

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

Vol. XVI.—DECEMBER, 1888.—No. 6.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—THE STUDY OF SCIENCE BY MINISTERS.

By J. O. MURRAY, D.D., DEAN OF PRINCETON COLLEGE.

THERE lies open before me a choice edition of a delightful and suggestive book, White's "Natural History of Selborne." It was once said of it, that "it proves in how laudable and useful a manner a parish priest may employ his leisure time, and how serviceable he may be to the natural history and antiquities of his country." Christopher North, in *Blackwood*, has a more glowing encomium: "Who ever read, without the most exquisite delight, White's 'History of Selborne'?"* It is, indeed, a Sabbath book worth a whole library of sermons, nine-tenths of the Bampton Lectures included, and will make a deist of an atheist, of a deist a Christian." The book was published in 1789, while the author was curate at Selborne. Allibone specifies fifteen different editions of it. In fact, it is a classic in English literature. Its story is simple. While fulfilling his parish duties, White was a careful and constant observer of nature. He studied the habits of the birds, the trees and shrubs, the insects, the reptiles which made Selborne their habitat. One of Mr. Darwin's latest scientific studies was the earthworm. I think a reference to White's thirty-fifth letter to Hon. Daines Barrington would show that White anticipated Darwin by a century in his notice of these creatures, which he introduces by saying, "earthworms, though in appearance a small and despicable link in the chain of nature, yet, if lost, would make a lamentable chasm." In a series of letters to his friends, charmingly written, White gives all his observations, often very minute, sometimes very striking, always fascinating. It is a book to make one love the outer world. It will rank in literature with "Walton's Angler," and I pity the clergyman who does not appreciate both. Yet Gilbert White was a parish priest, declining all church preferment, and finding his life not in ecclesiastical rivalries nor theological subtleties, but in simple and devout study of God's works about him. In Dr. McCosh's "Typical Forms and

* Bennett's Ed., revised by Harting. London.

Special Ends" will be found another illustration of what clergymen may sometimes accomplish in scientific study. His botanical researches gave him high credit as an observer. He has had his followers in America. The late Dr. Beadle, of Philadelphia, was an enthusiastic student of conchology. Dr. Henry McCook, of that city, has made a scientific reputation by his study of ants. He is a busy and faithful pastor of a flourishing church. But he has found in these studies of nature what has made him, I am sure, all the better a minister and all the broader a man. It strikes one a little oddly that both these American clergymen belong to the *city pastors*, where paved streets and brick walls seem to shut out nature effectually. Perhaps, however, this very fact led them to search out what immediate surroundings could not give. But the great body of our clergymen in rural parishes—Nature at their very doors in all her infinite varieties—why should there not be more Gilbert Whites in our Selbornes of the New World?

Here, however, a question must be asked and answered, *what kind* of scientific study can ministers profitably engage in? The answer must be, for most ministers, certainly, *general* not *special* studies. To be a scientific specialist in these days, demands an amount of training and of time which only the undisturbed, undivided energies of one life-time can meet. *Amateur* science is, we imagine, not held in great repute. Here and there we may find exceptions like Dr. McCosh and Dr. McCook. But science is an exacting master, and seems to demand all or none. Or, rather, she holds to the inspired saying, "No man can serve two masters." Besides, it is not the province nor the prerogative of ministers to extend the domain of science. They were not ordained for this. They had better leave special scientific investigations in the hands of those whose calling and responsibility it is to make them and give the world results. But it is a minister's business to secure some general knowledge of what is going on in the scientific world. If he has been through college, he has obtained a glimpse, probably, of what scientific progress has been made. Most Faculties have in them professors who impart the knowledge. Still, if the man who was graduated ten, fifteen or twenty years ago contents himself with this, he is making a great mistake. Science travels fast in these days, by means of the telegraph and telephone she has made. It will not be safe for the minister to quote from the pulpit what his scientific professors taught him ten or twenty years ago in the class-room. He should, however, try to keep pace with what is brought to light from day to day. There is a *general* scientific knowledge which is part of every well-furnished intellectual man. If our ministers, for example, have not read Prof. Young's book on the sun, or some similar modern work, and know little or nothing of what spectroscopic studies have taught us, they are culpable behind the times. Their ignorance is as culpable as if

they had kept themselves totally uninformed on the Irish question of Home Rule or the papal policy in the modern Vatican.

There is a field of observation in nature which it is a matter of wonder more of our country ministers do not keep up. Many of them had in college decided scientific tastes, might indeed have been excellent scientific students if they had given their lives to this. They might become careful observers of the botany of their parishes, or the birds, or the insects, just as White did at Selborne. And this not to play at being scientific men, but for the enrichment of their minds, for diversion, for knowledge of God in nature. How many of our country clergy could tell us the names of the birds which make their nests in the branches of their parish trees? If they would only read the delightful books of John Burroughs, I am sure they would see how rich a field of observation is open to them here, and would thank me for calling their attention to it.

The facilities for such scientific study are at hand. Every science has its hand-books, its popular treatises. Some of us can recall the lively and profitable interest with which we listened to the lectures of Professors Tyndall and Proctor. One could do worse than go through the modern text-books in use among our colleges. Every minister should have access to the *Popular Science Monthly*. It will keep him posted on many scientific topics which ministers should at least know something about. "A little learning is a dangerous thing" only when it makes its possessor think he has more than a little. "Better half a loaf than no bread" is a true maxim here. And if he can obtain a microscope and learn how to use it, there will be open to him a source of wonder and delight from its use on objects he could gather in every parish walk, which will be a permanent spring of enjoyment and profit. The universe of God is made up of little things. No man ever realizes this who has not known something of microscopic revelations. No men need to know this more than ministers. Yes, the helps to general scientific knowledge are at hand. As I write, my eye falls on a series of *history primers*, and *literature primers*, and *scientific primers*, costing perhaps twenty-five cents apiece. Among the latter I find one on "Chemistry" by Roscoe, and another on "Physics" by Balfour Stewart, some on "Physical Geography" and "Geology" by A. Geikie, one on "Astronomy" by J. N. Lockyer. These *primers* will show any one how to pursue the study further, if he be so minded. I venture the assertion that few ministers could read them without astonishment at the problems they suggest. Some of our scientific men, I believe, discredit these attempts at popularizing science as tending to degrade or belittle scientific study. But we think their fear is groundless. Science cannot afford to be a monopoly for the few. Give us outsiders and scientific laymen a chance at the crumbs which fall from the loaded tables of modern discovery.

Are there, however, no dangers attending such acquaintance with

science? We hear so much in these days about the infidel tendencies of science, etc., etc., that many good people are afraid to dabble with it too much, lest they should make shipwreck of faith and so become castaways. Of course there are dangers. There are dangers in going to Europe to see the Old World. There are dangers in horseback exercise. There are dangers, too, in being ignorant of some things taught us by modern science. Ministers sometimes utter what they suppose to be scientific truths in the pulpit, when they are venting exploded ideas of a generation or more ago. Let me, however, point out a few dangers which may attend such scientific study as ministers can afford to give.

First, there is the danger of supposing that science is hostile to revelation because one writer hit upon is inimical to it, or because modern science broaches conclusions which are not reconcilable with our pre-conceived exegeses of Holy Scripture. I was inexpressibly pained on reading a recent notice of Charles Darwin's life by a clergyman, to find that he uses Darwin's honest confession of a falsehood told in youth, to insinuate that perhaps he did not quite recover from the habit of lying in after years. What will impress all men who keep pace with modern scientific inquiry, is the enthusiastic pursuit of truth by men of science. The scientific men have erred sometimes; have used hard words sometimes about theologians. Have the theologians never provoked them? Have they always used the "soft answer which turns away wrath"? It is a wholesome lesson for the clergy to recall the early controversy on Genesis and geology. Better remember this and let the scientific men go on investigating evolution before we put ourselves on record as denouncing its anti-scriptural, infidel tendencies.

There is another danger in such study—the danger of attempting too much. The field is the world, but ministers can ill afford to scatter too much time over so large a surface. Dr. McCook has found that the study of ants has given him all that he can do wisely and well. Choose your favorite science; be it astronomy, or botany, or ornithology, or physics, or entomology. Find your spare hours for reading up in that, keeping your eye on the whole. Everything in these days goes by specialism. No mortal man can drive all the sciences abreast. But it is astonishing how much one can come to know by simply keeping his eyes open in one direction.

There is still another danger in scientific study for ministers. It is that of airing their scientific knowledge in the pulpit. The chances are they will blunder about it. Some of the so-called scientific statements made by divines in a late General Assembly were, as viewed by scientific men, so much hopeless blundering. They only made men of science laugh. They were uttered with a sublime unconsciousness of their egregious folly. But none the less were they a humiliation to the religion they were supposed to be upholding. The pulpit teaching is sometimes enriched by apt illustrations from science. But there is

danger in too free use of scientific knowledge in sermons. The preacher may shoot over the heads of his people, or he may blunder in its use. And yet there are positive uses for such studies, and among them that of illustration, as we shall see. This is very different from that display of scientific knowledge—lugging it in under every possible and impossible plea, as if to impress the pews with the notion that science had lost a shining light when the minister forsook the laboratory or observatory for the pulpit.

What, then, are the uses of such studies to the working minister? Can he afford to spare precious minutes from the Greek Testament and his commentaries, from the grand old theologians like Howe and Charnock, from the great preachers like South and Barrow, for the general knowledge of modern science? Unhesitatingly, yes. The apostle in 2 Timothy iii: 17 lays great stress on the *completeness* with which Christian workmen should be furnished for work. It is not enough for the minister to know books and men. He should know what he can of the world of nature in which men live and on which books are written. So he will be the workman in apostolic phrase—*ἄρτιος, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρητισμένος*.

More specifically, the disciplinary use of such studies must be noted. One cannot come even into general contact with scientific studies and not admire the exactness in the use of terms and the closeness of reasoning which they display. Verboseness is at a discount; plain, clear, logical statement is at a premium. Surely, in all this the minister may find a useful discipline. For he is often compelled to treat of subjects on which such qualities must be bestowed. The pews are often bewildered for want of them. It is no hard judgment on the modern pulpit to say that it is lacking just here. It has admirable powers, but is there no danger that the power of exact statement may be sacrificed to the love for popular effect? At any rate, such studies may serve to keep the minister's hand in, and the pews will never complain if the pulpit always says what it means, and means what it says. Another use of such studies is found in the number of telling illustrations they will suggest. There is danger here of becoming too technical, and of parading scientific knowledge without skill to handle it, or aptness in the illustration itself. But there is a wide field of facts which may be used with great power to illustrate Biblical truths. In this the preacher but follows the lead of inspiration itself. The world of natural life—seas, mountains, stars, forests, all birds of the air and fruits of the field, flowers of garden and meadow—every work of God is used to illustrate His Word. The Psalms and Prophets are full of such illustrative uses of natural objects. They light up with wonderful beauty the divine Word. "Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow?" asks Job. No minister could answer that question in a sermon till he had heard the latest word of science on the subject.

I opened Dr. William M. Taylor's volume of sermons,* to his discussion on the eagle's nest, and found that he had introduced a wondrously apt and choice illustration from Sir Humphrey Davy's "Salmonia." There will be found in the "Bibliotheca Sacra" a discourse on the sea by Rev. Leonard Swain, D.D. It was published many years ago. But it could not have been written, had he not studied what modern investigation had taught on the subject. And it rivals in its wealth of imagery and solemnity of impression that lecture of Rufus Choate's on the same great theme, which lives in the memory of all who ever heard it. Dr. Chalmers' celebrated astronomical discourses are also in point. For one, I should like mightily to hear Dr. McCook preach a sermon from the text, "Go to the ant, thou sluggard," etc. It seems almost superfluous to point out the uses of such studies as mental diversion, or relaxation. But the best rest one ever gets is by change of mental occupation. There come times when the overworked minister, and lawyer, and physician, and business man need absolute rest from all occupation. Let him travel or go trout-fishing, or if nothing better turns up, let him eschew Saratoga and Newport, and go to some breezy unspoiled country home and lie on his back in the green grass, watching the clouds sail over his head. But in the season of work the minister often needs relaxation. He may get it from a good book of poems, or a good novel, or a good history. He may get it from an excursion into scientific fields, with such men as Professor Young to guide him along the fiery path of the sun, or Professor Guyot over the earth as an abode for man, with the numerous scientific guides who are writing every day new works in their departments. The regret some of us older ministers feel is that we have made so little of this vast and interesting branch of modern research. The men who do take up scientific studies speak enthusiastically of the mental refreshment such studies bring. They bring into exercise a new set of faculties. If they do not make us laugh or cry, they make us wonder and admire. A good stretch of wonder is like a cool bath on a summer morning. It leaves every sense alert and active. The student of modern science, as he comes upon some of the new revelations science has made, can best express himself by quoting the closing lines of Keats's celebrated sonnet, "On first looking into Chapman's Homer":

"Then felt I like some watcher of the skies,
 When a new planet swims into his ken;
 Or like stout Cortez, when, with eagle eyes,
 He stands at the Pacific—and all his men
 Looked at each other with a wild surmise,
 Silent, upon a peak in Darien."

* "Limitations of Life."

II.—CHRYSOSTOM AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., NEW YORK.

NO. II.

AFTER the death of Nectarius (successor to Gregory Nazianzen), toward the end of the year 397, Chrysostom was chosen, entirely without his own agency and even against his remonstrance, Archbishop or Patriarch of Constantinople. He was hurried away from Antioch by a military escort, to avoid a commotion in the congregation and make resistance useless. He was consecrated February 26, 398, by his enemy Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who reluctantly yielded to the command of the Emperor Arcadius, or rather his Prime Minister, the eunuch Eutropius, and nursed his revenge for a more convenient season.

Constantinople, built by Constantine the Great, in 330, on the site of Byzantium, assumed, as the eastern capital of the Roman Empire, the first position among the patriarchal sees of the East, and became the center of court theology, court intrigues and theological controversies. The second œcumenical council, which was held there in 381, under Theodosius the Great, the last Roman Emperor worthy of the name, decided the victory of Nicene orthodoxy over the Arian heresy, and gave the Bishop of Constantinople the title of Patriarch, next in rank to the Bishop of old Rome—a position which was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon, but disputed by Pope Leo and his successors.

Chrysostom soon gained by his eloquent sermons the admiration of the people, of the weak Emperor Arcadius, and, at first, even of his wife Eudoxia, with whom he afterwards waged a deadly war. He extended his pastoral care to the Goths, who were becoming numerous in Constantinople, had a part of the Bible translated for them, often preached to them himself through an interpreter, and sent missionaries to the Gothic and Scythian tribes on the Danube. He continued to direct by correspondence those missionary operations even during his exile. For a short time he enjoyed the height of power and popularity.

But he also made enemies by his denunciations of the vices and follies of the clergy and aristocracy. He emptied the episcopal palace of its costly plate and furniture and sold it for the benefit of the poor and the hospitals. He introduced his strict ascetic habits and reduced the luxurious household of his predecessors to the strictest simplicity. He refused invitations to banquets, gave no dinner parties, and ate the simplest fare in his solitary chamber. He denounced unsparingly luxurious habits in eating and dressing, and enjoined upon the rich the duty of alms-giving to an extent that tended to increase rather than diminish the number of beggars who swarmed in the streets and around the churches and public baths. He disciplined the vicious clergy and opposed the perilous and immoral habit of the clergy to live under one

roof with "spiritual sisters," against which, in an earlier age, Cyprian had to raise his protest. His unpopularity was increased by his irritability and his subservience to a proud and violent archdeacon, Serapion. The Empress Eudoxia was jealous of his influence over Arcadius and angry at his uncompromising severity against sin and vice. She became the chief instrument of his downfall.

The occasion was furnished by an unauthorized use of his episcopal power beyond the lines of his diocese, which was confined to the city. At the request of the clergy of Ephesus, and the neighboring bishops, he visited Ephesus in January, 401; held a Synod, and deposed six bishops convicted of shameful simony. During his absence of several months he left the episcopate of Constantinople in the hands of Severian, bishop of Gabala, an unworthy and adroit flatterer, who basely betrayed his trust and formed a cabal headed by the Empress and her licentious court ladies for the ruin of Chrysostom. On his return he used unguarded language in the pulpit, and spoke on Elijah's relation to Jezebel in a manner that Eudoxia understood it as a personal insult, which she could not forgive. The clergy were anxious to get rid of a bishop who was too severe for their lax morals.

At this time Theophilus of Alexandria, a haughty and contentious prelate, jealous of Chrysostom, interfered, and in connection with Eudoxia and the disaffected clergy, brought about the deposition and banishment of Chrysostom on false charges of immorality and high treason.

The indignation of the people and a violent earthquake caused his recall, but soon afterwards he was banished a second time by the ambitious Empress, who was severely rebuked by Chrysostom for erecting a silver statue of herself on the Forum before the Church of St. Sophia for public adoration. He ascended the pulpit on the commemoration day of the martyrdom of John the Baptist, and was reported to have uttered the imprudent words: "Again Herodias is raging, again she is dancing, again she demands the head of John on a platter." The comparison of Eudoxia with Herodias, and himself (John) with John the Baptist, was even more directly personal than his former allusion to the relation of Jezebel and Elijah. Whether he really spoke these words is at least doubtful, but they were reported to Eudoxia, who, as a woman and an empress, could never forgive them. She demanded from the Emperor signal redress. In the conflict of imperial and episcopal authority, the former achieved a physical and temporary, the latter a moral and enduring, victory.

The enemies of Chrysostom flocked like vultures down to their prey. Theophilus directed the plot from a safe distance. Arcadius was persuaded to issue an order for the removal of Chrysostom. He continued to preach and refused to leave the church over which God had placed him, but had to yield to armed force. He was dragged by imperial

guards from the cathedral on the vigil of the Resurrection in 404, while the sacrament of baptism was being administered to hundreds of catechumens. "The waters of regeneration," says Palladius, "were stained with blood." The female candidates, half-dressed, were driven by licentious soldiers into the dark streets. The eucharistic elements were profaned by pagan hands. The clergy in their priestly robes were ejected and chased through the city. The horrors of that night were long remembered with a shudder. During the greater part of Easter week the city was kept in a state of consternation. Private dwellings were invaded, and suspected Joannites—the partisans of Chrysostom—thrown into prison, scourged and tortured. Chrysostom, who was shut up in his episcopal palace, twice narrowly escaped assassination.

At last, June 5, 404, the timid and long-hesitating Arcadius signed the edict of banishment. Chrysostom received it with calm submission, and after a final prayer in the cathedral with some of his faithful bishops, and a tender farewell to his beloved Olympias and her attendant deaconesses, he surrendered himself to the guards and was conveyed at night to the Asiatic shore. He had scarcely left the city, when the cathedral was consumed by fire. The charge of incendiarism was raised against his friends, but neither threat, torture or mutilation could elicit a confession of guilt. He refused to acknowledge Arsacius and Atticus as his successors; and this was made a crime chargeable with degradation, fine and imprisonment. The clergy who continued faithful to him were deposed and banished. Pope Innocent of Rome was appealed to, pronounced the Synod which had condemned Chrysostom irregular, annulled the deposition, and wrote him a letter of sympathy, and urged upon Arcadius the convocation of a general council, but without effect.

Chrysostom was conveyed, under the scorching heat of July and August, over Galatia and Cappadocia to the lonely mountain village Cucusus on the border of Cilicia and Armenia, which the wrath of Eudoxia had selected for his exile. The climate was inclement and variable, the winter severe, the place was exposed to Isaurian brigands. He suffered much from fever and headache, and was more than once brought to the brink of the grave. Nevertheless the bracing mountain air invigorated his feeble constitution, and he was hopeful of returning to his diocese. He was kindly treated by the Bishop of Cucusus. He received visits, letters and presents from faithful friends, and by his correspondence exerted a wider influence from that solitude than from the episcopal throne.

His 242 letters are nearly all from the three years of his exile, and breathe a noble Christian spirit, in a clear, brilliant and persuasive style. They exhibit his faithful care for all the interests of the Church, and look calmly and hopefully to the glories of heaven. They are

addressed to Eastern and Western bishops, presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, monks and missionaries; they decrie the fatigues of his journey, give advice on a variety of subjects, strengthen and comfort his distant flock, urge the destruction of heathen temples in Phœnicia, the extirpation of heresy in Cyprus, and encourage the missions in Persia and Seythia. Two letters are addressed to the Roman Catholic bishop Innocent I., whose sympathy and assistance he courted. Seventeen letters—the most important of all—are addressed to Olympias, the deaconess, a widow of noble birth, personal beauty and high accomplishments, who devoted her fortune and time to the poor and sick. She died between 408 and 420. To her he revealed his inner life, upon her virtues he lavished extravagant praises which offend modern taste as fulsome flatteries. For her consolation he wrote a special treatise on the theme that “No one is really injured except by himself.”

The cruel Empress, stung by disappointment at the continued power of the banished bishop, forbade all correspondence, and ordered his transfer by two brutal guards first to Arabissus, then to Pityus on the Caucasus, the most inhospitable spot in the empire. The journey of three months on foot was a slow martyrdom to the feeble and sickly old man.

He did not reach his destination, but ended his pilgrimage five or six miles from Comana, in Pontus, in the chapel of the martyr Basiliscus, on the 14th September, 407, in his sixtieth year, the tenth of his episcopate. Clothed in his white baptismal robes, he partook of the eucharist and commended his soul to God. His last words were his accustomed doxology, the motto of his life: “Glory be to God for all things. Amen.” He was buried by the side of Basiliscus, in the presence of monks and nuns.

He was revered as a saint by the people. Thirty-one years after his death, January 27, 438, his body was transferred with great pomp to Constantinople and deposited with the emperors and patriarchs beneath the altar of the Church of the Holy Apostles. The young emperor, Arcadius II., and his sister, Pulcheria, met the procession at Chalcedon, knelt down before the coffin, and in the name of their guilty parents, implored the forgiveness of Heaven for the grievous injustice done to the greatest and saintliest man that ever graced the pulpit and episcopal chair of Constantinople. The Eastern Church of that age shrunk from the bold speculations of Origen, but revered the narrow orthodoxy of Epiphanius and the ascetic piety of Chrysostom.

The personal appearance of the golden-mouthed orator was not imposing, but dignified and winning. He was of small stature (like David, Paul, Athanasius, Melancthon, John Wesley, Schleiermacher). He had an emaciated frame, large, bald head, a lofty wrinkled forehead, deep-set, bright, piercing eyes, pallid, hollow cheeks, and a short, gray beard.

THE CHARACTER OF CHRYSOSTOM.

Chrysostom was one of those rare men who combine greatness and goodness, genius and piety, and continue to exercise by their writings and example a happy influence upon the Christian Church in all ages. He was a man for his time and for all times. But we must look at the spirit rather than the form of his piety which bore the stamp of his age. He took Paul for his model, but had a good deal of the practical spirit of James, and of the fervor and loveliness of John. The Scriptures were his daily food, and he again and again recommended their study to laymen as well as ministers. He was not an ecclesiastical statesman, like St. Ambrose; not a profound divine, like St. Augustin; but a pure man, a practical Christian, and a king of preachers. "He carried out in his own life," says Hase, "as far as mortal man can do it, the ideal of the priesthood which he once described in youthful enthusiasm." He considered it the duty of every Christian to promote the spiritual welfare of his fellowmen. "Nothing can be more chilling," he says in the 20th Homily on Acts, "than the sight of a Christian who makes no effort to save others. Neither poverty, nor humble station, nor bodily infirmity can exempt men and women from the obligation of this great duty. To hide our light under pretense of weakness, is as great an insult to God as if we were to say that He could not make His sun to shine."

It is very much to his praise that in an age of narrow orthodoxy and doctrinal intolerance he cherished a catholic and irenic spirit. He by no means disregarded the value of theological soundness, and was in hearty agreement with the Nicene Creed, which triumphed over the Arians during his ministry in Antioch; but he took no share in the persecution of heretics, and even sheltered the Origenistic monks against the violence of Theophilus of Alexandria. He hated sin more than error, and placed charity above orthodoxy.

Like all the Nicene fathers, he was an enthusiast for ascetic and monastic virtue, which shows itself in seclusion rather than in transformation of the world and the natural ordinances of God. He retained as priest and bishop his cloister habits of simplicity, abstemiousness and unworldliness. He presents the most favorable aspect of that mode of life, which must be regarded as a wholesome reaction against the hopeless corruption of pagan society. He thought with Paul that he could best serve the Lord in single life, and no one can deny that he was unreservedly devoted to the cause of religion.

He was not a man of affairs, and knew little of the world. He had the harmlessness of the dove without the wisdom of the serpent. He knew human nature better than individual men. In this respect he resembles Neander, his best biographer. Besides, he was irritable of temper, suspicious of his enemies, and easily deceived and led by such men as Serapion. He showed these defects in his quarrel with the

court and the aristocracy of Constantinople. With a little more worldly wisdom and less ascetic severity he might, perhaps, have conciliated and converted those whom he repelled by his pulpit fulminations. Fearless denunciation of immorality and vice in high places always commands admiration and respect, especially in a bishop and court preacher who is exposed to the temptations of flattery. But it is always unwise to introduce personalities into the pulpit, and does more harm than good. His relation to Eudoxia reminds one of the attitude of John Knox to Mary Stuart. The contrast between the pure and holy zeal of the preacher and the reformer and the ambition and vanity of a woman on the throne is very striking and must be judged by higher rules than those of gallantry and courtesy. But after all the conduct of Christ, the purest of the pure, towards Mary Magdalene and the woman taken in adultery is far more sublime.

The conflict of Chrysostom with Eudoxia resulted in his exile, and in this way was overruled for his own benefit. For in his exile his character shines brighter than even in the pulpit of Antioch and Constantinople. His character was perfected by suffering. The gentleness, meekness, patience, endurance and devotion to his friends and his work which he showed during the last three years of his life are the crowning glory of his career. Though he did not die a violent death, he deserves to be numbered among the martyrs, who are ready for any sacrifice to the cause of virtue and piety.

CHRYSOSTOM AS A PREACHER.

The crowning merit of Chrysostom is his excellency as a preacher. He is generally and justly regarded as the greatest pulpit orator of the Greek Church. Nor has he any superior or equal among the Latin fathers. He remains to this day a model for preachers in large cities.

He was trained in the school of Demosthenes and Libanius. He was not free from the defects of the degenerate rhetoric of his age, especially a flowery exuberance of style and fulsome extravagance in eulogy of dead martyrs and living men. But the defects are overborne by the virtues, the fulness of Scripture knowledge, the intense earnestness, the fruitfulness of illustration and application, the variation of topics, the command of language, the elegance and rhythmic flow of his Greek style, the dramatic vivacity, the quickness and ingenuity of his turns, and the magnetism of sympathy with his hearers. Gibbon, who read only a few of his Homilies, attributes to him "the happy art of engaging the passions in the service of virtue, and of exposing the folly as well as the turpitude of vice, almost with the truth and spirit of a dramatic representation." Dean Millman called him an "unrivalled master in that rapid and forcible application of incidental occurrences which gives such life and reality to eloquence. He is at times, in the highest sense, dramatic in manner."

But what gives his Homilies a permanent value is, after all, their

instructive and edifying matter. He knew how to draw, in the easiest manner, spiritual nourishment and lessons of practical wisdom from the inspired text, and to make it a divine voice of warning and comfort to the heart and conscience of every hearer. He was a most faithful preacher of truth and righteousness, and fearlessly told the whole duty of man. If he was too severe at times, he erred on virtue's side. He preached morals rather than dogmas, Christianity rather than theology; an active, practical Christianity that proves itself in holy living and dying. He was a martyr of the pulpit, for it was chiefly his faithful preaching that caused his exile.

The effect of his preaching was largely due to the magnetism of his personality, and cannot be fully estimated by reading a translation or even the Greek original. The living voice and glowing manner are far more powerful than the written and printed letter. He attracted large audiences, and among them many who would rather have gone to the theater than hear any ordinary preacher. He held them spell-bound to the close. Sometimes they manifested their admiration by noisy applause, and when he rebuked them for it they would applaud his eloquent rebuke, "You praise," he would tell them, "what I have said, and receive my exhortation with tumults of applause; but show your approbation by obedience; that is the only praise I seek."

The poet of the "Divina Comedia" assigns to Chrysostom a place in Paradise between Nathan the prophet and Anselm the theologian; probably because, like Nathan, he rebuked the sins of the court, and, like Anselm, he suffered exile for faithfulness to his conviction.

III.—LE CONTE ON EVOLUTION AND MATERIALISM.

BY SAMUEL P. SPRECHER, D.D., CLEVELAND, OHIO.

IN his book on "Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought," Professor Le Conte assures us that a decided reaction has set in "against materialistic evolution." "Thinking men," he says, "are fast coming to see that 'the materialistic philosophy is an unwarranted inference from the law of evolution.'"

This would be mere commonplace if it meant simply that thinking men are coming to see that evolution may be held in a way that is consistent with theism. Thinking men have always seen this. Evolution itself is not hostile to the idea of design. It is easy to see that it may be the divine method of creating. It makes no difference how God created things, whether at once or by a process of evolution. The ghost of materialism does not rise at this point. It is only when evolution comes in the shape in which Professor Le Conte holds it that it is considered questionable. If he means that a reaction is going on against the materialistic interpretation of evolution as it is expounded in his book we may indeed chronicle a new departure. This is taking higher ground than thiestic evolutionists have generally ventured upon.

It is tenable ground ; but it is a very decided change of base. Theistic evolutionists usually hold that the first germs of life came directly from the Creator's hand, and that in the evolution which followed the controlling factor was an internal principle of transformation. Professor Le Conte's book recognizes neither of these positions. He believes that life originated in the first place from non-living matter by the action of natural causes, and that evolution has been carried on wholly by external physical agents. Of course he does not pretend that spontaneous generation ever takes place now. On the contrary, he argues from the very nature of evolution that it could not take place now, since "the conditions necessary for so great a change could not be expected to occur but once in the history of the earth. They are, therefore, now not only unreproducible, but unimaginable. Evolution goes only onward."

Yet he believes that those conditions did occur, as Haeckel would say, during the processes of a cooling world, and that life did then originate without special divine intervention. Indeed, he considers this only as consistent evolution. And he sees no need of a special creation, even at the introduction of life, on which to hang his faith that the hand of God is conducting the whole order of evolution. Certainly we must rejoice to hear that those who believe as he does on this point are fast coming to see that their views are not materialistic. Who will say that they are necessarily materialistic? It is true that this is the popular notion among Christians. Even Charles Darwin, in his book on "The Origin of Species," defends himself against the charge of materialism solely on the ground that he held that the first germs of life came directly from the Creator's hand. Such a charge ought not to be brought against those that believe that the chain of evolution has been complete. The rejection of special creations is not tantamount to dropping the whole process of evolution into the abyss of materialism.

Yet Professor Le Conte has to admit that there is no proof that life originated from non-living matter. There is no possibility of approaching the fact (if it be a fact) by means of practical research. In the nature of the case it is out of the sphere of empirical investigation. Therefore it may be reasonably held that there was a special creation at the introduction of life on this earth. And while this is the case, Christian evolutionists will be slow to accept Professor Le Conte's view. For though the question of *theism* is not affected by unbroken evolution the Biblical account of creation *is*. The Bible seems to teach that there were special creations at the origination of matter, of life, and of man. To say the least, science is not in conflict with the Scriptures at any one of these points.

Theistic evolutionists generally believe that it is necessary to recognize an internal principle of transformation as the main factor in

evolution. Professor Le Conte makes no reference to such a factor. Enumerating "the recognized factors of evolution," he mentions only the two discovered by Darwin, viz.: "natural selection" and "sexual selection," and the two discovered by Lamarck, viz.: "the physical environment" and "use and disuse of organs."

To these he thinks, there may now be added "physiological selection." All of these are purely external causes. True, he says, there are doubtless other factors, not dreamed of in our philosophy, yet to be discovered. But he does not intimate that these unknown factors are needed to rescue those he names from the materialistic interpretation. It is well known that Lamarck recognized an "internal formative principle" which he called "the power of life." The environment he called the "modifying cause," the "products of which are various and irregular deviations in the power of life." On the basis of this factor M. Janet reconciles Lamarck's theory with the idea of finality or ends in nature. But Professor Le Conte does not include this factor of Lamarck's theory among the "recognized factors of evolution." In the whole course of his argument he does not once refer to Professor Cope's theory of "an internal principle of transformation" nor to M. Naudin's theory of "an internal plastic force." Perhaps these suggestions have not obtained recognition in the scientific world, but the point is that Professor Le Conte does not recognize that the teleological argument has any need of them. He evidently means to protest against the materialistic interpretation of the recognized factors which he mentions, and he means to say that thinking men are coming to see that evolution of this nature is not materialistic. We believe he is right again in this position, but he should have noticed the difficulties which deter many others from assuming it. He confines his argument entirely to the general law of evolution. He contends that it no more excludes the divine agency than any other law does; for example, the law of gravitation, which is the Creator's method of sustaining, as evolution is his method of creating, the cosmos. This no thinking man will question, while many eminent thinkers not only seriously question, but emphatically deny that evolution of the Darwinian type can be reconciled with theism—with design or intelligent purpose in Nature. M. Janet, in his book on "Final Causes," declares that Darwin's theory excludes the principle of finality and cannot recognize intelligent purpose. He says "there must be besides [Darwin's factors] an internal principle of transformation," such as Professor Cope holds. Dr. Charles Hodge wrote a book, entitled "What is Darwinism?" the purpose of which was to show that Darwin's theory is necessarily materialistic. These are probably mistaken judgments. They certainly are if no factors different from those recognized in Professor Le Conte's book, have had to do with evolution: for then evolution itself would be in conflict with theism. But we should not accept Darwinism hastily

under the impression that it is as free from materialistic tendencies as the law of evolution in general. Charles Darwin himself declares over and over that his theory cannot be harmonized with design in nature. He says that if beauty or any variation of structure can be shown to be intended it would "annihilate his theory." In his work on "The Variations of Animals and Plants under Domestication," Vol. II., pp. 515, 516, he asks: "Did He [God] ordain that crop and tail-feathers of the pigeon should vary, in order that the fancier might make his grotesque pouter and fan-tail breeds? Did He cause the frame and mental qualities of the dog to vary, in order that a breed might be formed of indomitable ferocity, with jaws fitted to pin down the bull, for man's brutal sport? But if we give up the principle in one case: if we do not admit that the variations of the primeval dog were intentionally guided in order, for instance, that the greyhound, that perfect image of symmetry and vigor, might be formed; no shadow of reason can be assigned for the belief that variations, alike in nature, and the results of the same general laws, which have been the groundwork through natural selection of the most perfectly adapted animals in the world, man included, were intentionally and specially guided. However much we might wish it we can hardly follow Professor Asa Gray, in his belief that variations have been led along certain beneficial lines, as a stream is led along useful lines of irrigation."

He tries laboriously to show that the most complicated organs, such as the eye, were formed without any design or purpose whatever. And certainly his doctrine of natural selection seems, at first thought, to imply this. The eye, he would say, was at first only a nerve more sensitive to light—a mere "accidental variation"—in some creature. But this variation was favorable to those possessing it, in the struggle for life, and they survived while the multitudes perished. As the process went on, surviving offspring would, on the average, be better than their parents in this respect. Thus, unintelligent physical causes, selecting for survival the creature having the best optical apparatus, would, in the course of millions of years, form an eye. Of course we are not obliged to accept Darwin's interpretation of his theory. This reaction against materialistic evolution might reasonably claim that the variations in plants and animals which Darwin calls "accidental" are *not* accidental, and that what he calls the "unintended action of blind physical causes" is *not* unintended, and that the causes are *not* blind. The facts which Darwin's phrases profess to describe are as intimated above. In plants and animals there is a constant tendency to variation within certain limits—some of these variations being useful to the plant or animal in the struggle for life, those which possess them survive while others perish; on the average, the offspring will be more marked in these respects than the parents, and so, the process going on, new species are formed. Now it does not settle the matter to say that

these causes are unguided. That is a begging of the question. There *is* purpose in them. There *is* a tendency to direct themselves toward an end, otherwise the orderly result before us could not have been produced. When have unguided physical causes ever produced a reasonable result? Much less can it be in the power of unguided causes to produce such marvelous results. Proof that things have been working intelligently toward an end should be looked for in results, not in processes. And why should it make so much difference whether the result is brought about by an internal force in the plant or animal, working with or against external causes, or by wholly external agents? May not external physical causes be God's instruments? If we can prove intelligent purpose in Nature at all, it is there all the same, however it came about. If the principles of causality and finality are true, no method of creation can make them inapplicable. Therefore we think that there is good ground for a reaction against the materialistic interpretation even of Darwinism.

And yet we may indulge more than a hope that the factors of evolution, which it is conceded are yet to be discovered, will prove to be more of the nature of that suggested by Professor Cope than any of "the recognized factors" enumerated by Professor Le Conte. Is not this consummation foreshadowed in such a statement as this: "Darwin does not attempt to account for the *origin* of varieties. He assumes divergent variation of offspring as the necessary material on which natural selection operates. He who shall explain the origin of varieties will have made another great step in completing the theory of evolution."

IV.—HOSPITALITY AS AN EVANGELIZING AGENCY.

BY REV. NEWELL WOOLSEY WELLS, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

As Christian love becomes more intense it becomes also more extensive. The fire that is hottest sends its heat farthest. When the Spirit of Him who is love first possesses Himself of a human heart He begets in it an answering love. "We love him because He has first loved us." Then this love circles outward. Its hallowed and hallowing influence comes to be felt by those who are most nearly related to him who has become its possessor. The bond between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and brother, discovers a new sanctity. Afterward it touches life's friendships and consecrates them. Then it passes onward to the stranger and discloses new obligations to him. Finally it arrives at the outermost circle of all and touches the enemy with its gracious influences, exhibiting itself in a glad readiness to forgive injury and bury the recollection of offenses forever out of sight.

Hospitality is the attestation of love to one's fellow through the medium of the home. It is not simply a formal, ceremonial reception extended to him under one's roof; but a cordial entertainment. Its

invitation is larger than the simple Come; it is Welcome. It is offered not in the mere extending of the hand, but in the expanding of the heart. It opens not merely the door of the spare room, but that of one's own room. It is willing not only to bring a stranger in, but to turn one's self out. It greets not only with a Take, but Share. It not simply acquiesces, but urges with sweet compulsion. It heeds not many-voiced convention, but hears a single voice, "I was a stranger and ye took me in."

Not yet, we believe, have Christian men and women begun to realize the wonderful evangelizing power there is in a true spirit of hospitality; nor have the possibilities of its proper exercise begun to be seen. Our home doors signify not so much protection as exclusion. Their bolts and bars are eloquent of limitations set upon love. We meet men on a level in our business offices and upon the street, but recognition of equality, and in many respects of obligation, ends there. Our houses are our castles, surrounded by impassable moats, across which the drawbridges fall only for those of our immediate social circles. We have not yet learned with our Master to say to him who inquires of us, "Where dwellest thou?" "Come and see," save as such an invitation will further some self-centered purpose; have not learned to "use hospitality without grudging." The spirit of caste is undeniably one of the mightiest obstacles in the way of that kingdom whose single and comprehensive law is love.

To one who will carefully study the Gospels and Epistles with the purpose of ascertaining to what extent this grace of hospitality was employed in the early history of the Christian Church to accomplish the spread of the gospel, the results will be interesting if not surprising. In example, in precept and in parable, our Lord laid special emphasis upon it. He had no home of his own, whose doors He could throw open for the accommodation of guests. Yet we find him on more than one occasion playing the host. The feeding of the 5,000, and again of the 4,000, what was this but a rebuke to the inhospitable spirit that led his disciples to say, "Send them away." And after his resurrection, what else was it that was emphasized in the preparation of the simple repast for the toil-worn disciples? He disclosed his identity to the two disciples, with whom He had come to Emmaus, "in the breaking of bread." And this spirit He sought to encourage in others by manifesting a gracious willingness to become their guest. What a picture of hospitality do we have in the Bethany home! What a disclosure of the true and the false methods of hospitality in the home of Simon, the Pharisee! What an encouragement to a hospitable spirit in the command to Zaccheus: "Make haste and come down, for to-day I must abide at thy home"!

And is it not a very plain revelation of the true nature of hospitality which we have in the injunction: "When thou makest a feast call the

poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind ; and thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee ; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

And in the parabolic teachings of Christ, is not the cultivation of this grace one, at least, of the lessons of each of the stories, the Great Supper, the Good Samaritan, and Dives and Lazarus? So we believe. There were other and, it may be, larger lessons ; but this was one, and a by no means unimportant one.

After the ascension of our Lord to heaven the early disciples turned their homes into churches. Doubtless all the social influence which they possessed was employed to gather into the circle of those who realized the blessedness of the gospel, as many as possible of those who had hitherto been ignorant of its power. That the "fellowship" in which the apostles continued included acts of a hospitable character, we readily believe. The breaking of bread from house to house was not exclusively sacramental, unless, indeed, we may accept it as true that each meal was to them more or less sacramental in its character, an outward sign of an invisible grace. The community of goods which characterized those days was an indication that the church idea governed every relation. Each home was consecrated as a winning-place of souls. Men recognized one another as members or members-to-be of a common household of faith. Cæsar's official or Philemon's slave, it mattered not. Social distinctions were lost sight of in the one idea of brotherhood. There was no respect of persons. Male and female, Jew and Greek, barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, rich and poor, wise and unwise, all were one. If etiquette had its punctilios, these were forgotten in the one thought of a common relationship to the King of kings, for the sake of which each was entitled to every consideration. "Honor all men" became the law of the new society, a law which overruled conventionalities. So that Paul could write the quondam master as to him who had been his slave. "Receive him not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved. Receive him as myself."

Injunctions as to the exercise of this grace are given alike to the ministry and the laity in the Epistles. The two apostles, Peter and Paul—the one the representative apostle to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles—both urged its cultivation. Peter emphasized the spirit that should accompany it—the free, generous, ungrudging spirit. Paul in writing both to Timothy and to Titus declared that the bishop or elder must be characterized by a love of hospitality, and enjoined upon the members of the church at Rome the *pursuit* of hospitality ; a peculiar expression, as though he would have suggested that the mere willingness to entertain strangers was not enough ; they must seek opportunities of entertaining. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews bade them not to be forgetful of this duty, for that in its performance some had found that they had been ministering to angels,

Coming down to post-Apostolic times we find this one of the distinguishing characteristics of the church. "We give ourselves to hospitality and receive all with a friendly and joyous welcome; for we fear to have it said, as in the instance of Joseph and Mary, that 'there was no room for them in the inn'; or lest our Lord should say, 'I was a stranger and ye took me not in.'" (*Hieron Apol. in Rufin.*) "Who," wrote Clement to the Corinthians, "who has not admired your Christian temper and moderation? Who has not proclaimed your habitual and noble hospitality?" In his *Ancient Christianity Exemplified* Coleman tells us that "some built, at their own expense, houses of entertainment for strangers. Of one it is said that he was but a guest in his own house, for his house was filled with strangers and with the poor; of another, that he was the entertainer of all the saints; of a third, that he was the servant of strangers; of another, that he was given to hospitality." It cannot be wondered that when Christian love took so practical a shape the religion of Christ spread with amazing rapidity, and its enemies were compelled to adopt similar tactics to counteract its influences. Doubtless the love-feast, in its original conception, was little else than one expression of this grace.

In view of what we have said, it becomes a question worthy of serious consideration whether the church of to-day has not almost, if not altogether, ignored one of its most potent evangelizing agencies in departing from the customs of the earlier days in the exercise of the grace of hospitality. And when we speak of the church we mean the church in the individual membership. By far the larger proportion of that membership fails to come into any personal contact with the stranger and with the needy. They are seen afar off; they are greeted through committees; they are assisted through contribution boxes. But rarely does eye look into eye, hand grasp hand; rarely does the word of welcome fall from the lips. Church notices read well: "Strangers cordially welcomed," but in what respect do they differ from business bids for patronage? It is a question worth pondering.

A youth comes from the country to one of our modern cities, and what does he find? On almost every street corner an attractive resort, elegantly appointed, by night brilliantly illumined. He enters and finds himself welcomed; invited to make himself at home; supplied with the daily papers; afforded many comforts and conveniences. His own quarters may be confined and ill-appointed. What wonder if he speedily becomes an *habitué* of the barroom? And what has the church done to offset the magnetic influence of these abodes of vice? Must we not say, very little, if not absolutely nothing. For what is an occasional coffee-stand or a chilly and poorly-furnished reading-room in comparison with these places? In putting behind it as a relic of a less-enlightened age the practical hospitality of the early church, has not

the church of to-day, in an important sense, demitted its ministry? So we are inclined to believe.

But in what way would we have the evils to which we have referred met? Would we have the church set up its corresponding counter-attractions on our street-corners, and by its gaudy advertisements allure those whom it would reach away from the dangers that now encompass them? We believe that some such device would be far better than nothing. But such hospitality would necessarily be indirect, and, in a sense, impersonal; the hospitality of a place rather than the hospitality of hearts. What is needed is direct, sympathetic contact between man and man as host and guest or welcomer and welcomed. The substitution of gas-light and furnace-heat and newspaper communications for the light of eyes, the warmth of hearts and personal intercourse will not do. They speak of interest, indeed, but only *sotto voce*, and will inevitably come to be construed as the equivalent of an utterance on the part of Christian men and women. "Thus far shalt thou come, but no farther." They virtually tell of condescension without humility, of charity without love; of a sense of obligation to do something, but of a desire to do that something, so far as possible, by proxy and at a distance. Men must be touched mainly through their sympathies, and these cannot be reached while they are held at arm's length, as though contact might breed contagion.

There are two or three suggestions of a practical nature in regard to the exercise of the grace of hospitality which, if followed, would, we believe, help to solve the great question that is weighing upon the hearts of many Christian people to-day, How shall the masses be reached with the gospel of Christ?

The first is for those who are engaged in the work of Sabbath-school instruction. It is that teacher and scholar should come to know each other more intimately than is possible through the brief association of the Sabbath, or through the occasional visit of the instructor to the homes of those intrusted to him for instruction. We take it for granted that every faithful teacher is acquainted with the dwellings of his scholars. A true teacher is an under-shepherd, and does pastoral work, not simply feeding, but tending his little flock. But his influence is greatly enhanced if, at times, he gathers his class within the walls of his own home and manifests an interest in the social well-being of his scholars. Dr. Trumbull, in his admirable book on "Teaching and Teachers," hints at the excellent results that have attended the adoption of this plan by certain of his acquaintance. Not only is an excellent opportunity hereby afforded for some "private, personal word," but an encouragement is also given to the cultivation of a true spirit of discipline, through the development of a personal affection. Obedience comes to be regarded as a courtesy to one beloved, not a mere obligation to one half feared or coldly respected. The establish-

ment of a sympathetic relationship in the home is the best of all preparations for the spiritual instruction in the school.

Our second suggestion has reference to the inducement of our non-churchgoing population to become church-attendant. During the past year or two, in some of our larger cities, pastors and members of evangelical churches have been organizing local alliances, the main purpose of which is to accomplish the end just mentioned. The method employed is a thorough visitation of all the families in the city, a visitation systematic and persistent, by members of the churches represented in the alliance. This visitation is to be once a month for each month in the year, that, through the gradual formation of a more or less intimate acquaintance, the matter of church attendance may be presented unobtrusively, and the present reproach of indifference be wiped out. Doubtless much good might be accomplished by a wise prosecution of this plan, although an acquaintance with results in certain individual instances leads us to be somewhat skeptical concerning its general working. Visitors come to be regarded as agents, official representatives of a system, and lose influence as this conviction grows. There is "a more excellent way," we are inclined to believe; a way which has had little trial, but which, when tried, has been greatly blessed. It is that of employing the social influence of our Christian homes; exercising the grace of a Christian hospitality toward "those that are without." There is hardly a Christian home in any of our cities which does not number among its immediate neighbors two or three households at least which have either drifted away from their old church moorings or have never cultivated the habit of church attendance. The members of these households are constantly meeting one another on the street, in the store, or, perchance, in friendly social intercourse in one another's residences. The cultivation of an intimacy might readily prepare the way for the proffer of an invitation to one's own home, and so to one's own sanctuary, or for the frank avowal of concern as to the result of a continuous disregard of religious obligation. We recognize the difficulties arising from the apparently binding obligation of certain conventional restrictions. But the service of Christ oftentimes comes into direct antagonism with conventionalism. Though it has respect to the becoming, it ignores the merely formal. It breaks down the middle walls of partition which have been erected by a spirit of caste. It has no respect of persons because it has respect for persons, realizing something of the immense significance of personality, the infinite value of individual souls. He who cannot bury a social prejudice in order to accomplish the salvation of a fellow mortal, nay, immortal, has far to come ere he arrives at the likeness of Him "who, though he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich"; who, though Lord of lords, "made himself of no reputation," that those who were vile through sin might become

sons of God. No man can stand at the foot of Calvary and talk long of social distinction. No man can drink the living water of the Spirit of the meek and lowly Christ and lay much stress on conventionalities. The propriety that overmasters all is the propriety of our Redeemer in us. No Christian could honor his home more than by making the way of the Lord straight through it to the heart of a neighbor.

A final suggestion as to the exercise of hospitality. A church is simply a family—its building a home. We need a larger development of this grace in the treatment of strangers in our churches, especially of those who may be unable, judging from appearance, to do very much in the way of assisting us to meet our financial obligations. It is the home feeling which we should endeavor to awaken in them, and this can only be accomplished by a manifestation of cordial welcome. A genial smile, a pleasant word, or a warm grasp of the hand, has an immense influence in making one feel "at home" in a church, as elsewhere, and ninety-nine cases in a hundred will awaken no feeling of resentment. But an icy stare, such as a conscious intruder might look for, will speedily chill fervor into disquietude, and close a man's heart to the influence of truth that might have been saving.

In "Modern Cities and Their Religious Problems," Mr. Loomis has written words to which we may well give heed: "It will not be difficult to convince those who are acquainted with the life of our cities, that the Protestant churches, as a rule, have no following among the workingmen. Everybody knows it. Go into an ordinary church on Sunday morning and you see lawyers, physicians, merchants and business men with their families. You see teachers, salesmen and clerks, and a certain proportion of educated mechanics; but the workingman and his household are not there. It is doubtful if one in twenty of the average congregation, in English-speaking Protestant city churches, fairly belongs to this class." There is too great a tendency, we believe, among writers of the class to which Mr. Loomis belongs, to ignore the fact that the large percentage of our so-called laboring classes represent nationalities which have long been under the domination of Rome, and that, although Americanized in a measure, they still retain their affiliation for the Papacy, and naturally are to be found in the membership of its churches. At the same time it is deeply to be regretted if any obstacle is to be found in our Protestant churches, which keeps our laboring men from an attendance upon religious services. Its removal will depend not upon any change in the nature of these services; not upon any change in the character of the truths proclaimed; not, perhaps, upon any change in the method of their presentation; but upon a change in the moral temperature of the church. There must be a thawing out of the membership of the church. No class is more sensitive to atmospheric conditions than the laboring poor. And this sensitiveness must find

a responsiveness on the part of those who have come into the household of faith. It cannot be ignored. No free-pew system will take the place of hospitality. The world, including workingmen, is to be overcome by faith, indeed, but by a faith that works by love. This love must meet men, not condescendingly, but on the level. It must recognize the true status of manhood. And when it shall so do, when the liberty, equality and fraternity of men, of whatever class, are felt and acknowledged, we may look for the Pentecostal blessings, desire for which now makes up the burden of our prayers.

V.—JOHN MORLEY AS CRITIC OF VOLTAIRE.

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

MR. JOHN MORLEY claims the attention of intelligent Christians, and especially of intelligent Christian teachers, by a threefold title. He is an influential statesman, he is an influential man of letters, and he is an atheist.

Mr. Morley's character as an atheist is inextricably blended with his character as a man of letters. He has exerted his literary influence to propagate atheistic views. That influence he has brought to bear in two ways: he has been an author and he has been an editor. As editor he conducted the *Fortnightly Review* fifteen years, the *Pall Mall Gazette* three years, and *Macmillan's Magazine* two years. He also had editorial charge of the "English Men of Letters" series of books. How an editor could, and how Mr. Morley did, make himself felt in a given direction, when fulfilling a trust of the latter sort, is sufficiently indicated by the mere reminder that James Anthony Froude was chosen to present John Bunyan to the public.

As author Mr. Morley has written essays many enough and long enough to fill ten handsome volumes in the collective edition of his works in which his English publishers have lately introduced him to American readers.

Within a few years Mr. Morley has, as it were, formally withdrawn from literature to devote himself to statesmanship. This transfer of himself from authorship to affairs will naturally, if he wins commanding success in his new sphere of exertion, tend rather to increase than to diminish his literary influence. There will inevitably be a carrying over of credit reflected from the statesman to the author.

Of Mr. Morley, however, as statesman, I say nothing directly except to mention that during Mr. Gladstone's last ministry he was this great leader's trusted lieutenant, having, indeed, a very large share in the honor and responsibility of that famous measure of Home Rule for Ireland which, in the event of parliamentary fortune, drove him with his chief for a time indefinite out of power. Admirers of Mr. Gladstone, of whom the present writer reckons himself one, will recognize

in the relation thus pointed out as subsisting between these two statesmen a strong presumptive title in the younger to esteem on their part for purity and elevation of personal character. This title is felt to be confirmed rather than invalidated in a study of Mr. Morley's literary productions.

For Mr. Morley, though an atheist, is no mocker. He is emphatically a grave and serious man. He is even too grave and serious. A leaven of humor would improve his intellectual, perhaps to his ethical, quality. But, at any rate, Mr. Morley does not scoff. He may offend you with dogmatism, but he will not offend you with levity. He is as solemn in opposing the Christian faith as the most solemn of Christians could desire. There is left to his reader no room for doubt that this writer sincerely believes himself to be doing a needed service for mankind in the attempt to overthrow Christianity and even to abolish God. He presents, in fact, a bold contrast to the "philosopher"—we must quote this word when we apply it to Voltaire—who was so impressed with the usefulness of the idea of a Divine Being, that he said: "If there were no God, it would be our duty to create one." Mr. Morley vehemently thinks that the idea of God, with its circle of related ideas, is not only false, but morally injurious. No-God is, in his view, better than God.

But the wisest of my readers will feel surer if they see a statement in Mr. Morley's own words of his position in the sphere of religious thought and belief. This I furnish in the following extract from his long essay "On Compromise," originally, like most of his writings, published in the *Fortnightly Review*. It will be seen that Mr. Morley's confession is sufficiently sweeping and positive. There is no need of mistaking *his* views. He says:

"Those who agree with the present writer, for example, are not skeptics. They positively, absolutely, and without reserve, reject as false the whole system of objective propositions [of course, the existence of God; the immortality of the soul] which make up the popular belief of the day in one and all of its theological expressions. They look upon that system as *mischievous* in its consequences."

Obviously to consider here this distinguished writer chiefly in his character of atheist and advocate of atheism will be doing him no injustice. The atheistic motive and interest are fundamental and controlling in his literary work. When I say this I mean to include in the idea of atheism the whole group of positivist ideas, especially moral and social ideas, which the idea of atheism, as held in these Christian times and climes, seems naturally to involve.

The most important part of Mr. Morley's literary production consists of a series of essays or monographs on eighteenth-century French authors. These essays or monographs are in effect, if not also in motive, fully as much anti-Christian polemics as they are critical studies in biography and literature.

I do not say this in condemnation, but simply in description. To conduct a biographical or a literary study with an ulterior argumentative aim, may be perfectly proper and fair. One need only exercise the requisite caution—and the caution requisite is very great—not to let the aim mislead the study.

This requisite measure of caution Mr. Morley, in treating Voltaire, has, I think, not exercised; and to show that such is the case is the chief object of the present paper.

I must not thus frankly disclose an object on my part unfavorable to Mr. Morley in his "*Voltaire*," without acknowledgment accompanying as ample as I can candidly make it of the merits that even here are undoubtedly his. Mr. Morley is a high-minded, conscientious, pains-taking writer. He thinks and he stimulates thought. You feel that he deals frankly with you, and you cannot but respect him accordingly. There are occasional felicities of scholarlike and cultivated diction and phrase which gratify your taste, and sometimes even a touch of true poetry surprises you into delight as you read.

But, despite all such concessions justly his due, a certain difficulty in accomplishing my object confronts me, created by the nature of the style in which Mr. Morley expresses himself. That style, with whatever other merits it may fairly be credited, certainly has not the merit of lucidity. On the contrary, it is often confusingly obscure, puzzlingly ambiguous. It is not a careless style, but it is not wisely careful. It is full, but it is too full, of thought. There has been labor, and the labor somehow seems still to continue, everywhere. All these strictures on Mr. Morley's style I limit in their application to the "*Voltaire*." A single illustration, by no means the most striking adducible, shall suffice to show what I mean. Mr. Morley is speaking of Voltaire (p. 72):

"From this [exactly what 'this' here is, I confess myself unable, after some attentive study of the context, to tell] there flowed that other vehement current in his soul, of energetic hatred toward the black clouds of prejudice, of mean self-love, of sinister preference of class or order, of indolence, obstinacy, wanton fancy, and all the other unhappy leanings of human nature, and vexed and fatal conjunctures of circumstance which interpose between humanity and the beneficent sunbeams of its own intelligence, that central light of the universe."

There, Mr. Morley's reader finds "flowing," from some fountain, uncertain what, another "current," "other" than what is again uncertain, but at all events a current of "hatred"; it is hatred toward sundry "black clouds," namely, clouds of "prejudice," clouds of "self-love," clouds of "preference of class or order," clouds of "indolence," clouds of "obstinacy," clouds of "wanton fancy," and clouds of "all the other unhappy leanings of human nature," and clouds of "vexed and fatal conjunctures of circumstance," which clouds many, and assuredly diverse, "interpose" between "humanity," on the one hand, and "sunbeams" proceeding from "its own intelligence," on

the other, this same "intelligence" being, by way of finish to the sentence and to the sustained rhetorical figure, declared to be the "central light of the universe."

But now, to let pass what here is doubtful in meaning, also to let pass what to some may seem not perfectly felicitous in expression, consider for a moment the intelligible thought conveyed. Voltaire is represented as vehemently hating "mean self-love." The literary man, that is to say, who, though rich (his annual income at his death was found equivalent to about two hundred thousand dollars, present value), wrangled through a long correspondence, in a manner described by Mr. Morley himself (p. 110) as "insolent, undignified, low-minded and untruthful," about what? why, about some fire-wood which he insisted that the gentleman with whom he quarreled had *given* to him, and which he wanted to wriggle dishonestly out of paying for—that man effusively represented to be a vehement hater of "mean self-love"!

Mr. Morley constantly glozes the faults of his heroes, the adversaries of Christ. He does not conceal their faults; he desires to be fair, and he tells them. He not only tells them, but often he has some wholesome, honest words of righteous blame. And then he proceeds to gloze them. This may be said to be his almost invariable method. It is like an established formula of procedure with him. In the case last referred to, that of Voltaire's conduct in the matter of the fire-wood, after using the four condemnatory adjectives already quoted, Mr. Morley adds:

"The case happily stands alone in his biography."

Not in any important sense "alone." For instance, Mr. Morley himself tells us (p. 209):

"While Voltaire constantly declared that he could never forget the outrages which the King of Prussia (Frederick the Great) had inflicted on him, neither did he forget to draw his pension from the King of Prussia." "Voltaire, though a man of solid wealth, complained shrilly because it [his pension] was irregularly paid at the very time when he knew that Frederick was so short of money that he was driven to melt his plate."—Morley's "Diderot," p. 297.

Poverty-stricken Rousseau, on the contrary, declined the offer of a pension from Frederick, on the very good ground that that sovereign was really unable to afford it.

Yet again, Mr. Morley (p. 206) relates that in a certain considerable business transaction of Voltaire's with a Jew:

"He [Voltaire] had interpolated matter to his own advantage in a document already signed by his adversary, thus making the Jew to have signed what he had signed not; and second, that when very hard pushed he [Voltaire] would not swerve from a false oath, *any more than his great enemy, the Apostle Peter, had done.*"

And this same Voltaire, forsooth, had a "vehement current in his soul of energetic hatred toward the black clouds" of "mean self-love"! The gratuitous fling at Peter as precedent and parallel to

Voltaire for perjury, conveyed in the words which I italicize in the foregoing, may be taken as characteristic, less, I trust, of the personal spirit, than of the controversial method of Mr. Morley. The difference in the two perjuries is that what was solitary and utterly out of character for Peter was perfectly in character and of the nature of habit for Voltaire. Besides, Voltaire perjured himself deliberately, and for a sordid purpose of swindling; whereas Peter, surprised with sudden temptation, foreswore himself to save his own life.

But "mean self-love" is not all that, according to Mr. Morley, this generous hater hated. He hated also "sinister preference of class or order." And yet Mr Morley himself says (p. 140) of Voltaire, already in the full maturity of his manhood, "He was now essentially aristocratic and courtly in his predilections"; again (p. 338), "He was to the last a man of quality." Still further, with all the strength implied in Mr. Morley's strong figure, Voltaire, according to his critical English biographer, hated the "black clouds" of "wanton fancy." The author of "Pucelle," that is to say, hated, vehemently hated, energetically hated, "wanton fancy"! (The "Pucelle," as, happily, I may need to explain to some, is a burlesque heroic poem on Joan d'Arc, in which the poet befouls the noble and beautiful legend of that woman with fictions of "wanton fancy," gross beyond the imagining of one who has never happened to bring his nose within reach of the reek of it.) Mr. Morley tires of telling in detail all the things that Voltaire nobly hated and he masses them in one sufficiently comprehensive expression. Besides hating the various things specifically mentioned, Voltaire hates, broadly and in general, "all the other unhappy leanings of human nature." Let us see.

I gather out of Mr. Morley's own pages a few illustrative notes that may throw light on this critic's praise of Voltaire for his universal virtuous hatred. Mr. Morley calls him (p. 65) "the greatest mocker that ever lived." He says (p. 102): "Vanity was one of the most strongly marked of Voltaire's traits." This, by the way, is said in the course of the glozing applied to Voltaire's adulterous "connection" with the Marquise du Châtelet; "to this side of him [namely 'vanity'] relations with a woman of quality, who adored his genius, were no doubt extremely gratifying." Gratifying, "extremely gratifying," that is to say, to a certain "side" of—whom? Why, of a gentleman in whose soul "flowed" a "vehement current of energetic hatred toward the black clouds of sinister preference of class or order"! Mr. Morley speaks (p. 100) of the "damnable iteration of petty quarrel and fretting complaint which fills such a space in his [Voltaire's] correspondence." Mr. Morley says (p. 109): "His [Voltaire's] fluency of invective and complaint . . . was simply boundless when any obscure scribbler earned a guinea by a calumny upon him." Mr. Morley represents (p. 203) Voltaire to have been "excitable as a

demon." Mr. Morley relates (pp. 203, 204) how, on a certain occasion, "the furious poet and philosopher [Voltaire] rushed up to his visitor [a bookseller who "*injudiciously* came either to pay his respects or to demand some *trivial arrears of money*"—Italics mine] and inflicted a stinging box on his ear." Mr. Morley says (p. 204): "Voltaire's account [of still another matter respecting himself], witty and diverting as it is, is not free from many misrepresentations, and some tolerably deliberate lies." Mr. Morley uses (p. 198) the pregnant and suggestive expression, "even Voltaire's spleen." Mr. Morley says (p. 160): "He [Voltaire] sought to catch some crumb of praise by fawningly asking of the vilest of men [Louis XV.], '*Trajan est-il content?*'" Mr. Morley says (p. 337): "We find him [Voltaire] playing the equivocal part of being all things to all men. . . . Voltaire's lively complaisance to all sorts of unworthy people is something worse than unedifying." Mr. Morley says (p. 338): "Voltaire not only disclaimed works of which it was notorious that he was the author, but insisted that his friends should impute them to this or that dead name."

Of the foregoing very inadequate collection of notes furnished by Mr. Morley himself for the illustration of Voltaire's character, let us now briefly take the sum and make the instructive comparison naturally suggested of our author with himself.

For the sake of clearer true effect, I condense, so far as possible, each different specification of Mr. Morley's into a single equivalent word. The reader will be able at his leisure to look back and consider how far the present critic is justified in the series of condensations thus made.

Voltaire, then, as appears from Mr. Morley, was vain, he mocked, he deceived, he lied, he forged, he swindled, he perjured himself, he fawned, he flattered, he haggled, he begged, he scolded, he whined, he wrangled, he brawled, he stormed, he struck, he wrote ribaldry, he practiced adultery; and yet, according to Mr. Morley, this vain man, this mocker, this deceiver, this liar, forger, swindler, perjurer, fawner, flatterer, haggler, sponge, scold, whiner, wrangler, brawler, stormer, striker, ribald, adulterer, had in his soul a vehement current of energetic hatred toward the black clouds of "all the unhappy leanings of human nature"—quite "all" of them!

I write here from no unkindness to the memory of poor Voltaire. He had his merits, and I have no wish to disparage them. But it is not now Voltaire that is on trial. It is Mr. John Morley as critic of Voltaire. What I submit to all candid readers is the following postulate as to Mr. Morley's eulogy of Voltaire in the sentence just criticised, namely:

Voltaire's eulogist said, in that sentence, good things of his hero *without sufficiently considering whether or not the things that he said were true.*

I now generalize this judgment and say broadly of Mr. Morley's monograph as a whole that, from the beginning to the end, it is characterized by the same inconsiderateness of assertion as was found illustrated in the sentence (about "hatred toward" various "black clouds") already put by way of example under criticism.

I am well aware of the seriousness of the charge that I thus make. The charge amounts to nothing less than the denial of high critical value to Mr. Morley's work in the "Voltaire." This denial I do in terms make. Mr. Morley's "Voltaire" is an untrustworthy treatment of its subject. This I allege, not because I believe, though I do believe, his main argumentative contention against Christianity to be a mistake in historical and philosophical criticism. Such a central mistake a writer might conceivably commit, and yet keep to truth and soundness and consistency in the details of his writing. So to have done would leave one's work, if it were for instance a work in the kind of Mr. Morley's monograph, substantially just and good as biography and criticism, while as argumentative polemic perhaps remaining, in the view of everybody save the author himself, inconclusive and void. In the case, however, of Mr. Morley discussing Voltaire, the central mistake, or more strictly perhaps the motive created by the central mistake, seems to have injuriously affected everything. The anti-Christian purpose, earnest no doubt on Mr. Morley's part, but too eager, has unconsciously bribed, not his love of truth, let us say, but his power to see the truth. This is conjectural, of course, as to the psychology of the matter, and it may be wrong. I by no means insist upon it. The fact, and not my own conjectural account of the fact, is the thing that is pertinent. And the fact, I repeat, is that Mr. Morley as critic of Voltaire is not to be trusted, and this for the reason that he makes critical statements *without sufficiently considering whether the statements that he makes are true.*

I have already shown this in one representative example, and I proceed to show it in what I may take to be a sufficient number of others.

First, however, let us make somewhat more sure of that which has already been accomplished.

Some alert and fair-minded readers may be asking within their own minds: Has not our present critic simply been putting to critical torture a single unfortunate sentence of his author's—an exceptional inadvertence of haste on his part—and wringing from that witness a testimony which the general tenor of Mr. Morley's book would contradict? A righteous doubt in Mr. Morley's favor to which we shall do well to give its just weight.

Elsewhere, then, and otherwise, than in the one ill-considered sentence here selected for examination, has Mr. Morley written in praise of Voltaire things as irreconcilable as are the things said in that with

what Mr. Morley himself has been obliged to admit was Voltaire's true character? My readers shall see.

Mr. Morley says (p. 221) :

"There was not a man then alive . . . who was on the whole, in spite of constitutional infirmities and words which were far worse than his deeds, more ardent and persevering in its practice" [that is, in the practice of the "generous humanity" of the Sermon on the Mount.]

Is adultery, then, is lying, is wrangling—I confine myself to what may be considered either habitual or at least very frequent practices with Voltaire—are these things and things such as these included by Mr. Morley in the "generous humanity" of the Sermon on the Mount? Or is forgery, for example, forgery perpetrated by a rich man for the purpose of swindling, to be reckoned among "constitutional infirmities"? Those forged words of Voltaire's, those at least, are not to be made light of as being forsooth "far worse than his deeds." They were his deeds. So were the words in which he told his lies. So were the words in which he wrote his "Pucelle." So were the words in which he mocked at things divine. In fact, Voltaire did almost all his deeds in words, and those words still live and are trumpet-tongued to tell what Voltaire was. I think they never told anybody till they told Mr. Morley, that Voltaire was as "ardent and persevering" in living up to the "generous humanity" of the Sermon on the Mount as was any man of his time. John Howard, the philanthropist, was one of the men "then alive."

The proportionally very small measure of truth in that highly uncritical judgment of Mr. Morley's is that Voltaire did ardently and perseveringly certain generous things, notably, vindicate the cause of the oppressed and persecuted Calas family. Let these things be, without grudging, set down to Voltaire's credit. But surely it is not such things alone, nay, it is not such things chiefly, that constitute the "generous humanity" of the Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. Morley, being about thus virtually (p. 221) to pronounce Voltaire equal in goodness to the best among his contemporaries, boldly (p. 147) calls him also, without qualification, the "greatest man of his time." Now it might in fact happen that the far from ideal character that, out of Mr. Morley's own pages, Voltaire has already been shown to have been; a man to whom, further, Mr. Morley attributes (p. 271) "insufficient depth of nature"; a man of whom, at Berlin, Mr. Morley testifies (p. 195) that he "took a childish delight in his gold key and his star"; a man of whom Mr. Morley (p. 341) relates that "the gorgeous ceremony with which in his quality of lord he commemorated its opening [that is, the opening of a chapel on his estate, rebuilt by the mocking proprietor himself] made everybody laugh, not excepting the chief performer, for he actually took the opportunity of lifting up his voice in the new temple and preaching a sermon

against theft"; a man of whom Mr. Morley further relates (p. 341) that, in sequel to the foregoing, he "tried to make a nominal peace with the Church by confessing, and participating in the solemnity of an Easter communion"; a man of whom, yet once more, Mr. Morley (p. 342) relates that, subsequently to the things foregoing, he, Voltaire, in order to accomplish the last mockery possible, "was at once [on occasion apparently of some warning against him issued by the bishop to the curé] seized with a [pretended] fever and summoned the priest to administer ghostly comfort," in consequence of which "he did duly receive the viaticum," declaring that "if any indiscretion prejudicial to the religion of the State should have escaped him, he seeks forgiveness from God and the State"; a man of whom Mr. Morley has something additional in the same line of conduct to relate, which he simply calls "one other curious piece of sportiveness," but which we need not trouble ourselves now to understand (it is interesting, however, to remember that these "curious pieces of sportiveness," were the pranks of a youngster of only about seventy-five years of age);—it might, I say, in fact happen that a man like this was, notwithstanding all, what Mr. Morley calls Voltaire, "the greatest man of his time." The men of Voltaire's time might be to that degree small. Still, one recalls that Frederick the Great lived then, Peter the Great, Marlborough, Washington, Franklin, Newton, Chatham, Burke, Locke, Hume (of whom, in his essay on Turgot, Mr. Morley himself says, "the greatest of the whole band of innovators," Voltaire, of course, being one), Pope, Lessing, we might almost include Goethe, who was twenty-nine years old, and had written "Werther" and "Goetz" when Voltaire died, to say nothing of Turgot, Montesquieu, Buffon, Diderot among Voltaire's own countrymen—one recalls these names coeval with Voltaire, and one wonders whether it was not uncritical confidence or uncritical enthusiasm on his part that betrayed Mr. Morley into being altogether so clear and decisive on the point of Voltaire's pre-eminence in greatness over all the men of his time.

But Mr. Morley supplies the means of checking him out of himself at this point. He quotes approvingly (p. 73) Voltaire pronouncing him "right" who to the question, Who was the greatest man? that is, of all history, had "answered that it was undoubtedly Isaac Newton." Nor is this all. Mr. Morley, in the preliminary chapter to his volumes (p. 17), says: "To have really contributed in the humblest degree, for instance, to a peace between Prussia and her enemies in 1759, would have been an immeasurably greater performance for mankind than any given book which Voltaire could have written." This, of course, is not said by Mr. Morley to disparage Voltaire's ability as a man of letters in comparison with other men of letters. It is said in the course of a passage devoted to showing how much higher a sphere the sphere of action is than the sphere of literature. Mr. Morley here was

vindicating Voltaire against the disparagement of those who had treated with contempt his anxiety, never gratified, to play diplomatist. Voltaire's anxiety, Mr. Morley thinks, did him credit. (This is Mr. Morley estimating diplomacy when it seems to him desirable to defend Voltaire for seeking to be a diplomatist. When it becomes his object to approve Voltaire sneering at diplomacy, Mr. Morley (pp. 314, 315) will use this different language: "Diplomacy and its complex subterranean processes, which have occupied so extremely disproportionate a place in written history and which are in acted history responsible for so much evil, were in the same way informally relegated [by Voltaire] to the region of inhuman occupations." The very "humblest" contribution to the bringing about of a certain peace would have been an "immeasurably" greater achievement than any book that Voltaire could have written. These superlative words, are they considerate? are they critical? "In the humblest degree"? "immeasurably greater"? But at all events this comes out clear, namely, that Mr. Morley ranks the vocation of letters far, very far, perhaps even "immeasurably" far, below the vocation of statesmanship, government, action. Now how does Frederick the Great stand comparatively in Mr. Morley's esteem, as one among those who have exerted themselves in that sphere of active affairs which is so much above Voltaire's sphere of letters? The following sentence will show. Mr. Morley (p. 187) says:

"Such an achievement as the restoration of the germs of order and prosperity, which Frederick so rapidly brought about after the appalling ruin that seven years of disastrous war had effected, is unmatched in the history of human government."

It appears, then, that, according to Mr. Morley, Frederick achieved the very highest in a far higher sphere of things than Voltaire's, while Voltaire was a greater man than Frederick. Was this perhaps because, though Voltaire was actually a mere man of letters, he was yet potentially capable of greater things? No, for Mr. Morley (p. 117) tells us that "if ever man was called not to [various other things] but to literature . . . that man was Voltaire." To point the inferiority of "literature" still more sharply, Mr. Morley (pp. 117, 118) distinguishes "literature," as being "essentially an art of form," from those exercises of intellectual energy which produce work like that of "Shakespeare and Molière, Shelley and Hugo." Voltaire was thus essentially, not fortuitously, a mere man of letters, and letters are so far below diplomacy, for example, that the "humblest" success in the latter line, at least if it happened to be won in the bringing about of a certain peace, would be an "immeasurably" greater achievement on Voltaire's part than the greatest achievement possible to him with his pen—all this, and yet Voltaire a greater man than the accomplisher of the greatest feat in rulership ever yet accomplished in the history of the world!

To make the wondering confusion of his reader complete, Mr. Morley (p. 188) strongly says: "I do not know of any period of corresponding length that can produce such a group of active, wise and truly positive statesmen as existed in Europe between 1760 and 1780 [Voltaire's time]. Besides Frederick, we have Turgot in France, Pombal in Portugal, Charles III. and D'Aranda in Spain." So many men so great—so great in a sphere so much greater than that of Voltaire—all flourishing contemporaneously with him, and Voltaire "the greatest man of his time"!

Such contradictions as the foregoing are not properly to be considered the mere casual fruit of the spirit of hyperbole in expression. This spirit is, indeed, itself anything but critical. There is perhaps hardly a better superficial test to be found of the comparing, the judging, the critical temper and capacity in any given writer's case than to observe carefully how frequently, and how, he uses superlative and absolute expressions. This test Mr. Morley's writing in "Voltaire" would prove ill able to bear.

My space runs rapidly away or I should like to collect here, as it would be easy to do, a demonstrative number of instances in which Mr. Morley risks himself unwisely in very uncritical judgments of the absolute or the superlative sort. But, as I have intimated, Mr. Morley's contradictions of himself are not to be explained simply by being attributed to an uncritical habit of exaggeration on his part. He contradicts himself often, not merely in terms of expression, but in substance of thought. This it would be easy to show in many other examples, but meantime the extraordinary distraction of Mr. Morley's various sentences on Voltaire is as yet far from being fully presented.

Mr. Morley, as I have said, does not dissemble the faults of his heroes. He makes it plain enough that Voltaire was one of the very falsest of men. The peculiarity of the case with Mr. Morley is that his conscientious candor in letting us know this about Voltaire does not prevent his telling us also (p. 204) that Voltaire was "fundamentally a man of exceptional truth"! "Exceptional," indeed, I should hope that Voltaire's style of "truth" was. Voltaire lied well-nigh as multitudinously as any man ever did, and his critical biographer uses his omniscience to find out for us that Voltaire was, notwithstanding, "fundamentally" not merely a man of truth, but a man of "exceptional truth." Mr. Morley, after severely, and no doubt sincerely, blaming Voltaire's lying "complaisance with all sorts of unworthy people," reassures us about the matter by adding that "there was nothing false about these purring pleasantries." If he tells us that Voltaire was "the greatest mocker that ever lived," he sets us to wondering with one of his unqualified strong assertions to the effect that Voltaire was likewise "*always* serious in meaning."

The inelasticity of space compels me abruptly to stop, with my case

against Mr. Morley, as critic of Voltaire, and, in that capacity, antagonist of Christianity, much less than half presented.

I hope no one will mistake the purpose with which I have written here. I have not sought to confute Mr. Morley. I have merely sought to give Mr. Morley a fair chance to confute himself.

VI.—CLUSTERS OF GEMS.

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

NO. XII.—TRUTH.—(Continued from page 419.)

Sinners like to believe a lie, and will not come to the light, lest their deeds be reprov'd. A celebrated clergyman riding in the same conveyance with a noisy infidel, and hearing him propose a shallow objection to Christianity, thought he would see how sincere he was, and he said: "My dear sir, have you ever examined the book of the *prophecy of Jedediah* as furnishing an answer to your objection?" "Yes," said the skeptic, "*I have examined it thoroughly and do not deem it satisfactory!*" Dr. Brookes, of St. Louis, once challenged a blatant infidel who had much to say about the irreconcilable contradictions and absurdities of the Bible, to show him *one such contradiction*, offering \$500 reward for each instance. After four weeks of brooding over the challenge, he sent Dr. Brookes the following amusing reply:

"DEAR SIR: In Matt. xii: 30 it is said: 'He that is not with me is against me.' In Mark ix: 40 it is said: 'He that is not against us is on our part.'"

And on this shallow basis he claimed the \$500!

There is very little honest skepticism. Men take refuge from a guilty conscience in cherishing doubt of the truth; they try to persuade themselves that some things are not true because they do not want to believe them; and sometimes they succeed. But there comes a day when the eyes open to see—though it is too late.

A Death Vision. A young, talented architect of my acquaintance had led a life of neglect of God and religion, and cultivated skeptical opinion, till he got to doubt even whether there was a God or a future life. One day he sank into a slumber so profound that he was supposed to be dead. After a half hour he opened his eyes, and slowly said: "Yes, there is a life beyond! I know it now, for I have been treading along its boundary and looked across into the eternity beyond." And shutting his eyes he passed into the great hereafter. He had come back long enough, after touching the bound, to leave his testimony! A glance into the future, from the dying hour, cured him of his skepticism.

The telling of the truth transfers all responsibility to the hearer. He that knows the truth is responsible for acting or not acting up to his knowledge. And therefore he that knows his Lord's will and doeth it not shall be beaten with many stripes. This, above all, will make the sinner speechless at the bar of God. To have heard and to have rejected the gospel of salvation makes damnation both sure and terrible. Men frame many pretexts to cover their guilt here; but no excuses will stand at the great white throne.

About 1826 the Third Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N. Y., was organized. Joel Parker was chosen pastor. Samuel Lee was one of his first converts. At the request of Samuel Scofield, one of the elders and a brother-in-law of Lee, Mr. Parker called on Lee to talk with him about his salvation. Mr. Lee was indifferent and self-righteous and full of excuses. He thought

himself a pretty good man. Was moral and industrious; that he was quite as good as many professors of religion, and in his own opinion much better. Mr. Parker tried to make him realize that he was a sinner; that he must be born again of the Spirit or he could not be saved. After a long and earnest conversation Mr. Parker saw that he had made no impression on Mr. Lee's mind. Mr. Lee had thrown off all his arguments with this and that excuse.

At last he said to him: "Mr. Lee, I want to tell you one thing, and I want you to remember it. Will you remember it?" "Probably," said Mr. Lee, "if it is anything important." "But," said Mr. Parker, "I want you to promise to remember it." Mr. Lee hesitated. He thought, "What has Mr. Parker got to tell me, that he wants me to promise to remember? What can it be? He has been talking about death and the future life. What can he have more to tell?" "Mr. Lee," said Mr. Parker, "Will you promise to remember it?" "Yes, I will," said Mr. Lee. "You will have no excuse at the bar of God, poor man!" said Mr. Parker, and turned and left him. Mr. Lee resumed his work. But the arrow had penetrated through all his defenses and reached a vital part. "No excuse," rang in his ears. He tried to drown this inward voice by the increased noise of his hammer. (He was a silversmith.) But his awakened conscience repeated in thunder tones, "No excuse! No excuse!" Then he stopped work and said to himself: "Did I not go forty miles to Batavia on foot to bail out Brother Scofield, where he was sent to prison for debt? Is that nothing?" "No excuses!" came back. Then he called up one kind act after another of his life, and said to himself, "Is there no excuse or set-off in these deeds?" His awakened conscience replied to all these pleas for justification, "No excuse! No excuse!" At length his conviction became so deep that he dropped his hammer, closed his shop, went into his house, took down his unused Bible, and with it under one arm and his wife on the other, went to his chamber and there fell on his knees and prayed and wept, and wept and prayed, and read the Bible until he found joy and peace in believing. His joy was so great that the same day he went around among his friends to tell what a Saviour he had found.

That day in after years was kept sacred as his birthday. No work was done. In the morning at family prayer he recounted to his wife and children the mercies and blessings received during the last year; then family prayer and thanksgiving. The balance of the day was spent in calling on his friends and recounting God's mercies.

To obey the truth is to make constant advance. Some people, however active, were to be not at all aggressive; there is motion, but no progression. They are like the man who got on the ferryboat and kept going to and fro. At last he was asked where he was going. He said "he started for Charleston, but they had been making landings ever since, and he could not seem to get on!"

Devotion to Truth and Justice. In Regulus, the Roman Senator, calmly turning away from his weeping family and the awe-struck Senate to redeem his pledge to the enemy and meet the dreadful death prepared for him rather than break his word, you have a magnificent example of the virtue of whatsoever things are *true*; also in the Roman Judge delivering up his sons to die, amid tears and intercessions of wife, mother and citizens; and in the steadfast resistance of that Hebrew youth to the solicitations of sin in circumstances of most powerful temptation; so in the Roman matron presenting to her trembling husband the dagger plucked from her own bosom, "It is not painful Paetus"; or Lady Jane Grey bidding farewell to her hus-

band as he passed on to the scaffold, where she was so soon to follow; or the widow of John Brown, of Priesthill, gathering up her husband's scattered remains and yet warm skull, and answering to the rude taunt of the murderers, "What thinkest thou of him now, woman?" "I aye thoct much of him, and now much more than aye."

Departures from Truth. One denial of essential truth leads to another, until the first step of departure ends in the falling away of a dreadful apostasy. A man plays Hamlet on the theater stage who was some years since an orthodox Congregational minister in Brooklyn, N. Y. He first became unsettled as to the doctrine of the atonement, then successively abandoned the incarnation of God in Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures; then a future state of rewards and punishments. He was called to succeed Robert Collyer of Chicago, but so rapidly did he go down into the abyss of utter unbelief, that even the loose creed of the Unitarian was too confining to his "liberalism," and he startled that congregation of skeptics by announcing his inability longer to defend any distinctive doctrine of our holy faith. He proclaimed himself an agnostic—sure of nothing, not even the existence of God, and so turned to destroy the faith he once preached: an awful warning of the rapid apostasy that follows the denial of one fundamental doctrine. And he is but one of hundreds whose downfall illustrates the same law of progress in denial of the truth.

Truth is like food; it is capable of accumulation, appropriation, assimilation; and only so can it reach its noblest and richest effects and results, becoming incorporated with our very being.

Dignity of Truth. "The truth cannot be burned, beheaded or crucified. A lie on the throne is a lie still, and truth in a dungeon is still truth; and the lie on the throne is on the way to defeat, and the truth in the dungeon is on the way to victory."

Loyalty to the Truth. When the Italians were smarting under the yoke of multiform oppression, and yet jealous of their own liberty and independence, they managed to display their darling tricolor in the very face of their foes, by a seemingly accidental arrangement of *red, white and green*, the colors of Italy's flag, in the very vegetables they displayed in market or carried to their homes. "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth."—Ps. lx: 4.

Truth vs. Consistency. "Don't be 'consistent,'—but be simply TRUE. The longer I live, the more I am satisfied of two things: first, that the truest lives are those that are cut rose-diamond fashion, with many facets answering to the many-planned aspects of the world about them; secondly, that society is always trying in some way or other to grind us down to a single flat surface. It is hard work to resist this grinding-down action."—O. W. Holmes.

Offended at Truth. Matt. xv: 12-14. Every character rooted in error is destined to be torn up and destroyed. That is a lesson on CHARACTER. "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." That is a lesson on INFLUENCE. Truth, understood, loved, obeyed, is the only basis for manhood, or for leadership.

What is Truth? The "Gospel of Nicodemus," which the learned Tischendorf ascribes to the second century, has in it this very suggestive addition to the narrative of John xviii: "Pilate says to him: What is truth? Jesus says: Truth is from heaven. Pilate says: Is not there truth upon earth? Jesus says to Pilate: See how one who speaks truth is judged by those who have power upon earth."

Aristotle on Truth: "Truth is what a thing is in itself, in its relations, and in the medium through which it is viewed." It is impossible to separate our vision of truth from the organ of vision. A humid atmosphere not only bedims the heavenly luminaries, but invests them with a false halo. A colored lens will impart a hue to any object viewed through it. A diseased eye sees double. "If thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness."

Obedience to the truth brings the certainty of experiment. When Congress appointed the famous committee of five to examine as to the expediency of appropriating \$30,000 to build that pioneer telegraph line from Washington to Baltimore, the vote stood two and two—the fifth man withdrew and experimented on a miniature telegraph line erected for the purpose. On returning, he said, "Now gentlemen, I am prepared to vote "Yes," for I have myself had a communication over the wires!"

Prayer in its Relations to Truth. Dr. Plumer finely says that prayer is not only the oratory, but the observatory of the soul.

Near to the Truth, but not Walking in It. On September 5th, 1870, a caravan of eleven persons left ChamoniX to ascend Mt. Blanc. Messrs. Randall, Bean, and Corkindale with guides and porters. On their way down they were overtaken in a wild storm which lasted more than a week, and they were found—ten of the eleven—dead near the summit. They became bewildered, and wandered around, going over their own tracks, in a space not more than a hundred yards square, until, exhausted by hunger, cold and fatigue, they at last lay down to die, not knowing that they were so near to the path that five more steps would have brought them into it! How many souls perish as close as that to the way of truth and life!

SERMONIC SECTION.

THEOLOGY IN FICTION.

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

In him was life, and the life was the light of men.—John i: 4.

THE secret of the Christian religion is the person of its founder. He is its core and substance; the object of our faith; the source of our inspiration; the ground of our personal hope; the pledge of final and eternal triumph. Our Redeemer liveth; our King is on the throne. There have been three answers to that lofty affirmation, the first two of which may be regarded as obsolete. The first was one of brute force. The clenched fist of the Roman smote the lips of the Christian disciple. The second was that which was given by the Deism of England, the Rationalism of Germany, the Materialism of France, and the infidelity current one hundred years ago

in our own country. A third answer is now given. The aim is declared to be the purification of Christianity, a return to its original simplicity. The writings of the Gospel must be carefully sifted, and everything miraculous must be rigidly excluded as a means of restoring the actual history. This answer deals with the New Testament as a literature of romance, false in hard fact, eternally true as sentiment, incredible as prose, and inspiring as poetry.

"Robert Elsmere" belongs to this modern class of critical ventures. It is never flippant. Its moral ideals are lofty. Its ethical air is bracing and pure. Its spiritual tone is intense and pervasive. The book is not easy reading. I began it with a yawn, and for an hour I was restless. But once fairly launched, and I could read or think of nothing else, fairly rushing through its crowded

pages, with a thousand questions in my beating and heated pulses. For the plot I cared nothing, as it was plainly incidental to the writer; but within the lines of the narrative was crowded the controversy of the present century, with its tremendous implications and far-reaching consequences. The story concerns Robert Elsmere, a young and brilliant evangelical rector of an English parish, who marries Catherine Leyburn, a sincere and passionate adherent of the Church, while her husband drifts away from his early faith by his historical studies and under the influence of a wealthy and scholarly aristocrat who has ceased to believe in any religion. Catherine is all heart, the Squire is all head, while Robert Elsmere is the battleground where intellect and feeling cross swords. The Squire is represented as having a dash of insanity in him, and it is suggested that he might have been a different man had he ever loved any one deeply; a profound suggestion, for sympathy is the life of the intellect. Catherine, on the other hand, is all love, narrow in her ideals, but intense, absorbed in her faith, dreading criticism as dangerous and alarmed that her husband ventures upon what she regards as blasphemy. Both are conscious of an inner separation which daily becomes more pronounced and painful, well nigh unendurable, but which finally ends in a reconciliation through a surrender of the wife to the husband, in which she suffers a paralysis of thought. She yields to Robert's thought, without accepting it, while she holds on to her early faith. Even after his death she keeps up the divided life. She is found at church on Sunday morning, and in the afternoon among the artisans of London, at Elgood Street Hall, where Robert Elsmere had organized the New Brotherhood of Jesus Christ, after his convictions had forced him to withdraw from the

ministry of the church. Here the keynote of his speech had been the human Christ, as the image comes out when you have carefully eliminated every miraculous or supernatural element; when you have surrendered the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Ascension and the Enthronement. A silver medal, worn as a badge, takes the place of baptism in the new brotherhood, which represents the new and purified Church; a common meal is substituted for the Holy Supper, and adoration takes the place of prayer. Here is the heart of the book. It is a novel only in its form. It is a theological treatise for substance. It is, as Mr. Gladstone says, a "propagandist romance." It gives the author's ideal of true religion, in which Jesus Christ holds the supreme place, but in which all that is supernatural in His life is surrendered as useless and burdensome.

I have already said that there is no trace of flippancy in the book, and it covers nearly seven hundred compact pages. I do not believe that the reading of it can harm any one, for its moral enthusiasm is too lofty and persistent. It treats every phase of religious thought and experience, even the most intolerant and ascetic, with a gentle and tender sympathy. In all this it marks the substantial advance of the present century over the last. The criticism of Christianity in our day does not have in view the destruction of religion. It is not atheistic and immoral. It emphasizes duty and God, and inculcates a life of charity. Religion, it tells us, man must have, because he has a heart in him. The sense of dependence drives him to God; consciousness of duty holds him there; the sweetest joy is his who follows the steps of Jesus Christ in His loving ministry to the poor. God be thanked for that concession! For myself I hail it as the dawn of a better and brighter day. Yes, to strangle

the heart is incipient insanity of the intellect; and Robert Elsmere was right when he insisted, amid the wreck of his old belief, that he would not trample upon the authority of love. His dying words are fearfully pathetic. He heard once more the cry of his firstborn, stood once more by the bed of his wife, and with their names he coupled twice the name of God: "Thank God! Thank God!" If any can read the long story unmoved I do not envy them. If any Christian can fail to discover the earnest moral purpose dominating every line, I am not one of them. I believe in this linking of God and home, of motherhood and religion. I believe that love has eyes, and that love's pure eyes cannot fail to see God.

And yet, I have my decided reserves. I do not speak impulsively, but deliberately. I was borne onward by the swift current of the story. I shot through its foaming rapids, I circled in its whirlpools, but when I came to the end I landed squarely on my feet. And first I was conscious that there was something strained, unnatural and unhealthy in the temporary alienation of Robert and Catharine. She is represented as persecuting him by her timid and persistent avoidance of listening to his mental debates, and the barriers of intimacy are removed at last only by her unconditional surrender. She keeps her faith, but she puts her intellect to sleep. Was that loving in Robert? Ought he to have exacted and accepted such a sacrifice? I say no, a thousand times no. Personality has its indefeasible rights, and may not be coerced into unintelligent bondage. Catharine parted with her glory when she imprisoned her thought and gave Robert unqualified liberty to speak out his own; and I can only pity her when I see her dividing her Sabbaths. She had as good a right to be consistent as had he: nay, she was under the

highest obligation to be true to herself. And as for the husband, there is to me something morbid and tyrannical in his insistence that his wife shall listen to what she regards as blasphemy. Call her weak, if you will, and call him strong; the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak. Your child believes in Santa Claus and the fairies. Its eager faith provokes a smile. But you do not lecture it, and you do not feel that the intellectual difference chills your affection. Only one thing can do that—persistent moral perversity. The pure and the impure cannot love each other, no matter how close their tie of kindred. But Robert and Catharine were both noble-minded and pure, and that is the golden bond of true friendship. In Corinth there were men whose wives were not Christians, and women whose husbands were not in the Church, but Paul told them that this tremendous difference in religion did not affect the sanctity of the marriage bond and was no bar to domestic love. Difference in religious views, however radical, so long as it does not involve immorality, is no just barrier to domestic confidence. To think otherwise is fanaticism, and incipient tyranny. The weakest has a right to himself, and he who is strong should be all the more careful to defend that right. And so, in this chapter of their strained domestic life, so intense in its passion and so prolonged, I am with Catherine and against Robert. For her peace of mind was as valuable as his own, and he was bound to hold his speech in the leash of a true and tender love.

But what of Robert Elsmere's reconstructed Christianity, the logic upon which it was based, and the results to which he tried to carry it? The new gospel is easily defined. It is religion minus the supernatural. The revolutionary criticism starts from a single principle—"Miracles do not happen." Thus we come

upon the old and perpetual controversy between faith and unbelief. Guizot has said that the question of the supernatural is the question of our day; but it is the burning problem of every day. And when you push the inquiry to its roots, the debate is between atheism and theism, between no God and the living God. For deism and agnosticism virtually deny that there is a God. They resolve Him into a name with which thought may play, but which can mean nothing for actual life. The deist tells me that there is a God, the infinite personal Spirit, Creator of the world and man, almighty, omniscient and good; but that the universe is a closed circle, and that converse between God and man is absurd in theory and needless in fact. Such a God can be of no more concern to me than the inhabitants of Saturn. The agnostic tells me that there is a God, but that it is impossible and irreverent to define Him; that I may not even ascribe consciousness to Him; that I am forbidden to say whether He is a thing or a person. What possible use can any man have for such a being? There is no logical halting ground between atheism and theism. Either God is God in mighty fact as well as in name, eternally and universally living and supreme, regnant in creation and with access to all souls, as the king moves in his palace and through his realm, or He is a gigantic zero, a mere figurehead, shut up in an inaccessible and distant castle whom I have no need to revere and whom I may make sport of with impunity. Robert Elsmere remains a theist, and a Christian theist at that. Grey is a theist pure and simple. The Squire has no need of a God in his system, and he is the only consistently logical man of the three. If "miracles do not happen," if they are philosophically incredible, the only alternative is to deny the supernatural altogether, to make the word

God a name, the empty and unmeaning sign of a human abstraction or delusion. The Squire does that; he never prays, he does not concern himself about God; but mark you, he is the victim of inherited insanity. In that pathetic touch of description I am reminded of what the Psalmist said: "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." Robert Elsmere will not part with the living God, because his spiritual nature can rest only in Him. But in so doing he sacrifices his logic without knowing it. For that simplest of all creeds, "I believe in God the Father Almighty," is the most emphatic affirmation of the supernatural. Such a being is Himself the great and eternal miracle. But even with the denial of God the fact of miracle is not eliminated. For existence remains. Something is. I am here. You are there. The earth is under my feet. The stars gleam above me. How did all these things come to be? If they exist only in my thought, whence comes my thought? If they were all created their maker surely is the most wonderful of all beings, eternal, independent, almighty, sovereign. If they have always existed the fact of their unbroken existence is still the great and startling miracle. Where is the cradle of the universe? In the creative thought of the living God, or in the attenuated and universally diffused fire mist? Whatever the answer, either God or the fire mist is the eternal miracle and miracle-worker. So that the whole theological fabric of Robert Elsmere rests upon an assumption discredited by his own logic and by any logic. You cannot believe in anything without believing in miracle somewhere, and a miracle anywhere makes it possible everywhere. You cannot tell at what point it may not emerge, nor can you presume to define its forms and its frequency.

The question of the Christian miracles, therefore, is a question to

be determined by an impartial historical criticism. Whether Jesus Christ rose from the dead must be settled by an appeal to facts, not by the phrase, "Miracles do not happen." Robert Elsmere feels the difficulty, and how does he deal with the evidence? He does not say that the witnesses lied. He treats them as honest men. They really believed that their Master had risen. But, he says, you must remember their environment. Their habits of thought were primitive and crude. They were credulous, not critical. They could not help exaggerating the facts, giving them an imaginary perspective and a miraculous coloring. The ability to describe things as they really are in the result of a long process of training. In other words, it is the philosophy of evolution which Robert Elsmere applies in dealing with the Gospels. The Squire is his master here, who spends his life in gathering materials for a book on the "History of Testimony," a project that he carries through the first and second parts, but leaves unfinished at death. This book professes to trace the steps of development through which testimony passes from unconscious exaggeration to scientific and conscientious accuracy. Men began with lying, though they meant to tell the truth; and it is only now that, under the surgery of modern science, their eyes have become sound and clear. I hardly know how to deal with so monstrous a theory. It undermines the value of all testimony, ancient and modern. It makes recorded history a snare and a delusion. It digs one wide, deep grave for the annals of every time, for the labors of Xenophon and Herodotus and Livy and Tacitus and Cæsar, as well as for the evangelists and Paul. It makes the primitive man a constitutional falsifier of facts and makes the confusion only worse by telling us that he could not help it. The moral sense

revolts against such an assumption. The presumption always is that men speak the truth, unless there is a motive to the contrary, or unless falsehood can be proved. If men are to be judged innocent of crime until proved guilty, surely it is monstrous to charge them with the vice of original and persistent falsehood. No; the reverse is the fact. The presumption always is that men speak the truth in what they report, if they are known to be personally upright and honest; and the force of their testimony can be destroyed only by stronger evidence to the contrary. That test the Gospels and Epistles have abundantly and triumphantly endured. Beside, it cannot be said too often that the age in which Christianity appeared, and in which the New Testament was written, was the most severely critical and thoroughly skeptical period of antiquity. The Greeks and the Romans of that day were not so easily duped. They were quite as keen as the men of our time, as any one may discover who will take the trouble to read Celsus and Porphyry, and the permanent wonder is that Paul's gospel survived the sword of the Roman and conquered the pen of the Greek. Such a triumph in such an age, on such a scale, with results so far-reaching and abiding, attests the truth of that message which the disciples everywhere preached, and the substance of which was: Jesus and the Resurrection. To break the force of that practical logic by an unwarranted and unworthy assumption is like weaving a spider's web around the globe to check its momentum.

I think every one must be conscious that Robert Elsmere's last work is a house built upon the sand. The "New Brotherhood of Jesus" is a poor substitute for the Christian Church. The ceremonies do not fit the stern, practical men who engage in them. The preaching has a hol-

low ring. The reverence for Christ is overshadowed by the discredit cast upon everything salient in His life. It is all very beautiful and touching, but it is the charm of a soap bubble collapsing at the first breath of earnest protest. The world has no use for such a substitute of the old and historic gospel. Nor is it an untried plan that is here commended. Robert Elsmere has had a thousand forerunners and has a thousand imitators. The experiment of Christianity without the divine and risen Christ has been long and widely tried, and it has failed. It lacks spring and motive and aggressive force. It does not plant missions on any large and enduring scale at home or abroad. During the reign of terror in France there arose a party who called themselves Theophilanthropists. They believed in God and righteousness and the immortality of the soul. They composed a catechism and a ritual. They invented substitutes for the sacraments. They boasted at one time of 30,000 adherents. They held together for just five years and then disappeared, the contempt and laughing-stock of the infidels. It is not so easy to found a religion. It was not easy 2,000 years ago, with Judaism and Greek philosophy and Roman law in possession of the world. But it was done. Jerusalem and Athens and the Eternal City surrendered. The cross and the open sepulcher mastered them. The barbaric nations were tamed into gentleness and loving loyalty, and upon the foundations of that ancient faith have been raised the walls of modern Christendom, dominant in Europe and America, and circling the globe with its missionary enterprise. The scorn of its foes has not withered its life, nor have the unseemly contentions of its friends broken its power. How comes it? Because behind its creeds and cathedrals, behind its sacrament and ritual, radiant and clear, rises

the figure of the Christ of Bethlehem and Olivet, risen from the dead, regnant in the heavens, the incarnate Son of God. And upon the seas of modern controversy I see His pierced feet treading their wildness into eternal peace.

I have tasted this new wine, and for myself I say, "*The old is better.*"

SPIRITUAL TRUTHS SELF-VERIFIED.

BY I. K. FUNK, D.D. [LUTHERAN],
BROOKLYN.

If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.—John vii : 17.

THE new version gives the text more point by rendering it, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching," etc. The will of the man who is to be taught the truth is the point upon which turns acquirement of spiritual knowledge—the bend of his will toward or from the truth determines in the end whether he will know the truth or not.

What is truth? How may we know it? what the test—the touchstone of truth? These are questions that have come down to us through the ages and are still the most important of all questions. Philosophers have asked them for these thousands of years and are still awaiting satisfactory answers. Scientists have climbed by telescopic ladders to the stars in vain search for truth; they have dived deep into the earth, scraped and broken the solid rock and read there the recorded history of the past. They have found out much, yet they know that that which remains is infinitely beyond in value and in quality what they know. At the best, they are but upon the outside of the temple, studying the rougher outer walls—not having so much as entered the vestibule, much less the temple itself. Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard the things that are within, *nor can they.*

Different processes have been made use of by different persons, and in different ages, to find out what is truth.

The method known as the Aristotelian, that one unfolded more fully by Bacon—the inductive—is the one by which we reason backward from facts. To it logic is everything. It requires that the chain be unbroken, that no link be missing, that no chasms be leapt; and this demonstration must be in the realm of the five senses. Only that is a fact which can be felt or seen, tasted, smelled or heard. The logical understanding is the only faculty competent to determine whether the links form a single chain. Each fact is a separate link, but separate links are no chain. The links must be inseparably attached as cause and effect before the understanding will say, That is good, that is a demonstration. If water is seen going upward in the form of mist the inductive philosopher says that there is a cause for it, and sets to work to find out that cause. A stone falls to the ground; he says a force drew it; and when he finds that force he says that force is the effect of another force. Step by step he goes backward and backward, and by-and-by demonstrates that all facts within the reach of our senses are the effects of causes, and he is sure that these causes are the effects of other causes back of them—all physical effects and all physical causes. Then, with a strange betrayal of his philosophical method of research, after going back along his chain of causation as far as he can go, he takes a blind leap into the dark, declaring the law of physical cause and effect to be of universal application—this he is sure to do unless he is under more self-restraint than the average of this class of philosophers. As of old, we are to believe the snake bearing aloft, one upon the other, the turtle, the elephant, the world, goes *clear down*.

The Baconian materialist cannot logically assert that there is no first cause, that there is no spiritual world, that there is no God; he cannot know. Agnosticism, knownothingism, is the final refuge of every consistent Baconian reasoner. But alas! how often these men are not consistent. They assert what they cannot prove; they deny what they do not know. The spiritual world is to them an unexplored country and so must be forever by their methods.

When locked up to this method of reasoning from physical fact to physical fact, the reasoner is doomed, like a blind Samson, evermore to be grinding round and round in darkness. There is a gulf fixed between the created and the Creator. Logic, as employed by the physical understanding, can never construct a bridge across that gulf. It goes back and back along the chain of causes as far as the reach of the most delicate instruments, but the scientist knows that that chain goes *beyond*. He cannot, in countless ages of discovery, climb to the *first cause*. It will elude forever his most subtle analysis; in the search, the time will come when his most sensitive instruments will prove coarse and exceeding clumsy. No man by searching, through his physical senses, can find the spiritual world—that world of first causes.

His assumption that the logical understanding is the only faculty for the discovery of truth shuts the inductive reasoner up to materialism. The sensuous process cannot rise above its source. Unavoidably it puts out the eyes of its devotees. It is the siren voice that robs of all spirituality and changes into stone those who listen to it too long.

How mad it is to suppose that the understanding which was made to deal with the outer world can take cognizance of the inner world! As foolish as to employ the eye to detect sound or the ear to determine the

fragrance of a flower, is it to employ the understanding to find out whether Christ is the Son of God, or whether the New Birth is a necessity, or what gave its marvelous impulse to the primordial germ—an energy more wonderful than any miracle the Bible records, that has carried this germ through ages and ages of development, if the theory of evolution be true. These truths belong to a wholly different realm—a realm that cannot by any possibility be reached by a process of reasoning, a process that cannot move except along a chain of physical cause and effect.

Yet this is the process of reasoning on which is based the philosophy that is back behind the marvelous material development of these last two centuries. It has led the world to great discoveries in nature, uncovering her secrets, harnessing her stupendous forces and urging forward into a physical civilization undreamed of by past ages.

But this material development is a one-sided growth, and, unless supplemented by a wholly different and higher development, is self-destructive. The world has eaten of the tree of knowledge—it knows; and it now must eat of that other tree or its knowledge will be its destruction. It is dazzled by, it is lost in admiration for, the great material forces that science has discovered, such as steam, gravity, electricity, magnetism. "We are reaching the realm of first causes," cry the blinded devotees of the material sciences; "Nature is our God."

Never has the race witnessed a fetishism among the intelligent so general, so enthusiastic, as that of to-day. Says Tyndall: "Matter has the promise and potency of every quality of life." What worshiper of stones, of trees, of rivers could say more? Ye are my gods. I need no other God. O Nature! thou containest the potency of every quality of life. What need I more? Ye

credulous, incredulous scientists, are ye not falsely called scientists?

This is the crowning of the boasted progress of the nineteenth century—the outcome of the exclusively inductive system for the discovery of truth. What is it without its glamour? Is it anything more than a universal fetishism? We are out-heathening the heathen. The vast network of railroads and telegraphic wires, the springing up of manufactories and of cities as by the rubbing of another, but more wonderful, Aladdin's lamp, the accumulation of fortunes of a hundred millions by single individuals, is the logic of this philosophic fetishism. "The material has in it the promise and potency" of all things, then what more is needed? Hence the insane determination to have the material. The rule of Christ is read backward: "Seek first the kingdom of this world and all things will be added to you." But said Christ: "Seek first the kingdom of heaven." The pyramid is placed upon its apex. The heaven-ordained course of the universe is reversed. Like Mary at the feet of Christ, we have been sitting at Nature's feet, saying, "The world has been seeking superstitiously, the one thing, the spiritual, while these many things of nature are the necessary things."

To this fetishism, this brilliant materialism, the exclusive Baconian method of truth-finding, the logic of the understanding, has brought us, and has brought us naturally and inevitably. From premise to conclusion there is not a missing link in the chain. How can the eye hear? Can you make it hear by increasing the sound? It cannot know sound. How can you make the ear see? By what process will you enable the taste to detect the beauty of the violet? As vain is it to seek by the physical understanding to know first principles, to discover the truths which belong to

the spiritual realm. As well go out with an ear trumpet to take observations of the stars. The truths upon which our spiritual natures feed—the truths which make us akin to angels and bring out the lineaments of the Father upon our faces and mark us heavenborn—these truths must be otherwise discovered and verified than by the processes of the understanding. The scientist cannot know by his processes whether the doctrine of Christ are the teachings of man or of God. He cannot by all the focussed light of all the material universe stand by the bedside of the afflicted and say, "I know that all these things work together for good to those who love God, that infinite power directed by infinite wisdom and mercy has harnessed all the forces of the universe and makes them do service to love." The ten thousand truths of Christ, the ten thousand consolations of the Bible are whispered by other lips into the ear of the soul.

Another way for the discovery of truth is that of authority. Prove to me that he who speaks is of heaven, then I will believe what he says is true. Prove to me that Christ came down from above, then I will know whether His teachings are of men or of God. That would seem a sure way to demonstrate truth. But is it?

The Pharisees demanded signs. Give us miracles; work wonders, said they to Christ, then we will know that you are of God and will believe you. Let Him come down from the cross and that will end doubt. Christ knew better: if they believe not Moses and the Prophets, though one be raised from the dead they would not believe. Christ knew that signs and wonders could not carry permanent conviction. They might startle, they might gain attention, but their work would be surface work and temporary. This is not the way to verify spiritual truths. Testimony, however backed

by miracles, does not carry conviction in the spiritual realm. It may carry conviction on its own plane, but that is way down to the level of the logical understanding. Christ made light of miracles as a means for the establishment of truth. It is not clear that He performed any miracle for the authentication of His mission, to prove that He was from heaven; but he performed them, almost always, if not always, as acts of mercy to the afflicted. The multitude was famished, He made bread to grow to feed them; He called Lazarus from the grave to the arms of his weeping sisters; the only son of a widow was brought to life, the demon-tortured were released—all acts of mercy.

When appeal was made to Him to perform a miracle for the proof of His mission He would not do it, for He knew that there was no proof to the spirit in miracles, and all of His truths were addressed to the spirit: to the realm of the spirit they belonged. A mere assent of the understanding amounts to nothing; the way of the physical understanding ends in grossness and carnality. He who thinks it is in a miracle to verify spiritual truths proves by that thought that he does not dwell in the upper realm of the soul. Said Christ to such, in a consuming denunciation and with a most far reaching insight into the soul: "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign!"

Has not the importance to Christianity of signs, phenomena, miracles, been greatly exaggerated?

To speak across the sea through solid iron, as by the telephone, so that the voice of the speaker can be recognized, would have been deemed, a few years ago, a most notable miracle. None that the Saviour wrought could have seemed more outside and beyond the laws of nature. Most likely the miracles of Christ were outside and beyond nature. It is altogether probable that the turning of

water into wine, the making of bread to grow, the curing of the sick with a word, the raising of the dead, were not marvelous works accomplished through a greatly superior knowledge of physical forces, but were wrought, as we believe, by direct creative energy. But this is not my point; the point is that a natural man cannot know whether a marvel is wrought through superior knowledge of the laws and forces of nature or whether it is wrought by a divine creative energy. Hence, as a proof of the divinity of the being by whom they are wrought, they fall short. Had Christ's voice been heard and recognized at Jerusalem when he was on the shores of the sea of Canaan, it would certainly at that day seemed most miraculous, even though He had used the medium of an iron wire. Who would be bold enough to assert that it is absolutely impossible for a mother to hear the voice of an agonizing child in certain moods a thousand miles away, and this through no visible medium? "Oh! my father is in a house on fire and can't get out. He is burning up," cried a child on awakening from its sleep, in an eastern State. That very hour in the city of St. Louis, a thousand miles distant, the father was consumed in a burning hotel. Coincidence? Perhaps. But may there not be some mysterious communication between heart and heart, soul and soul, not yet discovered? Who is willing to risk a negative? Should a man appear who would claim to be sent of God and offer us proof of his divine mission that he can so speak in New York as to be heard in Chicago, using no visible medium, we might marvel and say, What next? Would we accept it as certain proof of his words? By no means. It would prove only that there are laws of nature with which we are unacquainted and with which that man is acquainted. "There are more things in heaven and earth,

Horatio, than are dreamt of in thy philosophy."

A wonder-worker may be but a prodigy in physical science. I cannot possibly by my logical understanding prove the contrary. If iron swims, ah, say I, there is a property in iron of which science is not aware. It is not in the capacity of iron to bring proof on a spiritual plane. Water changing into wine may suggest to my mind that there are chemical laws beyond any which science has as yet comprehended. It is not in the nature of water or wine to prove a spiritual truth. They belong to an entirely different plane—a plane where the senses are supreme. It is not within the reach of anything that comes through my five senses to give such indorsement to testimony as to bring demonstration to me that Christ is God or that I must be born again to enter heaven. These truths belong to a wholly different universe. Again we are reminded that the eye cannot hear, the ear cannot see; much less can either of these senses take cognizance of that which transpires in the inner—the spiritual universe. Christ was infinitely conscious of this. It was a worldly and adulterous generation which lived on a plane where anything external satisfied as proofs of spiritual truths. He would say, Ye have ears, but hear not—ears that can hear these coarse, secondary, physical sounds, but cannot hear the sounds of voices of that truer universe, the inner, the universe that is the source of all things; ye have eyes but see not; ye see these inferior things, the mere shadows of the spiritual, the transitory; but the permanent, eternal verities ye see not. Ye are blind; ye are deaf, dead; ye must be born again to know these things. Ye need the awakening of other senses to take cognizance of them. Though the dead arose and bore testimony it would be in vain. The Son of God came down

from heaven and revealed His glory, a glory so effulgent as to make angels hide their faces, yet man looked on and saw nothing. There is not the quivering of a nerve in a stone when it is turned full toward the noon-day sun. It has no eyes; but man, when the sun flashes into his eyes, throws his hand before his face; he has eyes for the sunlight, but scarcely more vision has he for spiritual glories than has the stone for the rays of the sun. The Light of the Universe, Christ, cometh into the world and that "Light shineth in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not." Christ was seen but outwardly. Grieved at heart, He would cry: "Ye follow me because of the loaves and fishes, because of my miracles, but what are these and what is there admirable in this state of mind?" They saw only a man. They had no capacity by which to discern the Son of God, they had no way of discerning whether His doctrines were of God or whether He spake of himself.

But if the proofs which are to carry conviction as to the truths of the inner world are not to be secured through the logic of the understanding, and if these truths are not to be accepted because of the authority of the teacher, however backed the teacher may be by a wonder-working power, then where are we to look for that which is to carry conviction? How may we know that a spiritual truth is a truth? How may we know that Christ was, indeed, sent of God, and that His utterances are to be accepted?

Christ reveals in the text the true method for the verification of spiritual truths. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." Will know how? Not by logic; not because Christ, the Son of God, has uttered them. *The truths on a*

level with a soul at any stage of its development are self-verified. The developed soul is the touchstone of the spiritual truths it can accept.

This is not a new truth in human experience.

If I am destitute of all musical development, how will you demonstrate to me that there is harmony profound in Handel's Oratorio of the Messiah? You may appeal to my reason and prove logically that such and such notes will produce such and such waves of sound and the result must be harmony. I may assent and say the argument, as far as I can see, is flawless, and it must be so. But what composer would be satisfied with that kind of a conviction? Let the trained, developed musician hear the oratorio, and immediately he recognizes the harmony. It flows into his soul. He claps his hands, his eyes fill, his inner nature is thrilled. He did not reason it out. He took nobody's word for it. Had he seen the words written across the sky in blazing letters, "This is harmony," it could not have so convinced him that there was harmony there. He knows it. How? The faculty that takes cognizance of harmony has been developed by obedience to its laws, and it recognizes at once this harmony. *The developed musician's soul is its own touchstone for musical truths up to the level of its development.*

The same law holds in the aesthetic realm. You may argue by the day with the man who has never developed the aesthetic sense to prove that Raphael's "Transfiguration" in the Vatican gallery at Rome is a work of high art. "Yes," he would say, "it must be so. Your reasoning seems sound that such and such lines and such and such color would produce beauty. And then great judges say it is so. It doubtless is a great work of art."

A true artist would be driven to desperation by a conviction thus wrought. The good judge of a pic-

ture is one who, when he sees a true work of art, knows it is beautiful, not through the understanding or the testimony of others, but by something beyond these—a developed artistic soul. *Æsthetic truths on a level with a soul's æsthetic development are self-verified.*

What loving child need reason out its duty to love and obey its parents? When argument is necessary to make this duty clear, the wise sadly turn their faces. A lover who needs be convinced of his duty to make sacrifices for his loved one brings a shriveled heart to Cupid.

No, no; love and all the other attributes of the soul have a power of comprehending truths in their respective spheres that is far above the reach of mere logic. Develop a faculty and you develop a vision that belongs to that faculty. Each soul-faculty has its own instinct. Let any one conform to the laws of development; let him will persistently to love music, to love art, and obey the laws of each, and he will know by-and-by, through a power altogether different from reason, how to distinguish between the true and the false in these different realms of truth.

Now apply these truths in the spiritual realm. Says Christ, "The tests you are making as to whether I am the Son of God are wrong. You cannot satisfy yourselves by watching my miracles, or by consulting the Scribes and Pharisees. Obey the commandments of God, do right, and then you will be in the right road. Develop your spiritual natures and my truths will need no argument. They will be self-evidenced. You will *know*." You need not ask whence learned this man letters? His education or lack of education brings nothing in the way of proof of the truth of his utterances. The undeveloped spiritual man may give intellectual assent to the truth that God is love, that he who loves fulfills the law, that the unseen things are

the eternal and are infinitely to be preferred to the seen. You may appeal to his understanding, as when you undertake to prove that two and two are four or that the sum of the parts is equal to the whole, and he may say, "Yes, that seems reasonable." But there is a lack of illumination. No electric flash. No vision of soul.

Like the musically developed soul, like the æsthetically developed soul, the spiritually developed soul recognizes by spiritual instinct truths up to the level of its development, We know these truths like we know it thunders, like we know the sun shines, for it is within the capacity of the soul senses to carry as certain conviction on their level as it is within the capacity of the physical senses to carry on their level. He that willeth to do the will of God will so develop his soul capacity that he will know whether a teaching is of God or man.

Let us now look at two or three inferences which we draw naturally from this truth.

The convincing argument for the truth of Christianity is not the historic. The religion of Christ, of the Bible, does not rest upon a historic basis. Did it, we would have reason to fear. As we drift further and further away from the manger, from Jerusalem, from Calvary, from the dates of the events described in the gospels, the more and more uncertain, to all except the most thorough of scholars, must become the historic argument. We are told already that this and that book of the Bible was not written by Paul or Luke or Moses; that this portion and that are interpolations. The question is in the air, we hear it all too frequently, "Is the Bible the Word of God or does it contain the word of God?" Destructive criticism is at work. Piles of learned arguments are reared. The candid, brave, honest

scholar finds that it takes years of exhaustive work to come to a decision. What are the millions to do? The individual scholar, here and there, may be safe, but the countless multitude, what are they to do, each possessing an immortal soul? Must they, before they can believe that Jesus is the Christ, settle whether Renan and Robertson Smyth are right or wrong?

No, no, thanks to Him who has created the soul of man and given it its religion, it is not left to ratiocination. The intellect is not the only, nor the highest, tribunal to which Christ's appeal is made. History is outward and of but secondary importance. It is not a question of history, but of inner illumination. We have within us faculties, the development of which depends upon our will, which must settle the question whether the doctrines of Christianity are of God or of man.

The certainty that Christianity will endure is not because this book and that can be defended successfully, but because the moral and spiritual instincts of man are responsive to its teachings.

Again, as our spiritual powers unfold, and as we gain more and more perfect control of them, new truths in the Christian system as revealed in the Bible and new understandings of old truths will rise above the horizon. He who has climbed Mount Washington has observed as he ascends that new visions of the surrounding regions break upon him. At first he sees only those things which are near, those around the base of the mountain; here the horizon shuts down. He sees yonder station, the stretch of the railway for a few miles, a few fields, many trees. That seems the whole of the world. But fifteen minutes after, as he looks upon the scene, how all is changed! Yonder woods, which seemed before unlimited, is but a

narrow strip, and that farm is only one of many farms, and yonder rivulet loses itself in a large stream, and that is but a branch of a still larger one, and the mount itself is but one of a great chain of mountains. As he goes upward still higher other views break upon his vision, and the horizon removes farther and farther. Every new moment in his ascent to the clouds objects increase in number, and new relations are formed. He must not dogmatize at any stage of his upward progress. He does not see all. At any moment there may break upon his vision that which will modify his conclusions. He knows that he is on Mount Washington; he knows the way upward; that must suffice for his certainties.

Thus it is on our ascent of Calvary. We cannot adopt the views held 1,500 years ago, or 500, or 50 years ago, or the views held to day as *the whole of truth*. With Paul we must ever say, I do not count myself as having apprehended, but I press forward. What would we think of a man half way up Mount Washington who verified his observations by a map made by one who had climbed but a hundred feet? The man highest up is in position to make the better map. To-day we can make a better schedule of Christian truths than could those who had not climbed so high 300, 500, 1,500 years ago. The Holy Ghost is with us, working with omnipotent power to uplift into higher and still higher experiences—with us as he was with the Wesleys, with Calvin, with Luther, with Augustine. Did Christ say, "Lo, I am with you until Augustine's time"? No. "Until Luther's time"? No. He said, "Lo, I am with you *always*, even unto the *end* of the world." He has been with us working mightily to bring about a better comprehension of spiritual truths during the 400 years since the Reformation. Has he utterly failed in lifting us up to a higher field of vision? I do not be

lieve it. It is unbelief, it is heresy to believe it. Must we take the map of the field of vision made by these fathers of 400 years ago and slavishly verify our observations to-day by their observations? In 400 years has the omnipotent and infinite wise God failed in lifting the Church to a higher field of observation? Dead men are not the best judges of the things of to-day.

No, no; the Church has never reached a clearer and better illumination than to-day. Watchman, what of the day? Our vision confirms all the grand central truths of the past, but with a clearer understanding of their relations and meaning, and new truths are rising above the horizon.

Who dreamed in the day of Christ that "Ye are brethren," and the Golden Rule meant the end of slavery and the unity of the races? Who dreamed in the day of Christ that "I am the light of the world" meant thousands of years of the unfolding of modern civilization, with all of its marvels, physical, mental, moral—the electric spark, the iron horse, the printing-press—a Bacon, a Milton, a Shakespeare; for without the opening of the door to progress by Christianity, without its quickening power, these developments were not possible?

On the summit of the nineteenth century, with all of its noonday glory about us, we still hear a voice out of the clear ether, seemingly clear to our dull eyes, but which still hides the form that utters it, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard the things that are beyond." We have not attained the summit, nor will we in millions of years, but we will be forever attaining.

In conclusion I urge that none of us forget the condition upon which this attainment is based: "If any man willetth to do His will," etc.

"Willeth,"—the attainment depends upon your will and mine. If we will to know, and thus exercise

and thus strengthen our spiritual faculties, we will know more and more certainly the things that belong to the spiritual world. The spiritual is the realm in which volition is supreme. Inner illumination is not a gift. It must be wrought out; it is the result of a development, of a growth. The capacity for development is a gift; but not so the exercise of the will upon which this development depends. True, the divine will works with our will, helps; but there is a point at which the development depends wholly upon our choice. There is no royal road upward. The learned and the unlearned, the favorably conditioned and the unfavorably, can alike choose. The turning-point in the road upwards or downwards is subject to every man's will. Seek and thou shalt find. Seek is the first round in the ladder that Jacob saw, and seek is the second and third and fourth round, and so all the way to the foot of the throne of God.

And is not the end worthy of the effort?

"Go wing your flight from star to star,
From world to luminous world, as far
As the universe extends its flaming wall;
And one moment of heaven is worth them all."

One moment of enjoyment that comes from the unfolding of the spiritual faculties, is worth more than all of the enjoyment of the physical universe.

Such is that plan of salvation which has for its end the restoration and development of our spiritual powers; so simple and yet so universal in its application. Come whosoever will. He who willetth, beggar or king, can climb to the supremest heights. Ah, the marvelousness of that plan!

"Could we with ink the ocean fill,
Were the whole earth of parchment made;
Were every single stick a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade;
To write the love of God to man
Would drain the ocean dry;
Nor could the scroll contain the plan,
Though stretched from sky to sky."

THE PRE-EMINENCE OF CHRIST.

BY C. H. PAYNE, D.D. [METHODIST],
NEW YORK.

That in all things he might have the pre-eminence.—Col. i; 18.

In this afternoon of the nineteenth century there rises in view a complete, colossal figure, sublime in its perfections, the glory of believers, the perplexity and despair of infidels. It is that of Jesus, the Christ, the theme of the text. Let us look at Him from the mountain peaks of observation; first, that of the divine purpose, and secondly, from the lofty height of achieved history.

First. From the divine purpose. God alone in eternity purposed to bring this world into existence and to populate it with free, intelligent beings. If in this moral system sin be a possibility, redemption must be a fact. If man is to be a sinner, he must have a Saviour. Christ is to be that Saviour. The Creator and Sovereign becomes a babe in Bethlehem.

Second. Now hear the voice of history. As Ebal and Gerizim confronted each other, and responsive voices were heard across the dividing valley, so from these two mountain peaks solemn witness is heard; for out of the divine purpose issue the events on which is founded the verdict of history concerning the Son of God. Christ HAS the pre-eminence. In what sense?

1. In character. He stands peerless and alone. Among all the discordant sects and parties of men there has appeared but one perfect character, that of Jesus of Nazareth, in whom center the finest sensibilities, the noblest graces and charms that can be conceived. His was a perfect example. He alone could say: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" He was incomparable in His pure and holy teachings. Compare with them the wealth of wisdom uttered by the great thinkers from Zendavesta and Plato till now; apply

the principles of science and criticism to His life and words, and Christ has "in all things the pre-eminence." Apply the theory of evolution to this sublime fact of an immaculate character, this consummate flower of eighteen centuries ago, and ask: "How is it that there has been nothing like it since, but rather a retrogression?" The theory breaks down.

2. As a formative and controlling force in the world's progress. Carlyle and Emerson were once looking at an English church made memorable by Wordsworth's verse. The former remarked that it was because Jesus Christ once hung on a tree that that church was built. He referred to Orpheus also, and said that our Orpheus once lived in Judea and breathed the true melody which still echoes in all human hearts that have felt his grace. Christ is the great constructive and reconstructive force at work in the world. His gospel is the regenerative power that has wrought the changes which society has seen since the advent of Christ. Then ignorance and cruelty abounded, childhood and womanhood were crushed, the sanctity of marriage little esteemed, pleasures and amusements were corrupt, slavery and pauperism everywhere abounded, Now childhood and womanhood are emancipated from the tyranny that bound them, and these other evils largely diminished. Industrial arts are cultivated, hospitals and other forms of organized benevolence are fostered, marriage ennobled, and society uplifted wheresoever that Christ is known. What has wrought this change? Let the philosopher and historian answer. Apelles, visiting Protogenes of Rhodes, found the painter absent from his studio, and seeing an unfinished picture on the easel took the liberty of completing the work in his own inimitable style. Returning to his room sometime after, Protogenes

exclaimed, as he saw his ideal wrought out upon the canvas with such beauty and grace, "Apelles has been here!" for he felt that no one else could have accomplished it. No one but Christ could have done for man and for society what has been done. Christ has been here, marching down the centuries, and is here now, the inspiration of all that is noble in art, true in philosophy and just in legislation; the life of great moral reforms and the source of power in all kingly characters. Gibbon, himself a disbeliever in the religion of Christ, is forced to bear witness to the transforming power of the gospel on barbarian tribes.

3. In the empire of the affections Christ has the pre-eminence. He is the monarch of human hearts. Caesar and Charlemagne built empires by force, but Christ by love. There are millions who would now lay down their lives for Him. He moves through this world of distress and pain saying, "Come unto ME and I will give you rest"—a blasphemous utterance were He not God. He answers queries that no one else could have met, doubts and questionings that have baffled us as we have stood by the closed coffin and the open grave. "If a man die shall he live again? I am the Resurrection and the Life." Standing by the grave of my son in a New England cemetery, whose form I laid away twenty-five years ago, I recently asked myself, "Where is he? Does he live?" Passing on to the graves of sisters and to that of my mother who went to rest at the age of eighty-four, I asked myself, "Have these beautiful lives all gone out as the candle dies in its socket? Does that godly mother live?" The fading bouquet of flowers on her grave, the sighing branches above her head and the silent sky beyond were dumb. Nature gave no response. But then the voice that spoke at Bethany, "Thy brother shall rise again," spoke its assuring

promise to my heart that these whom Jesus had taken to Himself should some day meet me and greet me again. Finally,

4. The Lord Jesus has the pre-eminence in that He alone is the hope of the future for the human race. It is night now. We put the query to Materialism—"the gospel of dirt"—as to the prospect before humanity, and the answer is, "Dirt thou art and to dirt thou shalt return. Death ends all. The farce of life closes with the tragedy of death." Then we ask Agnosticism—the philosophy of ignorance and yet pretending to know all, to have so compassed the nature of God as to be sure He will not reveal Himself to us. Agnosticism has nothing to tell us. We turn to Christianity. We read that to us a Child is born, a Son is given, the Wonderful! The government is on His shoulders. Of His kingdom there is no end. There cometh one in dyed garments. He is mighty to save, and therefore is the hope of this ruined earth. This is the voice of revelation. Science, too, speaks through such gifted souls as Hugh Miller, proclaiming the steady ascent of man Godward, and Christ to be "the adorable monarch of the future." Thanks be to God for such testimony as to the pre-eminence of the Lord Jesus!

If this be so, and Christ is peerless and alone in all these particulars, shall He not have pre-eminence in our lives, in the Church which is His body? Shall we not joyfully yield to Christ's authority, proclaim Christ's truth, carry on His work, and in our domestic and business relations, in private and public life, exalt before the world the glory of His grace and thus furnish the people with the true type of Christly living?

Then shall we be prepared to meet Him with joy, and to join in the triumph of those who sing in celestial song, "Unto him that loved us and washed us from sins in his own blood,

and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, amen!"

TWO BETTER THAN ONE.

BY REV. CHARLES R. BARNES [METHODIST], HOBOKEN, N. J.

Two are better than one.—Ecc. iv: 9.

AN axiom like this needs no discussion. A child that knows that two times one is two, yet two units side by side may represent eleven, or a larger number, ninety-nine. One of the exact sciences, like mathematics, may illustrate moral truth. As each unit may be intensified by right relationship, or by a minus mark be made a minus quantity, so in the evolution of human lives the law of adjustment may ennoble, quicken and enlarge, and the fact of misadjustment may retard or annul. The spheres of business, the realm of politics and the activities of the church furnish illustrations of this principle. Power or efficiency, material and moral, depends for success on the placing of its factors. Two are better than one. No man is at his best alone. No man can be at his best alone, though some conceited ones think differently.

Some powers are dormant and practically useless to the individual. Competition is one form of stimulus. It may act through our selfishness. We desire to surpass another, to do better or acquire more and so meet oppositions and antagonisms with resoluteness. As iron sharpeneth iron, so intellects may be whetted and made keener by mental attrition. The ax does not sharpen itself on itself, but by a stone. So are human minds improved by these emulative endeavors. But love is a better discipline than competition. It is akin to the regenerative power of God. Two friends walk in loving unity and fellowship. They aim to enlarge their faculties of observation. The two see more objects than one pair of eyes could possibly see, perhaps

threefold or tenfold, for in the friendly effort, each to excel, their individual faculties are more vigilant than if each were alone. Two physicians attempt together the diagnosis of a case, and for the same reason their powers of observation are stimulated and multiplied.

In church life these principles of development constantly obtain. Some come to the place of worship and instruction with the true hunger of the soul. They not only help the preacher, who may represent the original unit by their added sympathy, but enlarge their own spiritual appreciation of truth, while others come and go unaffected, as the gate swings on its hinges and remains unchanged, save that the hinges are worn thinner. The former grow themselves, are helpful to their pastor, and in their growing unity as members of the church, fulfill the prayer of Christ, "That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee."

A mother's power over her children is great. Who can measure it? But if the unconverted father is brought to God her influence is more than doubled. Then they walk like priest and priestess before God and their household, and their children are allured into the same relationship. Failure to co-operate in church work is crippling. It is like putting the minus sign before a quantity. You cripple not only a finger by removing a joint, but embarrass the whole hand. The entire grip is gone forever. Paralyze the little muscles that play over a pulley moving the eyelid and the lids drop over the eye. So the weakest member of a church may help or hinder the integrity and efficiency of the whole body of Christ. What a blessing was that little girl whose simple testimony to the prophet's power led to the healing of Naaman! What a benediction on the sanctified offering of the self-denying poor came from the

widow's coin dropped in the treasury against which Jesus sat!

The law of sympathetic adjustment is also a factor in the progress of the arts and sciences. Enthusiasm has here its genesis. The word among the Greeks meant "possessed of a god." It may have been Jupiter or Apollo, or any other god. But in the redemption of the lost soul Christian enthusiasm finds a nobler play. The dream of the Greek becomes an actual fact. The Christian is filled with God. The love of Christ throbs in the heart. The man who is saved sees in the Christian more than his own unaided power, even the power and grace of God himself.

As indifference is deadening and disheartening, whether in religious or political enterprise, when people are slack, dubious and apathetic, so co-operation stimulates and the heart of the toiler rises with courage and hope. This reduplication of efficiency is hinted at in the phrase, "One shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight." Gideon's army was sifted of the faint-hearted and of those who were strenuous as to trifling proprieties. Men of ardent consécration won the victory. United in a high and holy aim they were invincible.

It may be objected that one loses his individuality. But no one is strictly independent. Material forces are adjusted to each other, as the centripetal and centrifugal, day and night, attraction and repulsion, muscular flexion and extension. Souls have their orbits as well as planets. These may be contracted or enlarged according to the influences exerted. No man liveth to himself or is independent of shrinking or quickening influences. If you come stat- edly and devoutly to the sanctuary, you secure a blessing to yourself and you help God to convert men. You help me in fulfilling the command to preach the gospel to every creature.

Nor by your presence alone, but by your testimony spoken for the Master, the utterance of your experience of His love, to which a brother may add a corroborative "Amen." Two are better than one. As we view material objects and see them differently with the change of visual angles, so with doctrinal truth and personal experiences in life. A composite picture is formed by the union of these varying visions.

In the work of the Church, too, we have, with one Spirit, a diversity of operations. Unity and co-operation and wise judgment will surely secure success. So, too, in the last place, in Christian companionship, two are better than one. For if one fall by the way the other may lift him to his feet. Thus the crosses and losses of life become more tolerable, and the unity and harmony of earthly fellowship become prophetic of the unbroken and perfected felicities of heaven.

THE GOOD PHYSICIAN.

BY REV. L. M. KLEIN, D.Sc., PROF.
IN DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.*

I was sick and ye visited me.—Matt.
xxv : 36.

REASON, no less than revelation, assures us that the true dignity of man on this earth consists in knowing, loving and serving God. This is logical; for the ultimate end of our being is an adequate object of our faculties. Hence we derive large measures of peace and happiness in working out God's purposes, whatever our lot may be, and in alleviating the anxiety and misery of mankind about us. Doubts sometimes enter the mind of the thoughtful man as to whether he is really doing God's work in his life-work or serving merely man, possibly man's enemies. In the choice of a profession one is not always guided by the consideration in what way he can best

* Before the British Medical Association; reported for HOMILETIC REVIEW by a member of the body, Dr. E. P. Thwing.

serve God, or what sphere he is best fitted for. But it is a source both of consolation and strength when one does feel that he really is carrying out the will of God and doing just that work in His vineyard which is appointed him to do.

The work of the medical man is one of the noblest forms in which God's own purposes can be served, a path in which one may honestly feel assured that he is working the will of God, co-operating with Him in a service among the highest given to man to perform in this life. The nature of that work proves this, the ministry of skill and love to the suffering and unfortunate. So Scripture also proves the dignity of the good physician. "I was sick and ye visited me." The passage in which this stands is one of august sublimity. Before the Son of God all nations are represented as standing; the good and bad, represented by the sheep and goats, are divided and to those on his right hand He says, "Come ye blessed of my Father." As the Lord tells of their service to Him, they with surprise inquire, "When saw we thee hungry, sick or in prison?" and He answers, "Amen, I say unto you, as long as ye did it to the least of my brethren ye did it unto Me." Think of the depth of meaning in these remarkable words. Yours is a ministry to the poor and the suffering, a profession which requires more self-abnegation, labor and attention, than, perhaps, any other. We never hear of an engineer being censured for declining to build a bridge or a lawyer for declining a case, but the medical man is seriously condemned if he allow a fellow man to suffer and die without extending professional skill and attention. This service often involves great hardship, yet it invests that service with an indefinable majesty and gives it a value that money cannot represent. It also stands related to problems

which occupy the thought of our greatest thinkers and political economists, how to help the needy without doing harm to society at large and how to limit the wastes of society. The poor we shall always have with us, and with poverty disease and pain.

It is natural to demand at the present time that, with all these perplexing and intricate problems of society to solve and with increasing facilities for study, that the course of education for the physician should become extended. Animated by a divine faith, the people of this city and this country have, in the midst of hardships and sufferings, raised many noble institutions for the best training of young men for this grand ministry. This city of Dublin, which gave birth to a Stokes, a Graves, and a Todd, has a noble record. Ancient Irish chieftains, too, maintained hereditary doctors at their own expense, something as in China. Grants of land were given. They were created hereditary peers, and the names of the Munsters and O'Cassidys, and others, are seen in the Royal Academy, successors of those who, a still older race, were found in our monasteries.

Aside from the economic and historic features of interest in the profession, the good physician will remember that his work has to do with the welfare of mankind in both its temporal and eternal relations. He is to use all his faculties and professional experience to the glory of Christ, who calls him into life and into this special, exalted mission. Then will he win the beatitude and the welcome which the Master has here uttered. May the favor of Almighty God rest upon you in this great annual convocation, and upon the greater work which it is its purpose to promote.

PENTECOSTAL GIFTS.

BY O. H. TIFFANY, D.D. [METHODIST], NEW YORK.

And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.—Acts ii: 47.

IN the narrative which concludes with these words we have an inspired picture of the New Testament Church; showing us the members daily in the Temple, in harmonious union praising God, in favor with the people and receiving daily accessions to their number.

The question I wish to discuss is: Is this obtainable now, or are we to consider the narrative as the record of an exceptional experience?

The wonderful bestowment was distinguished by three things, and only three:

First, the baptism of the Holy Ghost; secondly, the gift of tongues; and third, the conversion of multitudes of people.

Which of these things was exceptional? They were all new, of course; we say exceptions to former experience; but which, if any of them, was of such a nature or character as to preclude the idea of a repetition?

In reference to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the "cloven tongues" may be regarded as confined to this one occasion. It was needed as a visible demonstration that the Spirit of God had really come to begin His work in men's hearts. The fire was not the Spirit, but the sign of the Spirit.

Many passages of Scripture warrant the idea that we may still expect the Holy Ghost, for, says the Master himself, "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." This seems to make it perfectly clear that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was intended to be realized by the Church in its subsequent history.

The miracle of the "cloven tongues" has been superseded by the discovery of the art of printing by movable type. The persons present on that day in Jerusalem who were illuminated spoke sixteen different languages or dialects only, while to-day, by means of translations of the Scriptures, the people that use 313 different languages and dialects may hear and read of the goodness of God.

The gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost is multiplied in its efficiency to-day more than nineteen times!

In reference to the multiplying of believers, I would say that so long ago as 1843, 153,210 persons were converted in connection with our own Church in a single year—that is more than 419 for each day of the year.

From these things I conclude that in this day we may expect a Pentecostal blessing. Let us enlarge our hearts to expect and pray for it.

LOYALTY AND LIBERTY.

BY J. S. KINNARD, D.D. [BAPTIST], SING SING, N. Y.

Paul a servant of Jesus Christ.—Rom. i: 1.

THE chief apostle delights and glories in the relation he, and every loyal Christian, bears to the Master, and in none more than in this of a *bondservant*. This is no morbid sentimentalism—though conquered, he was not cowed. The disposition is *rational*, for to all finite things the most perfect submission to the law of their creation is the most perfect freedom. The higher, mightier, the nature, the more absolute its subjection to law in order to achieve beneficent results.

With this, to Roman eyes, humiliating title, Paul introduces his most profound and philosophical letter to a people of whom some knew from experience the feelings of master and some those of slave. The designation involves:

I. That *he is not his own*—a purchased bondservant, bought not with silver and gold, but the crimson coin of blood. It is a recognition of highest ownership.

II. *Absolute submission to the law of Christ.* He takes that law in its entirety—no idea of being an eclectic, or of asking questions. The application of the law of Christ to actual life may be difficult to the flesh, but the heart and will have already determined that it shall be done. Humanity craves a king, hence hero worship. Submission to the rule of the highest and best the only path of progress towards higher conditions.

III. *Absolute surrender of the mind to the truth of Christ.* He is "the truth." If these seem hard sayings, things too deep for his plummet; still, if proved to be the utterance of the Master, he accepts and upholds them.

IV. *Absolute conformity to the life of Christ.* Seeking His footprints, imitating his example, cultivating His spirit. Not thinking of a lower standard.

V. Eager, steadfast, joyous pursuit of the *work of Christ.*

These are the laws through which liberty is achieved. The more perfect the harmony with Christ's will the more complete the freedom.

Free towards good, free from friction and failure. To the obedient the larger scope, the least restraint.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. Possession by Dispossession. "And the children of Joseph spake unto Joshua, saying, Why hast thou given me but one lot and one portion to inherit?" etc.—Joshua xvii: 14-18. A. T. Pier-son, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
2. The Secret of being Honored. "Jabez was more honorable than his brethren. And Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying, Oh that thou wouldst bless me indeed. . . . And God granted him that which he requested."—1 Chron. iv: 9, 10. Rev. J. H. Sam-mis, Grand Haven, Mich.
3. Satan on his Travels. "And the Lord said unto Satan: Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."—Job i: 7. T. De Witt Talmage, D.D., Brooklyn.
4. The Gibraltar of the Christian Evidences—the Person of Christ. "They are dead which sought the young child's life."—Matt. ii: 22. Sam. P. Sprecher, D.D., Cleveland, O.
5. Christ Repressing Rash Discipleship. "A certain scribe said unto him: Master, I will follow thee. . . . Jesus said unto him, The foxes have holes," etc.—Matt. viii: 19, 20. Alex. Maclaren, D.D., Manchester, Eng.
6. Christ's Ownership and Use of Us. "The Lord hath need of him."—Mark xi: 3. T. L. Cuyler, D.D., Brooklyn.
7. The Crucial Test. "Sell all that thou hast."—Luke xviii: 22. T. W. Chambers, D.D., New York.
8. Our Treasure—Where? "Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivest thy good things," etc.—Luke xvi: 25. Howard Crosby, D.D., New York.
9. Spiritual Needs of Man. "I am the way, the truth, and the life."—John xiv: 6. Bishop John Williams, D.D., Philadel-phia, Pa.
10. The Place of the Old Testament in Religious Culture. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning."—Rom. xv: 4. John Hunter, D.D., Glasgow, Scotland.
11. How Paul Understood Christ's Commis-sion. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."—1 Cor. i: 17. A. J. F. Behreeds, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
12. Paul's Three-fold Cross. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc.—Gal. vi: 14. Thomas Armitage, D.D., New York.
13. The Immanence of Christ in the Church. "The church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."—Eph. i: 23. Henry Hopkins, D.D., annual sermon before the American Board.
14. Infidelity Tested in Trying Hours. "At that time ye were without Christ . . . having no hope, and without God in the world,"—Eph. ii: 12. J. L. With-row, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
15. God's Knowledge of Us, Rather Than Our Knowledge of God, the Soul's Security. "But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God,"—Eph. iv: 9. J. M. Ludlow, D.D., East Orange, N. J.
16. The Indwelling of Christ. "Christ in you the hope of glory."—Col. i: 27. John Reed, D.D., Yonkers, N. Y.
17. Church Attendance. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is," etc.—Heb. x: 25. Chas. C. Wallace, D.D., Syra-cuse, N. Y.
18. The Everlasting Kingship of Jesus Christ. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."—Heb. xiii: 8. David H. Greer, D.D., New York.

SUGGESTIVE THEMES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

1. An Unbroken Family in Christ. ("And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him into the ark, because of the waters of the flood."—Gen. vii: 7.)
2. Limiting the Blessing. ("Borrow vessels abroad of all thy neighbors, even empty vessels; borrow not a few . . . not a

- vessel more. "And the oil stayed."—2 Kings iv : 3, 6.)
3. Joyful Enthusiasm an Element of Power in Revival Work. ("For the joy of the Lord is your strength."—Neh. viii : 10.)
 4. Herod and the Ghost of John, or the Remorse of Infidelity. ("At that time Herod heard of the fame of Jesus, and he said, . . . This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead."—Matt. xiv : 2.)
 5. Tokens of Perdition. ("So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors."—Matt. xxiv : 32-33.)
 6. Love Taking the Aggressive. ("Compel them to come in."—Luke xiv : 23.)
 7. When Sin Occurs God Cannot Consistently Prevent It. ("It is impossible but that offences will come; but woe unto him, through whom they come!"—Luke xvii : 1.)
 8. The Guest Who Brings Salvation to the Home. ("Make haste, and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house. . . . This day is salvation come to this house."—Luke xix : 5, 9.)
 9. An Hour of Consummation. ("Father, the hour is come,"—John xvii : 1.)
 10. God Near and Tangible to the Touch of Faith. ("That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."—Acts xvii : 27.)
 11. Protean Forms of Modern Skepticism Reproductions of the Old. ("For we are not ignorant of his devices."—2 Cor. ii : 11.)
 12. Man's Natural Power and Spiritual Weakness. ("Of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage."—2 Peter ii : 19.)
 13. The Bondage of the "Freethinker." ("While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption."—2 Peter ii : 19.)
 14. Mercy Changed to Judgment. ("Behold I stand at the door," etc.—Rev. iii : 20. "The Judge standeth at the door."—Jas. v : 9.)
 15. Mercy the Coronation of Majesty. ("There was a rainbow round about the throne."—Rev. iv. 3.)
 16. The Records of Redemption and of Retribution Opened. ("And the books were opened."—Rev. xx : 12.)

PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By J. M. SHERWOOD, D.D.

DEC. 2-8.—SORROWS OF OLD AGE WITHOUT RELIGION.—Eccl. vi : 3, 4.

Even with all the comforts and hopes of Christianity, old age is not a desirable condition of being. We naturally desire to live; we shrink instinctively from death—and yet many an aged one longs to lay down the oppressive burden of life before the appointed time. If this be true, with all the consolations and supports which true religion affords, how unutterably sad and sorrowful must old age be to the aged, weary pilgrim who has no home in the skies to look forward to—no God and Saviour to light up the dark valley and welcome him to an eternity of bliss!

But why are the sorrows of an irreligious old age so many and poignant?

1. A portion of them is *natural and common alike to all*. Nature will decay; the system wear out. The organs of the body and the faculties of the mind become impaired. The world palls on the senses. We are out of touch with the life around us. We lose our interest in life—in the very things which once gave us delight. Our children, our friends, our neighbors, are gone from us. We

are solitary, desolate. "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity," we repeat a thousand times. The day is spent; the sun touches the western horizon; we have nothing to grasp; a year, a day, and we are gone—forever gone from all these scenes—but where?—what beyond this brief, vain life? Great God! What an experience is this! What thoughts and reflections are these to a rational, accountable, immortal being, standing on the confines of two worlds!

2. The *retrospect of a godless life from the period of old age* must necessarily be a painful one, at least one destitute of rational comfort and satisfaction. The day of activity, of passion, of recklessness, has gone by. With old age come reflection, introspection, seriousness, and the monitions of a coming judgment. To come into the "sere and yellow leaf" of life, and look back upon years wasted in vanity and sin, a probation nearing its close and yet nothing done; everything here fading, slipping away, waxing old, and life itself ready to go out! O the bitterness of the retrospect of a life devoted to the world—a life without God and without a serious purpose—a life without

the sunshine and the solace of religion—only a vanity!

2. If such the bitterness of the *retrospect*, what shall we say of the *anticipation*? Very few repent in old age. Scarcely one in a thousand who live to “threescore years and ten” impenitent, ever change. So that the hope of final repentance does not rationally come in to solace the aged sinner. What he is and has been all his life he will almost certainly continue to be to the end. Look, old man, seriously and faithfully at your condition. Survey the past. Con over all your privileges, opportunities, mercies, warnings, sins, neglects, and the outcome of all God’s grace to you. Look ahead. The best of life is gone. A bare chance is left you. Are you alarmed? Is conscience aroused? Has the Spirit fled? Is your heart dead, indifferent? What is your hope? Not the Christ of God, for you have rejected Him. Die you must, and soon, and you are not ready; you have not taken one step towards it. You are yet in your sins. Death and the grave have no cheer for you. Your life is almost sure to go out in gloom and despair! What a retrospect! What a prospect! A misspent probation, a hopeless death, a lost eternity!

Surely, if such be the sorrows and the outcome of a godless old age, we may well dread to come into the condition, and pray and strive with infinite anxiety and earnestness for early conversion, not only for ourselves, but for our children and friends.

Dec. 9-16.—FAITHFULNESS IN LITTLE THINGS.—Luke xix: 17.

We do well to note the contrast between man’s estimate and God’s estimate of what we call *little* things. Man despises them as of no value—not worthy of consideration. It is only great things—grand opportunities, great occasions, some great service—that stirs his blood and enlists his prayers and efforts. But

with God how different. It is the spirit, the purpose, the principle, not the outward service. The widow’s two mites counted more than all the gifts of the rich. A cup of water in the name of a disciple is sure of gracious recognition. The servant whose single pound had gained ten pounds was liberally rewarded. “Because thou hast been faithful in a *very little*, have thou authority over ten cities.”

1. Let us remark that what we are apt to call *little things* make up the *staple of our opportunities*. God, as a rule, does not call His people to martyrdom, to heroic deeds, to extraordinary sacrifice, to mighty exertion, to grand service in the sight of angels and men. On the contrary, their calling is the quiet, humble sphere of daily little duties, conscientiously performed in the sight of God; daily striving for the mastery over evil in their own hearts, performing the gentle ministries of love in all the relations of life and making their little sphere, however unobserved or seemingly unimportant, radiant with the Master’s smile and the Master’s benediction. If any of us ever receive the Master’s Well done, it will not be for a martyr’s crown, for grand victories, for achievements that won the plaudits of the world; but “because thou hast been *faithful in a very little*.” The reward will be determined by the *principle* of the service, not by its relative greatness.

2. Consequently we should be on the lookout for the *little*, the *common every-day opportunities of service for the Master*. If we watch and wait only for *great* opportunities, we shall miss our chance altogether. They will not come to us; our “pound” will gain nothing. The most useful Christian is the man who day by day begins his round of duty with the rising sun, and ceases not till he pillows his head at night—every claim, in the home, in business, in society, in the church, in

the whole wide world, scrupulously attended to, as under the eye of God. Such an one will never have to *wait* for opportunities; they will wait upon him every hour of the day and fill his hands with work—blessed work for the Master! The more willing and ready he is to give attention to the things which daily and immediately press upon him, the more will his sphere enlarge, the farther will he reach forth and gather the clustering fruit and then more talents will be entrusted to him.

3. Let us learn to *look at duty and service as God looks at them and estimates them*. Let us not forget that the virtue and the reward lie in the *principle* which rules our heart and life—not in the kind or the amount of the outward service. God may see and recognize a higher virtue in a little act of self-denial for him against fearful odds, than if you were to burn at the stake. To conquer pride, to forgive an injury, to pray for your enemy, may in His sight be a greater exploit than to conquer a city or save a nation. Blessed be God the rewards of Heaven are not beyond the reach of the weakest, humblest, obscurest Christian! The *very little* things of consecrated love and endeavor here will bear fruit in the eternal Kingdom.

Dec. 17-22.—CHRISTMAS THOUGHTS: NO ROOM FOR JESUS.—Luke ii: 7.

The incident narrated in the text is significant in its meaning. While the birth of the infant in a "manger" seems a natural event, in the circumstances of the case, it was, nevertheless, the most extraordinary event that had transpired in the history of the world. The simple reason assigned for the birth of the Son of God in a stable is, "because there was no room for them in the inn." The fact was more than a mere incident of travel. There is a profound providential and spiritual meaning in it. The naked, unadorned fact expresses more eloquently than language

could set forth, the extreme humiliation to which the divine Son of God subjected himself in His incarnation. Had he been the son of a prince, or of a rabbi, or a rich Jew, then would "room" have been made for him in the inn. But the Son of Man came to be a servant of servants; was born in poverty; tasted extreme humiliation even in His "swaddling clothes."

1. My first Christmas thought, then, carries me back to the hostelry in Bethlehem, where the infant Saviour lies in a manger, wrapped in swaddling clothes. This glorious Christmas day, which we celebrate so joyously, dawned in a stable. The life that was to manifest God in the flesh—that was to bring redemption to a race, and fill earth and heaven, time and eternity with glad hosannas—began in extremest weakness and humiliation. The little city of Bethlehem, and the great city of Jerusalem hard by, wot not of the coming of the great King, the divine Deliverer. Angel cohorts heralded the birth to the shepherds on the plains, but the "city," the great bustling world, had no "room" for the Christ. So God exalts the "manger," the "garden," the "cross," to be the symbols and the thrones of Almighty power and of divine glory and blessedness.

2. The "*inn*" that had no room for Heaven's exalted Son, fitly represents the heart of the natural man.—It sees no beauty in Him that it should desire Him. It discerns no need of Him. It feels no kindlings of gratitude and love towards Him. It feels no penitent longings after His forgiving love. It hears the songs of angels praising Him; it witnesses the new life and the holy joys of redeemed souls; it basks in the sunshine and blessedness of Christmas joys and privileges, but it recognizes not the King of Zion; it accepts not the Saviour of sinners—it has "no room" for the Lord of

glory—no room for Him even on this glad day, radiant with His glory, and burdened with His benedictions.

3. *The world has no room for the divine Saviour of man.* (a) A large class of men and women, who owe all that is worth living for to the Christ, take pleasure and great pains in disparaging His claims and dishonoring His name. They do all in their power to EXPEL Him from the world! (b) A larger class still are so devoted to Mammon, so absorbed in the pursuit of earthly things, that "no room" is left in their thoughts, desires, plans or pursuits, for spiritual things. Christ is not so much as *thought* of. There is not interest or concern enough felt in Him to give any heed to the matter. The Lord of Life, the God of Glory, the only Hope of lost man, is cast away for a song, a bauble, a jest, a pastime! (c) Alas, that it should be necessary to add that many a church finds "no room" for the Christ of sound doctrine, of evangelical faith, of a truly liberal, catholic spirit, of a spiritual, holy, consecrated, apostolic life and mission!

DEC. 23-29.—RETROSPECT OF THE CLOSING YEAR.—Ps. xc : 12.

"Our birth is nothing but our death begun."—YOUNG.

"Nought treads so silent as the foot of time :

Hence we mistake our Autumn for our prime."—YOUNG.

1. It has been a year of unnumbered *mercies*. Each month, and week and day has been crowded with God's blessings. In our homes, in social circles, in business pursuits, in temporal and spiritual things, Heaven has rained down gifts upon us. Has our *gratitude* abounded?

2. It has been a year of glorious *opportunities*. (a) For growth in grace. (b) For enlarged views of life and duty. (c) For winning souls to Christ. (d) Above all, for making our own calling and election sure. Have we prized and made the most of these golden opportunities? They

are past and gone, never to return—except to confront us in the Judgment day. *What will be their testimony?*

3. It has been a year of *trial and discipline*, it may be, sharp and severe. Dear ones may have been snatched from us. Sickness may have brought us low. Reverses of fortune may have overtaken us. Sorrow and sighing and groaning may have been our lot. Well, none of these things came by chance. Every one of them was of God's ordering, and He had a gracious purpose in it all. *What has been the effect?* Have these storms rooted your faith firmer? Have these chastisements led you to cry, "Nearer, my God to Thee?" Can you say, over the year's trials and sorrows and losses, "It is good for me that I have been afflicted"?

4. The year has *terminated the life and probation and fixed the eternal destinies of untold millions of our race*. The thought is solemn as eternity. We do not realize the extent and rapidity of death's ravages. We have no just conception of the number that die each year. What a countless throng of human beings have been marching across the narrow plane of life during the year about to close! According to estimate, not less than 31,500,000 will go down to the grave and enter eternity during the year 1888! Place them in line and they will make a moving column of more than 1,300 to each mile of the earth's circumference! What a spectacle, as they move on—tramp, tramp, tramp—on this stupendous dead march! Nearly 100,000 souls in this vast cavalcade drop out and die *each day* of the year. Truly this is a *dying* world! And yet, amidst the awful carnage, we have been spared. *And to what end?* How short does life seem as we stand on the threshold of the expiring year and see the end of this mighty column drop incessantly into the grave!

5. To *moralize over another de-*

parting year is wise—not in a sentimental way, but with a roused soul, and a praying heart.

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

Our days are numbered. The sands in life's glass are fast falling. Death is certain. Life is uncertain.

“To-morrow?
Where is to-morrow? In another world!”
And there our soul may be before
its light dawns on earth.

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

CONDUCTED BY J. H. W. STUCKENBURG, D.D., BERLIN, GERMANY.

RELIGIOUS CONTRASTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY.

AFTER an absence of eight years the editor of the European Department has visited the United States. He was struck with much which is in marked contrast with the Old World, particularly in the religious thought and life. The commingling of people from various nationalities, from all continents, and with different kinds of civilization, gives to the States a heterogeneity the like of which cannot be found in Europe. Our people are the most cosmopolitan in the world. There are, indeed, distinct characteristics, but they can hardly be called national, since they are found to differ in the North and the South, in the East and the West. Not only are the European nations more homogeneous, but the grooves in which thought and life move are also deeper. History, tradition, custom, rank, formality, ceremony, have more power than in the United States. In most of the European countries the monarchical principle and the respect for authority have also exerted great influence on national life.

In the pulpits, the churches, and the religious life generally, the peculiarities of our people are striking, and it is not strange that they occasion so much comment on the part of Europeans. There is a tendency to make freedom synonymous with the rejection of all authority, so that it becomes arbitrariness and license. Individualism has free scope; hence the variety in the pulpit, in worship, and in the forms of the religious life.

Our life has not the even regularity of the old nations; ours is the land of rapid and great changes, of inventions, and of startling novelties. The Athenian greed for what is new has entered our churches, and there are pulpits which seek to meet this craving by means of a free use of the sensational element.

The freedom of the American pulpit gives it a supreme advantage, but is also its greatest danger. It offers a powerful incentive for the most perfect development of the individuality and personality of the preacher; it gives room for the highest perfection, but also for grotesque perversions. The pulpit of America is in some respects the best in the world; but it also permits performances of a character that would hardly be possible in any other Protestant country. In other lands there is usually an average sermon, and the varieties are limited; but in its sermons, as in other respects, our country is the land of extremes.

On the continent of Europe there is a greater separation between the ordinary and the religious life than in the States. The American pulpit consequently touches life more fully at all points, is more free to discuss politics, business, literature, art, and in fact all that concerns the people. Society is thus viewed as the meal, every particle of which is to be leavened by the gospel. Thus the American preacher boldly discusses subjects which are excluded from the pulpit on the Continent, where preaching so often means a strict interpretation of the text and a

limited application of its teachings. The German sermon is biblical, but too much apart from life; while the American sermon is often intensely realistic, but so little biblical or exegetical that it is secular. The Germans distinguish far more closely than the Americans between a sermon and a religious address. If the German sermon too often grows from the gospel without scattering its blossoms to adorn every form of life, and without bearing fruit to nourish men in all their occupations and relations, the American sermon too often fails to make divine truth its seed, its root, and its soil. German preachers are more intent than heretofore to bring the gospel more into direct relation to the various forms of life, and one of them declares that Spurgeon and Talmage are the two preachers who are calculated to teach the German scholastic pulpit how to bring the gospel home to the hearts of the people. In point of Scriptural exegesis, the German preachers are unrivaled; and yet writers on homiletics continually urge that this exegesis be made deeper and more fully the vital element of the sermon, while at the same time the preaching is to be made more popular by making it more realistic.

In Germany the churches are too much under the dominion of the State and under the control of the pastors; the congregational element is not prominent, the activity of the members is not developed. In striking contrast with this is the religious life of the church in America. It is more the entire congregation that is interested in religious affairs and in Christian work than is the case anywhere on the Continent. This gives the church in America an inestimable advantage; it is so mighty because it is the church of pastor and people, not merely of the pastor. In spite of the complaints heard in the States about the

lack of activity on the part of the churches, the zeal displayed in missionary, in Sunday-school, and in church work generally, is very encouraging compared with the Continental churches.

Coming from Germany to America, a positively painful impression was made by the lack of reverence during divine services. This is not universal, nevertheless quite common. The behavior of the congregation, the bearing of the preacher, the sermon, and the announcements, too often put divine services on the level of an entertainment. Sometimes the entertaining feature is not only apparent, but actually announced as a special aim. As a consequence, the levity found in certain congregations ought perhaps not to be a surprise, however shocking it may be to those who have come solely to worship God and to receive instruction from His Word. Religious solemnity need not be confounded with long faces and repulsive gloom; we may insist on the need of Christian cheerfulness and the right of Christian humor, while at the same we are repelled by levity and frivolity in the house of God. When a minister descends to the sensational, the vulgar, and the laughable, as the chief means for attracting an audience, we naturally wonder why he is in the pulpit. With such preaching, astonishment ceases that the congregation lacks solemnity, is ready for a laugh, and can enter and leave the house of God without a thought of offering a silent prayer to fit the heart for worship and to deepen the convictions of the services.

The assertion would startle some that in some of the most orthodox churches of America there is a species of infidelity unknown in the German churches. And yet there would be truth in that assertion. It is not uncommon for ministers and laymen, in addressing religious meet-

ings, particularly prayer-meetings, to claim that the assurance of salvation is the great aim of their seeking. Believers who profess to have faithfully tried for twenty or thirty years to serve God speak of this assurance as doubtful. Indeed, it is evident that they make their variable emotions the test of their standing with God. They profess faith in Christ, and believe in God's mercy, and yet rely on the changes in the religious moods more than on the unchangeable mercy and promises of God. When the German Christian cherishes faith in Christ, he never questions his acceptance; he does not permit his moods to nullify the truth which assures him that Christ is his Saviour; and he never doubts that so long as his faith is alive, God will be true to His promises. Where an excessive stress is laid on personal feeling, instead of deep and broad and vital faith, as the condition of salvation, a morbid element is apt to be introduced into religion, an element which is hostile to some of the most precious truths of evangelical Christianity.

Many other points of interest in the ministerial and religious life of America were found to be in contrast with those which prevail in Continental Europe; but the above were most apparent. Many American preachers complain that their practical duties are such that they have but little time for study. This is no doubt one reason why it is so difficult to find suitable men for prominent theological professorships. The professors in German universities, as a rule, began to teach as soon as they completed their academic course; all their studies were made subservient to their aim to become teachers, and their whole life is unreservedly devoted to their chosen profession. They did not wait to be appointed by any authority before they began to teach; but after graduation they passed a special examination which

at once gave them the right to lecture in the university. Only if the *Privat-Dozent* is to become a professor is a special appointment necessary; but before such an appointment he is already expected to have attained some degree of eminence in his specialty. Many of the American ministers seem to have no learned specialty. Our land is as yet more the country of general intelligence than of scholarly specialization.

During the visit to America the question frequently arose, whether the ministers and churches are alive to three subjects which are burning questions in Germany and cause profound agitation—namely, infidelity, Jesuitism and socialism. More fully in the land of Luther than in America are the peaceable intentions of the present Pope recognized as those of the wolf intent on devouring the lamb. In America not a few despair of understanding socialism, which is so thoroughly studied in Germany, and whose just demands many believers recognize and are eager to meet. The German Church has felt the power of infidelity too keenly to be insensible of the efforts to undermine the religion of Christ; while the American churches can hardly be persuaded that they owe to their own children, sent abroad amidst the most destructive forms of infidelity, as much duty as they do to the heathen. There may be loud, even fanatical, complaint of the tide of foreign infidelity coming to our shores, when not a little finger is raised to provide churches for American students who are subject to infidel influence at the fountain-head of thought.

A comparison of the religious life in the United States with that on the Continent has deepened the conviction that the former has great advantages, but is also subject to peculiar dangers. America is the land of momentous problems. There is evidently more hearty unity there between the various evangelical

churches than between the different factions of the same State Church in Germany. Whether these churches can form a co-operative union against Jesuitism and infidelity remains to be seen. From an educational point of view there is also much encouragement in America, though much may still be learned from Germany. With all its defects and all its distractions, and with all the dangers peculiar to the religious life of the States, in respect to vigor and vitality and success the American churches can bear comparison with any in the world. This is not ground for boasting, but for gratitude to God, and for encouragement to still greater energy.

BOOKS AND PERSONS THE PREDOMINANT FACTORS IN MOULDING LIFE.

Professor Zimmer, of Koenigsberg, addressed the leading theologians of Germany, and also some of other countries, with a view of ascertaining what five or ten books, besides the sacred Scriptures, either theological or in any other department of literature, had exerted the greatest power in developing their minds in forming their convictions, and in fitting them for their official duties. The answers received, and the comments made on the most influential works, have been published in a volume entitled "Buecherkleinode Evangelischer Theologen."

The book gives important glimpses of the processes which have been at work in the minds of leading thinkers. The first great intellectual and spiritual impulses are indicated, and secret springs of thought and life are revealed. It is interesting to note the varied sources of power. There are, it is true, certain authors who are mentioned by many as having exerted a moulding influence on their minds and hearts, and particular books of these authors are frequently named. Among such writers are Luther, Bengel, Schleiermacher, Harms, Neander, Tholuck.

Julius Mueller, Nitzsch, Rothe, Beck, Dörner, Martensen and Luthardt. Nevertheless, one is struck by the diversity in the works which have determined so largely the present theological thought of Germany. Not only are these works taken from all departments of theology, but also from philosophy, history, novels and poetry. One theologian apologizes for referring to two novels which greatly aroused him, and adds, "They were written by a woman." There are, of course, instances in which the inspiring books were all of a particular class, and it is at once evident that the peculiar course of the man finds its interpretation in these works. Thus one mentions chiefly critical theological works; another, mainly devotional books and sermons; while others give long lists of philosophical volumes. In numerous cases the works of Lessing, Kant, Lotze, Goethe and Schiller, have been decisive; sometimes hymn and prayer books awakened and directed the soul. It has frequently happened that a single author or a single volume has been so influential that no others are thought worthy of comparison. One theologian regards Hamann's works as the chief element in his education, and he writes: "I mention no one except the *only* Hamann." Another names only Steinmeyer, while another refers solely to the sermons of Klei-foth, and still another mentions only Schleiermacher's "Monologues." Instead of books, certain passages are occasionally given as the leavening power. Thus Prof. Baur, of Leipzig, quotes this sentence from Tauler: "Wherever God is to enter, all other things must be banished." He found Schiller's words a valuable law for life: "Excellence of character is formed by being severe with self and tolerant toward others, while the most despicable character is formed by being lenient with self and severe with others."

Books forgotten by the age may live in an eminent man and through him influence the world. A deep and lasting impression was made in early life on Prof. Delitzsch by a small volume published by Neddersen in 1772. It seems that no one else knew of the existence of this book, of which Delitzsch says: "The essence of my theology may be seen in the unpretentious volume of Neddersen, which has never ceased to be my dearest *vade-mecum*." It is, of course, not surprising that even in the case of profound scholars the leavening works have been those of an inspiring and quickening, rather than of a scholastic character. After living books had aroused the mind, the more scholarly ones were found especially valuable in disciplining and directing its thoughts.

Many of the living theologians have attained their present place and power through the severest conflicts with skepticism. Works of a rationalistic and negatively critical character often served to excite the mind deeply; and the very effort required to find rest for the soul, and to solve the weighty problems presented, served to stimulate thought to the utmost. The sublime victory thus gained meant strength to help others. Important lessons were learned from works whose systems or methods were found defective. Of Strauss and his system a theologian says: "A mighty theological power on the wrong track; hence, now an entirely bankrupt theory." Another declares that the work of Strauss on "Dogmatics" proved valuable to him, because it was so unsatisfactory, and therefore could not be final. Particularly those who were at the university forty or fifty years ago fought their way through infidelity to Christianity; many of them began in the school of Baur and Strauss, but ended in that of Christ. Of the "Life of Jesus," by Strauss, a preacher says, that in his struggles

with doubt this book gave him an insight into the emptiness and ridiculousness of the result of skepticism, and convinced him that the whole structure was erected on sand. Professor Lipsius, one of Germany's most philosophical theologians, admits the great power exerted on him by Hegel's works, but adds: "They could not satisfy my heart." It is interesting to learn that so orthodox a preacher as Koegel read, while a student of eighteen years, works of Strauss and Feuerbach — the most destructive literature of the century. And Delitzsch writes: "My instruction at school and my education in general were rationalistic; until I began my studies at the university in 1831, the person of Christ was involved in mist. This continued to be the case so long as I sought truth and satisfaction in philosophy, particularly in the system of the elder Fichte." After he found Christ he was especially attracted by ascetic literature. Frommel, court-preacher in Berlin, was at first skeptical, was then deeply affected by Tholuck's book on "Sin and the Redeemer," and was finally brought to faith by the theosophic works of Oettinger and Auberlen.

It is peculiarly gratifying to find that our own Prof. Schaff is repeatedly named as an author whose works have been powerful in shaping the lives of Christian thinkers.

Many valuable hints are given respecting books and their use, but there is only room for reference to a very few. Exegetical studies and commentaries are frequently recommended to theological students and preachers; one theologian, however, advises that commentaries, because they so often confuse the mind, be studied less, and that the Scriptures themselves be studied more. One urges the reading of books on Jesuitic morality, in order that the character of the Papacy may be better understood. Even Zola is rec-

commended as an author who gives a knowledge of men and the times. One preacher attributes his success largely to the fact that he has persistently excluded certain elements of current literature, such as novels and journals, of the latter reading only what was necessary for his work. This dictum is also given: "*Multum, non multa*; concentration on that to which one is especially adapted and which he is in duty bound to consult. This good domestic rule is highly to be commended."

Professor Zimmer was especially desirous of learning from the theologians to what particular influence they attributed what they regarded as of most value in the thought and life. The answers received revealed the fact that books, however great their value, have by no means always been the most potent factor. Prof. Strack, of Berlin, writes: "The best that I have has not been derived from books; I am indebted for it to life's providences." The experiences of life are repeatedly referred to in the answers as having determined an important career; likewise books are often mentioned as valuable on account of the experience they produced. "Various personal experiences led me to the writings of Jacob Boehme," is the testimony of Prof. Delitzsch.

Most significant, however, is the influence ascribed directly to persons. The testimony in this respect is most weighty, being so clear and so emphatic and so general, and teaching a lesson of the utmost importance. The editor of the volume says in the preface: "I can truthfully affirm that not one of the men contributing to this book thought that a complete theologian can be made by books. . . . It was an almost stereotyped form of expression in most of the answers received: "What is best in me is not owing to books but to persons." The editor says that he was convinced before that this was the

case, but adds, "I did not dare to hope that it would be so unanimously confirmed by men of all parties, and apparently more definitely by professors than by preachers, that their lives were determined mainly by their providential experiences and by persons." Often the very persons are named whose influence was greater than that of books; particularly are teachers mentioned as giving direction to life. Hence, the editor states: "I must confess that never before have I been so fully conscious of the importance and responsibility of the academic teacher as when the testimony received emphasized the fact that the *character* is of supreme importance." A professor of theology wrote: "If we teachers aim to become maturer students' guides to science and to life, it cannot be done by means of pastoral labor, and yet it must be accomplished by a real care for souls; namely, by learning, through personal contact, the needs of the students, so that we may meet these needs by giving advice respecting the course of study and reading. The principal thing, however, is that we ourselves be Christian and scientific characters, and lead before our students the life of a Christian and evangelical theologian. Efficiency in this respect must be God's work."

So general was the reference to persons as exerting the greatest influence that the answers making mention of this fact are published in only a few instances. The testimony of Prof. Lechler is: "Less through reading and study than through life and experience have I been trained most in knowledge and thinking. During my career as student and tutor I regarded science and the world of thought as far superior to practice and to reality. England was the first to shake this opinion. In Christian meetings prominent persons made addresses, which were powerful on account of the eloquence

of character; and it became evident to me that neither *esprit*, nor acumen, nor originality of thought is most effective, but the person and the disposition. In this way my entire mode of thought and my view of the world were changed."

"Do what we will, the important thing after all is the personality," is a saying of Goethe which receives abundant confirmation in the volume. Funcke, one of the most popular preachers in Germany, writes: "Books are not much to me; Christian persons and characters, among the laity still more than among theologians, have been everything." Tholuck's personal influence produced a marvelous effect. One writes: "If I am to name the first human source whence came the best I possess as a theologian, I must not mention a book, but a person, namely Tholuck." "I owe to my noble teachers, Tholuck and Mueller, the best I have in this life," writes another. Beck, of Tuebingen, is also mentioned by several as a person whose direct influence was mighty; he was regarded as an embodiment of the biblical truth he taught. Neander and Herbart, the philosopher, are also named as exerting a powerful personal influence. Not abstract truth, but truth in life and character, is thus pronounced by eminent thinkers to have been most effective in forming them intellectually and spiritually.

AN EXPERIMENT AND ITS LESSONS.

Before me lie three new philosophical books, one by a Dane, the other two by Germans, all of which aim to find a substitute for religion. The Dane wants to put morality in its place, and seeks to deprive morality of all authority except that which has its basis in human nature. He has evidently been strongly influenced by English writers, particularly by Spencer. Of the German authors, one regards questions pertaining to happiness and to morality

—both pronounced purely humanistic and naturalistic problems—as the only ones which can give satisfaction to the human mind and heart. Religion can, therefore, be dispensed with; earthly happiness and natural morality are its substitutes. The third volume aims to supply the place of religion by something that shall transcend it, something more reliable and more perfect than the doctrine of God and of immortality. This more perfect something is not as yet very definite, but it is something toward which we are to progress in the course of evolution. Perhaps a more perfect organization than is ours at present is in store for us. Perhaps by hope and effort it will at last be found that some kind of redemption awaits humanity. The author is particular in calling his book a "Super-religious View of the Universe," and the title is one of the most striking things about the book.

Not for the sake of the specific contents, but to denote a wide tendency, these volumes are here referred to. Never before, so far as we can tell, was the experiment made by so many in Christian lands to live without God and without the hope of immortality. The best way to determine the value of a theory is to give it a thorough trial. When thus tested by a large number the validity of a theory or system may be finally established or effectually overthrown. What will maintain itself as a speculative problem may fail utterly in practical application. The time seems to have come when atheism and agnosticism must be tested as the practical rule of life. Thus far, as one of the authors mentioned admits, all efforts to find a substitute for religion have been miserable failures; and his own substitute is so indefinite, so improbable, and so unsatisfactory that an earnest man wonders how it could be proposed seriously. The experiment now being made has probably not yet reached

the climax of its developments; but already a number of the experimenters have made the effort to ascend from nature and from man to a personal God and a personal immortality. The soul cannot breathe in a void.

While the experiment is in progress the observers will be able to learn important lessons. The fact is highly significant that those who reject religion go about to find or invent a substitute. Why not just drop religion and be done with the whole matter? Here is an unintentional and unwilling testimony in favor of religion from its enemies, a testimony, too, of the most weighty character.

But beside this testimony we must put another fact which is rather sad: in order to exalt the substitute it is found expedient to misrepresent religion. One of the above books is heralded with the announcement that "Materialism and pessimism are the culmination of Christian philosophy"! There is another intentional lesson here: what is a cause worth that needs such an advertisement? Then it has become common to represent Christianity as too purely religious, and not ethical enough; hence appeals are made to promote a morality superior to that of Christ's religion, and to form ethical societies for this purpose. Perhaps a hint is given here of a field which has been too much neglected by Christians, and which ought henceforth to be more cultivated. Another slander on Christianity is that it places such stress on the life to come that it neglects the present life, and that it values the soul so highly that it makes the body of no account. It is but too evident that instead of the real Christianity of Scripture these objectors know only caricatures of it, made either by themselves or by others.

The experiment teaches another important lesson. The usual apolo-

getics are but paper bullets aimed at the armor of these men. The arguments must of course be met, and the perversions must be corrected. What depth and breadth of culture are required to banish the religious and irreligious mistakes and ignorance of the cultured! But essential as this is, the time for merely negative apologetics is past. It is enough for a Christian if the objections of infidels are overthrown; that leaves his faith free to expand. But these experimenters have no faith; hence there is none to grow, even if all their objections are successfully met. They are like the man in the gospel who is absolutely empty after the evil spirit has been cast out. The negative work must be supplemented by the positive; the removal of the rubbish is valuable only because it prepares the way for a foundation and a building. We must go to the bottom in dealing with the skepticism of the day; and beginning with the ultimate principles of thought, must construct the edifice of religion. Destruction for the sake of construction is the law; and very often the vigorous prosecution of the positive work will also do all the negative work required. That is: destruction by construction.

PROBLEMS IN ENGLAND.

Infidelity. There is downright and avowed atheism. Men like Bradlaugh may be less violent than formerly; but the actual denial of God's existence is an unquestioned fact. Efforts are indeed made to foster a religion without God; but it is evidently a perversion of terms to speak of an *atheistic* religion. All the materialistic tendencies concentrate thought on nature and make it the interpreter of all human phenomena. Even if philosophically overthrown as a system, materialism continues its practical influences. Positivism professes to aim at a conservation of some of the ideal treasures of the mind, and boasts of a worship of

humanity; yet it is but too evident that Comte's philosophy is a naturalism whose tap-root is materialism.

Agnosticism is the most prominent form of English skepticism. So far as it claims to have fixed forever the limits of the unknowable, it is the most astounding effrontery in the guise of hypocritical modesty. Only if for all time the power of human reason has been absolutely determined, can it be affirmed definitely what that reason can know and what lies beyond its sphere. Agnosticism claims that we can know only the relative; and in the same breath asserts that it has *absolutely* fixed the limits of the knowable! Agnosticism needs to be made fully conscious of itself. Perhaps it might then discover that there is some absurdity in the boast that it *knows* the *unknowable*. There are two radical defects in this system: it fails to distinguish clearly between the unknown and the unknowable, and between knowledge and faith. It is time for agnosticism to pass from the dogmatic to the critical period, which no doubt means the period of dissolution.

From England agnosticism is spreading on the Continent. Everywhere it is found that what one bold thinker affirms a thousand will thoughtlessly echo. The worst effect of the tendency is that it serves to empty the mind of thought rather than to arouse and to energize the mind. It is a sedative, not a ferment. Without any further inquiry thousands foolishly dismiss all religious problems with the verdict, Unknowable! It paralyzes effort; it ends the energy of the doubting inquirer by landing him in nihilism. Its pernicious influence is seen in the fact that it deadens the highest aspirations of the intellect, crushes the spirit, makes religious indifferentism a system, and practical godlessness the law of life.

In England as well as in Germany, the inefficiency of materialism to ac-

count for the universe is admitted more and more fully by scholars. Among theologians this inspires new courage. The Archbishop of York said in a sermon before the Church Congress, in respect to the body as the house of the soul:

"We do not know all its functions yet; but we know enough to declare that there are not in the narrow house special folds and compartments to be the seat of the higher mental endowments of the wise discourse, of the spiritual love, and, above all, of the imperial will, which, freed from lower conditions by divine light, governs all that system which we call a man; and governing itself, controls all nature, and exercises power, to us inexplicable, over lower human minds not yet so free. To say upon the evidence of fifty years ago that the mind is a function of the brain would be presumptuous nonsense. We now know better. There are no brain-organs for the higher functions of the mind. Starting from the sensations of the brain, the mind is now far above what the mere sensations would have made it. The mind sits upon a throne prepared for it; but it is not therefore a function of that throne."

With a degree of triumph the Archdeacon claims advantages for religion from the discussions of materialism. "The controversy of materialism has left us more freedom and confidence than before. . . . Now that the search has been pursued, that the changing frame has been probed to the quick, divided to its last elements by the keenest scalpel, we find that while science has claimed much, it admits that it cannot claim the whole. We can treat men as free, as capable of noble action, without examining bumps, or counting pulses, or gauging with callipers the area of the cranium. We can claim as genuine the well-known results of Christianity; it was no delusion that the world was

changed in twenty-five years by the belief in the Resurrection; the transforming development of St. Paul, the Apostle, out of a narrow-minded, intolerant Pharisee was possible; nor need we wonder whether the brain was altered in equal measure with the widening hopes and more perfect self-sacrifice of that great, noble, world-embracing soul."

While, in respect to materialism and agnosticism, the problems are the same in England as on the Continent, it is evident that biblical and historical criticism is much more thorough and more extensive in Germany. As agnosticism passes from England to the Continent, so the negative criticism passes from Germany to England. It consequently has the faintness of an echo. Much of the recent apologetic literature of England is of a popular character. So far as it is scholarly, it is largely philosophical. In this respect men like Martineau are doing excellent service. Solid work is also done by the Philosophical Society of Great Britain. In the Bampton Lectures an effort is made to meet all phases of skepticism, biblical as well as philosophical. Nevertheless, recent experiences in London proved that there is a demand for a popular rather than for a profound inquiry into the truths of religion. In Paternoster Row search was made for scholarly works in apologetics, and "Nelson on Infidelity" and a volume of sermons were suggested. Two prominent publishing houses were consulted, but failed to answer the question, Which are the latest and best scholarly English books in apologetic literature? This experience, together with an examination of late works, led to the conclusion that this department is much less prominent than in Germany, where the freedom of thought in the universities promotes the most candid and most thorough discussion of scientific and philosophical skepticism, and of the

negative biblical and historical criticism. The German theological student is thrust into the midst of the profoundest agitations of the age. He hears conflicting views and must grapple with the most perplexing problems, and feels the need of the deepest and most comprehensive apologetics.

Socialism. London is rapidly becoming the world's center for socialistic agitations. It is the refuge and the home of socialists from the various Continental countries, particularly from Germany. A German socialistic paper, *Freie Presse*, is published there; and the *Socialdemokrat* has just been removed from Zurich to London. Marx's classic on socialism, his great work on "Capital," was prepared in that city; and Mr. W. H. Dawson has just published in London an excellent book on "German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle."

London furnishes the best conditions for socialistic agitations, and can at any time crowd the Strand with an army of communists, anarchists, and nihilists from the East End. But this very fact has also aroused the better elements. Englishmen as a class are too practical to be carried away by hopeless visions and fanatical theories. Socialists have injured their cause by extreme measures, and thus have prompted a reaction against their own plans. It seems strange to a foreigner to hear the dreams of socialists advocated on Sundays in Hyde and Regent's Parks; but this very freedom helps to make the poison evident and harmless.

For a view of the spirit and hopes of socialism I quote from *Justice*, the organ of the Social Democracy. A leader in a recent number says: "Ten years ago native English socialism was practically non-existent—to-day it is a great and growing power. Into the lives of many men and women have entered new ideals, new hopes, new aspirations. They see to-

day a glowing future for the race, of which ten years ago they did not even dream. Penetrated by the misery, the degradation and the hopelessness of the present social order they have learned to see in Social Democracy the promise of a heaven for men which differs from the heaven of theologies in that it may be realized here on earth." The same writer says: "Clericalism and ecclesiasticism of all kinds, whether it be Catholic, Anglican or Nonconformist, must be eliminated from our education and true democracy take its place. Ecclesiasticism is always anti-democratic, and on that ground we fight it." There is an earnest warning against precipitancy, and the first leader is headed, "Without Haste—Without Rest." Long and thorough education is advocated as the surest means of gaining the end of socialism. "It is the public at large who have to be educated, and we can only do it by pegging away."

Thus in England, as well as in other countries, there are evidences that socialism is passing from a hasty revolutionary to a more deliberate educational stage. But the kind of education? Purely secular, of course. What this will do for the elevation of the masses remains to be seen. Perhaps the ethical and spiritual elements may yet be added as a heaven. Among the socialistic leaders are men of high intellectual development, and their opponents but stultify themselves if they underestimate the influence exerted by their journals and books.

The socialistic agitations have been fruitful of good results. Real evils which were formerly hidden have been exposed to the gaze of the public; the social condition is studied as never before; the existence of injustice and oppression is admitted; the demand for remedy is recognized as just; and not a few feel that great social changes are a necessity. But the problems at once pushed to the

front are so overwhelming as to have a stunning effect. Every one admits that something must be done to meet the pressing needs of the day, but no one seems to know just what ought to be done. The exposure of the evils existing in society has also led to the most earnest efforts at relief; and many of these are crowned with success. A recent personal inspection of East London made this evident, and gave bright hopes of still greater results to the numerous and vigorous efforts to evangelize the neglected masses and to relieve their wretchedness.

The admission and appreciation of the existing evils is the first condition of serious efforts at relief, and the concentration of attention on the real state of society is therefore of the utmost importance. The scales are falling from the eyes of men so that they can see their brother's misery. England is aroused as never before respecting the misery of vast multitudes in its great cities. There are quarters which would disgrace heathendom; and there are social distinctions which seem to make the religion of Jesus a mockery. Let us hear the Bishop of Rochester respecting modern society:

"Its glaring contrasts are scandalous, and the gulf which yawns between the two zones of enormous wealth and degrading poverty may, if not wisely bridged over, presently generate a tornado which, when the storm clears, may leave a good deal of wreckage behind. In every great community there is a vast mass of hopeless and almost inevitable destitution, which no statesman can greatly mitigate, and which is not likely to disappear till human nature is changed. There is also much dull and dumb misery which, chiefly through the competition in wage-earning labor, just contrives existence—can hardly be said to live, for it knows nothing, hardly hopes to know anything, of recreation, change,

society, joy. It plods on wearily, cheerlessly."

The demands made by this condition of things are urgent, and the time for turning a deaf ear to them is past. Hence the Bishop says respecting socialism:

"Whatever we may think about it, this all thoughtful and just persons must admit, that the facts and the discontent and the purposes which are behind it, are not to be answered with a few haughty or flippant words, unless some day we are prepared to settle with them in a very ugly and abrupt fashion. They claim to be listened to. They expect and deserve reply."

Character he emphasizes as the one thing that is especially needed. Better the material condition of the laborer and the poor; but at the same time develop a character fit for the appreciation and use of the improved condition.

Romanism in the English Church. My space is too limited to permit more than to quote from journals such statements as bear directly on the subject. Thus a leading article of a recent number of *The Church Review* says:

"We must not forget that we too have grievously erred by making our terms of communion so lax that they who deny the Real Presence and the Power of the Keys, as well as they who affirm new and strange doctrines of justification by faith, predestination, and the like, can remain in the communion of the Church."

A London clergyman said in a sermon:

"I assure you, my brethren, that one hour of devotion before the adorable sacrament, always present on the altar, in the dim twilight of morning, with your spirit purified by fasting, is worth a whole week of devotion in your own houses."

Another clergyman, who signs himself "A Colonial Priest," thinks the Church of England must be purified

and Catholicized before it can be "ready for the Holy See." He demands "daily celebration of the Mass by every priest," the Mass to be regarded as "a true, real, and propitiatory sacrifice, as well for the living as for the departed"; "saeramental confession of mortal sins"; the recognition of "seven sacraments"; "the full recognition and use of Extreme Unction"; as well as other doctrines and practices of Rome.

Another Anglican insists that there is "no precedent for aggressive action against the Church of Rome," and opposes "an alliance with the Old Catholics" because it would imply "an absolute condemnation of the Church of Rome as no longer safe for Catholic believers."

All this is astounding and almost incredible. The following, from *The Church Intelligencer*, is not less so, and really makes us wonder whether the times are serious, or whether the most sacred things have become a mockery. This official announcement has been made to the congregation of St. Andrew's, Worthing:

"Communicants are particularly requested to observe the following points: 1. To receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Body into their hands, viz., the palm of their hands, and not to take it between their thumb and finger. 2. To take hold of the foot of the chalice when it is administered to them, and so to insure being communicated. This will save the priest much anxiety. [Signed] Gilbert Moor."

A correspondent informs us that at a church near Andover, the officiating clergyman "refuses to administer the sacrament unless the recipient will receive the bread in the palm of his hand; he won't allow anybody to touch or take it with the fingers, and if they attempt to do so he passes them by without farther notice, not even offering them the cup."

Other burning questions are: Dis-

establishment; the Down-Grade controversy, which is by no means ended; how to reach the masses; intemper-

ance, and immorality. There is, however, no room to discuss them now.

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

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

I.

CHASTE CONVERSATION ON THE PASTOR'S PART COUPLED WITH FEAR: AN OPEN LETTER.

THERE is one class of pastoral relations in which you will need to exercise exceptional prudence, namely, your relations to women. It is a delicate matter to discuss, even to name; but the delicacy of it does not diminish the importance of it. You can scarcely be too cautious in the conduct of this class of your pastoral relations. It is indispensable, absolutely indispensable, to your good influence, that you be not only above blame, but above suspicion in these respects. Never receive a call from a woman alone in your study. Should a woman visit your door for the purpose, immediately propose with all courtesy that you have your interview at a friend's house, offering at the same moment to attend her thither. You may previously have made an arrangement with some discreet friend providing for this. An alternative plan would be to ask some judicious member of your church to be present at the interview. These suggestions suppose the call to be made at your study—situated, for example, in the church edifice or in some other way isolated—by a lady not accompanied. It would be unadvisable for you to receive in your private room a call from any lady alone—unless the age and known character of the lady were such as to make scandalous suspicion and slanderous gossip ridiculous. In determining a doubtful case, lean to the side of prudence and safety. We need hardly say that a degree of delicacy and tact will be necessary on your part, managing an incident of the sort supposed, to avoid wound-

ing the sensibilities of any lady of modest spirit who should be inconsiderate enough to make a call upon you under circumstances not guarded against the tongue of rumor.

You have three things to protect yourself from in your relations with women. One is temptation, another is machination, a third is calumny. To temptation, you may think yourself superior. In that case, guard yourself doubly and trebly. For you know not what manner of man you are. But, again, a plot to ruin you in reputation is always among the possibilities. Be forever on your guard. Lastly, however really above temptation you may be, however free from evil intent your caller, the tongue, remember, the tongue of rumor, is a wild beast that no man hath tamed. Give that wild beast no chance to make you his prey.

The same caution will need to be observed in responding to calls made upon you for ministerial attention to strangers at their homes. Learn, if possible, something trustworthy about the character of the persons whom you are summoned to visit. If this is not possible, or if your information leaves you in any doubt as to the good character of the persons concerned, be sure to go accompanied with some sober man of your church, whose good name will be a tower of strength for you. Sudden calls for pastoral visitation, made, perhaps, late in the evening, are for aught you know, a snare. Do not venture on such an errand alone, until you are perfectly assured of your safety in so doing.

These latter suggestions, of course, have their chief application to cities and large towns. But the principle of the suggestions is permanent and

of universal application. Be always and everywhere on your guard to give no occasion of evil-speaking in your relation with women. Shun habits of free-and-easy jocular familiarity with them in your ordinary intercourse. Be respectful and sufficiently dignified to make freedoms proceeding from them toward you impossible. As for promiscuous kissing, let it not be once named among you, as becometh ministers. We charge you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Christ, refuse to gratify yourselves in any of these matters. Christ, at least, will know, and you will know, if you examine yourselves as you ought; and there is every chance that society, too, will know, when you dally with a woman in any manner whatsoever, for your fleshy delight. We are speaking plainly, but we are speaking of things concerning the King. You cannot dwell a moment too long in meeting the eyes of a woman; you cannot continue a little too far the pressure of the hand in greeting; you cannot modulate your tone in conversation to express a sentiment that you would not dare put in words; you cannot toy with equivocal trifles in remark that may mean nothing, or that may mean much, according as fortune or mutual understanding decides—you cannot do any of these things without staining your souls with some touch of that sin which becomes adultery, when it is finished, and then bringeth forth death. Remember where the Lord lodged adultery. It was in a look. Carry your heart as white as Christ washed it with His blood—at least in all that concerns such sins.

If you are a married man, your wife, by bearing you company, will often be able to relieve the embarrassment that would otherwise, in certain instances, attend the performance of pastoral duty.

II.

RULES FOR CHOOSING SUBJECTS.

1. Let your subject, on each occasion, be one, the presentation of which is clearly related, in your own conscious purpose, and in perceived adaptation, to the end of securing obedience to Christ.

2. In ordinary pastoral preaching, pursue *simultaneously* these three distinct methods of choosing subjects, viz. :—

I. Follow a line of special Scriptural investigation, either consecutive, or in some other way independent, as far as may be, alike of your own individual experience, and of the supposed present circumstances of your congregation;

II. Consult heedfully the current actual needs of your hearers;

III. Obey the suggestions furnished by your own intellectual and spiritual experience and development.

III.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

1. "In a late number of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW some brother proposes a question concerning 'Pulpit Notices,' to which you give a general reply and say that you 'will wait until some one submits an actual case' before you will attempt to lay down any more definite rule. In behalf of that brother, whom I know not, I will submit the 'actual case': A lady of my church came to me two weeks ago and asked me to read a notice to the effect that a Miss ——— would lecture in the town hall on Monday evening on 'Some New Phases of Temperance.' The lady making the request said she could not assure me that the speech would not be a presentation of temperance from a third-party standpoint (as it afterward proved to be), whereupon I promptly declined to make the announcement, for the same reason that I should decline if asked to announce that J. Ellen Foster would lecture on 'Temperance from a Republican Standpoint'—viz.: the gross outrage that is committed against the Church of Christ by turning her pulpit, consecrated to the preaching of the Word, into a bulletin-board for the furtherance of political party ends."

Our correspondent did as we ourselves in a like case should do. The suppression of the evils of the liquor traffic—which to us means the suppression of the liquor traffic—is, in our opinion, a moral issue, and one

proper to be treated, in a proper way, in the pulpit. But as soon as a particular *method* of such suppression is made the watchword of a political party, that particular *method* must cease to be a topic of pulpit discussion. It follows as a corollary that *notices* of such discussion, when the discussion is to be directly in the interest of any political party, ought to be excluded from the pulpit.

2. "In the March number of the REVIEW, on page 280, under the heading "Correction," I see the theme "The Young Man Armed," taken from Judges iv : 20. Now, the theme may be a *suggestive* one, but that text would never have *suggested* that theme to me. In the text Sisera commands Jael to utter a falsehood : Should any one ask, 'Is there any man here ? that thou shalt say, No.' I *suppose* the last clause is *supposed* to suggest the theme. Now, is it not incongruous to preach on such a theme from that text ? or is it ? I am a young man, not quite a year out of the seminary, and I should like to know whether or not it is proper to take a few words of Scripture out of their setting and deduce a theme from them, as has been done in this case.

"Any light you can give on the subject I am sure will be appreciated by myself and other young ministers."

"The young man armed" is certainly a violent, it is even certainly an unwarrantable deduction of theme from the text indicated, which runs, in full : "Again he [fugitive Sisera] said unto her [Jael, supposed to be sincerely hospitable], Stand in the door of the tent ; and it shall be when any man doth come and enquire of thee, and say, Is there any man here ? that thou shalt say, No." It is always irreverent handling of Scripture to disregard or dismiss the true original sense of a passage, and then exercise one's ingenuity or indulge one's whim in making that passage serve as text to a sermon. The fault is flagrant, when, as in the case before us, between the text and the sermon the relation is such that it would be a hopeless conundrum to guess how the one could possibly have suggested the other. We are glad to see, as from the note of our young correspondent we freshly do,

that the pages of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW are read with discriminating eyes among its subscribers. Contributors (editors, too, it behooves the present writer to remind himself,) should be prompted to greater and greater vigilance in preparing the work from their hands which is here submitted to the assay of so many alert and intelligent minds.

We write this reply to our correspondent under circumstances that forbid our referring at the moment to the page itself which he names of the REVIEW. The sermon on the theme so improperly deduced may there have been shown to be in itself an excellent sermon. No degree, however, of excellence in the sermon could possibly, we should say, undo the impropriety committed in the deduction of *that* theme from *that* text.

3. "Will you explain and illustrate what expository preaching is ? What topical preaching is ? What textual preaching is ? What a Bible reading is ?

Expository preaching is explanatory preaching. The object of the expository preacher is to make clear the meaning of Scripture. Whatever goes beyond this, goes beyond expository preaching in the strict sense of that expression. As a matter of fact, however, what is called expository preaching is so called because exposition or explanation of Scripture constitutes its principal, merely, not its exclusive, aim. Incidentally, practical application, warning, exhortation accompanies. Usually, almost invariably, indeed, expository preaching is done on the basis of some considerably extended passage of Scripture as text. Often the exposition is continuous from Sunday to Sunday, undertaking to go over in course a whole book of the Bible. Archbishop Leighton's discourses on Peter's Epistles, Andrew Fuller's series of lectures on Genesis, F. W. Robertson's homilies on the Epistle to the Corinthians, William M. Taylor's sermons

on Elijah, are examples sufficiently various in kind of expository preaching.

Topical preaching is preaching on a topic. In topical preaching the text is employed simply to furnish a topic which is then treated in a manner nearly or quite independent of the text. Or even the topic may be decided upon first in order of time, without reference to any text whatever—some verse of Scripture being afterward chosen to serve as a kind of motto to the sermon.

Textual preaching is preaching in which the text itself suggests and dictates to the preacher the matter and the method of his sermon. Andrew Fuller's sermon on "All things work together for good to them that love God," is an excellent example of the textual sermon. The present writer is obliged, at the moment of this writing, to rely on his memory of years past; but he cannot be far wrong in indicating the course of that admirable sermon as follows: 1. "All things"; not some, but all. This idea of universality amplified and insisted upon. 2. "All things work." No stagnation, no quiescence; everywhere movement. The earth itself moves. The air is never still, nor the ocean. This idea also amplified and illustrated. 3. "All things work together." 4. "All things work together for good." 5. "All things work together for good to them that love God."

The foregoing hints from memory will perhaps serve to show in a capital instance what a textual sermon is. A recent volume, entitled "Notes of Sermons," by that noble and veteran preacher, Rev. J. M. Pendleton, D.D., contains admirable examples of textual sermons in outline. We give a single one: Text, Exodus xv: 11—"Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" Theme: No being like God. I. *Glorious in holiness.*

Two senses of "holiness"; one moral purity, another, the sum of all moral perfections, goodness, justice, veracity, etc. The latter the Scriptural sense. This holiness makes the *Divine glory*. II. *Fearful in praises.* God is to be feared while He is praised. III. *Doing wonders.* I. *In creation*; 2. *In providence*; in redemption. REMARKS.—I. Love this infinitely glorious God. II. Believe what He says. III. Do what He commands.

A "Bible reading," as, among a certain class of religionists, that expression is currently used, means an exercise in which the reader takes his Bible and, selecting passages of Scripture from here and there, connects them (often it is by very arbitrary associations) one with another in a running comment ostensibly explanatory of their meaning. It is, in fact, expository preaching of a loose, irregular sort. Such an exercise is a good thing, or a bad, according to the manner in which the reader does it. If he intelligently and logically holds to the true sense of God's Word, and if he possesses besides the requisite aptness to teach, his "Bible reading" may be very useful. Less cultivated minds may even be the more profited on account of what the logical will consider the skip-about style adopted by the "reader."

Our correspondent asks additionally which one of the above-mentioned methods in preaching yields the highest class of sermons. In reply, we have to say that to our own mind the ideally best sermon is one which is at once expository, textual, and topical. Take, for example, that sermon of Andrew Fuller's to which we have already referred. It is evidently textual, but it is also truly expository. The preacher might well enough have made it topical, too, by taking the pains to find some original form of expression that should include the whole meaning of the text

in a statement of topic. Such a course is always theoretically possible in the case of a sermon possessing true oratorical unity. Any minister who reads these remarks would find it an interesting and a profitable exercise to attempt the quest of some formula for Andrew Fuller's text that would cast it into the mould of a topic. The formula might, for example, begin: "The Harmonious Co-operation," etc. We should be glad to print a few admirable statements of topic from this text, furnished by enterprising volunteers among our readers.

VALEDICTORY.

With the current number, the pres-

ent department ceases to be a separate feature of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW. The conductor desires in taking farewell to express his cordial sense of the kindly spirit in which, to judge from his correspondence, his efforts to serve his Master in serving his brethren have so widely been regarded. Those who have sent in questions not yet answered will be able themselves to account for the writer's silence. His readers and he may meet again through the printed page in other relations; but in this particular relation he herewith bids them, one and all, a loyal and affectionate good-bye.

WILLIAM CLEAVER WILKINSON.

THE STUDY TABLE.

CONDUCTED BY JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

AFTER DEATH.

ONCE had an opportunity, such as rarely occurs even in the experience of a physician, of studying the relations of the soul-life and the sense-life. A person had been slowly dying. Days had passed since the fatal stroke was first announced. Almost the entire frame had passed under paralysis. The power of motion was gone, except in the extremity of the hands and an occasional ability to move the tongue in briefest articulation. No part of the body was sensitive to touch except a spot in the center of the palms. The most pungent odors elicited no response from the sense of smell, and the taste failed to recognize the sharpest condiments. The optic and auditory nerves had been for some time deadened, so that the person was not conscious of the brightest light or the loudest sounds. The heart beat and the lungs heaved mechanically, as an engine may throb for a little after the fire has died out. The post-mortem examination showed that the brain had been for a long time affected. But during this slow decadence of physical vitality there was no corresponding weakening of the mental powers; rather

a strengthening and quickening in inverse ratio to the impairment in nerve and sense. Memory, imagination and judgment were being hourly intensified. The sufferer, realizing that he was becoming more and more shut in from communication with the outer world, invented shrewder devices for using the avenues that might be left, at the last framing a system of alphabetical signals by means of which friends could communicate with him through the remaining sensitive spot in the palm of his hands. A distinguished physician, watching the case, remarked: "I am discovering more in this scene than I ever learned through philosophy." And when the tiny spot in the palms lost its sensitiveness, and the heart was still, no one could believe that the strong intelligence had ceased. But what became of it when released from the body? What becomes of the operator when he removes from his seat at the telegraphic instrument, because his instrument can no longer be worked? Here is a realm for speculation, or for faith.

A gloomy speculation this is, if unilluminated by faith. Does the soul remain conscious, only dungeoned in

solitary confinement, since it is without sight or sound or even the companionship of feeling the body? Or will new avenues of communication be opened for it into the new environment of the spiritual world? Does the failure of sense-knowledge preclude all knowledge?

This leads us to inquire what is a sense? It is not a positive power, but a latent condition until utilized by something external to the organ itself. You cannot, for instance, summarize sight by saying that it is the eye, optic nerve, and a soul back of them. These are only conditions of sight. Whether one sees depends as much upon something outside of one which evokes what we call sight. If, for instance, there were no light we would not see, though the optical apparatus were a million times more subtle than it is. Indeed, if there were no separate objects lying in the light, only a luminous expanse, there would be no vision. And further, if there were objects, but no colors brought out by the way in which the light divides itself as it falls upon the peculiar surfaces of these objects, we would see nothing. It takes the outward environment to evoke the visual sense, or even to make us aware of its existence. So with hearing. If the atmosphere did not exist, or were of different constitution, we would be in a world of silence. So of all the senses. We say we have five senses: for ought we know we may have fifty of these latent conditions ready to become senses, if only the proper something external to us shall evoke them. If I had been born somewhere out in the ether that overlays our atmosphere, or on some atmosphere-less planet, I should certainly not have some of my present senses, and might have others of which I now have not the remotest suspicion. The educating power is in the environment.

When, therefore, one dies we can only say that he has passed out of

this world, which, in its peculiar composition, evoked his present five senses. But what he shall know will depend upon his new surroundings.

Paul seems to have had some such thought when, speaking of the distinction between our present knowledge and the things that remain to become known, he used the fine figure (2 Corinthians v: 1-4): "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "Being clothed (with this building) we shall not be found naked." This "building," answering to the "tabernacle" of the flesh, can hardly be another body, however spiritual. The expression, "not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," cannot be understood to mean anything less than the heavenly world itself, our "Father's house." Is not this a superlatively grand thought: The whole spiritual world about the redeemed soul performing the part of the body! We shall need no medium of definite senses: the soul will be like one vast spherical sense opening in every direction, and played upon by everything, as now light plays upon the retina, and atmosphere upon the eardrum. The soul will not have to feel its way along trembling nerves to eye-gate or ear-gate, but shall be translucent with information, immediately "in touch" with the enveloping universe.

What did the men we call "inspired" see? and how did they see it? We do not know, except that God allowed a little of that spiritual world to break in upon them. Like Paul they could not tell whether they were "in the body or out of the body," for what they received came independently of their senses, a clairvoyance indeed. They could not tell us what they took in, because, with ideas limited to what we have learned through our meager senses, we could

not understand it any more than one born blind can conceive of the world of colors.

"What do you think of such attempts to picture the possibilities of the future state as 'Gates Ajar,' 'Little Pilgrim,' etc.?"

All such "attempts" to move the furniture of our nurseries and drawing-rooms into the "many mansions" of our Father's house seem extremely puerile, if not irreverent. The novelist is apt to claim a roving commission to run his plot through any part of creation he pleases, yet the shadow of heaven's gate might be supposed to awe even him. But if he essays to pass that portal he is the veriest intruder if he does not look about him with the loftiest imagination. Milton and Dante apologize for their "attempts," though they indulge only in sublimest thought visions. When St. John caught a glimpse of the reality, he used as his metaphors blazing suns and bursting worlds, the utmost splendor of nature, together with the choicest imagery collated from the writings of the prophets who had gone before him; and even then he left his picture vague with an incomprehensible glory. When Paul was lifted to the highest heavens, he said it not was "lawful"—literally possible—to give any detailed description. Our Lord Jesus, whose mind was aglow with the definite scenes of the home He had left, and to which He would conduct His saved ones, made no "attempt" to picture it, beyond that involved in the expressions, Paradise and "my Father's house." Whittier's sentiment is the prompting of genuine religious imagination—

"What space shall awe, what brightness
blind me ?

What thunder-roll of music stun ?
What vast processions sweep before me,
Of shapes unknown beneath the sun ?

"No fitting ear is mine to listen
As endless anthems rise and fall ;
No curious eye is mine to measure
The pearly gate and th' asper wall.

"Forgive my human words, O Father !

I go Thy larger truth to prove :
Thy mercy shall transcend my longing ;
I seek but love, and Thou art love !"

"I am intensely interested in the study of the BOOK OF JOB. Can you, or any of your readers, help me to formulate its THEME? What is its chief or central thought?"

Perhaps our correspondent lays too much stress upon the necessity of discovering a single theme in order to understand this wonderful book. It seems to have been written to expose several grand truths. It is a mountain-range of doctrine, glorious with a number of peaks, which are not only the summits of human thought, but are lost in the sky of revelation. Commentators differ as to which is the most significant, just as the inhabitants of the Catskills used to differ as to the altitude of the peaks about them, until Dr. Guyot's surveys showed that no one's guess had been correct.

The book is an "allegory of patience." It teaches, too, that "virtue is its own reward"; that fidelity will be rewarded, it may be here, and certainly hereafter; that the ancient notion which connected all definite suffering with definite sin was erroneous; that the human mind cannot comprehend the divine purposes, etc. To read Job intelligibly one must hold in mind this circle of themes.

The book is in two distinct parts, which may be compared to a night landscape and the starlit sky above it. Upon the ground we have Job in his suffering, and his human advisers—all in the dark. As the sky above, we have the scene in heaven, the council in which Satan is allowed to appear, and where the mystery of human suffering is partly revealed.

If the book is a dramatic composition instead of a narration of literal fact—as most advanced scholars agree—the scene in heaven may have been suggested by an ancient king's council chamber. The great angel-

ministers of state are there, giving in the report of their respective departments. Satan means the Accuser, and some regard him as a sort of prosecutor in the crimes department; as Christ is represented afterward as man's special Advocate or defender. This view would imply that the doctrine of the fall of Satan was not known, certainly not in popular thought, at the time the Book of Job was written. It reminds us of the similar conception of Zechariah, who had a vision which might be called that of the case of Jehovah *versus* Jerusalem, in which he saw "Joshua, the High Priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him." But in the Book of Job Satan seems to have been a lower official, a sort of detective in the crimes department, a huge "Inspector Javert," whose heart was in his work of exposing human shortcomings, and whose delight in securing a conviction was measured by the previous fair repute of his victim. To the Lord's query, "Whence comest thou?" he replies, "From my beat; 'from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.'" He believes in the pessimistic doctrine that "every man has his price," that integrity is only for gain. God, who made man, resents this, and is willing to allow Satan's malicious shrewdness to disprove his allegations by tempting Job; and that no injustice may be done the victim, He arranges the sequel in which Job is to be rewarded abundantly for his suffering.

But whether the book be an inspired dramatic composition, or an inspired report of actual facts, the lessons are the same. These are :

1. *Whatever evil falls upon good men is under the permission, not of a vengeful, but of a beneficent God.* Not even Satan can ultimately get the soul of one who would maintain his righteousness and trust. In this

respect Goethe's "Faust" is a lie, not merely an allegory. As in Peter's case, Christ says of all believers "Satan (the Accuser) shall sift you as wheat"—pass you through an examination such as no lawyer ever gave a witness; "but I (your Advocate) have prayed for you," etc.

2. Whenever God permits evil to fall upon a good man He *will turn it to good*. He shall be justified and compensated.

Note, incidentally as it appears in the plot of the book, but most prominently in the impression made, *two ways in which God looks upon a good man*.

First, as compared with God Himself, *every man is a sinner*. When God said to Job, "Gird up thy loins like a man, and I will inquire of thee," the man shrunk and shrivelled, like a worm in the sunshine, into a sense of moral nothingness, and cried: "Mine eye seeth Thee, wherfore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes."

But secondly, when Satan assumed to criticise Job, God *stood for the man*, declaring him to be upright. Whatever Job's faults, they were not such as He would permit Job's enemy to use against him. Our children are not perfect. We discipline them continually, notwithstanding they are trying to be filial and obedient. But let an enemy endeavor to blacken their characters, and how our righteous wrath will flash at him, and how closely we will enfold them! Thus God stands by every man who wants to be true, and would rebuke every spirit that would interfere, whether that spirit be the spirit of our own doubts, of the world that sneers at the defects of our piety, or this black-browed spirit of the Abyss. He rebukes us in our hearts as He communes with us through His loving but Holy Spirit; yet He justifies us before the universe.

Note another thing incidentally brought out: *God takes special de-*

light in all displays of moral heroism among men. When Satan came back, baffled in his first assault upon Job's integrity, the writer of the book represents God as glorying at the Accuser's discomfiture: "Hast thou (indeed) considered my servant Job? . . . and still he holdeth fast his integrity." Ah, if poor Job could only have heard that praise which ran thorough heaven, he would not have even groaned when he said: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." It would have been a huzza of his soul. But Job did not know that heaven was praising him. It was a part of his trial that he should not. We, however, through this book, are made to know this grand truth, that God applauds us, and never with empty hands, but with hands full of the riches of reward which He will bestow by-and-by. We do not hear that applause, yet the echo of it falls onto our consciences. As some deaf persons cannot catch distinct sounds, yet feel the vibration when a great shout is raised, or the crash of splendid music falls upon the ear, so God's "Well done," rings within our consciences. It tones our moral manhood, even when we do not think of what it means.

We cannot realize at this advanced stage of Christian revelation, what an effect such a book as Job must have had upon the ancient world when it was first known. The current opinion then was that God was incessantly punishing men's defects of character by blows upon their bodies or estates—a notion that made every outward misfortune crush a man's heart, instead of strengthen him to bear it; which made every man under trial to be despised by his fellows, just when he most needed their sympathy. We cannot wonder

that this great work, written in the grandest style the world had ever heard or read, and taking off that horrid weight from the heart of suffering humanity, came to be loved and cherished; that men would not let it be forgotten, but enshrined it in their sacred canon.

CURE FOR MINISTERS' BLUES.

YES, my bland-faced brother, you do get discouraged sometimes. This work of building up a spiritual house out of souls secularized by modern business and household worries, seems now and then as futile as the attempt to build a palace in the desert, using only its dry sands for walls. What is the remedy? Prayer? Alas, we are so saturated with the spirit of discouragement that we cannot spread our soul-wings. Take to the Bible promises? The Scriptures are, indeed, all electric with God's good words of cheer, but as the electricity oozes out of the telegraph wire when it lies on the ground without being properly insulated, so our dull, cloddy condition of soul dissipates the power of God's promises over us. A few of us clergymen were recently talking together of this matter, and found that we were accustomed to adopt a common remedy for such ministerial blues. It was to give one's self up for a few hours, or a day, to the humblest and hardest sort of pastoral work; to visit poverty in its worst forms and make the habitual shadows lift from some desponding face; to grapple with some moral waif; to tell the good news of a better life to some one who, but for our words, would have died without hope. We need Christ's presence for our encouragement in Christ's work, and we will always find the Master in these hardest places of the field; and He will return with us to our studies.

HOLIDAY SERVICE.

BY J. M. LUDLOW, D. D.

Christmas Thoughts.

Historic Hints.

CHRYSOSTOM called Christmas the root of the festival life of the Church.

The authorization of the day is ecclesiastical and rational, but not definitely Scriptural, the observance being neither commended nor followed by the New Testament writers.

It was first observed, so far as we have historical data, about the middle of the fourth century, A. D. 360, in Rome; 380 in Antioch, 430 in Alexandria; probably having originated a little before the earliest of these dates.

According to Schaff (III. 396) the Christian festival was a "transformation or regeneration of kindred heathen festivals," occurring during December, which "might be called unconscious prophecies of the Christmas feast," "the church fathers themselves confirming the symbolical reference of the feast of the birth of Christ, the Sun of righteousness, the Light of the world, to the birth festival of the unconquered sun, which on the twenty-fifth of December, after the Winter solstice breaks the growing power of darkness and begins anew his heroic career." The belief that Jesus was born December 25th naturally riveted the nail that fixed the feast.

St. Stephen's day is December 26. The ancient hymn ran thus.

"*Hic natus est Christus in terris,
Et hodie Stephanus nasceretur in caelis.*"

"Yesterday was Christ born upon earth, that to-day Stephen might be born in heaven."

As a mark of the growing concurrence of sentiment regarding the propriety of Christmas observance, recall the hostility of many of the early Protestant sects. Calvin had from the first advocated keeping the day, and secured its restoration in the calendar of Geneva. But the Scotch could not brook it. Macaulay (Vol. III, p. 199) describes a Christmas among the Covenanters. "Each band marched

to the nearest manse and sacked the cellar and larder of the minister (Episcopal). The priest of Baal was reviled and insulted, sometimes beaten, sometimes ducked." The ceremonial party, it need be added, kept the day with equal rancor against Non-conformists. The present happy festivities of all sects in Christian communities make the day a good mile-post of progress toward the realization of "peace on earth, good will toward men."

Homiletic Hints.

They shall call His name Emmanuel
—God with us.—Matt. i: 23.

There was a fabled diamond which was so clear that whoever knew the art could find in its crystal depths the answer to whatever question troubled him. Such is this word Emmanuel among words. There shine from it such thoughts as these:

I. God *is*. A demonstrated fact; not an argument.

II. God is *among men*.

III. God is *in man*. Jesus not merely a man, but *the* Son of man, *i. e.*, manhood typified; therefore His prayer: "As thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." "Ye are partakers of the divine nature."

Contrast this glory of human destiny with the fairest offspring of uninspired thought, Pantheism. Pantheism unites the divine and human by degrading the divine to the human; but the incarnation lifts man into the divine.

IV. Some doctrinal sequences of this:

(a) The divine-human affords a basis for *justification*. How can guilt attach to that which has become "hid" in God?

(b) The divine-human provides a force for *sanctification*; the Holy Spirit in us.

(c) The divine-human necessitates immortal life.

The life was the light of men.—John i: 4.

Common science is familiar with the idea of light being associated with the generation of life; but a deeper science is reversing the view, and making life the fountain of light.

The life of Christ pours forth such light-beams as these:

I. The light of the *love of God*, unknown and longed for, now clearly revealed.

II. The light of *human duty*. In Him the "law drawn out in living characters."

III. The light of *human forgiveness*; Christ the Lamb of God.

IV. The light of *life everlasting*; Christ risen the first fruits of humanity.

Practical summary: Not see and live, but live and see; or life in Christ the source of religious knowledge.

New Year Thoughts.

The End of the Year.

Then shall the end come.—Matt. xxiv: 16.

The last day of a year suggests:

1. The *great last day*.

2. *Every* day is the last day for something.

Each day's *responsibility* settled for itself. The works that are begun and ended between a morning and evening.

Any day may end our larger projects. Count up our intermitted works that may never be resumed.

Nothing is Ever Lost.

God requireth that which is past.—Eccles. iii: 15.

The meaning of a sentence cannot be gathered into its last word; the last word takes significance from what has gone before. So with life. Dying utterances and even thoughts may not be taken into account. Every dying man *would* be a saint. A great Southern statesman said to those who asked if some one should pray for him, as his pulse was failing: "No; my life must be my prayer. This solemn moment is not so significant as the solemn years that are gone. Let them stand."

EDITORIAL SECTION.

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

Christian Culture.

The Minuteness of Providence.

But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.—Matt. x: 30.

THE Epicureans imagined a God who was passively indifferent to men, and the Aristotelians taught that God condescends only to communicate with celestial beings. Christ declares the intimate and particular regard of His Father for all His creatures.

The particularity of Divine care may be shown,

I. From the thought revealed in the minutest things of His creation. The microscope reveals it. He fashions the filament of the tiniest leaf and the organs of the evanescent animalcule with the same elaborate wisdom that He shows in fashioning and governing planets. All the air and

water filled with happy creatures. It were mockery to say that God cares for such in their infinitesimal want, and not for man, created in His own image.

II. From the express teachings of Revelation. In definite statements and in the particular history of individuals recorded in the Old and New Testaments. The dependence of the creature upon the Creator enforces it. *e. g.*, Joseph, Moses, etc.

III. We may sin against the doctrine of a particular providence by repining over the past, or despairing in view of present trials, or imputing our sins to God, or by fatalism—relying implicitly on second causes.

IV. We shall avoid this sin by establishing our minds on the doctrine and by looking to God in every event.

An Earthly Mind.

Who mind earthly things.—Phil. iii : 19.

THE portrait of all the unregenerate, refined and coarse, virtuous and vicious alike. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. Earthly things, and not heavenly, fill their minds and hearts. God and Mammon are the two masters that monopolize the race.

I. Man was not made for earth. His residence here a mere episode in his eternal history. Yet he pursues it as if it were the be-all and end-all. "Lovers of pleasure." Men whose God is their appetite. Slaves of gold, of "society," etc. Aims all limited by the horizon of earth.

II. To mind earthly things as paramount. (a) Degrading to an immortal soul. (b) Involves immense loss. He that saveth his life (for earth) shall lose it for higher things. Gifts and pleasures of piety unknown to him. (c) It is to live in fearful condemnation. (d) Ends in eternal destruction. "To be carnally minded is death."

The Temple of the Spiritual Church.

To the ancients the temple was the noblest and most sacred of all buildings. The entire body of redeemed, spiritualized, sanctified believers is God's eternal temple, now in process of erection.

1. A spiritual building: the masterpiece of all structures.

2. The Architect Divine. "Its Builder and Maker is God." No part of it planned by man. It is for His glory.

3. None the less is it *real*, thoroughly *human*. "Ye as lively (living) stones are built up," etc. Its *foundation* Christ, "God manifest in the flesh." It is now being reared on earth, in the midst of human society.

4. It is meant to display the divine perfections, be the habitation of the divine presence, and stand forever in the light of Heaven, when earth and

time shall be no more, a house of eternal praise.

A Fool's Verdict.

The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.—Ps. xiv : 1.

I. Not the verdict that results from evidence examined, but from proof ignored and eyes shut.

II. Not the verdict of the judgment or conscience, but of a deceitful heart and proud self-will.

III. Not a verdict that he believes, but that he wishes to believe, and so keeps saying it in his restless heart.

IV. Not a verdict that he will stand by in death, nor one that will stand by him in the judgment.

Revival Service.**A Sleeping Church a Comfort to the Ungodly.**

Thou art a comfort unto them.—Ezek. xvi : 54.

THE great mass of the worldly are careless and secure in their unbelief. Due largely to the torpor of the Church.

I. The ungodly find comfort in the conformity of Christian life and standards of conduct with their own.

II. The unconcern of Christians for them assures them that there is no real peril or need.

III. They delay seeking God till a great revival comes on whose flood-tide they hope to be floated into the kingdom. They fold their arms and say, "A little more sleep." Christians when *they* awake will awaken us.

IV. A sleeping church is responsible for this.

New Converts Exhorted.

And he exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord.—Acts xi : 23.

THE entrance of new disciples into the Church is an occasion of joy, and also of solicitude. They are babes, recruits, apprentices in labor, novices. Christian love will lead to our watching over and nurturing them. The Church in Jerusalem deputed Barnabas to visit and strengthen the large numbers of new brethren in Antioch.

I. They had "turned" (v. 21) unto the Lord. Now they were exhorted to "cleave" unto Him, which implies:

(a) The clinging of steadfast trust amidst the temptations to doubt.

(b) Of unshaken loyalty amidst the temptations to follow the multitude.

(c) The adhering to the truth as it is in Him amidst the multitude of "opinions," ordinances of men.

(d) The adhering to His Church, in her ordinances, services, work and discipline.

II. This is to be done "with full purpose of heart," *i. e.*, not merely while "happy," nor while the revival lasts, nor while all goes smoothly; but always, altogether and everywhere. In evil report and good report, in peace and in persecution—as a fixed principle, not according to varying feelings.

III. This steadfastness alone will prove the reality of conversion, satisfy the skeptical observer—vindicate the truth and increase the glory of the Lord that bought them.

A Solemn Exhortation.

To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.—Heb. iv : 7.

By several lines of argument based upon the typical, preparatory and temporary character of the Mosaic or

Levitical dispensation, the author seeks to fortify the Hebrew Christians against the insidious efforts of Judaizing teachers, who sought to lead them away from the cross of Jesus. They were in imminent danger of apostatizing. The Epistle was mainly written to confirm their wavering faith—to prevent their relapse into legalism and ritualism.

I. THE VOICE:

1. Of Creator, Preserver, Judge, Redeemer.

2. Uttered from the cross, in the Word, in providences, in adversity, etc.

3. It speaks in righteousness and love, and is full of gentleness and entreaty.

II. THE DUTY:

1. To hearken with sincere purpose of obedience.

2. This hearkening is optional, depending on individual choice.

3. Important to the soul's welfare: "Hear, and your soul shall live."

4. Should be attended to without delay—*to-day*.

III. THE DANGER:

1. Not to hear is to harden the heart, *i. e.*, willful disregard hardens.

2. Bitter consequences follow.

3. Ossification of the heart means "death." R.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

Our Corrupted Suffrage.

What will ye give me? . . . And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver.—Matt. xxvi : 15.

No political campaign probably in the history of our country has been accompanied by more and greater charges and counter charges on the part of politicians with attempts to corrupt and purchase the suffrage than the Presidential campaign just passed. If one-tenth of these charges have been true, they show a serious menace to the stability of the government. For when the citizens of a popular government are willing to barter their most powerful and

sacred political trust for a money consideration, it indicates a rottenness at the base of the social structure which augurs ill for the perpetuity of free institutions.

That these charges of attempted corruption of the suffrage were supplemented on election day at hundreds of thousands of polling-places throughout the country by the most flagrant and unblushing buying and selling of votes, can be proven by the testimony of honest men everywhere, and still further by the open boasts of the bribers themselves.

A cry should go up from every American pulpit against this infamy.

The records clearly show that no one political party is alone guilty of this crime against the people. The following extracts from a letter, said to have been written by Col. W. W. Dudley, Treasurer of the National Republican Committee, to the county leaders of that party in the hotly contested State of Indiana—whether true or not—is an illustration of the systematic manner with which this crime of corrupting the suffrage is carried on by the leaders of our politics:

"HEADQUARTERS REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, 91 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, Oct. 24, 1888. }
 "DEAR SIR: I hope you have kept copies of the lists sent me. Such information is very valuable and can be used to great advantage. It has enabled me to demonstrate to friends here that with proper financial assistance Indiana is surely Republican for Governor and President, and has resulted, as I hoped it would, in securing for Indiana the aid necessary. Your Committee will certainly receive from Chairman Huston the financial assistance necessary to hold our floaters and doubtful voters and gain enough of the other kind to give Harrison and Morton 10,000 plurality. . . . Write each of our precinct correspondents, first, to find out who has Democratic boodle and steer the Democratic workers to them and make them pay big prices for their own men; second, scan the election officers closely, and make sure to have no men on the Board whose loyalty to us is even questionable, and insist on Republicans watching every movement of the Democratic election officers; third, see that our workers know every Republican voter entitled to vote, and see that they do vote; fourth, divide the floaters into blocks of five and put a trusted man with necessary funds in charge of those five and make him responsible that none gets away and that all vote our ticket. . . ."

Here is a similar charge made by the Republicans of Indiana against the Democrats. It is from the *Indianapolis Journal*:

"In Morgan County the Chairman of the Democratic Committee issued the following:

"Strictly Confidential.

"DEAR SIR: I desire exact information in regard to your district. Morgan County is remarkably close, but by proper organization and vigorous work it can be redeemed from the clutches of ring rule and the blight of excessive taxation. Much depends on your efforts. You should select men to assist you, but only such as you can trust should be chosen.

"Therefore, I request you to make an exact list of all the voters in your precinct for your own use and report to me the exact number of each on the inclosed slip. Please report to me not later than Monday, September 10, and every two weeks thereafter. Make the doubtful list as small as possible, and mark every one who has to have money as a 'float.' Those who have to be bought are not 'doubtful,' but are 'floats.' Look closely after every one. Let no one escape. Your prompt action in this matter will aid materially in the efficiency of our efforts. Respectfully,

"N. A. WHITTAKER, Chairman.
 "MARTINSVILLE, IND., Sept. 7, 1888."

The *New York Tribune*, of Nov. 4, printed the following, showing an alleged detailed plan to purchase voters on the part of the Democrats in this city without being detected:

"One of Higgins' chief endeavors since coming here has been to invent some method of buying votes without directly using money. He is unable to find men to take the risk of being detected for bribery and sent to the penitentiary. He has prepared a coupon book about three inches long by two and a half in breadth, which he is proposing to use on Election Day. The leaves of this book are perforated in the middle. He has adopted letters to stand for money, as follows:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
\$1	\$2	\$3	\$4	\$5	\$6	\$7	\$8	\$9	\$10

"Thus A stands for \$1 and E for \$5. Any letter doubled, as E E, would mean double the amount, E E standing for \$10. Higgins' idea is to arm each one of his buyers of votes with one of these books. Each voter is to be numbered. Say that a voter is numbered 35. The number 35 is put on each end of the leaf of the book that is perforated through the middle. This book has marked upon it either E or E E, or whatever the amount paid for the vote will be. Then the leaf is torn in two, half of it is given to the voter and the stub retained. The man receiving half of the torn leaf is to present this at some place according to agreement, where it is to be matched with the other half and he given his pay for his vote."

Similar instances of specific charges made by both parties applying to particular persons and localities, can be found by the score in the files of any of the daily papers immediately preceding election. But enough has been quoted to show that the purchase of votes and the marshalling of the "floaters" has become as important a part of the machinery for carrying an election as the marshalling of the intellectual paraphernalia of the parties into platforms for public discussion.

Laying aside the danger of such base methods, the most ignoble conclusion arrived at by the intelligent and conscientious citizen is, that the army of "floaters," marshalled by the "financial assistance" of the "boodlers," holds the balance of power in every election. No matter how tremendous or far-reaching the significance of the moral or financial issue involved, no matter how great the strain of honest men to convince the people of the righteousness of their chosen position, the "boodler," with his money-bag standing in the center of the scales, can tip the beam at his own sweet will.

O for a law, backed by public conscience and the resistless will of the people, disfranchising forever the corrupt buyer of a vote as well as the corrupted seller!

INDEX TO VOL. XVI.

July to December, 1888.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
General Index.....	571	Index to Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.....	575
General Reference.....	571	Index to Living Issues for Pulpit Treatment.....	575
Index of Authors.....	571	Index to Prayer-Meeting Service.....	575
Index of Subjects.....	572	Index to Preachers Exchanging Views.....	575
Index of Minor Articles.....	573	Index to Study Table.....	575
Index to Editorial Notes.....	574	Textual Index.....	576
Index to European Department.....	574		
Index to Hints at the Meaning of Texts.....	574		

GENERAL REFERENCE.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Editorial Notes.....	98; 194; 386	Prayer-Meeting Service.....	154; 254; 353; 441; 541
European Department.....	61; 158; 261; 362; 445; 545	Preachers Exchanging Views.....	91; 165; 281; 379; 475
Exegetical and Expository Section.....	39; 259; 358	Sermonic.....	34; 130; 231; 329; 420; 520
Hints at the Meaning of Texts.....	93; 188; 286; 382; 478; 567	Study Table.....	79; 276; 374; 464; 561
Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.....	75; 171; 272; 370; 458; 558	Suggestive Themes.....	56; 154; 254; 353; 441; 540
Living Issues for Pulpit Treatment.....	96; 193; 289; 385; 481; 569	Themes and Texts of Recent Sermons.....	56; 153; 253; 352; 440; 540

INDEX OF AUTHORS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Abbott, Lyman, D.D., The Christian Church and Our Workingmen.....	411	Davies, Prof. W. W., Ph.D., Exegesis of Job xix : 25-27.....	358
Allen, Rev. James C., Full Assurance.....	152	Foss, Bishop Cyrus D., D.D., Certainties in Religion.....	42
Andrews, Bishop E. G., Serving the Lord Christ.....	149	Funk, I. K., D.D., The Daily Newspaper we Need, 84; Spiritual Truths Self-Verified.....	525
Armstrong, Geo. D., The Wheat and Tares Growing Together.....	51	Gallagher, H. M., D.D., The Shipwrecked Apostle.....	250
Barnes, Rev. Chas. R., Two Better Than One.....	536	Greene, Rev. Geo. F., Strong Convictions in Religion, 151; The Pulpit and the Labor Question.....	183
Bascom, John, D.D., Woman as a Factor in American Politics, 213; The Public School System and the Ministry.....	304	Griffis, Wm. Elliott, D.D., Japanese Preaching.....	20
Bersier, Eugene, D.D., Jesus Christ Refusing to Divide an Inheritance.....	34	Hall, Chas. Cuthbert, D.D., The Problem of Personal Power in Social Life.....	137
Braisin, Edward, D.D., Christ's Continuing Life.....	347	Heard, J. B., D.D., Preaching, Not Sermonizing. An Old-World Contrast.....	117
Behrends, A. J. F., D.D., Christian Evidences: Miracles, 408; Theology in Fiction.....	520	Herrick, S. E., D.D., The Trial of Christ's Personal Virtue.....	424
Boyd, Rev. Melville, Burden-Bearing.....	430	Hill, Thomas, D.D., Five Fallacies of Modern Thought, 46; A National Lesson.....	344
Brewster, Rev. Chauncey B., The King's Appeal.....	236	Hunt, A. S., D.D., Who is God and What is He?.....	231
Bristol, Frank W., D.D., The Stone and the Image.....	49	Hunt, Prof. T. W., Ph.D., Sacred Discourse.....	201
Broadus, J. A., D.D., The Christian Doctrine of the Resurrection.....	246	Johnson, Herrick, D.D., Apologetics in the Pulpit, 291; The Influence of the Church of God.....	420
Colby, Henry F., D.D., The Temptations that Beset Intellectual Culture in the Ministry.....	8	Judson, Edward, D.D., The Motive of Love.....	54
Conant, W. C., The Incubus of the Kingdom.....	473	Kelly, Thomas, D.D., Christian Seamen.....	145
Croll, Rev. P. C., Zaccheus a Type of the Christ-Seeker.....	357	Kinnard, J. S., D.D., A Midsummer Sermon, 252; Loyalty and Liberty.....	539
Crosby, Howard, D.D., Exposition of Matt. xxv : 31-46; Should Political Questions be Discussed in the Pulpit?.....	112		

PAGE	PAGE		
Klein, Rev. L. M., The Good Samaritan	537	Schaff, Philip, D.D., John Chrysostom	402; 489
Lawson, Albert G., D.D., The Love of the Spirit	217	Sherwood, J. M., D.D., The Prayer Meeting Service	57, 154, 254, 353, 441, 541
Ludlow, James M., D.D., The Study Table, 79; 276; 374; 464; 561; Holiday Service	566	Sprecher, Samuel P., D.D., Le Conte on Evolution and Materialism	495
McNulty, J. M., D.D., Why Callest thou Me Good?	259	Storrs, R. S., D.D., The Spirit of Life in Christ, 142; Looking at the Unseen	341
Meath, The Lord Bishop of, (Dr. Reichel) The Redemption of the Body	433	Stuckenberg, J. H. W., D.D., The European Department	63; 158; 261; 362; 445; 545
Moore, Rev. A. W., The Belief of Thomas Murray, Prof. J. O., D.D., The Study of John Howe, 26; The Study of Wordsworth's Poetry, 297; The Study of Science by Ministers	483	Stuart, Rev. Chas. M., Some Hymn Myths	178
Nelson, Rev. T. A., The Christian Not His Own	439	Stryker, Peter, D.D., The Soul's Cry	329
Ormiston, Wm., D.D., Our Country: A Delightsome Land	335	Swan, Rev. Jas. S., Quid Pro Quo	351
Payne, C. H., D.D., The Pre-eminence of Christ	534	Temple, Rev. L. D., The Cleansing Power of Truth	438
Pentecost, Geo. F., D.D., Evangelistic Methods	182	Thanksgiving Service	362
Pierson, A. T., D.D., Clusters of Gems, 32; 127; 228; 327; 417; 517; The Weekly Prayer-Meeting	88	Thomas, J. B., D.D., Christian Evidences: How Affected by Recent Criticism	195
Pogue, Rev. Jas. Wood, Fulfilling the Law of Christ	349	Thrall, Rev. W. G., The Supremacy of Love	436
Randall, Rev. Wm. H., God's Host	241	Tiffany, O. H., D.D., Pentecostal Gifts	539
Read, Geo. D.D., Evangelistic Methods	180	Twitchell, J. E., D.D., A Waking Church	470
Riggs, H. C., D.D., Definiteness of Belief	53	Van Dyke, Henry J., D.D., Apologetics in the Pulpit	3
Riggs, Rev. James F., Note-Books and Homiletical Preparation	16	Warfield, Prof. B. B., D.D., Christian Evidences: How Affected by Recent Criticism	107
Robinson, Chas. S., D.D., Evolution as a Theory of Creation, 23; Was Adam Created by Process of Evolution? 323; The Lesson of a Song	248	Warren, Bishop H. W., Bearing One Another's Burdens	248
Robinson, J. E., Ownership and Service	483	Wells, Rev. Newell Woolsey, Hospitality as an Evangelizing Agency	499
Round, W. M. F., Sec., On the Care of the Body	309	Wilkinson, Prof. W. C., D.D., Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, 75; 171; 272; 370; 458; 558; Goethe's Faust, 314; John Morley as Critic of Voltaire	506
		Wolf, Prof. E. J., D.D., "Born of Water,"	60
		Wortman, Denis, D.D., The Teaching of the Withered Fig-Tree	130
		Wylie, Rev. A. McElroy, The Requirements of the Ministry of To-Day	222

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

PAGE.	PAGE.		
Apologetics in the Pulpit: Are They not more Hurtful than Useful? No. II., Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D., 3; No. III., Prof. Herrick Johnson, D.D.	291	Clusters of Gems, A. T. Pierson, D.D., 32; 127; 228; 327; 417; 517	
Bearing One Another's Burdens, Bishop H. W. Warren	244	Criticisms on Some of the Ablest Representative Preachers of the Day, by an Eminent Professor of Homiletics, No. VIII, Rev. John A. Broadus, D.D., 99; 207; No. IX, Alexander MacLaren, D.D.	387
Belief, Definiteness of, H. C. Riggs, D.D.	53	Daily Newspaper, The, We Need, I. K. Funk, D.D.	84
Body, On the Care of the, Sec. W. M. F. Round	309	Evolution as a Theory of Creation, Chas. S. Robinson, D.D.	127
Broadus, John A., D.D., Criticisms on, as a Preacher	99; 207	Evolution, Was Adam Created by Process of? Chas. S. Robinson, D.D.	323
Certainties in Religion, Bishop Foss	42	God, Who and What is He? A. S. Hunt, D.D.	231
Christ, Fulfilling the Law of, Rev. Jas. Wood Pogue	349	God's Host, Rev. Wm. H. Randall	241
Christ's Continuing Life, Edward Brailsford, D.D.	347	Goethe's Faust, W. C. Wilkinson, D.D.	314
Christ's Personal Virtue, Trial of, S. E. Herrick, D.D.	424	Howe, John, The Study of, J. O. Murray, D.D.	26
Christ, The Pre-eminence of, C. H. Payne, D.D.	534	Hospitality as an Evangelizing Agency, Rev. Newell Woolsey Wells	499
Christian Church, The, and Our Workingsmen, Lyman Abbott, D.D.	411	Japanese Preachers, Wm. Elliott Griffis, D.D.	20
Christian, The, Not His Own, Rev. T. A. Nelson	439	Jesus Christ Refusing to Divide an Inheritance, Eugene Bersier, D.D.	34
Christian Evidences, How Affected by Recent Criticisms: No. III, Benj. B. Warfield, D.D., 107; No. IV, J. B. Thomas, D.D., 195; No. V, A. J. F. Behrends, D.D.	408	King's Appeal, The, Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster	236
Church of God, The Influence of the, Herrick Johnson, D.D.	420	Kingdom, The Incubus of, W. C. Conant	475
Church, A Waking, J. E. Twitchell, D.D.	470	Le Conte on Evolution and Materialism	495
Chrysostom, John, Philip Schaff, D.D.	402; 489		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Looking at the Unseen, R. S. Storrs, D.D.	341	Redemption of the Body, The, Lord	
Love, The Motive of, Edward Judson, D.D.	54	Bishop of Meath.....	433
Love, The Supremacy of, Rev. W. G. Thrall.....	436	Resurrection, The Christian Doctrines	
Loyalty and Liberty.....	539	of, J. A. Broadus, D.D.....	246
Maclaren, Alexander, D.D., Estimate of		Sacred Discourse, Prof. T. W. Hunt, Ph.D.	
as a Preacher.....	387	Shipwrecked Apostle, The, H. M. Gallaher, D.D.....	250
Midsummer Sermon, J. S. Kinnard, D.D.	252	Spirit, The Love of the, Albert G. Lawson.....	219
Ministry, The, of To-day, The Requirements of, Rev. A. McElroy Wylie.....	222	Spiritual Truths Self-Verified, I. K. Funk, D.D.....	525
Ministry, The, The Temptations that beset Intellectual Culture, Henry F. Colby, D.D.....	8	Song, The Lesson of a, Chas. S. Robinson, D.D.....	248
Modern Thought, Fallacies of, Thomas Hill, D.D.....	46	Soul's Cry, The, Peter Stryker, D.D.....	329
Morley, John, as Critic of Voltaire, Art. on, W. C. Wilkinson, D.D.....	506	Stone, The, and the Image.....	49
National Lesson, A. Thos. Hill, D.D.....	349	Thanksgiving Service.....	362
Notebooks and Homiletical Preparation, Rev. Jas. F. Riggs.....	16	Theology in Fiction, A. J. F. Behrends, D.D.....	520
Ownership and Service.....	438	Truth, The Cleansing Power of.....	438
Our Country: Thanksgiving Sermon, Wm. Ormiston, D.D.....	335	Two Better than One, Rev. Charles R. Barnes.....	536
Pentecostal Gifts.....	539	Wheat, The, and the Tares Growing Together, G. D. Armstrong, D.D.....	51
Political Questions and the Pulpit, Howard Crosby, D.D.....	112	Why Callest Thou Me Good? J. M. McNulty, D.D.....	259
Prayer-Meeting, The Weekly, A. T. Pierson.....	88	Woman as a Factor in American Politics, John Bascom, D.D.....	212
Public School System and the Ministry, John Bascom, D.D.....	304	Wordsworth's Poetry, The Study of, J. O. Murray, D.D.....	207
Physician, The Good, Prof. L. M. Klein.....	557	Zaccheus a Type of the Christian Seeker, Rev. P. C. Croll.....	351
Preaching, not Sermonizing, J. B. Heard, D.D.....	117		

INDEX OF MINOR ARTICLES.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Ability Developed by Responsibility.....	382	Latent Energy Aroused.....	95
Alarm, An.....	383	Life, How to be Successful in.....	58
Athletics, Christian.....	154	Life, Making the Most of.....	356
Backslider, The, Encouraged to Return.	59	Life, A Right Start in.....	357
Barnabas.....	94	Life, The Ideal Realized.....	385
Behold Your Calling.....	478	Life, The, Worth Living.....	288
Church, The, Christ's Body.....	93	Life or Death—Which?.....	443
Christ, Taking at His Word.....	257	Meetness for the Inheritance.....	384
Christmas Thoughts.....	543	National Evils, The Giants of.....	444
City Life, The Opportunities of.....	384	New Ark of the Covenant, The.....	188
Communion Service.....	192, 384	Nothing but Leaves.....	355
Constellations, The Eternal.....	479	Over-Blessing, The.....	190
Dedication Service.....	192	Persuasives to a Christian Life.....	94
Diversity of Operations, but one Spirit.....	479	Prayer, Faults in.....	157
Doves flying to their Windows.....	480	Repentance, Persuasives to Immediate.	57
Evangelistic Methods.....	180, 182	Retrospect of the Closing Year.....	544
Excuses, Inexcusable.....	442	Rulers, The Duty of Praying for.....	57
False Prophets, Beware of.....	156	Saviour, The, Our Song.....	286
Faithful Until Death.....	258	Sin, Will God Punish?.....	155
Fair Lilies Growing in a Foul Pool.....	478	Sorrows of Old Age Without Religion.....	541
Faithfulness in Little Things.....	542	Startling Question, A.....	287
Follow Me.....	256	Standing the Strain.....	188
Foreordained Service.....	189	Slothful, The Field of the.....	441
Future, The, Will Set Things Right.....	95	Song, The, At the Well.....	287
Gathered One by One.....	191	Summer, The Close of.....	288
God's Meeting Obdurate Sinners.....	190	Strong Pillars and Lily Work.....	188
God, Reasons for Praising.....	354	Stronger than the Strong.....	382
Heaven, How to Attain.....	254	Tears Amidst a Triumph.....	480
Heaven, A Whole Family in.....	480	Transfiguration, The.....	255
How I may Know I Am a Christian.....	353	Value, The, of an Evanescent Life.....	191
Jesus, The Silence of.....	287	Virtue, A Crowned.....	286
Joy, Restoration of.....	383	Wearing God.....	189
Labor Question and the Pulpit.....	183	Youth, Bearing the Yoke in.....	384

EDITORIAL NOTES.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
"English as She is Preached".....	98	Missionary Review of the World.....	194
Heart Talks to Heart.....	194	Prof. W. C. Wilkinson.....	386
Is the Palpit Thought of Narrow Range?.....	98	The Disciples Went to School.....	98
Luther Didn't Speak English.....	194	"The Study Table".....	194

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

	PAGE.		PAGE.
An Experiment and its Lessons.....	351	Nationalism in Religion.....	269
A Significant Plea for Religion.....	69	Originality in the Pulpit.....	451
Books and Persons the Predominant Factors in Moulding Life.....	548	Problems in England.....	365
Buckle's Mistake.....	162	Professor E. Riehm, D.D.....	456
Christianity and Modern Thought.....	67	Proof of God's Existence.....	160
Christian Teaching which Trains.....	164	Protestant and Catholic Statistics of Germany.....	362
Classification of Religious Tendencies.....	449	Self-Culture and Ministerial Activity.....	445
Current Thought.....	63, 261	Sermons of Vulgar Rationalism.....	162
Decay of Ethical Principles.....	454	Tendencies and Needs.....	71
Doubters.....	162	Tholuck's Homiletical Principles.....	358
English Orthodoxy.....	65	Thoughts for the Times.....	158
Emperor William II.....	264	The Ritschl School.....	163
Freshness in the Pulpit.....	166	The Resurrection of Jesus.....	161
Growth of Christian Organizations.....	267	Unity in Diversity.....	72
Hints to Preachers.....	452	With the Thinkers.....	447
Inner Missions.....	266		

HINTS ON THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Ability Developed by Responsibility.....	382	Negative and Obstructive Powers in the Church.....	287
A Fool's Verdict.....	568	New Converts Exhorted.....	568
An Alarm.....	383	Over-Blessing, The.....	190
An Earthly Mind.....	567	Personal Power in Social Life.....	94
Ark of the Covenant, The New.....	188	Persuasives to a Christian Life.....	94
Barnabas.....	94	Praiseful Seeker, The.....	191
Behold Your Calling.....	478	Precious Life, A, cut Short.....	191
Christ's Body, The Church.....	93	Providence, The Minuteness of.....	567
Church Fellowship.....	384	Restoration of Joy.....	383
City Life, The Opportunities of.....	384	Royal Preacher's Verdict on Life.....	96
Communion Service.....	288	Saviour, The, Our Song.....	286
Dedication Service, A.....	192	Secular and Religious Duties Not in Con- flict.....	94
Destruction of the Impenitent.....	480	Sleeping Church a Comfort to the Un- godly.....	568
Diversity of Operations, etc.....	479	Sermon to Young Men.....	384
Doves Flying to their Windows.....	480	Solemn Exhortation, A.....	569
Eternal Constellations, The.....	479	Song, The, at the Well.....	287
Evanescence Life, The Value of.....	190	Standing the Strain.....	188
Faith, Contending for the Primitive.....	382	Startling Question, A.....	287
Family, A Whole, in Heaven.....	480	Stronger, The, than the Strong.....	382
Foreordained Service.....	189	Strong Pillars and Lily-Work.....	188
Gathered One by One.....	191	Summer, The Close of.....	288
God's Meeting with the Obdurate Sinner.....	190	Tears Amidst a Triumph.....	480
Ideal Life, The, Realized.....	383	Temple, The, of the Spiritual Church.....	568
Jesus, The Silence of.....	287	The Future will Set things Right.....	95
Latent Energy Aroused.....	95	Virtue, A Crowned.....	286
Life, The, Most Worth Living.....	288	Wearying God.....	189
Lilies growing in a Foul Pool.....	478		
Meekness for the Inheritance.....	384		

HOLIDAY SERVICE.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
CHRISTMAS.		Nothing is ever Lost.....	567
Historic Hints.....	566	THANKSGIVING SERVICE.	
Homiletic Hints.....	566	Thanksgiving Sermon.....	335
NEW YEAR.		Full Outline Sermon.....	344
The End of the Year.....	567	Themes and Suggestions.....	362

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

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

	PAGE.		PAGE.
An Open Letter relating to Candidating.....	461	Rules for Treating Texts.....	463
Chaste Conversation on the Pastor's Part Coupled with Fear.....	557	Second Open Letter.....	55
Ought a Minister to have a Hobby?.....	276	Self-Criticising as a Help to Inventing.....	173
Pastoral Visiting—How to do it.....	273	Sciolism in the Pulpit.....	372
Plan of a Sermon Criticised.....	458	Singing at the Prayer-Meeting.....	371
Questions Answered.....177, 276, 373, 463, 558		Third Open Letter.....	171
Rules for Choosing Subjects.....	558	What Practical Steps may a Minister Take to secure his own Settlement....	175
Rules for Preaching.....	78	What is Expository Preaching, and Topi- cal and Textual?.....	569

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Burial Reform.....	386	Secret Ballot, A.....	194
Drink Habit, The, and Business.....	482	Shall the Indian become a Citizen?.....	482
Free Rum on the Congo.....	385	Suffrage, Our Corrupted.....	367
Gambling, Results of the Licensing of.....	385	Sunday Newspapers.....	385
How far is the Saloon Responsible for our Criminals.....	289	Rum Traffic, The, and Christian Mis- sions.....	385
Immigration Question, The.....	96	Tenement House Evil, The.....	193
Practical Co-operation.....	97	Wheat Corner, The Great.....	481

PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

CONDUCTED BY J. M. SHERWOOD, D.D.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Backslider, The, Encouraged to Return.....	59	Life or Death—Which?.....	443
Beware of False Prophets.....	156	Life, A Right Start in.....	357
Christian Athletics.....	154	Life, How to be Successful in.....	58
Christmas Thoughts.....	543	Nothing but Leaves.....	35
Duty, The, of Praying for Rulers.....	57	Prayer, Faults in.....	157
Faithful Until Death.....	258	Reasons for Praising God.....	354
Faithfulness in Little Things.....	542	Repentance, Persuasives to Immediate.....	57
Follow Me.....	256	Retrospect of the Closing Year.....	544
Giants, The, of National Evils.....	444	Slothful, The Field of the.....	441
Heaven, How to Attain.....	254	Sorrows of Old Age without Religion.....	541
How I May Know I am Christian.....	353	Taking Christ at His Word.....	257
Inexcusable Excuses.....	443	Transfiguration, The.....	255
Life, Making the Most of.....	356	Will God Punish Sin?.....	155

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Apologetics in the Pulpit.....	186	First Adam, The.....	91
An Inquiry.....	95	Get a Typewriter.....	283
Book-Mark.....	92	God's Host.....	382
"Born of Water".....	187, 282	Harmony, A, Possible.....	379, 475
Can two Walk Together except They be Agreed?.....	285	Is the Application Legitimate?.....	381
Christ's Prayer in the Garden.....	32, 281	Paul's Infirmity.....	185
Christian Freedom.....	475	Prompt Payment of Salaries.....	477
Criticism on Matt. vii: 12, 289; Criti- cism on "J. S. K.".....	477	Pulpit Notices.....	91, 478
Criticism and Query.....	283	Query, A, and An Answer.....	185
Criticism, A, Criticised.....	187	Vocal Culture.....	186
		Which, if Any One, is Right?.....	381

THE STUDY TABLE.

CONDUCTED BY J. M. LUDLOW, D.D.

THE PASTOR'S DRAWER.		PAGE.	PAGE.	
An Eloquent Sermon.....	83	Classifying Current Fiction.....	467	
Reason in Animals.....	578	Creed Tests.....	79	
Scripture Analogies in the Sacred Books of the Heathen.....	374	Creed Tests (continued).....	276	
		Cure for Ministers' Blues.....	565	
		Prayer-Meeting Methods.....	84	
		Raising Money for Church Purposes.....	378	
		The Book of Job.....	568	
		The Popular Habit of Novel Reading.....	464	
THE PEOPLE'S DRAWER.				
After Death.....	61			
Answer to question concerning such books as "Gates Ajar," etc.....	563			

TEXTUAL INDEX.

	PAGE.		PAGE.		PAGE.
Gen. ii : 17.....	155	Matt. vi : 2.....	350	Acts xiii : 17.....	344
vii : 1.....	480	vi : 33.....	356	xxi : 28.....	94
xxviii : 16-22.....	357	viii : 22.....	256	xxiv : 25.....	57
xxxii : 1, 2.....	241	x : 30.....	567	xxvii : 23.....	438
Num. xv : 16.....	96	xiii : 30.....	51	xxviii : 3.....	250
xxi : 16-18.....	287	xvii : 1-12.....	255	Rom. i : 1.....	539
Deut. xxxii : 49, 50.....	191	xix : 16-30.....	254	ii : 8, 9.....	155
1 Kings vii : 22.....	188	xix : 16-22.....	259	iii : 15.....	567
1 Chron. ix : 13.....	287	xxi : 19.....	130	viii : 2.....	142
2 Chron. vii : 1.....	192	xxii : 21.....	94	viii : 23.....	433
Job xix : 25-27.....	358	xxiv : 16.....	567	xiv : 5.....	151
Psalms xxii : 26.....	191	xxv : 31-46.....	62	1 Cor. i : 26.....	478
xxxvii : 34.....	480	xxv : 36.....	537	vi : 19.....	439
li : 12.....	383	xxv : 45, 46.....	155	xii : 7.....	479
xiv : 1.....	568	xxvi : 15.....	569	xiii : 13.....	436
lxi : 2.....	329	xxvi : 22.....	192	xv : 58.....	246
xc : 12.....	544	xxvi : 63.....	287	2 Cor. iv : 18.....	341
cxvii : 23-24.....	145	xxvi : 35.....	385	v : 14.....	54
cxviii : 14.....	286	Luke ii : 7.....	543	Gal. vi : 2.....	244
cxxxvi.....	444	v : 1-11.....	257	ii : 2.....	349
Prov. iii : 1-10.....	58	vi : 38.....	91, 137	Eph. i : 23.....	93
viii : 1-3.....	384	ix : 51.....	288	ii : 1-7.....	63
xi : 26.....	481	ix : 13.....	382	ii : 10.....	189
xxiv : 30-34.....	411	xi : 21, 22.....	382	iv : 14, 15.....	53
Eccles. i : iv, 9.....	536	xii : 13-14.....	34	iv : 16.....	97
vi : 3-4.....	541	xiii : 6-9.....	355	vi : 13.....	188
xii : 8.....	96	xiv : 16-24.....	442	Col. i : 12.....	384
Isa. vi : 5.....	248	xix : 1-10.....	351	i : 18.....	534
vii : 13.....	189	xix : 13.....	382	i : 24.....	347
xxvii : 12.....	191	xix : 17.....	542	iii : 29.....	149
xxviii : 3.....	190	xix : 41, 42.....	480	vi : 5.....	430
lii : 1.....	95	John i : 4.....	520	Phil. i : 21.....	383
lx : 8.....	480	iii : 5.....	60	iii : 8-11.....	42
Dan. ii : 34, 35.....	49	v : 4.....	286	iii : 19.....	567
xii : 2.....	443	v : 6.....	287	iv : 22.....	478
xii : 3.....	479	v : 24-29.....	443	1 Tim. ii : 1, 2.....	57
Ezek. xvi : 54.....	568	vii : 17.....	525	2 Tim. ii : 3.....	154
lvii : 2.....	420	x : 29.....	148	Heb. iv : 7.....	569
Jer. viii : 20.....	288	xii : 26.....	256	iv : 9, 10.....	252
xiii : 16.....	383	xiii : 7.....	35	viii : 10.....	188
Hosea xiv : 1, 2, 4.....	59	xiv : 8.....	231	x : 14.....	152
Zech. v : 1-4.....	438	xiv : 6.....	298	x : 38, 39.....	258
Mal. iii : 12.....	335	xviii : 37.....	236	James iv : 3.....	157
Matt. i : 23.....	566	Acts ii : 42.....	384	iv : 14.....	191
iii : 10.....	190	ii : 47.....	539	Jude 3.....	382
iv : 1.....	424	xi : 23.....	568	1 John iii : 14-24.....	353
				iv : 1.....	156