

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—OCTOBER, 1891.—NO. 4.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—CLERICAL CONSERVATISM AND SCIENTIFIC RADICALISM.

BY PRINCIPAL WILLIAM CAVEN, D.D., TORONTO, CANADA.

ALL conservatism is not clerical, and all radicalism is not scientific. We have here to speak of Conservatism as limited by the epithet clerical, and of Radicalism as modified by the epithet scientific. The relation of the clerical mind to conservatism and of the scientific mind to radicalism is the topic which comes before us in this paper. Moreover, the province which we have in view is the religious, the theological, the biblical, not the political or the philosophical. The conservative and the radical types of mind might be expected always to reveal themselves impartially in the various regions of thought or action in which each individual is concerned; yet we often find it otherwise. Quite frequently conservatism in politics is associated with radicalism in religion, while the political radical or progressist is a religious conservative. The relations of philosophy and theology are such that the same tendencies will generally prevail in both; though here, too, there are many instances of a contrary kind. What is the explanation of the fact referred to we need not inquire; as to the fact itself there is no doubt.

Speaking, then, of conservatism in religion or theology, it is obvious to say that all the clergy have not been conservative. It may even be affirmed that radical ideas and movements in religion have very generally been originated and largely promoted by ministers of religion and professional theologians. The doctrinal deviations and the schisms of the early Church were nearly all headed by ecclesiastics. Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches were theologians; and though Pelagius remained a layman he adhered to the monastic discipline. Many causes and events prepared the way for the Reformation, and several princes and literary men bore a conspicuous part in promoting it, but the real leaders of that great movement—which, though conservative of scriptural truth, was very radical in relation to the Church and the theology of the time—were ministers of the Gospel. There are really no names of laymen to be placed in the same

rank with those of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Cranmer, and Knox. The rationalistic movement of last century and this is mainly the work of clergymen; for though in Germany and elsewhere a few prominent theologians who figure as leaders of rationalism had not received ordination, the chief promoters were nearly all in orders. Any person who consults the Church histories or takes note of the liberal or radical movement in theology in our own day has abundant evidence that all clerics are not conservative;—if, indeed, he does not reach the conclusion that nearly all heresies, corruptions of Christianity through philosophy, and novel opinions in doctrine are due to those who were specially appointed to teach and defend religious truth. We do not intend by these statements to bring any charge against the ministers of religion nor, on the other hand, to claim credit for them, seeing that it cannot be affirmed of either conservatism or radicalism that it is wholly good or wholly evil. Any broad and general declaration to this effect would overlook distinctions and discriminations, which are of the utmost importance. A well-balanced mind is at once conservative and progressive;—conservative of everything good which has come down to us, while it seeks by careful investigation to enlarge the boundaries of ascertained truth and to purge away errors and mistakes. Above all things, we should seek to know what is true, and to have all doctrines, institutions, and modes of action brought into harmony with the truth. Pelagianism was a pernicious innovation, the Reformation a most benign one.

That the clerical mind is, on the whole, conservative in religion and theology may, however, be freely admitted. The existing doctrinal and Church systems have found their chief defenders among the clergy, who, as a body or class of men, have shown aversion to radical change. While the Apologetics of Christianity has been mainly the work of its ministers, we cannot deny that errors and abuses which had come to be regarded as part of the Church, which had obtained prescriptive authority, have, as a rule, been defended by the clergy. Any attempted changes in the doctrine, polity, or discipline of the Church, whether for corruption or renovation, have had to reckon upon the opposition of the ecclesiastical body. Various causes of this clerical conservatism, some of them entirely honorable, others not so, may be specified.

1. The piety, the faith of the clergy has been an element in determining their resistance to radical change. Even those who judge Christian ministers most severely will hardly deny that many of them have really loved the doctrine and the Church of which they were the zealous defenders; while those who, under the influence of Christian sympathies, think more favorably of ministers, though they mourn the decay which, in many times and places, has affected the piety of both pastors and people, gratefully acknowledge that a large proportion of the clergy have, according to their lights, been true servants of Christ. That some of them have led scandalous lives, and that many have been self-seeking and unholy is con-

fessed with sorrow ; but we should not be blind to the clear evidences of piety which shine forth in the character and work of so many Christian ministers.

Now we cannot be wrong in regarding the piety of the clergy as part of the explanation of their conservatism. Any one can see how it will act. Piety and faith are ever associated with reverence. They make men afraid of doing or sanctioning what may hurt religion even under the guise of promoting it. Reverence clings to all that is good in the past—all that has been transmitted to us as good from the wise and the holy. Even where in the state of the Church evil or serious imperfection is fully admitted, there is, on the part of many, an unwillingness to adopt vigorous remedies, lest more harm than benefit should ensue ; lest the wheat should be rooted up with the tares. That religious feeling should sometimes incline toward an unreasonably timid conservatism may be matter of regret but not of surprise. Enlightened Christian men should, indeed, be able to distinguish between excrescences from which the Church of Christ should be freed and the essential doctrine and life of the Church, which must at all hazards be preserved ; but, nevertheless, it is an historical fact that the best and holiest ministers and members of the Church have often so identified doctrinal errors with the true teaching, and abuses of administration and discipline with a Divine constitution, that they failed to recognize the necessity of reform or improvement. And, again, when the presence of errors and abuses was undeniable, when the false growths could not be concealed, good men have shrunk from the apprehended risk in applying the pruning-knife. Staupitz was not so admirable a man as Luther, but he was a true servant of Christ. Many a one does not add "virtue" to his "faith."

2. The special education of the clergy partly explains their conservatism. In most countries and periods the clergy have had a liberal education, and for centuries learning was a monopoly of theirs ; they were the "learned clerks." In the education and studies of the clergyman much attention is necessarily given to Dogmatics. The *credenda* of the Church is presented to the ministerial candidate for personal belief and as the matter of his teaching when he shall receive official authority. He is carefully taught to interpret and defend the system of doctrine which is deduced from Scripture and embodied in the formularies of his Church. A general training in languages, philosophy, and science could not adequately qualify him for his duties ; he must have full and accurate knowledge of the *depositum* committed to the Church, whatever may be peculiar in the construction which his Church puts upon the deposit. The object is to build him up in faith and knowledge, and thus fit him to be an earnest and effective teacher of others. The Bible, or the Church it may be, is regarded as the unerring fountain of Divine truth, and the creeds or formularies authorized by the Church—even at the lowest estimate of them—have the stamp of the Church's best judgment upon them after their con-

tents have been sifted and tested for centuries. A merely critical training in relation to religion, the Bible, and the Church would be entirely inadequate for those who shall be appointed to teach and preach. Such a training would easily lend itself to rationalism, but could not be suitable for those who are to teach positive truth, and whose object is to produce and strengthen faith in God, the soul, redemption, immortality. Were the position of the Christian minister merely that of a speculator in philosophy, who on purely rational grounds sustains his opinions as best he can—opinions which make no pretence to direct support from revelation—a discipline very differently ordered would be the proper thing for him. To inculcate upon the student of philosophy that submission of heart and intellect to authority which is so indispensable in the student of God's Word would be absurd. When God's voice is heard we must be silent; but the utterances of all human teachers must be carefully weighed and verified.

We are not here arguing, be it observed, that clerical education has been always wisely directed, or that an excessive reverence for antiquity and Church authority has never been inculcated. On the contrary, our opinion is that some churches have erred and do err exceedingly in this regard, and that a large amount of *reprehensible* conservatism is thus to be accounted for. But our contention is that the necessarily dogmatic character impressed upon clerical education serves much to explain (without imputation of moral obliquity or dulness) the prevailing conservatism which has characterized the clergy. Though we regret and condemn this conservatism when it becomes obstinate and unreasoning, it were a poor remedy to train our religious guides to be doubters or mere critics of religion.

3. The responsibilities of public teaching and Church administration tend toward conservatism, and the bias of the clergyman's education is thus confirmed. Responsibility for administration in any department of life seems to develop the conservative side of our nature. In politics it is notoriously so. The vehement radical of the opposition becomes a cautious conservative when the weight of government is laid on his shoulders. The Christian minister feels his responsibility, and the more so in proportion to the sacredness of the interests with which he has to deal. Having to give account of his work not only to the Church but to God, he is not disposed to place excessive confidence in his own judgment when he differs from his brethren, and to strike out new paths for himself. Should his fond speculations in doctrine turn out to be miserable errors, or should his rash devices cause his work to fall to pieces in his hands, how shall he answer to his Master for his self-confidence and self-will? Reflections like these will surely occur to him.

4. The least worthy cause of clerical conservatism is self-interest. We should be glad were it not necessary to allege this cause. To what extent it has operated or is operating now we do not presume to say. To make an entirely reliable analysis of men's motives, separating the evil from the

good where both factors are present, is not in our power ; nay, we often fail in judging ourselves. But the most charitable reader of Church history will be forced to conclude that bodies of clergy have resisted reform and tenaciously held to the false lest they should endanger their position. In the case of the very worldly this motive may have been the sole one ; in the case of those less selfish it has strangely mingled with better motives. Demetrius, whose "craft was in danger," is the type of the worst class. So gross and glaring were many of the abuses pointed out by the reformers in the Church of Rome that it is hard to credit their apologists and defenders with any motive higher than selfishness. Tetzel is precisely of the same category as Demetrius. Often has the cry "the Church is in danger" been raised by men who were utterly indifferent to Divine truth and the welfare of souls. We cannot fail to observe that ecclesiastics of this sort are far more solicitous respecting the *Church* than respecting the Gospel, and are not unfrequently ready to tolerate any error which does not seem to threaten the Church's authority and revenues.

Thus, both good and evil, it is obvious, have resulted from clerical conservatism, as from conservatism in general. To hold the balances accurately and show which preponderates, taking account of the whole period of the history of Christianity, hardly lies within our competence. So far as conservatism has been found in alliance with sound judgment, with openness of mind to the fuller manifestation of truth, and with the desire to follow wherever truth and duty shall lead, it is entitled only to respect and approval. As appears from what has been already said, a wise conservatism can hardly be separated from true piety. It is needed to defend the truth and resist the ingress of error. It keeps the present in living connection with the past, and it serves the present heir to the treasured wealth of the past ; it does this in face of the ungrateful levity with which the attainments of the past are often renounced. It recognizes the important truth that the Maker and Governor of all has so related the ages that the present always comes out of the past ; so that we are building upon foundations laid in the centuries which went before. Were the Church handed over to extreme radicalism, with its defective reverence and its unwarranted confidence in the human intellect as an instrument of discovery and progress in religion, we should lose nearly all for which pious souls love the Church of God.

This is the good side of religious conservatism as represented in both the clergy and the membership of the Church ; and we have here an answer to those who have nothing but contempt for the old. But there is another side to the shield. Should the conservative tendency have exclusive sway, should it lead to obstinate rejection of evidence in support of the new, or refusal even to consider such evidence, it declares itself the enemy of truth, and forfeits every claim to respect. The most absurd and pernicious errors of the Greek and Latin churches shelter themselves under

an unreasoning conservatism ; and this notwithstanding the fact that many of these errors are unknown even to antiquity.

There are many instances of theologians, whose character, attainments, and services to religion command high respect, who have permitted their conservatism to carry them into great extremes in certain directions or on certain topics. How we regret to find a scholar like the younger Buxtorf maintain that every letter of the current Hebrew text of the Old Testament remained unchanged by transcription, and that the vowel-points and accents were given by inspiration ! Still more regrettable that the elder Buxtorf should counsel Cappellus to suppress his work on the late origin of the vowel-points, lest by creating doubt as to the infallibility of Scripture he should injure the Protestant cause and give advantage to Romish controversialists. So also we regret and condemn the attack of Owen on the " *Biblia Polyglotta*." Owen's object is excellent, even to refute the allegation that " the original copies of the Old and New Testaments are so corrupted that they are not a certain standard and measure of all doctrines, or the touchstone of all translations," but this cannot justify either the substance or the form of his criticism. Attempts to improve the English and other translations of the Bible have likewise been denounced as tending to impair the confidence of the people in the Word of God. It need scarcely be said how absurd and foolish all this is, and how real is the injury done to religion when, in its name, opposition is made to the legitimate work of scholarship. How much better that scholarship should complete its task, and thus vindicate the integrity of the sacred writings as no obstructive conservatism has it in its power to !

But we must not leave on the mind of any one the impression that the Protestant clergy, at least, are principally or even largely responsible for any obstruction placed in the path of Christian and biblical scholarship. Purely ignorant and perverse obstruction has proceeded more from other quarters. The very men named in the preceding paragraph were illustrious biblical scholars, and have rendered service to the Bible which does infinitely more than atone for the mistakes which are recorded against them.

The attitude of the clergy toward the doctrinal reconstructions proposed at the present time is a subject too large and requiring too careful handling to be discussed in a few sentences. That no *special* charge can be sustained against the clergy is abundantly evident, for the most ardent advocates and defenders of both the old orthodoxy and the new theology are found in their ranks.

Scientific radicalism. Scientific, we may here understand, in a large sense as applicable to Philosophy and Historical Criticism, as well as to Physical Science. The radicalism which appears in the sphere of religion comes by no means from scientific sources only. It is often a matter of disposition or spiritual tendency rather than of scientific training and habit. But science has certainly contributed, and at present is contribut-

ing largely to the radical tendency in theology, whether in dogmatics or in biblical scholarship. The bold scientific thinker when he comes to handle religious and ecclesiastical topics is not unlikely to bring with him the mental tendencies and habitudes which he has acquired in another province of investigation. Unless he shall recognize what is necessarily special to the methods of theological study in its several branches, the probability is that he will insist upon very radical procedure. Many distinguished philosophers and men of science, it is true, have not only bowed with all submission to the authority of revelation, but have given hearty assent to the usual forms in which the evangelical doctrine is expressed ; but others, though not devoid of religious feeling, have advocated a freer handling of religion and the Bible than any of the great churches would approve.

Among the causes of radicalism in the theological speculations of scientists, the following may be noticed :

1. In certain departments of science demonstrative evidence is alone valid ; and when men accustomed to require such evidence enter a province where moral evidence rather than demonstrative prevails, they are not unnaturally inclined to suppose that nothing in it is settled, nothing ascertained ; and should they not reject supernatural religion altogether, they are likely to follow some method of very fundamental reconstruction. Many instances will readily occur to illustrate this remark.

2. When scientific study has been mainly or exclusively physical it constitutes a very imperfect preparation for dealing with questions of a spiritual nature. Here, again, mental habits which may lead either to unbelief or to very radical revision of theology are quite commonly acquired. The physiological or chemical laboratory does not qualify for the interpretation of spiritual phenomena. Perhaps it is believed that there are no such phenomena, and that matter contains in itself all the potencies. Or should so extreme a conclusion not be reached, should the existence of soul be allowed, a view of the nature of the soul and the conditions of its activity may be entertained which cannot be reconciled either with the ordinary theology or with the plain meaning of the Scriptures. *E.g.*, the connection of all mental phenomena with certain action of the brain and nervous system has persuaded many that the soul when separated from the body must continue unconscious till the resurrection, or else that at death another and more refined organism is evolved, by means of which the soul's activity is maintained. Suppose any such views to have been accepted on physical grounds, it would follow that the teaching of the theologians regarding the nature of the soul must be rejected and that Scripture must receive a new interpretation.

3. Lastly, among a certain class of men engaged in scientific pursuits, there is a sort of undefined feeling to the effect that theology has not been thoroughly and scientifically treated, and that the current theologies and interpretations of Scripture are not entitled to any great degree of respect.

Many writers of considerable name have been recently proclaiming that our chief works on Systematic Theology are constructed on a purely deductive method, and that the inductive reasoning to which all science defers has hardly begun to be applied to dogmatics—a serious charge, indeed, if true. When men who thus regard our theological literature condescend to deliver their opinions on matters of doctrine and interpretation, we are not surprised that they should be of a somewhat radical type.

But having thus indicated sources of danger to theology when men whose studies are too exclusively scientific enter a province to which they are not accustomed, it becomes necessary to add that scientific attainments and a good scientific training are in many respects of the greatest value to the student of the Bible and of theology. Too high demands cannot be made on theology as to the legitimacy and scientific accuracy of its methods. The unscientific should certainly not find refuge in that province of human thought which is the highest and holiest; for in every department where science has right of entry the unscientific will probably lead to the untrue. Let theology, then, be thoroughly scientific, but let no methods and canons which are properly applicable to other subjects but not to it be unseasonably introduced. Let the accuracy of thought, the strict regard for fact, the devotion to truth, which are the honorable characteristics of the man of science, have their complete illustration in the theologian; but let him still remember that the evidence by which he must establish his weighty conclusions is chiefly moral; that in discussing questions which relate to God and the soul humility and reverence are quite as essential as clearness of thought, and that none but the Spirit of God can interpret for us the things which are of God. Should the study of theology be prosecuted in a spirit in which scientific fidelity is properly blended with devotion, there will be little difficulty, we apprehend, in harmonizing the claims of the old and the new, of the earlier centuries with the present; the conservative and the progressive will so happily combine that each shall but supplement and regulate the other. These words of Lenormant are well worth transcribing: "I am a Christian, and proclaim it loudly; but my faith fears none of the discoveries of criticism when they are true. A son of the Church, submissive in all things necessary, I for that very reason claim for her, and with even greater ardor, the rights of scientific liberty. And it is just because I am a Christian that I regard myself as being more in accord with the true meaning and spirit of science than those who have the misfortune to be without faith."

We do not here enter upon an allied topic, the valuable contributions which several branches of physical science are actually making to Christian Apologetics—an interesting bond of union between the man of scientific research and the man of faith, and a rebuke, on the one hand, to the supercilious flippancy of certain scientists in their references to the Bible and, on the other, to those believers (a rapidly decreasing number) who speak evil of science and scientific men.

An unreasoning conservatism and a presumptuous radicalism are thus both at fault—both to be treated as hindrances to the full apprehension of Divine truth and the interpretation of Scripture. The application of the critical spirit and method to theological studies by which our own age claims to be pre-eminently distinguished, must not be regarded with any alarm. It is inevitable and it is desirable that all doctrines should be thoroughly sifted, that the strong wind of criticism should blow away all the chaff, and the wheat only remain. The doctrine of the Canon, Textual Criticism, the Interpretation of Scripture, the History of Dogma, and Dogma itself are all subjected to the most rigid scrutiny; sometimes, indeed, by men whose only qualifications for such work are intellectual and literary, but also by men of equal parts and attainments who love and reverence the Word of God. The final result will be good; “those things which cannot be shaken will remain.” The substance of the message which the New Testament delivers has in all ages been apprehended truly by the pious, and there is no danger that when scientific criticism has accomplished its work the great lines of evangelical doctrine will be laid in another direction; nor is it possible that in the coming days the Bible will be less to its devout students than it has been to God’s children in the past. We do not claim that theology, in any department of it, has fully accomplished its task, and that nothing remains to be done by those who shall come after us. Let scientific theology press forward in its legitimate course, for it has its rights and its own value; but let us not expect from it results which it cannot yield, nor for a moment imagine that any possible reconstruction of theology will remove the difficulties which, we are often told, make faith too hard for a scientific age and alienate large numbers of religious spirits from the Christian Church.

II.—THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE TOMBS OF EGYPT.

EGYPTOLOGY No. VIII.

BY REV. CAMDEN M. COBERN, PH.D., SAGINAW, MICH.

“ Misri’s poems once the Mufti took,
Read them one by one, to note their claim,
Then deliberate threw them in the flame;
Went to nothing the fair-lettered book.”

—GOETHE, *West Easterly Divan.*

ALL who have followed the writings of the “Higher Critics” must have been struck with their scant recognition of modern Oriental discoveries. Many of these works would not afford a hint that their authors suspected that there was such a thing in existence as an ancient Babylonian and Egyptian literature. It is an astonishing fact that in all these voluminous

"historico-critical inquiries" into the origin and history of the Israelites and their national records the chapters treating of "The Date and Historicity of the Hexateuch Archaeologically Considered" have yet to be written. It is much to be regretted that the work of the humble truth-upheaving spade has found so little favor in the eyes of these scholars. A glance in this direction would have saved some of them great weariness in the elaboration of theories which had already been proven unhistoric. For example, the fundamental hypothesis upon which massive arguments filled with appalling learning have been built is the supposed incredibility that Semitic knowledge, such as is taken for granted in the Pentateuch, could have been possible in the Mosaic age; but the spade of the excavator has dug a grave for the pillars supporting that hypothesis and buried them long ago. It would seem demonstrable that no structure more substantial than an air-castle could survive such a catastrophe.

Let it be confessed that the present scribe does not pretend to be able to follow the Higher Critics through all the haze of bewildering and erudite speculations with which they surround themselves. This he calmly acknowledges. He only ventures to record the observation that while Professor Peter von Bohlen, a little over fifty years ago, published a great work which won the applause of both Gesenius and De Wette—the best representatives of the "Lower" and "Higher" criticism then living—in which he gave long chapters to the unhistoricity of the biblical narrative as shown by its blunders whenever it mentioned Egypt, yet it is a noticeable fact that no competent scholar for a quarter of a century has built an argument upon these supposed "blunders." Indeed it would not be guessed from the various works of the critics of this generation that such charges were approved by the critics of the last generation.

Bishop Colenso had read Professor von Bohlen's argument, but having also read its annihilation by Dr. Hengstenberg,* he entirely ignored the particulars which had been deemed so conclusive by that earlier critic of the Bible. The bishop very prudently confined himself almost exclusively to certain supposed internal contradictions of the narrative, yet did unfortunately specify a few historical or archaeological mistakes. Does it not appear significant that, although the Higher Critics of this decade have extensively used his work and still characterize it as "an absolutely pulverizing criticism" set forth with "relentless thoroughness," † yet they strangely refrain from even the slightest reference to those archaeological blunders which the Bishop of Natal considered fatal to the claims of Scripture? To some it has seemed that this overstrained reticence might be due to the fact that since the bishop's book was written, the monuments with "relentless thoroughness" have proved that every specification referring to Egypt in the historical paragraphs of this "pulverizing criticism" was a blunder, not of the biblical author, but of the Episcopal critic.

* See "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua," J. W. Colenso, London, 1862-79, vol. i., *Preface*.

† "An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch," A. Kuenen, 1886.

The later writers of this school appear to depend less upon excavation and more upon introspection than the earlier ones. Merely by examining its fossil remains these scholars can give the "anatomy of the Pentateuch" and show how it grew, chapter by chapter, to its present form.* The present writer must acknowledge that he is not sufficiently well acquainted with archaic anatomy to follow these great doctors into the secret and lonely clinics held in the profound depths of their critical consciousness. He frankly confesses, in his ignorance, that the bones on which they operate seem very dry, and in all the clinics to which he has been admitted he has seen no sign of life or a possible resurrection from the dead.

More than this, he has been discouraged at finding that a fossil bone which one leading examiner would assign with unhesitating confidence to the head, another examiner, equally acute and eager with the scalpel, would declare to belong undoubtedly to the toe of the corpse. On such questions this scribe acknowledges his incapacity to express an opinion, but he must be allowed to utter the regret which he has felt for years that these introspective critics have not considered it advisable in these later decades to ask any questions of Egypt respecting the minute accuracy of R or R', the Deuteronomist, the Great Unknown, or any other of the supposed writers of the earlier Scripture narratives.

This regret may not be necessary much longer, however. At length one who is in the highest degree qualified to speak has spoken, and has declared that certain recent Egyptian discoveries confirm the theories of those critics of the scriptural text who, "with scientific freedom from prejudice, have surmised that Moses could not possibly have been the compiler of the five books passing under his name." Such is the claim of Dr. Heinrich Brugsch, in a late issue of the *Deutsche Rundschau*. Such a claim made by such a man demands a most thorough examination.

His first proof is as follows: "If in the story of Joseph the Rameses town is already mentioned, why, that is a historico-geographical error, for it is nearly 400 years after the time of Joseph that it is mentioned [in the Egyptian records] for the first time—viz., when King Rameses II. had this city built, or had an older town extended, and allowed it to be called by his name." Here, then, the "last redactor has assigned to the older record, quite unquestioningly, what really belonged to a later epoch."

The answer to this is swift. The only place in the story where this word occurs is Gen. xlvii. 11. The statement that Joseph gave his brethren a possession in the "land of Rameses" contains no slightest indication of a post-Mosaic authorship of the passage, since no one denies, and even Dr. Brugsch himself affirms, that the city of Rameses did have an existence at the Mosaic epoch. As the Septuagint designates the "Land of Goshen" as "Gesem of Arabia," and the Coptic version as "Tarabia," and the Arabic translators as "Sadir," so does the Hebrew writer of the Mosaic age refer to it as "the Land of Rameses," because that was the name by

* "Prolegomena to the History of Israel," Julius Wellhausen, 1885.

which that particular district was then known.* If this can justly be called an "historico-geographical" error, what shall we say of Judge Cooley for beginning his history of the "Commonwealth of Michigan" a century or two before it had gained its present name? There is no error in either case. This is a permissible use of language; and thus Dr. Brugsch's first argument is shown to be fallacious. It would only become of weight if a Josephic authorship of the Pentateuch were claimed.

His second and final argument is drawn from the appearance, in the Hebrew text, of Egyptian words, which he affirms were never used as early as the Mosaic era. He rests his proof upon two names—Potiphra and Saphenat-Paneach (Gen. xli. 45). Of Potiphra (Pu-ti-phra) Dr. Brugsch says: "Proper names of Egyptian persons with the prefixed word Pu-ti, Pe-ti (the gift), and with a following god-name, appeared first in the ninth century, and are altogether unknown in the earlier periods of the old Egyptian history. The last redactor of the history of Joseph . . . picked out for the foster-father of his hero a name which belonged to his own time." From the name Saphenat-Paneach he feels himself able to draw "a still closer proof" that this portion of the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses. He says, "From the ninth century on, and with especial frequency in the seventh, the Egyptians took a fancy to names whose initial word 'Sa,' or 'Se' [it spake] followed the proper name of a divinity, while the word 'efouch' [let him live] expressed the key of the combination. Such a name was that given to Joseph by Pharaoh—'Sa-pnute-ef-ouch,' and meant 'The God spake it, may he live.'"

Let us examine the strength of this argument. Stated syllogistically it would read:

No hieroglyphic names analogous in form to Pu-ti-phra or Sa-pnute-ef-ouch were ever used in Egypt earlier than 1000 B.C.

But the Hebrew words Potiphra and Saphenat-Paneach correspond exactly to these hieroglyphic groups.

Therefore this section of the Pentateuch was not written earlier than 1000 B.C.

The only objection to this argument is that the premises are weak and the conclusion is inconclusive.

In the first place, it is not incredible that Pu-ti-phra and Sa-pnute-ef-ouch, even if later forms, might be only a legitimate rendering of older forms. If the city of On in this same verse (Gen. xli. 45) is rendered in the Arabic version "Un," and in the Syriac "Avan" and "Ovan," and in the Greek "Heliopolis;" and if the Hebrew name Saphenat-Paneach is rendered in the Vulgate "Salvatorem Mundi," and in the German "Heimlicher Rath," it ought not to be thought strange if in the Hebrew text occasionally an archaic form should in the course of time be replaced by a new form more easily understood. Granting, then, that both pre-

* "Goshen," Edouard Naville, 1887.

mises were correct, the proper conclusion would be, not that this section of the Pentateuch, but only that these particular words were changed by the "youngest redactor" not earlier than 1000 B.C.

But, in the second place, the premises cannot be relied upon. It is by no means certain—*e.g.*, that the Hebrew Saphenat-Pancach is a translation of the Egyptian name *Sa-pnute-ef-ouch*. Few Egyptologists have assented to this. Even Dr. Brugsch has not believed this long. In 1881 he proposed another identification, declaring that Saphenat-Pancach "answered exactly letter for letter" to the Egyptian name *Zu-p-u-nt-p-aa-aneckh*.* In 1889 he had changed his mind and hit upon *De-pnute-ef-ouch* as the proper form.† Now he announces that *Sa-pnute-ef-ouch* is the proper hieroglyphic group, instead of that which a few years ago "answered exactly letter for letter" to the Hebrew. On the whole, we can but believe that any one who examines this minor premise with "a scientific freedom from prejudice" will decline to accept this identification as infallible; but if this be doubtful the entire argument falls.

Finally, it might be well to suggest that the major term of the above syllogism is neither shamefaced nor stingy in its sweep. Does it not seem a vast assumption to declare that no such names as these were ever used in Egypt prior to a certain date? Such knowledge is too wonderful for us! If our Bible were torn in pieces and scattered to the winds, it would appear strange if some foreigner, who should find and translate a few of the flying leaves, should forthwith assume that a man by the name of Joseph never lived earlier than New Testament times, because his name did not appear earlier than that on any of his scraps. It will be no parsimonious induction on the part of the archæologically disposed New Zealander, who 3000 years from now shall excavate our cemeteries and churches, if he shall declare that on no tombstone earlier than 1776 has he seen any trace of the name Washington, and that, therefore, he feels himself justified in announcing that no man of that name ever lived in America prior to 1776, and if any so-called contemporaneous records pretend to narrate the adventures of a Colonel Washington, who fought Indians a century or two earlier, so much the worse for the document, which must necessarily have been written or redacted since the middle of the eighteenth century.

Analogous to this is the argument of the Berlin Pasha. It would be enough to answer that the monuments can speak affirmatively, but they cannot speak negatively. But a more direct answer has just been given to this assumption by the distinguished Egyptologist, Henry George Tomkins, who has actually given many names of identical formation with that of *Pu-ti-phra*, etc., from unquestioned monuments of the age of Joseph or earlier.‡

Thus ends the first notable attempt in our times to defend the "Higher Criticism" from an Egyptological standpoint.

Let us conclude this paper with a few hints as to the date of the Penta-

* "History of Egypt."

† "Die Egyptologie."

‡ *The Academy*, January 31, 1891.

teuch, drawn from a comparative study of the Scriptures and the Egyptian records.

1. No tablet or papyrus yet discovered has conveyed to us any information contradictory to the traditional belief that the composition of the "Books of Moses" was a work of the Mosaic era. No revision of the Scripture narratives has as yet been advised by those Highest Critics—the monuments. No mistake has yet been shown in the Old Testament narratives as tested by contemporaneous Egyptian documents.

This may look like the iteration of the "dogma of the inerrancy of Scripture," which Professor Briggs has frowned upon as "a ghost of modern evangelicalism to frighten children;"* but, if so, not the writer but the monuments must bear the frown. Certainly the facts of criticism must be gladly accepted, but must we with equal gratitude accept all the fancies of criticism? It is not a fact but a fancy that any historical errors have as yet been pointed out by the Egyptian records in the Scripture narration.

2. It is instructive to note the character of the Bible references to Egypt outside of the Pentateuch.

Here we find a general miscellaneous knowledge. The sacred scribes speak of the medicines of Egypt and the cemeteries of Memphis as other foreign writers do. There is no fulness of detail as if the account were written by a resident of the country. There are no statements that the classical authors cannot parallel. Just such expressions and observations occur as we would expect from the pens of men who were living in a neighboring state, with which Egypt had at times a friendly, and at other times a hostile intercourse. The notices are accurate as far as they go, but they do not show more than a cursory and hearsay acquaintance with the country. The writers generally seem far more interested in Nebuchadnezzar, or Cyrus, or Darius than in Pharaoh.†

3. But in the Pentateuch the references to Egypt are in marked contrast with those of the other books.

In the first place, there are more references to Egypt in the Pentateuch than in all the other books of the Bible combined, even when we include in this count the prophecies concerning Egypt and the multitude of allusions in the Old and New Testaments based upon the Israelitish oppression and exodus. Besides this, in these earlier books, many strange archaic words are used which have been recently discovered in the hieroglyphic texts of the Mosaic age, while it is a noticeable fact that the transcriptions of Egyptian names are given with the greatest exactness in the earlier sections of the history.‡ A few of these words are supposed to occur only in the texts of the Ramesside period—*i. e.*, of the Mosaic era. No word

* Inaugural Address. *The Interior*, March 19, 1891.

† In the Book of Ezra alone Cyrus is mentioned by name fifteen times, Artaxerxes twelve times, Darius nine times, Nebuchadnezzar five times, and Esarhaddon and Ahasuerus each once.

‡ "Essay on Egyptian Words," Canon Cook and *Contemporary Review*, September, 1887.

later than that period has as yet been proved to have a place in the text.

It is also noteworthy that in the Pentateuch the Pharaoh is the only ruler. Assyria and Babylon and the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah are as absolutely ignored as if they were not yet in existence. The Egypt of the Pentateuch is the Egypt of Moses', not the Egypt of Ezra's day. De Wette shrewdly pointed out long ago, in his "Critical and Historical Introduction," that a certain general acquaintance with Egypt would not be a proof that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. True; but this author, whoever he may be, describes like a spectator and with the accuracy of an eyewitness. The entire story is full of vivid touches that seem like reminiscences. Professor R. S. Poole, of the British Museum, has declared, "It is not merely that it shows a knowledge of Egypt, but a knowledge of Egypt under the Ramessides and yet earlier," and adds that the condition which the exodus narrative pictures was true of the Mosaic era, and "of no much later date."

4. Such exactness and minuteness and copiousness, if found in any other documents than these, would be counted conclusive evidence that they were the productions of an Egyptian scholar of the Ramesside period.

In the *Codex Alexandrinus*, because of a few suggestive particulars, such as the Egyptian form of the alpha in the red letter title, "The Exodus from Ægypt," Dr. Maude Thompson has argued that the whole manuscript "if not written in Egypt must have been immediately removed thither."* But if an Egyptian letter or two and a few other slight hints can prove the Egyptian character of the *Codex*, why may not the Egyptian character of the original be proved from its hundreds of minute and circumstantial references, many of which have only been understood since the tombs of Egypt have found tongues? While the Pentateuch does not claim to treat on the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians, yet incidentally and quite naively much information on obscure points is given. Indeed, it happens that scarcely a stratum of Egyptian life with which an enslaved people could be brought in contact is left untouched. The schools are not mentioned, though the learning of the times is indicated in a way once called absurd, but now known to be strictly in accordance with common usage; † but practically innumerable allusions to the private life of the common people are made, together with several references to the etiquette of the court. The kitchen, the armory, the field employments, the labor of the slaves, the brick monopoly of the king, the position of women, the international complications, the origin and position of towns and walls—all these and a thousand and one things more are touched upon, not seemingly with premeditation, but by the by, and in no single instance has an error of statement been detected.

Even Professor Kuenen draws an argument from the discovery of the

* Autotype facsimile of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, 4 vols., British Museum, 1881.

† See, e.g., Gen. xxxviii. 18; Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. vi. 8, xxvii. 2, 8.

city of Rameses, which city has not been discovered even to this day ;* but these supposedly late and nameless writers have not blundered once ! Can we credit the existence in Ezra's day, for example, of a Hebrew archaeologist of such careful and scientific habit ? Could any Hebrew of post-exilic times have entered so perfectly into all that ancient Pharaonic civilization and ventured such a full and apparently careless relation of events without blundering ?

5. This leads us to notice the marked contrast between the graphic Scripture narrative and the most authoritative classical history. It was not far from the time when the Redactor, that man "without father, without mother, having neither beginning of days nor end of life," according to the Higher Critics, was editing the Pentateuch with notes and emendations, that Herodotus was editing his famous work. Now, even a superior man like Herodotus, who went to the country for the purpose of learning and writing out its exact history, and thus making his reputation, and who, according to his own statement, enjoyed the peculiar privilege of having the chief priests of Memphis and Thebes as his teachers—even he has tripped so often that it is not uncommon now for scholars to speak of his history as "a series of guide-book stories." That I believe to be an exaggerated statement, but his gross mistakes all must acknowledge. To have chosen Moses instead of Herodotus as an authority on Egyptian matters a few decades ago would have drawn out the criticism from the Higher Critics that such a position could only be taken by one "not qualified to judge," or by a "mere casual visitor to the field of Old Testament research." But the fact remains that, so far as their accuracy is concerned, when compared with all other ancient delineations of Egypt found in poems, histories, or travels, these "free creations of unconscious art," as Wellhausen calls them, remain entirely above competition, parallel, or rival.

When Francisco Ubertini in the sixteenth century painted Potiphar, he clothed him in Italian armor, and armed him *cap-a-pie*, with his helmet adorned with feathers. When Herodotus, in the fifth century B.C., painted his picture of ancient Egypt, he did it with Greek pigments. But when certain nameless Jewish artists, not far from the same time (if we are to believe the "higher critics"), painted their picture of ancient Egypt, they did it with an Egyptian brush, and the colors to-day are as fresh as those on the monuments, and the life and style as archaic as those now to be seen at Karnak or Beni Hassan.

To any man who can cry "Credo !" to this, one can only reply, wonderingly, "Great is thy faith ! I have not found so great faith, no, not in Orthodoxy."

* "The Religion of Israel," Eng. ed., 1882, vol. 1, p. 123.

III.—RICHARD ROLLE, THE HAMPOLE HERMIT.

BY PROFESSOR T. W. HUNT, PH.D., LITT.D.

NOTHING more is needed to justify us in calling the attention of the readers of the HOMILETIC REVIEW to the life and work of this Old English author than the striking language of Ten Brink as he says, "All in all, Hampole is the most notable English religious writer of the first half of the fourteenth century, and he had a corresponding influence upon later religious literature, especially that of the fifteenth century."

This high eulogium is elicited partly because of what Hampole was and did, and partly by reason of the fact that he appeared just at the time when such a man was needed to conserve and perpetuate what was best in the life and teaching that preceded him. Born at Thornton, in Yorkshire, about 1290 A.D., he is known to us now as Richard of Hampole, a province in the southern part of Yorkshire, near Doncaster, where he died in 1349, right at the middle of the century—looking backward and looking forward as he did to what was praiseworthy in Old England and to what might yet be done for the cause of good learning and Christian character.

Little as we know from the Cistercian records and other sources as to his personality and mission, enough is known to stimulate us to seek for more and to give to this old Northumbrian monk a far higher place in Middle English history than has been hastily assigned him. Early inclined to educational life, we find him at Oxford deeply absorbed in scriptural and theological studies, and in secular study on the ethical side. So strong did this desire become to devote himself to such a line of inquiry, that, leaving Oxford, he entered at once upon the more secluded life of a hermit, and went about with crook in hand teaching, preaching, and working in a truly apostolic manner. Belonging, formally, to no ecclesiastical sect or order, he was a self-appointed herald of the truth and comforter of the people, amenable, as he held, to no other voice than the voice of God as heard in the Scriptures, and often heard, even more impressively, within the most interior recesses of his soul. Partly a monk of the cell and the cloister, he was also an evangelist out among the people, if so be he might win them to the religious life. He was enough of a Romanist to hold in traditional veneration the Pope, the Church, the sacraments, and established doctrines of the Holy See, and also enough of a Protestant to note the necessity of spiritual life behind all dogma and ritual, and incline the Lollards themselves to examine his writings in search of anti-papal teachings. It would not be unhistorical to speak of him as a devout Romanist with evangelical and Protestant tendencies. No one can read his treatise on Divine Love (*De Amore Dei*), to the spiritual perception of which he came through the medium of holy meditation, and not discern repeated evidences of the Reformed theology, while yet the English Reformation was three centuries distant. Feeling his indebtedness to the faithful anchoress of Anderby in the line of his literary work as an English author, it is most

interesting to mark that he seeks partially to repay the debt by instructing her, as we are told, "in the art of the love of God." It was, as we know, for this same religious helper that he wrote the short treatise called "The boke maad of Rycharde hampole, heremyte, to an ankeresse," a book thoroughly in keeping with the homiletic and parochial method of that age. At her suggestion he also prepared (1340) what is for us in many respects his most significant literary and religious work, "A Metrical Version of the Psalms," corresponding to an earlier "Prose Psalter," in 1327, by William of Shoreham, and the still earlier "First English Versions," by Alfred and Aldhelm, in the eighth and ninth centuries; these various versions thus bringing us down almost to the great "Wiclifite Version" of 1380. Add to this a partial paraphrase of Job and his numerous though mainly unedited treatises in prose and verse; we note the fluency and fertility of this old author, as also the definitely biblical and moral purpose for which all that he wrote was written.

One of these treatises, in metrical form, has been ably edited by Dr. Morris, and is worthy of special notice. Prepared both in English and in Latin, it is as a strictly English production that it is now studied, under the title "The Pricke of Conscience" (*Stimulus Conscientiæ*), addressed, as we are told, "to the lewed (unlearned) men of England that conneth (can) nothyng but English understand." This pungent title has naturally suggested to Ten Brink and others a somewhat similar poem by Michel, of Northgate, "The Ayenbite of Inwyt; or, Remorse of Conscience." Hampole's poem is precisely what it purports to be—a spiritual stimulus, a terse and pointed thrust at the sins of the heart, and as such fitly illustrates the very method commended by Solomon, the preacher, "The words of the wise are as goads and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies"—a method specifically exemplified in the Word of God as "quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." Made up of seven books or parts, the one text in all may be said to be that of Ecclesiastes, "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher, all is vanity." Christ and Antichrist, heaven and hell, life and death, time and eternity, and the final, general doom are in turn reviewed by the devout poet after the manner of the mediæval theology and with the practical aim of personal, religious reformation. While not devoid of passages of hope and cheer, the burden of the song is in the minor key, as this Old English Bernard speaks of the wretchedness of man's birth and life and old age; of the fear of death and judgment. A line or two may be cited:

"Naked we come hider, and bare,
 And pure (poor), swa sal (so shall) we hethen fare (hence go),
 Bot als tyte (soon) als a man waxes alde
 Than waxes his kynde (nature) wayke and calde,
 The last ende of man's lyfe es hard
 That es, when he drawes to ded-ward."

He compares the present world to four things—to the sea ebbing and flowing, to a wilderness full of wild beasts, to a forest in a wild country, and to a field full of battles and enemies. Of the evil of sin he writes :

“ That if a man might properly se his syn
In the kynd (natural) lyknes that it falles be (befalls) in
He shuld for ferdnes (fear) titter (sooner) it fle,
Than any devel (devil) that he might se.”

At length, however, the sombre tone gives way to a bright and hopeful description of heaven :

“ Alle manere of ioyes er in that stede (place),
Thare es ay lyfe with-uten dede (death),
Thare es yewthe ay with-uten elde,
Thare es alkyn (all kinds of) welth ay to welde (wield),
Thare es, with-uten myrknes (darkness) lyght,
Thare es ay day and never nyght.”

Thus the poem begins and ends, running on “from grave to gay, from lively to severe,” the severe prevailing. Hampole and his contemporaries wrote in prose and verse, much as the Old Testament prophets wrote, with “the burden of the Word of the Lord” upon them, and they must utter the plain truth in the plainest way. No harm would come to the church of our day if there were more Hampoles in the pulpit. The old monastic method undoubtedly erred in the line of religious moroseness and the undue emphasis of the graver features of the scholastic theology, but have we not long since passed over by reaction to the far more dangerous extreme of a loose theology, a loose method of preaching, and a decided widening of that “strait gate” through which Christ has told us we must pass into His kingdom ! More of the “Pricke of Conscience” would be timely in the modern pulpit, as the occasion, under God, of that scriptural Remorse of Conscience, so urgently needed, in larger measure, in the pew.

Two or three of the leading characteristics of the personality and authorship of this Hampole hermit may be briefly noticed.

We are impressed at the outset, as we read him, with his sincerity and courage. Though not in any sense an original thinker, he was a strong-minded and an independent thinker. From the days of his Oxford study he was an earnest searcher after the truth, inquisitive and assiduous, and not content to take all of his beliefs and opinions at second hand. Versed as he was in the writings of the Fathers and the Schoolmen and the general history of opinions, he insisted upon his individual rights as a man and a student, and in this respect departed widely as well as wisely from the many of his own day who subjected their consciences and intellects to the Pope and the Church. A man of clear perceptions and strong convictions, he looked at truth, secular and sacred, in his own way, and when he saw it expressed it in his own way, quite regardless of the canons of the critics

or the laws of æsthetic art. He magnified the idea above the word as much as Latimer or John Knox did, "striving only," as it has been tersely said, "to make what is black right black, and what is bright very bright." In this sense he was a reformer before the Reformation, a Puritan before the days of Milton and Cromwell, and an important factor in that slowly developing movement which later in English history expressed itself in freedom of conscience and of speech. A still more noteworthy feature of the character of Hampole is seen in what may be called his devout ardor. The old French writers and preachers would have called it unctio, the natural revelation of what has been fitly styled "his rich, subjective experience." His temperament was "sensuous and impassioned," and that on the ethical and spiritual side. What he thought and believed he profoundly felt. His convictions passed through the medium of his personal experience. Early in life he was strongly inclined to the meditative and devout, and when, after leaving Oxford, he assumed the parochial and ministerial duties of a monk, he did so with all the intensity of a Crusader, awakening interest and enthusiasm as he went about from place to place in his evangelistic work. No one can read such of his treatises in prose as "The Active and Contemplative Life," "The Gifts of the Holy Ghost," "The Virtue of the Holy Name of Jesus," or "The Virtue of our Lord's Passion," and not be reminded of Thomas à Kempis, in his "Imitation of Christ," or of the great Augustine, in his "Confessions;" while here, again, the question arises, whether modern Christianity has not something to learn from mediæval Christianity in the line of a deep, intensive spirituality, Johannean and Petrine in its type, and whether we have not too largely sacrificed such an order of religious life to the cold and often frigid formalism of the day!

There is no question whatever but that Hampole was a mystic, and as such often passed over the line of temperate, Christian emotion into the province of excessive spiritual ecstasy, when he enjoyed, as he tells us, "the vision of the heavenly gates, the inflowing and perception of the celestial." So was Augustine a mystic in his "Confessions" and Jonathan Edwards in his "Religious Affections," as were Pascal and Bernard and a host of other worthies of the Church, papal and Protestant.

There are some things worse than mysticism, and care must be taken lest, in its sweeping condemnation, we do not prove too much and confirm the modern Church in its tendency to the indifferent and heartless. The New Testament would be incomplete without the writings of John, as the Old Testament would be without the Canticles. Abelard is as much needed in Church history as Anselm, and Edwards is as much needed on "The Affections," as Edwards on "The Will."

How much, after all, are we indebted in life and teaching to these old semi-evangelical hermits and authors! But partially enlightened at the best, they were ever seeking for increasing light, and, all their errors of faith and practice conceded, did a work for their own age and ages follow-

ing of which no adequate estimate can be made. Back in the midst of mediæval crudeness and superstition, they still seemed to see afar the promise of a better age. Romanists as they were, many of the best among them were better than their church or creed, and often openly avowed their Protestant proclivities. Spiritualists in the mystical sense, they were also spiritualists in the biblical sense, and saved the times in which they lived from total demoralization. It was this "ghostly" piety, as he calls it, for which the old Yorkshire hermit pleaded, and which suffuses all his prose and verse as it sweetly suffused his life. We resort to Hampole and these Old English authors in quest of philological knowledge, and with the interests of English scholarship in view, and while securing such results are doubly compensated, as we also find that from the days of Alfred on to Richard of Hampole, and on to Wiclif and Tyndale the English language was mainly the medium of religious truth. It is strangely reserved for the nineteenth century to utter a protest against this subordination of culture to character.

IV.—POPULAR MISAPPREHENSIONS OF ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, POLITY, AND USAGE.

BY REV. CHARLES C. STARBUCK, ANDOVER, MASS.

THESE are mainly owing to three causes: (1) Animosity. This, of course, can only be corrected by moral advancement. (2) The gradual divergence in the use of ecclesiastical language since the Reformation. (3) The unconscious substitution of the Protestant point of view for the Roman Catholic, in interpreting Roman Catholic forms of doctrine.

I purpose neither an attack nor a defence of Roman Catholicism, but only an explanation of it, where most open to Protestant misapprehension, as to doctrine, polity, or usage. The errors being rather promiscuous, my rectification of them will necessarily be desultory, though I shall endeavor to secure a reasonably lucid order. Except as to points where the terminology evidently tempts to mistake, I shall confine myself, merely as samples, to errors actually met with, of prominent clergymen or laymen. This article being meant for current reading, I have not encumbered it with heavy references, but in every case rest on authorities of unquestioned weight, compared, tested, and digested through years of careful study, and therefore, in a certain mitigated sense, attested by an expert.

DOCTRINE.

1. *Salvation by Works.* It is true and false that Rome, as interpreted by Trent, teaches Salvation by Faith *and* Works. False as respects the first translation from the condemnation of Original Sin into a State of Grace, through Baptism, or the restoration to it after the loss of Baptismal

Grace by Mortal Sin, through Penance. In neither case, it is held, can anything done by the sinner properly give a *claim* upon God for forgiveness. The part of the sinner is purely receptive, and the remission of eternal penalty purely of grace, though of covenanted grace. But being once in a state of grace, it is held that he may, by God's goodness, "who will have the fruits of His own grace to become the merits of His creatures," do works which shall merit more grace, and thereby, derivatively, not independently, purchase not, indeed, salvation, but a higher *measure* of salvation. To this increment of grace there is no assignable limit, even till the point is attained at which it merits the grace of final perseverance.

2. *Necessity of the Sacraments.* It is often said that Rome holds that the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist are necessary for all men to salvation, the former for all whatever, the latter for all reaching the full use of reason, and Penance, or Confession, for all who, after Baptism, have forfeited Baptismal Grace by Mortal Sin, as opposed to Confirmation and Extreme Unction, which are helpful, but not always necessary; Matrimony, permitted to most, but not objectively imposed on any, and forbidden to some; and Orders, which are necessary only to give validity to certain other sacraments. True, with the addition, expressed by the Council of Trent, that where the external sacrament of Baptism, the Eucharist, or Penance cannot be had, the *votum*, or effective desire of it, with Contrition for Penance (more exactly, *spiritual* reception of the Eucharist), secures the appropriate sacramental grace. An infant dying unbaptized is held incapable, not, indeed, of perfect natural beatitude, including the natural knowledge and love of God, but of the beatific vision, as having neither had the sacrament nor the effective desire of it. A *mere* desire in an adult, which would not infallibly result in act on opportunity given, is not held availing. An unbaptized infant murdered as the child of Christians is held to be admitted to the beatific vision, as having likewise received "the baptism of blood." Modern Roman Catholic theology inclines to esteem the *implicit* purpose of a necessary sacrament, involved in general loyalty to the mind of Christ, as equivalent to the *explicit* desire, where ignorance or inevitable errors of education stand in the way of this latter.

3. *Only Roman Catholics can be saved.* True and false. It is held that Christ appoints all baptized Christians to be organized under the episcopate and priesthood of apostolic succession, presided over by the Pope. A neglect of this, if wanton, shuts out from grace. But if it is only the fruit of invincible errors of education, it is not imputed by God as sin. Such *material* heretics, holding the *matter* of false doctrine, but not *forming* it into sin by evil intent—*i. e.*, not being *formal* heretics, are held by God as Roman Catholic Christians, belonging to the *soul* of the Church, though not to her *body*, and therefore capable of salvation, though in a peculiarly precarious state, as being, if Protestants, deprived of a valid priesthood, and therefore of nearly all the sacraments, which Rome

esteems as the chief channels of saving grace. The bull Unigenitus, however, condemns every form of the doctrine that "grace is not given out of the Church." And Pius IX., in his address to the Italian bishops, quoted by John Henry Newman in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, and by Dr. Hase, in his *Protestantische Polemik*, has papally ratified the doctrine that the goodness of God will never give over to eternal death any persons whatsoever, who, being by invincible error out of the Church, are nevertheless studious to fashion their lives according to the precepts of His law written on the heart. This, having been for at least two hundred and fifty years a cherished tenet of the Jesuits, has now become an uncontradicted tenet of the whole Church. Yet salvation, precarious to all, is held, *ceteris paribus*, to be doubly precarious to those outside the communion of the Roman Catholic Church.

4. *Membership in the Church insures salvation.* The very reverse of the truth. Rome teaches that every baptized Christian, not excommunicate, or self-excommunicate by heresy or obstinate schism, remains a member of the Church. Yet if he commits any mortal sin, thereby falling out of grace, then, unless recovered by the sacrament of Penance (Confession) or by perfect Contrition with the desire of Penance, he is hopelessly lost. Church-membership, therefore, is held not to insure salvation, but simply access to the principal means of salvation—namely, the sacraments.

5. *Papal excommunication, unreversed, shuts out of heaven.* Erroneous. This confuses the *forum internum* of the confessor, which determines the relation of the soul to God, with the *forum externum*, which determines only her relation to the Church. But Excommunication belongs to the latter, and only partially affects the former. Some Catholic doctors hold an unjust excommunication to be null and void, even ecclesiastically. The great Bellarmine thinks otherwise, but says of a man unjustly excommunicated, that "though man may condemn him, God will crown him." St. Alphonso Liguori, the great present authority, says, as cited by Father Curci, that any church sentence, if notoriously unjust, may safely be neglected by the person concerned. If unjust, but not notoriously so, it should be respected, not as ratified of God, but out of regard to public order. Even a just excommunication may be remitted by any priest, even though himself excommunicate, where there is apparent danger of death. In the event of recovery, assuming repentance, we have, say the authorities, the case of a man who is at once absolved as toward God and condemned as toward the Church until he reconciles himself publicly. Even if, being justly excommunicated, he dies impenitent, it is, strictly speaking, not the sentence, but the sin that destroys him. The doctrine as thus expounded is, says Curci, the unanimous teaching of the Doctors, by which all extravagant language of heated ecclesiastics must be corrected and controlled.

6. *A sacrament requires for its efficacy, as a channel of personal grace, no subjective condition of the receiver.* It requires one, and only one: The

absence of mortal sin. Some attenuate the condition as to some sacraments still farther, but have not, thus far, carried through their view. Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, received in mortal sin, convey each its respective indelible character, but not its sanctifying grace until the sin is removed; and so, *mutatis mutandis*, of Matrimony. It is acknowledged by all, however, that the fuller the faith and love with which a sacrament is received, the richer its fruits, and the greater the probability of maintaining its grace.

7. *The excommunication of a priest or bishop annuls his subsequent sacramental acts.* Only true of his Absolution, and not even then, if solicited *in extremis*; or, says an eminent bishop, by a penitent ignorant of the excommunication. His incapacity to ratify Matrimony depends not on excommunication, but on deprivation. His other sacramental acts continue valid, but are held to be ordinarily sacrilegious, involving mortal sin in those who use them unnecessarily. Especially does a priest, even after degradation, remain always capable of consecrating the Eucharist, and a bishop of admitting to every degree of Orders. The Monophysite and Nestorian churches, though excommunicate from Rome for 1400 years, have a succession which she forbids to be questioned. And, say the learned Wetzer and Welte, had the Church of England maintained an unbroken episcopal succession, with the necessary rites and the sacramental intent, her schism, heresy, and excommunication by Rome would still have left her with valid orders. And even now Rome, though treating her orders as void, has never rendered a formal decision against them. To the Greek Church, says Dr. Döllinger, the Roman doctors allow even spiritual *jurisdiction*, which many extend even to the *heretical* Eastern churches. But there are those who apparently refuse to concede jurisdiction even to the Greek Church, of course acknowledging her orders.

8. *Sacramental marriage means sacerdotal marriage.* The exact reverse of the truth. Since Trent it had been an article of faith, guarded by anathema, that a Christian marriage does not, intrinsically, require the presence of a clergyman for validity. But Pius IX., having decided that all valid Christian marriages are also *sacramental* marriages, even those that are validly celebrated without a priest, has thereby established the previous majority doctrine, that the contracting parties, and not the priest, are the complex minister of this sacrament, and the clergyman only a "public witness," whose presence is necessary to validate the contract, and therefore the sacrament, where the Church prescribes, and only there. The Church prescribes it for Roman Catholic marriages in about all, and for mixed marriages in most Roman Catholic countries, and in a few Protestant regions. Elsewhere marriages, Roman Catholic or mixed, are held valid with or without a priest. Any contrary action is either ignorant or fraudulent. Protestant marriages in Protestant parishes, even in Catholic countries, are held not subject to the law of Trent.* But the

* Provided these parishes were organized before the promulgation of the *lex clandestinitatis* in the particular country.

marriage of any baptized with any unbaptized person without allowance of Rome is held absolutely null and void, and even when allowed, is accounted as being, even for the Catholic party, probably non-sacramental. Only "inter fideles"—that is, between such persons as by baptism are held bound to profess the faith, has it been papally decided that a valid marriage is always sacramental. An unbaptized person, though capable of a valid, is held incapable of a sacramental marriage or of any sacramental act. "Baptism is the door of the sacraments." But no Protestant baptism may be questioned to the prejudice of a marriage.

9. *A venial sin means a sin of small account.* Grossly erroneous. A *venial* sin, though not, like a *mortal* sin, incurring, if unexpiated on earth, eternal punishment, may incur, it is held, torments inexpressible until the day of judgment.

10. *There can be a change of doom after death.* False through and through. Rome holds, more absolutely, perhaps, than any other church, that the eternal destiny of every human being, without any exception whatever, is decided by the question of being in or out of a state of grace before the final severance of the spirit from the mortal body. Purgatorial torments may be more or less completely remitted through Intercession in various forms. But no one, it is held, ever enters Purgatory who is not a predestined heir of salvation. "The *holy* souls in Purgatory" are prayed for, and no other are known. All who do not enjoy the prayers of the Church are either in heaven, where they intercede, but need no intercession, or in hell, from which no intercession can ever deliver them. And a fall from Purgatory into Hell is no more admissible in the Church doctrine than one from heaven into hell, though some doctors think that an illusory fear of this is a possible purgatorial torment. Yet the very plot of a fiction published by a learned religious society rests upon this impossible heresy.

POLITY.

There are two points as to which I have observed some confusion here.

1. That Bishop, Archbishop, Cardinal, Pope, are four different orders, resting, like Deacon, Priest, and Bishop, on separate sacramental consecrations, and constituting, like them, intrinsic individual differences. But Orders conveys neither ecclesiastical rank nor jurisdiction, both of which, even the papal, have been enjoyed in a few cases by men who, being in minor orders, were spiritually only laymen. Sacramental consecration gives only sacramental competency. But every bishop has full sacramental competency, has the plenitude of the priesthood. There can, therefore, be no sacramental consecration of a bishop to any higher degree. The distinctions between Bishops, Archbishops, Primate, Patriarchs, Pope, rest only on the distinctions of rank and authority between their respective bishoprics, not on any differences of personal order between the men themselves. And Cardinal is neither an order nor a grade of an order. It is simply a personal dignity, involving one great prerogative, and permitting

one great ambition, a dignity which may be given indifferently to a deacon, priest, or bishop, or even, by dispensation, to a man of lower order, and which leaves him, in point of sacramental competency and of jurisdiction, precisely where he was before, saving only his nominal connection with his titular church in Rome. A priest may, therefore, say, "My bishop;" an ordinary suffragan, "My archbishop;" but no one, with propriety, "My cardinal." As cardinal, his authority is confined to the city of Rome.

2. Regular clergymen are naturally, but erroneously, opposed to irregular. But an irregular priest merely means one who, by certain lapses, has lost sacerdotal rights. The antithesis of regular is secular. A *regular*, whether clergyman or lay person, man or woman, is one who follows a monastic *regula*, or rule. A *secular* is any person, clerical or lay, who lives in the *seculum*, or world. If he is a priest, deacon, or subdeacon, a secular vows celibacy and canonical obedience to his bishop *as respects his ministry*. He neither vows poverty nor obedience to the bishop in his private capacity. His property he manages and bequeaths at pleasure, and if he dies intestate, it goes not to the bishop, but to his own heirs. If he, as a widower, has legitimate children, he is not subject to ecclesiastical control in his guardianship. If the bishop endeavors to coerce him, an appeal lies against him for tyranny. But a *regular* (or religious) vows also poverty and *personal* obedience to *monastic* superiors, as to every act of his life, being only permitted, even if a Jesuit, to except "what in my conscience I am persuaded to be manifest sin," and, say great canonists, "any act commanded contrary to essential human dignity" and to essential filial obligation, though from this last exemption Thomas Aquinas dissents, so far as respects the right of leaving the cloister to tend an infirm parent.

By a certain strain of language, certain less strictly bound regulars are designated as seculars. The Oratorians, Paulists, and some others follow monastic rules, but take no monastic vows (taking only, as clergymen, the vow of celibacy), and may resume their separate status without censure, though perhaps not without a certain discredit.

The statement once made by one of our most eminent journals, that every bishop or priest among us is bound, if the Pope wills, to go to Paraguay to-morrow, is whimsically erroneous. Such an obligation is not assumed even by regulars, as respects the Pope, except the Jesuits, and among them only by that small governing minority called "the professed of the four vows."

The expression, sometimes occurring in monastic rules, "this or that vow binds to sin," means not to the *commission* of sin, but, if violated, to the *penalty* of sin. The Jesuits limit the power "of binding to sin"—*i.e.*, of binding on the conscience, if neglected, the guilt of sin, to the four fundamental vows of chastity, poverty, obedience, and, when taken, of obedience to the Pope. All other parts of their rule are *regulative*, not *obligatory*, except so far as a superior may give to some part, for some

Cl
ore
of
of
Ori
be
war
T
equ
tion
Sac

Rt
doctr
were

brother, the same power "of binding unto sin," in which case a neglect of this part also will leave the brother in conscience "bound up unto sin"—*obstrictus ad peccatum*. Some rules, like that of the Oratory, have not, in any part, the power of "binding up unto sin," so that any violation of them incurs only a loss of membership, not any obligation of confessing even a venial sin. But most monastic rules "bind up unto sin" throughout, so that the unpermitted neglect of even the smallest part of them incurs at least the censure of a *venial* sin.

USAGE.

This, being external, is less open to misapprehension. I therefore note only one misstatement of a very widely circulated paper, which explains to its readers that Roman Catholic excommunication secludes the offender from the reception "of the wafer supposed to be the body of Christ, dipped in the wine supposed to be His blood." My probable readers hardly need to be reminded that all communicants of the Latin rite (perhaps nine tenths of the Church), whether lay persons or non-celebrating priests, receive a wafer which has never touched the wine, but is held to include the blood of Christ by necessary concomitance with His body. The Council of Trent makes it an article of faith to believe that the whole Christ, body, blood, soul, and divinity, is contained in either kind or *species* of the sacrament and in the least part of either.

CONCLUSION.

The Reformation, breaking off from the whole development of the Church as it had proceeded from the second century to the sixteenth, in order to take an altogether fresh departure from St. Paul, the prototype of Luther, has necessarily thrown the Protestant mind almost entirely out of gear as to the interpretation of Catholic modes of expression, Roman or Oriental. If this great divergence is always borne in mind differences will be accentuated, but rash accusations will be greatly diminished, and awkward though innocent misapprehensions will be largely obviated.

The charge of mangling the Decalogue to cover image-worship, applying equally to Lutherans, and resting on pure ignorance of Jewish interpretation, needs no refutation for my present readers. (See the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1882.)

V.—SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION.

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

(Concluded from page 224.)

RULE VI.—*Due regard must be had in interpretation to the progress of doctrine in the Bible.* God has communicated His truth gradually, as men were fitted to understand it; has had constant reference in His revelation

to the partial hardness of men's hearts and the remaining blindness of men's minds. Condescending to their weakness and ignorance, He has given them the knowledge that they could appropriate, and has made each step in the divine teaching a preparation for some higher step. It follows from this that earlier revelations are often superseded by later ones, and that to quote an earlier against a later as if it were of equal authority, because part of the same book, is to ignore the fundamental principle of the Book's construction. In the Old Testament the standard of the prophets is higher than the standard of the law, their inspiration is fuller, and their authority as a source of doctrine is greater. And so great is the advance when we come to the New Testament, that before a single one of its plain declarations, in all cases where there is a conflict, the whole of the Old Testament goes down in helpless insignificance. In the clear light of the moral and religious standard established by Christ Jesus, the only teacher with absolute authority, all Scripture must be judged, and so far as any of it falls below that standard it simply forfeits all claim on our highest respect, all right to command us. All the other teachings of the Bible must be brought to Jesus for confirmation, revision, or rejection. In the New Testament itself there is also a progress of doctrine, not in the sense of there being any other teacher than Christ who has a right to revise or reverse His decisions, but in the sense that what is taught in the germ by Jesus, privately and enigmatically, because the set time for full disclosure had not yet come, is taught by His apostles more elaborately and clearly, with immediate practical application to the exigencies of daily life, they being especially indwelt and endued by the Holy Spirit according to promise, for the very purpose of thus giving us the largest, completest disclosure of the mind of God; for the purpose of founding the Church and bearing the truth of the Gospel to the world, but not for the purpose of giving authoritative decisions as to all ecclesiastical or theological questions which might in far subsequent times arise.

There should then be no trouble at all about the low morality of many passages or personages in the Old Testament, such as the hateful deed of Jael and the vow of Jephthah in Judges, the imprecatory Psalms, and the superstitious notions in regard to the discovery of marital infidelity in Numbers. There should be no attempt to evade them or to justify them. They were what might naturally be expected in the time and place where they occurred. We who have passed beyond their stage of civilization and revelation are not concerned with them, except to mark their inferiority and rejoice at our higher privileges.

RULE VII.—*No Scripture precept is directly binding except on those to whom it was directly given, and it is binding on us only so far as we are in circumstances similar to those which surrounded the original recipients of the command.* In other words, there is a very large local and temporary element in the Bible, not without use to us of the present day in that it shows us how God dealt with the people of the older time, but needing an

independent exercise of our own judgment, if we would draw from it light as to what He means us to do. We may, reasoning by analogy, derive important principles, having wide application to this day, from those ancient precepts. This is the business of the preacher, and it will afford large scope for his utmost skill. But if he were to take the precepts literally as they stand, precepts made for an entirely different state of society, and press them rigidly as of binding force unaltered in these days, he would make a vast mistake. Yet such mistakes, alas! have been and still are constantly made. Of this an excellent illustration is furnished by the strange attempt to cramp and confine the activities of the American woman of the twentieth century in obedience to precepts called forth by the surroundings and conditions of the Asiatic or European woman of the first century. It is of a piece with the attempt in other days to bolster up slave-holding and wine-drinking by appeals to special texts written for a different stage in the world's advancement. Practical exegesis very largely consists in deciding on the degree of present application to our own situation attaching to these words spoken or written thousands of years ago. The greatest injustice is often done both to the Bible and the Christian conscience by lack of sound judgment at this point. The common practice, which is to take the ancient word as of literal present force, so far as it accords with our interests or prejudices or desires, and reject it otherwise, cannot be too severely condemned.

RULE VIII.—*The final appeal in the interpretation of Scripture, for determining what really is the genuine word of God, must be to the spiritually illumined reason and conscience of the general Church, the community of believers.* In other words, the Holy Spirit who gave the Book is its one supreme interpreter. Inspiration is needed to understand it as well as to produce it. The same Spirit that guided the writers in writing must guide the readers in reading. As Christ opened the Scriptures to His apostles, so the Holy Spirit opens them to us. And this Spirit dwells to-day in the hearts of God's little ones, His believing children, whom He has promised to guide. He who has the mind of the Spirit has the truth of God. It is necessary to know God and His Christ in order to know the Bible. None but the Master can give us the master-key to the Word. The Scripture cannot be understood from outside by grammar and history and rhetoric alone, but from the inside, from the heart of Jesus. They who have most of the Spirit, other things being equal, are most likely to apprehend aright what the Spirit has spoken, or has moved holy men of old to set forth.

Hence also a large number of true Christians are more likely to have the right interpretation, if they are agreed, than any one or two or three who may be in opposition to them. While every Christian is inspired, the community or body of believers is in a still larger sense the true subject of divine inspiration. The Church existed before the Bible, and produced it. The Bible is of and for the Church as well as to the Church. Chris-

tian consciousness has an authority of its own which cannot be contravened by the authority of the Bible, but is in some respects above it, since it must sit in judgment on many points connected with the book. It is accordingly of great importance to consider the views of those Spirit-taught men who have in many lands through many centuries studied the word before us. An interpretation which has run the gauntlet of thousands of devout minds and still stands firm, commanding the assent of the vast majority, has a great presumption in its favor. He is very presuming who ventures to call it in question. If this Christian consciousness, or the general agreement of the most enlightened believers, definitely rejects what has long been considered the true interpretation of any passage, that interpretation must be modified, must be looked upon as a proved mistake, in the same way that the interpretation is voted a mistake which is found to be in direct conflict with some thoroughly established fact of science in the material world. It is in this way that the old Calvinistic interpretation of many texts is being steadily pushed into the background and authoritatively rejected by the changed Christian consciousness of the age. It is thus that provision is found for the development of Christian doctrine and the progress of theological science. The truth of the Bible is one thing, and our interpretation of it, our opinion about it, is quite another thing.

An important corollary to this proposition that the general Christian conscience and reason is the final authority in Scripture interpretation may be stated as follows: whenever and wherever no general agreement can be reached on a point of Christian doctrine, the interpretation of the texts supposed by some to support it being sincerely disputed by equally good and able men, it is perfectly safe, and the only proper thing to conclude, that the matter lies outside the circle of the essential truths that belong to the Christian faith. If this were only generally remembered, how mightily it would help to increase Christian charity and produce unity of spirit in the midst of widely diverging views!

It will, of course, be objected by some that this rule gives too much authority and dignity to the Christian consciousness, and detracts from the reverence due to the written Word. It will perhaps be stigmatized as a desertion of the Protestant position, and a conceding of the claims of Rome or of Rationalists. But such it is not when rightly viewed. The Protestant position as against Roman Catholicism was that "the Bible alone is authoritative and sufficient concerning things necessary for salvation, both as respects faith and morals;" which sounds all right until it is asked, Who is to decide what writings belong to the Bible and what do not, and who is to authoritatively interpret the Book? Then it is perceived that some further considerations must be brought in. The Bible is a collection of writings. To have an infallible Bible, the authority by which the collection was made must be infallible. If the Church was not inspired in making the collection, then we have no guarantee for the

inspiration of the collection made. No one can believe in the inspiration of the Bible who does not believe in the inspiration of the Church. But by the Church here we do not, like the Romanists, mean the pope and the councils. We mean the body of genuine believers, the majority of Spirit-taught men of God, not the organized visible Church, but the invisible. To every regenerate man true Scripture has a self-evidencing power. It speaks for itself, authenticates itself as worthy by its contents. It is accepted as canonical because it speaks to the soul with a divine might, satisfying the conscience. It has witness borne to it by the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer. So there comes about in the course of time a common consent of the children of God, eliminating that which is of lower value, of a merely national or temporary character, and consecrating that which on the whole is best fitted to survive. It is a process of supernatural rather than of natural selection, because made by the Divine Spirit dwelling in the souls of holy men.

And this same process or power which has settled the greater question of the canon is the only one that can really settle the lesser questions of how this or that part of the canon, this or that particular verse, is to be understood. It has ruled out certain books from the Bible, and put others which have been admitted into a distinctly secondary position. It can also be trusted to make a distinction between certain portions of books, and say this or that, though in an accepted canonical book, cannot be the veritable word of God. But this is a different thing, be it noted, from subordinating the word of God to the consciousness of any individual; a very different thing also from making the unilluminated, unsanctified, haughty, independent reason of the natural man a judge and critic of the divine word. We do neither of these things. What we say is that the spirit-guided intelligence of the body of sanctified or Spirit-born persons is the best, highest, most authoritative interpreter of the written word that we can possibly have.

This clears up, we think, in great measure the important relation of the Church and the Word. Each supports and corrects the other. Neither can be independent of or absolutely and in all things superior to the other. The Bible is dependent for its existence and interpretation upon the Church. The Church is dependent for its development and purification upon the Bible. One and the same Divine Spirit is the creator and life of both.

These rules, we believe, are in full accord with the trend of modern biblical study which has been so rapidly advancing in the last fifty years. Out of them may be gathered perhaps a working theory as to the true place of the Bible. The Book should not be made a fetich or a despot to fetter the conscience and bind the reason of those that are conscious of being directly guided by God. There should be no bibliolatry, no blind adherence to traditional views. Room must be made for all *facts*, from whatever source they come. There has been in the past too much deifying of the letter. We are finding out that it is the Spirit which maketh alive.

The children of God must prize and use their freedom, and not be brought into bondage even by so good a thing as the good Book.

Good men in the past have made very sad mistakes in the matter of interpretation. Some have spiritualized everything; have found sacred mysteries in all sorts of most unlikely passages; have made every word, letter, and syllable an allegory of some kind, using it to escape difficulties in philosophy and theology, and to maintain their peculiar views. Others have literalized everything in a way equally extreme and mischievous. Scholastics have gone to one extreme, Rationalists to another. The former have ignored the human features, making the Scripture altogether divine, with the same attributes of unity and infinity that God has, and interpreting everything with the severe precision which alone is worthy of God. The latter have made too much of the human features, ignoring the divine, and regarding the Book as a bundle of miscellaneous heterogeneous writings without unity or authority. The truth is, it is a *divine-human* book, human but not heathen, divine but not deity. We have this treasure in earthen vessels because, on the whole, it is best it should be so; but it is a treasure nevertheless of unspeakable worth and more than mortal value. It cannot be proved, and it should not be claimed, that the Bible is, in every particular expression, in the fullest sense, the infallible word of God. Some errors there are. Let it be freely admitted. There is in the admission no cause for alarm. Nothing that is of importance to our Christian faith has been or will be jeopardized by any errors discovered. We are in favor of the freest, fullest investigation, and the widest search after truth. The faith of the properly instructed Christian will in no way suffer therefrom. It will be established on still more unassailable foundations; it will glow with clearer, more resplendent light.

If the eight rules of interpretation which have been set forth and explained in the preceding pages are correct, then before the meaning of any passage of sacred Scripture can be fully settled, the following eight questions should be asked—namely:

1. What does the grammar and lexicon say concerning this verse?
2. What modification is demanded by the historical perspective?
3. What application have the laws of rhetoric and logic to the form of expression here used?
4. What meaning best accords with the context and with the general drift of Bible teaching?
5. Is the passage a part of the very marrow of Scripture, or is it an unimportant accessory?
6. Is it a part of the very latest revelation, or is there something later of higher authority, by which this is superseded?
7. Is this of local and temporary character, or has it general and permanent force?
8. Is this interpretation ratified by the general agreement of the most enlightened and devout Christian minds?

SERMONIC SECTION.

THE MEASURE OF IMMEASURABLE
POWER.

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

That ye may know . . . what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ.—Eph. i. 19, 20.

“THE riches of the glory of the inheritance” will sometimes quench rather than stimulate hope. He can have little depth of religion who has not often felt that the transcendent glory of that promised future sharpens the doubt—“and can I ever hope to reach it?” Our paths are strewn with battle-fields where we were defeated; how should we expect the victor’s wreath? And so Paul does not think that he has asked all which his friends in Ephesus need when he has asked that they may know the hope and the inheritance. There is something more wanted, something more even for our knowledge of these, and that is the knowledge of the power which alone can fulfil the hope and bring the inheritance. His language swells and peals and becomes exuberant and noble with his theme. He catches fire, as it were, as he thinks about this power that worketh in us. It is “exceeding.” Exceeding what? He does not tell us, but other words in this letter, in the other great prayer which it contains, may help us to supply the missing words. He speaks of the “love of Christ which passeth knowledge,” and of God being “able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think.” The power which is really at work in Christian men to-day is in its nature properly transcendent and immeasurable, and passes thought and desire and knowledge.

And yet it has a measure. “According to the working of the strength of the might which He wrought in Christ.” Is that heaping together of synonyms, or all but synonyms, mere

tautology? Surely not. Commentators tell us that they can distinguish differences of meaning between the words, in that the first of them is the more active and outward, and the last of them is the more inward. And so they liken them to fruit and branch and root; but we need simply say that the gathering together of words so nearly co-extensive in their meaning is witness to the effort to condense the infinite within the bounds of human tongue, to speak the unspeakable; and that these reiterated expressions, like the blows of the billows that succeed one another on the beach, are hints of the force of the infinite ocean that lies behind.

And then the Apostle, when he has once come in sight of his risen Lord, as is his wont, is swept away by the ardor of his faith and the clearness of his vision, and breaks from his purpose to dilate on the glories of his King. We do not need to follow him into that. I limit myself this morning to the words which I have read as my text, with only such reference to the magnificent passage which succeeds as may be necessary for the exposition of this.

I.—So, then, I ask you to look, first, at the measure and example of the immeasurable power that works in Christian men.

“According to the working of the strength of the might which He wrought in Christ.” The Resurrection, the Ascension, the session at the right hand of God, the rule over all creatures, and the exaltation above all things on earth or in the heavens—these are the things which the Apostle brings before us as the pattern-works, the *chef-d’œuvre* of the power that is operating in all Christians. The present glories of the ascended Christ are glories possessed by a man, and that being so, they are available as evidences and measures of the power which works in believing souls. In them we see the possibilities of humanity, the ideal for man which God had when He created and breathed

His blessing upon him. It is one of ourselves who has strength enough to bear the burden of the glory, one of ourselves who can stand within the blaze of encircling and indwelling Divinity and be unconsumed. The possibilities of human nature are manifest there. If we want to know what the Divine power can make of us, let us turn to look with the eye of faith upon what it has made of Jesus Christ.

But such a thought, glorious as it is, still leaves room for doubt as to my personal attainment of such an ideal. Possibility is much, but we need solid certainty. And we find it in the truth that the bond between Christ and those who truly love and trust Him is such as that the possibility must become a reality and be consolidated into a certainty. The Vine and its branches, the members and their Head, the Christ and His Church, are knit together by such closeness of union as that wheresoever and whatsoever the one is, there, and that, must the others also be. Therefore, when doubts and fears, and consciousness of my own weakness, creep across me, and all my hopes are dimmed, as some star in the heavens is, when a light mist floats between us and it, let us turn away to Him our brother, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and think that He, in His calm exaltation and regal authority and infinite blessedness, is not only the pattern of what humanity may be, but the pledge of what His Church must be. "Where I am, there shall also My servant be." "The glory that Thou gavest Me I have given them."

Nor is that all. Not only a possibility and a certainty for the future are for us the measure of the power that worketh in us, but as this same letter teaches us, we have, as Christians, a present scale by which we may estimate the greatness of the power. For in the next chapter, after that glorious burst as to the dignity of his Lord, which we have not the heart to call a digression, the Apostle, recurring to the theme of my text, goes on to say, "And you

hath He quickened." And then, catching it up a verse or two afterward, reiterates clause by clause what had been done on Jesus as having been done on us Christians. If that Divine Spirit raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, it is as true that the same power hath "raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." And so not only the far-off, though real and brilliant, and eye and heart-filling, glories of the ascended Christ give us the measure of the power, but also the limited experience of the present Christian life, the fact of the resurrection from the true death, the death of sin, the fact of union with Jesus Christ so real and close as that they who truly experience it do live, as far as the roots of their lives are concerned, and the scope and the aim of them, "in the heavens," and "sit with Him in heavenly places"—these things afford us the measure of the power that worketh in us.

Then, because a Man is King of kings and Lord of lords; and because He who is our Life "is exalted high above all principalities and powers;" and because from His throne He has quickened us from the death of sin, and has drawn us so near to Himself that if we are His we truly live beside Him, even while we stumble here in the darkness, we may know the exceeding greatness of His power according to the working of the strength of the might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead.

II.—Secondly, notice the knowledge of the unknowable power.

We have already come across the same apparent paradox, covering a deep truth, in the former sections of this series of petitions. I need only remind you, in reference to this matter, that the knowledge which is here in question is not the intellectual perception of a fact as revealed in Scripture, but is that knowledge to which alone the New Testament gives the noble name, being knowledge verified by in-

ward experience, and the result of one's own personal acquaintance with its object.

How do we know a power? By thrilling beneath its force. How are we to know the greatness of the power but because it comes surging and rejoicing into our aching emptiness, and lifts us buoyant above our temptations and weakness? Paul was not asking for these people theological conceptions. He was asking that their spirits might be so saturated with and immersed in that great ocean of force that pours from God as that they should never, henceforth, be able to doubt the greatness of that power which works in them. The knowledge that comes from experience is the knowledge that we all ought to seek. It is not merely to be desired that we should have right and just conceptions, but that we should have the vital knowledge which is, and which comes from, life eternal.

And that power, which thus we may all know by feeling it working upon ourselves, though it be immeasurable, has its measure, though it be, in its depth and fulness, unknowable and inexhaustible, may yet be really and truly known. You do not need a thunderstorm to experience the electric shock; a battery that you can carry in your pocket will do that for you. You do not need to have traversed all the length and breadth and depth and height of some newly discovered country to be sure of its existence, and to have a real, though it may be a vague, conception of the magnitude of its shores. And so, really, though boundedly, we have the knowledge of God, and can rely upon it as valid, though partial; and similarly, by experience, we have such a certified acquaintance with Him and His power as needs no enlargement to be trusted, and to become the source of blessings untold. We may see but a strip of the sky through the narrow chinks of our prison windows, and many a grating may further intercept the view, and much dust that might be cleared away may dim the glass, but

yet it *is* the sky that we see, and we can think of the great horizon circling round and round, and of the infinite depths above there, which neither eye nor thought can travel unwearied. Though all that we see be but an inch in breadth and a foot or two in height, yet we do see. We know the unknowable power that passeth knowledge.

And let me remind you of how large importance this knowledge of and constant reference to the measureless power manifested in Christ is for us. I believe there can be no vigorous, happy Christian life without it. It is our only refuge from pessimism and despair for the world. The old psalm said, "Thou hast crowned Him with glory and honor, and hast given Him dominion over the works of Thy hands." And hundreds of years afterward the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews commented on it thus, "We see not yet all things put under Him." Was the old vision a dream, was it never intended to be fulfilled? Apparently not, if we take the history of the past into account, and the centuries that have passed since have done nothing to make it more probable, apart from Jesus Christ, that man will rise to the height which the Psalmist dreamed of. When we look at the exploded Utopias that fill the past; when we think of the strange and apparently fatal necessity by which evil is developed from every stage of what men call progress, and how improvement is perverted, almost as soon as effected, into another fortress of weakness and misery, when we look on the world as it is to-day, I know not whence a man is to draw bright hopes, or what is to deliver him from pessimism as his last word about himself and his fellows, except the "working of the strength of the might which He wrought in Christ." "We see not yet all things put under Him." Be it so, "but we see Jesus," and, looking to Him, hope is possible, reasonable, and imperative.

The same knowledge is our refuge from our own consciousness of weak-

ness. We look up, as a climber may do in some Alpine ravine, upon the smooth gleaming walls of the cliff that rises above him. It is marble, it is fair, there are lovely lands on the summit, but nothing that has not wings can get there. We try, and slip backward almost as much as we rise. What is to be done? Are we to sit down at the foot of the cliff and say, "We cannot climb, let us be content with the luscious herbage and sheltered ease below?" Yes! That is what we are tempted to say. But look! a mighty hand reaches over, an arm is stretched down, the hand grasps us and lifts us and sets us there.

"No man hath ascended up into Heaven save He that came down from Heaven," and having returned thither, stoops thence, and will lift us to Himself. I am a poor weak creature. Yes! I am all full of sin and corruption. Yes! I am ashamed of myself every day. Yes! I am too heavy to climb, and have no wings to fly, and am bound here by chains manifold. Yes! But we know the exceeding greatness of the power, and we triumph in Him.

That knowledge should shame us into contrition, when we think of such force at our disposal, and so poor results. That knowledge should widen our conceptions, enlarge our desires, breathe a brave confidence into our hopes, should teach us to expect great things of God, and to be intolerant of present attainments while anything remains unattained. And it should stimulate our vigorous effort, for no man will long seek to be better, if he is convinced that the effort is hopeless.

Learn to realize the exceeding greatness of the power that will clothe your weakness. "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, for that He is strong in might, not one faileth." That is wonderful, but here is a far nobler operation of the Divine power. It is great to preserve the ancient heavens fresh and strong by His might, but it is

greater to come down to my weakness, to "give power to the faint," and "increase strength to them that have no might." And that is what He will do with us.

III.—Lastly, notice the conditions for the operation of the power.

"To usward who believe," says Paul. He has been talking to these Ephesians, and saying "ye," but now, by that "us," he places himself beside them, identifies himself with them, and declares that all his gifts and strength come to him on precisely the same conditions on which theirs do to them; and that he, like them, is a waiter upon that grace which God bestows on them that trust Him.

"To usward who believe." Once more we are back at the old truth which we can never make too emphatic and plain, that the one condition of the weakest among us being strong with the strength of the Lord is simple trust in Him, verified, of course, by continuance and by effort.

How did the water go into the Ship Canal at Eastham last week? First of all they cut a trench, and then they severed the little strip of land between the hole and the sea, and the sea did the rest. The wider and deeper the opening that we make in our natures by our simple trust in God, the fuller will be the rejoicing flood that pours into us. There is an old story about a Christian father, who, having been torturing himself with theological speculations about the nature of the Trinity, fell asleep and dreamed that he was emptying the ocean with a thimble! Well, you cannot empty it with a thimble, but you can go to it with one, and if you have only a thimble in your hand you will only bring away a thimbleful. The measure of your faith is the measure of God's power given to you.

There are two measures of the immeasurable power; the one is that infinite limit of "the power which He wrought in Christ," and the other the practical limit—the working bounds of

our spiritual life is our faith. In plain English, we can have as much of God as we want. We do have as much as we want. And if, in touch with the power that can shatter a universe, we only get a little thrill that is scarcely perceptible to ourselves, and all unnoticed by others, whose fault is that? And if, coming to the fountain that laughs at drought and can fill a universe with its waters, we scarcely bear away a straitened drop or two, that barely refreshes our parched lips, and does nothing to stimulate the growth of the plants of holiness in our gardens, whose fault is that? The practical measure of the power is for us the measure of our belief and desire. And if we only go to Him, as I pray we all may, and continue there, and ask from Him strength, according to the riches that are treasured in Jesus Christ, we shall get the old answer, "According to your faith be it unto you."

CHRISTIAN LINEAGE.

By REV. WILLIAM R. CAMPBELL [CONGREGATIONALIST], BOSTON, MASS.

For in Christ Jesus I begat you through the Gospel. I beseech you therefore be ye imitators of me.—1 Cor. iv. 15, 16.

As a child who has been kept in ignorance of his parentage, after years of neglect from hirelings, and hard service under taskmasters and the blight of degrading associations, comes to know those who have given him life and loved him, and rejoices in the discovery, so we in times of evil condition and days of questioning may be strengthened and made glad in the knowledge that we belong to a noble race.

For our joy and assurance in regard to our spiritual ancestry let us consider *Our Christian Lineage Traced by Family Memorials and Portraits.*

I. THE RECORDS AND MEMORIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY.

"For in Christ Jesus I begat you through the Gospel."

The propagating power of the Divine

life in men is one of the distinctive features of the religion of Jesus. Other systems have made provision for carrying down their tenets by teaching or by conquest, but the office of the blessed Spirit of God is to recreate. Through Him the believer by prayer and faith imparts a new element to the man who accepts in obedient trust the message from above. The text, instead of involving an assertion of personal superiority, is only a proper fatherly exhortation as to the spiritual family of the apostle. A recently appointed bishop when asked for an account of his life is reported to have said, "I have had no wife, no children, no serious misfortune, and no honors worth speaking of." Those who know the man or who have heard him could, however, bear the strongest testimony that he has a vast Gospel household; that the impression of his life, words, and faith will go down as constant moulding influences and unspent forces far beyond this generation. Paul would doubtless have made a similar reply as to wife, sons, and daughters, but he speaks more than once, as in the text, of those whom he has begotten. John says in one of his epistles, "My little children, love one another." Jesus used a similar phrase, as in this instance, "Children, have ye any meat?" The founder of Christianity and His disciples claimed those in their own day who could be spoken of as "children," those who had been born again into a new family circle. In looking up the genealogy of any line, the fact that there were known to be numerous descendants gives us the best evidence that we shall be able to trace the branches to the parent stock.

Some of you have recently lost friends above ninety years of age who were disciples of Jesus. I know three such persons who have passed away at above this great age within the last month. Two hundred and eighty years would have been the period covered by their joint lives, if they had been successors of one another, instead of contemporaries. Twenty such persons would

take us back to the time of the Nazarene, and the last man would have heard the story of the Crucifixion from children who witnessed it, or himself might have been led in the sad procession to Calvary.

You can select out of each century a worthy historical character, one whose age nearly covered it, who might have passed on the Gospel traditions by word of mouth, as well as by the spiritual affinities of the heart, from Polycarp down to Gladstone.

Some days ago I was shown in a bookstore a Bible such as our own, beautifully written on vellum, every word by hand. The date was of the year 1300. In the year 1100, or a thousand years after Christ, we find churches whose creed and ritual we know and the character of whose piety bears similar marks to that of our own day.

One of the churches of which I speak was in Athens, a capital city. Rome has its seat in a city which has had a continuous history from long before the time of Christ and His apostles. Crispi, speaking last fall at Palermo, said, "Rome was great before the hierarchy. Rome will be great long after that dynasty has perished." The records of our Christian faith are interlaced with those of the cosmopolitan centres of the world and interlined with the annals of virile races now influential in the earth. The Jew, is he not a factor in the problems of the nations? and the Romans, are they not a living people? and the Greeks, dwelling in the same spot from which their ancestors went forth to Thermopylæ? The Church has as well authenticated outlines from the time of Constantine, in 325, as have the governments of the greatest nations of the past or their ruling houses. The emperors from that time onward espoused the cause of the Christian family, and their own household history, as well as that of their reigns, was recorded within its archives, stamped on the decrees of its councils, and emblazoned on its temples and shrines. At this early period also

we have a universal Council called to pass on the most important doctrine of the Christian faith, the divinity of our Lord. Thence comes our Nicene Creed. You will realize, however, that a church which has reached this stage of organization and influence from an obscure beginning must have some time allowance for its crystallization.

Your scientist wants you to grant him thousands of years for the erosion of the bed of Niagara and the glacier tracks and deposits of natural forces. He must not deny some fair period of Christianizing energy to cut the channel in which we find the love of God moving within the visible Church, so that the Gospel might spread as it had done from India to Spain and Britain; from a humble circle of persecuted followers to numbering among its disciples the greatest rulers of earth. The graves of the saints would bridge the gulf from Constantine to martyred Polycarp, if there were no other records. Their inscriptions of the Christian virtues, hopes of immortality, and faith in Jesus would restore the materials for our family history, and the types by which we could trace our ancestry if all other lines should fail.

It is not my purpose at this time to refer to the manuscripts of the Bible, the direct and ample records which connect our present Christian household with its ancestry, but to suggest those incidental lines of proof which each of us, without scholastic learning, may enter upon for himself.

As the scorice of Vesuvius have preserved intact the remains of the sites at its feet, so the dark ages discover on their farther side the perpetual outlines of our Christian institutions. Beyond the storm-tossed Atlantic the wash of its waves and its overthrown lighthouses are the silent but unshaken cliffs of a continent guarded by Alpine sentries.

Our memorials have been kept for us as the choice traditions of our literature, our science and art. In Plato's "Theatetus," Euclid, speaking of the

conversation of Socrates, says, "As soon as I got home I made notes, and afterward, as at my leisure I recalled more, I would write it out. Then, whenever I went to Athens, I used to ask Socrates what I had not been able to recollect and to set it right upon my return; so that I have nearly the whole conversation written out." Why may not a similar method have been employed by the writers of the gospels, seeing that from early days the disciples of great masters used thus to preserve their words?

There are records of a spiritual family extant who trace their descent from Jesus of Nazareth. Our books of heraldry and archives of the peerage come down in duplicate copies. "Alfred, Lord Tennyson," is said to be the license mark on some of the milk carts on the southern side of the Isle of Wight. The Christian coat of arms is inscribed on many monuments besides the Scriptures. Our armorial bearings adorn many heirlooms beside the illuminated missal.

II. PROOFS OF OUR SPIRITUAL LINEAGE.

"For in Christ Jesus I begat you through the Gospel."

It is often affirmed both by literalist believers and the cavillers outside the Church that the Christian society or brotherhood is not what it was meant to be or what it was in the days of the apostles. We might begin at Christ and show what He was, and then make a comparison as to His professed followers of the present day. But Paul traces his own new birth and life to Jesus, so that we may consider the great apostle to the Gentiles as a representative of what men had begun to be in the line of Christian descent, and compare ourselves with him. Then, too, we may reach his level, while we never could attain that of the great Master. We know the creed and character of one of the chosen followers of Jesus. We have an opportunity to

study what he was before and after the great change in him.

Christ was always holy, but Paul was once a sinner condemned, then a saint serving the same Saviour he had resisted. We know what he had been, then what he became. There was a transformation. Let us see what it was out of. "Though I was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; howbeit I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. i. 13). This he makes as a confession to Timothy, whom he calls "My true child in the faith." We are told what was the character of other people before they also were changed. "Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi. 9-11). This was what Paul wrote to the Corinthians shortly after the words of our text. We know that neither he nor they were any longer the kind of persons to whom these vices and evil traits would apply. Let us think what would be the opposites of these sins, and we have an indication of the characteristics of Christian disciples in that day, and can tell whether we are like the people of Corinth before or after the new birth. In order to set forth more clearly the type of the new family, an example is given of one of Paul's pupils: "For this cause, therefore, I sent unto you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ." Here is, as it were, a spiritual grandson of Jesus. We have three generations in line to study, Jesus, Paul, Timothy. We can tell what the Gospel was as it worked in the son, sire, and founder of our faith. Then Timothy is particularly not to teach doctrines only, but to

put the people in remembrance of Paul's ways. They could see whether the child's walk and features were like those of the parent, and were "in Christ."

There are many varieties of temperament among children of the same household, and the Christian family presents us those with differing and peculiar traits. But does any candid man dare arise and say he cannot find in the world to-day the type of those who formed the early Church in spirit, love, and works? If we consider the change which takes place in men, the wide gulf they cross from darkness to light, the many forms of service, the devotion to the same Lord, can we fail to trace the features of Jesus and Timothy and Paul in the lives of men of our time? What changes would take place in a family in twenty centuries under the conditions similar to those which the Christian faith has encountered? Are the differences which you think you find between the life of modern and ancient believers any greater than those which climate would account for in races, some variations in complexion and the color of the skin? If the men of the kingdom are not all you wish or those of the local church come short of your ideal, ask yourself where you received this noble image of the mind save from the Christian types you have looked upon or read of in the annals of Gospel history. It should not be a matter of surprise that grotesque forms come to us from the isolated frontier communities of the world. The wonder is that they have preserved any likeness to our great ancestors. Races persecuted, left to themselves, have often degenerated to extinction. It is no wise strange that the members of the Christian household under the same conditions should bear some impress of their hardships and isolation. Select the best examples of faith and service in our world to-day, and you will be careful how you say you cannot find Christ, or His truth, or His will for you to obey. If in our city, if any-

where on the earth, there are the flower and fruit of the Gospel, any spiritual children of that faith, every careless one among us should pause reverently to inquire into this long descent of the followers of Jesus. If the Church had departed very far from a true standard, and anywhere in the world we found this noble type, tracing its ancestry to Christ, we of the nineteenth century would have no more sacred duty than to seek out and restore these lost features of our religion. But no man will calmly claim that specimens of the true children of Jesus are infrequently found. Our spiritual lineage and kinship with Paul and John is practically conceded.

Through all the ages of darkness, of idolatry, of persecution and punishment, the strain has continued in the blood; the Spirit has been among men.

III. AN INVITATION TO JOIN THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY.

"I beseech you, therefore, be ye imitators of me."

Next to the hopelessness of the unsupported future is the thought that there is nothing back of us to lean upon. What a curse for children to be thrust out in each generation to pick up a new religion! They begin at the point of least advantage, without experience, ignorant, helpless, and are compelled to experiment through life, and then when death comes they have only the same dark, cloudy winding-sheet of doubt which has enveloped so many others. For myself, I read with thankfulness the genealogies of Jesus in the beginning of the gospels, one of which traces His ancestry back on the human side not only to Adam but to God. The slender life did not lodge here as an uprooted branch swayed by every fierce storm from the ends of the earth. He was in God and we are in Him. You have seen boys trying to balance a stick on the hand moving about to keep it up, but when the motion stops it topples over. Our lives, without some root in religious ancestry,

some family bonds, are like these playthings of the children, waiting only for the movement to cease when they shall fall to the earth.

We are invited, by furnishing no more difficult bond than a right spirit, to join ourselves with the household of faith. "Follow Me," said Jesus. "Be ye imitators of me," was the invitation of the apostle to the same blessed family. You can tell where you are by observing the change wrought in your character as you mingle with the visible saints and the unseen ministers of souls. You know if you are in a land of rich foliage and luscious fruits that you are beyond the Arctic circle. You will learn, if you hold the truth and imitate the grace of these first children of Jesus, that you belong to the family.

CHRIST OUR ARCHETYPE—OUR EXEMPLAR.

BY REV. W. H. WELLS [METHODIST EPISCOPAL, SOUTH], OWENSBOROUGH, KY.

Thus it was written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer.—Luke xxiv. 46.

"Thus it is written." The crucifixion had passed. The resurrection had occurred. The remaining eleven apostles were assembled at some house in Jerusalem. The women had been early at the sepulchre, and were convinced by what they saw and heard that their Lord was alive from the dead. Peter and John had been added to the number of believers. Luke and Cleopas had had a most wonderful experience on their journey to Emmaus and in breaking of bread. "And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how He was known of them in breaking of bread."

While this conversation was proceed-

ing Jesus appeared in the very midst of them and said, "Peace be unto you." They were "terrified and affrighted," supposing Him to be a spirit. To remove this delusion, He reminded them that a spirit had not "flesh and bones," as they could see He had. He showed them His hands and feet, in order to perfect identity, and then, calling for something to eat, actually dined with them. Then proceeded the wonderful statement of which our text is a part. Said He, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me." Then opened He their understandings, that they might fully comprehend Him, and uttered the language used as a text. Hence, "Thus it is written."

Christ was not in the world by accident. The plan of salvation is not an afterthought. God is not surprised. He is not disappointed. He is not compelled, on the sudden and in an emergency, to rush some plan to the front for man's rescue. All was foreknown and provided for. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Christ is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The shouts of angels over an accomplished sacrifice mingled with the voices of the sons of the morning who rejoiced at the birth of time. It was a pre-arranged plan. Jesus was ready to save as soon as there were sinners needing salvation. Men began to write and explain as soon as sinners needed information and explanation. "Thus it is written." Christ was in the world on purpose and to meet certain demands of "the Law," and fulfil all "things written of Him in the prophets, and in the Psalms." In this regard He was the marvel of the ages. Whatever you may think and say of Him as to His Divine nature, you will be impressed, on the human side of His life, with His adaptation to the pre-arranged plan, and as to His ability to

meet all its conditions. He worked to His model perfectly. Whatever may be your views of the architectural skill and beauty of the plan, you are compelled to give Christ credit for following its details to the final minutiae. Any thoughtful and impartial man who will first read the scheme of human redemption as portrayed in "the Law, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms," and note their fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth, will be amazed and admire. Remember, these details are given in prose and poetry; foreshadowed in a multiplicity of types, symbols, and shadows; described in every possible detail by different men speaking and writing independently at intervals of four thousand years. Read their fulfilment as detailed by the four evangelists, and wonder and adore. Such subordination of the will; such surrender of private judgment and preference are without parallel in human history. Take His life from birth to death, and you cannot find a break in this particular. Apart from other claims, He challenges the world's confidence and admiration for His consistency and conformity; and in others you extol this virtue. Your complaint is that church-members are wanting in conformity to their creed. We profess much, act little. Plan admirable, programme faultless; but you complain of failure to execute. No such charge can be brought against Jesus. He is the perfect Archetype. He is worthy to be our Exemplar.

To be consistent with our creeds would indeed make us so good that the world would call us "cranks." If we measure up to the standard fixed in the life of Christ, we will surely become "a peculiar people." However much justice there may be in the charge against the average church-member, certainly the most violent and envenomed enemy will not find a flaw in the Christ. Considerate men contemplating Him in this attitude to the will and plan of another will be amazed at His self-abnegation. And it is not sur-

prising that these same reverent students of His history should thus be led to further inquiry, and thence to deeper and stronger faith in the God-man. Examine His life and criticise it if you can. Let Him be studied and criticised from the only two possible standpoints of just criticism—in His words and deeds.

"Thus it is written." Every word uttered is prophecy and promise fulfilled. While free from the charge of being loquacious, yet He talked much. Every word meant something. He spake as it was written of Him. Not a word less than demanded, and yet not a redundant sentence. The prophets give in detail the matter, manner, and spirit of His message to the world. And so He spake to the final syllable.

The first word recorded of Him was, "How is it that ye sought Me? know ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" (Luke ii. 49). His last word, according to Luke, was, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit." John gives as His last word, "It is finished." Here is a space of twenty-one years intervening between the first and last words of this wonderful Teacher. How much He must have said in these years! He was a public teacher and private instructor. Speaking as never man spake, it is quite natural the people should ply Him with questions and desire to hear Him on every possible subject. Possessed of all learning and master of all the philosophies, men would naturally desire to hear Him. To Him they carried all their difficult questions. With matchless skill and ease He resolved their doubts and relieved their fears. He was alike familiar with the past, present, and future. Such a person could not be silent. And yet of Him it was truthfully said, "There was no guile found on His lips." Such was prophecy. "His name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor."

But His acts are equally in keeping with what was written. The same is true, "Thus it is written." Prophecy

defined the character of deeds He would perform. He was to be a prophet "mighty in word and deed." He was to do the works which no other did. He was to give sight to the blind; hearing to the deaf; speech to the dumb; soundness to the lame and halt; deliverance to the captives; the opening of the prison to them that were bound, and salvation to the penitent believing.

He raised Lazarus from the dead. He had been four days dead. A great commotion followed. His enemies felt the force of such a miracle, and in their desperation said, "Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world is gone after Him." Jesus challenged them, saying, "Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me: or else believe Me for the very work's sake." His was a busy, merciful life. "He went about doing good." After recounting such as he was directed to do, John added, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

Think of a life so thoroughly occupied, so filled with deeds, and yet every one in fulfilment of Scripture! Not a thing done in all this vast range of benevolence out of harmony with the will of Him who sent Him and the best interests of our race; not a selfish word or deed. In all the mighty range of His dazzling performance not a thing was done for mere display. It was not a self-constituted panorama to attract attention to Himself. He sought not to create any glamour about His head by moral pyrotechnics. He worked by a rule and to a plan. Herod had long desired to see Him, and hoped to witness some miracle wrought by Him. But no prophet had said He would work miracles to gratify such evident curiosity. Fine opportunity this for the mere display of His powers, and to provoke the empty adulations of a villainous king. But in the midst of the awful pressure from the human side He

maintained that marvellous reticence and stillness peculiar to our Divine Exemplar. He made no vain show of His extraordinary powers. He was about His Father's business. He came to do the will of another. He was here on a mission devised by another. It behooved Him to be obedient, as a son, in all things. To His works He appealed for confirmation of His mission. And not only because they were greater than any other man's, but also because they conformed in detail to what was written.

Charles Wesley has well described Christ in word and deed fulfilling Scripture.

"He speaks—and, listening to His voice,
New life the dead receive;
The mournful, broken hearts rejoice;
The humble poor believe.

"Hear him, ye deaf; His praise, ye dumb
Your loosened tongues employ;
Ye blind, behold your Saviour come,
And leap, ye lame, for joy."

"And thus it behooved Christ to suffer."

Divine necessity was laid upon Him. He was under moral obligation to execute a certain plan. It was an agreed and accepted plan. The execution was voluntary. "He gave Himself a ransom." "He gave up the ghost and died." Said He, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit." "I came not to do My own will, but the will of Him that sent Me." Remember His first public, authoritative, utterance, "I must be about My Father's business."

Another class of Scriptures teach that He was in the world on a mission for another. Take these: "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." Put the emphasis on the word "sent." Again, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him, might not perish," etc. The emphatic word here is "gave." "He that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me." The Bible places tremendous stress on the "oughtness" of hu-

man redemption. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?" Paul to the Thessalonians argued thus, "And Paul, as his manner (habit) was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that Christ *must needs* have suffered." To the Hebrews he said, "It was therefore *necessary* that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these," etc. The argument is that, whoever executed the Divine plan of human redemption must lead just such a life and die such a death as did Jesus of Nazareth. Paul says He worked to certain heavenly plans. He is under moral constraint to say and do certain things. "It behooved Him." This necessity is the outgrowth of several considerations.

1. God had promised just such a plan should be executed for human salvation. Though not in the slightest degree responsible for man's fall and degradation, He was moved with sympathy for him, and through kindness puts Himself under obligation by promise to save him from the execution of threatened wrath. And having promised the race a Saviour, He dooms His Son to a life of trial and a death of ignominy. In the gift of Christ He makes good every pledge.

2. The shedding of blood was made a necessity to the perfection and efficiency of the plan. This is the second reason why it "behooved" Him to suffer. Plainly it is written, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." Said Jesus, at the institution of the Supper, "For this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Paul to the Hebrews says, "When He had by Himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." The life and suffering of Jesus must be in certain manner, measure, and spirit to meet the demands of the Divine veracity. *Thus* and *thus* it is written of Him.

But it behooved Him also "to suffer."

The manner and measure of His sufferings are to be considered in order to ascertain His fitness as an Exemplar. We inquire whether He fulfills all the conditions of our Archetype. Bear in mind that He suffers as it is written of Him. As in words and miracles of life, so in the sufferings of death, there is conformity to prophecy. He does not choose either the manner or measure of His sufferings. When we come to analyze these sufferings by their natural divisions, we shall find their exact conformity to what was written of Him. Read carefully the prophecies and then the record of fulfilment, and you will see the precise correspondence. Take, for illustration Isa. liii.; Ps. xxii. 6, 7; Dan. ix. 24-27; Ps. xxii., and then compare the accounts given by the four evangelists.

The seemingly small omission of the rule to break the bones of the legs of malefactors, in order to hasten death, in the case of Christ, is matter of prophecy. Read Ex. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12, and Ps. xxxiv. 20. To the very minutiae the words of these prophets are fulfilled in His sufferings. So, often, you read that this and that was done "that it might be fulfilled."

But let us examine the account of these sufferings by their natural divisions and compare Scripture with event. They were in two main divisions—physical and mental.

In the latter must be included much that seems to belong to a higher realm. We must, therefore, give very large scope to our ideas and definitions.

And, first, as to physical suffering. What does it include? What does it amount to? How is it expressed? We answer: by hunger, by thirst, by fatigue, by actual pains from punishment inflicted. Were such as these actual experiences of the Son of man? To what degree did He suffer? The New Testament gives the answer. If, in anything required, He failed, then designate the failure. If He dodged any issue or evaded any possible suffering required by Divine promise, then we

yield our claim for Him and surrender Him as our Exemplar. Reading the accounts of His life, we fail to find any proof that in His body He did not "bear our stripes." "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him," etc. Looking at the human aspect of His sufferings we are compelled, with the poet, to exclaim :

O, Lamb of God!
Was ever pain, was ever love like thine?

Secondly. Let us consider his *mental* sufferings.

In what did they consist? How were they expressed? We answer: by being homeless; by being friendless; by being the subject of constant and unreasonable censure; by the most heartless and relentless persecution; by having His words perverted and His motives impugned; by being classed with the vilest impostors and denounced as a hypocrite; by being charged with consorting with harlots, publicans, and sinners; by being accused of being in league with Beelzebub, the prince of devils; by being arrested at the instance of a mob as a common thief and highwayman; by being tried without due process of law; by being accused of crimes of which He was absolutely innocent, and the truth of which they could not get a single witness that would not have been pronounced unworthy of belief in any court; by insult and indignity without number, and passing description; by a trial whose every form was a caricature on the semblance of justice; by the shameful insults offered Him during those five awful hours He was a prisoner; by the mockery of His sentence after thrice being pronounced innocent by the only competent authority to adjudge in such matters; by His betrayal at the hands of one of His trusted disciples; by the denial of Peter, another chosen disciple; and, finally, by His desertion on the part of every friend, leaving Him

helpless and unpitied in the hands of an unreasonable mob.

The higher realm of mental distress may have been touched by Him in the garden of Gethesemane when He said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Again He seems to have experienced an extraordinary degree of agony when on the cross He cried out, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

"Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer."

The Captain of our salvation was "made perfect through suffering." "Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." In Christ, therefore, we have the fulfilment of "all things which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms." He is our *Exemplar*.

What excuse can be framed for those who reject Him? Need we look for another? If we desire salvation will we likely find it in any other? "For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." He that rejects our Christ is truly "without God and without hope in the world."

Accept Him and make Him your model. Amen.

THE BEST OF ALL LEGACIES.

By T. D. WITHERSPOON, D.D., LL.D.
[PRESBYTERIAN], LOUISVILLE, KY.

And Elisha said, I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.—2 Kings ii. 9.

Two men are ascending one of the rugged slopes that leads up from the Jordan valley to the high table-lands of Gilead. The practical eye and steady step of the one in front tell of experience gained in his boyhood amid these rough hills. The younger man who follows, unaccustomed to such hard

climbing, would long since have yielded to the considerate entreaty of the elder, and have gone back, had not prophetic voices declared that his master should be "taken away from his head" that day. As we gather about the bedside from which one of our loved ones is about to be translated, and watch and linger, counting every moment of these last hours of intercourse more precious than rubies, so Elisha presses on with the "As the Lord liveth, and thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee," until the wind-cloud comes down and, unfolding, reveals the chariot, and Elijah is borne away. It is in that hallowed interval, on the borderland betwixt earth and heaven, that Elijah turns to his beloved disciple and says, "Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee?" Elijah is the man who has power with God. What shall his last great prayer for the young disciple be? Could any choice be more appropriate? As ever and anon we see the chariot descending to take some Elijah from among us, what prayer can come more appropriately to our lips? When we think of the generation of men and women who laid the foundations of Church and State in this country, and then of the present generation coming into their room, hard pressed, like Elisha, to keep pace with their hardy virtues, shall we not ask a double portion of their spirit? Notice that in Elisha's case, where the prayer was answered, Elisha was not transformed into another Elijah. The two men were cast in different moulds. Each had his own work to do. Each needed just the qualities he had. Elijah was a stern, rugged man, fitted for the clearing of forests and the opening of furrows. Elisha's was a mild nature, fitted for the gentler process of harrowing in the grain. A slavish copying of Elijah's methods would have been fatal to Elisha's work. It was not for the forms or methods, but for the spirit of Elijah that Elisha prayed.

I. The spirit of Elijah was one of imperturbable faith in God and in revealed

truth. The age in which he lived was one of religious vacillation. The multitude halted between the claims of Jehovah and those of Baal. They were not certain in which they believed. They were not certain of anything. Elijah's faith was clear, sharp cut, well defined. There was no doubt as to his position, no ambiguity as to his utterance. He was a firm and fast believer, a man of undoubting and unquestioning faith. So were the noble men who preceded us in high places of Church and State. They were men who believed in God and in revelation. They had no doubts about inspiration and no squeamishness about future punishment. But we are fallen upon times when it is fashionable to doubt, when the popular fad is to play the rôle of the agnostic, when it is a mark of independence and intellectual manhood to cavil at creeds and disavow orthodoxy. We need a double portion of the Elijah spirit that expresses itself in the words "As the Lord liveth before whom I stand."

II. It was a spirit not only of settled convictions, but of courage to avow and maintain them. Not Ahab, with all his power and insolence, can intimidate him. Single-handed he enters the lists against the four hundred and fifty priests of Baal, with all their princely retinue and prestige at the royal court. He builds his altar over against theirs. It is nothing to him that he is on the unpopular side. He is right—that is enough for him. This was also a characteristic of the great men into whose inheritance in Church and State we have come. If they had convictions, they were ready to avow them, to defend them, to suffer for them, to go through fire and sword in vindication of them. They were no trimmers, no timeservers, no weathervanes, showing ever the direction of the popular current. Great-souled men they were, just such as we need now—men who, if convinced that they are right, will stand up in the face of the whole world and glory in their convictions.

III. A spirit of incorruptible integrity and regard for the principles of honor. Elijah not only could not be intimidated, but he could not be bought. The highest honors and greatest emoluments of the kingdom would have been at his disposal, if he had been willing to sacrifice convictions and join in the orgies of the Baal-worship. The fascination and flattery of the modern Baal-worship are far more to be dreaded than the whip of its sarcasm or the crucifixion of its scorn. The men into whose places we have come had a jealous care of their reputation and a high sense of personal honor. They put character above all price. Honest in all their commercial relations, clean in all their business transactions, just and impartial in the administration of all public trusts, they were like Elijah at the court of Ahab, representatives of principle that is above price. Of such a spirit may a double portion descend upon us in this age when embezzlement and defalcations are about us on every hand.

IV. The spirit which underlay the two last named and gave them power was that of whole-hearted consecration. Elijah was a consecrated man. He had a work for God. He had come to do it. Everything was subordinate to it. How significant his oft-repeated adjuration, "As the Lord God liveth, before whom I stand!" His attitude was that of a servant standing to receive and execute God's command. His time, his talents, his labor, his influence—everything he recognized as in the service of God. Such were in large measure the men whose inheritance of civil and religious liberty we enjoy to-day. The times demand a double portion of this spirit of consecration. Our opportunities are greatly enlarged, our facilities wondrously increased. We want a host of consecrated men in every department of life and of labor. The pulpit needs them—men who will go forth in the spirit of Elijah, content with camel's-hair raiment, and willing to set up an altar over against that of every Baal-

worshipper, even though he be of Ahab's court. We need them in the pews—these consecrated men who will give freely of their time, their labor, their money, their influence to the Lord. We want consecrated men in our business houses, in our great moneyed corporations, in our halls of State and national legislation. As the gray-headed men and the venerable women pass from among us, and go up through the parted waters of the Jordan in the chariots of fire that await them on the other shore, may the Lord God of Elijah cause their mantles to fall upon the Elishas who are following them, and striving to keep close to their dear persons until the chariot descends. May a double portion of their spirit rest upon those to whom the great interests of Church and State are for all coming time to be committed.

THE SPIRIT OF YOUTH.

By A. H. BRADFORD, D.D. [CONGRESSIONALIST], MONTCLAIR, N. J.

The child shall die a hundred years old.

—Isa. lxxv. 20.

This declaration forms a part of the description of that happy period when God's people shall enjoy the work of their hands and each one dwell under his own fig-tree in peace. There is promised a practical annihilation of the line which divides youth and age. Youth shall be wise and age shall be ardent. The young will not regard the aged as fossils, and the aged will not look down on the young as heedless and unwise, but there will be mutual appreciation and regard. We are to study the spirit of youth in history and in the Church. But I do not forget the achievements of age; that the greatest preachers of to-day are over fifty years; that the greatest rulers are over sixty; that men like Ruskin and Gladstone have borne fruit in old age; that Bryant wrote his "Flood of Years" at eighty-two, and Longfellow his "Moriturus" near the end of his long and beautiful

life as a testimony to the possible accomplishments of age. Chaucer was sixty when he wrote "Canterbury Tales," and Goethe eighty when he finished "Faust." Thus the Gulf Stream of youth sometimes flows on to warm the Arctic seas of life's latest years. But we speak of youth.

Hope, enthusiasm, energy, and audacity are elemental forces in youth. These are all good. How dreary life would be if it really was as some view it in middle life, whose ideas are dull and monotonous, and who sneer at ardent youth as dreamers! Luther was audacious to burn the bull of the Pope. Cary was told to sit down when, a century ago and more, he proposed missionary endeavors for India. He was told that the Lord would, without his effort, convert the heathen in His own good time. Peter was audacious in saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men," and Paul in attempting to convert Europe, apparently single-handed.

Youth makes mistakes, but age magnifies difficulties.

Age regards that impossible which to youth presents the prospect of success. Most of the leaders of our American Revolution were under forty, and the same fact appears in European history, so that Disraeli was right in saying, "The history of heroes is the history of youth." So in art. Raphael died at thirty-seven, Keats at twenty-two, Shelley before thirty, and Professor Clifford at thirty-four. The time for action is the morning!

There is a fiery enthusiasm in youth. It is to be utilized. When steam is generated, do you open the valves and let it all escape for fear that the boiler will explode? Shall youth be confined in action because youth makes mistakes? The Church to-day shows the new activity of the spirit of youth. The Endeavor societies have stimulated its action as nothing else has during the century. Luther was but twenty-four when he denounced the Papal Church, and Calvin twenty-six when he wrote his great work, "The Institutes." So

with Wesley and Summerfield, who made themselves felt in early manhood. Robertson, of Brighton, died at thirty-four. Though preaching to but few, he has influenced the world by his broad and catholic views. Henry Martyn died at thirty-two, and Harriet Newell when hardly out of girlhood. We never tire telling over and over again the story of the four young men at Williams College who, by the haystack, begun conferences which issued in the formation of the American Board, or of the Bowdoin Band from Andover Seminary who buried themselves in what was then Western solitudes, planting the seeds of a Christian civilization where now some of them, old men, see populous cities growing year by year. Are youth blind? Oh, it is sometimes good to be blind to danger and difficulty, uninfluenced by discouragements, if only awake to the grandeur of the work and the promised alliance of God! I would not encourage self confidence or a zeal not according to knowledge, but it is well for us who are older to realize that as we soon shall leave the field there is behind us an army of those who have faith and hope, and who are better equipped, even, than we, and that these are to fill our places. Would it not be a source of rejoicing to us in battle to know that though we were to fall, millions were just behind us to reinforce us and to win the victory? It is true. From a purer heredity and from a Christian stock there is a generation coming upon the stage to do valiant work for Christ. From this review we infer,

I. The elder should not be jealous of the younger. They should not be critical and querulous. I have little respect for one who never made a mistake, "who never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one." It is pitiful to see a cynical spirit shown toward those who are coming to take our places. Better imitate the magnanimous temper of John—was there ever a grander example in all the world?—who said, as he saw the growing popu-

larity of the Master, "He must increase, I must decrease."

The coming generation must do their own thinking and make their own philosophies. We have had our own way. Let them have their liberty as well. Wisdom was not born with us. It will not die with us. God honors individuality. He makes faces unlike and minds unlike.

II. The Church should be alert to train youth to be equal to the demands of the age. Its offices of trust should not be wholly in the hands of old persons. Too often the earnest young man is coldly and loftily suppressed by his seniors in the Church. Let the young be educated by bearing responsibilities.

III. We remark that some people never seem to lose their youth. It is a lovely sight to see the youthful spirit strong at seventy. It is like seeing a river pouring its life through a desert. Such young old men move among their juniors with cheerful sympathy, participate in their plans and pleasures and hopes and aims. They do not talk of failure, but of the grand possibilities of life which they have found and which are still before the coming generation in larger limits. Some petulant lives, like a November blast, cut like a razor; but other aged men—far more in number—are bright and sweet as an October afternoon, full of the color and beauty of a brilliant sunset.

IV. We learn how to continue to be youthful. If linked to Christ, how can we be otherwise than glad and growing, hopeful and purposeful? A vital, vivid constant faith in God feeds enthusiasm with perpetual strength. Pessimism denies this constant, personal presence and help, therefore life is dark, its burdens heavy, and its mysteries baffling. Suffering often brings a deep, quiet joy. Shrink not from it. Moreover, we can cultivate this youthful spirit. We can compel ourselves to look on the bright side of things. "If the world is to be saved it is to be done by the optimists," said an acute Frenchman. They who believe that all things work

together for good to those who love God ought to be continually young.

In closing, let me ask each of you what are you doing? What do you read? Novels? Have you continued the studies you dropped when you left school? No? yet find time for tennis, tea-parties, concerts, theatres? Do you spend all you earn, and is your life growing leaner instead of larger every year? This is the case with too many of those who have great opportunities. We may pity them. We will rejoice to believe that a larger number remain true to their ideals and go forward to a glorious future.

On a monument in London to "Chinese Gordon" are these words, worthy to be written in letters of light and to be a guiding motto to all who realize the value of life and its responsibilities: "At all times and everywhere he gave his strength to the weak, his substance to the poor, his sympathy to the suffering, his heart to God!"

A FUNERAL SERMON.

BY REV. CHARLES M. SHEPHERD
[PRESBYTERIAN], EVANSTON, WYO.
TER.

All things are yours; . . . or life, or death.—1 Cor. iii. 22.

VICTOR HUGO said that the battle of Waterloo was a change of front of the universe. The believer may adapt his figure to illustrate the work of Christ in the soul. It makes all things new. It is a change of front of the universe. In nothing is this more manifest than in our ideas of death. What is the natural image? To the Hebrew, a pit engulfing the soul; to the Greek, a stroke of fate; to the barbarian, a spectre ravaging the world.

Turn now from these to the conception of our text. What a heaven of contrast! To Paul death has become the heritage, the servant of the soul.

This is indeed a transformation of thought. In what sense is it true?

I. In that death is to the Christian a

means unto the highest end. It does what he most desires to have done. Such is the thought of the text. Paul has been speaking of the temple of God. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" Then, referring to a special hindrance in the work of temple-building, he concludes with a category of helps. Splendid and puissant host! "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours." We may properly draw the inference that death is a constructive force in the kingdom of God. The connection forbids any other thought. Paul, Apollos, and Cephas help by counsel, by sympathy, by holy example. The world is full of the wisdom and goodness of God. Life is a series of opportunities, and death—death is no longer that Titan spectre blotting out the sun. He is an angel of kindly though solemn mien, with trowel and plummet, building up the temple of the Lord. Why weary you with reasons? It is a matter of experience. Some of you can testify to the work of the angel of death in your own souls. Some of you can say, "I entered the valley of the shadow of death one man; I came out another."

Now were there but one in the world, he would be a marked man. He would be an exception to a general law of mind. But it is the experience not of one, but of multitudes.

II. Again, the assertion of the text is true in the sense that death is a revelation of spiritual values and a converter of the lower into the higher. May we not refer to your present experience for illustration? Your eyes have heretofore been filled with things seen. Your hearts have been laden with anxious cares. The King and His beauty have indeed been afar off, on the very horizon of your thoughts. But now, in a moment, all has been changed. The things your hearts have been set upon are as stubble. The things not seen,

truth and love, God and life eternal, are as the sun and stars to some lonely watcher on the desert. What has wrought this change? The touch of death. He has lifted a cloud. You are now contrasting the things of time and the realities of the celestial world. That such impressions are fleeting, that in some cases they never recur, makes nothing against their truth. Rarity and transientness are notes of ultimate values. Only twice have mortals been translated to heaven. Only once, an instant in the world's long day, did God walk in the flesh. Yet these are really glimpses of the inner, eternal order. But these impressions are wrought most commonly by death. One may lose wealth, fame, health, or happiness. His thoughts will range the world in quest of them. Let death take away his treasure, his imagination must follow it to the unseen universe. If he seeks it, he must seek it there. And yet we believe that the things seen have a value. They are the work of God. They are the body of the mortal life. The truth is, they have the value of means. In their present shape they are uncurrent coin in heaven. They must be exchanged. We recall Jesus' incomparable teaching of the treasure laid up in heaven. We remember His estimation of the widow's mite. Nature affords analogies. The seed becomes the flower, the rough friction of the electric engine passes into light. God's government is full of suggestions touching the transition of the lower into the higher. Used after a godly fashion, your wealth, talent, strength, or beauty takes on its spiritual form. And death is a most potent instrument of conversion.

Is it not so? I went into the chamber of death with the conception of God as the universal ruler, the Almighty One. I came out looking up and saying, "Abba, Father!" I entered thinking, "Some of self and some of Thee." I came out confessing, "None of self and all of Thee." How literally, too, may some of you inter-

pret this transforming office of death! You have lost a husband, father, child, or friend. You have gained a deathless spirit, a ministering angel, a pillar in the temple of your God. You may not see these things just now, but your vision will clear; the time will come when you can say, "Death has been to me a servant and a minister."

III. Finally the text is true in the sense that death is one of the modes in which Jesus manifests Himself. It is a law of the lower life, an element in the travail of the soul, that God's ways should have a fearful aspect. "Clouds and darkness are round about him." "He rode upon a cherub and did fly." We have a type in the cloud of Israel. To them it was light, guidance, comfort, strength. To their foes it was gloom, discomfort, and terror.

To God's people, in rebellion and apostasy, it wore its face of wrath. Yet its essential import was ever the same—the holiness and truth of God. Here, again, we have an idea that pervades the universe. The march of creation is through convulsion and pain. The progress of society is along the line of struggle, war, and outward failure. The highest form of the truth is seen in the spiritual world. The darkest hour of the kingdom of God was that when Jesus hung upon the cross. Then night and chaos seemed about to swallow up the world again. Yet from that darkness broke the Easter dawn. And that is the type. The inner side of the heavenly life is a thing of faith.

This thought is uppermost in the representation of death as the coming of the Lord. Oh mourning heart, can you not receive the solace of the thought? That was no unfriendly presence in your home. It was the Lord.

Shall he not do that which seemeth good to Him? His dark mantle has cast a shadow over your life. Turn, like the afflicted soul of old, and touch its hem. He will look upon you. He will not hold His peace at your tears. The healing impulse of His love will penetrate your inmost soul.

Wherefore comfort one another with these words, "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

THE WHEAT AND THE CHAFF.

By PROFESSOR J. B. THOMAS, D.D.
[BAPTIST], NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

What is the chaff to the wheat?—Jer. xxiii. 28.

SOME years ago I read a magazine article on "How Mr. Frye and I preached it," a flippant story of the confident criticisms which a young man made on a sermon he had heard. It well illustrated the readiness with which everybody, newspaper reporters and correspondents included, passes judgment on the motive and method of the preacher's work. People who never have preached think it is easy work. The critic of Ole Bull's instrumentation confessed that he had never learned to handle a violin, and many a critic of the sermon has no just conception of the aim of the ministry. But this is the one determining test of judgment. On this depends the justice and accuracy of our comments. The work of the minister is unique. It is needful for us to discriminate. God's Word does. The story of creation discriminates light from darkness, the sea from dry land. Further on, the clean and unclean are separated. Linen and woollen are not to be mixed, nor different seeds in sowing. In Christ's hand is a fan to purge or separate chaff and wheat. The contents of the Gospel net are to be separated; the wheat and tares, and at the judgment day the sheep and goats. So here we are to judge carefully and set over against the dream the truth, against the chaff the wheat. Look at these substances. As in other phenomena of nature, we find here the concealed thought of God. The chaff is blown away by the wind.

It is not vital and nourishing. It has no reproductive power. It is not undeveloped wheat. So with human speculations compared with Divine truth.

There are men who look forward to human perfection through the evolution of natural forces, a sifting out of error and evil, a development of the New Jerusalem from the Old. But good is not a product of evil, truth a resultant of error. "No lie is of the truth." The two are essentially antagonistic. God made man upright. Apostasy is quite a different thing from ignorance or immaturity. The false teachers alluded to in the text gave their own notions as God's truth, whereas the dreamer should tell his dream as such, and not pass it off as an authoritative utterance. The preacher has a peculiar function.

I. He is not a novelist. The writer of fiction gives his own views gotten of the world by observation. The minister is a bearer of a Divine message. The two are put not in comparison, but in contrast. "Ye are from beneath, I am from above," Christ said. The truth and impulse and guidance of the messenger of God are from above. The aspiration of a soul is not its inspiration, the fancies of men are not the truth of revelation. "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream." We hear a great deal about free thought. You get it in dreaming. Ideas are lawless and free, often incredible. "We are all pashas in sleep," as the Oriental proverb runs. The bankrupt dreams that he is rich again. How insane he would be if, on waking, he began to issue checks on his imaginary wealth! Indeed, what is insanity but a perpetual, waking dream! In sleep we are cut off from the control of fact. The reality of the outer world has no influence on us. The text implies that the dream has no basis in fact, but comes wholly from within, and therefore is not true.

The word of truth we preach is, on the other hand, the mind and will of

God. Christ said that He in the bosom of the Father had learned the message He brought down to earth. His disciples spoke with something of the same positiveness, "That which we have seen and handled, and our eyes have looked upon and our hands have handled of the word of life, Him, we declare unto you." What does the novelist bring to us? His own conceptions of truth, often distorted and generally buried in a mass of matter. It is a wonder to me in a world like this, and with time so scarce to study it, that people can patiently spend hours and days wading through hundreds of pages to find something that never happened; how they can wander about in an unreal land and weep artificial tears and get enthusiastic over that which brings no result to mankind. Such reading is not only a waste of time, but is positively injurious to the sensibilities. If the sewerage of the body or of a house be obstructed, the poison is fatal to health if not to life. If emotions be roused and spiritual secretions excited which are neglected and reabsorbed, the results are disastrous. One may witness scenes of fictitious distress in a play, and have the feelings excited for the moment, and come out of the theatre and push aside the pleading news-boy who seeks to sell his last paper, the heart being left as selfish as ever.

Again, the novelist aims to amuse. He often caricatures and takes unfair advantage of his position by putting people in abnormal relationships or attributing untrue motives. Religious novels almost always introduce incongruous elements, as in "Robert Elsmere." Theologians had better not write novels, and novelists better not meddle with theology. Let the shoemaker stick to his last. I have read in books of travel, ostensibly giving rehearsals of journeys, people, and places, open attacks on Christianity. We say it is unfair. So it is also unfair for the novelist to pervert facts in his effort to amuse. I do not condemn fiction indiscriminately. Sick people may be

diverted by it. Overtasked brain-workers may gain relief by occasional diversion, but in a world like this, so opulent in truth, a realm of inquiry so vast, is it wise to give much time to unrealities?

II. As the preacher's aim is not that of a novelist, so his aim and method are not those of a lecturer. Science deals with the finite and visible, but it cannot touch the infinite. No Babel can reach heaven and no human phenomena solve the mystery of God. Yet the dreams of science are often presented to us as the facts of God. Science thus violates the canons of self-restraint which it has established. We cannot push our way into this globe very far, for it is too hot. We cannot soar away into the limitless altitudes of space above it. We must stick to this planet where we are. So the tether of material science is too short to allow us to go beyond the seen and by our powers of analysis and synthesis fathom and explain the unseen. The lecturer can teach and the orator can delight, each confined to his own sphere, but the messenger of God has to do with sublimer themes and draws from higher sources.

III. Like the Master, the preacher speaks with authority. Some have said that men yielded to Christ's words because there was an instinctive response in their hearts to the truth of this message. They thus would belittle the greatness of that message from heaven He uttered. But men did not yield thus instinctively. "It is a hard saying; who can bear it?" was once replied; "Not so, Lord," at another time. "Ye will not believe," was Christ's own verdict. Even the disciples themselves were slow of heart to believe. The source of Christ's truth was celestial. He dealt in statements from out of the infinite and he pointed to miracles and prophecies as credentials.

So Paul spoke not in his own name, but as an ambassador of God put in trust with the Gospel; not as pleasing men, but God, who trieth the heart.

He did not deal in dreams and evolve his message from his own consciousness. Neither did men teach him his message. He spoke what he received from God, therefore it was infallible, therefore it was mandatory. The sermon is not a novel, not a lecture, but a message from heaven, from out of the land of truth, dealing in verities which will be proven when we reach the other side. Science itself teaches us to distrust our own uncorrected sense perceptions. We also find that our logical faculties are often uncertain, therefore our conclusions are not positive. As the school-boy has a sponge tied to his slate to erase computations made one hour to be crowded aside by others made the next, so human science is constantly setting aside previous conclusions and adopting new ones. The text-books of fifty years ago are almost useless now. But the word of the Lord endureth forever. The Divine utterances do not pass away as the clouds melt in the sky or as the fallible and fickle powers of man fail, but they are abiding and eternal.

Finally, the preacher is not to give the dreams and chaff of fiction, nor the fine sentences of the orator, and trust in eloquence of speech, but he is to put self out of sight and aim to burn the thoughts of God into the hearts of men, that they may carry away not some gem of rhetoric or words of worldly wisdom, but the truth which the Holy Spirit will bless to the salvation and sanctification of the soul. "Preach the WORD!" is the command. We are not to add to it or to diminish it. We are not to present the excellency of speech and the graces of oratory, but determine not to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified, even the Galilean peasant who hung on the vulgar cross, between two malefactors. Away with dreams and chaff, the straining after effect and the winning of human applause. Listen to what the Lord said to Moses. "What is that in thine hand?" Nothing but a stick, a simple acacia rod used to guide or pro-

teet his sheep, perhaps. Yet that simple, homely stick has its place in the history of the world. It becomes a serpent, then a stick again. Lifted up, it instrumentally brings bane or blessing. So the plain, simple word in the preacher's lips, a commonplace and familiar truth it may be, with the blessing of God will be a fruitful seed from which a precious harvest comes, in which the sower and the reaper shall together rejoice.

What God hath put asunder let not man join together. Let us not confuse the simplicity of the Gospel by mingling with it the dreary speculations of men, the chaff that comes from worldly, unsanctified hearts. "He that hath My word, let him speak My word faithfully." Remember also the solemn responsibility of those who listen. "Take heed how ye hear," for "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"

FOR THE PRIZE.

The Fruits of Christian Hope.

Now our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.—2 Thess. ii. 16-17.

Most affecting is the description of the pitiable condition of the ungodly as "having no hope, and without God in the world." Every man cherishes some kind of hope, but "the hope of the righteous shall be gladness, while the expectation of the wicked shall perish." The latter looks to transient things, the former to eternal; the one is based on the fluctuating and false, the other on the immutable and true (Rom. iv. 19-21). The hopefulness of the sinner is a natural emotion which grows weaker with age; that of the saint, a supernatural grace which shines more and more unto the perfect day.

Such a hope : I. *Establishes us in our spiritual life.* We lay hold upon it "as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast." Our soul is a ship tossed upon the stormy waters of life; but though the winds howl around her, and the waves swell high and beat against her, she is not driven from her moorings. Her anchor is not embedded in the loose sands of vain human philosophy or fickle sentimentalism, but

is fastened upon the eternal "rock of salvation."

The hope of salvation is also a "helmet" which protects our most vital and vulnerable parts from the assaults of spiritual foes, and so gives us confidence, strength, and courage.

II. *Mainspring of spiritual activity* (Heb. vi. 11-19). As in a ship firmly moored the sailors may attend to their duties without minding the storm, even so the soul which is restfully and happily assured of salvation does not expend its energy in anxious thought, but in profitable exercise. Moreover, hope incites to activity by realizing to our minds the reward (1 Cor. xv. 58).

III. *It produces patience, comfort, and joy in affliction.* "We are saved by (in) hope;" live in an atmosphere of eager and confident anticipation that buoys us up under the burdens of a sinful and sorrowful life (Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 16-18). "Hoping for that we see not, we do with patience wait for it." We are "patient in tribulation," because "rejoicing in hope."

IV. *It purifies us* (2 Cor. vii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 4; Titus ii. 12, 13). As the face of the moon turned toward the sun reflects its light and beauty; as the upturned leaf and flower catch the dews and absorb the light and warmth of heaven; so does the heaven-aspiring soul drink in God's grace and reflect His glory (1 John iii. 1-3). If we were sum-

moned to attend upon a king, we would procure the court costume, learn its etiquette, and study to adapt ourselves to the disposition and habits of our lord : and shall not we, who are heirs of the kingdom of heaven, strive to adapt ourselves now to our Divine and celestial relations ; become " meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" ?

V. *It cultivates a heavenly minded disposition* (Heb. xi. 13-16). " Thus Moses disdained the pomp of Pharaoh's court, and the pleasures of sin, and the treasures of Egypt, for he had respect unto the recompense of a higher reward, and endured the wrath of the king, as seeing him who is invisible" (Col. iii. 1-4).

ALETHES.

Backsliders in Heart.

The backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways.—Prov. xiv. 14.

THE bell-buoy must ring out over the rock all the time because the rock is there all the time. The reason the Bible warns so much about backsliding is because we are always in danger of backsliding.

A disease may be eating our life away ; our ship in the fog may be drifting upon a rocky coast. We are only in the greater danger if not aware of it. Backsliding begins unexpectedly : like a dangerous disease, it steals into our system so secretly that utmost vigilance is necessary lest we be taken unawares.

Knowledge of the nature, manner, causes, results of the evil should prove substantial help toward its avoidance.

I. Let us know, first, that backsliding begins in the HEART.

The leaves of a fruit-tree begin to fade, curl up, and wither ; no fulness of life, no fruit. You suspect a worm at the heart—something gnawing at the seat of life—the heart. Men fall as trees do—after gradual decay at the heart. " Keep thy heart with all diligence," etc. (Prov. iv. 23 ; Hosea x. 2).

II. Well to remember, also, *that a backslider in heart is not always a backslider in life*. Indeed, he is often a zealous worker in external things ; shows honest pride in all church success, as fine buildings large congregations, good choir—the " temporalities." Also keeps up the forms of personal and public Christian duty faithfully, etc. But the form without the power (2 Tim. iii. 5). Rich—poor (Rev. iii. 17).

III. Note, also, *some of the signs or indications of having backslidden*. For the backslider in heart may not be conscious of his own backsliding. Came upon him so quietly he did not know it ; just as one never is conscious of going to sleep. Some signs are

1. Loss of relish for private devotions. He may keep them up, but does not enjoy them as formerly (John xv. 9).

2. Loss of interest in God's Word. He may continue to read, but not to love as before (Ps. cxix. 11, 97).

3. Thinking lightly of sin. He is inclined to excuse or belittle it, and shows a lack of tenderness of conscience. Alarming symptom ! (Sol. Song ii. 5 ; Gen. xix. 20).

4. Loss of zeal in spiritual work. He does no soul-winning work, and shows no enthusiasm, warmth, or " close" personal interest and effort (2 Tim. iv. 2).

IV. Again, consider *what are some of the causes of backsliding*.

1. Getting off guard. Unwatched avenues of approach (Mark xiv. 38).

2. Love of the world. When the world is in, Christ is out (1 John ii. 15).

3. The habitual neglect of a single known duty (Jonah i. 1-3).

4. The habitual indulgence of a single known sin. Compromising ; sparing the little one, etc. (2 Sam. xii. 7).

V. Lastly, bear in mind *some of the results of backsliding in heart*. " Shall be filled with his own ways." Not God's ways for His followers.

1. With ways of *doubt*. Backsliding in heart how often doubt begins (Ps. lxxiii. 11).

2. Ways of *fault-finding*. Everything

looks weary because the heart is wrong (Ex. xvi. 2, 3).

3. Ways of *alienation*. Forsaking the Saviour and His service (Mal. iii. 13-15).

4. Ways of *despair*. Saddest human condition (1 Sam. xxviii. 6, 15).

Are you conscious of having back-slidden even the least?

Return! Return! (Mal. iii. 7-10).

EVANGELIST.

The Resurrection Body.

How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?—1 Cor. xv. 35.

The apostle, after proving the fact of the resurrection, goes on to illustrate its nature.

I. *It will be the same body*. Our "mortal body" will be "quickenened," "raised," "come forth." It will be a "resurrection," not a new creation. Christ's resurrection is the proof and illustration of ours. "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself." The dissolution of the body is no objection. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die;" the death of the body, like that of seed, is not annihilation, but disorganization in order to reorganization.

II. *Wonderfully changed*. "We shall all be changed" (1 John iii. 2; Phil. iii. 21).

III. *Glorified*. "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory." Our earthy bodies will crystallize into wondrous forms of beauty; the worm will be transformed into the butterfly, we shall exchange the glory of the terrestrial for the glory of the celestial. We have an illustration in the transfiguration of Jesus; His face, that careworn "marred countenance" "did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light." Even here the sanctified soul transforms and beautifies the form and countenance. There is perfect holiness; we "shall shine as the brightness of the

firmament, and as the stars forever and ever."

IV. "*Raised in power*." Our senses will be intensified and possibly multiplied. The higher the scale of animal life, the more perfect the differentiation of organs and faculties. May not man's higher development endow him with more perfect and even new faculties? At any rate, all imperfection will be removed. "Then the eyes of the blind will be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped," etc. There will be no weakness and pain arising from unsatisfied physical desires. "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more," etc.; "no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying." Different conditions of locomotion; how long did it take Enoch and Elijah to reach heaven? Glorious possibilities of enjoyment.

"Go wing thy flight from star to star, etc.
Take all the pleasures of all the spheres."

V. "*Sown a natural, raised a spiritual body*:" $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, principle of animal life; $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, rational and immortal principle. "Natural body," carnal, conformed to animal nature; "spiritual body," one conformed to higher attributes and life of soul. The "natural body" is earthy, gross, weak, falling, and destructible, like the principle of animal life. The "spiritual body" will be heavenly, ethereal, strong, incorruptible, and immortal, like the rational and spiritual nature tabernacled within it. This glorification of the body is due to its interest in the covenant of grace. "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly;" as we were given bodies adapted to the more animal nature of the first Adam, so shall our redeemed bodies correspond with the glorified spiritual nature of the second Adam. See Phil. iii. 21, "Christ shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto the body of His own glory." Even now the spiritual pervades, transforms, and sometimes almost glorifies the physical.

Ego.

Communion Sermon.

And He went away again the second time, and prayed, O My Father, if this cup may not pass from Me, except I drink it, Thy will be done.—Matt. xxvi. 42.

THE scene of our text is too tender for a cold, critical study. By its very nature it repels the merely curious and abashes the unbelieving questioner. We are lost in these deep shadows of Gethsemane to everything but our suffering Saviour. The inexpressible sadness of the moment, its pathos of experience, its deep-buried ends of self, its lofty purposes of submission in face of unutterable agony, all this overwhelms the believer, and he gazes in the silence of his own tears at the incidents of the moment. It stands the most critical moment in the history of the plan of our salvation.

I. *It was a moment of painful isolation.*

In all the crises of grief the heart is inapproachable. Words of sympathy, expressions of condolence are short-armed to relieve the pressure of agony. But the isolation of the human heart, under the sorest stress of grief, cannot compare for a moment with the absolute and limitless solitude under which our Saviour lies prostrate and prays. None of the twelve could enter the shadow with Him. Unreached by human sympathy, untouched by Divine intervention, alone in the pathway He cries from out of the depths of Gethsemane to His Father.

II. *It was a moment of mixed experiences!*

Earthly tremors shook the heart in which was lodged a heavenly determination. The flesh quivering with agony sounds a retreat, but His heroic soul marched on through pain and suffering to victory. There was fear and shrinking, but not the shadow of an idea of leaving the path. The human steps faltered, but never paused. It was for this that He came into the world. He knew the climax of His mission to be

death, and yet it wrung from His heart this pathetic prayer

III. *It was a moment of agonizing but willing submission to God.*

"Thy will be done" never came out from beneath such a load of dark and dreadful providences. The submission measured by the weight under which the soul willingly bowed was perfectly sublime. Before it our mind stands bewildered. The victory bought at the total sacrifice of self, by a surrender to shame, was great beyond comparison. The triumph was subjective, but such as the world never saw. Out of the shadows Christ emerged strong and equipped for the crowning struggle in the plan of salvation. Determination, perseverance, and perfect submission were the attributes of His love from this moment on till He expires on the cross. He halts in His pilgrimage at Gethsemane, but to show us deeper truth concerning the suffering He bore for us and the bitterness of the cup of death He drained, that we might taste the sweetness of life. CHALMERS.

STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS

LET no enthusiasm for humanity, no vague wild desire for human progress, no passion for fame, even of the noblest sort, lead you into places where you do not belong. As you reverence your own mind, as you would save it, if you know how, from the blighting touch of those who do not know and cannot teach, so do you beware of defacing another soul by a careless or a selfish touch. As you reverence the Divine possibilities within your own soul, so I entreat you bow yourselves humbly in the presence of these possibilities in others. Put from you all arrogance and affectation, all spurious humility, every form of vain and foolish show. Be content to do the thing you can do, doing it always with your might. Then every increase of your personal power will be an addition to the public wealth, then the progressive perfection of your own life will be a benefaction to your fellow-men.—*Little.*

INSPIRATION is the co-operation of the Spirit of God with the spirit of men in such a degree as to produce and preserve in terms of human speech an accurate record of such doings and sayings of God and of man, and in such proportions as the Holy Spirit deemed necessary to show the various lines along which the kingdom of God among men was to be builded; to show the human and Divine elements out of which He is to build it; to show the varied stages of its progress and growth, and to show its final and glorious consummation.—*Wood.*

Look at the common soldier. We know that

most frequently the ranks are recruited, not from the sober, industrious, self-respecting members of the community, but from the thriftless and ne'er-do-well, the improvident and idle, the loungers at our street corners, the frequenters of our public-houses. Well, but bring order and discipline to bear upon these men; instil into them devotion to duty; inspire some higher and nobler sentiment than love of pleasure into their lives, as, for instance, a pride in their regiment, attachment to their flag, a love of their country's honor, and lo! what a transformation is wrought! what incredible hardships will these men endure without a murmur; of what deeds of valor are they not capable; how fearlessly will they face wounds and death.—*Mackay*.

We must not forget that there are moral slums in regions where there is no such excuse as must be made in Whitechapel; there are candidates for the abyss in the avenues and squares; there are those who are now contracting the accursed habit of drink, and those who are beginning the still more accursed and shameful ways of licentiousness, who bid fair, in ten or twenty years' time, to be in as pitiable a condition as the vilest wretches in "Darkest England" are to-day. The Church has quite as important a work to do with respectable as with disreputable sinners; as much responsibility for the character of the upper ten as for the condition of the submerged tenth. Those higher up have less need of philanthropic exertions; but they have just as much need of saving grace.—*Gibson*.

He who plants a tree does well; he who fells and saws it into planks does well; he who makes a bench of the planks does well; he who, sitting on the bench, teaches a child, does better than the rest.—*Farrar*.

I HEARD for almost an entire day the great master Remenyi draw his wondrous bow upon the obedient strings of his violin; I saw the little company who gathered round played upon by his genius as some mighty orator brings to the features of his hearers the outward sign of secret thought or passion; I watched the most noted unbeliever in the world until the melody began to quiver at the great and overflowing heart of Robert Ingersoll, and as the big tears fell from the eyes which had so often blushed a withering scorn, I felt, as never before, the majesty of music as a gift immortal to the race. . . . Ay! forget not the mission of those of whom Longfellow writes:

"God sent His singers upon earth,
With songs of sadness and of mirth,
That they might touch the hearts of men,
And bring them back to heaven again."

Let all who sing remember how high and holy is their mission. Pure hearts and pure voices are sources of redemption to many a blasted and ruined life. "Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee"—how the lines melt to the tenderness of the Infinite Love! Wedded to appropriate melody and sung by him whose soul is filled with a joyous sense of the Divine Presence in forgiveness, these words become the hallowed prayer of a worshipful people. So with hundreds of the grand old hymns of the Church.—*Root*.

THERE are those who never think of God, or feel that He is near them, except when some terrible calamity occurs, or when the thunders roar and the lightning fires make them tremble. And if at any time these people felt impelled to utter the words, "O God, Thou visitest the earth," it would be when something appalling was taking place; when the pestilence was walking in darkness, and the arrows of death were darting about swift and thick. We can thus see what such men think of God. . . . To them God ever wears a robe of terror and a face of severity and gloom; and when they see earth or air, heaven

or sea assuming such aspects as these, then and only then can they say tremblingly, "God is come." Not so the Psalmist. It was earth's Spring-time, when he could especially see that God was here, and when everywhere was brightness and beauty, and reviving life.—*Clarke*.

MAN is like a palm-tree grown under Northern skies, stunted and dwarfed and misshapen because the bright sunlight and gentle air which are necessary to its right development are wanting, and yet having in itself that which, under favorable circumstances, would have made it a miracle of gracefulness and beauty. He is like the diamond or other precious stone in its rough shape, with nothing attractive about it, duller than a piece of common glass, and yet of such a texture that when polished and cut into a hundred facets it becomes the key to the treasury of the sunbeam, and breaks it up into all the colors of the rainbow. Or he is as the marble in the quarry; in its natural condition there is no beauty that we should desire it; but let it be cut and polished and chiselled, bring to bear on it the labor of the artisan and the knowledge of the builder, the skill of the architect, and the genius of the sculptor, and such artistic miracles as Milan Cathedral or the Venus of Milo may be the result.—*Mackay*.

In man, as soon as the instinct of civilization touches him, as soon, that is, as his proper manhood begins to work, there appears a power of raising his demands upon life, a power of progressive desire, which uses the satisfaction of the immediate and necessary needs only as a vantage ground from which to extend the range and the variety of his wants. Each fresh rise in the satisfaction does but increase and intensify the capacity of desiring, and the higher the level reached, the wider, the richer, the more illimitable the possibilities that open out above, about, beneath him. Each satisfaction renders him, therefore, less and less satisfied, it does but whet his ambition; his restlessness, his movement, his progress do but grow more urgent, and in this very urgency, in this very necessity for unceasing advance, lies his work, his life, his joy, his fulfillment. This is civilization.—*Holland*.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. God's Inheritance in the Saints. "That ye may know what is the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints."—Eph. 1, 18. Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Manchester, Eng.
2. The Intercession of Abraham. "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I do; seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him?" etc.—Gen. xviii, 17-33. Rev. John Smith, Northfield, Mass.
3. The Commercial Value of Christianity. "So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," etc.—Rom. 1, 15-20. George P. Hays, D.D., Kansas City, Kan.
4. The Sheepfold of God. "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; they also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."—John x, 16. R. Heber Newton, D.D., New York City.
5. "Me First." "And Elijah said unto her, Fear not; go and do as thou hast said; but

- make me thereof a little cake first, and bring it unto me, and after make for thee and for thy son."—1 Kings xvii. 13. Rev. John McNeill, London, Eng.
6. The Character of the Apostles. "Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him."—Matt. x. 2-4. Prof. R. E. Thompson, Northfield, Mass.
 7. The Gift of Life. "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."—John x. 10. Rev. T. F. Caskey, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 8. What the Pilgrim Fathers Believed. "Whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and forever."—Heb. xiii. 7, 8. E. P. Goodwin, D.D., London, Eng.
 9. Profession not Religion. "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me ye that work iniquity."—Matt. vii. 22, 23. Rev. W. G. Thrall, Williamsport, Pa.
 10. The Watchful Christian. "The wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps."—Matt. xxv. 4. W. F. V. Bartlett, D.D., Lexington, Ky.
 11. The Survival of the Weak. "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves."—Rom. xv. 1. D. Schley Schaff, D.D., Jacksonville, Ill.
 3. Labor and its Rewards. ("What profit hath a man of all his labor which he taketh under the sun?"—Ecc. 1, 3.)
 4. Vacation Observations. ("And he came to Nazareth where he had been brought up; and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day."—Luke iv. 16.)
 5. God and the Distribution of Land. ("All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever."—Gen. xiii. 15.)
 6. The Assertiveness and Exclusiveness of Faith. ("Though we, or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema."—Gal. i. 8.)
 7. Business Integrity. ("If thou sell aught unto thy neighbor, or buy of thy neighbor's hand, ye shall not wrong one another."—Lev. xxv. 14.)
 8. The Family Name. ("And I saw, and behold, the Lamb standing on the Mount Zion, and with him a hundred and forty and four thousand, having his name, and the name of his Father, written on their foreheads."—Rev. xiv. 1.)
 9. Breakers Ahead. ("These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts when they feast with you."—Jude 12.)
 10. Uninterrupted Consecration. ("Fire shall be kept burning on the altar continually; it shall not go out."—Lev. vi. 13.)
 11. Life for a Prayer. ("If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death."—1 John v. 16.)
 12. The True Source of Supplies. ("And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh; as it is said to this day. In the mount of the Lord, it shall be provided."—Gen. xxii. 14.)
 13. The Successful Forester. ("Thus saith the Lord God: I will also take of the lofty top of the cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the topmost of his young twigs a tender one, and I will plant it upon a high mountain and eminent; in the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it; and it shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar; and under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing."—Ezek. xvi. 22, 23.)
 14. Self-Condensation. ("It is not lawful for us to put any man to death."—John xviii. 31; "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."—Acts vii. 59.)

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. God and Race Development. ("I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered."—Gen. xiii. 16.)
2. Restitution as a Condition of Pardon. ("If any one . . . deal falsely with his neighbor in a matter of deposit or of bargain, . . . then it shall be, if he hath sinned and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took, . . . he shall even restore it in full, and shall add the fifth part more thereto; . . . and he shall be forgiven."—Lev. vi. 2-7.)

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

WE present first two companion themes:

A Warning for the Times.

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.—2 Tim. iii. 1.

NOTE here: 1. The nature of the

warning. It is not directed against the peril of open and violent antagonism on the part of Jew and Gentile, but rather against false teaching and practice corrupting the very church life itself.

2. The compass of the warning. Every command of the decalogue is compre-

headed. Self, money, and pleasure are the idols; God's name and day are to be disregarded by unthankful, unholy blasphemers; parents to be dishonored by disobedient children; fierce, incontinent, truce-breaking, false-accusing, and covetous men will trample on the laws that guard life, family purity, property, etc.

3. The *progress* of the warning. It begins and ends with selfishness, that root and source of all sins. But selfishness is here shown to lead to worldliness, formalism, rationalism, lawlessness, and general apostasy.

A Remedy for all Times.

But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and been assured of, etc.—2 Tim. iii. 14-17.

HERE is the preventive of all apostasy, and the secret of continuance. We must begin with the child. (1) A holy heredity (i. 5). (2) A holy training in the Scriptures. In seeking for ourselves and our children a complete education, not the wisdom of this world, that comes to naught, but the wisdom which is unto salvation is all important; for in the dread ordeal by fire, the gold, silver, and precious stones will perish as well as the wood, hay, and stubble, and only the living stones of the spiritual house survive.

The rendering of the Authorized Version is, in our humble judgment, much to be preferred to that of the Revised Version. The Greek reads without any verb—"All scripture God-inbreathed and profitable." To introduce the verb between two adjectives connected by the conjunction "and" is a violation of grammatical usage. In two other cases where this structure is found, the translators introduce the verb just where in the old version it stood—immediately after the nominative or predicate. Compare 1 Tim. iv. 4 and Hebrews iv. 13. If we are to read, "Every scripture, inspired of God, is also profitable," why not also, "Every good creature of God

is also not to be rejected," and "All naked things are also opened"? This passage teaches not only the inspiration of every sacred writing, but also its holy uses: for doctrine or teaching, for reproof or moral rebuke, for correction or reconstruction of character, and for training or complete instruction. The effect is that the man of God who properly uses the Book of God is not only kept from apostasy, but fully furnished for all good works. He is completely clad, not only in the defensive armor, but grasps the offensive weapon, the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.

A Funeral Sermon.

We spend our years as a tale that is told.
—Psalm xc. 9.

THE last three words are in italics, and are supplied. It is doubtful whether they add anything to the inspired thought. A tale is something that narrates in a few moments a story of events which may reach over many years. And this seems to be the conception of Moses. Human life is so brief in duration, and especially in retrospect, that it seems rather like a quickly recited tale than like the history of which it is the story—a *story*, not a *history*.

2. From this comes another and related thought. A tale is often fictitious; it deals in fancy rather than fact; and often what is founded on fact is mixed with fiction. Sometimes a story of a life reads like an unreal romance; and so we have a second suggestion. Life seems not only brief, but unreal. Its verities do not impress us; its responsibilities we do not weigh as we ought.

3. From this comes a third thought. Human life seems unimportant. We do not feel its awful value—its relations to the hereafter as the vestibule and the preparation for eternity. We live it as we hear a tale, with comparative indifference, and lo! it is gone, and we are gone with it.

A fine turn might now be made in

conclusion, showing the true *length of life*; it is long only when it answers the great end of life; it is real only as it works out eternal verities; it is valuable only as it serves God and man and fits us to enjoy God forever.

To put this theme in brief: 1. Life seems *brief*—more like a story than a history. 2. *Unreal*—more like a romance than a reality. 3. *Unimportant*—more like a trifle than a treasure.

"With Thee."

God's presence with the disciples is threefold. He goes before to lead the way; He goes beside to share the burden; He goes behind to follow up our work. His presence thus reached into the past, the present, and the future.

A Revival Sermon.

Acts iii. 19.

THE true reading is, "Repent ye, therefore, and be ye turned (to the Lord), that your sins may be blotted out, so that times of refreshing may come," etc. Of course, in primary application, this text is, as Alford and others make plain, dispensational. It refers to the connection of the repentance and conversion of the Jews with the final season of universal refreshing. The last great outpouring of the Spirit waits for the restoration of God's elect people to covenant allegiance and Divine favor (comp. Rom. xi. 15; Joel ii. 27, 28).

There is, however, a valuable suggestion here: that the repentance and turning to God of His professed but sinning people may be the indispensable condition of larger blessing upon mankind. Revivals may end with converting sinners, but they always begin with consecrating saints. The Holy Spirit needs believing souls who live in fellowship with God as the vessels and vehicles of His blessing to the rest of mankind. Hence a worldly and prayerless and in-

consistent church stands between God and the salvation of men, as surely as a holy and devout people become the channels of His grace to a dying world (comp. John vii.).

A Thanksgiving Sermon.

In everything give thanks.—1 Thess. v. 18.

NOTHING can be broader or more comprehensive than the expression *in everything*. It includes all things that enter into the experience of a believer.

1. All *external blessings*, whether temporal or spiritual, from the smallest of our daily comforts to the greatest of our redemptive mercies, every good gift is from above, and, therefore, demands grateful recognition and acknowledgment.

2. All *Divine discipline*, however antagonistic it be to our plans and feelings. It is God's loving chastening and correction. "Disappointments" may be viewed as "His appointments" (comp. Heb. xii. 1-10; John xv. 1-10).

3. All *future good*, yet unrealized, but appropriated by faith, and so enjoyed in advance and foretaste. Faith brings down to earth the days of heaven, and projects our lives into the future.

4. All *holy and grateful dispositions*, which enable us to recognize and realize our Father's hand and care.

"Nor is the least a thankful heart,
That tastes those gifts with joy."

As John Newton says, "Thanks-giving means thanks-living."

Suggestive Paragraphs.

IN Luke ix. 57-62 we have Christ's instructive dealing with three proposed followers: 1. The *ambitious self-seeker*, who obviously had some personal, perhaps temporal advantage in view, to whom Christ answered, "Foxes have holes," etc. If the Master had no temporal good for Himself to enjoy, He had none to confer on followers.

2. The *procrastinating time-server*, who sought an excuse for postponing an immediate duty, to whom Christ replies that not even for offices of filial love should the duty of following Him be delayed.

3. The *hesitating and half-hearted compromiser*, who was not ready to surrender all things, to whom the Master taught the needful lesson that His service admits no divided allegiance or affection. *Looking back means going back.*

In this same chapter, Luke ix. 33, 40, 45, we have three incapacities—speech without knowledge, action without power, and hearing without understanding. Also three wrong dispositions rebuked—verses 46–56—ambition to be greatest; intolerance in forbidding even exorcism, because the exorcists followed not with them; and vindictiveness, proposing to call down fire to consume men because they received not the Master.

HEGEL said there was only one thing his philosophy would not explain, and that was *Israel*. For ourselves we fail to find any explanation of this mystery of God's ancient people except the key given in Romans xi.

HEGEL also said that only one man beside himself understood his philosophy, and *he did not*. Much that professes to explain Scripture needs explanation. Sermons that deal in metaphysical subtleties and hair-splitting distinctions may gratify the preacher, but fail to edify the hearer.

UNDOUBTEDLY there will always remain mysteries in the Word of God; but while there are secret things that belong to Him, depths of His being which remain impenetrable because of His infinity, all the words of His law which belong to us and our children for the regulation of our daily life are ex-

plicit and apprehensible. To comprehend God would be to be His equal. The *mystery* of Scripture seals it as the handwriting of God; the simplicity of His law seals it as adapted to man. And if there be any mystery capable of apprehension, obedience to His law is the key to unlock it (comp. Deut. xxix. 29; John vii. 17).

ONE of the McAll workers in Paris was very much affected at finding a poor working woman, already in a dying condition, who had strayed into one of the *salles*, and there for the first time heard of Christ as the Good Shepherd of souls. She was trying to recall and put together in an intelligible shape the few hints she had picked up at that meeting (mere fragments of Gospel truth), and when she found one at her bedside who could give her the whole truth about this great Saviour her joy was so great that she forgot even the agonies of dying! And yet there are literally millions of souls in France hungering for just such a gospel.

WHEN Queen Victoria was crowned in Westminster Abbey, three presents were made to her: first, the Sword of State; second, the Imperial Robe; and, lastly, the Bible; these words accompanying the gift: "Our gracious queen, we present you with this book, the most valuable thing the world affords. Here is wisdom; this is the royal law; these are the timely oracles of God. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this book; that keep and do the things contained in it. For these are the words of eternal life, able to make you wise and happy in this world, nay, wise unto salvation, and so happy forevermore, through faith which is in Christ Jesus, to whom be glory forever. Amen." Words as true as they are beautiful!—and by no one have they been put to a fuller test than by the royal lady to whom they were addressed.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

OCTOBER 1-3.--HELPS TOWARD GETTING ON IN RELIGION.—Mark i. 35.

In our Scripture we get vision of the Great Model for the spiritual life nurturing His own spiritual life. Well for our spiritual life, and steadily ministering to its advance, will be, on our part, close copy of our Great Model.

Consider, first: our Scripture shows us the Master in *strenuous effort* toward the preservation and nurture of His spiritual life. Here appears the first help. We never find the Master resigning the nurture of His spiritual life to any time of leisure. We never find Him allowing the pressure of other duties to crowd that nurture out of its position of a supreme importance. How do these words, "And in the morning, rising up a great while before day," speak to us of stern effort! The day preceding had been sufficiently laborious. He had been preaching and teaching the good news of the kingdom. He had been spending Himself in helpful ministries. And when the night of the long day shut down, and the laborer left the fields to seek his home, and the kindly darkness began to ply its gracious dissuasions from toil—not with the kindly darkness did work cease for Jesus; for we read, "At even, when the sun was set, they brought unto Him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with demons; and all the city was gathered together at the door; and He healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many demons." In the largeness of your conception of Christ as Divine, do not forget His humanity, and suppose that He could toil thus through the long day and far into the night and not be weary. And yet, *very early in the morning*, long before the day had broken, we see Him casting sleep away and rousing Himself for effort toward spiritual culture. If the sinless Christ

needed such special and attentive effort here, how much more we, sinful.

Consider, second: our Scripture shows us the Master's *method* of spiritual culture. "And there *prayed*." Prayer was the Master's method. If determined effort is one help toward getting on in religion, prayer is another help. Notice, it was *beforehand* prayer. Prayer was the vestibule through which our Lord passed into the day's temptations and duties. Great saints have been wont to follow the Master in His seizure of this help of beforehand prayer. General Havelock would rise at four if the hour of marching was at six, rather than miss communion with God. Luther, in his busiest seasons, felt that praying time was never lost. When pressed with work he would say, "I have so much to do I cannot get on without three hours a day of praying." Said Sir Matthew Hale, "If I omit praying and reading God's Word in the morning, nothing goes well all day."

Consider, third: our Scripture shows us another help toward the nurture of the spiritual life the Master used—viz., the *solitary* place. Christians need the solitary place—the place of quiet loneliness with God. There is too little quiet in our time. It is full of whirr and stir. Men's hands are so crowded with things to do there is little time for thought how the things may be well done and religiously. Life goes at a constant run, and so gets tripped easily. Everything tends to outwardness, to clack and noise. "The Divine Spirit has gone into distance and strangeness from us, and is hard to reach; things just next the senses seem nearer to us than those which touch the soul; the crowd and noise are too constant, confusing our better perceptions, and leading us always to look around, seldom to look up; the glare of the lamps has destroyed the midnight and put out the

stars." But our Example teaches us that no life can get on well without the "solitary place." Here are the three helps toward getting on in religion: the sight of our Great Model our Scripture gives suggests—effort, beforehand prayer, meditative solitude.

OCTOBER 5-10.—THE EYES OF THE LORD—PROV. xv. 3.

"And we do fearfully live, as it were, out of God's atmosphere. We do not keep that continual consciousness of His reality which, I conceive, we ought to have, and which should make Him more manifest to our souls than the Shekinah was to the minds of the Israelites," thus wrote Dr. Arnold of Rugby; and I think no one of us can read the words and not feel they say a truth.

"Dare to be alone with God," wrote the true-hearted preacher, F. W. Robertson, to a friend. "Dare to be alone with God." Why should not the child gladly seek the Father's presence? Why should we shrink from intimacy with the infinitely pure and loving? Why should not the soul search for such communion, just as the leaf turns itself toward the light and prays for it? And yet any man who goes down into his own heart must feel that there is indeed needful a kind of moral bravery if he would shut himself alone with God.

The Indians of South America told the missionaries, "You say the God of the Christians knows everything, that nothing is hidden from Him; that He is everywhere and sees all that is done. But we do not desire a God so sharp-sighted; we choose to live with freedom in our woods, without having a perpetual observer over our heads." And the savages but said forth a feeling in which men civilized naturally share; for from purity conscious impurity slinks. Men may quarrel with the doctrine of depravity as they choose, but this instinctive hiding themselves from the eyes of the Lord is steady proof of the doctrine of a universal moral lapse.

Consider, men are always trying to put out the eyes of the Lord. By *atheism*—letting the bad, foolish heart tell the head there is no God, and trying to make the head accept the falsity. By *semi-panteism*—denying personality to God, calling Him "a stream of tendency." Simply a vague, impersonal "power not ourselves;" by trying to think of God in the ancient *epicurean* fashion, making Him but a huge and listless carelessness, as Thomas Carlyle so finely stigmatizes the notion, "an absentee God, sitting on the outside of His universe, and seeing it go;" by *identifying God with law*, hiding the thought and truth of God away in the muffling folds of natural law, and so imagining that they are somehow getting themselves out of God's real jurisdiction; by a *sensual carelessness of God*, living as though there were no God, though all the time His being and presence are theoretically confessed.

But yet, the eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good.

Therefore

(a) We, in our conscious sinfulness before their gaze, need *atonement* for our sin;

(b) And the readjustment with God the Holy Spirit works in us by *regeneration*,

(c) And the sweet consciousness of *forgiveness*;

(d) And so the *making possible the noble bravery* of welcoming His vision into our hearts and lives, that we may shun the evil and seize the good; and thus the living the true life only to be lived in "God's atmosphere."

OCTOBER 12-17.—OFFENDING IN ONE POINT.—JAMES ii. 10.

A law is the expression of the meaning of the law-making power. The Constitution of the United States is the declaration of the method by which the law-making power—the people of the United States—intends to govern. A law will be right and beneficent in the

proportion of the moral elevation of the power promulgating the law. A bad king, other things being equal, will promulgate bad laws. A community debased in moral tone will establish for itself correspondingly deteriorated laws. On the other hand, a supremely good governing power will express itself by law supremely good.

God is the governor of the universe, and God is the supremely good; therefore, the law which He has promulgated must be the expression of a nature infinitely good, and so must itself be infinitely good.

This infinitely good law of God is stated for us—in man's moral constitution; in the Ten Commandments; in the condensed universal formula for right living by the Lord Jesus, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul and strength and mind, and thy neighbor as thyself;" still further, this law of God is taken out of a merely cold and mechanical and dead statement and set before us and illustrated in the Living Person, Jesus Christ.

Our Scripture declares that though a man keep the whole of this law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. Why? Because, first, *of the essential unity of the Divine Lord*. The law of God is not made up of parts dissimilar in authority. You are under no less obligation to love your neighbor as yourself than to love God with your whole being. The sanctions sustaining either part of the law are just the same. The law of God is the expression of the one nature of God. Each particular of the law is equally holy with every other, and equally good with every other, and equally authoritative with every other. "For He that said, do not commit adultery, said also, do not kill; now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." The law of God is a complete circle. It makes little difference whether you break into the circle at what you call the top or bottom or on either side; if it be fractured anywhere it is broken. Here is some most precious statue, per-

fect save that it is broken as to its least finger. Is the statue whole? Is the unity of its beauty unimpaired? Is it not henceforth forever a broken thing? In some true sense do not features and feet and limbs and hands share in the damaged unity? Is it not really true that that broken finger, offending though only in that one point against the law of wholeness, is yet guilty of breaking the entire law of wholeness? That perfect statue is the law of God. God's law possesses in itself the majestic unity of perfection. It is the expression of the one perfect nature of Jehovah. Each least particular of it is essential to the unity and completeness of the whole. And if you break it in one particular you forever damage that law's oneness, and do, in most true sense, break it all, and so are guilty of it all. Profoundly true these words of Milton, "If the law allow sin it enters into a kind of covenant with sin, and if it do, there is not a greater sinner in the world than the law itself."

Because, second, that *disposition* which would break one point would, other things being equal, break any other point. "He who would, for sound religious reasons, keep one precept, would, from the same conscientious motive, abstain from breaking all the rest; and, on the other hand, he who would not for any religious reasons abstain from breaking one, has nothing within himself which would restrain him from breaking all the rest."

Because, third, *the sin in one point inevitably spreads into sin in other points*. A teacher chanced to put some money in his desk—a bill and a silver five-cent piece. The desk was open a little way. As the scholars were running about during recess, one of them saw the gleam of the silver. The teacher saw him stop and look at it. After he had run past two or three times, the boy thrust his hand slyly into the desk, seized the money, put it into his pocket. There the law was first broken at the point—thou shall not covet. Then the guiltiness at that point led on to the law's

infringement at another point—thou shalt not steal. The teacher had seen the boy take the money, but he wanted to give him a chance to be sorry and confess. So, before the school was done, the teacher told the scholars he had lost the money, talked to them of the sin of stealing, and then said he would wait after school, and the child who had done the wrong might own it and return the money. But the boy put on his cap and walked off just like the others—a further infringement of the law at another point—thou shalt not lie. The teacher rightly went to see the mother of the child. School had been out an hour and the child had not come home. "It is my rule for him to come straight home from school, and he knows it," the mother said—the first breaking of the law spreading into the breaking it in yet another point—obey your parents. At last the boy came in, his hands and face daubed with candy. "Where did you get it?" asked his mother. "John Smith gave it to me." Again is the law broken twice at the same point. Yes, only a child's story, but it tells the mighty fact that you cannot control sin; that breaking the law at one point, you will again at some other. Listen to Samuel Taylor Coleridge: "I used to think the text in St. James, that he who offends in one point offends in all, very harsh; but I now feel the awful, the tremendous truth of it. In the one crime of opium, what crime have I not made myself guilty of! Ingratitude to my Maker and to my benefactors; injustice and unnatural cruelty to my poor children; self-contempt for my repeated promise-breach; nay, too often actual falsehood."

And since all have sinned, not only in one point but in many, how desperate the need in all for the atoning Christ!

OCTOBER 19-24. — LIMITING THE HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL.—Psalm lxxviii. 41.

The old song of human doubt, or rather the old dirge.

Glance at the history of which the psalm makes mention. God's time had come, when the seed of Abraham should go forth to possess the land the faith of Abraham had consecrated. Through that magnificent gateway of miracle had the people passed and begun their journeying. Behind them Egypt; around them the Arabian wilderness, desolate and desert; but freedom also, and the presence of their God, by day in cloudy pillar, by night in flame; before them God's promise of inheritance and nationality, and the promise buttressed by such miracle.

And then, when barrenness was under them, God made the skies yield bread; and when there was no water, the rocks softened their strong heart and forth the waters gushed; and when there was no flesh, the evening wind brought quails.

Yet the people murmured. Egypt was better than the wilderness. Onions and cucumbers were better than the Divine promise. Who was God that they should trust Him? Were not these sands and these dangers between themselves and all fulfilment? And sands were hot and blistering, and dangers were menacing. How could God bring them through? So they limited the Holy One of Israel. And their doubt wrote its record in their bleaching bones strewing their desert way.

But this ancient and Israelitish unbelief finds continual modern and Gentile illustration. We are ever limiting the Holy One whom we profess to serve. Amid our wilderness of emergency, temptation, trial, our faithless hearts are asking the same question, "Who is the Lord that we should serve Him? How can He deliver us?" God stands there, over against each one of us, with an infinity of blessing in His hands—of deliverance, of present and abiding peace, of the promise of the *land beyond*; but unbelief is a staggering and blear-eyed creature, who often cannot see what God proffers, and even when she does, reaches forth such palsied hands they cannot reach and hold the blessing.

And who is our God? A being perfect in power, in holiness, in love. And yet how constantly we limit Him!

(a) *Concerning our own possible spiritual advancement.* By a kind of common consent the heights of present blessing and spiritual achievement, stated over and over again in Scripture—of love, joy, peace, victory—are regarded as beyond our reach, as a sort of inspired hyperbole. And so our usual style of Christian thought and speech is only as the baby prattle of the nursery compared with the thought and speech of maturity and manhood we should employ. We are like the products of Japanese culture, "dwarfed and dwindled" into shrubs when we should be towering trees. Just to escape hell, just to manage to get to the other side the gate of heaven—this is too much the limit of our praying and our living. We serve God because, on the whole, we think He "outbids the devil;" not enough for the sake of the essential nobleness of His service. And so our Christianity is of the weakest and most scanty sort.*

The remedy is the refusal to limit God by unbelief. What we need is thorough faith in God. And faith is "assent of intellect and consent of heart."

(b) We limit the Holy One of Israel too much concerning the advancement of His cause and work in the world. Such meagre and half-hearted Christians ourselves, possessing such scanty results of experience, we look out into the world, and, estimating the forces of evil and the forces of good battling for the supremacy, with faint hearts fear discomfiture for Christ. And then, as a necessary consequence—for no soldier can fight when he half distrusts his leader—our right arms deal but partial blows, our shields become encumbrances, and sometimes we even cease to fight at all.

Once, walking on some high hills surrounding a city, I stumbled on a stone.

* I am indebted for suggestion here to Dora Greenwell's "Patience of Hope," a most admirable book.

It was a common stone, such as you shall find lying on all those hill-sides. But when I stooped to look at it I found it was formed almost entirely of fossils—of the shells of fishes living uncounted ages ago; these shells of them, carefully preserved and solidified, were what had formed the stone. And then I thought, it is of such minuter and larger shells as these that God has built the hills. The chalk cliffs of England are only the aggregation of the shells of animalculæ too minute for the discerning of the unaided eye. But God, in the course of ages, shall form the mountains out of such as these. Could we have lived back in the geologic ages, and could it have been told us that from such particles as these the mountains should be builded, how our unbelief would have limited the Holy One of Israel! But God works grandly on, and, fossil by fossil, the mountains rise.

And so this truth possessed me: God works—in an infinite leisure, but He works. And just as here the cast-off and most minute coverings of fishes and animalculæ have built the hills, so in the other spiritual kingdom every least word and kindly act and prayer shall He preserve and use to bring to triumph His purposes of grace. Oh, for a faith like that of William Carey, flinging himself upon all India with the battle-cry, "Believe great things of God; attempt great things for God." Such faith is refusal to limit the Holy One of Israel.

OCTOBER 26-31.—STRIVING FOR MASTRIES.—2 Tim. ii. 5.

The figure is a favorite one with St. Paul. Again and again he introduces it. It is a figure borrowed from the great games so common in his day. It is as if St. Paul had said, "Here is a man about to run a race and compete for the prize;" well, if he will do it he must conform himself to the laws of the game; he must go through the prescribed training; he must be careful of his diet; he must develop his muscle; he must accustom himself to continued

and intense exertion ; he must increase his breathing powers ; he must render his body supple with oil ; and then, when the day has come, and the spectators are gathered, and the crowd waits breathless for the beginning of the contest, and the word is given, and the racers start intent upon the goal, he must observe all the laws which rule the game ; he must gather his strength and expend it in the most skilful fashion ; he must take no unfair advantage of his antagonist ; he must hold himself fairly to the course ; he must conquer by legitimate methods ; only so can he win the laurel wreath. Just so St. Paul would say, if a man is going to triumph in the Christian course, he must conform himself to the laws of the Christian course. Only so can he be crowned.

Two prevalent errors concerning the Christian life are guarded against by this statement of the apostle :

(a) That the Christian life is *all* in the beginning of it.

(b) That a man is going to triumph in the Christian life in a kind of beyond-law, miraculous, haphazard way.

Consider some of the laws supreme over the Christian arena.

The law of *Repentance*. While repentance is a law for the beginning of the Christian life, it is as much a law

for the subsequent course of it. When I was a boy my father used to set me at pulling up ailanthus shoots, which infested the yard. But you might get the ground completely cleared of them, and before the season was over armies of shoots would again spring up from the roots of the pestiferous tree. Just thus is it with our evil nature, whose roots so underrun us. It is continually shooting itself up into sinful acts. (See Romans vii.) You cannot do your repentance up at once and have done with it for a lifetime. A Christian man must steadily repent as long as a vestige of the old evil nature remains in him.

The law of *Faith*. Even must the Christian endure as *seeing Him who is invisible*.

The law of *Prayer*. We need supernatural help. Prayer is its inlet. We seize God's strength by self-surrendering prayer.

The law of *Action*. And this law must be obeyed in two directions—in the direction of diligent search for truth in the study of the Bible, the use of the means of grace, etc. ; and in the direction of the diligent expression in action of the truth when found. Our religion must be more than fervor and sentiment. It must be the steady *doing* of the will of God in the daily life.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

Studies in the Psalter.

By TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

NO. XXXIV.—THE 63D PSALM.

God the True Portion of the Soul.

THIS earnest spiritual song has been a favorite with devout minds in all ages. It has justly been called "A prayer without a petition," but the longing of the soul which it utters is not to be mistaken. The singer, cut off from the usual ordinances of worship, feels bitterly the loss, and pours out his heart in strains which seem extravagant to the undevout. But, as St. Bernard

says, *Lingua amoris non amanti barbara est*. Only the spiritual-minded can have sympathy with those to whom the living God is all in all. The title attributes the composition to David, when in the wilderness of Judah, which the older expositors understood to refer to his persecution by Saul ; but at that time he could not call himself king (ver. ii.), nor was the sanctuary then so easy of access. It must have been written during David's flight from Absalom, when he was king, when he felt keenly the loss of the privileges of Zion, and when he was pursued by enemies thirsting for his blood. Dr.

Cheyne puts it in the time of the Macabean princes;* but there is every reason to think that the canon was closed long before their day; none of them was a king, and the spirituality of the utterance differs widely from the rigid formalism of their period. Whether these reasons be satisfactory or not is of little consequence. For this is one of the numerous psalms the significance and importance of which in no degree depend upon the time when they were composed or the personality of their authorship. The text itself contains all that it is necessary to know in order to catch the spirit of the sweet singer and enter with lively sympathy into his feelings.

I. *The Longing for the Sanctuary* (vv. 1-3).

"O God, Thou art my God: earnestly I seek Thee!

My soul thirsteth for Thee, my flesh pineth for Thee,

In a dry and weary land where no water is.

So in the sanctuary I had vision of Thee,

Beholding Thy power and Thy glory.

For Thy loving-kindness is better than life!

My lips shall praise Thee."

The faith of the singer appears in that, although far away and in deep unhappiness, he does not relinquish his relation to the Most High. It is not God in general, but his God that he invokes. Him he seeks, not merely "early," as the A. V. says, a sense which the Hebrew has, and which led the early Church to use this psalm as a morning hymn in the Sunday service,† but, as, the word came to mean by a natural derivation, "earnestly," with such an intensity of desire as involved body and soul, each part of his composite nature yearning to see. The mention of the parched and sunburned region not merely occurs as describing his actual condition, but as symptomatic of his spiritual state. All human sources of consolation and peace were dried up; but he only thirsted the more for that Divine fountain which still remained open. This is the experience of all true

believers. Suffering turns the worldly away from God, but real piety, the more it is afflicted, longs the more intensely for Divine fellowship. The second verse recalls his former experience of this blessing. Just as he now desires, so heretofore he has had the vision of God in the sanctuary. There God has shown him His power and His glory. In the solemn services, in the company of fellow-worshippers, he has had an insight into God's being and works such as did not come to him elsewhere. Then he saw, he felt, that God's loving-kindness is better than life itself, the basis or condition of all other blessings. God's favor is the *summum bonum*. It was their deep conviction of this fact that made the Old Testament saints so attached to the public worship of the sanctuary (Pss. xxiv., xxvii., xlii., lxxxiv., etc.).

II. *God Himself the Soul's Portion* (vv. 4-8.)

"Thus must I bless Thee while I live,

In Thy name I lift up my hands.

As with marrow and fatness my soul is sated,

And with jubilant lips my mouth singeth praise:

When I call Thee to mind upon my bed,

Through the night watches I muse on Thee.

For Thou hast been my help,

And in the shadow of Thy wings I shout for joy.

My soul followeth hard after Thee,

Thy right hand holdeth me fast."

Thus—i.e., with the same ardent desire as before expressed, he feels himself summoned to praise, which shall continue as long as life lasts. And with the invocation of God's name as the object of worship, he will lift up his hands in thanksgiving (Ps. xxviii. 2). The highest expression of a truly renewed soul is the habit of earnest, grateful praise. But it is a privilege as well as a duty; and so the next couplet compares it to the joy of a rich and splendid banquet. Even in the arid wastes of the wilderness he is as much refreshed as he could be by the richest and most savory food; and his lips burst forth into jubilant song, the natural, necessary utterance of a joyful

* In *The Expositor*, July, 1890.

† So Athanasius, Basil and Eusebius.

spirit. So keen is this enjoyment that it continues even in the night. When he awakens during the hours of darkness, the thought recurs to him, nor is it a mere fugitive recollection, but keeps him absorbed in meditation through the watches into which the Hebrews were accustomed, for military and municipal purposes, to divide the night—the first (Lam. ii. 19), the middle (Jud. vii. 19), and the morning watch (Ex. xiv. 24, 1 Sam. xi. 2). The following verse gives the reason why the Psalmist cannot cease from his musing. The matter is inexhaustible. In all the past of his long and varied course God has been a help to him. This prosaic statement is repeated in the next member of the parallelism in the form of a beautiful and most expressive figure, a favorite with David as it occurs in Pss. xvii., xxxvi., lvii., and lxi., and always in the same connection. He perhaps borrowed the image from his great ancestor's address to Ruth (ii. 12), just as his far greater descendant expanded it in his touching apostrophe to Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 37), "How often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings!" The shadow is a protection from the heat, but to David the outstretched wings of Jehovah were a safeguard from evils and foes of every kind. Hence follows in the next verse a vivid statement of the mutual relations between a believing soul and its gracious Lord. It "follows hard after Him," that is, depends on Him and cleaves to Him, as Hengstenberg says, "like a burr to a coat;" it imitates Jacob at Peniel (Gen. xxxii. 26). He, on the other hand, seizes it with his powerful right hand and holds it up so that it does not sink into the abyss of destruction and despair. No metaphorical language could better express the trustful dependence of the believer and the constant favor and protection of his Lord.

III. *The Doom of His Foes* (vv. 9-11).

"But they, to their ruin, seek my life;

They shall go into the depths of the earth;

They shall be given over to the power of the sword;

They shall become a prey to jackals.

But the King shall rejoice in God;

Every one that sweareth by Him shall glory,
But the mouth of liars shall be stopped."

Every reader notices the sudden transition here. We pass all at once into a different atmosphere. We exchange high and heavenly musings,

"The calm retreat, the silent shade,"

for the noise of conflict, the doom of the ungodly. But the jar is only apparent, the incongruity only on the surface. David's enemies are God's enemies, and their success would frustrate His holy and gracious purposes. And therefore in the midst of the Psalmist's exalted spiritual fervor, he can turn aside to set forth their sure and deserved overthrow. "But they"—the pronoun is emphatic; making a sharp contrast between the wicked and himself—they who seek my life only procure their own destruction. They pass below the earth like those fierce rebels who in the days of Moses went down alive into the Sheol (Num. xvi. 33). The depths or "lower parts" of the earth seem to mean simply the unseen world or the place of the departed. The wicked are abandoned to the edge of the sword, and their unburied carcasses are left to be the prey of the animals of the desert. It is otherwise with the Psalmist, who here designates himself by his official title—the king. Such he was by Divine appointment, and such he should remain, and therefore he rejoices in God, his constant and competent protector. For every one who sincerely swears by Jehovah, and so acknowledges Him as his God and portion, shall have reason to glory; while, on the contrary, they who, having no fear of God, seek to prevail by lies, shall be brought to shame.

The great peculiarity of this psalm is its intense spirituality. It does not recount God's wonders in creation or in providence, does not dwell on anything He has made, but thinks only of Himself as He has been set forth in the in-

stitutions of the covenant people, or in the experience of the writer. The soul kindles as it muses on the Most High and His varied perfections. It is the Giver and not His gifts on which it loves to meditate. When God's praises are sung it is not formally or as a matter of course, but with jubilant lips as a most grateful service. And even in the stillness of the night the same theme occupies the mind as that to which it instinctively turns whenever left to its own impulses. No ancient literature of any people or country expresses such a rapturous sense of communion with God, and yet free from any sense of mystic absorption in Him. It is peculiar to the Psalter alone. And is there any reason to stumble at the typical interpretation of the Song of Solomon which simply uses the endearments of earthly love as expressed in Oriental form to set forth the reciprocal action of Divine love between God and the soul? The use of this lyric is to serve the purposes of a believer when in a very spiritual frame of mind, and when he is otherwise to set before him that at which he should aim. Alas, how many must mourn that even one confined to the weak and beggarly elements of the old dispensation has given a pattern of devotion that transcends the experience of multitudes under the Gospel.

Nor is the concluding strain of the psalm unworthy of what precedes. It shows us that David was not the victim of a weak sentimentality but the possessor of a robust faith which took in the whole nature of God, His justice as well as His mercy, and apprehended the sterner as well as the milder of His perfections. The question lay between David and his foes, and so far as they were implacable, his preservation and restoration involved their overthrow. Expecting as he does God's protection for himself, he anticipates their ruin—a ruin which they bring upon themselves—and he announces it without misgiving. It is a part of the Divine righteousness in which he thoroughly acquiesces, being in entire sympathy with the Holy

One of Israel. Such psalms as this one are of immense service in days like our own, when the moral fibre of Christians is weakened, and they speak with bated breath of the wrath to come, and fear lest any reference to the doom of the impenitent should sound harsh. For here we see by actual example that the very highest joy in God, the closest communion with Him, can and does coexist with a calm and deliberate approval of the surrender of His foes to the overthrow which their conduct has provoked. "Let God be found true, but every man a liar" (Rom. iii. 4).

**"Our Debts"—"Our Trespasses;" or,
How Shall the Lord's Prayer be Worded?**

BY E. J. WOLF, D.D., GETTYSBURG,
PA.

It is a pity that all Christians do not have a uniform version of the Lord's Prayer. It is a positive loss to public worship, and an unhappy disturbance of personal devotion when one accustomed to either form is surprised by hearing in the midst of the prayer a different phraseology. Concentrated thought, absorbed attention is one of the requisites of acceptable worship. This is possible only when the mind is left free, unhindered, and undistracted in spiritual exercise, when all its powers are intent on the blessing sought, wrapt up in the consciousness of communion with the Most High. Then and then only will the heart be able to pour upward its stream of praise and supplication, as the unseen fountain, shut in on every side, emits from beneath the earth its volume of living water.

Prayer is not an easy task. "How heavily we go" as a rule in the attempt to lift our souls to God! We cannot afford, while in this tension of thought, to be hampered by questions of phraseology or any other matters that are calculated to divide or draw away our attention from the Divine. Genuine, fervent, effectual praying demands that we be

"Lost in wonder, love and praise."

The interruption may last but a moment, yet it is a positive interruption; and the mind, so ready to wander, may not find it easy to return to praying, even though the lips may utter the remaining petitions.

This variation in the divinely given and common prayer of Christendom is to be seriously deplored; and churches are hardly justified in perpetuating a distinction which involves no confessional or denominational interest, the removal of which would be a manifest gain to Christian worship, and might even contribute a little to Christian unity. Its origin is doubtless to be traced to the divergence in this petition of the great religious manuals of the English-speaking world, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Standard or King James's Version of the Scriptures. The former, which dates from the middle of the sixteenth century, translated this petition in accordance with Tyndale's version, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." The authorized version of the Bible, which was made A. D. 1611, adopted the phraseology, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." It is to be remembered, too, that the public use of the Lord's Prayer in English was long restricted to the Episcopal Church in England and America, and that the use of the form in the Book of Common Prayer came doubtless into vogue in other churches by their following the form which is wont to be heard in that Church instead of that contained in our English Bibles. On the other hand, those who at one time omitted to use the prayer in public, or opposed its repetition in concert, would naturally use the phrase in their Bible when they came to repeat it in their devotional services.

It may have appeared also to some that they were showing special reverence for the Holy Scriptures by following *their* language in preference to the language of a prayer-book, forgetful of the fact that the Lord's Prayer, whether appearing on the page of Holy Writ or

within the lids of the Book of Common Prayer, is equally and unqualifiedly recognized as so much Holy Scripture. It is in both cases the same prayer, drawn from the same source; and, likewise, in each case it is but a translation of what our Lord uttered—a translation, in the one instance, of the sixteenth century; in the other of the seventeenth.

The reason why, in either case, the given rendering was made may not be accessible to-day; but an examination of the original in the Gospels may show why the rendering of the Book of Common Prayer is to be preferred. The term of the fifth petition found in Matthew is *ῥημιματα*: that given in Luke is *ἁμαρτια*.

Undeniably Matthew's *ῥημιματα* is synonymous with Luke's *ἁμαρτια*; and *ἁμαρτια*, as every New Testament scholar knows, is the generic Greek word for *sin*. How fully the two terms cover each other is shown very decisively by the passage Luke xiii. 2-4; when our Lord speaks there of certain Galileans as being regarded sinners above all the Galileans, He says *οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ*. When He speaks of those on whom the tower of Siloam fell as possibly sinners above all men, he says *αὐτοὶ ῥημιέται*.

Manifestly, then, *ῥημιματα*, which corresponds to our English "debts," is used in the New Testament as the equivalent of *ἁμαρτια*, and to call men *ῥημιέται* is the same as to call them *ἁμαρτωλοὶ*, the latter being notably a very strong term in New Testament Greek. Cremer (*Biblich-theologisches Wörterbuch*) says that in profane Greek the word *ῥημιμα* means simply *Schuld*, debt, *debitum*, not *culpa*, or *reatus*. Rarely it has also the sense of reward, tax, fine; but its New Testament significance is unknown. The latter is not a one-sided negative view of sin as merely omission of duty, but the term includes, among other things, technically the idea of *culpa*, *reatus*, *peccatum*—i. e., fault, guilt, sin. "Sin is *ῥημιμα* in so far as it imposes on the sinner the duty of repentance, of rendering satisfaction, of enduring punishment." So also Thayer,

in his Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, gives to this term the sense of both *debt* and *sin*. In imitation of a Chaldee term, the ὀφειλίτης is "one who owes God penalty, or of whom God can demand punishment as something due—i.e., a sinner."

Now if "debt" and "debtor" in English included the ideas of sin, offence, guilt, transgression, and the like; if the debtor in our current phraseology were a person who owes penalty to the law or to God, or of whom punishment can be demanded, it would be perfectly legitimate and proper to use the term in reference to our sins, and as equivalent to sinner or transgressor. But debt and debtor are with us very mild expressions. No sense of wickedness or criminality, no idea of penalty or punishment attaches inherently to them. A debtor, even a bankrupt, may be a man of excellent character. The law not only provides no punishment against him, but it shields him from any punishment which a creditor might wish to inflict upon him. His debts are, as a rule, regarded in the light of misfortunes. He is, perhaps, to be pitied on their account rather than to be blamed. His offending is not to be compared with that of a criminal. Debt and guilt are in his case not at all synonymous.

Now then, when we approach the Majesty on High, when we supplicate the mercy of our God, against whom we have sinned with a high hand and with presumptuous and defiant transgression of His laws, and before whose infinite holiness our sins are as scarlet and red like crimson, it does not become us to minimize or palliate our offences, or in any way to lessen or to cover up

the guilt of our sinful hearts and lives by the use of the weakest and mildest terms. Real prayer means not the denial, but the confession of our sins. For this we want the strongest expressions afforded by language; even these fall short of the reality, making thus acknowledgment of the exceeding sinfulness of our sins, and showing by the words we employ that we have, at least in a measure, some sense of their enormity. To use phraseology that means no more than omission of duty, a failure to render all that is required of us, has the appearance, to say the least, of an effort to cover our sins.

There is, therefore, no justification for the terms "debts" and "debtors" when we use the Lord's Prayer in our devotions. The Author of the prayer has Himself furnished the right term, whose true force in Greek and in English is unmistakable. Commenting upon the prayer immediately after He had dictated it, Jesus said: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, παραπτώματα, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive your trespasses, παραπτώματα." The true equivalent of the word in the petition, its correct interpretation is "trespasses," according to the explanation of the author.

This ought to settle the philology of the matter. And if we are willing to accept the Master's own interpretation we shall have but one form of His prayer in public use, a consummation devoutly to be wished. And are we not, all of us, prepared to substitute the rendering of the great Teacher for that of our catechisms, our translators, and our revisers?

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

Christian Faith and Christian Systems.

THE breaking up of theological systems is one of the signs of the times.

The various schools are modifying their principles and changing their positions. Only in a general sense can it be said

that theologians belong to the school of Schleiermacher, Tuebingen, or Ritschl; the thinkers go their own way in spite of the leaders. So if a man is called orthodox or rationalistic, we must define the term to get out of it any definite meaning. Men of the different schools freely discuss their differences; and in their free interchange of thought they learn from one another. The changes in science and the confusion in philosophic thought have deeply affected theology. Not only are theologians less dogmatic than formerly, they are also less ready to form theological systems, and admit that their work is only tentative where formerly scholars were ready with final assertions and with systems pronounced absolute. Our era is renowned for patient research and for the accumulation of learned material rather than for its comprehensive constructions and completed systems.

Past failures have made men afraid of systems. They involve too much theory, too much speculation, too much of the subjective element, for an age intent on facts and determined to build only on hard reality. And yet the tendency to unity and the demand for system are among the most powerful of the human mind.

The validity of Christian faith in spite of the failure of theological systems has become one of the weightiest of religious problems. Does the failure to establish a satisfactory system of Christian faith invalidate that faith? And if theological systems are shaken, does that necessarily overturn Christian faith? In Germany theology and religion are more carefully distinguished than in other countries; theology being treated as a matter of the schools rather than of the Church, and religion being emphasized as a matter of the heart and life rather than of the intellect. And yet there is no doubt that the theology of a man has a direct and very powerful influence on his life. But it is a mistake to suppose that a man's theology must be a perfected system, in which each religious thought finds its proper place,

and its complete interpretation. Such a system is not attempted by Christ and the apostles, and why then should it be a necessity for us?

The marvel is that Christians should have any faith in the possibility of constructing a final system of theological thought. The best attempt can only be tentative. The subjects are too great, too many of the thoughts are imperfectly understood, and many of their reasons and consequences are wholly beyond the reach of our present research and comprehension. Only a philosophy which claims such absoluteness as that of Hegel can demand an absolute system; and during its prevalence theologians were regarded as incompetent, unless they could construct complete and final systems. But since the failure of that philosophy is admitted, thinkers have less confidence in the synthesis of thought, particularly of thought that involves the nature, the origin, the destiny of man and the universe.

For more than fifty years a systematic treatment of the life of Jesus has been one of the chief aims of theologians. And yet the best results are a failure so far as system is concerned. Strauss, Renan, Weiss, Beyschlag, all have their peculiar theories, propose various constructions; and all fail to harmonize that life with itself or with the Gospels. The early years are wholly beyond the power of systematic treatment; and even the Gospel records of Christ's ministry do not present the facts in such a way as to make the construction of that part of the life of Christ as a systematic unity possible. Dr. Koestlin, a theological professor of repute, lectures with preference on the theology of the New Testament. Yet he declares that a conscientious historian cannot but regard impossible a life of Jesus in the sense in which we ordinarily speak of biography. For this, he says, we have not the materials.

Are we any better off when we attempt a system of Christ's doctrines? Can we fully explain and systematize

His teachings respecting God, or redemption, or eschatology? Paul moved amid Christian mysteries, and saw through a glass darkly; he declares that God's judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out. And it is a strange revelation of the profundity of theological thought to find it so little aware of its limits as to make it confident or even arrogant where an apostle walked by faith, not by sight, and where another apostle declared that it doth not yet appear what we shall be.

The only astonishing thing is that men are astonished at this inability, and that it disturbs their Christian faith. In other departments of thought which are far more within the limits of rational construction, we find exactly the same difficulty. With all its boasted exactness, science is severely limited to facts and their laws; as soon as it begins to construct theories of the universe, it meets with inextricable difficulties. Indeed, the great systems of the universe are philosophical rather than scientific. The ultimate problems are beyond the power of experiment and mathematics. All the attempts of philosophy to explain the universe meet with as much opposition as the theological systems. Thus evolution presents simply a process respecting which even scientists themselves are not yet agreed; but the beginning, the purpose, and the end of the process are not explained by the theory itself. When we come to materialism, we find it unable to explain mind and its phenomena, and therefore philosophical thinkers and the first scientists abandon it. Mechanical processes do not explain consciousness and volition. Pantheism fails to explain personality. Positivism rather places barriers in the way of reason than offers a solution of the universe.

When we come to individual philosophers and their systems, we find the same unsatisfactory results. Perhaps Aristotle is the greatest philosopher the world has produced; yet his system is said to teem with contradictions. Hume is one of the keenest minds Eng-

land has produced; yet he places two principles which are opposed to each other side by side, declares that he cannot reconcile them, and still affirms that he cannot abandon either of them. Kant is regarded as the profoundest as well as most critical philosopher of modern times; but under the head of antinomies he presents a number of contradictory theories which he cannot reconcile. But besides these, later thinkers have found many fundamentals of his philosophy untenable. When we come to Hegel, whose disciples claimed that he had developed the absolute philosophy, we find that it has been so completely rejected that few in Germany even study it. And when we examine Schopenhauer, Herbart, Lotze, and Hartmann, we may assent to certain principles, and yet but few regard their systems as satisfactory. The prevalent confusion in philosophy is due to the very fact that the old and modern systems have been found wanting.

But another fact is equally clear. While science offers no satisfactory comprehensive system of the universe, it presents facts and laws of indisputable authority. So philosophy has principles which no thinker will question. If now science and philosophy cannot present a final system, is it surprising that theology, with its transcendental objects, cannot harmonize all the problems of divinity?

Yet while it has not the data for a perfect and final system, that need not interfere with Christian faith. Religion has its facts as well as science, and it has its immovable principles as much as philosophy; and these furnish a realm of certainties so large that it can never be exhausted. The very fascination connected with mysteries is apt to draw the mind from the certainties; and yet the latter is the proper realm of religion and the sphere of practical success. We cannot reach to the bottom of the ethical principles; and yet the moral duties are unmistakable and imperative. We cannot give a complete biography of Jesus; and yet there

is more for thought, for the heart, and for the life in what we know of Christ than in any life we can comprehend. Religion is the realm of mysteries; and yet it is likewise the realm of what is clearest and most certain to the mind. And Christian faith may be firmly established where theological systems are untenable and pass away.

We do not want to join the common opposition to Christian systems. The lack of system is an element of weakness in the various departments of thought. A truth is only complete when it finds its proper place in an organism. The mind must perpetually attempt to construct a comprehensive and harmonious system of the universe. But the failure to do so in theology is no more an argument against the certainties of Christian faith than the failure of science to interpret the universe of being invalidates its experiments and the mathematical conclusions drawn from the same.

Reforms.

THE demand for reform has become a mania. Evils are exposed, the condition of things is declared intolerable, and it is fashionable to announce great transformations as in progress. The state is criticised, and a revolution is proposed in order to change it into a Utopia; the corruptions of society are analyzed and depicted in journals and novels; the school is blamed for failing to educate and train manhood and womanhood, and a reform in the subjects and methods of teaching is agitating schoolmen; and there is no end to the exposure of the inefficiency of the Church, of the weakness of the pulpit, and of the departure of the Spirit of Christ from His professed followers.

The need of reforms is beyond question. But what age did not need them? The evils may not be greater than formerly; that they are now more realized than in the past shows an awakening of consciousness which is a hopeful sign. There is desire for progress, a looking

for improvement; and yet a more careful study proves that much which is labelled "Reform" is nothing but a modern sham.

We may well hesitate as to whether it would not be as correct to call this a croaking, fault-finding age as to designate it an age of reforms. The cry for reform, where it is not a fashionable craze, is largely a sport. People like to see faults in others, and writers delight in making them as glaring as possible. Especially strong is the disposition to decry the means used to promote the highest ethical and spiritual purposes.

There is evidently much more declamation about reforms than real effort at reform. Men have ideal standards, find the reality far below them, and so have abundant reason for declaring existing institutions and agencies defective. Many see the need of improvement in others, but do not look at home, where it is most of all needed. Nor is self-reformation regarded as the first condition of all efficient reformatory activity. Where efforts at reform are actually attempted, they often lose themselves in mere negations, and may do the destructive but not the constructive work required. Frequently they are superficial, pertain to mere form and ceremony, stop with methods instead of beginning with the heart, the source of all method. Mere charlatans emphasize vestments, processions, and the putting of words into the mouths of people—and that they call divine service. Sham reforms are generally characterized by glorying in externalities. Men are apt to seek in institutions and mechanisms that salvation which Jesus showed to consist in the regeneration of the soul.

That the body of religion is not to be ignored needs no emphasis in an age which is apt to worship the body and lose the soul. The spirit is, however, the essence; it comes first and must rule. The recreated spirit must be the reformatory agent. Mere logic has no quickening power. Organization, so exalted now, is valuable in proportion

to the substances organized. An individual may be greater than an organization. The truth is eloquently praised; and yet truth is an abstraction and powerless, unless it becomes personality. Effective truth is individuality, but an individuality that is likewise social, that is diffusive as the light.

Real reforms are inner, deep, radical; their means are a leaven, not the pruning knife. They are vital and produce life. Reforms are not made; they grow. Ideas with irresistible power are the seeds whence they spring. Reformers by the grace of God are apt to be too greatly absorbed by the work committed to them to think of themselves as reformers. They have the creative thought, and the creative thought has them, so that they are but its agents. They need not worry about success; they produce what the age requires, give what is deeper, broader, and more effective than the old, and gain the victory by producing what is superior and more satisfactory. Whatever has inherent energy will work its way; and what is in itself weak cannot be made strong by means of organizations and institutions. An adapted truth will soon push aside an unadapted theory; a sufficient reason will prevail over an insufficient one; and the best form will make the imperfect one obsolete. The thermometer that reveals the degree of cold produces no warmth; the discovery of bacteria as the cause of disease does not remove the cause; and yet what we want for cold is heat; what we want in disease is health. So in reform we want reform, not mere gossip about the faults of the age. Reforms are creations; not creations out of nothing, but from nature and mind, from Scripture and history. The void of mere negation is filled by reform with new creations or new developments.

A strange phenomenon is witnessed throughout Europe. Theoretically men live in a new era; they loudly declare that many of the old agencies have become effete. They believe that the

progress of humanity in science, in religion, and in culture generally has inaugurated a new world. But it is only theory. Excepting perhaps some negations and numerous doubts, men remain where education, training, custom, habit have thrust them. Reform is in the air, and it remains there. What is needed is the making real and actual the reforms in the Church and society which men of God feel to be the imperative demand of the age.

Doellinger on American Life and Literature.

It cannot be said that American thought is deeply felt in Germany. Our literature, with the exception of a few writers, is unknown; and the impression prevails that we are too much engrossed in making money to pay serious attention to great intellectual problems or to devote ourselves to the culture of literature and art. Even those better informed are puzzled to know what the characteristics of American literature are, and what marks it as peculiar in comparison with the literature of other lands. Some wonder whether our writers are not mere imitators, especially of English models; others think our only peculiarity consists in describing American scenery and life, with perhaps a strong flavor of boasting and exaggeration. Lately two volumes on the "History of North American Literature," by K. Knortz, in German, have appeared in Berlin, and they will no doubt help to make our literary productions better known. The author thinks our country presents a striking union of ideal tendencies with practical life. He was surprised to find the drama so much neglected. It is the most complete work on American literature which has appeared in Germany.

Doellinger was a good English scholar, and took great interest in English and American literature. An address on the "Literary Activity of North America" was delivered by him in December, 1888, before the Academy

of Sciences in Munich, and has just been published with other addresses. We select from this address such general views of this eminent author on American thought and life as are of especial interest to the readers of the REVIEW.

He thinks modesty not a distinguishing trait of Americans, and therefore not a peculiarity of our literature. "On account of his training and the moral atmosphere which surrounds him, the American is early animated by a spirit of self-confidence. He errs much more frequently through over-confidence than through a timid depreciation of his abilities. He readily believes himself equal to the greatest difficulties."

Doellinger is suspicious that our national freedom has not been productive of individual independence of thought. "Strangers are likely to be struck with the fact that public opinion is so uniform that each one submits to it, and rarely does any one dare to oppose it. I find that Americans themselves pronounce this a kind of slavery; but they, of course, do this anonymously and in British journals. The fact is in part explained by the sameness of the people, there being no social ranks, no aristocracy or privileged persons of any kind, no learned class. . . . The door to every calling is alike open to all, and each one is afraid lest avowed opposition to the prevailing views may prove a barrier to success. . . . The mouths of the discontented are closed by the fear of that almighty monarch Public Opinion."

Our youth are early thrown on their own resources. This develops energy, but it may interfere with learning. "Early, mostly too early, and while still intellectually immature, the American youth leaves school, in order not to be left behind in the great race. He at once finds himself in possession of all political rights, and has a voice in the decision of the most weighty national problems. Life itself becomes the true high school for him. He begins with

practice, he ends with theory. 'You must help yourself,' that is almost the first admonition given in childhood, and it accompanies him throughout the journey of life. With this is connected a prevalent optimism—namely, the conviction that the political and social order is the best in the world."

Nowhere else in the world do the learned men form so distinct a class as in Germany. American scholars are more fully a part of the general public. "A learned class, a class of persons who devote their whole life to science, so as to live for its discovery and promulgation, is lacking in America. There is no want of specialists in natural science, in mechanical and technical pursuits; but small is the number of men whom we would call genuine scholars. Those who would be thus designated have nearly all obtained their education in foreign lands, namely, in Germany, France, or England. Such men, therefore, are apt to have periods of longing for the intellectual atmosphere of Europe, although amid their frequent visits to Europe they retain their attachment for their native land."

Aside from its enterprise American journalism has not won the admiration of European scholars. Our press is supposed to be on a vulgar level, and is then thought to be a correct expression of the life itself. Doellinger regards the American newspaper an injury to literature. He declares that with few exceptions the press is much lower than in England. The most trifling things are fearfully exaggerated, and empty phraseology abounds. "Petty gossip, whole columns devoted to the description of a ball, gross defamation of the most esteemed men, sentimental accounts of crimes and of criminal procedures—such stuff fills these papers, which are large, but, in point of thought, poverty-stricken. Thus the time which might be used for healthy intellectual food is wasted, and taste and appreciation for what is truly worth having are destroyed. It may well be affirmed that the journals are the ene-

mies of books, and that on their account many a good volume remains unwritten." Our office-seekers are pronounced a national curse; the ignorant voters are regarded a menace to the republic; emigration threatens our institutions. Being absorbed by present concerns, we have failed to cultivate a taste for history. All these national characteristics have an influence in determining the character of our literature. It is evident that in an address on so large a subject the stress must be laid on comprehensive views, rather than on details or on a description of particular authors.

The Socialistic Trend.

WILL the German social democracy gain the victory? This is now one of the burning questions, discussed frequently in public meetings, in journals, and in books. It is generally admitted that the present social structure, with the wealth in the hands of a few and the masses poor, cannot last. Others than laborers declare that the existing social organization is glaringly unjust, and ought not to be perpetuated. This conviction is evidently growing. Many of the claims of the socialists are recognized as just, especially those which demand more time and means to secure culture and its blessings. The socialistic state is, of course, vague and visionary; in some respects it is an ideal which is adapted only to ideal citizens. But no man of heart questions that the present reign of capital, particularly in the hands of great monopolies, is intolerable. The evils under which the masses suffer are too glaring to be questioned; the only difficulty is how to find a remedy.

At a recent meeting of university students in Berlin the chances of socialistic success were considered. It was declared that these are very strong, and that they will become still more so unless society is reformed, the school made more ethical and more religious, and the Church aroused to greater efficiency. Professor A. Wagner, one of the lead-

ing professors of political economy, made an eloquent speech. He showed that in socialism the economic must be separated from the religious question. Christianity, he said, does not determine the social structure aside from ethics and religion. It does not decide the problems of public and private property, or how many hours men shall labor, and what wages they are to receive. Thus many demands of the socialists might be complied with and yet Christianity not be affected thereby. The same view was advocated by a prominent theologian at the Evangelical Social Congress in Berlin, and it is evidently gaining advocates. A preacher in Wuerttemberg, Th. von Waechter, has publicly announced himself a socialist. He holds that the theory of private property as the basis of the family, of society, and of the State has no foundation in Christianity. He takes part in socialistic meetings, and claims to be a socialist on ethical and religious grounds.

The leading socialists are avowed atheists; but their atheism is not a necessary element of their socialism. It is surely a significant fact that Christians recognize the possibility of a socialistic state in which the Christian religion can be as pure and effective as in the present social structure.

The efforts of socialists to win the laborers in the country have thus far met with little success. These laborers are more religious and more attached to the Church than those in the cities. The atheism in the movement repels them. The agitators in the country have adopted peculiar tactics. Though atheists at heart, they speak respectfully of religion, and even quote Scripture for their views; nevertheless the conditions are against them. In their public meetings in the country they find men prepared to meet their arguments. The pastors and churches have been aroused, and are warning the laborers against the irreligious and fanatical elements in the actual social democracy. Then the employers and society gener-

ally in country districts have been impelled by the emergencies of the case to show more consideration for the laboring classes. Now the socialistic agitators are changing their tactics. They have literary bureaus, from which they attempt to flood the country with their literature. Whether this will accomplish what the public meetings have failed to do remains to be seen. The work is, however, pushed with the greatest energy, the hope of socialism being in winning the laborers in the country.

There are dissensions among the social democrats themselves. The more moderate ones are now in the ascendancy. They say little about revolution, but emphasize legislative and peaceable means for the accomplishment of their purpose. While admitting the necessity of revolution to gain their end, they are not ready to declare that it must be bloody. They deem it expedient to say nothing about destruction and blood, since this would drive many laborers from their ranks. A decided and very energetic minority, however, wants revolution to be a part of the public programme. They declare that the privileged classes will never voluntarily do justice to the laborer; and they believe the party will gain by boldly announcing revolution as the inevitable consequence of the socialistic movement. They are impatient, fearing that delay will weaken their cause and strengthen the other classes.

In the mean while the indolence, the luxury, the heartlessness, and the vices prevalent in wealthy circles are exposed mercilessly and receive the most scathing rebukes. Professor Wagner, at the meeting mentioned above, showed that the hopeless condition of society to-day is revealed in the exchange, in monopolies, in the wealthy circles, and in fashionable society. In these he sees much that is of the devil, and here he finds the greatest dangers to the State, while he recognizes many justifiable elements in the socialistic movement. One of his statements was most signifi-

cant. He said that from a Christian standpoint we have no right to declare monarchy the only authorized form of government, and asserted that in the United States, Switzerland, and France Christianity can be as effective as in a monarchy. Such a declaration by an appointee of the Government and at the seat of monarchical power means very much. Indeed, the social agitations are broadening the views of men, and are promoting revolutions in thought as well as in life

The Creative Thought of Life.

VARIOUS efforts have been made to select the best books in literature—say the best one hundred—and to recommend them as of most importance in education. In Germany and other countries scholars have also been appealed to for information respecting the dozen or more books which have been especially influential in determining their moral and intellectual character and their course in life. Valuable as the hints thus secured are, they are too vague to furnish the specific directions needed by earnest seekers intent on getting the best mental stimulus and making the most of themselves. Even in the best books much may produce but little effect. It is of doubtful value to learn that a dozen books have had the greatest influence in moulding the mind of some eminent scholar unless he at the same time states what produced the effect. How indefinite the statement that Neander's "Church History" or Julius Mueller's "Doctrine of Sin" determined the course of a life. It is of far more value to learn the particular thoughts which have wrought most effectively in moulding the intellect, in affecting the heart, and in shaping the career.

The creative thought of life, the seed whence the whole sprang—that is what we want to know respecting men whose course is especially worthy of study. It may be more difficult to determine the creative thoughts than to refer to the

inspiration of particular books ; but it is also more valuable. It gives a deeper insight into the mind and heart of a man. Many a scholar would find it hard to give the seed-thought of his life ; but the self-consciousness gained by its discovery would be of great importance to himself, as well as to others.

How essential to the rising generation to know the fundamental thoughts of men who have attained eminence in intellect, in literature, and in life ! If one hundred men of this character would give their moulding thought and highest inspiration, it would be a more tangible, more creative, and more directive power than to learn what one hundred books are deemed most valuable or what particular volumes have been most effective in individual cases. How helpful to preachers to learn from the most successful of their number to what they attribute their success, to what dominant thought or ruling impulse, and what first suggested the thought and gave the impulse !

For the Times.

CONTINENTAL writers are beginning to write the history of the century on whose last decade we have entered, and are trying to discover its leading characteristics and marked peculiarities. It is said that at the close of last century eminent scholars advocated culture of a universal character, rounded, complete, embracing all that pertains to humanity. But at the close of the present century we find the emphasis placed on specialization, on severe limitation, on exactness in details. As a consequence, learning is now usually limited to a narrower sphere, but it is more minute and more thorough. The advantages attained are great, but there are likewise disadvantages. Thought is distracted by details ; the mind is so absorbed by a limited sphere and particular objects that comprehensive views and great systems of thought are scarce and extremely difficult. In their specializations men lose sight of the rational

view of the totality of being and even of the great purpose of life. Formerly thinkers who produced comprehensive philosophies of the universe were leaders ; now pigmies are said to come to the front, made notorious through some experiment or some investigation, but without great thought and without fathoming the meaning of life itself. Those who cannot rest in these distractions find especial attraction in the comprehensive schools and systems furnished ready at hand in science, in philosophy, and religion. Hence the power of Catholicism.

Is the study of comparative religion it has been found that a number of ancient heathen religions contain precepts which sound strikingly like some given in the Gospel. Stress is especially laid on this similarity in comparing Buddhism with Christianity. It is surprising that in such comparisons an essential element is generally overlooked. Writers forget that precepts worded the same way in two religions are not for that reason alike. Thus sacrifice and love to the neighbor may be expressed in the same language in Buddhism and Christianity, and yet the meaning be very different in the two. The brotherhood of man, which, according to the Gospel, has its source in the fatherhood of God, is unknown to Buddhism. All the Christian commandments must be taken in their totality in their relation to the Father and to Christ, otherwise they cannot be properly understood. When the precepts of the Gospel are viewed in their depth and fulness, they are found to have an element peculiarly Christian which distinguishes them from similarly worded teachings in other religions.

THE rapidity with which movements spring up is a feature of the age. The press, the telegraph, all the modern facilities of communication, serve to spread popular thoughts and tendencies so as to make them national and inter-

national. But there is another side. Movements are not likely to be so deep, so absorbing, or so lasting as formerly. Modern life is too distracted for that. New interests arrest the attention, gain the ascendancy, and banish concerns which were uppermost yesterday. Thus the death of a movement may be as sudden and unexpected as its birth.

Germany affords a significant illustration of this. A year ago Egidy, a Saxon military officer, published a book entitled "Earnest Thoughts," in which he attacked the dogmas of the Church, advocated rationalistic views, but without depth, and attempted to establish what he regarded a practical in place of a dogmatic Christianity. The volume created much excitement; scores of thousands of copies were circulated, and an extensive literature was occasioned by it. The author held public meetings in Berlin at Whitsuntide this year to expound his views and to form an organization for their dissemination. And now? In spite of the fact that the author was declared to express the views of multitudes, within one short year the movement has spent its force. His views are still discussed; but even those friendly to him admit that the movement he began has had its day, and that no permanent traces of it are visible. Does not the very excitement

produced by a movement sometimes wear out the interest in it and produce indifference or create a counter-movement?

THE survival of religious feelings and practices amid professed religious indifference and even with theoretical atheism is significant. It is an argument for the depth of the religious instinct and for the psychological basis of religion. A German writer states that there is in Vienna an eminent scholar, the president of scientific institutes, who has at his fingers' ends all the philosophical objections to faith, and lets no one suspect that he does not regard them conclusive. And yet he goes to church daily. The same writer also says: "I myself knew Baron von Stifft, who died some ten years ago. He was a grandson of the celebrated physician of Emperor Francis. In the midst of the agitations of 1848 he was an extremely active member of the revolutionary and atheistic journalism of Vienna. His articles professed to annihilate all the eternal lights. . . . Nevertheless, this same Baron Stifft daily, in the earliest morning hours, when no acquaintances were likely to see him, visited St. Stephen's cathedral, and kneeling before the image of the Virgin Mary, offered his devout supplications."

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

The Socialists' Appeal to the Clergy.

By LAWRENCE GRONLUND, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I AM very glad to have this opportunity to make, as a socialist, an earnest appeal to the clergy. We wish to impress all men of intelligence and heart, but the clergy especially, as the accepted teachers of morality. Let it, however, at the very start be understood that this appeal to them is not, as has been intimated to me, to assist us "in lessening the evils of which socialists

complain and accomplishing the good that they desire to see done," which shows a misapprehension both of socialism and of the course of human evolution; I simply appeal to them to study socialism thoroughly.

Religious people as yet misunderstand socialism as completely as the Romans did Christianity fifteen hundred years ago; as Christianity then was supposed to mean murder and treason, so socialism hitherto has been thought synonymous with confiscation and robbery. Christian ministers now have no ex-

cuse whatever for further ignorance on that subject. The literature is now adequate, and some of their noblest and brightest brethren are luminous guides to them on the path of inquiry. Perhaps it is well to remind them of the fateful indifference of their predecessors in the ministry to the early anti-slavery agitation; "fateful" I call it, for had the opposite spirit prevailed, who knows but that our fratricidal war might have been prevented?

I ask them simply to study socialism thoroughly, for I know that such a study must lead them to a firm conviction that the advent of socialism is God's evident will; I know, further, that then they will hail its advent with joy, as it will advance morality and preserve religion. However curious these claims may sound to them at present, I have an abiding faith that they will come to like conclusions.

First. All thoughtful people who have profoundly considered the subject admit socialism is bound to become the reigning system in all civilized countries in the near future, whether we like it or not; the only question that may be doubtful is whether it will be the permanent *régime*, or will prove merely a temporary arrangement.

Second. We claim that socialism will realize the kingdom of heaven on earth. It is a radically mistaken idea that men must be moral before they can have better social conditions. The germ of morality is a Divine gift, but it is social conditions that determine its growth. It is to civilization we owe whatever morality there now is in the world; it is civilization that, *e.g.*, has converted our primitive beastly passions into conjugal love and universal sympathy. But we are at present at a peculiarly dangerous crisis—morally especially. The established competitive order has accomplished all the good it is capable of, and is fast becoming the foe of both morality and religion. I can here sketch the arguments only in large outlines.

I say, then, that the basis of morality

—to wit, integrity and loyalty—is seriously threatened by the reign of the present industrial system with the worse principles of competition—*i.e.*, struggle for life as its motive force. It is an indisputable fact that this system tempts us all to evil courses, while society surely ought to influence every one of us to the very reverse way, as it did during the Middle Ages, and, on the whole, even in antiquity. It tempts commercial men to all sorts of dishonesty—and in a rapidly developing industrial society like ours, the atmosphere is intensely commercial—and the worst is, it is the worst men and not the best men who necessarily give tone to business society. Nine just men in a given trade are forced to conform to the methods of the tenth, who is a scoundrel; hence the plane of business morals is always lower than the moral character of the majority of men who compose it. Irresistibly business men are drawn into corruption. Look how one utterly conscienceless man starts some new form of fraud. The more upright men first struggle against it, but the greater the number that yields the more unequal the battle. The pressure of competition becomes more and more severe; finally they are compelled to follow the unscrupulous leader. Is it not enough to rouse Christian men to a battle to the death against the present order, to see generous, upright men compelled to imitate the knaves at the risk of bankruptcy?

But business men are not intrinsically worse than others. We all continually fall into such temptations as are open to us. It is admitted that politics are carried on by systematic corruption, that political parties are only organizations to secure and partition the spoils. The established order tempts us by having made wealth for the first time in history the greatest social power, resulting in an indiscriminate respect for it, since by controlling the wealth, of which all must have a share, the rich man exercises a double pressure on the needy, by picking out the favored ones and

dictating his own terms. This social order tempts us to chase after wealth by every possible form of gambling, called euphoniouly speculation, so that it is said now to be a common practice for ministers of the Gospel, as often as they can spare a few dollars, to put them into margins and stocks, and our churches have become "witnesses for the principles of property." Closely connected with all this is that, though the necessity of obedience by no means has diminished (the power of particular persons over their fellow-men has never in any age of the world been so well defined and so easily and safely exerted as at present), the spirit of loyalty has grown very weak. Loyalty depends for its strength upon who it is that commands, and for what purposes. In our era of competition the chiefs are successful "self-made" men, whose mental horizon necessarily has been immensely narrowed in the struggle, and petty, selfish interests are their ends. This sufficiently explains the decay of loyalty, and the contempt that now attaches to the very idea of obedience.

If the present industrial system is inimical to honesty, it must be so to honor, which is its refinement. It is the monstrous fact that a man of refined honor, if he be poor, cannot be perfectly honorable, since, in order to satisfy his mere physical wants, he must stoop to gain the favor of some individual and advance this man's private interests. And how incomparably worse is the corresponding position of woman! How difficult it is for the poor girl to keep her "honor," wealthy ladies can never comprehend. The poor pay given to female wage-earners is a fearful temptation to prostitution. Lecky said, in his "European Morals," "The statistics of prostitution show that the great proportion of those who have fallen into it have been impelled by the most extreme poverty, in many instances verging upon starvation." Should not the scandalous fact that honor is now placed in one scale and

starvation in the other nerve Christians with energy enough to change this social order?

Now, I assert that socialism will radically change this; as we now are all tempted the wrong way, we shall, in the socialist republic, be all tempted the right way. It will become the interest of all of us to be honest. Wealth will cease to be the social power it now is; that is to say, there will probably be individual wealth then as now, but no one will need to apply to the rich to get a livelihood. Ability, skill, and wisdom will naturally gravitate to the control of affairs, which will be conducted wholly with a view to the social welfare; and, therefore, subordinates will again loyally second their leaders. All labor will become a social function. When every one is assured of a decent living, and knows that in the circles where he figures as consumer his interests are guarded, then he will, as a producer, perform his work well. It is simply human nature. Then the motives will once more be at work which ruled "when all England awoke every morning and went to its work with a prayer."

Again, not only will the motives to morality be much improved, but morality itself will be placed on a far higher plane. Can it be doubted that there are now numbers, among them some of our most intellectual men, who in their hearts look on morality as sentimental stuff fit only for babies and Sunday-schools? Socialism will convince them that morality is the highest interest of man; but, observe, true morality. For socialism will, in the next place, emphatically teach us that conventional "morality," which differentiates men into saints and sinners, is not morality at all, but pure Pharisaism; true morality unites men, is the voluntary co-operation with God for the brotherhood and fellowship of man. The unity of mankind—that is the end of morals; and therefore sympathy is the alpha and omega of morality; therefore also Jesus summed up the

law in the commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is easy to see that the present order, with its principle of struggle for life, does nothing to advance sympathy, but actually throws cold water over it. If it could and would speak out frankly and honestly it would pronounce the martyr, the man who does an act of self-sacrifice, nothing but a fool. True, sympathy has steadily grown, but grown in spite of our established order. Socialism, on the other hand, will advance sympathy to such heights as we now can have no idea of, in all its three forms: sympathy with others' pains, sympathy with others' pleasures, and—the divinest form of all—friendship.

But I go still further, and say that socialism will preserve religion; that it is the only power that can—I say it advisedly—save religion, as Christianity was the only power that could do it in the decay of the Roman Empire. Can any thoughtful man deny that atheism or agnosticism is spreading terribly, and spreading among the intelligent classes? Must not all religious minds shudder at the prospect? That makes the question all-important: Will the coming socialist republic be atheistic or religious? I know full well that if it should be filled with ever so many material enjoyments, but at the same time be grossly materialistic, nine out of every ten of its people will want to commit suicide, and there will be a general regret that mankind ever was weaned from its faith in nymphs and Olympus. If that were to be the end, it would be criminal to move the little finger to bring in socialism. But I am confident that socialism leads straight up to God, and that in a socialist commonwealth all scepticism about the presence of God and Personal Immortality will become impertinent. I say you should be socialists precisely because you are Christians, and thus make religion joined to socialism the strongest social motive force.

How to Prevent Clergyman's Sore Throat.

BY PROFESSOR A. S. COATS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

PROBABLY Dr. Charles Dunn, in his little work, "The Philosophy of Voice," has given the best account of the genesis of "clergyman's sore throat" that is generally available. It is as follows: "There is a class of men who seem especially to suffer from their attempts to create power falsely, so much so that the result upon themselves has given the name of 'clergyman's sore throat' to the disease. Of course all those who of necessity use the voice must thereby cause a greater flow of blood to the parts, and the parts being exposed, would be more liable to be affected by sudden change of temperature or by dampness than parts of those not so speaking: but this fact of itself will not account for the disease, for it has been observed that those who produce true tone do not suffer therefrom. So far as the disease is concerned, the first prompting cause is the substitution of constriction at the fauces for the true obstruction at the chords. A tightness is felt just under the jaws, and in a little while the speaker complains of his throat 'aching.'"

The way, then, to prevent the clergyman's sore throat is to use the voice rightly instead of wrongly, and usually more instead of less. More especially if the throat is in a healthful condition, since the hebdomadal strain to which most preachers subject their vocal apparatus when in its flabby condition from a severe rest of six days is doubtless one great source of the difficulty we are seeking to avoid. Daily voice exercise, then, daily use of the speaking voice—the voice properly used in addressing an assembly of people, daily use of the voice in an assembly room must be one of our means for the prevention of this disease.

But, and more especially, the voice must be rightly and not wrongly used. "The attempt to create power falsely" must be abandoned. How?

First, convince yourself that your auditors can all be made to hear you with ease and pleasure to themselves without great effort on your part. If you try to make loud tones you will most likely "create power falsely." Adopt, if you have not yet done so, the conversational style of oratory. That is the only common-sense style, the only style that convinces the judgment and moves the will, however much the old-fashioned bombastic style "split the ears of the groundlings." Begin with the "talking" tone, and never, from the first to the last word of your discourse, stray so far away from it in your bursts of eloquence that you cannot easily and gracefully take it up again.

Secondly, remember that a right use of the voice necessitates constant variety in force, rate, key quality, etc., thus bringing into constant use slightly different parts of the vocal machinery, while the other parts are resting. No style of oratory so contributes to this variety as the conversational, just referred to. Seek no more variety in quality, key, and movement of voice than you have in the nature and importance of your thoughts. Variety for the sake of variety is a curse, even though it prevent the clergyman's sore throat. But show by your voice the varying degrees of importance you attach to your thoughts as well as the different

emotions they awaken in your own heart. Thus you will weary neither yourself nor your auditors.

Finally, make your strong tones in the only place where such tones can be made easily—not in the lips, but in the open throat. Of course the sound is produced by the passage of the air over the vocal chords in the larynx, but it is converted into tone, and may be increased a hundredfold in power by the resonant chambers in the back part of the mouth, the throat, and the nasal passages. The larger these chambers, the stronger and fuller the tones. The more they are used the larger they grow, the more easily strong tones are made, and the more surely is this dread disease avoided. Remember the remark of the great French tragedian: "I have been all my life trying to get force without noise." The more noise you make the less forceful and effective your utterance. Know that you are speaking, what you are speaking, and how you are speaking, but do not *feel* that you are speaking. If you feel any sensation in your throat, you are not using your voice aright.

If you have the clergyman's sore throat, or what Dr. Morell Mackenzie very suggestively calls "the costermonger's sore throat," consult the best physician at hand and that wisest of nurses—Time.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

Studying vs. Killing.

I HAVE been much interested in this discussion. I cannot understand how any Christian man, minister, or layman can find pleasure in taking the life of bird, beast, or fish. I think relaxation gained at that price is bought at a cost too dear both to the victim and the moral nature of the sportsman. Let me tell the readers of the HOMILETIC REVIEW how I have gained the rest

sought by many. A friend, who is an expert ornithologist, gave a lecture on the birds of Ontario. I attended the lecture, and was inspired to know more about them. My friend took me "under his wing," led me over hill and dale, through meadow, swamp, and field, initiated me into the mysteries of bird life, and opened up to me an entirely new world. Week after week, when we could command the leisure, did we

set forth on our hunt for birds—to study, not to shoot them.

This plan I would commend to every pastor.

1. It gives all the change and relaxation required. It is in every way the reverse of desk work, mentally and physically.

2. It enriches one's own life without robbing any other being of its life. The evening when I found the tawny thrush and heard his liquid note for the first time was an era in my experience, and the man who would have killed that songster would be nothing short of a brute.

3. It leaves no pangs in the recollection. The visions of feathered beauty called up by memory as I think upon those walks is never marred by the thought of death or slaughter. I can look any bird in the face, for I have learned to love them better, and to admire more truly the work of Him who made and cares for them.

4. Still further change may be found. From bird life one may pass to botany, from botany to fishes, and to obtain endless variety without the disadvantages of shooting, snaring, or mutilating.

P. K. DAYFOOT.

STRATHROY, ONT.

Officiating at Funerals

My custom in officiating at funerals has been this: When not asked to omit giving a sermon, I have prepared a brief one, occupying about twenty minutes in delivery, and designed to be consolatory in its teachings and applications. A few selections of Scripture appropriate to the character of the deceased are read, and a sympathetic and comfort-entreaty prayer occupying two or three minutes is offered. When requested by the friends to give no sermon, I, of course, readily comply, and make brief remarks instead. As I am in the "rural regions," I am obliged to conform to the old custom of preaching funeral sermons. But even in the country this custom is gradually becoming

obsolete. From the very beginning of my ministry I have refrained from saying much about the departed, however good Christians they might have been. My reason for doing this is: I desire to avoid wounding the feelings of the friends, and at the same time to be faithful to the Gospel and to men. To say much in favor of one Christian and but little of another on such occasions cannot be done without causing unpleasant feeling on the part of the friends. Hence, if there be plain evidence that the deceased was a Christian, no matter in what degree, I simply say at the close of a Gospel sermon or some general remarks that we have reason to believe that the departed has died in Christ. Great caution is needed in officiating at funerals.

C. H. WETHERBE.

Was Paul Married?—A Negative View.

ALLOW a word in reference to this inquiry in the June number of the REVIEW. The argument in the affirmative is based on Acts xxvi. 10, where the apostle is supposed to say, "I gave my vote against them," according to the Canterbury revision. The King James version has *voice*. The change indicates the belief of the revisers that Saul was a member either of the Sanhedrim itself or of some tribunal with delegated authority to try and punish heresy. If a member of the first, he must have been married. Does the argument hold? Looking at the passage closely, we find the original is *κατήνεγκα ψήφον*. Here we have the first aorist, indicative of *καταφέρω*. Literally rendered, we would have "I bore down a stone." The verb occurs only in this place, and in Acts xx. 9, where it is rendered "being fallen" and "sunk down." The Vulgate (Rhemish translation) has, "I brought the sentence." The noun *ψήφον*, rendered *voice*, *vote*, *sentence*, occurs in the New Testament only in Rev. ii. 17. It is also found in the Septuagint in Ex. iv. 25, where the Canterbury revision has "flint" in place of

"stone." It means a pebble or small stone; and Paul may have referred to the custom of voting by casting pebbles in a box. With hesitancy I suggest that he merely states that he actually participated in the martyrdom of Stephen, casting down the first stone upon him. I know not that this possible interpretation has ever been advanced, but it commends itself to my mind. Against the suggestion is the fact that *λίθος* is the usual word for stone. Still a stone large enough to be sharpened into a circumcising knife (Ex. iv. 25) would do considerable damage in a stoning. It may be added that Saul's "casting down the stone" on Stephen may have been merely a formal act as the chief witness and prosecutor in the trial of the proto-martyr. See Acts vii. 58 compared with Deut. xvii. 2-7.

C. E. W. DOBBS.

CARTERSVILLE, GA.

for "the Word." Second, before preaching, fervently ask God to make your message a part of yourself; then, as you stand before your congregation, you will be *filled* with your subject, and when you preach you will thrill your hearers. Make your sermons short. Twenty-five minutes is long enough for one of your sermons of a Sabbath, and take care not to *repeat*. No sharper critics can be found than young men for this fault. If you repeat, they notice it at once, and grow tired. Have something in *every* sermon for them. Your truth must not be cold or lukewarm, but hot. Such preaching will interest and win them.

Always know them on the street, and be glad to stop and talk with them. I have been enabled to hold my young men through these and other means, and think others can also.

B. M. KENT.

Young Men: How to Hold Them.

THE question asked by A. B. H., how to hold our young men in the churches, is, I firmly believe, one of the most important questions of the day touching the prosperity of our churches. It is alarming how many of our intelligent young men drop out of church and Sunday-school at an early age. In a word, let me suggest, first, young men *can* be won for Christ, as in days past. Their hearts are as susceptible as in years past; but the pastor must *find the way* to their hearts.

This can be done not by preaching sermons to *please* alone, devoting an evening to travels, describing foreign lands, etc., having nothing of God but the text; such sermons will draw only a class of people that have no care for the church; neither must the pastor find the other extreme. God's Word given in a dry and prosy way will put even the old church-members asleep. We must, first, "preach the Word." Never let a longing desire to "draw" tempt any pastor to substitute *anything*

Plagiarism.

IN your July number, page 94, you very happily answer the query as to "a lawful and unlawful use" of the HOMILETIC REVIEW by quoting Mr. Spurgeon's views as to plagiarism. What he says is very helpful, and also suggests to any who are tempted to plagiarism a way of escape—viz., "Eat the roll;" take time to digest what is read, and then reproduce in one's own fashion. As to how far the use of another's matter may be used without plagiarism, the following illustration may be helpful. I have a gun and some powder, but no shot. I want to go gunning. In my front yard is a tree into which a friend of mine not long since fired off the load in his gun. I take out my knife and carefully pick out those shot in the tree. I put them into my gun, which is charged with my powder, and I fire off the load. Now whose shot did I shoot—my own or some one else's? The process of getting and the manner of use made them my shot.

A. W. LAMAR.

Perplexed.

I AM perplexed about certain statements of Scripture that seem to me to be conflicting. Yet it may be that some of my brethren have access to helps that give an adequate solution. If so, I shall be grateful for any help they may give me. In Gen. xv. 13 we read the predictive words of Jehovah to Abraham: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years. . . . But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." In accordance with this prediction, we read in Ex. xii. 40 the historical statement, "The sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years." But turning to Gal. iii. 17 we read the words, "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul." How to reconcile those passages I do not know. If the period from the giving of the covenant to the

giving of the law was four hundred and thirty years, how could the children of Israel—the grandson of Abraham—sojourn in the land of their bondage four hundred and thirty years?

It is of interest, moreover, to notice that the period of *affliction* is designated as four hundred years in length, leaving only thirty years or thereabouts for the peaceful sojourn of the sons of Jacob with their families before the beginning of the oppression. But the oppression did not begin until after the death of Joseph, when a new king rose who did not know him; and yet he lived one hundred and ten years.

I know that the question is one touching historical accuracy only, and is not very important in its bearing upon the saving truths of revelation, to convey which the Bible is given—in fact, is without any importance whatever in that regard; but I would like the problem solved for the satisfaction of my own mind—if a solution is possible—and would be greatly indebted to any one who might so solve it. T. M. S.

EDITORIAL SECTION.**LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT****The Ruler and the Law.**

When a ruler sinneth . . . and is guilty; if his sin, wherein he hath sinned, be made known to him, he shall bring for his oblation a goat, a male without blemish. . . . And if any one of the common people sin . . . he shall bring for his oblation a goat, a female without blemish.—Lev. iv. 22-27.

ONE of the striking provisions of the ceremonial law binding the Jewish nation in Old Testament times was that to which the above text directs attention. Nothing could be more suggestive of the Divine conception of the varying responsibility of individuals than the fact that in the event of a ruler's transgression he was required to bring as a

sin-offering a victim, like in nature, but superior in value, to that which was demanded of one of the common people. The idea conveyed by this demand was that the position of the official made defection upon his part a more serious thing than that of any one of his subjects. It was to be expected of him that by virtue of his office he would set an example of integrity for those the conduct of whose public affairs was entrusted to his hands. The law for them was, not equally merely, but in a higher degree, obligatory upon him. He must not only see to it that they obeyed it, but also must himself obey it the more carefully because of his official position.

"The single and peculiar life is bound,
With all the strength and armor of the mind,

To keep itself from 'noyance ; but much more
That spirit, upon whose weal depend and rest
The lives of many.'

The ceremonial law, it is true, "has had its day and ceased to be ;" but the principles within and behind it are still as truly in force as ever they were. To-day, no less than in the days of old, the prominence of the ruler makes disobedience to law upon his part a more heinous thing than it is in the case of one less conspicuous. It is a most lamentable thing, when the idea comes to possess him or his people under him, that he is not subject to the restraints obligatory on them, but can do as he pleases in all matters : lamentable because disregard for law on the part of the ruler starts a stream of disobedience and crime that broadens and deepens with its onflow until it undermines the foundation of a nation's strength and leaves ruin and wreck behind it. When Vashti, the queen, refused to obey her kingly husband, the Prince Memucan declared in response to the king's question as to what must be done with the royal rebel : "Vashti the queen hath not done wrong to the king only, but also to all the princes, and to all the people that are in all the provinces of the King Ahasuerus. For this deed of the queen shall come abroad unto all women, so that they shall despise their husbands in their eyes." Nothing tends more surely to rob law of its majesty than for so called majesty to claim exemption from it or ignore its provisions. And when a nation's judiciary countenances such action, there is the best of reasons for most serious apprehension on the part of the law-loving and law-abiding as to the outcome in the future.

Precisely thus do matters stand in England to-day. With a law upon her statute-books pronouncing gambling a crime for any of her subjects, the heir-apparent to the throne sets the example of, and encourages by explicit word, the infringement of that law. The most serious aspect, so it seems to us, of the recent notorious baccarat scan-

dal, was not the discovery of cheating on the part of one who participated in the game, but the fact that he who should have stood pre-eminently for the integrity of the law, he who by deed and word should have been an exemplar to his people and the supreme exponent of law's inviolability, could have condescended to undermine the authority of the throne by his ignoble and lawless action. It is no wonder that one of London's most famous preachers should have closed a sermon, in which he had treated most caustically the stigma that had fallen on England's royalty by royalty's own action, with the words, "Long live the queen!" He but expressed so a sentiment that was general throughout the realm among thoughtful and law-abiding subjects, that the day of the ascension to the throne of the present prince—unless

"Consideration like an angel came
And whipped the offending Adam out of him"

—would be a day that boded ill for the nation, since, when the sceptre came into his hands, it would be in the hand of one to whom self-gratification was of more moment than the law's exaltation ; a sentiment like that of the fourth Henry concerning the wild Harry :

"The soul of every man
Prophetically does forethink thy fall.
Had I so lavish of my presence been,
So common-hackney'd in the eyes of men,
So stale and cheap to vulgar company,
Opinion, that did help me to the crown,
Had still kept loyal to possession."

To those whose judgment is not blinded by the dazzling glitter of royalty the words that fell from the lips of the Chief Justice of England—wherein he condoned the action of the prince and endeavored to smoothe away the effects of the telling arraignment of the solicitor-general, acting as counsel for Sir William Gordon Cumming—are simply amazing. That a Coleridge should lower himself to the level of a Caliban in "foot-licking" would have been deemed impossible had it not been actualized. Well had it been had he kept in mind the counsel of the royal

proverb-writer: "It is not good to have respect to persons in judgment. He that saith unto the wicked, Thou art righteous, him shall the people curse; nations shall abhor him; but to them that rebuke him shall be delight, and a good blessing shall come upon them." The "lame and impotent conclusion" that the diversions of a prince were of larger moment than the sacredness of law, that the entertainment of the heir to the throne was more to be considered than the stability of the throne, a "conclusion" announced by one sworn to interpret and apply without fear or favor the law, upon respect for which that throne is founded, was but an indication of the inevitable tendency of royal demoralization. An unbalanced brain will cause the feet to stumble. If "princes are rebellious and the companions of thieves"—and what is disregarded for law but rebellion, or cheating but thieving?—their corruption is bound, by a law of nature, to circle outward and downward till the whole body-politic is more or less infected.

"The cease of majesty
Dies not alone, but, like a gulf, doth draw
What's near it with it: it is a massy wheel
Fix'd on the summit of the highest mount,
To whose huge spokes ten thousand lesser things
Are mortis'd and adjoined; which when it falls,
Each small annexment, petty consequence,
Attends the boisterous ruin."

Perhaps it is well to remind our American readers that a rebellious attitude with relation to law is not peculiar to the one individual upon whom attention has been fastened hitherto. When it is remembered that in almost every one of our great cities the common council contains no small percentage of men who represent a traffic that is notoriously antagonistic to existing law—men who are proprietors of saloons, and defiantly break the statutes concerning them week after week, year in and year out; that there is also good reason to believe that in every one of our legislative bodies, State and National, are to be found some who do not "shake their hands from the hold-

ing of bribes," but "with shame do love, Give ye;" that even in higher official position still there have been, if there are not now, men to whom public office is regarded as a private trust, affording opportunity for personal emolument; when all this is remembered, it will bring more closely home the conviction that there is a responsibility resting upon us as individual citizens which cannot be evaded, of seeing to it, so far as we may, that those who represent the people in the making and in the execution of law, in its enactment and in its enforcement, shall themselves be obedient to law. This will demand both vigilance and patience, and a willingness to put partisan considerations below those of the general weal. Moral principle must be regarded as the very first requisite in any candidate for political office. "They that stand high have many blasts to shake them." They need a sturdy conscientiousness to support them, and the possession of this should be the first of all the characteristics demanded of them. A man of integrity—one who is an integer and not a fraction—is the only kind of a man capable of worthily filling an office of trust. A clear conscience is the essential of a truly good judgment. He who has not the light of moral principle to guide him will walk in darkness politically.

Such should be the teaching of our pulpits. To this extent, at least, politics may enter its sacred precincts. A Christian citizenship should be taught to set honor upon office by demanding that honorable men alone shall occupy office—such men as Whittier pictures in his "Sumner":

"Suffice it that he never brought
His conscience to the public mart;
But lived himself the truth he taught,
White-souled, clean-handed, pure of heart.

* * * * *

His statecraft was the Golden Rule:
His right of vote a sacred trust;
Clear, over threat and ridicule,
All heard his challenge: 'Is it just?'

The Privileged Law-Breaker: the American Saloon.

By H. L. WAYLAND, D.D., EDITOR OF THE "NATIONAL BAPTIST," PHILADELPHIA, PA.

WE have among us a class of men who are above the law, who violate the law with impunity; who, if necessary, unmake the law; though, it is true, as a general thing they find it quite as easy to allow the law to remain unrepealed on the statute-book, but simply to set it at naught.

This class includes a very large range of persons—the distiller, who lives in a palace, who is clothed in purple and fine linen, who on occasion dispenses an almost royal hospitality, who perhaps has a pew in the broad aisle, and whose contributions would be greatly missed; who is a patron of the fine arts, who has a gallery, admission to which is a prized privilege; whose patronage is sought by artists; who often subscribes large amounts to public objects; the brewer, who, in England, stands a good chance of becoming a peer of the realm, as already several of the fraternity have done, as Lords Burton, Hindlip and Ardilaun; and, along with these, Patrick O'Donohue, whose stock in trade is a barrel of whiskey, or, more properly, a gallon of whiskey extended to a barrel (for the gallon resembles the widow's cruise of oil in being susceptible of indefinite multiplication); and the keeper of the lager-beer saloon, where politics are manufactured for the Teutonic voters who make up the ward. To these I might add the allies and slaves of these men, the politicians, who are sustained by their money and by their votes, and who in turn give them such laws and such officials as they demand; the owners of real estate, who derive from them a rent such as no other kind of business could afford to pay; the wretched victims who are enslaved body, soul, and will, and who yield up at their demand wages, home, wife, children, life, immortality; and the larger class of respectables, who from in-

dolence or from cowardice or from interest allow all these things to exist. The distiller, the brewer, the retailer, and all those who are swayed by them, through the potent influence of ambition, avarice, appetite, and apathy—all these I venture to class under the one name, The Saloon. And I affirm that the Saloon is the great law-breaker of our time.

The very existence of the Saloon is a violation of the unwritten law of every community; the law that no one shall infringe on the rights of his neighbor. The very existence of the Saloon robs all surrounding property of half its value; the vicinity of the Saloon exposes to ruin the young along with their parents. The law does not allow a road, however useful and necessary, to be carried through without adequate compensation to those whose property it injures. Every Constitution provides that no property shall be taken for public uses without compensation to the owner. And yet the saloon has no scruples in robbing me in a single day of half the value of my property. No one is allowed to put a bolt factory or a bone-boiling establishment or a manufactory of nitro-glycerine in the midst of a crowded city; but the Saloon unhesitatingly plants itself wherever it will.

It is a violator of the spirit, if not the letter, of all constitutions and all laws. The welfare of the community is the supreme law; and this law is perpetually violated by the Saloon.

While thus the Saloon violates the spirit of all law, it is equally a violator of the letter. It sets at naught the laws which forbid sales to minors, the laws which forbid minors to frequent the saloons, the laws which forbid sales on Sunday, the laws which forbid sales to habitual drunkards or to those already intoxicated.

The Saloon not unfrequently has the brutal candor to confess that it can live only by violating the law. A saloon-keeper to whom I spoke on the subject of keeping open on Sunday, said, "Sunday is worth to me three or

four ordinary days." In the city of Philadelphia a Methodist church—all honor to the valiant followers of John Wesley and of John Wesley's Master!—proceeded against a beer garden in the neighborhood, and forced the proprietor to respect the laws which forbade sales on Sundays and sales to children. This action in a short time compelled the closing of the garden; and the man by this act silently acknowledged that his infamous business could live only by violating the law; that obedience to the laws, lax and imperfect as the laws confessedly are, would be fatal to his business. Out of this action of the Methodist Church grew the Law and Order Society, which has been a great blessing to Philadelphia.

The Saloon allies itself most nearly with everything that is a violation of law; it allies itself to the lowest dance house, to the dive, to the den of prostitution. Some years ago, under the influence of the Society for the Prevention of Vice, in New Haven, Conn., the Commissioners refused a license for a building in which was carried on a Variety Show. As the result, the Variety Show was abandoned; the two were so mutually dependent that the one would not succeed without the other. The Saloon and the Variety Show, the Saloon and the Dive, the Saloon and the Gambling Hole, these are sets of Siamese Twins; the one cannot live without the other.

The following, from the *Wine and Spirit Gazette*, is surely significant:

"The Phillips law, passed by the last Legislature of Ohio, forbidding the sale of liquors in houses of ill-fame, went into effect on May 25th. The importers of champagne in this city are beginning to feel the loss of business in Ohio. Piper Heidsieck representatives in Cincinnati claim that the enforcement of the law in the big cities of Ohio will cost them \$40,000 annually; Mumm Company's representatives estimate their loss at \$30,000; importers of Pomery Sec claim that they will lose \$60,000, and other importers will suffer proportionate

losses. The local brewers also feel the effect of the new law, as many of the houses in Cincinnati and Cleveland sold large quantities of beer."

The statement shows how close is the relation between the Saloon and the house of prostitution. In fact, is there any crime, any form of infamy, any enemy to the home and to virtue, with which the Saloon does not ally itself?

The Saloon is the parent of every crime. It fortifies the intending murderer for his act; it inflames to crime him who otherwise is quiet and law-abiding; it sends the maddened drunkard to his home—no, that holy term cannot be applied in this case—it sends him, shall I say, to his kennel, to murder his patient, long-suffering wife. It lends itself to every crime. A minister in one of the inland towns of Pennsylvania said to me, "At the most gorgeous of our saloons, it is a common occurrence for a young woman, hitherto unfallen, to be invited to take some harmless refreshment. Then she is drugged into insensibility, and, while in this condition, is ruined; then, when she has recovered consciousness, there is set before her the impossibility of her returning home, and finally she is shipped off to Philadelphia or to New York as a recruit to the great army of the fallen, which with hideous steadiness keeps its ranks ever full, though the term be but of two or three years."

It is in the Saloon that the young man takes the first steps in the course which ends in defalcation, shame, and ruin.

With a no doubt unconscious humor, the Saloon in New York has appointed Hon. Paddy Diver, the keeper of many saloons, as police-justice. This eminent jurist will have one advantage over many of his fellows on the bench. When the law-breaker, the thief, the murderer, is brought before Judge Diver, the criminal may at least feel that he enjoys the great constitutional privilege of being tried by his *peer*.

At the foundation of republican government lies an honest ballot as the

expression of the will of the majority. Of this honest ballot, of this intelligent expression, the Saloon is the implacable foe. Just in proportion to the prevalence of the Saloon is the prevalence of fraud, of the ignorant, the drunken, the purchased ballot. Every citizen of the Metropolis knows that in the wards where the Saloon holds sway, the talk of a fair ballot is a mockery. Boss Tweed well understood how to rule the Metropolis, and through it the State.

The charter of a Nation lies, not in its written constitution, but in the character of the people. The experience of the South American republics reminds us of how little consequence are paper forms of government if there be not present behind these forms an upright, intelligent people capable of self-government. Against this character of the people, the Saloon, from the very necessity of the case, is pledged. It strikes at the very charter of the national life.

And yet, while the lawlessness of the saloon, while its violation of every law, written and unwritten, is so outbreaking, we are compelled to confess with humiliation that the Saloon is largely our master. I imagine it would be impossible, in any of our great cities, for a chief magistrate to be elected who was avowedly hostile to the Saloon. Along with its wickedness and unscrupulousness and lawlessness, the Saloon is united; it is in earnest; it means what it says; it knows what it wants; it means to have it; it is willing to pay for it; it is ready to strike down anything that stands in its way; it sticks at nothing, whether fraud, bribery, or murder.

We must make up our minds that the war against the Saloon must be marked by an earnestness, a tirelessness, a wisdom, a tenacity, a bravery, not less than that by which we are confronted.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Our Sermonic Section.

IN A REVIEW such as this, which is absolutely undenominational, it is the intention to exclude everything that may in any wise seem to suggest criticism or reflection upon the creed or polity of any of the various divisions of the Christian Church. This rule is religiously observed in every contribution of an editorial character, and it is the intention also to adhere strictly to it in the selection of articles for the Review Section, and of sermons for the Sermonic Section. As will be readily seen, the latter section presents opportunities for suggestion or assertion which may be construed by the unduly sensitive as assaults upon the systems which they represent. While we shall endeavor to keep it free from anything that is manifestly of such a character, we cannot hold ourselves responsible for the sentiments of the contributors to this section or for the sensitiveness of its readers.

An Erroneous Quotation.

IN AN admirable article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, Professor Hunt, of Princeton, a name well and favorably known to our readers, asserts that "one of the supreme tests, on the secular side, of a call to the ministry is . . . so to express thought as to make it perfectly plain to the recipient mind, so that, as the Scriptures declare, 'he who runs may read.'" The necessity of clear thinking and clear speaking is granted. But where are we to look for this so-called declaration of Scripture? Is it in the Old Testament or in the New? We venture the assertion that it cannot be discovered between the covers of any English version of the Bible, and also that there is nothing that corresponds with it in the Hebrew or Greek versions now in our possession. What may have been in the inerrant documents which certain of our friends claim to have come from the pens of the

original and inspired writers of the books of the Bible, we do not know. Indeed this hypothesis leaves us altogether at a loss as to how much of our present Scriptures are to be accepted and how much rejected. But this aside. The nearest approach we are able to discover to what is so frequently said to be a declaration of Scripture is the command of Jehovah to the prophet Habakkuk (ii. 2). "Write the vision and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it." It will readily be seen that the idea herein conveyed and that which is hinted at in the popular rendering of it are by no means identical. The latter, "he who runs may read," suggests that the message be so plain that the passing glance of one who is hurrying along shall be able to catch its significance; the former, "he may run that reads," suggests that the wording of the message be so plain that he who reads shall quicken his steps until he reaches a place of safety, thus reminding us of the angelic command to Lot, "Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in any part of the plain. . . . Haste thee" (Gen. xx. 17, 22). Both convey important truths, both emphasize the need of plain utterance; but it is hardly to be questioned that the scriptural expression is the more suggestive of the two.

Reopened Churches.

It is probable that by the time of the issue of this number of *THE HOMILETIC* all our city churches will be open again for their regular services. Doors that have been closed for two or three months will have been unlocked; dust that has accumulated through the summer will have been carefully removed; walls that have stared down on empty pews during that period will have begun to re-echo the sounds of ardent devotion from the lips of reassembled worshippers, and everything will begin again to evidence the spiritual prosperity of the respective congregations.

All of which is, of course, very encouraging.

But there is a question that will not down, and that is, Ought our churches, save for the sake of repairs or some corresponding necessity, ever to be closed? Is it not true that their closing is at the cost of the rights and desires of no small fraction of their various congregations? Is it not true that in nine cases out of ten the majority of the congregations of these closed churches spend their summers in, and not out of, the city? And even if this is not true, is it not the case that the spiritual needs of such of our church-members as remain in the city are as great during the summer as at other seasons of the year? And is it not also the case that there are enough of the unchurched classes in our cities during the summer to fill every one of our churches, some of whom, as the result of earnest, consecrated effort, might be induced to attend them; perhaps would do so the more readily that that which gives to some of them the title of "fashionable," during the rest of the year, is at that time absent from them?

We are persuaded that the closing of these edifices is a great mistake. Better far secure the pastoral services of some devoted servant of God, and the musical ability of some capable leader of song, and some efficient instrumentalist, and endeavor to utilize all the forces of the home-staying portion of the congregation, and let the work of soul-saving and soul-building go on, Sabbath by Sabbath, without interruption, the year round. It is too often the cry of the poor that our churches exist for the rich. To have any countenance given to such a cry, by virtually treating such as have the means to take a summering as the only ones worth regarding in the matter of church accommodation, is a great blunder, not to say crime. It is but fostering the idea of the existence of class distinctions in our churches, and the irritation between poor and rich, which is already deep-seated enough, perhaps not altogether

groundlessly. Our Protestant churches may well learn from their Roman Catholic neighbors a lesson in this particular. We do not yet adequately appreciate, as do they, how completely the religion of Jesus Christ abolishes such distinc-

tions as we have allowed to enter, and in some measure, to control our management of ecclesiastical things. Whatever their pastors and some of their members may do, let not our churches take vacations hereafter.

BLUE MONDAY.

The Best Parishioner.

WHEN I first took charge of my present congregation, more than twenty years ago, one of my best parishioners said to me, "Now I am president of a bank, and of two coal companies, director of a railroad, a member of our school board, etc. These have frequent meetings, but, unless there be something *very* urgent, you may expect me at every church meeting, *week-day* as well as Sunday."

From that day none has been more faithful and ready to take part in every service than he.

He then paid one-fourth of the salary, more than one-fourth of the benevolence, and made up the deficits at the close of the year, if there were any. At the close of one year, as his pastor was starting to synod, he handed him \$50 for missionary purposes, saying, "I want to give this extra to the Lord this year, for saving the life of my son George," who had been very seriously hurt by an accident in which two other young men lost their lives. Instead of curtailing his gifts to the Lord on account of extra doctor bills, he increased them because of the Great Physician's goodness. He was then in good circumstances financially. He afterward became embarrassed. He had given his note to Wittenberg College for \$5000, on which he was annually paying \$400 interest. He said to me, one day, "I have just paid the interest on my college endowment note, and left my taxes delinquent."

He is a man of very fine mind, of much more than ordinary intelligence, and has but few equals among the laity as a theologian.

We never speak in his presence that we do not feel there is, at least, one in the audience that knows more than we do.

He is the best listener we ever knew—never takes eyes off the speaker. Knows every word you have said when you get through. The best critic we ever had. Modest, unobtrusive and kind with all. After falling in business, and not able to *pay* to church as formerly, he resolved to do more of its spiritual work. He has kept his promise. Although over "threescore years and ten," he is still a zealous worker in church and Sabbath-school.

When absent from a church service, he seldom fails to either send his excuse to the pastor, or give it himself the first time he sees him.

Does all he can to encourage pastor and people, by praising their virtues and apologizing for their failings,

G. W. H.

A New Way to Tie Old Knots.

THERE was to be a wedding fine,
A little out of the usual line.

Two sisters fair resolved to mate,
And enter wedlock's holy state.

A double knot was to be tied;
Such was the choice of the elder bride.

Now each had chosen a different man,
According to the ancient plan,

And each had joined a different church,
While for the true way each did search.

The Presbyterians baptized one;
The other's praises, Methodists sung:

And each elected, as was right,
That her own shepherd should unite

Her heart and hand and all her life
To him who longed to call her wife.

'Twas so arranged, the feast was spread,
And to the altar both were led.

The Presbyterian did his part,
And filled with joy the bridegroom's heart.

The Methodist was still quite young;
His ministry had but begun,

And ne'er before had he been asked
To take a part in such a task.

The words he so desired to say
Took themselves wings and flew away.

His tongue grew dry, his knees did quake,
The awful silence none did break.

At last, with forehead beaded o'er
With sweat, that oozed from every pore,

He said in accents of dismay,
"Give heed, my friends, to what I say.

"I'm very sure you all must own,
That 'tis not well to live alone.

"This youthful pair desire to prove
That life is nothing without love.

"All who consent that they should try,
May make it known by saying 'aye;'

"And what is joined by human band
Must not be loosed by God's command.

"You now, my friends, are man and wife,
I wish you both a happy life."

MARION E. DEALL.