

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—MARCH, 1888.—No. 3.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—HARMFUL BOOKS.

By PROF. T. W. HUNT, PH.D., PRINCETON COLLEGE, N. J.

READERS of *The Forum* have undoubtedly been interested in a well conducted series of papers on the suggestive topic, "Books That Have Helped Me." As the caption indicates, the papers have been mainly personal in character, their respective authors aiming to show the varied forms of benefit that they have received in their perusal and study of books. An equally interesting series of articles might be written on the correlative topic, Books That Have Harmed Me. *A priori*, when we speak of books, we speak of good and helpful books, of those to which ex-President Porter refers in his treatise on "Books and Reading," or to those so ably discussed by Prof. Phelps in his "Men and Books."

There are, however, books and there are books, and though, as Mr. Howells tells us, "more good books are read now than ever before," still, the proportion in favor of the bad is greater than ever. Of all forms of evil current, none is more harmful than such a literature, now made so cheap as to be within the reach of the day laborer and even of the idler, and furnishing to thousands of the people the only staple of education. No page will ever record the sad experience of the multitudes of our race who have been injured or ruined by these pernicious volumes, and who, with the bad book in head and heart, have been proof against every moral appeal. It will be our purpose in this paper to call attention to certain generic classes of books that are harmful in character and tendency. As we write, our eye will be specially fixed upon the educated youth of the land, while we intimate to them, as best we may, what not to read.

UNWHOLESOME BOOKS.

These belong to the category of the positively immoral, as opposed to that literature which is wholesome and ethically pure. They con-

stitute what may be called the unclean publications of the press, ministering to the most depraved tastes of the reader and ever developing those tastes to still lower degrees of baseness. "Many judge of the power of a book," writes Longfellow, "by the shock it gives their feelings." The poet is speaking of this very class of unhealthful volumes, shocking to the purest instincts of men, and, for this very reason, dangerous in their influence. Startling and repellent at first, they at length secure attention and acceptance by their very peculiarities, until nothing will satisfy the expectation of the reader save the most pronounced departure from the normal and natural. These are the "earthly, sensual and devilish" books of the day, having to do with what an American author has recently called "the discovery of the unclean." No more fitting illustration of such an order of literature can be given than that which is found by comparing "The Confessions of Rousseau" with "The Confessions of Augustine," or with Coleridge's "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit." The main design of each of these treatises is the same—a personal and detailed disclosure of innermost experience, so that the reader may see below all that is external. As we would now say, these books are realistic, concerned with what Mr. Arnold calls "the criticism of life." It is just here that we can mark their radical difference in treatment and tendency. With the French author, realism is one thing; with the devout North African scholar and the philosophic English essayist, it is quite another and a better thing. With the one, it is synonymous with a sickly and revolting examination of what is basest in the heart for the sake of revealing it in its foulness; with the others, it is a natural and serious unfolding of human nature as it is, to the end that a better knowledge of life may be obtained and the highest interests of truth secured. No reader of any ethical sensibility can go far into the pages of Rousseau without discovering the fact that these confessions are detailed in the interests of a carnal curiosity. Who, on the other hand, can read a page of Augustine or of Coleridge and resist the conviction that here he is in the presence of devout and candid men, revealing the whole truth on behalf of the truth, if so be that what is base in them may be forgiven of God and avoided by men?

Even in the pages of De Quincey's "Confessions" and in John Stuart Mill's "Autobiography," this disgusting diagnosis of the French infidel is absent, and we are dealing with minds who, with all their faults of habit and errors of doctrine, are at least sincere in their devotion to the truth as they conceive it. The same is true of Tolstoï, the distinguished Russian novelist, as he reveals to us his life in his autobiographic works, "Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth;" "My Confession," and "My Religion." Whatever theological or literary errors may here be found, the author cannot justly be charged with insincerity of confession or with a morbid desire to subserve the interests of evil. If, as we

are told, "realism is the state of mind of the nineteenth century," and the worst must be revealed, then let it be revealed in the Augustinian spirit: for the moral good of men. The Bible is the most realistic book among books. Its realism is one of its virtues. Among the different species of literature that might be referred to as unwholesome, the Experimental Novel, on its baser side, is conspicuous. All novelists are feeling that, as they write, they must make what Dr. Munger terms *An Appeal to Life*, and the danger lies in the direction of an extreme minuteness of detail for the sake of the minuteness, and on behalf of an illegitimate craving for the unclean. It is here that the great Slavic romancer has sinned, and we are bound, with Maurice Thompson and others, to enter a serious protest against that extreme laudation of the moral quality of Tolstoi's fiction in which too many modern critics indulge. If we cannot justly class his personal confessions with those of Rousseau, we are as little warranted in classifying "*Anna Karénina*" among the clean and reverent writings of Scott and Kingsley. Realism in fiction, as in literature, is no new thing, and when we are told of the rise of realism our suspicions are at once aroused and we think it must mean what it does mean—the rise of an unwholesome realism for unwholesome ends. Daniel Defoe, the first English novelist, was as life-like an author as ever wrote. The old novel of character or of life and manners—what was it if not realistic? The difference between Zola and Dickens is not found in the fact that the one is realistic and the other not, but in the fact that, being equally true to nature and life, they illustrate, respectively, the "realism of the flesh and of the spirit." When we pass from Thackeray and Charlotte Brontë to Ouida and her school, we pass from the real to the real, but also pass from the clean to the unclean. So as to the unwholesome poetry of the time, as it aims to depict in vivid form what it is pleased to call the "inside view" of life. Here, again, realism is no new thing, and the "new school" is but the baser side of the old, the revival of the school of Dryden and Lord Byron.

Shakespeare, our greatest English poet, is also the greatest realist of all literature, while the names of all his less distinguished successors on to the school of Wordsworth and Tennyson, indicate their constant fidelity to truth and life. In poetry, as in fiction and all literature, that is a pernicious theory that confines the realistic to the lower phases of character; that makes the graphic portraiture of vice its best preventive; that demands larger latitude for the obscene, and pities, indeed, any one of us who fails to see and see again a full-length portrait of the genus man in his Adamic nudity. Against these "Adamites" even Swinburne warns us. Unwholesome books are among us by the thousands. The young, most of all, are to avoid them as they would avoid unwholesome food or air. As the taste for reading is formed early in life and goes far to shape personal character, no one can too

speedily adopt the principle of total abstinence as to all such literature. These books are bad all through—written, in the main, with bad intent, and are a curse to those who produce them and sell them and read them. They are baneful in the old English sense—murderous books, written with intent to kill all moral life. One has not to thrust his arm up to the shoulder into a white-hot furnace to know that fire burns, nor to read Zola and Whitman through and through to know that bad books demoralize and destroy. If readers are desirous of cultivating what Maurice has styled the friendship of books, then must they discard all that fails to minister to the highest morality. Here, as elsewhere, the Scriptural counsel is in place, and we are to accept and enjoy “whatsoever things are pure.”

UNSETTLING BOOKS.

These might be called, in denominational phrase, Unsound Books, coming, as such, under the condemnation of the authorities. We prefer the non-sectarian and wider word—unsettling. They are books whose main object is the disturbance of settled opinions, and they accomplish their end just to the degree in which they affect the foundations of personal beliefs. Their purpose is destructive. They make less attempt to construct a body of belief than to dislodge and overthrow the fundamental principles of all belief. The authors of such books are the true descendants of the old Levelers in the days of the Stuarts, or of the Root and Branch Society, whose office was the eradication of all existing institutions in Church and State. These publications may often be found within the same covers that contain those volumes we have called Unwholesome, whereby radical error is conveyed in debasing forms, and the double sin of skepticism and sensuality manifested. Most of that unhealthful fiction in which modern English and Continental literature abounds is as dangerous in the direction of the unsettlement of personal convictions as it is in the degradation of personal character.

There is probably no class of books in which the principles of common virtue are so ignored and undermined as in those romances whose pages represent the worst phases of human character under attractive disguises and obliterate all accepted distinctions between the allowable and questionable. Such examples as Ouida's “Held in Bondage,” “Friendship,” “Tricotrin,” “Under Two Flags,” and “Moths” are enough to illustrate the principle before us. In a recent number of *The Fortnightly Review*, Andrew Lang discusses what he calls M. Renan's Later Works. These works, partly fictitious and partly dramatic, partly autobiographic and partly general, mark the lowest level alike of opinion and character. In such comedies as “L'Eau de Jouvence” and “L'Abbesse de Jouane,” virtue is deliberately reduced to travesty, life itself resolved into a farce, and we see the revolting spectacle of a man of high intellectual acquirements aiming in the name of truth to bestialize his better nature

and bring in upon France once again, and upon the race, the general reign of lust and doubt. Most of these books are, perhaps, the product of men of intellectual and literary power, and are thereby all the more inimical to the interests of truth. In every age and nation some of the ablest minds have been devoted to the dissemination of error ; at times, indeed, from conscientious convictions as to their mission, but often and mainly from malice aforethought. It is thus plain to see that most of these unsettling books are of an ethical or religious character, appertaining, in one way or another, to the disturbance of religious views. We are here using the term religious in the broadest possible sense, as distinct from any sectarian sense whatsoever. We are referring to books whose authors question or even ridicule what are known as the established convictions of men as moral beings ; who boldly deny that there is or can be any such thing as fundamental truth as it is now understood, and at one fell blow reduce all creeds and all beliefs to a common level. We may call them, in a true sense, doctrinal books, inasmuch as they serve to overthrow accepted theories and systems of truth. They are, in the worst sense, skeptical books, in that they begin and end with doubt for the sake of doubt, and scout the commonly received ideas of God and man and the present order of things. Nor when we use the word unsettling are we decrying those books whose laudable purpose it is to provoke inquiry and honest discussion ; which readily concede that some things once learned must be unlearned ; once accepted as true must, upon new evidence, be modified or discarded, and which make a shifting of ground obligatory when present positions are proved to be untenable. Such books are absolutely needed in the interests of a true mental and moral progress. They awaken inquiry, stimulate thought, keep the world from intellectual stagnation, and, in the end, are the best promoters of a true conservatism.

We are dealing with books and authors that are maliciously unsettling ; that aim to carry Tennyson's idea of " honest doubt " to the extreme of captious and cynical questioning ; that are never so satisfied as when in full view of demolished doctrines, however general, and care not what becomes of truth so called, so long as their personal ends are accomplished. No better example of what we are here discussing and denouncing could be given us than what we find in the French Encyclopedists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An honest mind, here and there excepted, the majority of these authors were malicious disturbers of the moral peace of Christendom. Voltaire and Diderot, Crebillon and Condillac, Baron d'Holbach and Helvetius, were such writers. They wrote not only, as has been said, " to attack the national faith," but to attack and annul all faith, and substitute therefor the boldest unbelief. The Reign of Terror, what was it but the Golden Age of the Reign of Unsettled Religious Belief? A similar tendency in the line of destructive criticism is seen in the

school of Hobbes and Priestley, Gibbon and Hume and Bolingbroke, and the readers of their treatises must be apprised of the fact. In modern England and America, such authors as Clifford and Ingersoll are the true successors of these earlier men. Perchance the wild extremes to which these errorists resort are the best antidote of the errors themselves, and serve, under Providence, to contribute to the cause of truth. A greater danger to the reader lies in the line of books which are the product of authors whom we must regard as sincere, and yet who tend to uproot or weaken those generic convictions by which we live, and which, in the main, have been endorsed by the common conscience and reason. Not only are those verities that we call intuitional to be thus strongly held, but also all those cardinal and governing beliefs which have been reached by long experience and safe induction, and which in their authority, universality and utility lie right next to the self-evident convictions of men. They are neither distinctively Protestant nor Romish, Augustinian nor Anglican, American nor European, modern nor ancient, but are simply Christian as distinct from unchristian, religious as distinct from non-religious, biblical as distinct from non-biblical. We are not to be accused of narrow-mindedness or a bigoted opposition to the "progressive orthodoxy" of the day when we warn readers against all such books and bid them betake themselves to the Christian literature of the world. In the face of the natural irreligious tendencies of our own minds at their best, and the disturbing influences necessarily attending the stir of thought within us and about us, it is all important that men hold to what is essential and aim in their consultation of authors to confirm it. Religious beliefs, most especially, must be religiously guarded. No man has any moral right to play fast and loose with well-established truth, to be so inquisitive as to pry into all error, and so desirous of holding "advanced views" as always to keep a little ahead of Scripture and common sense.

We speak of settled convictions. Such convictions were never more needed than now, and never more endangered, and among other methods for ensuring their permanence is the negative one of abjuring all books that aim at their overthrow.

We note, as we close, the responsibility of readers. As authors are to take heed what they write, readers are to take heed what they read—placing a sentinel, as Addison suggests, at the door of their libraries to demand that every book applying for admission be morally wholesome, mentally substantial, and confirmatory of valid views of truth.

"It is to be desired," writes Mr. Howells, "that the tests of literature should not only be more and more practical, but more and more ethical." Readers should hold themselves amenable to such tests, and insist on applying them. The Christian ministry, the Christian college, the Christian press, and the Christian public have a duty in this

healthy guardianship and guidance of literature, if so be that "that inexorable force called public taste" is to be as pure and intelligent as it is inexorable. Those in charge of public libraries are here to be true to the trust assigned them and fill their alcoves with books that first of all have something in them, and then present it in wholesome and edifying form. In our copious English speech, good literature is plentiful enough to satisfy the largest demands. In the two great departments of biography and history, what a vast and attractive field is opened, and who could estimate the beneficent result if our American youth would devote to such an order of reading the larger portion of that time that is given to the rapid verse and the questionable romance of the day! In our best British and American miscellany, as also in our few standard novelists and poets, this spacious range of reading is indefinitely widened.

These are the books which, according to Bacon, "serve for delight and ability," and that, as such, are "to be chewed and digested."

They leave us the wiser and better for having read them; satisfy a clear head, a clear conscience and a clean taste, and thus fulfill in our experience the appreciative lines of Wordsworth:

"And books we know
Are a substantial world both pure and good.
Round these with tendrils strong as flesh and blood,
Our pastime and our happiness do grow."

II.—THE TRAINING FOR THE PULPIT.

NO. II.

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

"And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche."—*Chaucer.*

"Learning by study must be won;
'Twas ne'er entailed from sire to son."—*Gay.*

"Were men to live coeval with the sun,
The patriarch pupil would be learning still."—*Young.*

"Give attendance to reading."—*Paul.*

IN a previous article we treated of the kind of *men* whom it is exceedingly desirable, if not indispensable, to secure for the work of the pulpit—men rich in gifts and in the best qualities both of mind and heart; men characterized not only by faith fervent and unfeigned, zeal ardent and glowing, enthusiasm dauntless and unquenchable, but also possessed of a healthy, robust, vigorous physical constitution, an active, energetic mental temperament, a self-denying disposition, high moral courage, good common sense, some knowledge of human nature, and intense, unselfish devotion to the work.

We now proceed, with due diffidence, to refer to the preparatory training requisite for the *work* of the pulpit.

It will be granted by all, without hesitancy, that a well-educated, thoroughly-trained, and even learned ministry is highly desirable; and we are free to admit that, other things being equal, a good scholar will be likely to prove the more acceptable and more effective preacher. Nor is it questioned that very many of those trained in our theological schools, as they are now conducted, have proved themselves eminently able ministers and successful preachers of the gospel, while not a few have attained distinguished eminence in every department of sacred learning—a distinction, however, not always or mainly to be attributed to the methods of study pursued in the seminary, or to culture which they there received. Notwithstanding the results which have been happily achieved in elevating the standard of attainments and increasing the usefulness of the Christian ministry, it has occurred to many that the present methods generally adopted by our theological schools, in preparing candidates for the pulpit, are susceptible of improvement, and might be so modified as to furnish greater facilities and higher advantages to different classes of students, and to conduce much more extensively to the furtherance of the best interests of the church, specially as relates to her extension.

The instruction and discipline supplied in all our schools of theology is, or professes to be, nearly alike. Minor differences may exist in the examination required for entrance, or in the curriculum of subjects prescribed, or the order in which they are to be taken up, but in our popular institutions they are substantially similar. In most of them a college diploma, or something nearly equivalent, is demanded for admittance, comprising some knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, a certain amount of mathematics, an acquaintance with the principles of mental and moral philosophy and logic, and in later years natural science has been added. During the course of three or four years in the seminary all are required to attend the same lectures, receive the same instruction, and undergo the same examinations. Now, as a general rule, this may be all well enough. But owing to differences in the extent and thoroughness of their early training in languages, literature, philosophy and science, in their ages, natural endowments and diligence in study, and further in the various degrees of aptitude each may have for different branches of inquiry or investigation, the results are that the attainments and qualifications of candidates for licensure by classis or presbytery are exceedingly varied. One excels in the knowledge of classical literature and the languages of the sacred Scriptures, while another, whose standing in other branches of study may be highly creditable and command approval, knows but little Latin and less Greek, with a scanty knowledge of the Hebrew grammar, is able with difficulty to spell out a chapter in Genesis or a psalm or two. One is thoroughly conversant with philosophy and its bearings on religious systems and modes of thought; another is proficient in natural science

in its relations to Scripture and revealed religion ; and still another, who has paid great attention to patristic lore and scholastic theology and the history of doctrine ; while his companion is more versed in history, sacred and profane, the development of the church, and in modern literature, English and German. Not a few whose attainments in classics, mathematics and philosophy are sufficiently meagre, have acquired a thorough knowledge of the English Bible, and from the use of the best and most recent commentaries possess a fair knowledge of biblical criticism and careful exegesis, even though their knowledge of the original languages of Scripture and of patristic and scholastic theology may be limited. The ultimate results are that only a few really learned or profound theologians or erudite and accurate scholars are found in any denomination. The great majority of the ministry after entering upon their special work prosecute only such studies as more directly contribute to their work as preachers and pastors, and not a little of what they spent a good deal of time in attempting to acquire is found to be of little practical value and is laid aside. The results of the most profound scholarship and the keenest and most learned criticism are now brought within the reach of ordinary scholars by full and fresh commentaries in our own tongue or excellent and accurate translations of the best writers of other lands. Very few indeed, we opine, even of those who have a creditable acquaintance with ancient languages, would venture to place their own personal investigations or criticisms above the opinions of the great and acknowledged masters in this department. Many students necessarily, even without anything blameworthy in their conduct, can only attain a moderate degree of proficiency in several departments. And from the fact that their time and energies are so divided if not distracted by the multiplicity of subjects presented to them, their acquirements in any department are less thorough and extensive than they would have been had the range of subjects been less extended. All knowledge is in itself valuable and may be rendered subservient to the work of the ministry, but all branches of knowledge are not equally important and serviceable to the preacher ; and a thorough acquaintance with a few branches of study is a better mental discipline and of more service to the preacher than a slight acquaintance with many.

Following the bent of his own mind, or the direction of his earlier studies, or influenced by his surroundings, the pastor will usually select one favorite subject for continued and exhaustive investigation, which will not only freshen and strengthen his mind, but add to his stores of useful knowledge, whence he may draw in the preparation of his discourses. The training for the pulpit should have reference to the work to be performed, and inasmuch as diverse gifts are bestowed and various ministries are required—as teaching, preaching, pastoral work, and evangelistic services—some option in the course of studies

might, with utmost propriety, be allowed, and thus differences in the age, attainments and purpose of the students would be provided for.

For those who have the time, the means and special aptitude for the acquisition of languages, a course of extended and critical study of the Latin, Greek and Hebrew and other ancient tongues might be allowed, and doubtless some would take such a course and come forth from the school well equipped for the desk of the teacher or the pen of the critic, able by a faithful exegesis to expound the text of Scripture or by solid learning defend it against all attacks.

For such as may not have had the opportunity or the taste for acquiring a knowledge of the classics, a course in theology, didactic and polemic, with history, apologetics, and a careful study of the English Bible, might be arranged. For men who in the prime of life give themselves to Christ and feel they have a call to preach, a course of philosophy, natural science in its relations to revelation and religion, history, sacred and profane, and a thorough discipline in English literature and biblical theology, might be assigned. *All* the students should be rigidly trained, both by written and oral exercises in homiletics, the work of the pastorate, the subject of missions, both foreign and domestic, specially in the best methods of evangelistic services in sparsely settled parts of the country and in towns and cities. By such methods men would be prepared for different departments of the work of the church; we would still have as many, probably more, really scholarly theologians—men who could not only expound but defend the faith as delivered to the saints and revealed in the sacred writings. And many would leave the seminary equally well if not better fitted for the work of the pulpit and the pastorate than now, while more men of gifts and graces would receive such instruction, discipline and guidance as would qualify them for efficient service in the home mission field and evangelistic work generally. Heart strength and burning earnestness compensate for the lack of intellectual brilliance or extensive learning. The gospel may be clearly presented and impressively enforced, even though difficult and obscure points of theology are never discussed. Dr. John Hall, in his lectures before the Theological Department of Yale College, says: "There are certain lines of Bible truth over which we are carried in the seminary. Some of them, perhaps, were made deep and clear by a forcible professor. Over some of them, perhaps, we traveled often and painfully in view of an examination. They have assumed an undue importance in our thoughts, and we are tempted to think that they must be of great interest to the rest of the human race. Yet in point of fact, that portion of it for which we are responsible has no doubt about them, will not comprehend our argumentation, and feels no connection between it and daily life." In another lecture he says: "It is commonly believed that for the purpose of composition, mastery of our English tongue, and cultivation of taste,

a knowledge of the Greek and Latin classics is essential, the word classics being commonly limited to pagan writers." He adds, substantially, that we have possibly overrated this department of education, and that the moral evils to young men from reading these pagan writings more than counterbalance the intellectual gain. "There are other classics than the heathen, and it would be an omen of good if candidates for the ministry at least took Eusebius, Tertullian and John Chrysostom and others of a noble band, to whom we of the reformed churches have given none too much attention." We heartily concur in the sentiments expressed in these passages, and would suggest that a knowledge of the teachings and lives of these venerable fathers of the early church can be attained through excellent translations, probably superior to any that a student could render for himself from the original. It cannot be denied, however desirable it may be that the ministry of the church should be learned men, that the Gospel has made some of its most glorious triumphs and most rapid progress through the ministrations of comparatively illiterate men. There are many men who know the truth and love the truth and are willing to proclaim the truth, who have not the means or the time to take a full literary and theological course of study. In my opinion there should be in all our schools of the prophets arrangements made to accommodate such candidates, and that the church should regularly license them as preachers if they are found to have a familiar acquaintance with the Scriptures in our own tongue, and give evidence of an experimental knowledge of the saving power of the truth, and possess such a command of the English language as faithfully to proclaim the freeness and fullness of the Gospel.

How to prepare for pulpit service will be the topic of the next paper.

III.—THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES: HOW AFFECTED BY RECENT CRITICISM.

NO. II.

BY GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG, D.D., LL.D., NORFOLK, VA.

"THE Christian evidences"—the evidences which are appealed to in support of the claim of Christianity to be received as of divine origin, and so as the only true religion—are of various kinds—*e. g.*, the evidence furnished by miracles, by prophecy, by the history of Christianity as a power in the earth, by the character of the Christian religion itself, and above all by the practical evidence appealed to by our Lord, when confronted by the skeptical Jews, in his words, "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). To give anything like a full discussion of so large a subject as that proposed in the title of this article within the compass of a brief essay is impossible. The only

course which seems open to me in taking part in this symposium is to select some particular point in controversy between the Christian and the critic of Christianity and confine my attention to that alone.

When the skeptical critic has assailed Christianity he has often been met with the question, What do you propose to give us in exchange therefor? Man is confessedly a religious being—religious in the wide sense of that word—and hence, as all history testifies, he must and will have some religion. When the Christian, then, is approached with the proposition to demonstrate to him that Christianity is untrue, he has a right to ask, What do you propose to give me in its place? There was good common sense in Peter's reply to our Lord's question, when many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him: "Will ye also go away? Lord, to whom shall we go?" (John vi : 68.)

The reasonableness of this demand is so obvious that the assailants of Christianity have from time to time attempted to meet it. Among the latest attempts of this kind is that made by Herbert Spencer in his "Data of Ethics." Christianity consists of (1) a religion, in the distinctive sense of that term, as pointed out by its etymology (*religo*, to bind again, to knit anew the broken bond between man and God), and (2) a system of ethics which furnishes man with a rule of life founded upon the distinction between right and wrong. Spencer, having no faith in the existence of a personal God, has but little to say, in his book, on the subject of religion in the distinctive sense of the term; but a system of ethics, which shall cover the whole ground covered by Christianity, in so far as man's real necessities are concerned, he does attempt to give us, and it is this system of ethics I propose briefly to examine in the present article.

I. His "Data of Ethics" is intended to complete a series of which his previously published works on biology, psychology and sociology form a part. The informing idea—the idea which gives shape and character to them, one and all—is set forth in his words:

"Here, then, we have to enter on the consideration of moral phenomena as phenomena of evolution, being forced to do this by finding that they form a part of the aggregate of phenomena which evolution has wrought out. If the entire visible universe has been evolved; if the solar system as a whole, the earth as a part of it, the life in general which the earth bears, as well as that of each individual organism; if the mental phenomena presented by aggregates of these highest; if one and all conform to the laws of evolution—then the necessary implication is that those phenomena of conduct in these higher creatures with which morality is concerned, also conform. The preceding volumes have prepared the way for dealing with morals as thus conceived" (§ 23).

His purpose in writing "The Data of Ethics," and the character of the system of morals he proposes, are further set forth in the Preface to the book, in his words:

"The establishment of rules of right conduct on a scientific basis is a pressing need. Now that moral injunctions are losing the authority given by

their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative. Few things can happen more disastrous than the decay and death of a regulative system no longer fit, before another and fitter regulative system has grown up to replace it."

From the above extracts the reader will see (1) that Spencer claims for his system of ethics the sanction of science, and (2) that he proposes it as "a regulative system," to take the place of Christianity, which he regards as fast losing authority in the world.

1. "*The secularization of morals.*" The term secular is here evidently used as opposed to religious; and to secularize morals is to eliminate all consideration of God and of the soul therefrom. A God in the universe and a soul in man do not enter into the creed of Mr. Spencer, as we learn from his other works. His ideas of religion he gives us in these words:

"While, as in the rudest groups, neither political nor religious rule exists, the leading check to the immediate gratification of each desire as it arises is consciousness of the evils which the anger of fellow-savages may entail, if satisfaction of the desire is obtained at their cost. In this early stage the imagined pains which constitute the governing motive are those apt to be inflicted by beings of like nature, undistinguished in power; the political, religious and social restraints are as yet represented by this mutual dread of vengeance. When special strength, skill or courage makes one of them a leader in battle, he necessarily inspires greater fear than any other, and there comes to be a more decided check on such satisfactions of the desires as will injure or offend him. . . . Meanwhile there has been developed the ghost theory. In all but the rudest groups, the double of a deceased man, propitiated at death and afterwards, is conceived as able to injure the survivors. Consequently, as fast as the ghost-theory becomes established and definite, there grows up another kind of check on immediate satisfaction of the desires—a check constituted by ideas of the evils which ghosts may inflict if offended; and when political headship gets settled, and the ghosts of dead chiefs, thought of as more powerful and more relentless than other ghosts, are especially dreaded, there begins to take shape *the form of restraint distinguished as religious*" (§ 43).

This religion, the product of evolution, is the only kind of religion of which Mr. Spencer seems to have any knowledge. Strange that it should be so in a Christian land! and yet such seems to be the fact. A religion in which the central object is but a chief ghost can be nothing better than the ghost of a religion; and I think the Christian reader will agree with Spencer that its elimination from ethics is a desirable thing.

2. As to the opinion he expresses, "that the moral injunctions" contained in Scripture "are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin" in our day, I think he is mistaken. The statement was publicly made, on good authority, that during the year 1886 the strictly evangelical churches in the United States alone, built new churches at the average rate of ten a day. Now these strictly evangelical churches are made up of men and women who receive the Bible as the Word of God, and believe that the moral law contained in the Ten

Commandments was given of God from the top of Sinai, and is of perpetual and universal authority, and teach this doctrine in every church they build. These men and women have the average amount of common sense, and would not waste their money in building churches if there were not congregations to occupy them when built. The addition, in one year and in the United States alone, of 3,650 congregations to evangelical Christianity does not look as if the old faith were dying out.

II. Turning now to a particular examination of Mr. Spencer's system of "secularized morals"—ethics, the product of evolution—the system which he proposes we shall accept in the place of Christianity. What has he to say respecting the distinction between the good and the bad in conduct, a distinction universally acknowledged as fundamental in ethics? The third chapter of his treatise bears the title, "Good and Bad Conduct," and opens as follows, viz. :

"By comparing its meaning in different connections and observing what they have in common, we learn the essential meaning of a word; and the essential meaning of a word that is variously applied may best be learned by comparing with one another those applications of it which diverge most widely. Let us then ascertain what good and bad mean. In which cases do we distinguish as good, a knife, a gun, a house? And what trait leads us to speak of a bad umbrella or a bad pair of boots? The characters here predicated by the words good and bad are not intrinsic characters, for, apart from human wants, such things have neither merit or demerit. We call these articles good or bad as they are well or ill adapted to achieve prescribed ends. The good knife is one that will cut; the good gun in one that carries far and true; and the good house is one which duly yields the shelter, comfort and accommodation sought for. Conversely, the badness alleged of the umbrella or pair of boots refers to their failure in fulfilling the ends of keeping off the rain, and comfortably protecting the feet, with due regard to appearances."

And further on he adds :

"Always, then, acts are called good or bad according as they are well or ill adjusted to ends, and whatever inconsistency there is in our use of the words arises from inconsistency of their ends. Here, however, the study of conduct in general, and of the evolution of conduct, have prepared us to harmonize these interpretations. The foregoing exposition shows that the conduct to which we apply the name good is the relatively more evolved conduct, and that bad is the name we apply to conduct which is relatively less evolved" (§ 8).

According to this, badness, in the lowest stage of development, in its least differentiated form, as it comes within the purview of "secularized ethics," is that exhibited by a pair of boots which fail "in comfortably protecting the feet, with due regard to appearances." Does the reader say, Surely Mr. Spencer does not mean to predicate moral character of a pair of boots. If he does not, what does he mean when, in a treatise on ethics, he opens a chapter on the "Good and Bad in Conduct" with such statements as those quoted above?

In Chap. XII., "Altruism *versus* Egoism," he writes :

"The simplest beings habitually multiply by spontaneous fission. Physical altruism" (*i. e.*, devotion to others or to humanity; the opposite of selfishness.—*Imperial Dictionary*.) "of the lowest kind, differentiating from physical egoism, may in this case be considered as not yet independent of it. For since the two halves which before fission constituted the individual do not on dividing disappear, we must say that though the individuality of the parent infusorium or other protozoon is lost in ceasing to be single, yet the old individual continues to exist in each of the new individuals. When, however, as happens generally, an interval of quiescence ends in the breaking up of the whole body into minute parts, each of which is the germ of a young one, we see the parent entirely sacrificed in forming progeny" (§ 75).

And in Chap. VIII. he writes :

"Not for the human race only, but for every race, there are laws of right living. Given its environment and its structure, and there is for each kind of creature a set of notions adapted, in their kinds, amounts, and combinations, to secure the highest conservation its nature permits. The animal, like the man, has needs for food, warmth, activity, rest, and so forth, which must be fulfilled in certain relative degrees to make its life whole. Maintenance of its race implies satisfaction of special desires, sexual and philoprogenitive, in due proportion. Hence there is a supposable formula for the activities of each species, which, could it be drawn out, would constitute a *system of morality for that species*" (§ 48).

If altruism and egoism—*i. e.*, benevolence and selfishness—can be predicated of a protozoon, why may not moral excellence be predicated of a pair of boots? If a system of morality can be drawn out for each species of animal, *e. g.*—the ass (*Equus asinus*)—why not for an umbrella? And here, in passing, would it be impertinent to suggest that, as Mr. Spencer is the first voyager who has got a glimpse of this hitherto *terra incognita* of ethical science, he should push his investigations, and give us "a system of morality for the species" named above. Sure I am, its originality could not be questioned; and I am inclined to think that it would prove as useful to the species of animal whose morality it treated of, as his "secularized ethics" will ever prove to man.

Returning from this digression, Does the reader object that the difference between goodness in a pair of boots and goodness in a Christian man—the Apostle Paul, for example—is not only exceedingly great in amount, but is a difference in kind as well? To this I reply, Nevertheless, "adjustment to ends" is characteristic of both; and if "adjustment to ends" furnishes the fundamental distinction between the morally good and morally bad, then all differences, however great, sink into insignificance before this similarity. Besides this, the difference between goodness in a pair of boots and goodness in the Apostle Paul, both in amount and in kind, is not greater than the difference in humanity in a piece of protoplasm, or a protozoon, and that of the same apostle; and if in Mr. Spencer's hands evolution is competent

to bridge over the one chasm, why may it not bridge over the other also? Humanity in the protozoon, according to Mr. Spencer, is but humanity in the first stage of its evolution—just beginning its differentiations, so that it may be infinitesimally minute; so minute as to be undiscoverable to any eyes but those of such a scientist as Mr. Spencer; and only after its development has been going on for millions of years is it likely to become visible to the eyes of the common people? So the moral element in the goodness of a pair of boots is moral goodness in the first stage of its evolution—just beginning to differentiate—and so it should cause us no surprise that it proves invisible to such eyes as yours and mine, reader.

III. The reader has now a brief statement, in some of its characteristic features, of Spencer's system of "secularized ethics." For myself I confess that to me religion without a God, and morality without a soul, are, in the true sense of that much-abused word, "unthinkable." Is the question asked, How does Mr. Spencer succeed in rendering such a system of ethics plausible, to say the least of it? for he certainly has disciples both in this country and in Europe. To this question I make answer: Mainly, by juggling with certain phrases of such wide generality as to have become indefinite, and which can be made to mean anything or everything at the juggler's will. Such, for example, as "adjustment to ends"—a fundamental characteristic of ethical goodness, according to Mr. Spencer—and "the transformation of the homogeneous into the heterogeneous," which is Mr. Spencer's definition of evolution.

Christianity presents me (1) a moral law, embraced in what are popularly known as the "Ten Commandments," enforced by the authority of a personal God who gave them, and (2) a religion summarized in the words, "And what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah vi: 8); of which Professor Huxley feels constrained to say, "If any so-called religion takes away from this great saying of Micah, I think it wantonly mutilates; while, if it adds thereto, I think it obscures the perfect ideal of religion" ("Order of Creation," p. 62). These Mr. Spencer asks me to give up as unproved and irrational, and to accept instead thereof a system of "secularized ethics"—ethics, the product of evolution; a system which, according to his own showing, found its first proper application to the conduct of a pair of boots; and when further developed was fitted to regulate the life of an ass; and only in this late age of the world, and under the operation of special efforts to that end, by scientists such as Mr. Spencer, has become sufficiently evolved to be fitted to control the conduct of men and regulate the affairs of the world. To this demand my reply is, God forbid that I should "seek to fill my belly with such husks as these, when there is in my Father's house bread enough and to spare."

IV.—THE POETRY OF BROWNING : ITS VALUE TO
CLERGYMEN.

BY PROF. J. O. MURRAY, D.D., DEAN OF PRINCETON COLLEGE.

PERHAPS there may lurk in the minds of some, though we trust a few only, the question, Had clergymen better give any of their time to reading poetry? Or if they give any, should it not be that only which they may lawfully take for recreation from their sacred duties? We happen to know of one hard-working and successful pastor in one of our city churches—a man as devoted to theological study as he is to pastoral work—who always takes with him on his Adirondack trips his well-worn copy of Milton's "Paradise Lost." We strongly suspect he gives beside many a quiet hour in his study to other great poets. But the feeling of some is that except in vacations the minister has his hands too full of higher matters to justify him in giving any attention to poets and poetry; that his studies must be absorbingly biblical, with perhaps a few outside to help him get up sermons; that he will only disqualify himself for the most effective pulpit work should he attempt anything like serious and constant study of the poets.

The best answer perhaps to this fallacious view, in so far as it exists, may be furnished in an exposition of what the study of a poet like Robert Browning can do for a minister in direct furnishings for his calling. Let the way be cleared, however, for such an unfolding by a few "general observations."

There is a class of minds so hopelessly utilitarian in their philosophy that we despair of any success in convincing them. They belong to the so-called practical people, who can praise Pascal for inventing the omnibus,* but who think this was also the best outcome of his amazing genius, since his other writings deal only with matters of doctrine or abstruse mathematical speculation. So there are people born with no ear for music, no eye for color. We must simply accept them as God has made them, and be thankful they are so few.

The study of poetry by ministers is not for the purpose of making sermons poetical. In the early days of the English Church sermons were sometimes put into rhyme for the sake of arresting the attention of the people. But nobody wishes to have a poetical air about the sermon. Such study may at times give a preacher the use of a poetical quotation. If suitably done, the hush that steals over a congregation as it is recited attests its power and its usefulness. A glance at Dr. Shedd's "Discourses to the Natural and to the Spiritual Man," or Dr. W. M. Taylor's "Limitations of Life," will show how effectively two masters in opposite styles of sermonizing can use their studies among the poets.

* *Vide* Tulloch's "Life of Pascal," p. 51.

Not, indeed, to make poetical sermons, but to cultivate the imaginative side of our being, to rouse all our mental power by stirring the depths of emotion, to make us less prosaic and more keen-sighted in the comprehension of life and its problems—this is what a study of poetry can do and has done for many a hard-working parish minister. Dr. Tucker of Andover Theological Seminary, we understand, makes a study of some poets part of his homiletical course. In this he is wise. As incidental training, nothing could be better adapted to make effective preachers.

Aside from all this, such studies would prepare ministers to appreciate far more fully the glorious poetry of the Bible. How many of the ministry after all feel this, or are able to tell their people what the secret of its power is! They praise it in the hackneyed and set phrases of immemorial usage. But if they were to try to set forth in a lecture what the poetic elements really are in the Book of Job, or the Psalter, or the Prophets, they might be somewhat at a loss. They could not be if they had made themselves familiar with the best of uninspired poetry, specially if they brought some critical study to bear upon it.

And yet the clergyman may be pardoned if he stops to select, and to select carefully, his authors in the vast poetic field. Some he must neglect, for life is short and his necessary reading is long. Some he can well afford to neglect. He need not give much time to the love-lyrics of Herrick. He can afford to let the "fleshy school" of poetry severely alone. But there are poets like Shakespeare and Wordsworth and Browning whom he neglects to his own cost. For they can help him to better work as well as give him the delight and the culture true poetry can freely bestow. What, then, of Browning? A word or two on his personal history. Robert Browning was born at Camberwell, near London, May 7, 1812, and is therefore now in his seventy-sixth year of age. He cannot, like most of his great compeers in English literature, be called university bred, for he is a graduate of neither Oxford nor Cambridge, and is only said "to have attended some lectures" at the London University. In 1832 he went to Italy, where he made close studies of the Italian people in every condition of life and devoted himself to the study of mediæval times and characters. The fruit of all this is seen in his poetic works. His first poem, "Pauline," appeared in 1833, followed by his "Paracelsus" in 1835. The latter poem especially, satisfied the discerning few that a poet of high order had risen to divide the honors with Tennyson, then also looming on the horizon a bright particular star. Since that time Mr. Browning has been incessantly at work, "bringing forth fruit in old age," until his poetry is more voluminous than that of any other English poet. It may be admitted that, like Wordsworth's work, it must suffer some elimination. But the large residue is poetic work of the highest order. The range is wide from "How they brought the good news from Ghent to

Aix" to the "Ring and the Book." Yet Browning is essentially a dramatic poet, more so perhaps in his dramatic monologues and dramatic lyrics than in such dramas as his historical tragedy, "Strafford." But dramatic poetry is apt to be richest in its lessons for religious teachers, because it deals with the human soul in its deepest passions. Of all poets, Shakespeare is the best study for clergymen, and the verdict of competent criticism has awarded to Robert Browning the high praise of being more Shakespearian in his treatment of human life than any poet since Shakespeare wrote.

There has been indeed loud and long complaint against what is called the *obscurity* of Browning. He has been curtly dismissed by many, who say he is hard to read and hard to understand. It is only the blind partisanship of a Browning *cult* which refuses to see anything of this in their idol. He is not always easy reading. Not seldom he must be read over and perhaps over again before his meaning is grasped. We freely admit his poetic diction to be rough at times, and he seems to have a delight in rugged versification. Alas, however, for our age, the vice of which it is that it craves only *easy* reading. The voracious appetite for fiction has made many unwilling to make any effort toward comprehending an author. Sermons that tax thinking power in the pews are apt to go a-begging. Browning in all his best poetry is not obscure to those who are willing to make an honest effort to take in his meaning. It is not that Browning is obscure, but that some of his critics are shallow, that makes the trouble.

It ought to draw all religious teachers to this poet, that in all his poetic interpretation of external nature "it is not the order and regularity in the processes of the natural world which chiefly delight [his] imagination, but the *streaming forth of power and will and love from the whole face of the visible universe.*"* How exactly this coincides with the view of nature given in the inspired poetry of such a Psalm as the 104th! "A law of nature means nothing to Mr. Browning if it does not mean the immanence of power and will and love." Hence, when he is describing the flooding light of an Oriental noonday he finds words like these convey his thoughts:

*"He glows above
With scarce an intervention, presses close,
And palpitatingly, His soul o'er ours."*

Compare this with the view of God in nature set forth in the strophes of the 104th Psalm. It is evident that the Hebrew and the English poet use the same lyre and sweep its strings with the same touch. Surely a poet who looks out on nature with such an eye ought to be the study of men who are compelled to protest against a "science falsely so called" which beholds the created universe only to say, "*Here's law. Where's God?*"

* Professor Dowden. The italics are ours.

It is not, however, as the poet of nature but as the poet of the human soul that Browning has achieved his best work. Rev. Prof. Westcott has most aptly said, "he recognizes rarely and as it were at a distance the larger life of humanity, but the single soul in its discipline, its progress, its aspirations, its failures, is the main object of his study, analysis and portraiture." "Little else is worth study," Browning says himself.* A large class of his poems are a dramatic unfolding of the darker passions of the human soul. Shakespeare has not more keenly analyzed nor more graphically portrayed the working of the human conscience. Nor does any poet deal as Browning does with the "corrupt semblances, the hypocrisies, formalisms, and fanaticisms of man's religious life."

What his power is in depicting human passion can perhaps best be seen in "The Ring and the Book." All through it are found no lay figures, but men and women, actual flesh and blood creations, giving vent to every form of passion. Its characters range through the entire scale of human nature. It is a poem too of awful contrasts—the womanly innocence of Pompilia and the consummate villainy of Count Guido. What is there in Shakespeare more finely said than this passage on temptation :

. . . "Was the trial sore?
Temptation sharp? Thank God a second time.
Why comes temptation but for man to meet,
And master, and make crouch beneath his foot,
And so be pedestalled in triumph? Pray,
'Lead us into no such temptations, Lord!'
Yea, but, O Thou whose servants are the bold,
Lead such temptations by the head and hair,
Reluctant dragons, up to who dares fight,
That so he may do battle and have praise."

The "Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister" is a poem which will well illustrate Browning's treatment of false forms of religion. It is a picture of "superstition which has survived religion," while in "Johannes Agricola in Meditation" we have an "Antinomian predestinarianism" drawn with a graphic power only equaled by the portrait of the persecutor in the "Heretic's Tragedy."

And the treatment of conscience by Browning is only second, if it is second, to Shakespeare's handling of this subject in his great tragedies. "Paracelsus," "Pippa Passes," "Sordello," all are masterpieces in this analysis of its workings. Browning delights also in studies of life as a school of moral discipline. He believes profoundly in man's capacity for moral progress. His creed is found in lines like these from "A Death in the Desert":

. . . "Man . . .
Creeps ever on from fancies to the fact,
And in this striving

* Dedication to Sordello.

Finds progress, man's distinctive mark alone—
Not God's and not the beast's: God is, they are,
Man partly is and wholly hopes to be. . . .

Getting increase of knowledge, since he learns
Because he lives, which is to be a man
Set to instruct himself by his past self."

His early poem, "Paracelsus," embodies clearly this conception, wrought out in his life. The career of Paracelsus is traced from his wreck of manhood in the desire for *knowledge*, to its redemption through *love*. He "stands at last where the Christian is enabled by faith to stand at first. He is humbled, broken, purified."

The poem "Rabbi Ben Ezra" is another which embodies the poet's philosophy of life. "Our present life is to be taken in its entirety. . . . Its lets and limitations are not to be disparaged and overborne, but accepted and used in due order. Each element in human nature is to be allowed its proper office. Each season brings its own work and its own means." No quotation can do it justice, but a single stanza may reveal its spirit.

"Grow old along with me !
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which the first was made :
Our times are in His hand
Who saith, 'A whole I planned.
Youth shows but half; trust God; see all, nor be afraid.'"

Even more suggestive is Browning's unfolding of the view that life means final success through repeated failures. He teaches that an acknowledged failure is a promise of future attainment. It springs often from the corruption of man's heart. It comes too through our environments, specially a deprivation of needed helps to success. Take his little poem on "Apparent Failures." Its closing stanza reveals the poet's philosophy of failure :

"It's wiser being good than bad,
It's safer being meek than fierce,
It's fitter being sane than mad.
My own hope is, a sun will pierce
The thickest cloud earth ever stretched,
That after Last, returns the First;
That which began best can't end worst,
Nor what God blessed once, prove accurst."

This note is frequent. It is struck in "Abt Vogler," in "Saul," in "Popularity," in "James Lee." He is the poet of Hope, and his philosophy of failure as a discipline for final success reminds us over and over again of Shakespeare's immortal lines :

"The worst is not
So long as we can say, 'This is the worst.'"

It is only, however, when we consider Browning as *pre-eminently the Christian poet* that his claims for study by ministers can be fully set

forth. Professor Corson has put the matter well when he says that "Browning is the most essentially Christian of living poets." He is such beyond a doubt. "Christianity is with [him], and this he sets forth again and again, in a *life* quickened and motived and nourished by the Personality of Christ." There are two of his poems which perhaps convey most fully this aspect of his poetry. They are his "Christmas Eve" and his "Easter Day." Perhaps, his "Death in the Desert" also should be named. These poems embody what he conceives to be the essential spirit of Christianity. It is St. John rather than St. Paul whose spirit Browning has embodied. But he is attracted to St. John because he finds there most powerfully drawn out the power in Christ's divine personality. This, rather than any dogmatic statement of the atonement, has fascination for Browning. It may not be the whole truth, but it is a truth of Christianity immense in its power as it is soul-subduing in its conception.

There is one poem, "Bishop Blougram's Apology," which should be studied by every clergyman. It is said to be a picture of Cardinal Wiseman. But whether this be so or not, it is an amazing vivisection of worldliness in the garb of sanctity. Nothing like it can be found in the whole range of English poetry.

Of Browning as the poet of God and immortality we have not space to treat. Enough, however, has been said to show how deeply his poetry is imbued with truths and views of life which clergymen are concerned to grapple with. The poet is a seer. He may see deeper into the meaning of life, after all, than the so-called and much-vaunted *practical* man, who thinks he understands human life because he is well up in all the tricks of the trades or the caucus. We do well to study life as these seers of the soul embody it for us. No attempt has been made to set forth any presentation of Browning's poetic genius. That is many-sided. But its discussion belongs rather to the literary than to the homiletic magazine. We have only aimed to show that here is a great living poet whom our clergy cannot afford to neglect. One word by way of counsel to any who may be inclined to study him. Get Professor Corson's "Introduction to Browning" and read it first. That will disclose the secret of Browning's power. Read then the poems named in this article, and let alone those called the more obscure. There is plenty in Robert Browning against which no hint of obscurity will be charged. One thing is certain, that he is growing more and more in favor with thoughtful people, and has helped many souls into a nobler life. Can the clergy afford to let alone any poet of whom this can be said?

V.—HUXLEY ON MIRACLES.

BY SAMUEL P. SPRECKER, D.D., CLEVELAND, O.

THE current number, January, 1888, of the *Popular Science Monthly* contains a remarkable article from Prof. Huxley entitled "Science and the Bishop." It is especially interesting as an illustration of the fact that scientists and theologians are finding common ground to stand upon. Positions which have but recently been hotly contested between the two parties are in this article distinctly given up to the believers in miracles. Prof. Huxley even chides the Bishop of Manchester for yielding ground which the scientists cannot properly claim. He says :

"I do not think that the Bishop of Manchester need have been so much alarmed as he evidently has been by the objections which have often been raised to prayer on the ground that a belief in the efficacy of prayer is inconsistent with a belief in the constancy of the order of nature. The bishop appears to admit that there is an antagonism between the 'regular economy of nature' and the 'regular economy of prayer,' and that 'prayers for the interruption of God's natural order' are of 'doubtful validity.' It appears to me that the bishop's difficulty simply adds another example to those which I have several times insisted upon in the pages of this Review and elsewhere, of the mischief which has been done and is being done by a mistaken apprehension of the real meaning of 'natural order' and 'law of nature.' May I, therefore, be permitted to repeat, once more, that the statements denoted by these terms have no greater value or cogency than such as may attach to generalizations from experience of the past and to expectations for the future based upon that experience? Nobody can presume to say what the order of nature must be; all that the widest experience (even if extended over all past time and through all space) that events had happened in a certain way could justify would be a proportionally strong expectation that events will go on so happening, and the demand for a proportional strength of evidence in favor of any assertion that they had happened otherwise. It is this weighty consideration, the truth of which every one who is capable of logical thought must surely admit, which knocks the bottom out of all *à priori* objections either to ordinary 'miracles' or to the efficacy of prayer, in so far as the latter implies the miraculous intervention of a higher power. No one is entitled to say *à priori* that any given so-called miraculous event is impossible; and no one is entitled to say *à priori* that prayer for some change in the ordinary course of nature cannot possibly avail. . . . Certainly I do not lack faith in the constancy of natural order. But I am not less convinced that if I were to ask the Bishop of Manchester to do me a kindness which lay in his power he would do it. And I am unable to see that his action or my request involves any violation of the order of nature. How is the case altered if my request is preferred to some imaginary superior being, or to the Most High Being, who by the supposition is able to avert disease or make the sun stand still in the heavens just as easily as I can stop my watch or make it indicate any hour that pleases me? I repeat that it is not upon any *à priori* considerations that objections either to the supposed efficacy of prayer in modifying the course of events or to the supposed occurrence of miracles can be scientifically based."

On the authority of so great a scientist we may now consider several points as settled.

1. That the fact of the *universality of law* need not in the least affect our belief in miracles. We were formerly told that this modern discovery of the universality of law had given the death blow to faith in miracles. It was said that in the olden times men believed that all phenomena—rain and cloud, storm and calm, harvest and famine, sickness and health, earthquake and volcano—all the changes which they beheld in nature, were either uncaused or were the result of the varying moods of the gods or of God, by whose interference they were produced; that it was very natural for men to believe in miracles then. But now modern science has resolved every seemingly fitful change to the action of most uniform laws—revealing law everywhere—showing that every drop of rain, every breath of wind, every cloud, every wave, every sunbeam, every change of temperature, famine, pestilence—all are governed by laws as uniform as those which move the heavenly bodies; that there is no chance or uncertainty anywhere; that the same causes everywhere and always produce the same results, and that a belief in miracles is, under present knowledge, unscientific.

But we are no more to be so reproved in the name of science. On the contrary, we are assured that it is scientific to believe that God may work miracles or give answers to prayer, because either can be done without violating natural law, just as easily as when we ourselves interfere with nature's laws and bring to pass results which would not have taken place without our intervention.

We are given scientific permission to believe that He who holds the reins can guide the steeds even more completely than we can; that He can subordinate a lower law to a higher one, and by His superior knowledge of the laws of nature bring to pass results so far beyond our ability as that we call them miracles. Yea, it is even intimated that it would not be unscientific to believe, on sufficient evidence, that God had violated the laws of nature.

The famous argument of David Hume against miracles is wholly and absolutely given up. Prof. Huxley takes his stand with John Stuart Mill, who in his "Three Essays on Religion" says: "Hume's argument against miracles is valid only on the supposition that there is no personal God. Once admit a God, a creator of nature, and a miracle or interference with nature is to be reckoned with as a serious possibility, and evidence sufficient to establish such an interference is easily conceivable."

He retires entirely from Hume's position that "no amount of historical testimony can establish a miracle." He declares that it is simply a question of evidence, the ground on which the battle ought, from the first, to have been fought." He says: "The real objection, and to my mind the fatal objection, is the inadequacy of the evidence which has

been adduced to prove any given case of such occurrences. It is a canon of common sense, to say nothing of science, that the more improbable a supposed occurrence, the more cogent ought to be the evidence in its favor. I have looked somewhat carefully into the subject, and I am unable to find in the records of any miraculous event evidence which even approximates to the fulfillment of this requirement." We may suggest here that the old way of thinking among scientists, that miracles are unscientific and not to be believed on any amount of historical evidence, has much to do with this appearance, to Prof. Huxley, of inadequacy in the evidences. As an example of the hold which this old way of thinking has had upon the minds of skeptics take this sentence from the introduction to Renan's "Life of Jesus:" "Let the gospels be in part legendary; that is evident since they are full of miracles and the supernatural." Here it is simply assumed that accounts of miracles *must* be legendary. Or this sentence from Lecky's "History of European Morals:" "If, then, I have correctly interpreted the opinions of ordinary educated people on this subject, it appears that the common attitude towards miracles is not that of doubt, of hesitation, of discontent with the existing evidence, but rather of *absolute, derisive, and even unexamining incredulity.*" Strauss in his "Life of Jesus" says, "We must rule out of biblical history, as out of other history, all miraculous events as impossible."

Now is it not highly probable that Professor Huxley and multitudes of others are influenced greatly in their investigation of the evidence in support of the gospel miracles by this old predetermination not to believe in miracles?

The especial weakness of the evidence, as it appears to Professor Huxley, he defines in this sentence: "Scientific ethics can and does declare that the profession of belief in them on the evidence of documents of unknown date and of unknown authority is immoral."

The inadequacy of evidence here complained of does not obtain in the case of at least the fundamental Christian miracle, viz., the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This miracle is recorded in certain books the authenticity and the date of which are beyond all controversy: the four Epistles of Paul—Romans, Galatians and First and Second Corinthians. Critics all, without exception, admit that Paul wrote these books; that he was converted from six to ten years after the death of Christ, and that he wrote these books not later than twenty years after his conversion. Paul's account, therefore, of this miracle cannot be of the nature of legend, but must be just such as was preached by the apostles within several years or immediately after the death of Christ. If then it is to be purely a question of historical evidence, let any one attempt to account for that faith of the apostles, or of Paul, in the resurrection of Christ, without admitting the fact, and he will feel as did the celebrated Dr. Baur, the leader of the Tübingen school

of critics. This greatest of modern skeptics and acknowledged master of the modern critical school, at the close of his life made the concession that the conversion of the Apostle Paul was to him a mystery which could only be explained by the "miracle of the resurrection."

VI. — WAS ADAM THE FIRST MAN?

BY CHARLES S. ROBINSON, D.D., NEW YORK.

"AND so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul: the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."—1 Cor. xv:45. Was Adam really the first human being on this earth? This verse certainly calls him by the name, "the first man Adam." What does that mean? When Adam and Eve earliest became acquainted with the world, on which their residence was to be for all the future, and began to press forward some ordinary explorations which their interest and their curiosity would be likely to prompt, did they find anybody else, any persons resembling themselves dwelling on this terrestrial ball?

I. Three elements, at least, enter into our consideration. Among them is one that is historic, one that is exegetical, one that is theological; these are closely dependent the one on the other, and no man will reach any satisfactory conclusion who does not study them all.

1. There is, in the first place, a historic element of difficulty in deciding this question. Some of my readers will feel safer now, I grow quite persuaded, if we begin with quoting texts from the Word of God.

We are told that Adam and Eve, after their great sin which drove them forth forever from the Garden of Paradise, had two sons, Cain and Abel. In a fit of jealousy, because of the preference accorded to his brother's sacrifice, Cain slew Abel. The Lord cursed him for his retribution, and sent him away from his relatives and friends. The whole story is interesting, and it is best that it should be quoted exactly:

"And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me. And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him. And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden. And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch."

This name "Nod" means exile, or wandering; but nobody knows where the country was into which Cain went, except that it was out east toward Persia or India somewhere. Then the history proceeds; Cain is announced as being married; he has a son; he builds a city, calling it by his son's name; and now population there is rapidly on the increase.

So let us understand: There are some questions of which a disposal will have to be made before we can answer candidly whether Adam alone was the proprietor of the world on the day he was created. As an example, take these: Of whom was Cain afraid when he was sent away as a vagabond? If there were no other people living then, except his two parents, and he was going instantly away from them, who was there that could kill him? Josephus, at his wits' end, says he was afraid of the animals; but why would

the animals want to put him to death for Abel's sake? What special interest had they in this other brother?

Once more: Who was Cain's wife? If you say he married his relative in the family, where do you find it said that he had any relative of any sort—sister, aunt, niece, or cousin—clear down to the morning when Seth was born? To be sure, Adam is said to have had, in the subsequent periods of his life, "sons and daughters;" but this was not in time for Cain's marriage. Moreover, no one can study the record without being convinced that, when Abel was killed, and Cain was banished, our first parents believed the promise of a seed to bruise the head of the serpent was lost, at least to them. The name "Cain" means, as the margin suggests, "gotten, or acquired;" and so Eve, when Cain was born to her, cried out, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." That is, this is what our version declares she said; but the New Revision translates it differently: "I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord;" and a noticeable thing is, that the words *the help of* are in italics; this is to show that there is no such thing in the speech that Eve made. What she said was, "I have gotten the man Jehovah!" She thought that God's promise was then fulfilled: "I have gotten the man Yahveh!" the Coming One, He that shall be. She knew this mysterious name even then, long before Moses ever uttered it.

But now mark: Cain proved to be actively irreligious; he was wicked. Then Abel was born; ay this time, these expectations of the disappointed mother had become moderated. Eve records in the name of her baby her sense of hopelessness; the word *Abel* means *vanity*; vanity of vanities, to her all was vanity. Then Cain openly defied God and slew his brother. And now there is no record of any more children born for many long seasons, until Adam was a hundred and thirty years old; then Seth was added to the family; and his name, like the others, tells how the woman felt when he came. The word *Seth* means *appointed*; he was called so because he seemed to take Abel's old place, which apparently had still not been supplied: "for God," so Eve exclaimed, "hath appointed me another seed, instead of Abel, whom Cain slew." Now, how can such language be explained, if Adam and Eve, since Abel's death, had had other children? And if they had had no children since then, whom did Cain marry, we should like to know, if there were no other people on the earth except Adam's family? Is it wise to keep telling the children, over and over again, Cain married his sister?

For, you see, it is bad enough for a man to marry his sister anyway; but what do you think of a sister's marrying a murderer who, just now, had killed her brother and broken his mother's heart? What must we think of Eve permitting one of her daughters to marry a vagabond, whom God had cursed and marked and sent away forever? Did the girl go willingly, did her mother let her go cheerfully, and we never hear any more of either of them? Was a third one of Adam's children sacrificed to follow up the career of this wretched outcast from God? Was one of the daughters of this first woman of the race pushed out into the distant wilderness of Nod, forever separated from her parents, her religious training and help, her God and her hope, just to be the companion of this reprobate murderer until death should end her lonesome sorrow? And then, when Cain had a child, and built a city, who did the practical work of setting up a town, and who occupied the houses afterward?

2. Thus we all find that some disposal must be made of questions like these in the history; but meantime we pass on to a second element entering into this discussion, namely, the exegetical.

Here I call attention to one passage which has puzzled commentators and poets and theologians more than any other to be found in the history of the Old Testament. Let us read it over together :

“ And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair ; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh : yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days ; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them : the same became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown.”

Expositors have suggested almost everything conceivable concerning this part of the inspired record. Even angels have been declared, both by scholars writing history and by visionaries making fables, to have been these “ sons of God ” here mentioned as having married beautiful human brides. But the New Testament tells us that angels “ neither marry nor are given in marriage.” The common explanation, which comes up always in the class-books for children, is that Seth’s children, as a godly race, and so the offspring of the Creator, espoused some of the daughters of Cain, as supposedly wicked, in having had such a murderer for a father ; in this way morality was outraged and the world ruined. John Milton seems to lend his authority to this method of explanation :

“ That sober race of men, whose lives
Religious titled them *the sons of God.*”

But now look at the language, word by word, for a strange reversal of the sense is noticeable at the start. The expression, “ When men began to multiply,” is “ when the Adam began to multiply.” And so that next expression, “ sons of God,” is “ sons of the Elohim,” sons of gods. We have in one passage of the Old Testament the phrase, “ the cedars of God,” and rendered in our Bible, “ the goodly cedars ;” the meaning is a fine illustration of the Hebrew idiom. The name of God is added to an object of vast size, or of eminent loveliness, or of extraordinary height—a mere form of magnifying the superiority it possesses. So we have that parallel expression, “ the trees of the Lord,” signifying magnificently large trees ; and also, “ the mountains of God,” meaning lofty or majestic mountains. Over in the New Testament, when Stephen was talking to a Hebrew-speaking audience, he used the idiom even in Greek ; for as he spoke of Moses he called him “ a goodly child ;” and we see that out upon the margin the words are added, “ to God ;” this child was “ beautiful to God,” that is, divinely beautiful. In just this way the expression before us now may be traced through the Bible ; it is sometimes rendered “ princes.” And some very orthodox scholars assure us that “ sons of God ” may mean men of great rank, or great size, or strength—that is, chieftains, or famous giants, or men of exceeding renown. The Chaldee version says at once in this place, “ sons of the eminent ones.”

Then, further, the expression “ daughters of men ” is literally “ the daughters of the Adam,” that is, the children of the Adamite race which bore the image of God the Creator. This is the reason why right afterwards the Lord says his Spirit shall not always strive with Adam, or the Adamite race ; it was the women who were held responsible for an increase of wickedness, because they had in some way mated wrongly, and in so doing committed sin. Now, the chief question is concerning that race of husbands whom these daughters of the pious race married. Here the verse moves on

to say that there were "giants" in those days; read that one statement over again; notice its relevancy, each word exactly:

"There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown."

Who were these "giants?" The name refers to character and habit quite as much as it does to stature and strength; it signifies men who were tremendous in cruelty, rapine and violence. One commentator describes them as "usurpers, monsters of wickedness and lust, as well as of enormous stature." These strange beings appear all through the annals of those times. They have different names: Anakim, Rephaim, Gibborim. Frequent allusions are made to them, and possibly to this particular part of Genesis, which do not come to the notice of those who read the Bible only in English. For example: "He who wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." That word "dead" is in the original *giants*. "The house of the strange woman inclineth unto death," that is, "unto the giants." The specific notion seems to be in every case of a great, bulky, sensual creature, strong in mind and body, but destitute of conscience and morals.

Hence, this verse really seems to say, when the terms are plain to our understanding, that these daughters of the Adamite race grew up fair and attractive, but that they yielded to the blandishments of the warriors and hunters and rovers, mighty men of renown, and so betrayed their faith in God and gave up their religious principle. Then children were born, and godless races began to mingle with the population. Traces of this seem to have been carried over the deluge in the family of Ham; for before long Nimrod is mentioned as "a mighty hunter"—this same term being applied to him, a *giant* to be made a proverb out of, a rebel (as the name Nimrod means), a murderer, and a blasphemer of God.

3. So now we must pass on to specify the third difficulty in the discussion, mentioned in the beginning, namely, the theological.

For theology as a science it would be unfair to claim any immunity or advantage over any other of the sciences; but it so happens, in the formation of our systems and creeds, we have declared that we rely explicitly and entirely on the declarations of God's inspired Word. A conflict of theology with geology, therefore, is a conflict of science with God, provided our professions are honest and our confessions are founded on the Scriptures. Now, from the Bible we understand that Adam was representing the entire human race when he sinned and fell. If at that time there were other people living, other races building cities, and hunting beasts, or tilling farms, how should we know which one of a number of races Adam and Eve belonged to? Here come in those texts of Paul's epistles, to which allusion was just made. The apostle declares: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: for as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." That means Adam on the one hand, and Jesus Christ on the other. The verses lose all sense if there were ever in the world any people, previously created, who were not represented by Adam in his guilt, nor by Jesus Christ in his atonement for it. So with some other passages, too: "For if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Every-

body is a sinner; Adam's transgression dragged down the whole human family; the second Adam, that is, Christ, opened a way for pardon. And so our trouble comes in here: if there were any human beings whose stock was different, so that they were not like Adam, then there would be for them no share in the redemption provided by Jesus Christ.

II. It is plain that a reply to the question with which we commenced this discussion is not so very easy as might be thought. Allow me at this point to comment somewhat familiarly on the position; it is likely that this will help us as much as anything; for what we want in such a juncture is to know, if it be possible, precisely where we are.

Once already in a former article we have merely imagined there might have been dwelling on this earth a large and powerful race, possibly resembling human beings in look, habits, appetites, everything except the one grand, solitary thing, a religious instinct, with full capacities for communion with God as the Supreme Ruler over all. This was our hypothesis; nothing more nor less than a theory, which we never said was true, but which we surmised we might work for a little.

1. Would this aid to explain where Cain got his wife? Would the thought of people all around him—not belonging at all to Adam's race, you understand, but possessing the country; intelligent, but not good; no sense of God moving their souls—would this help to answer how his new city was built, and who inhabited it? Would this tell us whom the murderer was afraid of, before the mysterious defence was given him by his merciful Maker? Would this relieve us from our embarrassment in trying to pity that melancholy man, who, as some hitherto supposed, was weeping because he was quietly married to his exceedingly meek sister, and was going off among his own children, or some more sisters, or the relatives of his father, or some more nephews and nieces, whose names, by the by, had not anywhere been mentioned? Would this theory aid us in explaining what Cain meant when he said he was going away from God for all the future: "from thy face shall I be hid?" Did not the reprobate know very well that the Almighty could have nothing to do with such an ungodly species? So there could be for Adam and Eve no common or sympathetic basis of association: Cain was going away from good and God.

2. Then, again, suppose we take this hypothesis with us into our theological difficulties. It is evident that the exegesis of the familiar texts will settle every question concerning the creeds. Any one of men's schemes of philosophy will prove unsound, the moment it slips over the edge of inspired statements of truth as they lie in the Scriptures. So now we ask, in all humility, is there anything in God's own Word to give countenance to such a conjecture as this we have made?

There is this fact: two words are used in the Old Testament as a designation of what we call man. One is *Ish*, the feminine of which is *Isha*. Adam himself uses both of these when he says of Eve, "She shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man." In the margin, as an interpretation, you will find the names *Ish* and *Isha* in our English Bibles. A sharp distinction is preserved between these terms, as if a discrimination was designed to be suggested between body and spirit of the Adamite race. Hence, through the Scriptures the antithesis recurs frequently. "Give ear, all ye inhabitants of the world, both low and high:" literally, the words are, "sons of Adam, and sons of *Ish*." The same is found in another place, when sin prevails, and meets rebuke in the common denunciation: "Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lie." That is simply "sons of Adam, and sons of *Ish*." So in Isaiah ii: 9, we are told: "the mean

man boweth down, and the great man humbleth himself :” that is, sons of Adam and sons of Ish as before. In Isaiah v :15, with like meaning, we read : “The mean man shall be brought down, and the mighty man shall be humbled :” sons of Adam and sons of Ish. In most of these cases our translators have calmly applied the terms as if the Adamite had been the lowest race, and the other the highest ; but the thought would be clearer if the exact reversal in the statement had been chosen. There certainly may be found in God’s Word some singular suggestions of other races than that of Adam, if it is ever proved to be necessary to admit that there were such.

It becomes evident that the discussion must be arrested here for want of space to conclude it. Was Adam positively the first man ? The most I am able to say now is, that he was certainly the first Adam, as our quoted text asserts. Whether he was the first of the *sons of Ish* also, no one of us can yet decide. I imitate the construction of language employed by Hugh Miller when he was speaking from his side in an inquiry concerning the relation of Geology to Genesis ; and I say, that if devout naturalists should ever succeed in proving that there were a class or progeny or species of people looking like men, and yet destitute of conscience and a religious nature, residing on the earth while Adam and Eve were happy and holy in the Garden of Eden, I think it may be easy to find some texts that bear upon the conclusion, and candidly I know of nothing in the Bible, and nothing in our system of theology, which, rightly understood, will in the end stand opposed to it.

VI.—CLUSTERS OF GEMS.

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

NO. III.—DOING THE WILL OF GOD.

The essence of sin is voluntary conflict with the will of God. “The will of the flesh” asserts itself in appetite ; “the will of man” in the carnal mind, in avarice and ambition and selfishness ; the will of Satan in desires and deeds so malignant as to betray a diabolical source.

Hence the essence of piety is absolute surrender to the will of God. Hence, also, a holy life must be one of conflict, or victory through trial. Appetite and passion tend to their objects without restraint of moderation or moral obligation. The will of God, once accepted, rallies reason, conscience and spiritual force to oppose and control and finally vanquish carnality.

To understand that God’s will is always good, in accordance with love and pure benevolence, disposes us to delight in it. Obedience becomes a joy.

The last fortress—the central stronghold of the unregenerate soul—is *self-will*. The pride of human righteousness is the last to bow to God. After Alexander had passed the Granicus, he offered to rebuild Diana’s fane at Ephesus, with all its former magnificence, if he might be allowed to inscribe upon its frontispiece *his own name*.

Every life whose centre and secret is God’s will has a divine mission. Jean Ingelow adds : “Every life has an end to serve. With some people it is to teach others forbearance and patience, to try temper ; none of us know what we are till we are tried. Not that God designed any of his creatures for such purpose ; but if we do not perform the good part we all have it in our power to take upon us, God will make even our evil subservient to the good of others. God will turn our very faults into blessings for other and more obedient souls.”

Habitual doing of the will of God gives to *character both power of resistance and power of insistence and persistence*—defensive and aggressive en-

ergy—*grit and grip*. The obedient soul holds fast and stands fast. His will is like an anchor to hold and an anvil to stand.

Obedience to God's will makes man practically omnipotent, for his impotence is yoked to omnipotence. Some one says, "When God lets loose on the world a *thinker*, let men beware!" But it is far more true, that when God lets loose on the world a consecrated man, he turns the world upside down.

Doing God's will brings the peace of immovable serenity and firmness. Keble sings:

"How on a rock they stand,
Who watch His eye, and hold His guiding hand;
Not half so fixed amid her vassal hills,
Rises the holy pile that Kedron's valley fills."

To do God's will is the secret of increasing *knowledge*. John vii : 17, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." The will to obey—the doing of God's will in active obedience—is always followed and even attended by new revelations of knowledge. Obedience helps us intuitively to recognize God's will, it clarifies the vision.

Per contra, *not to do God's will* makes one more and more doubtful of truth, and darkens the mind and understanding as well as conscience. There is an opaque spot in the retina. The base of the optic nerve in the eye, the circular spot of the retina, behind which lies no part of the choroid coat, is itself incapable of conveying to the brain the impression of distinct vision; in a disobedient soul this "punctum cæcum" of the moral eye becomes larger and larger until it overspreads the whole orb of vision, and men are given over to believe a lie.

Hell is that place or state where God's will is unrecognized and self-will has complete sway. "Depart from me" is the typical doom of lost angel and lost soul.

Professor Drummond says: "What is the end of life? The end of life is not to do good, although many of us think so. It is not to win souls, although I once thought so. The end of life is to do the will of God. That may be in the line of doing good or winning souls, or it may not. For the individuals, the answer to the question, 'What is the end of my life?' is to do the will of God, whatever that may be. Spurgeon replied to a committee inviting him to preach to an exceptionally large audience, 'I have no wish to preach to 10,000 people, but to do the will of God,' and he declined. If we could have no ambition past the will of God, our lives would be successful. If we could say, 'I have no ambition to go to the heathen, I have no ambition to win souls, my ambition is to do the will of God, whatever that may be;' that makes all lives equally great, or equally small, because the only great thing in a life is what of God's will there is in it. The maximum achievement of any man's life after it is all over is to have done the will of God. No man or woman can have done any more with a life; no Luther, no Spurgeon, no Wesley, no Melancthon can have done any more with their lives, and a dairy maid or a scavenger can do as much. Therefore, the supreme principle upon which we have to run our lives is to adhere, through good report and ill, through temptation and prosperity and adversity, to the will of God, wherever that may lead us. It may take you away to China, or you who are going to Africa may have to stay where you are; you who are going to be an evangelist may have to go into business, and you who are going into business may have to become an evangelist. But there is no happiness or success in any life till that principle is taken possession of.

"How can you build up a life on that principle? Let me give you an outline of a little Bible reading.

"The definition of an ideal life : 'A man after mine own heart, who will fulfill all my will.' The object of life : 'I come to do thy will, O God.'

"The first thing you need after life is food : 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.'

"The next thing you need after food is society : 'He that doeth the will of my Father in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.'

"You want education : 'Teach me to do thy will, O God.'

"You want pleasure : 'I delight to do thy will, O God.'

"A whole life can be built up on that one vertebral column, and then when all is over, 'he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.'

Self-will must die daily. Where God's will is supreme, the believer dies to the bondage and penalty of law, to the power and dominion of sin, to works of self-righteousness which are works of self-will, and to self-indulgence, which is idolatry of self. Billy Bray in his simplicity said, "I resolved to be *nothing* ; for when I am nothing the devil can't get hold of nothing."

Heaven is that place or state where the will of God is solely, constantly, lovingly done, and no contrary will is known. "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven : " that is the ideal standard. Agassiz conjectured that "the highest conception of Paradise is the sum of the lives of all worlds" —a magnificent thought ; but it pales beside this sublimer idea of heaven, as the sum of the combined lives of all obedient beings angelic and human, where millions of wills are melted into God's will.

Those who *persistently* refuse to do God's will are *finally abandoned* to self-will. In the Mishna it is said that the shekinah or presence of God, after having finally retired from Jerusalem, "dwelt" three and a half years on the Mount of Olives to see whether the Jewish people would or would not repent, calling, "Return to me, O my sons, and I will return to you. Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near," and then when all was vain, returned to his own place. (Stanley's Sinai, etc., p. 186.)

The Swift Transition. An Alpine hunter, ascending Mont Blanc, in passing over the Mer de Glace, lost his hold, and slipped into a frightful crevasse. Catching in his swift descent against the points of rocks and projecting spurs of ice, he broke his fall, and reached the bottom alive, but only to face death in a more terrible form. On either hand the icy walls rose high, and above he saw only a strip of blue sky. At his feet trickled a little stream formed from the melting glacier. There was but one possible chance of escape—to follow this rivulet, which might lead to some unknown crevice or passage. In silence and terror he picked his way down the mountain side till his further advance was stopped by a giant cliff that rose up before him while the river rolled darkly below. He heard the roaring of the waters, which seemed to wait for him. What should he do ? Death was beside him and behind him, and, he might fear, before him. There was no time for reflection or delay. He paused but an instant, and plunged into the stream. One minute of breathless suspense—a sense of darkness, and coldness, and yet of swift motion, as if he were gliding through the shades below, and then a light began to glimmer faintly on the waters, and the next instant he was amid the green fields and the flowers and the summer sunshine of the vale of Chamouni. So it is when believers die. They come to the bank of the river, and it is cold and dark. Nature shrinks from the fatal plunge. Yet one chilly moment, and all fear is left behind, and the Christian is amid the fields of the paradise of God.

"MORS JANUA VITÆ."

The worldly man can only say : *Dum spiro spero* ; but the disciple can reply : "Dum exspiro spero."

SERMONIC SECTION.

"HIGHER! HIGHER!"*

BY LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D. [CONGREGATIONAL], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal, unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.—Phil. iii: 13, 14 (alt.).

A GREAT many sermons have been preached from this text, "One thing I do," on the necessity of concentration of effort and energy in life. The lesson is an excellent one, but it is not contained in the text. If you will look at either the old or the new version, you will see that the words "I do" are printed in italics. They are not in the original. What Paul says is this: "I have begun a Christian life. I do not count myself to have yet succeeded, but there is one thing: I am trying to succeed." The lesson in this text is not concentration of effort. It is *progress*.

I propose to speak to you this morning and next Sabbath morning on Progress in the Religious Life: this Sabbath morning on the duty, indeed on the inexorable necessity of it, and next Sabbath morning on the laws which govern it; in both, seeking simply to set before you the principles which Paul inculcates.

Naturalism regards all religion as simply a growth. Christian faith regards it as primarily and in its inception a gift. Naturalism regards all religious faith and all organization of religious life, whether in individual

* Preached in Plymouth Church January 8th, 1888, and reported stenographically by Arthur B. Cook for THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, and revised by the author.

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

manifestations or in organic manifestations, as a tower of Babel which men have builded that they may climb up toward heaven. Christian faith regards it all as the New Jerusalem let down from heaven among men. Accordingly, Christians have not unnaturally fallen into antagonism toward the idea of growth in religion. They have come to identify religious growth with the philosophy of naturalism, and to imagine that whoever stands for progress in religious doctrine, religious institutions, and religious life, is really a representative of the philosophy that religion is a product of human endeavor, not a Divine bestowment.

No! religion is not a product of mere human endeavor. The church is not something which man has himself constructed, nor theology something which man has himself evolved, nor the spiritual life something which man has wrought out of himself. It is all God-given. But what God has given is life, not the product of the life directly. What God has given has been, in every instance, the seed out of which the life in all its various forms has grown. "The kingdom of heaven," says Christ, "is like a seed planted in the ground." The seed is planted by God; to the seed God gives the life; but it is only a seed which he has planted—a seed which would have in it no power whatever to produce anything if there were not a God-given life within it. But that seed, once planted in human soil, in human thought, in human life, has wrought out of the human life, out of the human soil, out of the human mind, the whole process of religion in its intellectual forms, in its institutional forms, in its spiritual forms. Religion is an evolution, re-

ligion is a growth; but it is an evolution and a growth from that which has been divinely imparted in the outset. The moment religion ceases to grow, it ceases to be; for religion is life, and all life is growth.

In the first place, then, history abundantly demonstrates that theology has been a progressive science. Theology was not framed and formulated in the beginning, and handed over to man perfected, as a boat might be built by a boat-builder and then given over to the man to sail in. There is no perfected creed in the Old Testament, no perfected system of theology in the Old Testament, that stands, with no new growth in it, all through the Bible and all through subsequent time. On the contrary, from the days of Moses down to the present time, theology has been a succession of growths. It has come into its present condition by successive accretions. We can hardly realize to-day the mental state of men who supposed that there was a God for every province, every town, every city, and even every household; who supposed that there were as many gods as there were nations, as many gods as there were tribes. But that was the common conception of humanity in its earlier stages, and the first declaration which you will find in the Old Testament is that the God of the Jews is superior to all the other gods. He is God of gods, Lord of lords. "There is no God like unto thee." This is the first declaration, for this is all men could comprehend. The notion that there were not a multiplicity of deities could not have been hammered into the human mind, to begin with. And then there gradually grows out of this the larger truth that there is only one God, and all the gods of the heathen are but idols, imaginary gods, with no reality to them. And then there is further wrought the truth that this God is a God of justice; that he is not a mere nature God; that he is not mere blind force,

like the gods of the pagans round about; that he is a God with moral sentiments, that can be appealed to, and that he acts according to principles of right and wrong. And then there comes the further doctrine that God is a God of love and of redeeming mercy, that he is a pardoning God. "Who is a God like unto thee, that forgiveth iniquity?" And then finally this conception of God blossoms out into its full revelation in the Lord Jesus Christ; and that revelation is not made until, in the language of Paul, the fullness of time has come.

And yet theology, the doctrine of God, does not come to an end even then. Then the church begins to study Christ. The disciples did not understand who he was. They did not comprehend his nature. First there come four centuries of debate about the person of Christ, between Arianism and Athanasianism—battlings, many of which seem to us in our time foolish and idle and puerile, but out of which there grows the conception which at last has reached its completion; and the Christian church everywhere to-day recognizes that Jesus Christ is the manifestation and the incarnation of God. And then there begins a further battle as to the nature of man—who he is, what sort of a being he is; and at last there is wrought out the doctrine now universally accepted in the Christian church, that man is sinful, that he has departed from God, that there is a great gulf between man and God, that he is not merely an imperfectly developed norm of humanity, but that he is sinful and guilty, needing forgiveness and restoration to divine favor. Then there comes the epoch introduced by the Reformation—the question, How shall this sinful man be brought into fellowship with this just, righteous, holy, loving God?—a question that could not have been discussed in the days of Moses, could not have been discussed in the days of David, could scarcely have been

discussed with any fullness in the days of Paul. And out of that discussion there grows the doctrine of justification by faith—that this God of justice and righteousness and holiness is ready to receive every man without being bought, without being entreated and wrought upon. And then, when at last this doctrine of a God thus ready to give his love to whoever will take it has been fairly wrought into the experience of the church, then and not till then begins the great missionary age. Wesley introduced it; the Moravians carried it further. At last the missionary life was wrought into every church and into every nation, and we are living in that missionary age to-day, an age the preparation and foundation of which had been laid through all the centuries that preceded.

Men scoff at new theology, as though it were something new in the world to have new theology. Why, theology has always been new. There never has been a time in the history of the church when theology has not been new. The theology of Moses was new to the people that he led out of Egypt, and they said, "Who is this God?" And he had to tell them. It was news. The theology of David was new to the children of Israel when he built the temple for them. The theology of the exile was new when it was declared by Isaiah. The theology of Paul was so new that the Christian church could hardly dare to have it preached. The theology of Calvin was so new in his time that men persecuted him and hounded him for it. The theology of Wesley was so new that all the Church of England broke out into derisive laughter. The theology of Edwards was new, and he was driven from his church at Northampton for preaching it. The theology of Finney was so new that the religious newspapers bombarded him with a bombardment worse than this pulpit ever received. The theology of Lyman Beecher was so new that he was put on trial in

Cincinnati for preaching it. There never has been a time in all history when the great prophets and luminaries of the church were not preaching a new theology. Religious truth has grown in the church as vines grow, and when the vine ceases to put out new wood it is a dead vine.

And we have not come to the end yet. The history of the Christian church has been this, in successive stages: a prophet arising with a great truth born in his soul, and giving it forth; his disciples taking that truth, eviscerating it of its life, turning it in to a mereshkeleton of a system, articulating it, and holding it up and imagining they held the living thing because they held the articulated system. I think if Bushnell could rise from his grave to-day, the first thing he would denounce would be Bushnellism; and you know that Henry Ward Beecher abhorred Beecherism worse than Calvinism. Take the corpse, draw all the blood out of its veins, infuse in the place of that living blood the chemical preparation that shall preserve it from decay, and it is a mummy. And all mummies are alike, whether a mummified theology that came from Rome or a mummified theology that comes from Andover or Oberlin. If it is mummified, it is dead.

It is equally true that all ethical life is a growth. The great laws of right and wrong, it may be said with truth, do not change. No! the great laws of right and wrong do not change. Nevertheless, the standards of ethics change from age to age; they change in their actuality and they change in the application which is to be made of them to changing circumstances. There is not one and the same standard of right and wrong for the Bushman in Africa and for the civilized American in New York or Brooklyn. The ideals of right are historically progressive. The world has moved by successive stages to higher and higher conceptions of social and political morality. The

communal regulations that should bind together the community in fraternal fellowship have been modified from epoch to epoch and from age to age. The Old Testament allows polygamy; it allows free divorce; it allows slavery; and men living in the nineteenth century have gone back to that and have said: "See! the Old Testament allowed polygamy, therefore we may have it in Utah; the Old Testament allowed slavery, therefore we may have it in South Carolina; the Old Testament allowed free divorce, therefore we may have it in Indiana." But the moral life of the nations has changed. The Bible allows to men in a low-down condition that which is not admissible to them when they rise into a higher one; just as you will permit your children to do some things that you will not do yourselves if you are wise parents. My father said to me when I first went into the ministry (and the advice has been of great service to me ever since), "It is a law of mechanics that nothing can be taken from one position to another position without being carried through all the intermediate positions. This is equally true in morals," he said. "If you preach to a congregation that is at one point, and you want to get them to another point, content yourself with taking them one step at a time." This is true in the moral history of the world and in God's dealing with humanity. He has taken humanity one step at a time. The Ten Commandments afford no ideal of life for the Christian in the nineteenth century. In the first place they are all of them, with one exception, negatives: "Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not kill." Is that the ideal of human life? We come on through the ages, and we come to the Sermon on the Mount. Christ shows a new law, a deeper one: "It has been said by them of old time, so and so; I say unto you, thus and so." Still the Sermon on the Mount is largely a law

of negations. "Thou shalt not kill? no, that is not enough. Thou shalt not be angry? Thou shalt not bear false witness? no! thou shalt not forswear thyself." But he has not reached the culmination of his ideal then. Not until the close of his ministry does he say, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself;" and not until just as he is bidding adieu to his disciples forever does he say, "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you." There is a gulf as wide as 4,000 years between the mere negatives of the Ten Commandments and that ideal flung out before humanity, "Love one another as I have loved you." The man that merely obeys the Ten Commandments is at best a reputable Jew, and the man that merely obeys the prohibitions of the Sermon on the Mount is merely a half-Christianized Jew. The man is not a Christian until he has taken Christ as his standard and said to himself, "I will love, God helping me, as Christ loved." But even as a series of prohibitions the Ten Commandments is not an adequate standard for to-day. There is no law in the Bible against gambling; is gambling right? There is no law in the Bible against forgery; is forgery right? Changed conditions create a necessity for new standards and new laws. Even were the laws adequate, the applications would be varied. There is no better law of life than the law of love; there is no better rule of life than the Golden Rule. But the Golden Rule in the nineteenth century means something different from that which it meant in the first century. When a man has a thousand workmen working under him, whose very names he cannot know, how shall he apply the law of love in the workshop? He must find a way. The ethical questions of to-day are not the ethical questions of yesterday. The labor question of to-day

is not the labor question of yesterday. Thirty or forty years ago the labor question was this: Shall the laborer own himself? Shall he have any wages? Shall he have a right to his home? Shall he have a right to his household? Shall he have a right to his personal liberty? Shall he have a right to his own manhood and free education? Shall he have a right to learn to read the Bible? This was the question that slavery, which was the labor question of fifty years ago, presented. There is no difficulty about that question. We could all see, if we were not blinded by prejudice and self-interest, that slavery was a monstrous crime against God and against man. But to-day, with organized labor on the one hand, arming itself, and often guilty of violence, and with not a little of corruption going forth from concentrated wealth on the other; with selfishness on the one side and selfishness on the other; with virtue on the one side and virtue on the other, the labor question is far more complicated and far more difficult. But our future lies before us, and not behind us. Any man can be an anti-slavery man now. It does not take much courage to kick a dead lion. But to take the law of love, to take the law "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you" and apply it to all the complicated relations of the industrial situation in America to-day, on one side the line and on the other side the line, in the one camp and in the other in the counting-room and the office, and at the forge and in the machine shop—that is a very different matter and a very difficult matter. But we are not worthy of our fathers if we do not take hold of the problems of to-day and deal with them.

This duty of progress is equally applicable to church work and church life. As theology, or the science of religion, as ethics, or the social practice of religion, have been successive developments, as the standards of

truth have changed from epoch to epoch, and the standards of action have changed from epoch to epoch, and the applications of truth have changed in changing circumstances and conditions, so also is it necessarily true that the life of the church has changed. The church of to-day cannot be, must not be, the church of yesterday. It must not be, or it will not fulfill its duty. It cannot be, for if it is not growing it is decaying. No church can live on its past history, however replendent that history may be. No church can take the methods admirably adapted to yesterday and employ them to-day without considering the question whether the methods of yesterday are adapted to to-day. Can any one familiar with the history of the middle ages doubt that the monastery was a magnificent institution in the middle ages? It put the aegis of the cross over the only places of quiet thought and literary pursuit. It put the only protection which was counted for anything in that wild, savage, but happily superstitious age, over the treasures that have come down to us from a remote past. If it had not been for the monasteries and the libraries which they guarded, we should have no Virgil, no Homer, no Plato—no, not even the manuscript copies of the Bible. Can any man familiar with history doubt the service that the preaching friars rendered to England and to all Northern Europe? Can any man who has considered this past record doubt the moral power that went forth from the Church of Rome—ay, and from the Bishop of Rome—restraining men in their passions, and gathering out from them an elect few to something nobler in life than putting their one hand on men's throats and another hand in their pockets? and that was war all through the middle ages—brigandage. The trouble with the monastery and the nunnery and the priory is that they have outlived their time. They continue when the age has no longer

service for them. They were magnificent; they are antiquated; like the great castles on the Rhine, constructed for a different age—magnificent monuments of an age that, thank God, is forever swept into the past.

Oh yes, you all agree with that, because I am talking of Roman Catholic institutions. But it is exactly as true that a Protestant method that did for yesterday may not do for to-day. A hundred years ago we were a homogeneous people in this country, for the most part a Christian people. Our churches were gatherings of Christian households. The main problem of the church was how to nurture and protect and guard and strengthen its own spiritual life. The whole atmosphere, the whole condition of American life has changed. God has brought over from foreign shores great hordes of half-civilized and half-heathenized population. They lie at our very door. They live side by side with us. We brush against them in the horse-cars, on the streets—everywhere except in our churches. The church of the latter half of the nineteenth century must be a missionary church or it is not a church at all. It must take as its problem this: how it shall take the flaming light of God's love, as shown forth in the cross of Christ, and carry that gospel to the men that do not know it. And we are not solving that problem to-day. We are only just beginning to solve it. No matter what the congregation is in size, no matter what the wealth of its treasury, no matter what its culture and refinement, almost no matter what it gives in contribution boxes to heathen abroad or heathen at home; if the church has no hand-grasp for the poor, if it sheds no light upon the unchurched, if it is not, in some form or other, by some activity or other, laying hold of the great populations that God has brought to our shores that we may lay hold of them, it is not the living church of God and of his Christ.

As methods of church work must change, so the spiritual life and experience of the church necessarily changes from time to time, from age to age. Our hymn-books are the best exponent of church spiritual experience. When Plymouth Church Collection was made, thirty odd years ago, it was far in advance of the average church life of America at that time. Some of you will remember how sharply it was criticised because it ventured to put in some hymns of the Roman Catholic Faber, some hymns of Unitarian authorship, some hymns of the not-Christian Moore. Thirty years have passed, and there is not, I venture to say, a hymn-book which has been published within the last five years that has not in it more Unitarian and more of Faber's hymns than Plymouth Church Collection has. Fifty years of Christian preaching has wrought a great change in Christian experience. Such hymns as Whittier's "Eternal Goodness," such hymns as that of Faber's, with the verse,

"There's a wideness in God's mercy,
Like the wideness of the sea,
And a kindness in his justice
That is more than liberty,"

could not have been written if Maurice and Robertson and Cardinal Newman and Bushnell and Henry Ward Beecher had not preached. The bird cannot sing till it is hatched. The spiritual experience of the church has grown, ripened, widened. It is better to-day than it was yesterday, and it will be better to-morrow than it is to-day.

And this truth of progress in theology, in ethics, in church life and work, all grows out of the one fundamental truth that religion as a personal experience is a growth. Let me go back to our text. Paul, in this third chapter of Philippians, gives us a bit of autobiography. He describes himself, firstly, as a Jew; and as a Jew he says, "I was perfect. I lived according to the law; I was blameless." Judaism—at least Phar-

isaic Judaism—was not a progressive and advancing life. It was stereotyped. "I lived," he says, "according to the Pharisaic law, and I was blameless. But while I was so living there dawned upon me suddenly a conception of a new life. Christ came my way, touched me on the shoulder, beckoned me to follow him as he beckoned that tax-gatherer. I rose up to follow him. But now my whole conception of life has been changed. I no longer count myself perfect, no longer regard myself as blameless, no longer think I have apprehended. I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which I am apprehended. The ideal of life is forever a disappearing and vanishing ideal. It forever eludes me. I pursue it, and it still goes on before." And then he comes to our text. Now I will read it, not in the words of either the old version or the new version, but in my own paraphrase (if you please): "Brethren, I count myself not yet to have apprehended; but one thing—paying no attention to the things that are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before—I press on toward the distant goal, for the prize of God's calling in Christ Jesus—higher! higher!" This is what Paul said. Every attainment I make in Christian life, every victory I win, every result I have achieved, is but the call of God to me to go on, on, on. Always something beyond. In the mountain I am climbing there is no topmost peak. Reach up as high as I will, still the Mont Blanc rises higher, yet higher. Is it not always so with love? Do we any of us know the one we love? Does any child that bows in reverence before his mother know the length and breadth, the height and depth of a mother-love? Is there any husband that loves and reveres his wife with increasing love and increasing reverence as the years go on, that knows the fullness of his wife's nature? And do we know Christ? Perfect Christians!

I set before you, then, to-day Paul's ideal and God's call. Whatever victories may have been won (and they have been grand ones) in the theology of the past, God's voice says, "Higher! higher!" Whatever ethical standard of righteousness has been wrought in the community, God's voice says, "Higher! higher!" Whatever spiritual attainment has been wrought in the church, God's voice to this church, to every church, is still "Higher! higher!" Whatever you have achieved in yourself, in victory over your passion, over your appetite, over your pride, over your lower nature, God says, "There is no time to sit down and recount the victories that are past—no time to write bulletins: higher! higher!" And this voice that calls us higher, higher, is not like that voice which leads him who follows it only to perish on the mountain peak amid snow and ice, while above the sun of glory shines and below the pastures feed the flocks with their verdure. This voice calls us higher, yet higher, as the sun calls the lark, whose song drops down to earth from his winged flight, and the end of the ascending is the bosom of our God.

THE REQUIREMENTS AND RETRIBUTIONS OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

BY GEORGE LANSING TAYLOR, D.D.
[METHODIST], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Occupy till I come [Trade ye herewith till I come.—R. V.].—Luke xix: 13.

THIS is considered as one of the last of the wonderful parables spoken by Jesus, and it is impressively adapted to its closing place in the series. Jesus was now at the house of the converted Zaccheus, at Jericho, returning to Jerusalem from his last country circuit to make his last stay at Jerusalem, and within a few months of the close of his earthly ministry. His ministry and miracles had produced a profound effect upon the popular mind, but it was a mistaken effect, which he must reprove

and correct. As he approached Jerusalem, after his last triumphal circuit, the popular excitement ran high. The mistaken Jews "supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear." They imagined that their false Messianic expectations were about to be fulfilled. This fanatical delusion was rising to a fever heat, and threatened some sort of a public outbreak damaging to the true mission of the gospel. It was a proof of Christ's really *true* Messiahship that he "added and spake a parable" to suppress this dangerous error about a false Messiahship. Viewed in this light our parable was adapted to every hearer then, and is equally adapted to all classes of hearers now. As such it presents to us

I. THE REQUIREMENTS OF GOD'S KINGDOM IN ITS SUBJECTS. These requirements are here set forth as two, namely, submission and service.

1. *The Submission required of us in God's kingdom.* The parable introduces to us the transaction, well known in the great Oriental empires, of the investiture of a tributary king with his royal power, not by or among his own subjects, but by the imperial government, at the capital of the great empire of which his kingdom is a dependent part. The Herodian kings of Judea bore exactly this relation to Rome. The candidate for the crown of the subordinate kingdom is a "nobleman," a prince. The "far country" is the imperial capital whither he goes for royal investiture, and from which he returns as a king.

Now we have here a type of the relation and claims of Jesus with reference to us all. He claims our submission to his rightful dominion over our hearts and lives, and he has valid grounds for this claim. In the first place Christ is the "nobleman" *par excellence* of the human race, and especially of the Jews. In his human nature he had a royal ancestry of forty-two generations from Abraham through David and Solomon and the

fourteen generations of kings of Jerusalem, and could have challenged the crown of Herod. But he was a heavenly "nobleman" also, the Son of the Eternal God, a partaker of the divine nature, in whom dwelt all the fullness of the godhead bodily. In his incarnation he took upon himself our nature and became our Avenger and Redeemer, one entitled to die for us, to ransom us, and to reign over us for evermore.

In the second place Christ has ascended to heaven, the capital of the universe, there to receive the royal investiture, and to be robed and crowned as "King of kings and Lord of lords." He is our "Messiah," the "Lord's anointed," our "prophet, priest and king." "Him hath God highly exalted, and given unto him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii : 9, 10. As such a king he now sits "at God's right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come;" as "head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." Eph. i : 20-23. Surely with such a nature and with such an investiture from the throne of the universe, Jesus has a claim upon our submission which is as deep as our inmost nature, and as high as heaven itself. He has a right to demand that our rebellion cease, that in heartfelt loyalty we accept his sway over our hearts and lives. Oh that our hearts may joyfully reply :

"All hail the power of Jesus' name!
Let angels prostrate fall!
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown him Lord of all!"

But we have here also,

2. *The Service required of us in*

God's kingdom. On his departure to receive the kingdom the nobleman calls together his own personal servants, and distributes to each an equal portion of his money, and instructs them to "occupy," "trade," "carry on some sort of business" with it, until his return. This transaction must not be confounded with the similar one in the parable of "the talents." That parable was pronounced afterwards at Jerusalem, this at Jericho. In that the unequal distribution "to one five, to another two, to another one" talent signified the unequal allotment of earthly circumstances, mental gifts, etc., to men, and their corresponding responsibility for such talents. But here the equal "pound" to all signifies the great treasure of the gospel of salvation, freely and equally offered to all men. During his incarnation, and by his revealing and atoning work, Christ wrought out this great treasure for all men, and now "whosoever will" may have a free share in it, and an equal chance to improve upon all its provisions. And this is the treasure which Christ commits to our care, and says to us, "Occupy till I come," "trade," "do business for time and eternity, on the capital thus freely supplied for your use."

(1) *The Grounds for Christ's claim to our service* are surely reasonable. He owns us all, to start with. The "servants" of the English version is "bondservants," "slaves," in the Greek, as slaves were often educated to business in the East, and entrusted with large responsibilities. So we are Christ's "bondservants." "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price." "Render therefore unto God the things that are God's."

"My gracious God, I own thy right
To every service I can pay,
And call it my supreme delight
To hear thy mandates, and obey."

Again, Christ owns all the capital and furnishes all for us. The "pound" of revelation and redemption, the Holy Spirit's gracious work, our own

moral freedom, the glorious opportunity to work for God in the world, are all of Christ's providing. And more than this, his work of intercession and mediation still goes on for us in heaven, and all the probation and opportunity of men for God's work, till the end of time, is the result of Christ's gifts given to men, his capital lent unto us, on which to do a blessed and a gloriously profitable business for time and eternity.

(2) *The Laws of Christ's service* are wholly reasonable and good. It is an easy service. He says, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." But to be easy it must be a heartfelt, loving service. God says, "Son, give me thine heart." But we need certain clear and fixed principles to guide us in this partnership work with God. Some of these are:

(a) *A believing comprehension of the value of the capital entrusted to our use.* Money is the representative and equivalent of all commercial values. So the gospel of Christ is to us the representative of all spiritual values. "What shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" "The redemption of the soul is costly, and [if once lost] it faileth forever" (Psalm xlix: 8, Am. R. V.). But the soul's only redemption is through the blood of Jesus. The gospel is to be comprehended as the most unspeakable legacy and treasure in the universe, a capital that outweighs all else in earth or heaven. Now no man is competent for earthly business who does not know the value of money and capital. Even so no man is fit to do business for God and eternity who has no sense of the value of his own soul, and of the great redemption.

(b) *An identity of interest with Christ as our capitalist and senior partner.* In our "doing business" for Christ he furnishes all the capital, but we work for a share in the profits. The more we gain for Christ the more we gain for ourselves. No in-

vestment of heart or hand or mind or money by a Christian, which was contrary to God's will, ever resulted in anything but guilt and ruin in the end. And never did our believing and obedient risking of anything or everything at God's command fail to be, in the end, a good investment. It is our duty to invest our all as God directs, trusting him to look after a sure profit for all the firm. It is only from a lack of faith or from an unconsecrated and worldly spirit that we are ever afraid to risk all for God and righteousness. What we want is the faith to be ready to enter a "blind pool" with God any day, about any duty, with perfect certainty that what God takes a hand in is bound to succeed. When God says to Moses, "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward," we want a faith that will march straight into the Red Sea, or any other sea, and find it dry land when we do our duty. When, by the grave of a dead Lazarus or a dead church, Christ says, "Take ye away the stone"—remove the obstacle to God's work—we want faith enough to roll it away, no matter what rottenness we may uncover! It is only on the condition of our obedience that we shall ever see the dead brought to life. If we would be "workers with God" we must work by his plans, no matter how they mar ours. Unless our plans please God, the more they are marred the better for ourselves and everybody else. But we must have

(c) *An energetic and persevering devotion in Christ's business.*

The word *πραγματεύομαι* of our text is a business word, from the marts of trade. It has in it the care, the toil, the intense self-interest in its reflexive form, all the struggle and strife of the world's shops, or stores, or exchanges. It means that all men are to work, to plan, to strive, to be keen and bold and resolute in doing God's business, just as they are in doing their own. We must be ready, like Gideon, to strike by night to throw

down Baal's altars if we are likely to be hindered by day. Ah, that we had more of that bowstring tension of the exchange, that dash and sagacity of war, in our work for God! We need also to feel that all God's work is great. The humblest laborer for God, from the Sunday-school teacher or the poor widow trying to train her fatherless children for God, up to the pastor, the preacher, the writer, the statesman, all need to feel this profound zeal for God and his work, whether it seem great or small to men's eyes.

And this thought comes in here, namely, that "retiring from business," as it is called by business men, especially Christian men, is frequently a mistake and a disobedience to God's command. While health and faculties remain sound and opportunity exists, every man is bound, as God's steward, to keep up the consecrated activities and usefulness of life to the end. He is to be God's laborer, God's mechanic, God's tradesman, God's merchant, God's financier, just as much as to be God's writer or preacher, if that be his calling. "There is no discharge in that war." "Occupy till I come" is our Lord's command. Such are the requirements of Christ's kingdom for us all, a loving and whole-hearted loyalty to him as our rightful king and Lord, and an intelligent, obedient, believing devotion of all we have and are to his service. All this is only our "reasonable service" to our king and Lord, our master and owner.

And now we come to consider

II. THE RETRIBUTIONS OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM, including both its REWARDS and its PUNISHMENTS.

There are many rewards and many chastisements, of an encouraging or of a disciplinary character, which men receive in this life; but the final and abiding awards and sentences of human destiny are not in time, but in eternity. It is principally to this final and abiding result of human life

that our parable refers. As the nobleman, having been invested with his kingdom, returns in all the power and glory of a king to govern and care for his dominions, so Christ is one day to return to this world, invested in all the visible glory of his kingdom, to judge and reign over mankind, in the "new heavens and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Then, as at the nobleman's return as a king, all the affairs of his kingdom are brought up for examination. Then what is undone can never be made up, and what is done amiss can never be undone or done over again. All things must appear as they are before his all-seeing eye, his all-knowing mind, his all-judging law. And here we have first the reckoning, and then the reward.

1. *The reckoning, and its disclosures.* In this we have two classes of results disclosed by the reports.

(a) *The good reports* come first. There is no hesitation, no hanging back in these servants. They come forward readily and cheerfully, as men with good consciences always do, to make their report. Hear it: "Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds." "Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds." Ah, what a joy, what an honor, to be permitted to make such a report! Mark some points in these reports.

(1) *How great the gain!* Five hundred per cent., a thousand per cent.! What a hint at the glorious possibilities of grace for the diligent soul. "The little one shall become a thousand!"

(2) *How great the modesty!* Not I have gained, but "thy pound [thy grace] hath gained." "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory!" "Unto him that loved us, and washed us in his own blood, unto him be the power and the glory!"

(3) *What great and businesslike brevity.* "Thy pound, ten pounds—here it is—count your money!" That's all there is of it. No explana-

tions, or apologies, or fault-finding, or boasting. Each received one pound. Each has done as well as he could. Neither one despises or envies the other. A good report is easily made. The facts alone are needed, and they speak for themselves. But then comes

(b) *The bad report.* "And another came," and of another sort. "Lord, here is thy pound," etc. What a contrast with the previous reports!

(1) *It is false.* It was not "thy pound," but only what a less sum, at lawful interest, would have amounted to. There had not only been no gain, but an absolute waste and loss of all the lawful interest, not to speak of any larger profit from trade. He had not brought back his own to his master, but had robbed him of what the banks would have given him merely for the use of his money.

(2) *It is the answer of laziness.* "In a napkin." But laziness and bad manners generally go together, and so this is

(3) *An insulting answer.* "I knew thee" (R. V.), "I feared thee," "an austere (*i. e.* avaricious) man," taking what did not belong to thee, etc. What an outrageous insult and falsehood to the man who had "laid down" and "sowed" every penny of the capital, and who, furthermore, in this case, owned the laborer's own person himself, and had generously given him a chance to redeem himself, and lent to him the capital to do so! The man has shown by his own conduct that he presumed on his master's leniency rather than feared his austerity. His deeds give the lie to his words. How his master's "Thou knewest that I was an austere man," taking him at his own words, must have cut him through as with a sword! Stripped of every subterfuge, his mask of hypocritical honesty shown to be only another form of knavery, the self-condemned ingrate stands clothed with shame before his generous master and his well-deserving fellow-servants, a self-confounded,

self-degraded wretch. He had shirked, not worked; and had so wasted the one supreme opportunity of human life, and sealed his own doom!

And now comes

2. *The great retribution and its results.* The word "retribution" is from the Latin *re*, back, or again, and *tribuo*, to pay, and so it means a paying back with the idea of paying in kind, good for good, evil for evil. And so it is in the parable. Let us consider.

(a) *The punishments taught in the parable.* They are of two kinds or grades:

(1) *The unfaithful servant.* It would seem as though he were pretty sorely punished already, in his disgrace at exposure. But if he had possessed the keen sense of honor to suffer much at such an exposure, he would never have been so negligent. Disgrace is small punishment to those who are insensible to its sting. But disgrace is only one of the consequences of wrongdoing. There are no signs of repentance in the man's excuses, but only an attempt at a self-righteous justification of his wrong by throwing the blame upon his generous lord. Deprivation of wasted blessings is the beginning of the righteous sentence pronounced upon him. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant." Yes, my brethren, willful neglect is wickedness. This is God's law now, as then. "Take away from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds." "Put my money where it will do the most good" is a well-known modern saying. Take it away from demonstrated incapacity and untrustworthiness, and commit it to the care of demonstrated faithfulness, capacity and trustworthiness. Ah, what an awful privation, what an awful taking away that will be, when God takes away from unfaithful souls the privileges, mercies and blessings he has bestowed upon them only to be wasted! "Take away the

pound!" Yes, take away the neglected Bible, the forsaken closet, the broken-down family altar! Take away the irksome Sabbath, the reluctantly attended church, the lightly esteemed preached gospel, the forgotten hymns of praise, the forsaken prayer-meeting, the hated class-meeting! Take away the fellowship of saints disrelished, the Christian literature unappreciated! Take away the offerings for God that have been begrudged, the Christian benevolences that have been opposed and starved, the humane and Christian charities that have been barely tolerated! Take away the chance to work to save immortal souls, the opportunity to share in the glorious battles for reform and righteousness in the earth? Strike that name off the rolls of the glorious church of Christ on earth; off the rolls of the noble army of toilers, heroes, martyrs for God; off the rolls of the mighty upward march of man and of the kingdom of God in this world! "Take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book!" "Ephraim is joined to his idols, let him alone!" Nay, not alone, for his sentence is not merely a privation of good, it is also an expulsion from good. The parable of the "talents" completes the sentence left unfinished here: "Cast ye the unprofitable servant [not the spy, or possible assassin, as in the parable of the marriage—simply the unprofitable servant] into outer darkness; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xxv: 30). Ah, what a darksome doom! For the unfaithful servant there is no "Well done, thou good and faithful;" no "five cities" or "ten cities," no "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!" The unfaithful servant wanted nothing good, was ambitious for nothing good, toiled for nothing good, earned nothing good, deserved nothing good, and got nothing good! He got just what he worked for, what

he deserved, what he was fit for! He got nothing, and nothingness got him! Out from all good, into the hungry, gaping horror of night, the black and hopeless and hideous abyss of darkness, there went he who got what he worked for—nothing! But this is only the milder punishment of the unfaithful servant.

(2) *The rebellious citizens* are next taken in hand, and they meet a sterner and a swifter fate. Their offense has been open sedition and treason, and their sentence is a fearful word, but it is Christ's word, and our only duty about it is to accept its warning. But we may remark that the parable is true to the laws and customs of Oriental life, then and now. The tedious processes of European and American law are unknown there, and the brief examination of a case, the sentence, and its execution follow each other swiftly, often on the same day or in the same hour. These mutinous elements were unsafe for the kingdom, and might foment new rebellions at any time. The kingdom must now be settled and be at peace. The fall of great offenders would be a merciful warning to lesser ones, and a timely severity upon them might restore law and order and insure loyalty and peace for millions. Let the axe fall, for *justice to one is mercy to thousands* seems to have been the rule of law then, as it has ever been. Here in Christ's New Testament of love and mercy still crops out that bed-rock of eternal righteousness, without which mercy were a delusion. Ah, what a warning is here for the atheist, the skeptic, the scoffer, the haters of God and of his laws in the world! And what a warning too for those who dream that they can disobey God and grieve his Holy Spirit about *some* things, and yet escape because they obey in others. Many sins of ignorance and infirmity in us all need forgiveness, and to the penitent soul they shall be forgiven. "But though a man keep

the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." He has the spirit that would break all if it suited his interest or pleasure to do so. It is *disposition* that makes *character*, and so the sentence of all is righteously pronounced by God's word upon him. This is God's law, and our parable shows us how Christ will one day deal with us all unless we loyally accept his easy yoke and industriously do his holy will.

And now from the punishments of the unfaithful and disloyal we gladly turn to consider

(b) *The rewards of the parable.* And now we begin to discover that the nobleman had more than mere ordinary motives of sordid gain in his dealings with his servants. He expects to be master of a kingdom. He will have high places of trust, of honor, at his command, and he will need tried and trustworthy men to fill those places. The servants little understand, perhaps, that he has put them all on *probation*, not merely for his few pounds of present possessions as a private nobleman, but to test their capacity and fidelity for the grander openings which a kingdom may set before them. Oh, young man, how little you dream, perhaps, that the listless, slouching negligence of one small task ill done, when brought under the keen eye of your employer, has damned you from the higher and better work to which he had planned to raise you! You call it "a world of hard luck!" No! It is a world of golden possibilities hanging just over your head, had you only eyes to see the fidelity to deserve and the heart to seize them! Oh, Christian brethren, what a thought, that if we are faithful to God, with a consecrated diligence in his humblest work, the rewards of an eternal kingdom await us above!

And so came the rewards of the king to his faithful servants. They had only said, "Lord, thy pound hath gained *five* pounds, *ten* pounds, and here is your money—all yours, and

ourselves with it!" How the answer fell like joyful thunder from the throne, "Well done! Five cities for him! Ten cities for him! Faithful in little, rulers over much! No more my 'bond-servants!' Emancipated! Your lord's freedmen! Governors of great cities! The peers of noblemen and princes! Members of the royal court! Tried and true companions of your king! Enter into the joy of your Lord!" Thus, amid the acclamations of angels, shall the king receive and reward his faithful servants in the heavenly glory! Oh, brethren,

"T will be good to be there,
 Christ's glory to share,
 And that crown, never-fading, forever to wear!
 To hear the 'well done!'
 From the throne of God's son,
 And shout with glad millions time's victory won!"

BURDEN BEARING.

BY ABBOTT E. KITTREDGE, D.D.
 [REFORMED], NEW YORK.

Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.—Gal. vi : 2.

ADOPTION of this admonition is a preventive of spiritual selfishness. Christ never went anywhere or did anything to please himself. We this morning participated in the blessed privilege of sitting at the Lord's table, and in the joy that comes from such participation there is danger that we think too much of self and too little of the burdens of others.

What are some of these burdens?

1. *Daily toil for daily bread.*

Those of you who are employers do not pay your employees that which they will accept rather than starve, but rather what they are worth. Do not for a moment keep your employees waiting for that which is due them. Pay well and pay promptly.

2. *Poverty.* Many a mother in this great city wishes her child had never been born. Children forget how to laugh. Death is a coveted relief.

Christian love should alter all this. Give of your time to find employment for the poor. Go to desolate homes. The various organizations for charitable work within and without the church do not relieve you from your responsibilities.

3. *Sickness.* There are thousands of physical tabernacles that are racked and sundered by the blows of the workmen of death. With Christ it was the burden not the individual that appealed to his wondrous mercy. Where are these invalids? Perhaps they are your next-door neighbors.

4. *Bereavement.* Perhaps seeing the crape on the door is your first intimation of death and sorrow on your block or in your neighborhood. I am perfectly well aware of the fact that such and such social customs prevail here in New York—thank God, nowhere else in this country—but I say to you, care not what social usage declares to be proper, and go into these homes of sorrow as a follower of Jesus Christ, not as a member of society, and give your sympathy, even though you may not know the bereaved ones, even though you speak not a word. Your very presence will be a relief, and your smile be a ray of the sunlight of God.

5. *Anxiety.*

6. *Sensitiveness.* There are some people who are always construing something out of nothing, who are always fancying that they are being or have been slighted.

7. *Sins.* Sin is universal. Keep back your criticism of others. Say all that you can that is good and stop. Think twice before you speak once. You live in a glass house.

8. *Guilt and shame.* An army of criminals surrounds us. We hand them over to the police and roll off all responsibility. We have no right to regard them solely as nuisances. No sinner ever falls so low as to divorce himself from Christian sympathy. But for the grace of God your life would have been as bad as theirs. Christianity has no right to hand

over the criminal classes to the civil authorities. They should be rebuked for sin, they should be lifted up, their stolidity changed to the tear-wet cheek of a penitent. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone," etc. When Christian people realize that religion is not in costly edifices and elegant services, but in going out and rescuing fallen humanity, telling men of Christ's love and their love—for it is one thing to go to a man and say, "God loves you," and quite another to say, "God loves you and I love you"—then our prison cells will be empty and the world won for Christ.

AT EVENING TIME LIGHT.

By REV. J. JACKSON WRAY [CONGREGATIONAL], LONDON, ENGLAND.

At evening time it shall be light.—
Zech. xiv : 7.

THAT this refers to the Jewish nation, primarily, there is no doubt. How, where, when, we cannot say. But to its spiritual and individual application let us turn. "In that day," *i. e.*, in day of grace, the gospel day, the Christian dispensation, "the light shall not be clear nor dark." The church has had a mixed experience, not all dark, not all bright; now defeat, now success; now joy, now grief; mingled light and shade, but, "at evening time light" has always come.

So with each Christian, the church in miniature. It is not night all the time, or day all the time, yet it is "one day known to the Lord." The time was when the believer knew not God through the blindness in him. Some knowledge came at conversion, yet still he often blunders and errs. At times he is ready with emphasis to say "I know," and at other times he falters. He has been purified in part and has some love of holiness, but his sins and infirmities continually drive him to the blood of Christ for cleansing, the fountain for all uncleanness. His happiness is variable.

Now on Pisgah, a blue sky above and a green sward beneath; now in the valley and in the conflict. Tears and smiles, sighs and songs mingle. Trials and pain, yet ample compensations in gladness and triumph. Sometimes the neutral light, "not clear, not dark," may be best for us, neither extreme of elation or depression, in the practical work of the Christian life. James Montgomery pictures the Christian's experience when he sings:

"Yet clouds will intervene,
And all my prospect flies;
Like Noah's dove I flit between
Rough seas and stormy skies."

But the tempest passes and leaves
"the bow of peace."

What is the reason of all this? God creates and he sustains. Why this discipline?

1. We need it to correct mistakes of nature. Plato says that some men forget the gods and so incur their displeasure, while others rebel against them and are punished. So now, some seem to say, "There is no God." They take their fortune in their own hand and live as they list. Nebuchadnezzar had a long run of prosperity, established a great empire, forgot God and said, "Is not this great Babylon which I have builded?" This great *ego* was his God. He was brought into adversity and then he became repentant. Job had a long period of trial. His flocks and then his family, his wealth and health were cut off. He suffered concentrated misery. Even that grand old soul yielded so far as to "desire strangling" and to curse the day of his birth. But "at evening time it was light," and his last end was "blessed more than his beginning." God would teach us the lesson, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." This is not our rest. There are more enduring treasures above.

2. Our deliverance from sin and the development of Christian virtues are processes which involve this

mingled experience. God would have us furnished unto every good work—perfect, entire, wanting nothing. Of many a good man we say, he is upright, truthful, honest, but— Christ would slay the “buts” and remove these blemishes. He would have us all-round Christians. Prosperity as well as trial tests character. It may be easy for the poor and helpless to be humble; for those abounding in wealth and surrounded with all that heart can desire to say, “Thank God, I’m content.” But how is it if you are stripped of all? To forgive you must have received an injury that requires forgiveness. The keener the pain the richer the grace that forgives the one who inflicted it. So with trust. How sweet the fruit borne on the barren tree of trial represented in the joyful utterance, “Though he slay me yet will I trust him,” “The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.” As the harp gives no music till its strings are strung and struck, so the heart must have its pressure of woe and tension of pain before its truest melody is evoked. In life’s most fiery trial faith clothes the soul as with an asbestos robe which will withstand the hottest flame.

3. Our hold on God by faith and prayer is made more steady. Supposing that we knew positively that we should live twenty years, and that all those years should be free from discomfort and peril. Would we not be very likely to lose hold of God? He desires our daily confidence and fellowship and to hear our constant cry. I have seen a mother hide herself behind a child, out of sight from her darling, just to hear the music of that lost one’s voice, *Mother!* “Behind a frowning providence” God often hides. Because of the changefulness, uncertainty and suspense that attend everything here we must rely on unseen realities. Because I know not whether my foot shall next tread on a bed of flowers or touch the brink of an open grave, I must cling, cling hard to Jesus!

“But it shall be one day *known to the Lord.*” A precious compensation is this assurance that God knows. When a missionary, far away from my native land, my associates laid low with yellow fever, I stood one day on my veranda and looked across the sea towards England, and thought, “O if only my friends *knew* my need how they would pray for me.” But Christ does know. There is no *if*. He knows the load that makes you stagger, the bitter cup that presses your lips. Job was regarded a bad man because of his sufferings. He challenges proof. “Why do you therefore suffer?” He could not tell. He longed to see God. Forward, backward, on the right hand and left he sought in vain, yet he says grandly, “He knoweth the way I take.” He was sure that he would come forth as tried gold. He did.

“One day.” How variable the weather—hot, cold, moist and dry by turns, yet the day is one whatever be the sky. Put a seed into the soil at one end of the year and you may put a sickle in at the other. July’s flowers and January’s snows, April’s rain and December’s fogs, all are parts of one year. Life is not a mere mosaic. It has its unity. God is working out a definite plan. The golden thread of his purpose runs through all that to us seems mixed and contradictory. He weaves the warp and woof. Nothing is confused. “It shall be light!”

“It is *one day.*” It will be over soon. Life is but a span. Trials will end ere long. Two peasant women heard Dr. Chalmers preach in the City Church, Glasgow, and were cheered by what he said about Smyrna’s faith. They discussed the sermon on their homeward walk, not knowing that the preacher walked behind. “He said that Satan would cast them into prison and that they should have tribulation ten days, but he forgot to put in the *end.*” There is an end to all trial. Then the crown of

life. Then, "not a wave of trouble rolls;" all shall be peace forever. "At evening time it shall be light." We may understand this in three ways; probably all are included. In man's extremity is God's opportunity. This familiar aphorism may explain it.

When the storm came down on Galilee I seem to see Peter with his arm around the mast, clinging for life, while wave after wave made the boat quiver. He says to John, "If another comes we are lost!" It did not come. Christ came, and with him a calm. So at the worst point things often begin to mend. Or it may refer to life's evening. Religion makes one's last days the best. Plato suggested the propriety of putting old people out of the way, as useless to themselves or the world. Jesus says to the aged, "At evening time it shall be light." Bunyan pictures Beulah Land with song of birds and ripple of stream and green, shady paths where Christian and Hopeful walked and heard from afar the harping of the harpers. This is the border land of heaven in which many an aged saint is walking. At a love-feast at Ocean Grove, New Jersey, I heard a gray-haired saint of 84 years say that after sixty years' service for Christ, as he drew near home he felt younger than ever. At his eventide there was light.—Finally, at death, when the last shadows fall there will be a blaze of light to the believer's vision. I sat in a farmhouse in Chester and talked with a dear young man about our association in Christian labor in bygone years. He was near to death. As his eye caught a glimpse of the sun, setting in crimson glory, its rays coming in the kitchen window to him for the last time, he asked to be lifted that he might behold it once more, and said, "Farewell, I shall never see it rise." Then cheerfully he went on, as he was able, with the conversation. As it grew darker he was asked if he would have lights

brought in, and he said no. A white after a spasm of coughing seized him. His stalwart father held the lad's head on his breast. He turned his dying gaze toward the sunset window, as if recalling the brightness where now all was dark, and then with brightening face and joyful tongue exclaimed, "'Tis morning!" and fell asleep in Jesus.

To my mother when dying one of her sons said, "It is a dark valley, mother." "No, my laddie, there's a bright light at the other end!" Be of good cheer, Christian; a few more trials, then the shadowy valley, then the rolling river, then a welcome on the other side to Christ's gathered family and then God's smile forever!

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY E. H. JOHNSON, D. D., OF CROZIER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY [BAPTIST].

I am the way, the truth, the life.—

John xiv : 6.

POPULAR belief is often expressed and widely extended by an attractive phrase. "Christ is Christianity" is such an expression. It may mean much or little. It may praise or disparage the work of Christ. Because of this ambiguity as well as because of its almost irreverent brevity, it is a popular saying. If one means that all that the Son of God accomplished is in Christianity, he would emphasize the last word. If one disliked doctrinal truths, such as a vicarious atonement or the teachings of the gospel as to the justice of God, he would emphasize the first word and say, "Christ is Christianity." The phrase is growing more popular and it is likely to remain a cant phrase for men, one that allures by sound alone.

"I am the way, the truth, the life." Here are not three separate offices or truths so much as a three-fold expression of one fact. 1. Christ is the way. In being such Christ is Christianity, the way to God. The way between any two places has to

be determined by the position of either and by the character of the interval; so the way between God and us is fixed with reference to the character and condition of each and what is between us both. How may we know God? One old philosopher said that study would bring this knowledge. He believed that God geometrized and that in all his works there was mathematical order and musical rhythm. We must study. Knowledge is a means, but alone it is inadequate. Christ has bridged the chasm and closed the gap by his own person. "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man," etc. This and other similar utterances Christ did not explain, but presented them with force and distinctness. They are not in defiance of reason, but the offer to reason of a statement which is conclusive. A man may refuse to believe in the formation of ice from water and its sustaining power, as being something contrary to reason and nature. But we see ice bridging a river and heavy teams crossing on it. This ends controversy. Christ is the way to God, and souls are passing to God by means of Christ. He is divine, yet stood in our place. He is the creator and sustainer of all things. Only in him can we truly exist. He is the true end of all things. We should be in him and accept his government. God's character and plans were incarnated in Christ. There is no justification or life without him. His human nature came from Mary, who was not immaculate, but God was his Father, and Christ was therefore sinless. He had a largeness of sympathy and a divine insight—enlarged because of the human nature that clothed him. He was not less divine because born of Mary, nor less human because born of God.

Because Christ was God-man, he was the way. The Devil said, "if thou be," not "a man," but "the Son of God, cast thyself down." His dual nature intensified the severity of the

trial. So when he felt that twelve legions of angels only waited his call, and he patiently endured the shame of the cross and did not claim the kingdom in the Devil's way. Indeed we may say, "he *suffered*, being tempted."

2. Christ is the Truth. The ideal man has long been an object of study and search. What constitutes him? Is the observance of the Ten Commandments or the shorter rule, loving God and our neighbor, sufficient? It is only in Christ that we find the ideal. He was God's thought for man. He lived that thought. He was no dubious oracle. Ideal characters are not easy to delineate, but Christ is real to us. The ideal of one may be patched to that of another, but character is not made that way. You must grow character, develop life. Chemistry tells of the fourteen or more elements out of which we are made. Suppose that you bring your black carbon and yellow sulphur, your phosphorus, chlorine and other elements and mix in water. Is that black paste a *man*? No, because life is absent. Life builds. So he that hath the Son of God hath life. He is the truth concerning God, a revelation of divine perfections. Man is but a reduced image of his Creator. He cannot be the same in intellect, but may assimilate to him in moral character. Christ in both quantity and quality was like God. He loved holiness and resisted evil with the same vehement intensity. The divine justice was incarnated in him. You may get some idea of human law by reading dusty law books, but your heart is not roused to any just conception of it till you go to a trial—to a trial of a man for his life, perhaps. You hear the evidence and listen to the counsel; the charge to the jury and the verdict of "guilty!" You hear the awful sentence of death and see the wretched criminal in agony. You go now to your home with different feelings. Your dreams repeat the scenes which you have be-

held. Law and justice and penalty are all seen in visible, concrete realities. So in Christ you see the justice as well as the love of God. "No one ever spoke more terrible denunciations," says a New England skeptic, who saw without accepting the truth of Christ. It is only in Christ that we come to fully understand God.

3. The Life. What is it? You might ask, What is navigation? The building of a ship and sending it to be crushed amid arctic ice or to drift about in other seas, rudderless and helpless? Is man living a true life with no divine guide and guard? We are called "the branches" of Christ. Some try to explain what the mystical union is which subsists between us by which the moral vigor of Christ comes to be ours. We may not be able to explain it, but do we know it by its fruits? When Christ was said by Paul to be his life, he meant that he put Christ always before him, and that he entered into every purpose and plan. A man may carry a great hope or sorrow, a great purpose or service, and we say it is his life, for it gives character and tone to all his feelings and acts. In this sense, aside from any mystical conception of an indwelling Christ, we may say that the life Paul lived was Christ in him, the hope of glory.

We have thus reviewed the three-fold aspects of the expression "Christ is Christianity," meaning that all of Christianity, its vital elements and true significance, are found alone in him who is the "way, the truth, the life." Such an abiding life within we need. There are hours when but for him we should be in utter doubt and appalled with darkness. To us the Lord may be as real as any historic individual we have seen, like General Grant or any we have read about. More than that, he may, he will be, preciously near and with us as our guide and guard. Over all the darkness of our lives, over all that is glad or sad in the world, its wreck and ruin, there towers up one

inspiring object, the Lord Jesus Christ, substantial and real. Yes, "Christ is Christianity!"

ENTIRE CONSECRATION.

BY REV. E. MCCHESENEY, D.D. [METHODIST], NEW YORK.

Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body.—
1 Cor. vi: 19, 20.

It is impossible to find a more appropriate text than this for consideration on New Year's day. It has no qualifying word. It is to be accepted in the fullest sense.

Looking back through the past year and years we find that great have been our shortcomings in the light of this passage of Scripture. These shortcomings have been due and are due to certain clearly easily discovered causes:

1. *Self-assertion.* Manly independence should always be cherished, but it is impossible for this feeling to assert itself where it ought not. It should never bring us to that state where we say to God, "We have a right to ourselves." Man's entrance into the kingdom is governed by the measure of submission which he exhibits in this.

2. *A low conception of Christian character and living.* Our ideal should be the Christ, not the Christian, who oftentimes is a copy of another who is a copy of yet another copy.

3. *False conceptions of consecration.* It is a perpetual act. It cannot be done once for all. As new situations, new light, new temptations come every moment and day, just so must there be daily, yea momentary consecration.

Such are a few of the causes which have hindered growth and right living. What are some of the inspirations toward living this life?

1. *The beauty of it.* This life is to be an illuminated life.

2. *The obligation resting upon us.* "Ye are bought with a price." Redemption is back of creation. Forget not "The Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world." We are redeemed not only from the taint of inherited sin, but our own. Our obligation in this matter is enforced by the highest reason.

3. *The privilege of it.* By so doing we "glorify God." It is not irreverent thus to speak of God as being glorified by anything that we can do, notwithstanding he is already supremely glorious. By such a life of consecration of every power we glorify God in our own comprehension of him and for others by the exhibition of submission that we give. It is not the correctness of our theology nor the correctness of our expression of faith that impresses those who are our neighbors with the genuineness of our Christianity. It is our Christian living.

THE HINDERED LIFE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D. [BAPTIST], PHILADELPHIA.

The prisoner of Jesus Christ.—Eph. iii : 1.

1. A PRISONER by Jesus Christ. Christ had a hand in Paul's imprisonment. It did not fall out of chance or fate. Loving hands and for wisest ends made the prison close around him, that he might have rest after his mighty toil; that he might have opportunity protected—on the one hand from furious Jews, and on the other from persecuting heathen, by the mighty power of the Roman Government while he lay its prisoner—to tell his gospel to best advantage in the world's metropolis, that he might have leisure to write his epistles of the captivity, which shall last to the end of time.

And it is true of every follower of the Lord, if he seem to himself baffled and hindered, that Christ has a hand in his hindrances, and for large and propitious ends.

2. A prisoner for Jesus Christ. Even in his prison Paul had chance to serve Jesus: to preach to the soldier chained to him; to write his epistles, though he could not range the world and preach his sermons; to show how shiningly a Christian could endure.

And no rockiest and most imprisoning circumstance can help proffering a Christian some chance of service. If you seem hindered, look around yourself for the special service the hindrance cannot help offering you, even in its rude, forbidding hands.

3. A prisoner to become like Jesus Christ. Even Paul had need of discipline; even Paul confessed he had not attained. So far as discipline is needful, if we are to become "conformed to the image of his Son."

So even obstacles, hindrances, various imprisonments have their shining side. Let Paul in his imprisonment be an example to you in yours.

COMING TO GOD.

BY REV. THOMAS HEATH, PLYMOUTH, ENGLAND.

All who come to God by him.—Heb. vii : 25.

INTRODUCTION. The true essence and philosophy of the gospel is Christ. The great intercessor and mediator to bring man back to the Father in the text is a glorious demonstration of this infinite truth. We notice four things—

I. UNLIMITED SALVATION. "All." Here is encouragement for the whole human race, without respect to *nationality, attainments, or character.* Consequently it leaves not the shadow of an excuse; those who have greater privileges, greater is the responsibility.

II. NECESSARY ACTION. "All who come." Sitting still will not save. The sinner must arise and answer the invitation. "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" Neutrality, procrastination, will drown multitudes in perdition.

III. GLORIOUS ANTICIPATION. Salvation! what does this not include—safety, satisfaction, joy!

IV. IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITY. We may be left behind. How needful to regard the warning; delays are dangerous. We do not know what a day may bring forth.

The great work of atonement cost the life-blood of the Saviour. Will we then trample under foot this great salvation which so mercifully was made by the finished work of Christ? Then there will be nothing but a fearful retribution which will drown the impenitent in everlasting perdition; for "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT LEADING SERMONS.

1. Small Rain upon Tender Herbs. "As the small rain for the tender herb."—Deut. xxxii : 2. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, London.
2. The Heroic Element in Religion. "Who-soever is fearful and afraid, let him return."—Judges vii : 3. Rev. Louis Albert Banks, Cincinnati, O.
3. The Desire of the Upright Shall be Realized. "No good thing will be withheld from them that walk uprightly."—Ps. lxxxiv : 11. J. T. Eaton, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
4. The Secret of a Wisely Ordered Life. "I love them that love me; and those that seek me early shall find me."—Prov. viii : 17. A. J. F. Behrends, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
5. The Christian's Happy Estate. "Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God now accepteth thy works."—Ecc. ix : 7. T. D. Witherspoon, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
6. True Modesty of Aim. "Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not."—Jer. xlv : 5. J. L. Withrow, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
7. Christ's Power to Forgive Sin Duly Authenticated. "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. And he arose and departed to his house."—Matt. ix : 6, 7. Geo. D. Armstrong, D.D., Norfolk, Va.
8. No Neutrality in Religion. "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad."—Matt. xii : 30. Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
9. Growth Without Fruit. "He that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful."—Matt. xiii : 22. A. T. Pierson, D.D., Philadelphia.
10. The Elements and Victory of Great Faith. "Have mercy on me, O Lord . . . my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. . . . And she said, Truth, Lord, yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from the master's table."—Matt. xv : 22-27. Frank Rogers, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
11. Christ and the Rich. "When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple."—Matt. xxvii : 57. John H. Barrows, D.D., Chicago.
12. A Model Character. "Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile."—John i : 47. Henry Baker, D.D., New York.
13. One of the Apparent Mistakes of Moses. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter," etc.—Heb. xi : 24-26. Charles S. H. Dunn, D.D., Duluth, Minn.
14. The Worth of the Faith Cure. "Is any sick among you? Let him call of the elders of the church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."—James v : 14. T. W. Chambers, D.D., New York.
15. The Destructive Mission of Christ. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil."—1 John iii : 8. Rev. M. W. Jacobus, Oxford, Pa.

SUGGESTIVE THEMES.

1. The Military Spirit in Religion. ("The sword of the Lord and of Gideon."—Judges vii : 18.)
2. The Insensibility of a Backslidden State. ("And he wist not that the Lord had departed from him."—Judges xvi : 20.)
3. The Moral Earnestness of the Times. ("Is it a time to receive money, and to receive garments, and oliveyards and vineyards, and sheep, and oxen, and menservants, and maidservants?"—2 Kings v : 26.)
4. Advanced Thinkers. ("The children of Issachar . . . were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do."—1 Chron. xii : 32.)
5. The Wonderful Book. ("Thy testimonies are wonderful."—Ps. cxix : 126.)
6. A Preacher Angered by Success. ("But it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry."—Jonah iv : 1.)
7. The Reward of Unnoticed Living. ("And thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee."—Matt. vi 4, R. V.)
8. The Existence of Satan an Explanation of Sin and Evil. ("An enemy hath done this."—Matt. xiii : 28.)
9. Common Sense in Religion. ("The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."—Luke xvi : 8.)
10. Inspired Oratory. ("It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."—Mark xiii : 11.)
11. Profession and Confession. ("When certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus."—Acts xix : 13.)
12. Appearances Deceitful. ("And when the south wind blew softly, supposing that they had obtained their purpose, loosing thence, they sailed close by Crete."—Acts xxvii : 13.)
13. Religion a Certainty. ("I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beatech the air."—1 Cor. ix : 26.)
14. The Awful Doom of Those who Preach a False Religion. ("Though we . . . preach any other gospel unto you . . . let him be accursed."—Gal. i : 8.)
15. The Philosophy of Prayer. ("He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."—Heb. xi : 6.)

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY J. M. SHERWOOD, D.D.

Feb. 26—March 3. — RULING THE SPIRIT.—Prov. xvi : 32.

SELF-POSSESSION and self-control are elements of great strength and worth. And they are very rare traits of character. On this very field the final and the supreme conflict with our evil nature has often to be fought. Anger is an awful passion. It is kindled of hell! When it rules the heart, man is a very devil, and will not stop short of murder and perdition itself. A word, a look, the slightest provocation, will excite it, when it will break forth in uncontrollable fury and riot in lawless wickedness. There is no reason in anger, no fear of God or man. It is a frenzy, *madness!* A man of strong, uncontrolled temper is a dangerous element in the family, in the church, in society, and is a fit instrument in the Devil's hands for mischief.

The wise man puts it none too strong: "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty: he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

"*Slow to anger.*" This is contrary to the whole current of human nature, unchanged and uncontrolled by the grace of God. Anger in its very nature is fiery, combustible, easily excited, and in an instant all control is lost and it bursts forth in a raging, all-sweeping conflagration. A hasty word, a slight injury, an imagined insult, and there is instantly an eruption of flame and blood from the very pit! "*Slow to anger*" is a mightier conquest than the warrior chieftain ever achieved, for it is a victory over a sinful moral nature—over all the powers of evil in earth and hell. And no man is master of his evil temper who has not brought it under subjection by a long and severe discipline, by prayer and soul-strivings, it may be through long and

painful years. Nothing but the grace of God can *chain this tiger* in the human soul.

"*He that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.*" To take a city may require great courage, skill, strategy, and military prowess; while to rule his own spirit is to face and subvert and overcome the strongest moral and spiritual forces of the empire of darkness. Ambition, pride, lust, covetousness, the love of power, anger, sinful love—they are a "legion of devils" in the soul of man, and to keep them at bay, to bind them in chains, to exorcise them in the name and by the grace of Jesus Christ, is a sublime achievement, and will receive the highest reward in the kingdom of heaven.

Probably in no one thing do Christians in general oftener come short than in this matter of *ruling the spirit*. What sorry exhibitions of anger, hasty temper, the lack of self-control, are daily witnessed among the disciples of Him who was "meek and lowly in spirit." Characters without number are spoiled by uncontrolled temper. Many a strong man in intellect, position, gifts, falls an easy prey to some unconquered lust.

This subject comes home to every one of us. This is a warfare in which every one is enlisted. The battle rages in our own spirit. We cannot avoid taking a part in it. It is *our own self* that we are to conquer or be conquered. Nothing but prayer, discipline, ceaseless watching and struggles will avail, with God's almighty grace to help, to gain us the victory.

March 4-10. — THE BROTHERHOOD.
—1 Peter ii : 17.

The ties of *natural* brotherhood are tender and strong. Born of the same parents, sustaining the same

intimate blood relationship, and closely united in a community of interests, there is no relation in life more sacred and important, unless it be the marriage relation. *Blood kinship* is universally recognized as constituting a bond of sacred union, fellowship and interest of the tenderest and most sacred character. To slight or disrupt or sin against such a bond of union is as unnatural as it is sinful and monstrous.

And yet there is a more intimate, sacred, responsible and enduring bond than even natural brotherhood, viz.—the bond of *Christian* brotherhood. The ties which divine grace create are sweeter, purer, more elevating and ennobling than any ties of human consanguinity. The relationship is more intimate, more essential, more comprehensive, more lasting, more nearly divine.

Let us consider briefly the elements of this brotherhood which the New Testament speaks of on every page, and bids us to “love” and cherish as a divine birthright and an exalted privilege.

I. THE ROOT OF IT IS IN JESUS CHRIST.

The Christian is “begotten in him” to a new, a higher, a holy life, even “eternal life,” the highest gift of God. He is more than a “brother after the flesh.” Christ is this by infinite condescension, being born of a woman and taking our nature. He is our “Elder Brother” by appointment and by genealogical descent. But he is ours in an infinitely higher and more blessed relation still. He originates the life we live in him; it is the life of GRACE. He is Father as well as Brother—“the Father of our spirits,” “the Alpha and Omega” of our salvation. Hence our relation to Christ as Redeemer and the spiritual Head of believers is as much superior in every element of interest, worth and grandeur, to any and every other relation, as Christ Jesus the Lord of glory is superior to any creature.

II. THE ROOT OF THE UNION OF BELIEVERS ONE WITH ANOTHER IS ALSO IN CHRIST.

Not in each other, not in church relations. These are important, but they are only incidents. The grand essential relation is a *personal* one between the believing soul and the Christ of God. “Christ liveth in me,” and *that* is my life, my salvation, my boasting, the sole ground of my hope of eternal life. Christ is not ashamed of me. Christ lifts me up to his own exalted state and proffers me his fellowship, and will one day own me as his, and crown me in the presence of his Father and the holy angels. We are too apt to lose sight of the fact that *Christ* is the root, the life, the consummate flower of the Christian brotherhood, and magnify the mere incidents and externals of church life and relations. The real and the everlasting bond that binds together believers and exalts Christian fellowship into a heavenly privilege is that of the individual soul to a personal Christ.

III. THE GRACE, THE BLESSEDNESS AND THE CROWNING GLORY OF THIS BROTHERHOOD, ALL WILL COME FROM ITS DIVINE ORIGINATOR AND HEAD.

In heaven the dignity and glory of this gracious relationship will appear in illustrious lives. This Brotherhood will constitute the Royal Household in the everlasting kingdom. Every member of it will be constituted a priest and a king unto God the Father, and will share with the Christ in the exalted honors and glories of the future.

March 11-17.—OUR FAILURES.—Rom. viii: 15-21.

Nothing is more manifest to the conscientious Christian than his failure to keep the law of God. Strive as he will, he daily comes short and offends in thought, word and deed. He needs not to be told this. His own heart condemns him. He writes bitter things against himself. While the world is blaming and accusing

him, he is weeping in secret over his failings and offenses, and crying out with Paul, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" He grieves and laments, but does not excuse himself. He knows the law is reasonable, and he ought to obey it perfectly. His heart inclines to do it, and he resolves again and again to do so. And yet, as a stubborn, incontrovertible fact, he fails and offends, does what he allows not, and omits what he ought to do. He is perplexed, and often cast down and ready to despair. He wonders what it means; wonders if others have the same feeling; wonders if he can be a child of God and do such things.

This vexed and fearful problem the apostle solves for all Christians by giving his own experience in the words referred to in Romans. Eminent in grace and Christian attainment as he confessedly was, his testimony against himself is as strong and bitter as that of any of us. With contrition and agony in every word, he writes: "That which I do I allow not; for what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that do I. . . . For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing, for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not that I do. . . . So, then, with the mind I serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin." The man who does not see his own portrait in this picture is a stranger to his own heart. Grace and sin in his nature have never joined in mortal conflict.

APPLICATION.—There is much to comfort the sincere disciple in this inspired statement, while there is nothing to encourage the hypocrite or self-deceived.

1. Note the *conflict*. The dual nature is not harmonious. The "spirit" and the "flesh" are at perpetual war. There is no drifting with the current.

There is no folding of the hands in indolence or indifference. There is a daily, ceaseless sharp warfare kept up till death. The man who is a stranger to this inward conflict—the mind and law of God with flesh and lust—is a stranger to the converting grace of God.

2. Note the *purpose*, the *attitude* of the mind. Not only is the state of warfare in the inner man recognized, but the soul takes on a firm resolve, plants its batteries, carries on an active campaign, and resists lust and temptation and the flesh unto blood. The Christian is a *fighting* man even unto death! And his worst and bitterest foes are those of his own house.

3. Note the ground of *comfort* (see v. 20). Do not let us pervert its meaning. *Sin is sin*, in the Christian as well as in the sinner; but when there is an honest, earnest, persistent purpose and endeavor to resist and forever have done with it, a merciful God and a gracious Saviour will accept the mind's heroic and obedient service and forgive and blot out the occasional sins of the "flesh," which, in spite of prayer and resistance and fixed purpose, an evil nature brought forth, even like the sting of the serpent when the heel of the destroyer is crushing its head.

March 18-24. — LOST OPPORTUNITIES.—Gal. v: 10.

"Opportunity" is a very comprehensive and significant word. Almost every duty in life waits on it. Life itself turns on opportunities, improved or lost. Shakespeare puts it none too strongly when he says:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

Or when he says:

"Who seeks, and will not take, when once
'tis offered,
Shall never find it more."

Or still again:

"There is an hour in each man's life appointed,
To make his happiness, if then he seize it."

Opportunity is "appointed," and appointed by the God of providence. He enjoins not a duty but he furnishes the opportunity for its performance. He bestows not a gift or a grace that he does not afford the condition for its exercise. He lays upon us no responsibility without giving the chance and the occasion for its proper discharge. Every day and hour of life is crowded with opportunities of one kind or another—opportunities relating (1) to ourselves, (a) to correct an evil habit, (b) to repair a wrong, (c) to do a kind act to another, (d) to speak a word of warning to a sinner, (e) to reprove an erring brother, (f) to seek a higher consecration. (2) Opportunities in the family, (a) in the way of instruction, (b) of example, (c) of admonition, (d) of taking up some neglected duty. (3) Opportunities in the church and in the world, (a) confessing Christ, (b) attending the prayer-meeting, (c) encouraging your pastor, (d) greater liberality, (e) confessing sin and striving for a revival, (f) opportunities in business and in social life to stand up for truth and justice and honesty and business and social virtues. "As we have therefore *opportunity*, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."

Among the many reasons for enforcing this duty I have space to state only a few.

1. It is a sin against Providence to neglect or sin away opportunities. God's own wisdom and grace creates and adjusts all life's opportunities.

2. Any service done out of season, after the opportunity is past, if done at all, is necessarily done to great disadvantage and is seldom successful.

3. The opportunity, probably, never occurs but *once*—that is the "flood" mark of divine and human agency; if "omitted" the prize is lost.

4. Any opportunity lost is lost forever. Some other and seemingly similar opportunity may arise, but it is not the past and wasted opportuni-

ty; that we shall not meet again till the judgment of the great day.

5. The saddest regrets of old age and a dying hour will be associated with our splendid but "lost opportunities!"

6. The bitterest reproaches of the lost soul will be over his lost opportunities. Oh, it might have been otherwise! I had a *chance* of salvation and I madly threw it away!

March 25-31.—BE SURE YOUR SIN WILL FIND YOU OUT.—1 Samuel xv: 1-22; Joshua vii: 16-21.

Sin as a rule is committed under a false and pernicious impression, namely, (1) that it will never be *known*, or (2) if found out, in some way *punishment* will be avoided. If sinners did not deceive themselves on these points there would not be half the sin in the world there is! The Devil deludes them into the belief that the theft of the golden wedge or Babylonian garment, the act of embezzlement or forgery, the crime of adultery or murder, will never come to light: it will remain a secret. The Avenger of Justice will never overtake him! But all experience and observation confirms the awful testimony of Scripture, "*Be sure your sin will find you out.*"

And why? Because

I. THERE IS AND CAN BE NO SECRET THING IN GOD'S UNIVERSE.

Everything is open and naked to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do, even the thoughts and purposes of the heart, which have never been put into speech or action! Every sin, though no human eye or ear takes cognizance of it, is seen as soon as conceived by the All-seeing eye. That *sin a secret* when high Heaven knows it all! Why, there is not a cavern in earth or hell that can hide the culprit from that penetrating gaze; no night can conceal him. *Flee? Whither*, to hide his secret? If God knows all about it, how hide it from men? The secret will out in spite of himself—in his dreams, in

his agitation and fearfulness. Why, is he not "suspected"? Does not every one he meets know of it?

II. THERE IS IN SIN ITSELF THE ELEMENT OF EXPOSURE AND RETRIBUTION.

Sin, like every other natural and moral force, works out certain results, physical, spiritual and moral, and those results are not under man's control; they are the developments of omnipotent law. The transgressor is impotent. He cannot stay the Almighty Hand, which, by means of the law of cause and effect, has its firm grip upon him. He is no longer master of himself, much less of his secret. And a thousand influences are working upon him and closing in upon him, all tending to disclosure and final retribution.

III. ALL THE LAWS OF GOD'S UNIVERSE ARE PUT IN REQUISITION TO EXPOSE SIN AND BRING IT IN DUE TIME TO PUNISHMENT.

1. His *physical* laws. They even cry out against sin, as in the case

of the inebriate, the glutton, the adulterer, etc. The heavens and the earth conspire to track and fasten guilt upon the murderer. 2. His *moral* law. Under its flashes and thunder peals many a guilty soul has quaked and been driven to confession or suicide. Conscience, echoing God's law, makes cowards of sinners; makes life an insupportable burden, drives them from home and makes them wanderers on the earth, as Cain was. 3. His *providential* law. A thousand agencies and forces are set to work to expose and punish transgression as soon as it is committed. Earth, air and water, science, art, and human law, all furnish evidence to point out and convict the criminal and bring him to judgment.

No; secrecy in sin is impossible; sooner or later it must come into the light of noonday. "*Be sure your sin will find you out.*" The only way of escape from its shame and punishment is through the pardoning blood of Jesus Christ.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

"LET THE DEAD BURY THEIR OWN DEAD."

BY REV. C. M. COBERN, PH.D., DETROIT, MICH.

EVERY Bible student has probably been impressed with the obscurity of the above passage found in Matt. viii : 22 ; Luke ix : 60.

Any careful consideration of the explanation offered by commentators will only tend to deepen the obscurity. The circumstances upon which all commentators are agreed are these :

Jesus was about to depart from a certain place after one of his peerless sermons, when he was detained by several of his listeners who "desired or fancied they desired to attach themselves to him as permanent disciples."

The first of these was a scribe, who

exclaimed, "Lord I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." But notwithstanding his official dignity and position, although one would think that "one scribe might do him more credit and service than twelve fishermen," Jesus frankly and bluntly puts before him the hardship and unpopularity and homelessness which he must be prepared to accept if he followed him. Then came the man alluded to in the above text.

The common view of his coming and the attending circumstances has never been more felicitously expressed than by Canon Farrar in his "Life of Christ." "The second," writes he, "was already a partial disciple, but wished to become an entire follower, with the reservation that he might first be permitted to bury his father. 'Follow me,' was the thrill-

ling answer, 'and let the dead bury their dead'—that is, leave the world and the things of the world to mind themselves. He who would follow Christ must in comparison hate even father and mother. He must leave the spiritually dead to attend to their physically dead."

There has been, we think, no kinder way of putting the general features of this case, according to the ordinary view of it, than this, and yet the plain Anglo-Saxon of this latter clause is, "Follow me; let sinners bury your father." Does that sound like the Saviour?

Lest it be thought that we put the case too harshly, allow us to give the very words of several exegetes who undertake to paraphrase this expression of Jesus.

Dr. Joseph Hall says: "As for that excuse which thou makest of burying the dead . . . there are enough besides fit for this business, even those which lie still dead in their sins."

John Brown of Haddington writes: "Christ denies his request. . . . There were enough dead sinners to bury the dead corpse."

Dr. Scott's words are almost literally the same.

It might be said that these old expositors do not represent the "sweetness and light" of our times. But here is Lange, who explains the text in a precisely similar way, and adds: "It also alludes to the goal and end of those who are spiritually dead—their last and highest aim here is to bury one another."

Think of Jesus saying to one who asked permission to attend the funeral of his father, "No. Let sinners attend to your father—their highest aim here is to *bury one another!*"

We cannot think of Jesus speaking discourteously of the dead or to the living, and yet to explain these closing words as they are explained in most commentaries—the present writer has examined from Calvin's to the "Speaker's," and in all the Lives of Christ from Fleetwood to Eder-

sheim: "Let the spiritually dead bury the physically dead"—seems necessarily to introduce this discourtesy and harshness.

With this interpretation of the text even our most kindly and polished exegetes force Jesus to speak with unbecoming roughness.

Take these words of Dr. Howard Crosby: "Follow me. . . . There are enough spiritually dead who can bury their physically dead relatives;" or these of Jacobus: "Let the dead in trespasses and sins, who are not of my disciples, attend to this business;" or these of Dr. Eddy: "Those who are dead in worldliness and sin are competent to bury their dead, that is their appropriate work;" or these of Henry Cowles: "Let men dead in their sins bury the dead body you spoke of." Think of Jesus speaking such words to a son just made fatherless or about to be made fatherless by death! It were better to say, "This is an enigma. I cannot understand it," than to explain it thus.

It is not surprising that skeptical writers, from Celsus to Renan, should have more than hinted that the teaching of Jesus here would make "bad sons", and induce "hostility to the most natural necessities of the heart." It is not unnatural that a priest, as Pasquier Quesnél, who might think natural affection a sin, could write on this passage: "Fondness for relatives is an obstacle to salvation. . . . Ministers of the church cannot be told too often that they should leave the world and the people of the world."

But what shall we think of these words of Joseph Parker, affirming that this was the message of Jesus to that disciple: "Follow me . . . *quench every other love!*" or these of Matthew Henry: "The disciple was called to be a minister and therefore must not entangle himself with the affairs of the world;" or these of Mr. Wesley: "Leave the business of the world to those who are dead to God;" or these of Dr. Whedon: "Let a secular world perform its

duties to its secular members." As if burying our dead fathers was a secular business and not a Christian duty—"a temporal business which may as well be done by men of the world," to quote Bloomfield's own words on this passage.

No. Relief from what seems to be a harsh saying is not to be found by speaking lightly of death or a son's love, or in the intimation that the last sacred rites of sepulture are secular duties that may just as well be turned over to ungodly men.

Any explanation of any words or acts of Jesus which would read into them any belittling of human love and filial duty to the living or the dead parent must be a wrong explanation, the character and words of Jesus being our witnesses.

Some have sought to escape the above consequences of the common interpretation of the text by emphasizing the insincerity or hypocrisy of the man who could make "filial duty an excuse for not immediately following Christ" (Morrison), or who might even have desired to profess discipleship early, so as to get the advantage of it if Jesus succeeded in his Messianic claims and yet escape the sufferings and dangers of discipleship (Prof. Norton). But there is not a hint of this to be found in the Scriptures. So far as the account shows, this man may have been Johannean in spirit and may have followed Jesus promptly and obediently.

Others, to relieve the matter, have pointed out that it is quite probable that his father was not dead but only sick or aged; this man really answers the call of Jesus by saying, "Excuse me till my father dies, then I will come."

That this *may* have been the fact in the case seems evident.

Mr. Sadler ("Comments on Matthew" No. 31, 883) reports that he was told by one who came from India that on asking a faithful servant to accompany her home, the answer

was, "I must stay and bury my father," though the old man was alive and well. Many learned men have favored this view.

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown are very decided. They ask, "Was his father actually dead, lying a corpse, having only to be buried? Impossible." If so, the Lord would not "have hindered him discharging the last duties of a son to a father." No doubt the father was yet alive, though "frail or aged," and this view of the case will explain the "curt reply." Let the dead spiritually bury the dead physically."

But is this any real explanation of the said "curt reply?" If his father were yet alive we can see an additional reason for the refusal of Jesus to allow him to depart, but we can see no reason for what scholars call the "seeming harshness" (Kitto and Meyer) or "apparently rash direction" (Barnes) found in his "curt reply," "Let the spiritually dead bury their own physically dead," *i. e.*, Let those ungodly brothers of yours look after your aged father. It is appropriate business for them.

No wonder, with such an understanding of the meaning of the Saviour's words, Dr. Schaff exclaims, "This is a hard saying, and who can bear it?"

If these words could be got *out* of the way, or explained so as not to offend our best instincts, it is easy to see how some duties are so imperative and far-reaching as even to supersede that which a son owes to the dead body of his revered parent. Sons on the battle-field have seen their fathers fall, and moved on to the call of a higher duty than even that of filial tears. A husband by the bedside of a wife lying in anguish and danger of death may be pardoned even if he go not to his father's funeral.

To save the living is a more sacred duty than even to mourn over the dead. But this man was called to save souls from death. To save a

soul from death is a more pressing duty than even to lay down the body of a father in the grave.

Besides, there is evidently danger to his own soul in returning. Before the days of mourning are accomplished Jesus may have been crucified, this man's hope of apostleship forever gone, and perhaps even his desire for discipleship. "Even the tears of his loved ones" might have "shaken his resolve" to follow Jesus (Schenkel).

And who is this so nearly lost, so "saved by fire," to Christ's service? Lange thought it was the Apostle Thomas. Many are sure it was one of the twelve. It seems settled that at least it was one of the seventy, and probably Philip the evangelist.

Is it any wonder that at this crisis in such a man's experience Jesus took prompt and decided measures to hold him by his side until "settled and grounded in the truth?"

Edersheim (following Godet) truly remarks, "There are critical moments in our inner history when to postpone the immediate call is really to reject it—when to go and bury the dead (even though it were a dead father) were to die ourselves." Not in harshness then, but in love comes the call, "Follow me," and "Follow me now," even though he were forbidden to press a farewell kiss upon his dead father's brow. This was but the same cross as had been laid upon the heart of Ezekiel, who, when his wife died, was commanded, "Neither shalt thou mourn nor weep, neither shall thy tears run down" (Ezek. xxiv:16). *Not* because God depreciated the natural affections which he had implanted, but because he had a great and awful sermon to be preached through the renunciation of this natural and blameless mourning for the dead.

For this same reason this same law was placed upon the high priest and Nazarites (Lev. xxi:11, 12; Num. vi:26-28). Jesus then required of this man, whom he called to be a

"priest unto his God" (Rev. i:6), only such self-sacrifice as had ever been required of certain holy men among the Jews, and only such as every rabbi exacted of his followers at that very time (Geikie).

This whole matter, then, would be clear and the call of Jesus explained in perfect harmony with his life of love, if this one text could be explained where he seems to say, "Follow me. Leave sinners to bury your father's corpse." But does Jesus say, "Let the dead spiritually (those dead in sins) bury the dead?" Not at all. This is simply a figurative interpretation of the word used at the beginning and ending of this text. The literal translation of it, as all agree, is "dead," not "spiritually dead."

Several distinguished scholars (as Bengel) try to interpret according to the literal meaning, "Let the dead (physically) bury their own dead (physically)," but unfortunately in every case have given these words the meaning, "Let the dead bury themselves, *i. e.*, let them go unburied." This, however, scarcely sounds like the Saviour: "Follow me. Let your father remain unburied," etc.

Is there then no other way of explaining these words of Jesus, which literally rendered are, "Follow me. Leave the dead to bury their own dead?" Perhaps not. Perhaps this is an Oriental proverb, the meaning of which is lost to us although plain to the disciples. Certainly it is better to take this view of it than to explain it in a way which would be contradictory to the Saviour's kindness of heart.

We venture, however, to suggest an interpretation. The "dead," into whose keeping the Saviour committed the father of his disciple, were neither those dead in sins, the "spiritually dead," nor the cripples and infirm of the neighborhood, who, as one said, were "fit for nothing else;" but rather the "dead" spoken of were the *sainted dead*, like Moses

and Elijah and the prophets, who, though "dead," yet lived, according to the teaching of Jesus (Matt. xxii: 32; Luke xx: 38), and *from whose presence Jesus and three of his disciples had but just returned* (Luke ix: 28-37). Can this word "dead" be referred to these departed saints? Let John answer: "And I saw a great white throne; and I saw the dead small and great stand before God" (Rev. xx: 12). Here he uses the same Greek word that is used twice in the text. These are "the dead" (able to care for "their own") who shall minister, Jesus says, if need be, to this aged or deceased father. The first man who came had to be taught that he must trust himself perfectly to Jesus if he would be a true disciple, giving himself wholly into the Lord's hands, and trusting him, though he have no pillow for his head.

This man had to learn the harder lesson, that in order to be a true disciple he must trust not only himself but his helpless loved one to the Saviour's care. Feeling sure that he will care for him, though the "dead" (now ministering spirits) or the angels themselves came to bury his father, *as they did bury Moses* (Deut. xxxiv: 6; Jude 9).

This interpretation of the text not only relieves it of its "harshness," as no other interpretation does that we have seen, but positively assists the theological argument of Matthew and fits into the chronological arrangement of Luke in a peculiarly suggestive way.

EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH xxxiii: 17.

BY HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., NEW YORK.

"THINE eyes shall see the king in his beauty." Cheyne in his commentary on Isaiah asserts that this king cannot be Jehovah, for beauty is never ascribed to him. This is a shallow argument. Can an epithet never be given to God once, but must every epithet be repeated in order to

be true? Suppose that beauty is never ascribed to Jehovah in any other passage. Does that make it a certainty that it is not so ascribed here?

But if one sees Jehovah in Jesus there will be no trouble in finding beauty ascribed to the Messiah, and so to Jehovah. That Jesus is Jehovah needs no lengthy proof to any Bible student. The mighty God (El Gibbor) of Isaiah ix: 6 is the Messiah. The fourth commandment calls the Sabbath "the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God," but Jesus says that *he* is Lord of the Sabbath (Mark ii: 28). "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last," says Jesus (Rev. xxii: 13—cf. 16), but we also read, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty."

Jesus is Jehovah, and we find in the Messiah every form of beauty ascribed to him in the Canticles, which infidel commentators would make a mere carnal love-song, but which the church has always cherished as the song of Christ's love and loveliness to his redeemed people.

Again in the forty-fifth Psalm we find the King Messiah described as "fairer than the children of men;" and there is no great difference between assigning beauty to holiness (Ps. xxix: 2 and xevi: 9) and assigning beauty to the holy God. (The translation of "haderath kodesh" in those Psalms by "holy ornaments" is a rationalistic avoidance of the spiritual.) Moreover, in Zech. ix: 17 we find Jehovah thus referred to by the prophet, "How great is his goodness, and how great is his *beauty*." Here the identical word is used (*yephi*) that is found in our Isaiah text. In this last passage to refer the singular pronoun to God's people when they are spoken of with plural pronouns and verbs in the whole context is hardly a fair way to prove the proposition that beauty is never ascribed to Je-

hovah. But even if beauty is never ascribed to Jehovah anywhere else, as we said before, is that a substantial reason why it cannot be here so ascribed? The same king is here referred to that is mentioned in ch. xxxii : 1, "Behold a king shall reign in righteousness." To attribute the lofty things said of this king and his reign to Hezekiah is to make Isaiah a writer of bombast. Who the king is can be very clearly seen from v. 22, "For Jehovah is our judge, Jehovah is our lawgiver, Jehovah is our king." It is Jehovah who, as the man Christ Jesus, is seen in his beauty by every believing soul. "Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty." It will no more be the type and the prophecy which shall reveal him, but he shall become personally visible to men, and then "they shall behold the land of far distances," the extended kingdom which Messiah

shall rule, contrasted with the little land of Palestine.

Cheyne and all the commentators who follow the German lead degrade the prophecies by detracting from their spiritual and Messianic character. The prophet was *especially* a witness for Messiah (John v: 39, Luke xxiv : 27). The local and temporary affairs of Israel and Judah were secondary, mere stepping-stones to the Messianic subject. In Hezekiah and the Assyrians there was a mere text for Messiah and the enemies of the church. The glorious kingdom is always Christ's kingdom and the glorious king is Jehovah, Jesus, and the destroyed Assyrian is the consumed world-enemy of the church. Only as thus read are the prophecies comprehensible. Only as thus read are the prophets the foundation, with apostles, of the universal church (Eph. ii : 20).

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND SCIENCE.

GOETHE pronounced faith and unbelief the great problem of the ages. One need but watch the deeper tendencies of the present age to learn how much that problem is involved in the conflicts of the present. In the Protestant and in the Catholic churches the conflict differs considerably, owing to the difference of principles. If its freedom and its emphasis on the rights of reason have made the Protestant church peculiarly liable to agitations, the very authority claimed by the Catholic church has also involved it in peculiar difficulties. Not only has it exercised this authority in settling disputes, but it has also been obliged to maintain its claim to the supremacy of this authority, a claim specially difficult respecting science.

Even the boasted unity of Catholicism is rather outer than inner. Not

only are there different views respecting ultramontaniam, but also respecting the limits of freedom in scientific investigation. That church certainly deserves credit now for its learned labors and earnest efforts to harmonize science and religion ; but it will be surprising if it is not obliged to abandon some of its claims and to make the fatal admission that it has erred in the past. Indeed, its claim to infallibility will be hard to maintain if the statements of some of its own adherents are to be credited. For proof reference is here made to an article in the *Dublin Review*, by the Catholic bishop of Newport and Menevia, entitled "Dr. Mivart on Faith and Science," a review of an article by the scientist Dr. St. George Mivart, in the *Nineteenth Century* on "The Catholic Church and Biblical Criticism."

Mivart avowed himself a loyal

Catholic, yet asserted the freedom of Catholics in science and biblical interpretation. Respecting Galileo he says: "God has taught us by the actual facts of the history of Galileo that it is to men of science that he has committed the elucidation of scientific questions, scriptural and otherwise, and not to a consensus of theologians or to ecclesiastical assemblies or tribunals. . . . It is men of historical science now, and not theologians or congregations who are putting us in the way of apprehending, with some approach to accuracy, what the truth is as to the dates, authorities and course of development of the writings which were inspired for our spiritual profit." In this statement the bishop finds just truth enough to make it dangerous: "Does Dr. Mivart mean to assert that there are no matters of chemistry or biology which are so intimately bound up with revealed truth that the pastorate of the church may not be divinely protected in pronouncing upon them? . . . The sphere of science is to investigate facts and physical occurrences; but when these things have become the subject of revelation there is no room left, on those particular questions, for any further investigation, and science must simply bow to the teaching of God's witness." Not less clear as the statement of Pius IX., in the Munich Brief, quoted by the bishop: "Although the natural sciences rest each on its own principles, which reason investigates; nevertheless, Catholics who cultivate such sciences should have revelation before their eyes as a guiding star to save them from danger and mistake, whenever they feel that (as often happens) they are being led by natural science to utter what is more or less opposed to the infallible truth which God has revealed."

The bishop of course advocates the infallibility of the church, but its demonstration to laymen is virtually abandoned. "It is indisputable, then,

that Catholics are bound to admit that in some cases the authority of the pastorate, exercised by some of its organs, can directly and implicitly define truth. But I consider it impossible to lay down for laymen in anything like an exhaustive manner how and when this would take place. It would be most unadvisable even for a trained theologian to attempt to explain the whole subject to the ordinary layman. But if a layman attempt it himself, the result can only be mischievous. The discussion of the 'subject' and 'object' of infallibility is very interesting and very useful if a man takes it up thoroughly, with due preparation, and with that reverential wish to obey the church in all things, which is a note of genuine Catholicism." Those who have "the reverential wish to obey the church in all things" will no doubt be able to appreciate the demonstration of papal infallibility; but it excludes all mortals who desire to have the demonstration as a condition of obedience. Could a more signal exhibition of the weakness of the doctrine be given? If absolute obedience is the condition of demonstration, we can understand why obedience makes the demonstration useless and justifies its omission.

There must of course be a loophole somewhere if science proves false things heretofore held universally by the church. In this respect Protestants will have reason to change their views of the papal doctrine of infallibility as held by the Catholic church. Who would believe that a Catholic bishop admits that the universal consensus of the church may be proved false? Yet that is actually the case. The bishop quotes approvingly Rev. Jeremiah Murphy, who insists that the ordinary meaning of Scripture respecting man's creation shall be adhered to, "unless the evolutionists show that there is sufficient reason for departing from it." The bishop adds significantly: "What I conceive the reasonable Catholic the-

ologian's position to be in questions of biology and Scripture interpretation may be expressed in four sentences. First, he will not abandon a hitherto universal or quasi-universal consensus of opinion without very strict investigation into the claims of an opposite opinion; secondly, he will not, on the other hand, admit that anything physical or historical, anything which may be the object of research and experiment, is bound up with revelation unless there is adequate evidence that it is so; thirdly, he will be prepared to allow that the terms in which physical facts and historical events are expressed in the theological documents are not of necessity precise or accurate *objectively*; in other words, the divine author of revelation and of Scripture must have spoken accurately, but the recipients of the divine message need not necessarily have understood fully and to the bottom the fact involved. And fourthly, he will steadfastly maintain that the Church of God has the power both to define indirectly points of science or history which are involved in revelation, and to judge when they are actually so involved."

The first sentence admits the conclusion so ominous for Catholics, that a universal consensus of opinion may have to be abandoned. How far from final the decrees of councils and the views of the fathers are, thus becomes evident. But it is also directly confirmed by the bishop, who proceeds to apply these principles to the action of the church in the condemnation of Galileo. The weight of his argument to save the church from reproach is indicated in this passage: "I do not, of course, admit that the church's infallibility, or that of the church's head, is compromised by the mistakes made. But, short of that, I do not care for the moment to dispute the assertion that mistakes were made by theologians, cardinals, congregations, and the Sovereign Pontiff himself. What I say is, that the church, in this case, has made no *theological*

claim which she has since withdrawn." And what every candid thinker will say is, If mistakes are admitted on the part of "theologians, cardinals, congregations, and the Sovereign Pontiff himself," who that has any appreciation of consistency will care a fig whether the *theological* claim of infallibility is withdrawn or not?

The bishop quotes Cardinal Bellarmine's letter to an adherent of the Copernican system as proof that the opinion of the fathers is not decisive as to the interpretation of Scripture. The cardinal says: "All the fathers and modern commentators have interpreted literally those passages which speak of the sun in the heavens and its revolution round the earth, and of the earth's immobility in the center of the universe. Think calmly and prudently whether the church can allow a meaning to be given to Holy Scripture which is contrary to that of the fathers and of all interpreters, Greek or Latin. . . . *If there were any demonstration that the sun was in the center of the universe, and that it does not revolve round the earth, but the earth round the sun, then it would be necessary to proceed very solicitously and carefully in the explanation of those passages of Scripture which appear to be contrary, and rather to say that we do not understand than to say that what is demonstrated is false. . . . In case of doubt we ought not to abandon the interpretation of the fathers.*" The italics are the bishop's.

There is no refuge in the supposition that the unanimous consent of the church respecting the interpretation of Scripture on this point was not a matter of faith, for the cardinal says distinctly: "Do not say that this is no matter of faith."

The bishop's own admission utterly destroys all rational basis for papal infallibility, as the following proves. Respecting the condemnation of Galileo he says: "What the church tri-

bunals claimed was to condemn a certain interpretation as making Scripture false; they therefore had primarily in view to condemn the assertion that Scripture could speak falsely; and when they included in that condemnation the actual interpretation in question, it was, as I hold, with the implicit understanding that it might possibly be one day proved correct." That is, the church is infallible; it pronounced Galileo's view "heretical," as the bishop admits, and for that condemned him; but when it condemned the view as heretical, it did so with the "implicit understanding that it might possibly be one day proved correct." Were the discussion not serious throughout, we should expect this absurdity to be intended for an Irish bull.

Many other things deserve attention. Repeated assaults are made on laymen who have the temerity to speak on theological subjects. Thus a case is given which "is a sample of what mischief a layman can do when he takes to teaching theology." One imagines that the clerical arrogance and lay subjection of the Middle Ages is to be restored. The Bible needs the authority of the church. "Even an ordinary common-sense view would teach a Catholic that if the church is warned off the interpretation of the written word, she is stripped of half her power of guarding God's revelation." She may have to guard that word even from her children. "It cannot be denied that the church is within her rights and is in the main acting prudently when she regulates the reading even of Holy Scripture itself by her children."

SOCIALISM AND THE CHURCH.

IN his work on "Ethics," Bishop Martensen shows with what interest he followed the socialistic movements of the day. His last letter to his friend Dorner says: "A reaction, a change in the whole of society is

necessary. We are certainly approaching critical times." Since then the fears of the Danish theologian have become general. One can scarcely take up a paper without finding evidences that the "critical times" are already here. Thus a religious journal of Scotland says: "With plenty of money in the country, and plenty of bread, our towns are yet crowded with men who are unemployed; and so terrible is the pressure of poverty in some of the rural districts that praying men, as in Lewis, have been driven into an attitude most foreign to them—that of a virtual defiance of the constituted authorities. Troubles like these inevitably start questions of a revolutionary tendency, and nobody can feel surprised at the mental restlessness which is abroad, the revived interest in religious speculations, the agitation for changes in our laws and systems of government, and the re-appearance of the spectre of a leveling Socialism. By this agitation in general, society, all the churches, and all the religious societies have been more or less affected. Most of them have suffered in a material point of view."

The socialistic agitations in England, especially in London, are sufficiently known through the daily press. In Germany, in spite of the vigilance of the police, the Socialists make propaganda and secretly circulate thousands of copies of anarchical journals. As a consequence, the political parties are already discussing the propriety of prolonging the law to repress Socialism. Recent official reports from Vienna reveal a sad state of poverty in that city, and it is said to be on the increase. Many families have been obliged to give up beef entirely and to substitute horse-flesh, while others eat no meat at all, but live on cereals and vegetables. The food of many school-children has been found to be wholly inadequate, and 3,000 daily suffer from hunger. Of this number, 900 receive for dinner

only bread and coffee or vegetables, 184 have no warm dinner, 266 get only a piece of bread for dinner, 585 are not sufficiently fed, 324 frequently go without dinner, and 199 get no dinner at all. The result is that the percentage of recruits for the army decreases. In some of the country districts of Austria laborers earn but 22 cents a day; they do not get time to go home for dinner and frequently have to work at night.

Eloquent socialistic facts abound, and it would be unaccountable if Christian scholars ignored them. Great movements are apt to pass through four phases: first they cause bewilderment and confusion, then the facts are carefully gathered; the third stage is that of classification, mostly according to external marks of similarity; the last stage is that of an articulated system, when a complete mastery of the subject is gained. During all these stages theories, often of the wildest character, prevail. Taking a general survey of Socialism in Europe, we are safe in saying that the second stage has been reached. It is admitted that mere apprehensions will not meet the danger threatening society and religion, and that the only solution of the problems presented can be expected by first gathering the facts in the case.

However evident the superficial manifestations of Socialism, the problems it presents are deep and beset with difficulties. In order to understand them certain principles must be considered—principles which can here only be stated, not discussed. First, in the disputes between Individualism and Socialism, it must be remembered that an individualism which ignores society and a socialism which makes the individual but the wave on the sea are both false. There is no society except as there are individuals, and society must be viewed as an organism of which individuals are but the members and the organs. Second, a great movement is never isola-

ted; the entire age, with all its various tendencies, is in sympathy with it. Socialism is but the crisis of a diseased system. Third, a movement long in silent preparation may burst forth suddenly, it may seem to be new when in reality it is but the culmination of a long series of tendencies. Fourth, men are not equally endowed by nature and no artificial means can ever make them equal. Fifth, the happiness and misery of men depend far more on their character and state and far less on circumstances than is generally supposed. It is a radical perversion to attribute wholly to the environment what depends primarily on the man himself. Sixth, circumstances do not alter human nature itself. The sensibility may be as keen in a hut as in a palace. Seventh, all unconditional general statements respecting classes and movements are apt to be false. In the study of Socialism nothing is more needed than careful discrimination, exact definitions, and guarded specifications. That the study of the different classes must be sympathetic and free from prejudice is as self-evident as it is difficult.

While Socialism itself is carefully studied, Christian scholars and workers are intent on finding the best means for bringing the masses nearer the church. It has become evident that this is possible only by considering the condition of the masses and bringing the church nearer them. Hence there is a revolution in the church itself, in order to adapt it to the needs of the people, and to prove it the friend and helper of the suffering. For this the richest lessons are found in the gospel itself and in the example of Christ.

The Catholics and Protestants are rivals in their efforts to meet the demands made by Socialism. It is admitted that the church of the future depends largely on the question as to its power to meet the needs of the people. That Rome has external advantages is evident. Its compactness

and organization, the authority of its priesthood, the power of the church in all matters pertaining to faith and practice, are well calculated to impress the masses. Protestantism, on the other hand, depends on the Scriptures and purely spiritual factors, and instead of outward obedience to prescribed rules demands inner faith. Its requirements on the individual believer are much greater and more difficult than those of Rome, and it presupposes in its members a higher development and greater spiritual independence. It demands the heart where Rome asks for ceremonial conformity; it makes the more difficult word of Scripture the law where Rome makes the dictum of the priesthood final. There is no question that the personal ideal of Protestantism is immensely superior to that of the papacy; but this very fact also makes the realization the more difficult. The Catholic church pretends to do for the individual what the evangelical church makes the mission of the individual himself.

In the numerous discussions of Socialism on the part of German Protestant theologians the emphasis is continually placed on the Word of God as the great power of the evangelical church. The work to be done by the church in the crisis through which we are passing is ethical and spiritual. The material condition of the people must be thoroughly studied, all possible relief must be afforded, and the evils prevalent in society must be rooted out, but a permanent change for the better can only be expected if the Word of God dwells more richly in the hearts of men and transforms their character into the image of Christ. Thus the very demands made on the church by Socialism have become an occasion for the deepening of spirituality and for the promotion of the power of divine truth.

RELIGIOUS AGITATIONS IN ENGLAND.

THE "down-grade" controversy and the withdrawal of Mr. Spurgeon

from the Baptist Union have for some time been absorbing topics in the religious press of England. However much the wisdom and charity of Mr. Spurgeon have been questioned, it is on all sides admitted that his action was dictated by conscientious adherence to principle. The charge of heresy made against some members of the Union is clear enough, namely, that they (1) make light of the atonement, (2) deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, (3) call the Fall a fable, (4) speak of justification by faith as immoral, (5) refuse credence to the dogma of the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and (6) hold that there is another probation after death, with possibilities of a future restitution of the lost. But unfortunately it has not been indicated what persons are heretical, and to what extent the heresy prevails among the nearly 2,000 churches in the Union and the 200,000 members. Dr. Clifford, the vice-president of the Union, declares that the first four charges cannot be proved. On the other points he admits views prevail to some extent which differ from those formerly held, but claims that there is no ground for the charge that the Baptist and other Unions, as Mr. Spurgeon charges, "begin to look like confederacies in evil." There are signs that the heresy-hunting has begun in order to discover who the culprits are. But even if the charges could be sustained, not a few think that Mr. Spurgeon could not have labored more efficiently for purity of doctrine than by remaining in the Union. It is certain that others not less orthodox than himself feel at home in the Union. This is evident from numerous published letters, particularly from one signed by John Aldis, Joseph Angus, and Alexander Maclaren. The last has been called "Prince of Teachers," just as Spurgeon has been named "Prince of Preachers," and his thoughtful sermons, which have been very widely circulated, have exerted a powerful

influence. Together with many others he feels that this is a transition period, when peculiar demands are made on the church. Dr. Maclaren says:

"New questions arise of which the dead leaders never dreamed, and in which they can give no counsel. The perspective of theological thought alters, the center of interest changes, a new dialect begins to be spoken. So it comes to pass that all religious thinkers are left behind, and that their words are preserved and read rather for their antiquarian and historical interest than because of any impulse or direction for the present which may linger in them."

Mr. Spurgeon has not failed to preach and write in justification of his course, and many others have declared that there is ground for his charges. The controversy has been productive of considerable confusion, but it also serves to reveal the doctrinal status of the Nonconformist churches. That the critical inquiries respecting the belief of professors of theology and ministers will result in new definitions and fresh adjustments can hardly be questioned. There is likely also to be more clearness as to the relations and responsibilities of members of voluntary religious associations. It is a significant fact that less differences are usually tolerated in free than in state churches. Thus in the established Church of England all grades of belief are found, from severest orthodoxy to liberalism, and the same is true of the state church in Germany. Thus there are members of the Protestant Association of Germany who go far beyond the six points of Mr. Spurgeon, and yet they are in the same church as the advocates of the most rigid confessional orthodoxy. The views which have so suddenly startled the orthodoxy in England are older than the century in the state church of Germany.

A letter in *The Christian*, signed "Agnostic," gives evidence of the sad confusion produced by the crisis through which religious thought is passing. The writer entered a theological seminary with the intention of preparing for the ministry.

He had been "trained up in a godly family, where warm personal piety was wedded to earnest evangelical belief." But in the seminary his faith was undermined by the professors, who began "with admirable candor and honesty to expose the weakness of the orthodox position." He quit the seminary, abandoned the hope of entering the ministry, and became an "agnostic," all within a year after entering the seminary! This case reveals one of the worst features of our age—the haste with which the most momentous concerns are decided. Deep and earnest souls are more apt to be inquirers and seekers for life than to decide within a few months questions which have made the wisest pause, and which are the problems of the ages.

We cannot enter upon the endless details of the controversy, but some of its lessons are obvious. The situation is serious as well as earnest. It has become evident that the ministry must reckon with doubts in the church as well as with indifference and skepticism without. The fact cannot be disguised that there are multitudes who require intellectual convincing as well as spiritual awakening; fort after fort must be captured before the heart is won. The moral and spiritual work is not less than formerly, but the intellectual demands made on the ministry are far greater. From the side of biblical criticism as well as from philosophy and science, the most important fundamental questions are pressing for solution. In England much of the old battle of the Reformation must be fought over again; but still greater is that warfare in which the fundamentals of religion and all that is dearest to the soul are involved. The religious agitations in England are peculiar just now, but the problems are essentially the same as in America and Germany. A deep and all-pervading revival is needed, but it must affect the head as well as the heart and the will, and must

reach the university, the seminary, and the study as well as the pulpit.

The Church of England has many clergymen who in earnest biblical faith and in pure Christian zeal are worthy of a place among the best in other denominations. This is so well known that we are not in danger of being misunderstood when it is stated that there are other clergymen who, in view of the deep needs of the age, seem to be but triflers in holy things. Their endless and often silly talk about forms, processions, symbols, garments, and the like, would be less intolerable if there were not so many more weighty concerns demanding attention. In view of the multitude of modern interests, it is easy to find the psychological explanation of the selection of a specialty and making it the object of absorbing consideration, but on religious grounds the deification of ritual and rubrics remains a puzzle. Yet it is not exceptional in history for fanaticism to be intense in proportion as its objects are insignificant.

If less noise is made about ritualism than a few years ago, that is no evidence that it is on the decrease. Both on the continent and in England there are numerous evidences that it is flourishing. A recent paper says :

"The progress of Romanism in the Protestant Church of England is painfully indicated by the fact that praying and offering masses for the dead is greatly on the increase. The 'Office of the Dead' was 'sung' on a recent evening in sixty-seven churches in England, Scotland and Wales, and on the following morning masses for the dead were offered up in no fewer than one hundred and seventeen churches."

Disestablishment is among the burning questions of Great Britain. The Nonconformists of Wales are not only most determined in the movement, but are also most likely to be the first to secure their point. With the vast majority of the population against the establishment in Wales, there seems to be no better reason for forcing the Church of England on the people than for doing so

in Ireland. Twenty-six of the thirty Welsh members of Parliament favor disestablishment. A majority of the Scotch members also favor the separation of church and state. In England the prestige seems still to favor the establishment, but many of its friends are apprehensive that disestablishment is only a question of time. Hence voices are found among the bishops of the church urging greater zeal and spirituality, not merely to prove that the church is worthy of its privileges, but also to be prepared for the separation of church and state.

An outsider cannot but feel that the usual arguments in favor of establishment are intended to retain its friends rather than to convince its foes. The plea made by some that to disestablish would be a blow at religion itself and would weaken the cause of Christ certainly seems very strange. A church whose power consists in its relation to the state rather than in its spirituality furnishes to many the very best proof that it is not worthy of state patronage. Others, however, argue that the aid of the state simply augments the spiritual power of the church. It is evident that at home and abroad representatives of the English church speak and act with an authority which implies that they are backed by the whole of England. On the continent a peculiar respectability is supposed to be attached to membership in that church.

The *Saturday Review* pronounces the religious argument against the establishment as a mere subterfuge on the part of many; yet it admits that there are those who "honestly believe the establishment of any religious body to be an outrage on Christian principle. We have no special admiration for Mr. Spurgeon, and much less for Dr. Parker, but we have no reason to question their sincerity when the latter insists that 'the church of Christ is a purely spiritual institution and cannot therefore be lawfully allied with the state,'

and Mr. Spurgeon declares that it is 'treason against Christ for the church to submit her laws to the decision of Parliament.' Even in the established church itself 'a not inconsiderable party' holds this view, so that Mr. Spurgeon could say, 'In this respect I am a very High Churchman indeed.' Against others, however, the charge is made that they 'grudge the Church of England her property and her status,' and if they cannot find any decent pretext for appropriating the loaves and fishes to their own use, they are at least resolved that the rightful owners shall be plundered, for better let the endowment be wasted altogether—as unquestionably a large portion would be if their scheme were ever to be carried out—than go to sustain the power and pride of the hated 'state church.' Disestablishment is on their lips, but disendowment is in their hearts."

If such language only serves to inflame the zeal of the "Liberation Society," against which it is chiefly aimed, the historical argument in favor of establishment in the same review will hardly convince those who side with Mr. Spurgeon and Dr. Parker that they are wrong in opposing on religious grounds the union of church and state. The argument for establishment will have little weight with those who do not give Rome greater historical authority than Protestants are generally prepared to do. It is certainly significant that at the beginning of Christianity, and during the period of its greatest purity and vigor, there was no established church, and that as a result of the historical development since Constantine there is a decided tendency against establishment as well as a powerful religious life in churches wholly independent of the state. It is not a convincing argument against disestablishment to affirm that "it finds no counterpart in the church of the fourth or of the fourteenth century any more than in

the church of the eighteenth, and it can only be accepted as a new departure by the church of the nineteenth century."

In spite of determined attacks from without and numerous inner conflicts the Church of England is developing a marvelous activity in various directions. The "Church of England Temperance Society" has become a great power, and a Non-conformist affirms that by means of its temperance work the church has postponed the day of disestablishment more than by any other means. The "Church of England Workingmen's Society" and the "Church Army" are doing efficient work. A marked feature is the determination to make laymen more active in religious work and to break through the stiffness of the forms of worship. It is admitted that unusual means are necessary in order to win back the masses, that the form of religious service should be especially adapted to them, and that the spiritual work in their behalf must be done largely by laymen, and by laymen of their own class. A commendable effort is thus made to secure room for all kinds of activity, lay and clerical, female and male, and to meet the intellectual and spiritual needs of all classes. This revival of zeal and these cheering signs of progress are of much greater concern than mere theories respecting establishment and disestablishment.

THE PULPIT.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *British Weekly* gives the following "pearls and diamonds" from Dr. John Ker's lectures on "Preaching."

"If a popular preacher is to be liked by his brethren he must be very frank and human."

"This is often a difficulty in preaching—to be graphic without being small and shallow, and becoming like the river Euphrates, smitten in the seven streams till men can go over dry shod."

"Christianity is orthodoxy *plus* charity. When the apostle says, 'Hold fast the form of sound words,' he adds, 'in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.'"

"If you ask the difference between a doctrine and a dogma, I should say it is this: a doctrine is a truth held for its practical value; a dogma is a truth held merely for its place in the creed. The dogma is *ut credam*, the doctrine is *ut vivam*."

"In times of decay and falling faith the zeal of the missionary brings in new tides of life."

In Germany an appeal has been made for more sermons of an ethical character. Thus a volume has appeared on Moral Sermons, in which the need, the aim, and the nature of ethical sermons are discussed, and the same author has also published a volume of ethical discourses. It is evident in German as well as in other pulpits that the ethical element is too often ignored. This is owing partly to the fact that the rationalistic preachers have emphasized morality to the exclusion of spirituality, but also to inherent difficulties in the treatment of morality in the pulpit. Thus it is claimed that moral sermons are apt to be dry and coldly intellectual, and that there is danger of making them minister to mere practical utility rather than to an exalted spirituality. Yet it cannot be questioned that the age makes urgent ethical demands on the pulpit, and it is an encouraging sign that attention is called to the prominence given by Christ to ethical subjects. All objections to ethical sermons must cease, and the pulpit will gain new power by giving them more place, if the ethical is organically connected with the spiritual, as is done by Christ, and if the preaching is a living application of the morality of the gospel to the hearts and consciences of the people. There is in biblical ethics that health and nervous strength which many sermons need. The ethical sermon must strike its roots into the spiritual, and from that receive its life and nourishment. But while believers naturally proceed from the spiritual to the ethical, we live in an age when the process of many persons toward the spiritual leads through morality. Just as the

moral order in the universe may induce the recognition of God as the source of that order, so the moral element in the soul may lead to the recognition of the spiritual as its interpretation. It is in ethics that philosophy and religion meet, and the deep moral needs of humanity also create religious needs.

From the current German periodical literature I take the following hints. The form of the sermon must correspond with the contents. Rhetoric can never compensate for the lack of substance; it may only make more evident the poverty of thought. There is often an application of Scripture without a proper interpretation of Scripture. A preacher says, "What we proclaim to you is not to lead you away from Scripture, but into Scripture; and instead of interpreting into Scripture the commonly accepted views, we prefer so to interpret the Scriptures that we may become possessors of its wealth." It is the aim of preaching to promote faith, but it ought to be a faith needed by the present generation, and capable of living and working in the present age. The power of the truth must be trusted, and the ideals of Christianity must be preserved amid the realistic tendencies of the day. "Trust the people; the people loves its idealists."

A Catholic writer on homiletics gives the rule, that it should be the aim of the preacher to give the congregation such matter as Jesus would give if he now preached, and to give it in the same manner and form as Jesus would under the same circumstances. The interpretation and application of the rule are of course made dependent on the teachings of the Catholic church.

The sermon must be true to the word of God; it must be true to the preacher, so that the sermon is not a literary essay but living testimony; and it must be true to the needs of the hearers. The study of Scripture merely for the sake of getting ma-

terial for the sermon makes the work perfunctory, and robs the truth of freshness, life and juiciness. Hence living preachers and theological professors insist so much on the personal appropriation of the truth as the chief aim of biblical interpretation. Only what the heart has itself learned by experience can be presented in a living and effective manner. In the biography of Professor J. T. Beck an account is given of E. Oslander, one of the preachers who in early life exerted a deep influence on this eminent biblical scholar. It is said of this preacher that he made it

a sacred principle of his studies that in all the official labors of a minister it must be his first aim to get from the word of God a blessing for his own heart. And Professor Beck not only found much edification in the sermons of this preacher, but it also became the rule of his own life first of all to learn and to apply to himself the truth which he proclaimed to others from the pulpit and taught in the university. Many an appeal did he make to theological students to become what they were called to make their hearers.

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

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

I.

THE SUSPENDED DEFINITION.

OUR correspondence testifies to the interest awakened among our ministerial brethren all over the country in the quest proposed by us two months ago of a really regulative, standard definition of preaching. We have filed away a considerable, in fact an unexpected, number of suggestive and valuable responses to the invitation then extended by us to all our readers to supply, according to their respective individual views, a completion of the definition which, for this very purpose, we left with an important ellipsis at the end.

These responses—which, in accordance with the suggestion that elicited them, contain statements of reasons for the completions respectively proposed—we reserve to discuss in the future. It is noteworthy that no one of our correspondents has raised any question as to the propriety of our defining formula in the portion of it already presented. We may assume that, whatever differences of opinion may finally remain among those who seriously consider the subject, after this our joint canvass is finished, there will be no doubt with any one affecting our postulate that preach-

ing ought to act ultimately on men's *wills* to induce them to—take *some* definite determination. What that definite determination should be is the real point to be decided.

Other responses, additional to those already received, may yet—it is January the eleventh as we write—fairly be expected to come in, and we postpone in their favor our own preferred solution of the doubt or question we have raised.

It is perhaps proper to remind our readers that, in preparing THE HOMILETIC REVIEW for the large edition in which it is printed, the matter, for instance, of the present department must be in the hands of the compositor nearly a month in advance of the date of the number in which it is to appear. Thus the February department was already out of the conductor's hands when the January REVIEW reached the hands of the subscriber. In order, therefore, to afford to every minister wishing to answer our January invitation full opportunity to do so in time for us maturely to consider the suggestion he may make, before we commit ourselves to a final statement of our own, it will be necessary to hold back that statement for an appearance not earlier than

the next—that is, the April—number of this magazine. We use such language, although, as we said, it is still January when we write these words to be printed in March.

Let us all meantime, however much we may ponder, and especially however much we may in conversation discuss this subject, be careful to keep mind and heart obediently open still to recognize and embrace the truth when the truth shall appear—THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS. This means also, and equally, that we be guarded, mind and heart, against the entrance of error on a point so important, no matter how speciously the error may come to us commended.

PULPIT PLAGIARISM.

The mail brings us the following evidently very serious letter :

Will you please tell us what is a right use of books in pulpit preparation as distinguished from plagiarism?

Is it right to use the sermonic outlines as published in the Review? If not, why not, and how are they to be used? Please give examples of their legitimate use by taking something in the Review and using it in a way that would not be plagiarism.

Now don't dismiss the matter by telling us you have a holy horror of plagiarism—that is the only answer I have thus far been able to obtain from many others—but give us examples of what legitimate use we may make of the sermons, outlines, and prayer-meeting talks you give us in the Review, and oblige, etc. "TIMOTHY."

I have often presented this question to ministers but never could get a clear answer.

Our correspondent writes like a man not to be put off with evasion or vagueness. We will try our best to satisfy his wishes. But he will kindly allow us to do so with some view also to other interests than the sole interest of meeting his own very proper inquiries.

Plagiarism is the name given to the act of the man who consciously appropriates and uses as his own the product of another man's literary labor. Pulpit plagiarism is practiced when the act above described is done by the preacher.

Wherein lies the wrong of plagiarism?

In the first place, evidently it involves deceit. Nay, let us go farther, and say it involves lying.

Is it also stealing? Not exactly. The plagiarist takes nothing from another man to that other man's injury or loss. The other man still possesses all that he possessed before the plagiarism was committed. Generally, at least, this is true. Not always, for it is conceivable that a novelist, for example, from whom a novel has been plagiarized may thereby have been deprived of an opportunity, which otherwise would have been his, to profit from some market for his production wherein, as the case stands, he has been forestalled by the plagiarist. Ordinarily, however, the true original author is himself no sufferer by the act of the impostor. The impostor, if successful, gains without the true author's losing.

This is eminently apt to be the case in pulpit plagiarism. Rev. John Smith manifestly may preach as his own a sermon of Mr. Spurgeon's without Mr. Spurgeon's being in any sense whatever a personal loser from the transaction.

"Yes," some one, perhaps, is ready to exclaim; "and also without Rev. John Smith's hearers being in any sense the losers. Where, then, is the harm?"

We are, of course, willing to admit that probably a sermon of Mr. Spurgeon's read by Rev. John Smith, plagiarist, would be more edifying than would be a sermon originally produced by Rev. John Smith, he being supposed a man morally capable of committing a plagiarism. But it by no means thence follows that Rev. John Smith's hearers are not losers in the case. In the first place, it is a loss—a loss which you cannot calculate, indeed, but a real loss and a serious—to be served by a fraudulent preacher. The mischievous moral effect is not defeated, even if the preacher's fraudulent

character go unexposed and undetected. Moral influence is far too penetrative for that.

But there is further a material, a pecuniary, damage done Rev. John Smith's hearers, if Rev. John Smith is a plagiarist—a damage which you may approximately compute in dollars and cents. "How so?" is it asked? In this way: Rev. John Smith is supported by his hearers on the ground of his being what, in the case supposed, he pretends to be but is not. Rev. John Smith, plagiarist, is accordingly obtaining his subsistence by the practice of fraud. He is getting money (and reputation) under false pretenses. Business of this sort, when it is done by men of the world, is called by a name less agreeable, perhaps, but more easily understood, and fitter, than plagiarism. It is called *swindling*. The Reverend John Smith, plagiarist, is therefore a very irreverend swindler. Let us all agree together to call such a man by his proper name. Let us cease applying the rather fine term, plagiarism, in the case of the minister who gets living or fame by preaching other men's sermons as his own. Let us call his practice by an expression that truly describes it. Let us call it *pulpit swindling*—for pulpit swindling it is.

So much for the name. But now for the thing. How shall we define the thing—so define it that a man may understand clearly, 'If I do this, if I do that, I shall be guilty of plagiarism?'

To begin with, if there is no false pretense, there is no plagiarism. A minister might preach exclusively the sermons of other men, and never once be guilty of plagiarism—*provided* the matter be frankly understood between preacher and congregation. This condition is rigorous, inexorable. Without this condition, this *express* condition, the understanding of course is that the preacher produces the sermons that he preaches. We speak of our own country. In Great Britain such un-

derstanding is less clear. There the practice is not uncommon among clergymen of buying homilies for pulpit use. This practice, so we have heard, is notorious as a fact of frequent occurrence; but it is not, we believe, in individual cases often acknowledged. Even in Great Britain, therefore, some taint of fraudulent pretense attaches to the practice. This is evident from the fact that the practice is not open and confessed on the part of those who indulge in it.

In our own country the case is different. Here the understanding may be pronounced clear and complete that, where a minister does not expressly state the contrary fact, the sermons that he preaches are his own productions. To preach, without express notice given, sermons not one's own composition is therefore, in America, virtual swindling.

But what constitutes any man's literary productions fairly his own? That is really the question which vexes our correspondent. And no wonder our correspondent is vexed. There certainly has hitherto been lack of clear definition.

Let us start with an extreme case. A minister had pressed lights upon a printed sermon of Dr. Joseph Parker's which he thinks will serve his turn, and he preaches it. His people are pleased with the production, and ask to have it published. The minister consents blushing, but prints his blush—in the form of a preface regretting that his sermon was not worthier, and pleading haste and many present cares.

Such a performance is, of course, pulpit plagiarism—that is, pulpit swindling. The offense could hardly be aggravated by any circumstance, unless it should be through the circumstance of swagger and bravado displayed by the offender on detection and exposure. But suppose the article of apologizing for the sermon had been omitted; would that omission have undone the plagiarism? Obviously not; it would

merely have made the plagiarism less brazen. Suppose the article of printing the sermon had been omitted: would that have undone the plagiarism? Certainly not; the plagiarism then would only have been single instead of double. Suppose Dr. Parker's sermon had been changed and adapted by the minister using it: would that have undone the plagiarism? Certainly not; at least, provided the sermon still remained so much the same as it was at first that on comparison with its original form it would be recognizable as plainly Dr. Parker's. Slight changes, having in them no purpose of necessary adaptation to second and different use, would be justly liable to the suspicion of having been made to cover the perpetration of fraud. The fitting on to this sermon of a different text, the transposition of some of the parts of the sermon, the omission of a part or two, the introduction of an additional part or two, the replacement of a particular part with something else, something of the borrower's own—no one of these changes would at the best go farther than to extenuate the offense; and at the worst such a change might be held to aggravate the offense by an effort on the minister's part to veil it.

If, to make now a new supposition, the minister, adopting Dr. Parker's *scheme* of discourse, had independently rewritten the sermon throughout, the plagiarism then would have been limited to the appropriation of the plan; in the resultant product as a whole the second man would have acquired through his labor in composition some real proprietary right as author.

Once more: If the second minister had recast the plan furnished to his hand by Dr. Parker, but had incorporated without credit (and credit in a sermon merely preached requires something more than silent quotation-marks in the manuscript, there should be an unmistakable clause of acknowledgment couched

in words)—if, we say, under a new order of treatment devised by himself the second man had yet consciously incorporated passages of composition, without credit given, from the text of Dr. Parker, then there would have been plagiarism to the measure of such appropriated passages—and no farther.

We should ourselves advise any minister having it in mind to make public use, either wholly or partly, of the production of another man to indicate publicly in words to what extent he was thus indebted; and then, if the minister would hear it, we should say, Refrain altogether from making this use which strict honesty requires that you thus guard. Your credit with the public for intellectual independence—nay, your intellectual independence itself, and consequently your intellectual fruitfulness and growth—are vitally involved. Be a producer, not a borrower.

'But does any author justly enjoy a monopoly of all the thought that he has happened to put into words—so that I infringe that author's right if I put the same thought into words of my own?' So, at this point, we imagine ourselves almost indignantly asked by our correspondent. But no, we immediately answer. All thought is free plunder in the world of mind—as free as water, as free as air. Help yourselves without restraint. But, mark you, you cannot effectively help yourselves to thought without thinking that thought yourselves; and thought, as soon as you yourselves have thought it, is fairly and fully your own. Now, no man has thought another man's thought when he has simply read, transcribed, memorized even, that other man's expression of his thought. You can read, transcribe, memorize words, without touching vitally the thought underlying the words. But you cannot *think* the thought without touching the thought vitally. And your own vital touch to the thought

makes the thought different, imparts to it the individual differentia of *you*. It was not, but now it is, yours.

The diversity of mind and mind is such that two men could not strike out independently and originally, for instance, two plans of discourse mutually identical. No more is it possible for two different men to take exactly the same view of one and the same truth; two different men might as well try to see exactly the same rainbow. Equally impossible would it be for two different men to put any given thought, supposed one and the same to both, into exactly the same form of expression. As we said, the primordial and the educated difference of human mind and mind forbids it.

What every man needs, therefore, is to be genuinely himself. If a man meets with a thought anywhere, let him first make it his own by putting his own mark upon it, and then he is absolutely free to use it—nobody in the universe having right to say him nay. But, on this condition, no man will ever take bodily a "sermonic outline," ready-made, from another hand, and use it unchanged to preach from. If you examine such an outline carefully enough you will inevitably wish to change it at some point. This change will involve another change, and that another still, and so on, until, having thought the thing through for yourself, you will find a very different, perhaps a totally different, outline at last in your hand. This, we say, is inevitable, if you really think thoroughly enough, and refuse to let another mind overlie and oppress your own. The advantage, then, of the "outline" will have been to set your mind fruitfully to work. If now we should literally do what our correspondent suggests, and thus ourselves in specimen transform a "sermonic outline," we should therein be simply producing one additional outline, which our correspondent would still need, prophet-like, to stretch himself upon in order to give,

for himself, a dead body the breath of life.

The like is to be said respecting the prayer-meeting talks furnished in this periodical. If the fervent glow of them touches your spirit and sets you into sympathetic flame; if the copious flow of thought starts thought a stream in your own mind; if the endless, multi-form applicability of Scripture to human need therein illustrated opens your own eyes to behold anew wondrous things out of the law of God—why, such utilities, and other such, of these evangelical studies will be rich compensating gain to you. But, without feeling it needful to consult on the subject the several authors of the pulpit helps afforded in the pages of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, we are confident in affirming that they would not themselves advise any man to make other use of their suggestions than such use as that which the present writer, on his own individual responsibility, has here attempted to describe.

We arrest our pen for the present; but we engage with our correspondent and with our other readers that, Providence permitting, we will hereafter give some concrete *examples* of work done on lines furnished, work such as, in our opinion, entitles the doer of the work to call the final product his own.

II.

HINTS TOWARD MAXIMS FOR THE PASTOR IN HIS FIDUCIARY RELATIONS.

1. IF possible, in consistency with the purpose in view, have witnesses present on any critical occasion of giving pastoral advice.

2. Propose to yourself constantly, when conducting confidential conversations, the hypothesis, "Suppose what I now say should come to be known"; and then say nothing that, for your own part, you would not willingly have known. Be wise as a serpent, and harmless as a dove.

3. Calculate that, generally, what you say in private counsel will, in

point of fact, sooner or later, come to be known.

4. By parsimony, and by circumspection, of speech, provide thus to the utmost of your ability against the contingency of being misrepresented, through mistake or by design, as to the purport of what you say; but, still expecting to be sometimes misrepresented after all, rest under it with strong silence, and with great faith in the eventual vindication of God.

III.

QUESTION AND ANSWER.

1. "What does the Department of Pastoral Theology think of the current 'Russian novelist' craze?"

THAT is a question for an article, and a long article, rather than for a paragraph. Mr. Howells thinks Tolstōi incomparably the greatest novelist that ever lived. That may be an extravagant opinion, but wild, absolutely, recklessly wild, it would surely be unwise to assume it to be. Consider: Mr. Howells seems finally to have chosen it for the chief business of his life to produce novels, and he has made it a professional study to read widely and comparatively in fiction. His critical judgment may be at fault, but assuredly he cannot have admired the Russian novelists quite without reason. So much it is

safe to take for granted. You may have done as the present writer has done—that is, have read *into* some noted Russian novel, with wonder growing page after page that anybody in this country could possibly go through a whole volume of such stuff—much more than anybody could suppose himself to enjoy such stuff—arriving at the conclusion that it was not for you, at least, to understand the mystery of Russian realism in fiction. But if—in this also like the present writer—you persevered from story to story long enough to find something at last that you could yourself read through, then, certainly, you must have felt your own imagination and your own heart laid under the spell of a singular power in the Russian novelists.

The power is there—no doubt of that. But is it a beneficent power? Ah! that is a quite different question. It is a question to which one whose interest in literature is an interest chiefly for the sake of religion feels bound to undertake to find an answer. For one pregnant fact, at least, to the discerning judge of the times, stands conspicuously forth—namely, that the greatest teaching power for good or for evil in literature is likely, for the next generation of the civilized world, to be this same Russian fiction.

THE STUDY TABLE.

CONDUCTED BY JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

Pastor's Drawer.

TOPICAL VERSUS GENERAL READING.

IN response to the suggestion that we pursue single topics through various books, reviews, etc., several practical questions have been dropped into the Drawer.

Question: "*How can this advice be of service to a young man with a limited library?*"

The question prompts a hint as to the selection of a library. Many libraries of young ministers are painfully promiscuous, suggestive of some

catalogue of recent publications rather than of methodical study on the part of the owner. On the other hand, the libraries of men who have made themselves celebrities for scholarship often consist of few books, but they are such as are directly helpful on certain lines of study. Avoid buying a book simply because it is good in itself and *may* be useful at some future time. There are hundreds of thousands of such books; but if you had them all on your shelves you ought to avoid the temptation to open

more than one in a thousand of them. Do not be caught by the notion that the most recent publications are the best. Last year over four thousand new books were issued in the United States, and five times as many manuscripts declined by publishers. There is an army of scribblers scratching on our pocket-books. Novels, travels, biographies, theorizings, sermons, lie, like sin, at our study doors. A very small proportion of these involve original research or any comprehensive knowledge of the subjects treated. Those that have merit are often only condensations or partial paraphrases of better works which they are unfortunately superseding. This is especially so with histories. They who would be thorough are compelled to search for books pushed "out of print" by these new claimants. We speak from sad experience, having worked through piles of them to get dribblets of information which was reservoiried in refreshing fullness between the faded covers of some old-fashioned standard volume on the back shelf. Make every new-comer show its credentials; and even when satisfied with its intrinsic excellence have the moral courage to refuse to allow it to occupy your time unless your previously chosen lines of study make it a necessity. It has been well said that a wise man's library is the exponent of his own mind. If your library so represents your mental self it will be worth more to you, though it contains but a hundred or two volumes, than if, collected on any other principle, it covered as many running rods of shelving.

One of the first essentials of a good library is a good encyclopædia, and no encyclopædia is worthy of that name which does not mention the best literature on the subjects it treats. A first-class review will supplement the bibliography with references to new treatises of value.

Returning to the exact question as asked: one who has become deeply interested in a subject will be sur-

prised at the amount of information he will find in even a small library, if he attempts to make a "digest" of it. We have read, for example, many books on Mohammedanism, but received a better impression of the genius of that system and of its founder by analyzing a copy of the Koran, with the help of old Sale's notes, than from all other sources combined. Some of the best Bible exegetes have done their work remote from large libraries, and when able to consult little more than a single line of commentaries; but those commentaries were selected with discretion, not from publishers' sets, but with reference to the critical ability of the writers upon various sections of the Bible. As a rule, what we get out of a book depends largely upon what interest and ability we bring to its study. The inner eye kindled into alertness will discover rare things in commonplace pages, as Audubon saw marvels of ornithology in the dull woods, and one of our living botanists enriched us all by what he discovered among the summer weeds of a city back yard.

Question: "*What is the meaning in practice of the word 'topical'? Is theology or church history a topic?*"

They are very large topics, affording fields for life-long investigation. We would prefer to study them in subdivisions. Some read through volume after volume of general systems of theology, but we doubt its advantage. It is better to study various authors upon a given subject until we have measurably mastered it. Do not, for instance, pass the subject of "Inspiration" until you feel confident that you are familiar with the best opinions that have been expressed upon it, and until you have a pretty definite opinion of your own as to its nature and limitations. But even then do not tie yourself in to your own notions. Keep that topic always in the mind in such condition as to receive accretions, development,

etc. The argument from nature for the being of God is another topic for abiding consideration. The progress of science is kindling new lights all around it. A botanist bending over some flowers was asked what he was looking for, and replied, "For God." The minister should be searching for God everywhere. What a volume any one of us might write on that subject if we could only recall all we have ever noted as bearing upon it! How scripturally wise some of us would be if we had given one-half the time to the study of the books of the Bible, one by one, that we have given to sporadic text-picking from Genesis to Revelation!

So in Church History, one must limit the range in order to secure keenest interest and relish. Most students find it dreary work reading consecutively through the great volumes, like those of Neander. But it is even more tiresome to read the briefer outlines. We need to get local color, the illustration of incidents, pictures of character, dramas of biography; otherwise history will be like scanning a man's outline in shadow instead of the real form and features. A brief history, going over the entire era of Christianity, must sacrifice either the accuracy of summary to the interest, or sacrifice the interest for the sake of accuracy, and become little better than a table of contents. Take the best—indeed the only good—short history of the church we are familiar with. It is compressed into about 700 pages. It is no disparagement to the ability of the author to say that, as a rule, where he is entertaining he is not doing his best work as a chronicler, and where he is most judicious in chronicling he is dry. For example, turning to his pages on Protestantism in Ireland, the picture is such a "free hand drawing" that it contains no reference to the plantation of Ulster, the siege of Londonderry, the battle of the Boyne, the emigration from persecution there which

built up the Presbyterian Church in the Middle States of America. Leaving out these things, the author has not given us the full number of vertebrae, although he has got the color of the skin most admirably. For entertainment and profit we must study special periods, following special writers.

Question: "Would you consider 'Butler's Analogy,' 'Argyle's Reign of Law,' 'Drummond's Natural Law in the Spiritual World,' and 'McCosh's Divine Government,' as all treating the same topic?"

The same topic can be profitably studied in all these books, although each treatise has a scope that is not limited by that of any other. Prof. Drummond's book should be read with the hint that he seems to have mistaken mere analogy for identity of law. It is an exceedingly serviceable work if one is seeking for what we might call the *rhetoric of nature* applied to spiritual things. We think it is generally conceded by scholars that the author has not succeeded in tracing natural law in the spiritual world.

Question: "What relation, if any, has the advice concerning topical reading to the study of the great literary productions of the world? As a general thing, can we read literature topically?"

This depends upon what is meant by "literary productions." If the expression includes works written for the purpose of discussing or exemplifying topics, of course they can and should be read under a topical course. If, however, we mean by "literary productions" those written for the sake of their style, *belles-lettres* in the narrowest sense, we would say that they should be studied for the sake of forming style. Romances are worthless unless they provide studies in human nature or phases of society. Every great novel has a distinct purpose. A judicious reader studies the theme which the author proposes, and some of the most "tak-

ing" novels have excited the hardest head-work on the part of the wise reader. A profitable exercise is to study the *author* as well as his book. The mind of Dickens was as phenomenal as any character he drew. The *dramatis personæ* of Shakespeare are reflectors in which we see the many-sided genius of the master himself. Goethe is to our thinking almost as much the subject of Faust as he is of the autobiography. "Do you *know* Balzac?" asked an Englishman, using that peculiar insular expression. "No, but I have *read* him," replied an American, thinking to twit the interrogator on his use of words. The Englishman got the best in the repartee by adding, "A mighty poor reader, then."

People's Drawer.

REVIVAL GERMS.

THE FOOLISHNESS OF PREACHING.—One of the most noted revivals in Ireland was that which came as a baptism upon the new colony of Scotch and English Presbyterians who settled Ulster early in the seventeenth century. To it Protestantism in Ireland owes more than to any favors of royalty. The revival lasted several years, and resulted in the conversion of many who had been papists. A remarkable feature of it was that it began under the ministry of a wretchedly poor preacher. This Glendinning was advised, because of evident lack of pulpit abilities, to leave his church at Carrickfergus and seek some humbler field. He went to Oldstone, near Antrim. Says the historian Stewart, "Seeing the great lewdness and ungodly sinfulness of the people, he preached to them nothing but law, wrath, and the terrors of God for sin. And in very deed for this only was he fitted, for hardly could he preach any other thing. . . . He was little better than distracted, yea, afterwards, did actually distract. . . . But behold the success! For the hearers, finding themselves condemned by the mouth of God speaking in his word, fell in-

to such anxiety and terror of conscience that they looked on themselves as altogether lost and damned, as those of old, who said, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved?' I have seen them myself stricken and swoon with the word; yea, a dozen in one day carried out of doors as dead, so marvelous was the power of God smiting their hearts for sin, condemning and killing. . . . For a short time this work lasted as a sort of disease for which there was no cure, the poor people lying under the spirit of bondage; and the poor man who was the instrument of it, not being sent, it seems, to preach gospel so much as law, they lay for a time in the most deplorable condition, slain for their sin, and knew no remedy." The work was afterward carried on by such men as Blair, Welsh, Livingstone, and Hamilton—men lustrous for learning and piety; but the poor witing was used by the Holy Ghost to open the way for them to follow.

CONFESSION OF SIN.—In A. D. 1596 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland set itself to the great work of reforming abuses in high places and low. The great evils which afflicted the general conscience were, as the Assembly specified them, "Offenses in his Majesty's house, the corruption of estates, offences in the courts of justice, and corruption in the persons and lives of ministers of the gospel." It was proposed that the ministers should begin the reformation with themselves, vowing consecration "before the majesty of God." Says Hetherington: "So deeply searching were the words of their presiding officer that they wrought conviction in every heart, and his earnest and humble confession of sin drew tears of sincere penitence from every eye. While they were in this frame of mind he called upon them to pause, and in the privacy of their own souls to acknowledge, each man for himself, his personal guilt before God. For a quarter of an hour a sol-

enn stillness reigned, broken only by deep-drawn sighs and heavy, half-stifled sobs, as each man searched apart the dark chambers of his own bosom. After another fervent prayer and impressive address they rose from their seats, and lifting up their right hands they renewed their covenant with God." This scene was repeated in the various synods and presbyteries, and in all the various congregations throughout the land. God "opened the windows of heaven" and poured upon his people that spiritual strength and enthusiasm which sustained them during the terrible trials which followed, when they carried the banner of "Christ's crown and covenant" through seas of blood.

PERSONAL CONSECRATION. — No scene since the apostolic days was more thrilling than that of the subscription of the Scotch people to their National Covenant. The keynote of this pledge to defend their land and church from political and ecclesiastical tyranny was scored in the declaration that they "joined themselves to the Lord in an everlasting covenant, that shall not be forgotten." The leaders met in Greyfriars church in Edinburgh. After a solemn appeal to the Searcher of Hearts, the multitude, following the example of the venerable Earl of Sutherland, set their names to this article of consecration. It was then spread upon one of the flat tombstones in the graveyard and subscribed by the people, who afterward stood together with tearful eyes and right hands lifted to heaven. Copies were sent to all parts of Scotland, and the scene was repeated everywhere in the churches. The first result was a widespread revival of true religion. Backsliders were reclaimed; the worst of men were converted, and, leaving their haunts of dissipation, became humble and consistent disciples, many of them laying down their lives cheerfully for the cause which once they had de-

spised. Even the clans that heretofore had seldom met but with dagger and claymore for mutual strife now came together in love. Says the chronicler: "The fierce feuds of ages melted and disappeared beneath the warming and renewing power of that divine influence which so strongly and brightly shone around the covenant, as the snows melt from their native mountains when the summer sun is high in the smiling heavens."

INDIVIDUAL EXAMPLE.—A most gracious outpouring of the Spirit was that which in 1815 came upon the students in Princeton College. President Green said in his report of it: "The divine influence seemed to descend like the silent dew of heaven, and in about four weeks there were few individuals in the college edifice who were not deeply impressed with a sense of the importance of spiritual and eternal things. There was scarcely a room, perhaps not one, which was not a place of earnest, secret devotion." He attributed it largely to the fidelity of several of the younger students who took a public stand, among them Charles Hodge, then seventeen years of age. President John Maclean was accustomed to connect his own conversion with young Hodge's confession of Christ. Prof. Duffield thus repeats the story from Dr. Maclean's report of it: "John Maclean, then a junior in college, did not manifest any interest on the subject of religion until one day a friend, Edward Allen, said to him, 'Maclean, have you heard the news?' 'What news?' he asked. Allen replied, 'Hodge and Vandyke have enlisted.' He was for the moment startled by the statement, as there was at that time in Princeton an officer engaged in obtaining recruits for the army. After a brief pause Allen added, 'They have enlisted under the banner of King Jesus.' Maclean replied, 'Well, that is the best enlistment they could have made,' and was about to leave the room. His friend requested him to remain, and then

spoke to him of the importance of personal religion, and urged him to give the subject immediate attention. The result was the conviction that he ought to do so, and he at once began the study of the Scriptures, with prayer that he might be enabled to

make them the rule of his conduct. He was soon led to trust in Christ as his Saviour." Among those who became disciples at the same time were many well known afterward for eminent service, like Bishop McIlvaine and Bishop Johns.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Moral Instruction in our Public Schools.

THE article in the February number of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, by Professor Wynn, on the "Lack of Religion in our Public Schools," discusses one of the practical questions of the day. The article is clear, fresh and vigorous, and very suggestive. It is evident from all the light thrown upon the question by discussions running through more than a generation that it is a most difficult problem to solve. It is easy for disputants on either side to draw out a theory which appears to its author to furnish an easy solution, but the theory is found not to be acceptable to any one else.

It will be conceded on all hands that there is such a thing as morality. Men everywhere make moral distinctions. They regard one kind of conduct right and another wrong. It will be conceded also that morality is necessary for the well-being of mankind. In proof of these propositions see Herbert Spencer on Education. Even the "Demands of Liberalism" impliedly admit the necessity of some kind of morality. They demand that "natural" and not "Christian" morality be made the basis of law.

There ought to be some fundamental principles on which the whole question as to the kind and degree of religion and morality that should find place in the schools can be settled. As my contribution to the solution of this problem I submit the following:

1. In settling any such question, the state itself must be regarded as a party having rights and interests at

stake. As a rule this fact seems to be overlooked. The question is treated as though the only parties are the friends and the foes of religious instruction. The plea is made for secularized schools in the name of freedom and equal rights. It is said that all classes are taxed to support the schools, therefore the infidel, the Jew and others have the right to demand the expulsion of the Bible and all moral instruction of a distinctive Christian character. To which it is replied that Christians have equal rights with infidels, and therefore have a right to demand that their children be taught Christian morality. Now it is evident that this line of argument will never settle the question. The only legitimate result of it would be the breaking up of our school system. But when it is remembered that the state itself is a party concerned, equally interested in the children of Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or infidel, a principle is brought to the front that has more legal weight than any other that can be advanced. The state has a character to maintain. It is to decide the question, not for or against any class as Christians or non-Christians, but having a character, a mind, a will of its own, that character, mind and will are to determine its action. True, its decision is the resultant of the decisions of the citizens. (See Jameson's "Constitutional Convention," p. 343.) But it is not the voice of either Christian or infidel as such. It is evident, therefore, that no minority, large or small,

possesses the right to put a veto on the action of the state. If once you concede this veto power, where will you set a limit?

2. A second principle to be considered is, the state must have regard to its own safety. True, the state is the guardian of the rights of citizens. But suppose a conflict arises in which the so-called rights of the citizen are on one side and the safety of the state on the other, which shall yield? The state is the party to answer, and it can give but one answer. It can never imperil its own existence for the sake of giving certain claimed rights to a few of its citizens. Why does the state educate? Is it for the sake of its citizens, for its own sake, or both? I apprehend that it is chiefly for its own welfare. It should give just that kind and degree of education that will accomplish this end. It does not educate for eternity, but for time. All history proves that a mere secular education will not secure the well-being of the state. To say that morals should be left to the church would necessitate some sort of an arrangement between church and state binding the church to furnish the morals needed for the state's welfare. What would this be but union of church and state? The extreme of secularism would here meet the extreme of church and stateism. The only course left for the state is to secure that moral instruction which is needed for its own safety in the public schools. In a republic, and where there is no established church, there is greater need for moral instruction in the schools than anywhere else.

3. A third principle is, there is a moral code binding on the state. There is a standard of morals for all human action. The state is a subject of the moral government of God. It cannot banish moral questions from the sphere of its action. There are moral principles on which its own safety depends. Let these be determined and the measure of moral and

religious instruction competent for the state to give will not be difficult to find out. If we are a Christian nation, is it the part of Christianity to throw aside the divine law for nations and substitute "natural morality?" Let the Bible and Christian morality be established not only in school, but in all our political institutions.

RAY, IND.

R. C. WYLLIE.

Abraham or Jacob? Hebron or Shechem?

DR. McCABE, venerable father in the church and beloved instructor, makes a chivalrous defense of St. Stephen against "the conclusion that has been uniformly reached by exegetes." In the noble army of the martyrs Stephen leads the van, and we must ever entertain for him large admiration and warm sympathy. This crown no man can take from him. But we may admit that the style of his address was condensed upon the point of obscurity without invalidating his claim to sanctity or inspiration. His words were hurled at his accusers with Pauline force and fervor, but lucidity was sacrificed to compactness. The great apostle was not always careful as to the elegance of his rhetoric.

It is no grave allegation that in the text Acts vii : 16, as Stephen spoke it, Hebron is confounded with Shechem, or Abraham substituted for Jacob. As to the statement that "the semi-duplex form of sentence seems to have been a rhetorical favorite with St. Stephen," Acts vii : 7 is brought forward to illustrate. The reference is here clearly and solely to Gen. xv : 16. It is superfluous to refer to Ex. iii : 12 and so make a duplex or semi-duplex statement. The prophecy was uttered to Abraham, not "by Abraham." In the fourth generation they shall come hither again, for the iniquity of the Amorite is not yet full. The next illustration attempted is from the ninth verse. But we have here on the part of St. Stephen no undue condensation; rather undue expansion on the part of the Doctor. We

see in it simply a rehearsal of Gen. xxxvii: 28, not the whole story of Joseph's "heavenly mission of love and mercy;" nor is the third instance of this remarkable figure of St. Stephen's rhetoric more fortunate. The twenty-fourth verse reads, "Seeing one of them suffer wrong, he defended him and avenged him that was oppressed and smote the Egyptian." It sets forth a single act of Moses, and it is hard to find in it the grand combination spoken of by Dr. McCabe. Such weakness of illustration makes us suspicious of the strength of his argument. Meyer and Alford may be too ready to admit mistakes, but let us not insist on the *ipsissima verba* in order to our belief in them and reverential obedience. The multiplication of ingenious interpretations of difficult passages does not increase our respect for them.

That chronological errors have crept into the sacred text is confessed, and still the canon of Holy Writ stands in its integrity. Mistakes in regard to names are not necessarily more formidable. Hackett's suggestion that the word *Abraham* has been substituted in some very early copies for *Jacob*, does not appear to me alarming, but reasonable. Little historical weight should be attached to the statement of Josephus concerning the transfer of the bodies from Shechem to Hebron. Such translation would be unparalleled and improbable on the face of it as quite in violation of the jealously guarded honor of the northern tribes.

EDMUND H. POST.

The Higher Criticism.

DR. BRIGGS (in Jan. REVIEW, p. 11) says, "If then, on the one side, recent criticisms have weakened the independent value of the evidences from miracles and prediction, they have, on the other side, given something vastly better in their place."

When I read thus far I expected he was about to tell plainly and fully what this "something vastly better

in their place" is; but he fails to do this. He says, "They have called the attention to the presence of God with his people in external manifestations of theophany to guide the advancing stages of the history of redemption." Now what does he mean by this? His next sentence does not give any clue to his meaning, to my mind. In it he says, "Here is the citadel of our religion," etc., showing by this last declaration that he had stated the "something better."

I think I understand in some good degree the Christian evidences from miracles and prediction. Pray tell us what better has recent criticism to offer?

W. M. JENKINS.

ELK RIVER, MINN.

Not a Test of Fraternity.

DR. PARKHURST'S admiration for Dr. Maclaren, in HOMILETIC REVIEW (Feb., p. 182), was not misplaced, though I cannot say as much of his thrust at American Baptists, or of its publication in a magazine which claims to be undenominational. Equally appropriate would be an article opposed to infant baptism. He praises Dr. Maclaren for manifesting "gracious catholicity" and a "spirit of fraternity" in inviting all friends of Jesus to the Lord's Supper, and intimates that American Baptists lack this spirit of fraternity and catholicity. Evidently Dr. Parkhurst believes the design of the Lord's Supper is to express fraternity; Baptists do not so believe. Therefore, when we limit the invitation to the Supper we are not marking out the limits of friendship and fraternity. We find many legitimate methods of assuring other Christians of our regard for them without perverting an ordinance to that purpose. A man of Dr. Parkhurst's information ought to know our views in this matter; a man who pleads for fraternal recognition as he does ought not to misrepresent the Baptist brethren, whose fellowship he is courting.

KANSAS CITY. J. C. ARMSTRONG.

Luther and Second Probation.

It seems hardly fair that Dr. Riemsnyder should give us the quotation from Luther (Jan. No., p. 87), which if rightly given is in favor of a future probation, and then give us no outline of his refutation, but only refer us to his book and expect us to buy it to see what it is. Unless Luther meant to advocate that side it ought to be easy to show that the quotation is garbled or perverted, and the readers of your REVIEW have a right to know the facts. If the quotation were not given we could make no demand. But, dear brother, you ought not to raise a devil (of doubt) as you do without downing him, and that without sending a man elsewhere to have him downed.

PEABODY, KAN. H. B. BELMER.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.**No. I.—ITS MISSION.**

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

FIVE short articles are planned on as many different phases of church life. It will be wise for us at the start to ascertain, as best we can, the *divine idea of church organization*. In the mind of God there must have been some good reasons for such organic covenant relationships as are entered into by the followers of Christ. What are some of these reasons? Happily we are not left wholly to conjecture.

1. THE CHURCH IS :

(a) The house of God. This means that God *dwells* in the organized body of Christian believers. In ancient time the peculiar residence of Deity, the place of his remarkable manifestation, was the temple of Jerusalem. As that temple soon after the time of Christ, was to be and was destroyed, the Christian church was to be God's chosen dwelling-place, where he should be seen and felt as a blessed presence and power. The *character*, then, of Christians is to be circumspect and holy, so as to secure the

abiding presence of God among them. God is said to *dwell* with those who are of a "humble and contrite heart, and who tremble at his word." The church, then, is to be humble and devout in work and worship. Holiness becometh the "house of God." The world must not excel or equal the honesty, integrity, purity and princely character of Christians.

(b) The pillar of the truth. "Pillar" means a column by which a building is supported; thus a firm prop of any kind for any use. This word, employed here as a definition or illustration of the church, indicates that the organized body of believers is entrusted with the peculiar mission of holding the truth, maintaining it, and defending it from the assaults of error, and handing it down along the ages in all its integrity, purity and conquering power.

It need scarcely be said that it is the tendency and indeed the *effort* of the world to corrupt the truth; that because of the unbelief and hostility of the human heart, Christianity will be assailed; that violent oppositions will be experienced and wars be urged against the truth, and that under these conditions the church is required to come to its rescue, holding the truth in love, defending it from the wrecking hand of its enemies, and pushing its conquests among the nations of the earth.

(c) "The ground of the truth." "Ground" here, as "pillar" above, suggests architecture, and means that the truth rests on the church as a building does on its foundation, causing it to be fixed, stable, permanent, standing *firm and unshaken* amid all antagonisms, when systems of error tremble and fall, as houses which have not been built on the sand.

We have not of course to suppose that no new phases and applications of truth shall be found; that Christians are always to see and rejoice in the same measures of truth, have the same sweep of gospel vision, but that while other opinions change, other

doctrines disappear, and other religions run their race, the gospel of Jesus Christ, built on and lodged in the keeping of the church, is to have a permanent life and growth and power. Plainly therefore one mission of the church is to be the peculiar *dwelling-place of God*, is to hold and defend the truth, and be its repository from age to age. It therefore comes to be of exceeding importance what the church *believes and propagates*. All departure from the doctrines of Scripture, all philosophies and speculations which run counter to revelation or are not warranted by it, and all failures to hold and to defend, at whatever cost, the living spirit of the gospel are anti-scriptural and anti-Christian.

2. *The church is the BODY OF CHRIST.* This fact is brought out most explicitly and impressively in that wonderful discussion of Paul as to the significance and advantage of the Lord's supper. He refers to some who eat and drink "unworthily" or *irreverently*, with no recognition of the fact that this sacrament is a commemoration of the atoning death of Christ. The apostle then goes on to speak of "diversities of gifts" or endowments in the church, illustrating his point by referring to various members of the human body which have distinct offices or functions; then declares the church to be the BODY OF CHRIST.

This has been understood by some to mean that Jesus *manifests his life* in the church organization. The thought, however, more likely is, that Christ is the *Head*, or the Supreme *Ruler* of the church; that he presides over all believers and directs their affairs as an organized body unto the end of peace and righteousness, unto enlargement and victory for the cause of truth. *Conscientious obedience of Christ*, then, is another mission of the church. Love is to prevail in the church and have exhibition. Patience, forbearance and charity are to be exercised and shown.

A forgiving spirit is to be cherished and put in play. Holy fellowships are to be experienced and exhibited. The graces of the spirit are to be grown and given sway. Divine promptings are to be heard and heeded. In a word, the *Christlike spirit* is to have embodiment and illustration in the body of believers. Here is another mission of the church—*living the gospel* so as to commend it to the world and command the world's approval.

3. *A third mission of the church is HOLDING FORTH THE WORD OF LIFE.*

The thought here is especially of the church as a *light-bearing body* in this dark world, like the luminaries of our sky. Here we have the duty enjoined of making the gospel known to others and of keeping alive the knowledge of God along the generations. The church, then, is to be both a *witness* and a *torch-bearer*. It was organized for this purpose. Were it not for some such end in view, Christians would be translated immediately on their conversion. Under God, however, the teaching of the ignorant and the conversion of the unconverted are privilege and duty devolving on the church, and that church has small conception of its real mission which lives *merely for itself!* The moment any local church becomes a "mutual admiration society," that moment degeneracy begins.

Meeting-houses may be built and the ordinances of religion may be observed with some large thought of the edification and sanctification of believers; but they are for *unbelievers* as well. Every local Christian organization has a definite field for its own special care and culture, and souls around for whose salvation it is especially to seek. Divine commission is on every local church to leave no adult and no child unsought for Christ.

Pastors and peoples are not to wait for the careless and unconcerned to come to them. They are to *go in*

search of the lost sheep. These will not be sought and found unless the *church* seeks and finds them. Each individual communicant is to be a witness and a torch-bearer, illustrating the peace and power of godliness, defending the Christian faith when attacked, lovingly rebuking sin, clearly pointing out the path of life and being an earnest missionary of the gospel of the grace of God to a dying world.

Here, more than in anything else, the local church of to-day is at fault. The Christless and the churchless are *let alone!*—substantially only as the pastor goes in search of them, or as the church officer goes, or as some special committee is sent! Every Christian should be a *recruiting agent*. Such love and zeal should be shown that it can never truthfully be said, "Nobody cares for my soul!" Every community is dependent on the *church* for correct views of God, of Jesus Christ and of the way of salvation. Every church member should have part in making salvation known. Nothing in our time for the evangelization of America is so much demanded as this *sense of personal responsibility* for the purity and progress of the church of Christ. Every unconverted soul should be in charge of some *converted soul*. Work should be *individual* and *definite*.

4. *Another mission of the church is THE EVANGELIZATION OF THE WORLD.*

This will be accomplished only as the *church* accomplishes it. Whatever Paganism originates may well be destroyed in its inception. Phi-

losophy has given birth to no system of saving truth. The world as such holds no treasure of enlightening and delivering faith. The human mind has "no elastic energy" to bring it from the ways of sin and death, no "recuperative power to lead it back to God." If the kingdoms of this world are ever to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ," the *church* shall make them such. Hence the "Great Commission"—a commission laid on every local church and on every individual believer of this body. No matter how *poor* the church and how hard it has to struggle for existence, *something* can be done for making known the truth in far fields! No matter how *poor* the individual Christian, and what economy has to be exercised for the support of family or self, *something* can be done, and something *given* for world evangelization. Every church will grow poorer that confines its offerings and its labor to itself! That Christian, if such he can be called, will grow leaner and weaker who has no part in the grand on-goings of truth and righteousness among the nations. For many a church to become robed and crowned, nothing is more demanded than that it should broaden its beneficences and widen the range of its labors and progress. For many a soul to rise into the richness of its inheritance nothing is more demanded than that it should *get out of self* into sympathy with ignorance and impiety, and gird itself with heroic endeavor to be of use on earth.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

Christian Culture.

The God of the Winds and Waves.
For He commandeth and raiseth the stormy wind, which lifteth up the waves.—Ps. cvii. 25.

WHAT a strange power in nature it is! He sends out the wind and lashes

the great sea into fury. The ancient pagans worshiped it as a god—it was their Eolus. And can we wonder? It is so like God—an invisible, all-present, uncontrollable mighty Power. Sometimes fanning the heated brow, and then sporting with palaces, up-

rooting forests and tossing gallant fleets like straw upon the foaming main. The roar of the hurricane and the rush of the tornado are sometimes God's voice to the thoughtless. Floods come as a proof of God's proprietorship.

What agents God hath! The lightnings gather themselves around him and say, "Here we are." The thunders mutter till he bids them utter their voice. The sea is his, for he made it. All things do his will. Storm, fire, flood, frost, snow, tornado, lightning in the air, troubles in the winds, earthquakes on the land, tempests in the sea—they are all servants in his household, and he appoints each its own work. W.

Manhood in the Market.

(BY DR. ARTHUR LITTLE, CHICAGO.)

And through covetousness shall they with feigned words, make merchandise of you.—2 Peter ii. 3.

1. The parties concerned: *they— you.*
2. The motive: "Through covetousness."
3. The means employed: "With feigned words."
4. The thing they do: "Make merchandise of you"—merchandise of *men*, traffic in souls, bartering in humanity, exchange in human hearts.
5. Who are they that are engaged in this business?

(a) The liquor-dealers.

(b) Writers and publishers of obscene literature.

(c) Purchasers of the virtue of women.

(d) Bribers and bribe-takers.

(e) Mercenary journalists.

(f) Atheistic orators and religious quacks.

Christ's Idea of Discipleship.

Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit.—John xv. 8.

I. THE MOTIVE FOR BEING A DISCIPLE OF CHRIST.

Not (1) to be saved from hell—though there is a hell, as both Scripture and conscience assert, and faith in Christ is the only way of escape from it.

Nor (2) to be happy—though it gives the greatest happiness the soul can experience in *this* world, and opens into eternal bliss in the other life.

But, the superlative motive for discipleship must be the glory of God. All nature glorifies, and man *ought* to. Christ says, "Let your light so shine that men may . . . glorify your Father which is in heaven." "Man's chief end is to glorify God."

II. THE AIM OF DISCIPLESHIP—

"that ye bear fruit, *much* fruit."

Must bear fruit—

1. By what we are.

2. By what we say.

3. By what we do.

III. APPLICATION.

Am I bearing fruit, or am I a barren fig-tree? F. H. A.

Revival Service.

The Sinner's Pending Lawsuit.

Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him: lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.—Matt. v. 25, 26.

I. THE SINNER AND GOD ARE AT OPEN VARIANCE.

Not only is there a breach between them, but a state of actual hostility and active litigation. The Almighty One is his "adversary."

II. GOD, THE INJURED PARTY, PROPOSES A RECONCILIATION before the case comes up for final settlement. "Be ye reconciled to God." "Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord," etc. The gospel message makes the blessed offer and states the conditions.

III. A TIME OF RESPITE IS GIVEN, "a STAY OF PROCEEDINGS" GRANTED, that the defendant sinner in this suit, which involves liberty, life, heaven, may be induced to settle it before the great day of assize.

IV. God is not only IN THE WAY OF

RECONCILIATION, but he is *pleading with HIS ANTAGONIST TO AVAIL HIMSELF OF HIS OFFERED CLEMENCY*. "Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him," lest he take speedy steps to bring the issue to a close, lest the day of mercy end and the day of judgment begin.

V. The sinner, warned, entreated, and still unrepentant, WILL HAVE NO CHANCE AT THE BAR OF FINAL JUDGMENT. He must be condemned, even out of the lips of Eternal Mercy, and banished into outer darkness!

The Good Soldier.

Endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.—2 Tim. ii. 3.

INTRODUCTION. The Christian commanded to "fight,"

1. The battles of the Lord. 1 Sam. xxv. 28.

2. For our brethren and wives' sake (spiritual influence). Neh. iv. 14.

3. The good fight of faith. 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7.

I. THE PREPARATIONS NECESSARY FOR A GOOD SOLDIER.

1. *An examination*, which implies being

(a) Stripped—of self.

(b) Measured—by the gospel.

(c) Sounded—motives and purposes.

(d) Tested—strength of the "will."

(e) By the Holy Ghost—examiner and judge.

II. THE EQUIPMENT FOR A GOOD SOLDIER.—Eph. vi. 13-18.

For the

1. *Defensive*,

(a) A breastplate—"of righteousness" (v. 14).

(b) A helmet—"of salvation" (v. 17).

(c) A shield—"of faith" (v. 16.)

2. *Aggressive*,

(a) A belt—"loins girt about with truth" (v. 14).

(b) Feet shod—"preparation of the gospel of peace" (v. 15).

(c) A sword—"of the Spirit."

(d) Prayer—"praying" (v. 18).

(e) Watching—"watching" (v. 18).

III. THE REWARD OF BEING A GOOD SOLDIER.

1. *Enable to endure hardness.*

2. *Happiness in consciousness of having fought well and conquered.*

3. *A crown of righteousness* (2 Tim. iv. 8).

4. *A reigning time.*

APPLICATION. LEHMANN.

Funeral Service.

An Inspired Syllogism.

The fashion of this world passeth away.—1 Cor. vii. 13.

But—

We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.—2 Cor. v. 1.

Therefore,

Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat that endureth ("will keep") unto everlasting life.—John vi. 27.

I. NOTHING ABIDING HERE.

II. EVERYTHING ABIDING THERE.

III. THEREFORE, LABOR FOR MEAT TO EAT IN THE ETERNAL HOUSE.

J. A. C.

An Unexpected Requisition.

Thou fool! this night thy soul shall be required of thee.—Luke xii. 20.

Three questions:

I. What is the soul?

II. What is meant by its being required?

III. Why was this man a fool?

I. *Soul*, $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ —Life. It is the REAL LIFE, because

1. It is the seat of all life's *motives*. "The soul uses intellect and will as hands and feet" (Emerson). The soul really does all that we consciously do.

2. It is the seat of all *feelings*. There is no physical sensation ever, except as the soul is alert in the body.

3. It is the seat of all *responsibility*.

4. It is the only *enduring* part—immortal.

II. The soul REQUIRED,

1. Its *motives exposed*. No more concealment from others, from ourselves.

2. Its *feeling unchecked*. No more moral anaesthesia; no secular diversion from the sting of conscience, the bitterness of sinful memory. The soul like an exposed nerve.

3. Its *accounts audited*. Engrossed in eternal records.

4. Its *immortal character and destiny fixed*.

III. The man a FOOL, because

1. He did not realize

(a) That his soul was his real life, but thought it consisted in the "abundance of the things" that he possessed.

2. He did not realize

(b) That his soul might at any moment be required of him. L.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

The Labor and Liquor Problems.

Our inheritance is turned to strangers, our houses to aliens. We are orphans and fatherless, our mothers are widows, etc.—Lam. v. 2-5.

AN important element in the labor problem so called is the liquor problem. The money invested in the liquor business is represented by hundreds of millions of dollars, and employs, according to reliable estimates in 1887, 531,168 men. By the census of 1880, \$3,505.75 invested in liquor manufacturing employs one man. In the ten leading industries of the United States, representing a capital of \$2,790,272,606, by the same authority it takes only \$1,021.11 to keep employed a single man. Turn the money invested in manufacturing death and destruction in our national life into legitimate channels and it would give employment to *more than three times as many laborers as it now does*.

Again, 18 per cent. of the product of these ten leading industries in the United States is, according to the census, paid to labor as wages, while only 10 per cent. of the product of liquor manufacturing goes to labor. Thus the liquor business helps indirectly to foster a monopolistic class. Put the money invested in liquor manufacturing into legitimate trade and nearly twice as much of the income goes to labor.

Again, the value of the liquor product in 1880 compared with the capital invested is 1.22 per cent., while the value of the product of the ten lead-

ing industries compared with the investment is 1.93 per cent. Invest the liquor money in other business and the result is a proportionate increase in the wealth produced of 71 per cent., of which nearly twice as much goes to labor as now. Whatever benefits labor benefits business at large, as the laborer is the large consumer.

Let the \$900,000,000 now estimated to be annually spent for liquor, and largely by laboring men, go for boots, shoes, clothing, food and other necessities, and how quickly would business of all kinds revive and the bugbear of "over-production" be dispelled. As more goods of all kinds would be demanded, more would be manufactured, more labor would be required to make and sell them, and as a consequence wages would advance, which in turn would react on the business world, continuing the increased demand for all necessary products.

The destruction of the saloon would, too, largely relieve the labor market of the baleful competition of woman and child labor, with consequent lowering of wage rates and fiercer competition among workers for a bare livelihood.

Our Great Coal Monopolies.

The people of the land have used oppression and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy. They have oppressed the stranger wrongfully.—Ezek. xxii. 29.

THE recent great strike in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, the refusal of the coal companies to arbitrate,

and their reliance upon hunger and cold to bring the men to terms, again forcibly brings to mind the power of these gigantic combinations which so completely monopolize the price and production of an article of prime necessity to the whole people. It is stated as actual fact that during the great storms which swept over Dakota, Montana and other Western States during the latter part of January, many people froze to death simply because they were unable to obtain coal, the price fixed by the companies, coupled with the refusal or neglect of certain railroads—for reasons best known to themselves—to transport it in sufficient quantities, having put the fuel beyond the reach of the poor settlers. In proof of this statement it may be mentioned that a resolution was introduced and adopted, Jan. 17, in the lower house of the Iowa Legislature, deploring the high price of coal which had been advanced without apparent cause from \$3 to \$5 per ton in Central Iowa, "the effect thereof being most oppressive upon the laboring classes." No men have a more complete monopoly of a product of nature than the coal companies. No employees are more completely in the power of their masters than the coal miners. The American people, both consumer and producer, bow helplessly before these "barons of the nineteenth century." Is it not high time to break the bonds?

The Sugar and Rubber "Trusts."

Two powerful combinations of manufacturers, both of which have arisen for the most part during the past two months, are just now competing with each other for the palm of most effectually bleeding the American consumer, under the name of "the sugar trust" and "the rubber trust." They are composed of a union of the makers and refiners of sugar on one hand and the manufacturers of rubber goods on the other. Their purpose is to do away with

competition among themselves and its consequent cheapening of their goods to the consumer. Mr. A. L. Coolidge, the father of the rubber trust, is reported as saying, "Competition is the life of trade till it becomes the death of trade; when competition becomes injurious, combination is an unmixed benefit"—to the combine, he should have added.

The sugar "trust" has already advanced the price of sugars from 1 2-8 to 2 3-8 cents per pound, and the price of rubber goods is said to have been increased. The annual consumption of sugar in the United States is 52 lbs. per capita, and the mere incidental fact that some poor man may have to drink his coffee without it will have little effect on reducing the extra profits which the sugar "combine" will thus force out of the already none-too-heavy pockets of the people.

How a Gas "Trust" Works.

BEFORE 1887 there were in Chicago seven gas companies. During that year the consumers paid \$1.25 a thousand for their gas. These companies were forbidden by their charters to combine among themselves. During that year, however, a syndicate of New York capitalists obtained possession of most of the stock of three different companies and organized the "Chicago Gas Trust Company." Its first public act was to put up the price of gas from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per thousand. It has since adopted some scheme to increase the pressure in the pipes so that every meter registers about double the consumption of gas formerly recorded. As the gas companies' stock is valued at about \$25,000,000, it is not an easy thing for a rival company to successfully establish itself.

A Prize Essay.

THROUGH the munificence of a New York city merchant, the National Reform Association—Rev. R. H. McCreedy, 252 Broadway, secretary—is able to make the following offer: A prize of \$100 will be given for the

best essay that will answer the question, "Should the State, as such, recognize its relation to Jesus Christ, the Divine Ruler and Lawgiver? Why? How?" Matthew xxii. 21 is suggested as a suitable basis. The essay, which must not contain more than eight thousand words, shall have been recently preached to a congregation or read before a society, may be sent in at any time before May 31, 1888, and must be signed with

a pseudonym, the real name and pseudonym to be sent in sealed envelope to Rev. R. H. McCready at above address.

President J. Seelye of Amherst, Rev. David Gregg, Boston, Mass., and Gen. Clinton B. Fisk have consented to act as judges. The successful essay will appear in THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, the *Christian Statesman*, and the *Christian Nation* at the earliest date.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Popular Preachers.

I AM bothered not a little. There is a preacher here who has little or no education—not enough to enable him to frame a sentence grammatically. He is awkward in gesture, ungainly in person, with few of the graces of good manners. Yet this man is a most popular preacher. The common people hear him gladly. That is not so surprising, but even the refined and the educated are drawn by his preaching. How are we to account for all this? Can it be that education and good manners and the graces of oratory are of no avail in preaching? Are we pursuing the wrong methods to reach souls? Must there be a degree of foolishness in preaching in order to get and hold the attention of the people? I confess that I am puzzled. H—— L——.

——, Ohio.

There are two essential elements in the ideal sermon: the truth uttered and the personality of the preacher. We are prone to forget the one and magnify the other; to give all our attention to the messenger and none of it to the message. In Jesus Christ, whom the "common people . . . heard gladly," and at whose feet sat the doctors of the law, we find the perfect blending of these two elements—truth and personality—a perfect message and an ideal messenger.

Now we believe that the reason why the preacher who is described above is so popular is that with him the truth he weekly proclaims so satisfies the soul-hunger of his hearers that the minor defects of the mere mechanical portion of the message and the personal peculiarities of delivery are either not noticed or if noticed are willingly endured for the sake of the message. Yet having said this, it now follows that, given all he

now possesses plus education, "good manners and graces of oratory," this preacher would be even more potent and popular. The world too often judges a man by the clothes he wears. Thought and truth are similarly misjudged. There is always the danger of making clothes more than the man. There are primary and secondary elements in a preparation for the ministry. Of the former is the cultivation of an overwhelming desire to know the truth and to lead others to a knowledge of it. Of the latter, and down upon a far lower plane, are acquaintance with Greek and Hebrew, expertness in rhetoric and in oratory.

"Foolishness" is not a necessary ingredient in a popular sermon; simplicity is, *childlikeness* is, used in the New Testament sense of that word; but there are always those who will make "foolishness" synonymous with simplicity, childishness with *childlikeness*.

The Best Six Books.

IN response to a suggestion made by the Rev. Wm. Bryant in the November issue of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, and also in response to a letter sent to some of our leading clergymen, we have received replies to the question, "What six books on the Bible do you find most helpful to you, as a general rule, in preparing for the pulpit?"

Some of them will be found below. Others will be published in later issues.

The following books are full of

value, especially those of Hodge and Upham—the last very precious :

1. Outlines of Theology. A. A. Hodge.
2. Popular Lectures on Theology. A. A. Hodge.
3. Thoughts on the Holy Gospels. F. W. Upham.
4. Treasury of David. Spurgeon.
5. Conflict of Christianity. Uihorn.
6. Hours with the Bible. Geike. PHILADELPHIA. W. P. BREED.

-
1. Reference Bible.
 2. Young's Analytic Concordance.
 3. McClintock & Strong's Encyclopedia.
 4. Lange's Commentary.
 5. British Encyclopaedia.
 6. Homiletic Review. BROOKLYN, N. Y. J. O. PECK.

If I were to name to a young minister six books in which I had special satisfaction, I should name :

1. Notes of Lectures on Theology. Prof. E. A. Park.
2. The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. Bernard Bampton Lectures.
3. The Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement. T. J. Crawford.
4. Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ.
5. Theism. Robert Flint.
6. The Kingdom of Christ. Prof. Samuel Harris. BOSTON, MASS. A. H. PLUMB.

-
1. Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon.
 2. Robinson's Greek Lexicon.
 3. Alford's Greek Testament.
 4. Canon Westcott's Exegetical Works.
 5. Bishop Lightfoot's Exegetical Works.
 6. The Speaker's Commentary.

I should have placed upon this list at its head—

- The Hebrew Bible ;
The Greek Testament ;
The Revised Old and New Testaments ;
Young's Analytical Concordance—

had I not supposed these to be ruled out by the terms of the proposed list. CHAS. CUTHBERT HALL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

After selecting a text by some urgent need of the church, or with regard to logical connection in pulpit instruction, and having carefully examined the original, I collate the Bible references, mature my outline, and then depend chiefly on following aids :

1. Henry's Commentary.
2. Cruden's Concordance.
3. Smith's Bible Dictionary.
4. Brown's Cyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge.
5. Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Religious Literature.
6. Roget's Thesaurus. N. Y. CITY. R. F. SAMPLE.

Being a young pastor, I think I can offer some suggestions to young brethren :

1. Meyer's Commentary.
2. Horne's Introduction.
3. F. W. Robertson's Works.
4. American Cyclopaedia.
5. Worcester's Dictionary.
6. Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus. P. K. DAYFOOT. STRACHBURY, ONTARIO.

-
1. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.
 2. The Pulpit Commentary (English edition).
 3. The Treasury of David (Spurgeon).
 4. Lange's Commentaries.
 5. Trench on Miracles and Parables.
 6. Webster's (Unabridged) Dictionary. EDWARD P. INGERSOLL. BROOKLYN, N. Y.

I would name the following books :

1. Bagster's Interleaved Hebrew-English and Greek-English Bible.
2. Young's Analytical Concordance.
3. Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's Commentary.
4. Smith's Bible Dictionary (large edition).

5. Revised Version.
6. Encyclopedia Britannica.
T. D. WITHERSPOON.
LOUISVILLE, KY.

Sermon Briefs: The Award.

A YEAR since (February HOMILETIC REVIEW, p. 183) we offered the following premiums:

"For the best sermon-skeleton or brief of each of the following classes: (1) Revival sermons; (2) Funeral; (3) Miscellaneous, that will be sent us before May 1, the publishers of this REVIEW will forward to the author \$15.00 worth of such of their publications as he may select.

"CONDITIONS: (1) The sermon-brief or skeleton must be original. (2) It must not contain more than two hundred words. (3) A pseudonym must be signed to each brief, and the real name and pseudonym must be sent in a sealed envelope. (4) The brief may be sent at any time before May 1.

"The editors will not open the sealed envelopes until the final award is made.

"In determining which are the best three sermon-briefs the following course will be pursued:

"The editors of the REVIEW will print, from month to month, those briefs which they may deem worthy of publication in the 'Hints' department signed with the pseudonym and a *. After all the selected briefs are published, we shall request a vote of our clergymen subscribers as to the best three. This vote to be final."

In response to our request for a vote our subscribers have sent in their decisions, and the following are the results:

1. The largest vote for briefs under the class of Revivals was in favor of the one entitled "The Imperative Now," by "Evangel."
2. The largest vote for briefs under the class of "Funeral" was in favor of the one entitled "Sunset at Noonday," by "Laus Deo." It is but just, however, to add that the brief entitled "The Days of Our Years," by

"Pilgrim," received but one vote less than "Sunset at Noonday."

3. We regret to add that for "Miscellaneous" the vote was a tie, several briefs receiving the same number.

We have to request our subscribers therefore who have not yet voted to vote on this class of briefs, and thereby help us to settle the matter satisfactorily.

According to promise the authors of the two briefs which have received the largest vote, namely, "The Imperative Now" and "Sunset at Noonday," are each entitled to \$15.00 worth of such publications of Funk & Wagnalls as he may select.

Gossippy.

W. S. RAINSFORD, D.D., rector of St. George's Church, New York, stands at the foot of the center aisle prior to each service and welcomes the entering worshippers.

John R. Paxton, D.D., of the Presbyterian Church, New York, does not read the pulpit notices. This is done by the clerk of the session; and Rev. Dr. Meredith of Brooklyn has the notices printed and placed in the pews.

James M. King, D.D., of the M. E. Church, notwithstanding his aversion to Roman Catholics, recently expressed his desire of meeting F. W. Faber in heaven.

Wm. M. Taylor, D.D., recently used extracts from Charles Darwin's biography with telling effect in a missionary meeting. He cited that portion of the biography in which Darwin's attitude toward the South American Missionary Society is explained.

Chaplain McCabe, the "Apostle of Giving" in the Methodist Episcopal Church, if an occupant of the pulpit during a church service, does not allow this to prevent him from giving. He descends from the pulpit and places his offering in the plate.

It is well to teach a child to sing "I want to be an angel," but it is something better to teach him to sing "I want to be a man."

Correction.—In the December HOMILETIC REVIEW, page 525, under Suggestive Themes—"The Young Man Armed"—the Scripture reference given was 2 Kings iv. 20. This was an error. The true reference is Judges iv. 20. We make the correction because several have written to know the text for such a theme.