possibility of privacy. In almost every company there is at least one foul-mouthed, drunken brute, whose profanity and obscenity make the atmosphere of the barracks stifling and deadly. Men must dress and undress in each other's presence. This alone is calculated to destroy the finer sensibilities, and pro-

motes impurity in thought and speech. Should a man wish to kneel for a moment in prayer he at once becomes the target of all the ruffianism in the dormitory. If partitions would be too expensive, as it is claimed, it would seem that curtains might be used to advantage in shutting up three or four men to themselves, and allowing them some choice in the selection of associates. Partitions extending half way to the ceiling ought not to be an expensive alteration. Of course it is quite out of the question to give every man a room by himself; but even by putting four men in a compartment morality would be greatly promoted. I might enlarge upon the difficulties which beset us; but this page reminds me that I am reaching the limit of space and patience. The Chaplains' Corps is engaged in an aggressive campaign against evil in the army. It is not all smooth sailing. Warfare is labor everywhere. To promote *esprit de corps* among us, a Chaplains' Alliance was organized at Fort Leavenworth, May 13th, 1891. The distance being so great, many chaplains were unable to be present, though very generally the alliance was approved by the corps. The sessions attracted wide attention, and the work of the army chaplains has been better understood and more highly appreciated since.

In December of last year the *United States Army Visitor*, published at No. 82 Nassau Street, New York, by the United States Army and Navy Aid Association—a noble society—was changed in name to *United States Army Chaplain*. It is issued monthly from the above place. The Chaplains' Corps, at the request of the Army and Navy Aid Association, selected an editor. The lot fell to Chaplain Charles C. Pierce, of Fort Leavenworth. Major John B. Ketchum, who was at the head of the *Visitor*, is now managing editor of *The Chaplain*. The *United Christian Commission* held its annual session, December 22d-29th, 1891, in the city of Washington. There were representatives present from the Presbyterian, Luther-

an, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational and Episcopal churches. The W. C. T. U., the Y. M. C. A., the Army and Navy Aid Association were also present by representatives. The War Department was represented by Chaplain Orville J. Nave, to whom more than to any one person is due the creation of this commission for the benefit of Christian effort in the army. Many helpful recommendations were pressed upon the attention of Congress at this session. Almost every feature of our work had a fair showing, but chaplains must depend on their brethren in civil life to see these things through. Effective reforms in policies cannot be brought about by thirty chaplains scattered at vast distances apart over our well-nigh boundless frontier. Thus far can we go and no farther. We are officers under the same restrictions as those of the line.

How the Pastors May Help Us.

1. By their prayers. How often are we remembered in the Sunday morning prayers of the pastors? Who prays for chaplains?

2. By creating popular sentiment in favor of an increase in the number of chaplains, and by impressing members of Congress with the urgency of the demand. Let churches and convocations

call loud enough for this and they will be heard.

3. By demanding in the name of God and humanity the prohibition of all intoxicating liquors on military as well as Indian reservations; particularly the abolishment forever of the canteen or post exchange system and kindred schemes of the drink traffic.

4. By calling the attention of members of Congress and influential Christian citizens to the need of reform in the construction of dormitories for enlisted men.

5. By giving one Sunday in the year, say the Sunday before Decoration Day (May 30th), to be called "Army Day."* When Memorial or Decoration Day falls on Sunday, combine the two by causing tributes to the dead to take practical shape in Christian service for the living soldier. This suggestion is entirely my own, but I trust not unpractical or unwise.

We hear a good deal now and then about the immorality of the army, but precious little at any time about efforts put forth to lift the army up into better moral and spiritual life.

The readers of this magazine alone could, if they chose, bring about all the reforms in public policy outlined in this article.

May we not expect such support as we are sure they can give?

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

"Does It Pay?"

S. W. L., in the March HOMILETIC REVIEW, asks: "Does it pay to keep up the imperfect acquaintance with the Hebrew and the Greek which the majority of our ministers acquired while in college?" I would as soon think of inquiring: "Does it pay to keep up the habit of eating which the majority of us acquired in childhood?"

My acquaintance with the original

tongues is not of "that scholarly order that constitutes authority"—far from it; but I would no more think of giv-

* Since writing the above it has been learned that, in 1889, Chaplain Nave, in a printed circular sent to many clergymen, suggested an "Army and Navy Day" near the Fourth of July. The suggestion was approved by some church conventions, and has been to some extent acted upon. I am strongly of the opinion that, to make such a day effective, it must be the practical outcome of Decoration Day, better called Memorial Day.

ing up my study of the Greek and Hebrew Scripture than I would of cutting off one meal a day.

True, commentators and expositors are a great help; but one can no more depend on these alone for intellectual strength than on lactated food and malted milk for physical vigor. Such things are good, but they lack the elements that go to build up bone and muscle.

No pastor can afford to give up his study of the original Scriptures. The place of the Greek Testament can never be supplied by any "commentary" or "help," however good. Fifteen minutes every morning spent in a study of the Greek Testament sharpens one up for the whole day. It is useless for many of us to seek to be authorities in the originals, but it is suicidal to go to the other extreme and neglect their study altogether.

S. W. L. doubts if our Saviour knew the Hebrew. Such an authority as Dr. Stalker thinks that Christ read the Old Testament in the original Hebrew, and that His quotations show the same. Our Saviour may not have used Hebrew quotations largely, nor need the pastor cumber every discourse with Greek quotations—better not; but a faithful study of the originals, such as any studious pastor can give them, will enlarge and strengthen the intellect, refresh and inspire the heart.

REV. C. G. MOSHER.

MADISON, ME., March 4, 1892.

The Parsonage.

IN Vol. XXIII., p. 315, of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW an esteemed writer calls attention to "Clerical Authors and Men of Letters." The field there opened up to view is, however, so vast and interesting that we feel like calling on Professor T. W. Hunt, or some other who is competent, to write a book on the subject, unless such a one is already written.

What we desire is a work devoted specially to the ministry and the manse

—i.e., the pastor and the pastor's family as mental, moral, and religious factors in Protestant countries. The work ought to be similar in aim to that splendid book of Baur, "Das Deutsche Evangelische Pfarrhaus." At a time when in Europe the ministry is held in disrespect, when pastors "are the best-hated men of Germany," this eminent author has exhibited in his book the "Pfarrhaus" as entitled to the gratitude of the world. But his scope is too circumscribed. As a German he writes for Germans of Germany, as if that were the whole of Protestant Christendom. England and America are left out of consideration, as being outside of the author's self-imposed limits.

And this admirable book is too circumscribed in another aspect. We would expect him to elaborate more fully than he has done the vast results in every sphere, not only from the Pfarrhaus as a whole, but also from the sons and daughters of the parsonage. Here is a magnificent field. When we remember the distinguished Field brothers, still living; when we recollect that a few years ago we had simultaneously sons of ministers as governors of New York and Pennsylvania, and as President of the United States, we feel as if some one should write up "the ministry and the manse." There is a popular notion that the sons of clergymen turn out badly. Even the most cursory perusal of any cyclopædia will correct this mistaken idea. Hence what we say is easy to demonstrate. Some one should do it.

Again, over against the celibacy of the Romish priesthood we have every reason to defend the evangelical parsonage. It is *not* a pernicious institution. It has a good right to exist. In Germany and in England, as in other Protestant countries of Europe, it has a glorious history. So it has in America, notably in New England. It has been as a source and centre of mental, moral, religious, and literary activity second to none.

J. H. STEPLER.

CLEVELAND, O.

The Pulpit and Public Evils.

I HAVE been very much impressed with this remark made by Anthony Comstock (THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, October, 1886, p. 368). "It may surprise you, but it is a fact that the greatest discouragement which our society encounters in its effort to crush out the gambling business is the difficulty of awakening the Church to a realization of the prevalence and enormity of this evil," etc.

I think Mr. Comstock's assertion must be only too true, for I have looked through this monthly, from its very beginning down to the present time, in vain for a sermon on gambling or gaming. Everything that I have been able to find on the subject is in editorial notes. Neither have I been able to find a sermon on "The Dance" and a number of other ethical questions that have interested me. Now are our popular preachers indeed afraid to preach on such questions, or is it deemed unnecessary to print such sermons? "Gambling," "The Dance," "The Social Evil," "Law and Order," "Bribe-taking," "Corrupt Elections," etc.—all need to be handled by the pulpit, and young preachers would sometimes like to know how these subjects have been handled by older ones.

SAMUEL SCHWARM.

[We hardly think our correspondent will have reason for complaint much longer. The publication of the sermon by Dr. Parkhurst, in our last issue, will show him pretty conclusively that the pulpit is not silent on the matters of which he writes, while it is known by every one who keeps abreast of the times what the pulpit has done in securing the overthrow of great public evils in New Jersey and in Louisiana, as well as in other parts of our land.—Ebs.]

Purism.

AFTER reading the paragraph on "The Little Rift" in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW for March, p. 286, I picked up the *Christian Union* for March 19th, con-

taining Dr. Parkhurst's sermon of the Sunday before, revised by the author, and read on p. 556: "While this transaction was *transpiring* there were a good many other things *transpiring*." And I wondered if S. Y. E. could have been in the audience, and whether this one unlucky lapse would have ruined for him the manly vigor and directness of that indictment of Tammany and the city officials. Happily, by virtue of less sensitiveness of nature or less refinement of culture, most of us are not so ready to take offence at an occasional slip; and yet, for all his carelessness (?) (here, too, is a chance for the grammaticaster), Dr. Parkhurst will continue, no doubt, to be regarded as one of the foremost of living preachers, and will still move men so profoundly that they will have no thought of verbal criticism.

Now as to "none," used in the plural, I saw it in Tennyson, the faultless stylist, within a week; and all careful readers know that it occurs in Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Young, Byron, Lord Littleton, Blair (the critic!), and last but not least, the Revised English Bible—twice certainly in Corinthians (1 Cor. vii. 29, 2 Cor. i. 13)—instances of "reputable use" certainly, being vouched for by more than a hundred of the best scholars in England and America. See also Acts xx. 24, A. V. If other "authorities" are wanted, reference may be made to the standard dictionaries—Worcester, the International, and the Century. The use is certainly as old as "Piers Plowman." It would be easy to fill a page with citations from classical English authors. Open "Paradise Lost," e.g., the work of no bungler or apprentice, as S. Y. E. will acknowledge, and we will find: "In at this gate *none pass*"; "The vigilance here placed" (iv., 579); "Though men *were none*" (iv., 675); "Other *rites* observing *none*" (iv., 737)—thrice within one hundred and sixty lines, and this splendid section of a great epic not quite spoiled for most scholars.

May I allude to another note of pur-

ism? On p. 262 of the same number we read: "Professor T. was told he *would better* look after his subscription list." The attempt here to avoid the historically correct "had" gives us a word which really *does not make sense* in the connection. As to the correctness of the idiomatic "had rather" and "had better," appeal is made to immemorial use, and among late writers to Ruskin, Thackeray, Tennyson, Chief Justice Coleridge, and the Revision (Psalm lxxxiv. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 19), as well as to the best dictionaries and historical grammars (Stormonth here is incorrect, as are most of the school grammars).

Purism has perils of its own. The effect of Pater's "Marius the Epicurean" is greatly injured by the evident "consciousness of style," which forces itself on one's attention through large sections of the book. Better force with occasional faults than the stylistic faultlessness so often allied with feebleness. Mr. Moody's "grammar" is not flaw-

less, but the common people, and the members of English universities as well, hear him gladly, and are stirred to a new life.

The Greek of the New Testament abounds in irregularities. I do not see how the purist, if he know the Greek of Plato and Demosthenes, can possibly read it to any profit. J. E. G.

Queries and Answers.

1. What do Protestants understand by the phrase in the Apostles' Creed, "Communion of Saints"? and what is the ground of that belief?

"SEEKING LIGHT," Williamsport, Pa.

2. Will some one of the readers of the HOMILETIC please state briefly and clearly the so-called premillennial and postmillennial theories of the second coming of Christ? What are the best books that have been written on the subject?

A READER, Santa Barbara, Cal.

3. Do any of the readers of the HOMILETIC know of any book that gives reliable deductions from scientific discoveries in a concise form?

I. N. McC., Maryville, Mo.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

Mob Law.

And they . . . lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live.—Acts xxii. 22.

"LYNCHING," says the Indianapolis *Sentinel*, "is fast becoming a national disgrace, and unless it is checked it will soon become a national menace." The assertion is not a whit too strong. The fact that the number of lynchings was in excess of that of legal executions last year is sufficient testimony to the truth of the statement. Of the latter there were but 123, of which number 96 took place in the South and 27 in the North. Of the former there were 195, of which 169 occurred in the South and 26 in the North. What is especially suggestive is the fact that States wherein most

manifest proof was given of an intention to carry out the provisions of the law with reference to capital crimes were the very States wherein lynchings were most frequent. Georgia, in which there were 16 executions for murder, records 12 cases of lynching, while in Texas the figures were reversed, there being 12 executions and 16 lynchings within her borders. Louisiana has the shame of heading the list as to the number of lynchings while coming third in the number of executions, there being 26 of the former—equalling the entire number throughout the North—while the latter were but 9. Mississippi came close behind her in disgrace with 23 lynchings to 8 executions. We cannot refrain from questioning whether the frequency of the murders, to which the number of the executions bear witness,

may not in measure be due to that indifference to the value of life which the crime of lynching has both manifested and fostered; whether lawlessness has not resulted from the unwillingness to await the due process of law in the punishment of crime. With not the slightest sympathy with those who are ever ready to make political capital out of the facts, we cannot but regard it as both lamentable and ominous that last year should have recorded in one section of our land 169 cases of lynching, and that the present year should have witnessed some of the most appalling scenes on record, even in the history of uncivilized nations, where torture has been wantonly added to the punishment illegally meted out to miserable offenders or suspects, as at Texarkana, where a negro—charged with the commission of a most outrageous crime, it is true, but protesting his innocence—was slowly burned to death amid the jeers and taunts of the mob that surrounded him. Whether race prejudice has anything to do with the fact that out of the 169 cases alluded to, the victims in 118 cases were negroes, we do not know. If such prejudice exists, we are well aware that there have been strong provocations in the nature of some of the crimes committed by certain of their number; but no provocation could be strong enough to justify any such procedure as that mentioned. This is what we desire to emphasize—that where there are laws taking cognizance of crime in its various forms, and courts of justice for the interpretation and administration of such laws, no consideration whatever can justify a resort to mob law. In his "American Commonwealth" Mr. Bryce says, concerning what we may call the peculiarly American institution of lynching:

"Those highly technical rules of judicial procedure, and still more technical rules of evidence which America owes to the English common law, and which have in some States retained antiquated minutiae now expunged from English practice, or been rendered by

new legislation too favorable to prisoners, have to be applied in districts where population is thin, where there are very few officers, either for the apprehension of offenders or for the hunting up of evidence against them, and where, according to common belief, both judges and juries are occasionally 'squared' or 'got at.' Many crimes would go unpunished if some more speedy and efficient method of dealing with them were not adopted."

In reply to this apology for this "institution" we have to say that if it be true that in certain portions of our land the machinery of the law is cumbrous and its movements slow, so slow that patience is grievously tried, mob violence only tends to put off the day when the proper remedy shall be applied. It educates away from and not toward a law-abiding spirit. Moreover, it is not true that cases of lynching are confined to districts "where population is thin." Witness the scenes at Louisville, with its population of 161,000; and Omaha, with its population of 140,000; and Memphis, with its population of 64,000, in all of which localities there are provisions wholly adequate for the proper punishment of crime, and in none of which did there exist the slightest reason for believing that the prisoners, taken forcibly from the hands of those sworn to protect them until brought before the proper tribunals, and robbed of their lives without due process, would not have had justice at the hands of those whose duty it was to try the charges against them according to law. If it be true that there are purchasable judges and juries, then let the remedy be applied to them for the improper condoning of offences. If it be true that some clever lawyer can find technicalities in existing law sufficient to enable him to secure the indefinite postponement of a trial or to ward off the execution of a sentence, then let the law be bettered by the elimination of whatever makes such interferences with its manifest intention possible. If the responsibility for delay or for the improper con-

duct of a trial rests with the district attorney, then let him be removed as incompetent. If the trouble is with our jury system as at present administered, then let the remedy be applied here. We are inclined to believe that the time is long past when it should be regarded as a necessity that twelve men should have one mind before the verdict of guilt or innocence can be properly pronounced, or that one man should have it in his power to prevent the rendering of a verdict that, on the strength of the evidence submitted, is supported by the almost unanimous sentiment of society at large. If the trouble lies with the exercise of the pardoning function by the chief executive of the State, let this duty be entrusted to a committee more truly representing the will of the entire State. Let the remedy be applied where the disease really is. But let not the failure of those to fulfil their obligations who hold their office by the will of the people be regarded a sufficient warrant for the utter abrogation of all law or for the perpetration of such offences against existing law as are of the nature of most appalling crimes. For such is lynching. We are aware that the claim is made that all that is intended by those who participate in the punishment of offenders without due process of law is to make sure that justice shall be done. But we are inclined to deny the truth of the claim, from the fact that those who participate in such transactions are apt to be the most lawless members of the communities wherein these occur, and that what they do is done, in very many instances, against the protest of those who are known to be the law-abiding classes of such communities. Moreover, the mood in which so-called lynching parties go about their outrageous work is not that which conduces to the recognition of the demands of justice, nor is it that in which such demands ought to be meted out even to the most debased of criminals. It is the mood of passion, of frenzy. The taking of a life to satisfy the claims of justice is too awful a procedure to be accompanied, as it too

often is in the execution of mob law, with drunkenness, profanity, ribaldry, brutality in its most degraded forms. It was once our melancholy duty to witness the execution of the penalty of the law against murder. Amid absolute silence and after prayer for Divine mercy on the condemned, in the presence of witnesses whose heads were bared, down the cheeks of some of whom tears were coursing without stint or shame, tears of pity for the culprit, the murderer met his doom. Not one of those present, even of those whose pity was deepest, but felt that the doom was just. Not one would have uttered a word to change it. There was in all those present a reverence for the majesty of law, and at the same time a respect for life as God's high gift to His creature, that gave an awful dignity to the entire procedure. What a contrast between that and every lynching scene! What a contrast between the spirit actuating those who participated in it and that of those participating in the violence of mob law! Every lynching is a murder; every lyncher is a murderer.

How can a stop be put to such occurrences as have become so frequent of late years? Some of our contemporaries suggest the introduction of the old English system of "the hundred," under which the country was divided into districts each of which was represented by its hundred, who, in the event of unlawful death, of whatever kind, were required to produce the guilty person or persons or to pay a heavy penalty. The *posse comitatus*—that is, the power invested in the sheriff to call to his aid, for the purpose of maintaining the law, the assistance of any man capable of bearing arms—is another suggested remedy. But a difficulty presents itself in the fact that in some cases the "posse" and the mob are identical. To us it seems that the first step in the work of suppressing mob violence is to construe it, and, where the offenders can be identified, to punish it as murder. But beyond this is the remedy that strikes deeper down than does the mere

vindication of violated law, and that is the endeavor to foster by every agency possible that reverence for the majesty of law which is the essential of the strength of our social organization and the condition of our national prosperity. Let the pulpit proclaim this in no uncertain tone. Let the press, religious and secular, maintain it; never, directly or indirectly, countenancing the idea that the will of a community can supersede the law of the commonwealth, or the disorder of anarchy righteously take the place of existing order. Let the duty be taught in the schools of our land, of absolute obedience to law and

of respect for constituted authority. The words of the artist Haydon occur to us as indicating the duty of the hour in the matter before us. "Sir Robert Peel said: 'Register, register.' O'Connell: 'Agitate, agitate.' I say, 'Educate, educate!'" Let the youth of the land be taught that law is a sacred thing; that obedience to law is a supreme duty; that nothing but the unrighteousness of a law can justify disobedience under any circumstances, and that the unrighteousness of a law can only be determined by its failure to accord with the law of God as revealed in His Word.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Summer School of Christian Philosophy.

THE sixteenth summer school of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy begins July 12th at Prohibition Park, Staten Island, with a lecture by Joseph Cook on "Fast and Loose Theories of Evolution." The remainder of the week's programme is as follows:

Wednesday, 13th.—G. R. W. Scott, D.D., Andover, Mass., "Man's Responsibility for his Belief." Discussion by Dr. Scott and others. Night—R. Fulton Cutting, Esq., New York, "Tenement-House Evil."

Thursday, 14th.—George Alexander, D.D., New York, "A Believing Spirit Essential to the Learner." Discussion by Dr. Alexander and others. Night—Richard Abbey, D.D., Mississippi, "Where Was Man Before He Was?" [Dr. Abbey has deceased; but his paper is ready.]

Friday, 15th.—William Leroy Brown, President of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, "The Progress of Education of the Colored Race in the South." Night—Anniversary. Addresses by Rev. Dr. Deems and others.

Saturday, 16th.—Professor E. Hershey Sneath, Yale University, "Stoicism and Christianity." Discussion by Professor Sneath and others. Night—a paper on "Prison Life," by W. M. F. Round, Esq.

Sunday, 17th.—Annual Sermon by Carlos Martyn, D.D., of Newark, N. J. Night—Address, "The Brotherhood of Christian Unity," Professor Theodore F. Seward.

Monday, 18th.—Hon. Walter B. Hill, Georgia, "Anarchy, Socialism, and the Labor Move-

ment." Night—A paper on "Our Shop Girls," by Professor Hyslop, of Columbia College.

Tuesday, 19th.—Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D., President of Lafayette College, "The Philosophy of Education."

To members of the Institute all these lectures are free. To others an admission fee of ten cents will be charged to help meet the heavy expenses. The payment of \$5 secures a course ticket and membership for a year, including a subscription to *Christian Thought*, which contains the lectures. Prohibition Park is easily reached from New York. Take the Staten Island boat (fare ten cents) at South Ferry, and after a delightful ride of four miles over New York Bay to St. George, close connection is made with rapid transit trains, which, without extra charge, land one at Port Richmond, from which point the electric cars on Jewett Avenue run directly to the park. Persons wishing circulars of the Summer School and Prohibition Park, or information concerning hotel accommodations, cottages, or the Summer Assembly meetings, which will continue in the Park for twelve weeks, should address Mr. C. L. Haskell, Superintendent, West New Brighton, Staten Island, N. Y. For information about the Institute, address Mr. C. M. Davis, Secretary, 4 Winthrop Place, New York.

A New Church Annex.

THE suggestion of Dr. Rainsford, the well-known rector of St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, as to the solution of the "temperance problem" certainly has the virtue of novelty, if it has no other, and it is hard to see any other it can possibly have. That the Church of Jesus Christ, composed of redeemed sinners and entrusted with the work of making that redemption a world-wide actuality, should enter upon the traffic in intoxicants for the purpose of minimizing the harm done by that traffic, is a proposition so utterly at variance with all that is generally regarded as rational, that we marvel at the boldness of the good rector in advocating it. The cunning with which the prince of darkness sometimes insinuates his suggestions into the minds of consecrated men, and secures for them the advocacy of consecrated lips, was never better illustrated than in this instant. When it is

kept in mind that the ranks of moderate drinkers furnish the material from which those of immoderate drinkers are kept filled, that a church that teaches that no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God on the strength of God's own testimony should make provision for the manufacture of moderate drinkers, and so for immoderate drinkers, and so for the loss to the kingdom of God of men who otherwise might have entered it, seems too preposterous for the advocacy of any sane man. What a spectacle would a bar-room annex to each of our church edifices present to the world! It is a satisfaction to record that Dr. Rainsford's proposition has awakened the antagonism which it deserves, even from the secular papers, which so often come so far short of voicing the public conscience. We have yet to see the proposal seconded by any organ representing the decent sentiment of the community, while the voice of the pulpit is unanimously condemnatory of it.

BLUE MONDAY.

REV. Z. served a weak and scattered parish of three or four country churches in the county of —, Pa., for several years. The salary irregularly paid amounted to about one dollar per day. On entering the field the pastor learned that the people demanded more pastoral visiting than they had been receiving from former pastors. Pastoral visitation was unanimously conceded as all-important, though in this particular parish an attempted compliance with the expressed demands in this respect meant more labor and exposure than most ministers would either undertake or endure. Rev. Z., believing also in pastoral visitation, and being physically qualified to make many and distant visits through the week, and preach three and four times each Sabbath according to requirement, set manfully to work.

In this particular parish a horse was an indispensable object in a minister's outfit, and as Rev. Z. was a very large man, and as his appointments and visits could be made to much advantage and comfort by travelling on horseback, a large horse was secured. Now in time these parishioners found that the frequent visits of their pastor, for which they had been clamoring, cost them large feeds of oats for the large horse, and no small amount of provision for the large preacher, for the long rides and rough roads created a manifested appetite in man and beast,

which occasionally was not too eagerly relieved by some of these people.

And when at the close of the last year, when pastor and officers met for final settlement of salary, and forty dollars were yet due the pastor, they decided that as he had visited so much in the parish, and thereby saved considerable for boarding for himself and his horse (at the same time hinting that it had taken so much to feed *his* horse), they would therefore call the account settled.

P. W.

Fresh from the Mint.

BROTHERS McC. and S., ministers on an adjoining circuit, were holding a "four days' meeting," last week, at Enniskillen. They invited Brother K. from the next circuit for a night's meeting. During the after service, Brother K., who is an old veteran in the work, and somewhat dull of sight, was walking down one of the aisles of the church "looking for sinners." Finally he put his hand on an old man's shoulder, saying, "Well, my old man, don't you think it is time you gave up your sins and quit serving the devil?" A smile passed over the countenances of those near enough to hear the pious injunction. The old gentleman addressed was an elder of fifty years' standing in the Presbyterian Church across the way.