

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—FEBRUARY, 1888.—No. 2.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—BETTER TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR THE MINISTRY.

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

ANYTHING like a full discussion of the subject suggested in the title to this paper would include a consideration of four points, namely,

1. The Choosing of Teachers ;
2. The Choosing of Students ;
3. The Choosing of Subjects to be Taught ;
4. The Choosing of Methods for Teaching.

Of the four important points thus stated, I select for present treatment two only, the first and the last. In treating them I will try to be as direct and as practical as possible, saying what I have to say with frankness and with candor.

In the first place, then, as to the choosing of teachers for the work of theological instruction.

I do not think we exercise careful wisdom enough in seeking to get the best teachers obtainable for our theological students. One reason is that we do not sufficiently recognize the difference between teachers and teachers. Good teachers are never anywhere in abundant supply. The teaching gift is rare ; it is perhaps as rare as it is precious. I have myself, first and last, had a great many different teachers, but among them all there are not more than two or three whom I could conscientiously pronounce eminently good ones.

Consider. To be an eminently good teacher, you must first know ; second, know how you came to know ; third, know that others are not necessarily to take that same path, or any same path, in coming to know ; fourth, be quick in intelligence to see, in each several case, what path to knowing is the one natural and best for another to take ; fifth, alert ever to understand that other's conception, right or wrong ; sixth, sagacious to divine his difficulties ; seventh, fertile in providing alternative forms of expression for an idea to be conveyed ; eighth, indefatigably patient to insist on the learner's really getting what is conveyed ;

ninth, imperturbably exacting to require that, in order to the learner's really getting what is conveyed, the learner be able to give what is conveyed in at least one new and independent statement of his own ; tenth, inexpugnably skeptical about the learner's ability to do this, until he has actually done it.

All this hints, and only hints, what your equipment as teacher must be, in order barely to convey ideas successfully from your own mind to, or perhaps I should say into, the mind of another.

But that is quite the least and lowest of the functions of the teacher. Far more important it is that you be competent to make the learner form original and independent judgments of his own. For, causing the learner to learn, that is, effectively to understand what you communicate, is only a first thing—the first thing, if you please—necessary in teaching. A second thing—more important, I repeat, than the first, though it must follow that—is causing the learner to form opinions or judgments of his own on that which he has come to understand. Thus to form independent judgments is to begin truly to *think*. That farther and higher form of thinking which consists in originating propositions for others to understand and to pass judgment upon as true or as false, is a quite different matter—a matter not capable perhaps of being taught, but depending upon innate capacity in the individual thinking mind. Discipline, however, toward just and fruitful intellectual exercise in this line cannot be different from that required in learning to form judgments on propositions submitted to the mind from without itself.

The ability to teach to think is by no means the same as the ability to think. Many a man stands in the teacher's place who is a thinker himself indeed, and who very likely excites in learners just enthusiasm of admiration for his powers, but who, in truth, does not teach those admiring learners to think. Open-mouthed admiration, on a student's part, for his teacher, is one of the most disqualifying conditions imaginable for learning to think. Far better shock and stagger your pupil with paradox, or with absolute eccentricity and whim, than permit that pupil to sit stupidly agape with mere credulous admiration of you, his teacher. In truth, no really first-rate teacher will let any pupil of his lapse into the passivity of listening to vacantly admire. The best stimulation is stimulation to question, to doubt, to discuss, to differ, and at last to accept, if accept at all, only for reason, and not at all for authority. The ideal teacher—human teacher, that is to say—will have no disciples to swear into his words as into the words of a master. All his disciples he will lead to pay regard, not to himself, but only to truth.

I have limited myself to speaking here of the distinctively teaching gift in the teacher. That the teacher should be also a man of character is of course understood. If, beyond this, he possess, too, something of

that indefinable quality which we call personal magnetism, it is well. But this last thing, desirable as it is, may possibly be dispensed with. The teaching gift—that is the one thing, apart from sound moral character, which the teacher absolutely must possess.

Yet it is not too much to say that this one only indispensable trait—mental and moral both—in the teacher is practically treated as something desirable no doubt, if it happen to exist in conjunction with various other traits in the candidate, but incidental rather than principal. Not until there comes to be, on the part of those who select teachers, a general intelligent recognition of the quite inexorable necessity of the teaching gift in a candidate for the teaching office—not until then shall we be even well on the way toward that actual best choice of workmen in the art of ministerial education which is urgently needed. Meantime, one thing is too evident to admit of being gainsaid, or even argued—and that is the expediency of keeping as long as you can a good teacher whom once you have had the singular felicity of finding.

But how find the good teacher? That is really our question. In the choice of teachers for theological students, so much depends practically on the president of the particular institution that, first of all, to have him the right man is indispensable. If he himself teaches, he should of course be a good teacher; but it is almost more important that he be a good judge of teachers. And if he is, he will regard the teaching gift in a candidate for the teacher's place as of primary, not of secondary, consequence.

Practically, the question, How find your theological professors? almost resolves itself into the question, How find your president of the seminary? Whether this ought to be so may be doubted; but that in fact it is so is certain. Given a sufficiently long run of time, and as is the president, such will be the institution. There perhaps ought not to be in a theological school such an office as that of president. But if there is such an office, then what I now say of it is necessarily true. Almost the entire responsibility of administration is devolved on the president—the board of trustees and the executive committee sustaining to him much the same relation as the Roman senate sustained to the Roman emperor, and, for the most part, merely registering his decrees. It is hardly more than fair that this should be thus, so long as the president is virtually held responsible for the prosperity and growth of the institution. But such an existing state of the case at least emphasizes powerfully the importance of getting the right man for president.

The president of a theological seminary, if there is to be such an officer, should superadd to the teaching gift necessary to him as a teacher a strong personality, which will be necessary to him as administrator of government and discipline. One without personal experience of his own in a theological seminary as professor or as student might

naturally suppose that of discipline, in such a school, there could be no need. But a supposition of that sort would be a great mistake. Discipline is necessary, though, indeed, if the right president be in the chair, the discipline will be preventive rather than punitive. It will consist in maintaining such a tone and atmosphere in the institution that insubordination and mischief-making on the part of students will have been rendered impossible before they could take a start. This tone and atmosphere will be, in an important part, maintained by keeping the studentship *clear of men who ought not to be theological students.*

Another trait besides powerful, positive personal character the president should possess, and that is keen sagacity and insight for divining the character of men. The president ought to know students almost from the first moment of their presenting themselves for admission, by a kind of instinct in him swifter far, and surer, than any process of observation and inference. This will go far toward enabling him to keep men out of the seminary who ought not to be in it. And it is useless to disguise the fact that too many such candidates offer themselves for enrollment among theological students. The attractions of the ministry—the worldly attractions, I mean—are neither few nor inconsiderable. There is a great deal of talk—talk such as once was true, but such as now is conventional—about the self-denials and self-sacrifices involved in the choice of the ministry for the vocation of a life. The simple truth is that, as things at present are among us Americans, the temptations addressing themselves to the worldly spirit in a young man to draw him into the ministry are by no means to be thought of little account. I feel prepared, through personal observation, to testify that at this precise point is to be found one of the most serious insidious dangers threatening the true life of the Christian church in our country.

There is therefore hardly any responsibility whatever more grave weighing on the president of a theological seminary than that of jealously guarding the entrance to his institution against men morally or spiritually unfit to be ministers. Our theological seminary presidents need every practicable help and incentive afforded them to be sagaciously faithful to their trusts. The beneficiary system must perhaps be maintained, but it certainly ought to be both incorruptly and wisely administered. As things are, this serious trust is almost wholly, not in form, perhaps, but in fact, in the hands of our seminary presidents. All this manifestly confirms me in saying that you must have the right man for seminary president. Already, in making these remarks, which seemed necessary, I have trenched upon a topic of the general subject—the topic of choosing students—which I reserve to consider more fully at another time and perhaps in another place. I go now to my second present topic, that of choosing better methods for teaching.

This topic admits of being, for convenience, divided into two parts :

namely, first, the question of organization for the seminary as a whole ; and, second, the question of procedure in the class-room, in the face-to-face relation of teacher with pupil. Let us take up these two points in their order.

1. As to the organization of the seminary.

This I would completely revolutionize—the organization, that is to say, such as it is generally found among the seminaries that exist. I would make the studies of the course, all of them, elective ; “elective,” that is to say, in a certain sense, a sense which I will presently describe; and “all of them” so, with one very important exception, an exception which I will presently name.

The sense in which I would establish the elective system is this : I would erect each department of instruction belonging to the seminary into a kind of independent sovereignty by itself, holding to the institution, as a whole, somewhat the relation of the individual State to the general government in our own American political system. Each department, under the autocracy of the responsible head of the department, should have full power and authority to graduate its students. Graduation from all the different departments should constitute, in the end, graduation from the seminary as a whole. I have thus indicated the organization actually, I believe, adopted, from the example of the University of Virginia, by the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, as also, more recently, from the model of the Louisville institution, by the “Baptist College,” a theological seminary, in Toronto. The different departments are, in these institutions, called “schools.” There will, for example, be the “School” of Hebrew, the “School” of New Testament Exegesis, the “School” of Church History, and so on. The Seminary is the collective group of these several “schools.”

The obvious advantages of this plan are very great, and the disadvantages are practically nothing. The disadvantage likely first to be thought of, in instinctive objection, is that students, remitted to their own preferences, might often, in leaving out the studies to which they were least inclined, leave out the studies of which they were most in need. But election would, of course, always be made by the student somewhat under the advice and direction of the faculty, whose influence could practically, in every individual instance, be carried as far as might be found desirable toward the limit of the virtually compulsory.

One advantage of the new organization recommended is that students pursuing studies elected by themselves, rather than studies required of them by others, would be pledged and incited to an indefinitely increased zeal of proficiency. The professor, on his side, meeting only with students animated with such zeal, would be agreeably and helpfully stimulated to do better in teaching than under existing conditions is possible to him. The misery of, for instance, a

Hebrew professor compelled by the fatuity of a cast-iron organization embracing his seminary to drag along a dozen reluctant students, who will eventually learn nothing valuable, all for the sake of two or three eager students who, but for their loath compulsory companions, might learn thrice as much—the misery, I say, of a Hebrew professor so conditioned is an occasion for pity. The absurdity of a plan of organization that inflicts this misery on the teacher and this real wrong on the best students is too transparent to be argued. There is really no reason in the world, none but the impracticable inertia of a false conservatism, why the change to a rational system should not be immediately effected. Under the mediæval system that prevails, we waste more than half our teaching force.

If it be feared that ministerial scholarship would suffer should Hebrew and Greek no longer be required of ministerial students, two things to reassure may justly be said—first, that scholarship is not indispensable to ministers; and, second, that ministerial scholarship would in fact gain, rather than lose, by the change proposed. You do not make scholars of men by choking Greek and Hebrew down their gorges. Some degree of relish for food is agreed by physiologists to be necessary for successful digestion. The like is true in matters of intellectual assimilation and nourishment. What you make of men by compulsory doses of Hebrew and Greek is, at most and at best, mere sciolists in those languages. You fit them to be pretenders in scholarship, not scholars. God be thanked, men may be good preachers and not know anything of tongues save of those manners of speech wherein they were born. Undoubtedly it is better for a minister to be a good scholar in Hebrew and a good scholar in Greek, if such he may be, than it is to be utterly ignorant of those languages; but I insist it is better that he be utterly ignorant of those languages, than that he impose on himself, or impose on others, the idea of his knowing something effective in this line when, in fact, he knows nothing whatever as he ought to know. The pulpit suffers, perhaps, less by ignorance than it suffers by vain pretension of knowing. Scholarship is good; but genuineness is still better than scholarship. Let us have genuine scholars; and willing students will be found to have made the only genuine scholars. But let us also admit that men may make first-rate preachers, and not be more than third-rate scholars.

The historical argument in favor of organization by schools is already strong, and it grows stronger and stronger year by year. The experience of the Louisville and Toronto institutions leads, I believe, all the members of their faculties to regard their own adoption of the scheme as a measure of high advantage to both teacher and student.

So much, briefly, on the subject of changed organization for the theological seminary. I have yet, however, to name the one exception I would make to the rule of electivity for all the studies of the course.

That exception should be—the Bible. I would require every seminary student to go through the entire Bible in English under a teacher before becoming a graduate either of the seminary or of any department in the seminary. In now and then a case it might be well to let an examination resulting satisfactorily exempt a student from the necessity of so studying certain parts of the Bible with which he might already by exception be intelligently and effectively familiar. But graduation, either complete or partial, should always mean that the graduate is, by test, reasonably proficient in knowledge of the Bible.

Just how this comprehensive study of the Bible should be accomplished is an important question of detail into which I cannot here enter at large. There are weighty considerations in favor of the plan of dividing the Bible into sections for study, to be judiciously apportioned among the several departments of instruction already ordinarily existing in our theological seminaries. Thus the department of Systematic Theology—Biblical Theology, perhaps, would be a better name—might take the more distinctively doctrinal parts of the Bible; the department of Church History, those parts which are prevailing historical; the department of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology those parts which contain specimens of preaching, formal or virtual, or which contain directions specially addressed to ministers; and so forth.

I hazard now, of course, the merest tentative hint toward a possible arrangement of the matter. The departments of Hebrew and New Testament Greek might reserve to themselves such portions of Scripture as they severally judged to be best adapted to serve as discipline to mastery of the languages and of the principles of Biblical interpretation—while, additionally, they should take their proportional share of such parts of the Bible as were not found naturally assignable by preference to any one particular department of instruction more than another. This whole affair is, as I have intimated, an affair of detail which I am far from undertaking, even thus tentatively, to settle. The thing on which I feel prepared to insist is that somehow the whole Bible shall have been effectively studied by every seminary graduate, complete or partial. There would naturally, also, need to be instruction given on the Bible as a whole made up of parts—as a book not less than as a collection of books. Let the Christian constituency in the churches signify their will, and, it may safely be trusted, a way will be found. The will is indeed full half of the way.

2. Of importance not inferior to that of the point just treated, namely, the question of organization for the seminary as a whole—is the last question that remains for present discussion, namely, the true method of procedure to be followed in the actual business of teaching, that is to say, where professor and student come to close quarters, face to face with each other in the class-room. One sole principle should guide, the principle of making the process itself of learning, on

the student's part—the process, I mean, irrespective of result—become a perpetual discipline to the future minister for the work of his life. That work is preaching and pastoral care. The theological seminary exists in order to make preachers and pastors. This I assume as a postulate that will not be questioned. If scholars, if exegetes, if commentators, if professors, as distinguished from actual ministers, are also made, that, I take it, is incidental, accidental almost. The seminary is not founded, is not maintained, ought not to be administered, for that. The theological seminary, I repeat, exists in order to train preachers and pastors. Let us keep this fundamental fact in mind and govern ourselves accordingly. Let us adapt the whole course of training as directly and uniformly as we can to that principal, proper aim for which the theological seminary exists.

Now, the recluse, studious habit in a man is not the right habit for a minister. The minister's true haunt is not among books, but among men. The minister's true object is not to learn in order that he may know, but to know in order that he may teach. The mere act of acquiring knowledge is in itself, every time, a force to disqualify rather than to qualify the acquiring mind for the act of imparting the knowledge acquired. For this reason the whole seminary course, as frequently conducted, naturally tends to unfit the student to make that practical use of his acquisitions which nevertheless is to be the one business of his subsequent life. This, of course, is all wrong; and wrong the more because it is all needless. The intellectual training imparted in the seminary admits of being imparted in such a way that the process itself in which the student engages shall be one continuous discipline to the peculiar work of his life in the ministry.

What, to a minister, is the work of his life? That work may be said to consist of two functions, the function of learning, and the function of telling. This equally whether the minister exerts himself as preacher or as pastor. The student, then, should be immediately put upon the way of learning things distinctly and practically with a view to telling the things that he learns. Every exercise in which a class engages, and this indifferently with every professor, should, to every student, be an exercise in the art of imparting ideas that have been gained expressly for the purpose of being imparted. There should be *no* mere pouring in on the part of professors. There ought never to be a single passive moment allowed to any student under the hand of any professor. Every moment of time, in every class-room, should be to every student an active moment. If a student, in his turn, listen to his teacher, or listen to a class-mate, he should, in either case, listen actively—that is, with judgment incessantly exercised as to that which he hears, the truth of it, the value of it, the application of it, and then, besides, as to how that which he hears is said—with silent, collaborant, creative effort maintained meantime to improve, if possible, alike the thought and the

expression. Every time a student "recites," as the word goes, he should task himself to his utmost, not only to report his matter truly, but to report it clearly, strongly, elegantly, and this in point of articulation as well as in point of diction, syntax, and rhetoric. He should make sentences, short or long, whenever he speaks. All this it belongs to the province of the teacher wisely to enforce. And what I now urge applies, as I have said, alike to work done in whatever department of instruction—Hebrew and New Testament Greek by no means excepted. It is quite too much to expect of the departments of Homiletics and of Elocution that they shall, by dint of a few hours of right instruction given weekly, turn out good writers and good speakers, when, four or five times as many hours weekly, every student in the seminary is subjected, in the other departments, to a dispensation of slovenly utterance in the class-room—in which, perhaps, some of the professors even might be found to lead and outdo their pupils in the practice of interlarding broken syntax, vicious pronunciation, and bad grammar with innumerable hems and haws!

The just limits of space forbid that I should here elucidate by adequate illustration the hints I now submit as to the true law of method to be adopted in theological instruction. The fundamental maxim is, Make the activity of the student a perpetual praxis under criticism in what is to constitute the work of his life, namely, the getting and the giving of truth. This principle condemns the method by lecturing, much more the method by "dictation" in lecturing, and it condemns the use of a text-book, whether the professor's own production, or the production of another man—the use of a text-book, that is to say, as constituting the *basis* of the class-room instruction. The student should himself be set upon purveying and producing. This should not be incidental, but principal, in the part that he plays. It is a great damage to any man whose vocation is to make him a finder and promulger of truth to subject his mind, during three of the most eager and most plastic years of his life, to a process of being filled up, without originant effort of his own, with little effort of any sort, indeed, except the barren effort of remembering. A human intellect that, for three choice youthful years, has been converted into a passive "dumping"-ground to receive the thoughts, the analyses, the systems, the conclusions of other intellects is in a poor state of preparation for the strenuous business of the preacher and the pastor. The natural thing for a man to do who has been thus prepared for the ministry of the gospel is to serve his hearers as he has himself been served. He will first clear his "dumping"-ground of what has been loaded upon it, shoveling it off in undigested and indigestible masses, and, this done, wonder where henceforth he is going to get his sermons, now that he has preached all the metaphysics, all the church history, all the comparative religion, all the unapplied exegesis, he accumulated while in the seminary.

If the question be asked, How can what you recommend be converted from theory into practice? why, the answer is not very hard to give, but it would occupy space beyond what is now properly at my disposal. On a future occasion, I may return to the subject, should sufficient responsive interest be awakened to justify a somewhat extended exposition and illustration of the new method recommended. Meantime let me trust that to earnest conviction on the writer's part will be forgiven any unmeet dogmatism in tone of expression into which his wish to be at once brief, and clear, and strong, may here insensibly have betrayed him.

II.—HOW MAY THE LACK OF RELIGION AND MORAL CULTURE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS BE REMEDIED?

BY PROF. W. H. WYNN, PH.D., DEAN OF MIDLAND COLLEGE,
ATCHISON, KANSAS.

IN founding a system of Public Schools that will admit to equal privileges the children of all classes, there must be no restrictions on the score of race, or color, or religious opinion, or social standing. Particularly as a State institution it should be free from all interference from the church or the churches of the country, as to the kind of instruction to be imparted in the schools. In other words, the schools must have no ecclesiastical trammels; they must be secularized. They must be relieved of their old parochial limitations. And this process of secularization has gone on step by step in this country, until now there is scarcely a trace of the old parochial system left.

The first schools were church schools, and in these, of course, a prime object was to put the children in possession of so much general information as would fit them to receive intelligently the doctrines of the church. But those were days in which the church itself was under the patronage of the State, and the parochial school, originated in closest communication with the life and institutions of the church, was drawn more and more into the embrace of the State, with vastly augmented facilities and enlarging capacity, but with proportionate alienation from religion and the church. Then when the union of Church and State was severed, the schools very naturally and inevitably went with the State. And so everything conspired to bring about a complete secularization of the schools.

In this country we have very nearly reached the farthest limit possible in this direction. Bible reading and prayer as an opening exercise, and perhaps the occasional interspersing of a gospel song—in no way to be reckoned with the old-time direct methods of teaching religion in the schools—even these have come to have a very uncertain tenure in our great city schools. A few States have made statutory provision that no

ordinance shall be passed by any local board of education forbidding the use of the Bible in the public schools, but, as a general rule, the whole matter is put at the option of the local boards. Where the Bible is admitted it must be "without note and comment"—that is, it must not be expounded; the great organ of religious instruction, admitted into the school-room, must be kept as far away from the pupils as possible, and be handled as cautiously as if it were an explosive bomb.

This controversy, however, about the Bible has fallen into quiescence before newer and graver issues that are now staring us in the face. The curriculum of our public schools is not "godless," as our Catholic opponents are wont to say. That it could never be. So many of the secular studies there pursued were born of religion, and drew in Christianity with their vital breath, that they cannot be paganized, do with them what we will. All the leading civilizations of modern times are Christian civilizations; and the man that would undertake to teach history to children by avoiding all mention of the religion of Jesus, or by treating it as a mere excrement of superstition, hanging on the outskirts of national endeavor and impeding progress, would be set down as a charlatan, or worse, and could not get the humblest place in our schools. Modern history is Protestant Christianity "writ large." This is not the verdict of a sect, or a theologian, or a school. It is the reality of history; the truth of events. Take the history of Germany and France and the Netherlands, with England as a most conspicuous figure, and our own United States close by its side—what is it all but Protestant Christianity breaking away from the long lethargy of mediæval ecclesiasticisms and the effete despotisms for which they stood? We must teach history in our public schools; but that is almost the same thing as tracing out, step by step, the triumphant march of the religion of Jesus to the ends of the earth.

Our reading books are in the same plight. The simple stories made to interest children while they are learning to read, and the great masterpieces of English literature that are under study in the higher grades, are all more or less pervaded by the principles of the Christian religion, and the slightest taint of infidelity in any of them would exclude them from the schools. Now the epithet "godless," or even "Christless," will not apply to this state of things.

Nevertheless, it must be conceded that our schools are so far secularized as to disallow all positive and formal instruction in morals and religion, and to limit the teacher to only such indirect methods of impressing these subjects upon the minds of the children as may come round imperceptibly from his own personal bearing and character, or from the kind of discipline he may maintain. In other words, morals and religion are not directly taught in the public schools. These schools are for the people of all classes. The children indiscriminately must be welcomed to them. And as there prevails in every community the

widest diversity of belief and non-belief on the subject of religion; and as on this subject people are more sensitive than on any other, it would be impossible, it is argued, to touch upon it at all without wounding some prejudice, or setting up as propagandist for some particular sect. A Protestant teacher that would inculcate views of religion in the minds of Catholic children would be a mortal offense to the Catholic parents; and so, precisely, if the case were reversed. Yet both these classes, and all classes, have an equal right to the privileges of the school. Therefore, rather than embarrass the broadest and most liberal patronage of a system of free public schools, whose prime object at all events is to make citizens and not sectaries, the whole subject, despite its supreme importance, should be dropped out.

This style of reasoning, very forcible and specious in its day, is somewhat outgrown by the coming in of new conditions and new developments in the system which give to the problem an entirely changed aspect. We begin to see that it is a fatal error to identify denominational Christianity with religion, and so, for fear of doing despite to some one's theological shibboleth, in the name of every shibboleth casting all religion out. The fallacy is patent. To be religious is to be sectarian? There is no most bigoted denominational devotee that would not, at once and emphatically, deny the truth of that proposition. Somehow we all feel that, hopelessly wide asunder as we may be in other respects, religion is something broader and deeper than the incidental differences of our creeds, and that, in this shape, it can be grasped and incorporated without offense—nay, under the stress of a universal need—into our systems of instruction for the young.

Within the past few years science has discovered the fact—which somehow theology had overlooked—that religion is as much an indigenous growth in the complex spiritual organization of man as is art, or morals, or government, or any other distinctively human trait. It is a natural necessity running parallel with the other susceptibilities and powers, and not, as was aforesaid thought, of adventitious arrival in some gracious period of maturer years. The wide researches of comparative mythology and the science of religion, abetted by the fullest anthropological induction, have settled the question of the universality of religion, and demonstrated also that, instead of being simply co-ordinate with the other faculties in the constitution of human nature, it stands back of them all, and pushes them forward by a kind of divine incitement to higher and better things. It stimulates the intellect. It braces the will. It makes moral heroism possible. It sets up order in the world. Perhaps the one great lesson of history is that religion has had the perplexing pedagogy of every other faculty of man, aberrant and refractory as they have all been, leading them on, or pushing them up the acclivities of time. It is true that in times of reform and sharp social conflict religion has discharged its offices in a militant and controversial

spirit, but a generous philosophy can easily see that such a spirit was only incident to the exigency of the times.

Now, if such be the teaching of science—to wit, that religion is universal, and the deepest and strongest propulsive energy of the human soul—it becomes a question of the gravest importance as to whether it can be safely omitted, or even slighted, in the regime of our public schools. Abstractly religious instruction is fundamental to all other instruction, and if no provision is made for it in the schools, the inevitable product of a training purely intellectual, when it comes to be thrown upon the world with a *conscienceless* habit, will be a generation of skilled adepts in schemes of selfishness and greed. There is no risk in saying that purely intellectual training, the most thorough and efficient in the world, is as likely to bring forth a progeny of villains as a race of upright and order-loving citizens—excepting, perhaps, that a general refining influence is to be credited always to intelligence as against the coarseness and brutality which ignorance implies.

There are those among us now, farseeing men and statesmen, who are foreboding just this result upon the social life of our people from the absence of formal religious instruction in the public schools. They think they see it in the younger generation of business men that have just entered upon the various lines of trade with this non-religious equipment; in the lack of serious purpose in the young women; in the spirit that pervades the high schools and State universities; and generally throughout all the newer ranks of young people just pressing upon the stage. Religion was ignored for them in their school-days, the most plastic period of their lives; what wonder if, when out in the world, they should more and more lose a sense of its motives, and finally speak of it with sneers?

To all this assent may be given, but at the same time it may be thought an insuperable obstacle in the way of supplying the needed instruction, that denominational prejudices and infidel spleen cannot be enlightened on the subject. What will the Catholics say, with whom, also, Mr. Ingersoll and his disciples follow suit? It may be true that religion is indigenous in the human breast, and requires training as any other faculty does, and that in any regime of instruction it can easily vindicate its right to a commanding place. But the consummation is wholly ideal. It never can be realized so long as Christendom is divided up into sects, and so long as infidels enjoy their rights. The State must be no respecter of persons; it is the disinterested mother of us all; and so long as her laws are not violated, and her authority not resisted, she is bound to stand by us all, whether we are religious or not. We religionists have recourse elsewhere, they say. We are at liberty to send our children to Sabbath-school, or have them specially instructed at home in all the details of our religion, and of our religious caprices as well, if we regard the subject as of such paramount importance; but

to force it into the routine of the public school is simply impracticable in the existing order of things.

So they say. But, after all, is it impracticable to introduce formal religious instruction in the public schools? There is the Bible there to be read; and we are confident it will hold its place there as long as the schools exist. Legal restrictions as to how it is to be used, or prescriptions by local boards, can do nothing beyond inhibiting sectarian renderings of it and school authorities would probably find no occasion to interfere so long as the ethical and spiritual aspects of Bible history and poetry and teaching were judiciously and earnestly impressed upon the children's minds. "Without note and comment," alas! who is there to object if I, a Christian teacher, shall, every morning for five minutes, say, interrogate the children concerning some event, or series of events, in the life of our Lord, with the view, specifically, of drawing out from so high a source a moral principle to govern the life? If I better the morals of the children thereby, I certainly do well, but I do something more. Perfunctory morals, isolated morals, are by Christian invoice a worthless material; but morality with Jesus at the heart of it is only another way of defining the spiritual quickening he brought into the world. The supreme value of this can never be computed by man. We cannot conceive of any school board ever so abusing their office as to interdict this kind of religious teaching in the schools. The presence of the Bible in the schools will fairly guarantee this degree and kind of use to be made of it.

I would, therefore, venture the suggestion to all the Christian teachers of the land—and they make up three-fourths of their profession—to take their liberty here. If they have Christian experience at all; if they love Jesus, and have his fellowship as a moral power upon their lives, they have nothing in the whole inventory of their attainments so precious to communicate, and nothing that the rising generation of our day so much needs. Christianity is the universal religion; and what the teaching fraternity want to do is to seize upon its universal aspects—those features of it that are outside the old-time wars of the sects—and get these into the shape of a daily school-drill.

What then? We are reminded that no child, and no man, was ever made religious by instruction. That thing involves the co-operating will of man and the Spirit of God. It comes of training. It is achieved in a real battle with the evils of our estate, and out in the trials and ordeals of actual life. It cannot be dropped into the soul as men drop seed into the ground. And so, therefore, our five minutes' formal religious instruction, pursued never so earnestly, cannot of itself bring the result. The teaching will not secure religion to the child.

But is all religious instruction, therefore, of no avail? The pulpit, the Sabbath-school, the whole instrumentality of books—is every didactic agency in religion vain? Precisely what the pulpit does for

the congregation, or the book for the reader, that, also, positive religious instruction in the public school would secure for the child, viz., the intellectual *habitat*, so to speak, in which all spiritual life must grow. Instruction in religion, though not bringing in that great matter by any kind of necessary sequence, renders its coming a thousand times more hopeful than if it had to force its way up against the combined darkness of ignorance and sin. The Master knew this, and therefore bade his disciples go into all the world, and preach. The burden of their office was to make disciples of men, that is, *learners*—teaching them to observe—the rest, of course, the individual responsibility would have to bear.

Well, then, why not let it remain with the church, upon which it was originally imposed? Why, in any manner, share this feeding of the lambs with the public schools? Because, we answer, of the new and modern order of things, which has brought the church into altered relations with the people, pressing out the parochial school, and putting a large proportion of the children of any community beyond the reach of the church; and because the Sabbath-school cannot make up the loss. The Sabbath-school is a great and powerful instrumentality, but its limitations everyone feels. Religious instruction, like all instruction, must be line upon line, and should have the advantage of a daily and persistent routine. It has a double claim to this. It is more important than all other information, and it stands back of all other as its moral incitement and support.

Our venture may, indeed, lack the hearty and confident assent of many of our public men most deeply versed in the civil aspects of this great school question, but the leading educators of the land are beginning to feel that our public schools, wholly secularized, are vitally at fault at the point in which their fashioning agency is strongest; that in promoting knowledge they drown out reverence; that the aggregate results of their methods, whilst sufficiently satisfactory as against illiteracy, are deplorably lacking in that ethico-religious element which in all ages of the world has inspired true citizenship, and has been at the heart of all patriotic devotion to God and the native land. To remedy this state of things I have not hesitated to recommend a *tour de force* on the part of the Christian teacher, whereby he shall occupy the interdicted territory in the name of the King.

III.—A GREAT COURT PREACHER AND HIS SERMONS: A STUDY OF DR. ROBERT SOUTH.

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

WHEN a student in Andover Theological Seminary, Professor Phelps, then holding the chair of Homiletics, called my attention to Dr. South's sermons, strongly commending them as in some respects furnishing

excellent hints for a young preacher. It was sound advice, as his advice on all subjects was wont to be. I have never opened the volumes since, but to be more deeply impressed with the singular abilities of the noted English divine. His eccentricities, his bigotry, the absence from his discourses of everything like evangelical fervor, have obscured his merits as a preacher, have repelled too many from close acquaintance with his sermons. All models must be taken with exceptions. Servile imitation is pernicious folly. It is easy, however, to make all needed exceptions to South's sermons as complete models, and as for imitating him, the study of the man himself would be very apt to cure any such desire.

It will, perhaps, give point to some of the comments if we glance at the career of this unique and powerful specimen of the English pulpit. He was born in 1633—lived through the two great revolutions in England, dying in 1716. He was the direct product of the seventeenth century, was the contemporary of great poets like Milton and Dryden, of great Non-Conformists like Baxter and Owen, of great Churchmen and prelates like Laud, Jeremy Taylor and Sherlock. He was a student at Christ Church, Oxford, at the same time with John Locke, and in 1657 took his degree of A.M., "not without some opposition" from Dr. John Owen, then Dean of the college. His rise as a preacher was rapid: appointed University Orator in 1660, Prebendary of Westminster in 1663, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1670. After an absence on the Continent as Chaplain to the Polish Embassy, on his return to England he was made rector of Islip, and when he died was honored with a tomb in Westminster Abbey. It is to his credit that he was superior to ecclesiastical ambitions, and would accept no high preferment from either Charles II or James I—though it is said some of the highest dignities of the church were urged upon him. He was a marked instance of the *nolo episcopari*, conspicuous by its absence from the lives of English Churchmen. From the outset he was a bitter and somewhat unscrupulous assailant of Puritanism. He could not perceive its nobler side: only its forbidding features ever came into his view. His sermons—some of them, at least—are filled with acrid thrusts at Puritan practice, and with stinging sarcasms on Puritan leaders. It is not too much to say that he was as bigoted and fanatical in one direction as any whom he assailed on these grounds in others. But we can well afford to pass all this by in recognition of the nobler qualities he undoubtedly possessed. Calvinists should not forget his avowed and fearless assertions of Calvinistic doctrine. Trinitarians should remember how zealously he contended for what he thought a true doctrine of the Trinity, and how determined was his opposition to Socinianism. Puritans should consider that he showed no mercy to divines of his own household, as his onslaught upon Jeremy Taylor and Dr. Sherlock sufficiently attests. A good biography of Dr. South is yet to be written. But when it is written, few more interesting char-

acters will be found in that prolific seventeenth century. What will first strike any student of South is his masterly power of analyzing a subject and of arranging the order of discussion. It is evident that he had *thought through* his topics before he began his work of composition. Any good edition of his sermons has his plan of each prefixed to the discourse. It would be interesting to know how these plans were preserved. We conjecture that it must have been his habit to write them out fully on his manuscript. At all events, their preservation and publication, along with his sermons, make the volumes unique specimens of homiletical literature.

His introductions are specimens of a direct and business-like method for taking hold of his subject. They have the cardinal virtue of an introduction—*pertinency* to the matter in hand. And, what is of still more moment, his conclusions are always a welding together of the foregoing discussions for an intensely practical end. They are leveled point blank at the consciences of his hearers. Invariably his sermons end by “commending the truth to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

For modern hearers, the fault of these plans is excessive subdivision. In South’s time, people were not in love with essay-like discourses. They prized above all things a clear-cut and logical analysis. The modern pew dislikes anything so formal, and many preachers in their anxiety to have no “skeleton” appear, have left out nearly all the bones. Invertebrate sermons are not uncommonly heard, and, like all other invertebrates, belong only to the lower orders of creation. It would do many preachers a world of good to realize this, and study closely such a master as South in this art of dividing a subject.

The next quality in South, one which has a high homiletical value, is his style. It has every quality which the rhetorics lay down as fundamental, specially those fundamental to popular discourse—perspicuity and energy. This alone makes his sermons a vital part of English literature. For this he has been lauded by critics so competent as Jeffrey and Southey and Whipple. There is no English author where the power of well-chosen words fitted into well-compacted sentences is more manifest. Professor Fisher, in his recent admirable church history, has said of him, “His sentences follow one another like the strokes of a flail.” Here is a specimen from his sermon on “Interest Deposed and Truth Restored”:

“Martyrdom is stamped such only by God’s command; and he that ventures upon it without a call must endure it without a reward. Christ will say, ‘*Who required this at your hands?*’ His gospel does not dictate imprudence. No evangelical precept justles out that of a lawful self-preservation. He, therefore, that thus throws himself upon the sword, runs to heaven before he is sent for; where, though, perhaps, Christ may in mercy receive the man, yet He will be sure to disown the martyr.”

There was never greater need than now for study of good, racy, nervous English, in which the Saxon element plays its full part. It is what, after all, the people like best to hear. Any preacher who will make it his study is sure to find his reward. And no English preacher is a better model for this than South. He had faith in his mother-tongue. He has shown his faith in his works. A course of reading in his sermons would be a homiletical drill for many a young sermonizer, which would double his power as a preacher.

South, too, is a master in the use of figures of speech, not however by way of ornament. This he disdains. But for the purpose of making his thought take hold of his audience, of vivifying and pointing it, he lays illustrative imagery under tribute. In his sermon on "Christ's Promise the Support of Ministers," he gives his view of what sort of rhetoric ministers should use. Preaching is to be "easy, obvious and familiar; with nothing in it strained or far-fetched; with no 'airy fancies'—nothing like 'the fringes of the north star,' 'the down of angels' wings,' the 'beautiful locks of cherubim.'" No starched similitudes introduced with a "Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion'"—a palpable hit at Jeremy Taylor. South's creed is that there is a "certain majesty in plainness." Hence, though he uses figures of speech not sparingly, they are always for use, and never suggest any trick of ornamentation—as when he says of innocence, "It is like polished armor; it both adorns and defends," or of an old and decrepit sensualist, that he is "creeping, as it were, to the devil on all fours." When he wishes to point out the difference between the joys of a thoughtful person and the pleasures of a *gourmand*, he says they are as unlike "as the silence of Archimedes in the study of a problem, and the stillness of a sow at her wash." He says of man, as bearing the divine image, "We might well imagine that the Great Artificer would be more than ordinarily exact in drawing his own picture." It would be easy to multiply instances of his skill in the use of comparison or metaphor. A metaphor with him is often an object lesson in logic. When Emerson wanted to show Congressmen the fallacy in "pairing off" when votes on a great issue are taken, he simply asked what would have become of Grecian liberties if Leonidas and his Spartan band had *paired off!* So South often cleaves some absurdity in twain by a happy metaphor. Every effective preacher knows how to use such weapons. No one ever reproaches such a one as Beecher for using "flowery language." His metaphors, like his style, always mean business.

Dr. South's wit is commonly named as the distinctive characteristic of his preaching. This is, however, a superficial estimate of its power. His wit is an incident—a powerful incident, but still an incident—compared with the main element of his strength in that energy and incisiveness of style resembling "the unwearied fire of the epic poet," and in that close, clear thinking which makes his treatment of all sub-

jects open them to the dullest apprehension. Still, his wit is of so high quality, and is so masterful, that it richly deserves notice. Mr. Edwin P. Whipple has well analyzed it, as "no light and airy plaything with him, but generally a severe and masculine power. It gleams brightest and cuts sharpest when its possessor is most enraged and indignant. Though sometimes exhibited in sly thrusts, shrewd innuendoes, insinuating mockeries, and a kind of raillery half-playful and half-malicious, it is more commonly exercised to hold up adversaries to contempt and scorn; to pierce iniquity with shafts that wound as well as glisten, or to evade logical dilemmas by a lightning-like substitution of an analogy of fancy for one of the reason." Yet Dr. South knew well when to forbear the use of this weapon. There are many of his sermons where it would be out of place, and he is never witty for the sake of being so.

But is wit a proper weapon for the pulpit to use? There are those who deprecate its use as unbecoming the sacred office. We do well to remind such that the Hebrew prophet did not scruple to use it, and Elijah could not restrain his fiery sarcasm as he shouted to the priests of Baal, "Cry aloud; for he is a god: either he is musing or he is gone aside, or he is in a journey, or, peradventure, he sleepeth and must be awaked." If God has endowed any preacher with wit, he had best not hide that talent in a napkin. Guard it, but use it. But a preacher had best be sure he has it. Nothing belittles preaching like "smartness," and the mistake is often made nowadays of confounding vulgarity and slang with wit. Dr. South has sometimes misused this gift. In him, however, the offense is condoned by the noble service it rendered often in his scathing rebukes of sin—the sins of his time. Space forbids any lengthened series of illustrative passages from his sermons. We give one, however, from his discourse on "Satan Transformed into an Angel of Light." He is speaking of some spurious forms of sorrow for sin, and says: "On which case of supposed sorrow for sin, but real disturbance from some other cause, it is not questioned but many repair to the divine whose best casuist were an apothecary, and endeavor to cure and carry off their despair with a promise, or, perhaps, a prophecy, which might be better done with a purge. Poor self-deluding souls! often misapplying the blood of Christ under these circumstances, in which a little effusion of their own would more effectually work the cure; and Luke, as a physician, give them a much speedier relief than Luke as an evangelist."

Another element of power in South is his skillful analysis of all those moral states which lead to or involve a blinded or blunted moral sense. He had evidently studied the human conscience—not in treatises on moral science, but as he had seen human consciences working about him on all questions of the day. It is impossible to study such sermons as that on "Shamelessness in Sin," "Good Intentions No Excuse for

Bad Actions," "Of the Heinous Guilt of Taking Pleasure in Other Men's Sins," "Concealment of Sin no Security to the Sinner," without seeing how apt he was in tearing off all disguises and exposing men to themselves. Dr. South is never, or rarely, scholastic. He can be deeply theological, and yet use the language of everyday life. He knows how to discuss the whole round of doctrines, and yet always treat his subject in everyday fashion. He never forgets the "majesty of plainness;" and if men in the pulpit had learned from him how to discuss such themes, we should have far less foolish talk about the dryness of doctrinal sermons. No sermons are more doctrinal than South's, and none are less dry. He held Calvinistic views on sin, and he used them to good advantage in his discussion of the human conscience. The difficulty with much of our modern preaching is that nobody in particular seems hit by it. It is sound and orthodox, but for want of an analysis of the soul's operations in any course of sinning, the coat fits everybody alike, and no one puts it on. If any reader of this magazine will look carefully through the second general head of the discourse on "Shamelessness in Sin," he will see how by his masterly analysis of the subject South struck home, every time he took up a subdivision, to some people in his audience. I fear he little knew how to guide an awakened conscience to its only source of peace. But he certainly knew how to demolish the refuges of lies in which the sinners of our day, as of his, are sheltering themselves.

It would be omitting what is, after all, Dr. South's noblest quality as a preacher if we did not emphasize his bold attacks on the social immorality of his day. What that was can be read in the pages of Macaulay or Jeremy Collier's descriptions of the stage, or in any history of the time. For details our readers must go to such sources. But it is enough to say that never was immorality of every description more unblushing, and never was it more entrenched behind the prestige of the Court. We in recent times have known enough of the immorality of high life in London to make decent people shrink with disgust. But the Court of Queen Victoria is purity itself compared with that of Charles I or Charles II. She—the bright example of every womanly virtue—has purified her Court and made it all it is. But in South's day morality was sneered at or laughed at not less often by Charles II than by the creatures about his throne. Remember, now, that South was no Puritan. He was a Court-preacher. He believed in the divine right of kings. He held his position only by their gift—though he disdained all preferment to high office. It has been truthfully said of him that "never were debauchees and criminals exposed to a more merciless storm of ridicule and execration than when he poured on them the flood of his mingled contempt and wrath." His invective lights on every rank and degree beneath royalty, and there are sentences in his sermons which, if not aimed at the King, seem to strike him nevertheless. Thus, he says,

"A corrupt governor is nothing else than a reigning sin ; and a sin in office may command anything but respect."

Nothing can excel South's boldness in attacking sin in high places. He attacked nobility, men and women of fashion, statesmen, the men of wit, the corrupt authors of a corrupting literature. His shafts flew in every direction. He preached righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come*. South not only believed in hell, but believed in preaching it, at least to this class of sinners. All praise to him for his noble fidelity ! We can forgive him, in the memory of it, for all his bitter, stinging sarcasms against the Puritans. And commenting on this characteristic of South, Mr. Whipple* has said (we commend the whole passage to our readers): "A spurious toleration and liberality have supplanted the old earnest zeal. We live in an era of good feeling. The word unmentionable to ears polite burns the fingers of those who should launch it at sin. The meaning attached to the phrases of God's wrath and justice shocks our modern sensibilities." These be solemn words. And reading our newspapers from day to day, with what they disclose of modern sin and modern sinners, I have more than once asked myself why some Dr. South does not appear, and till then must commend the study of this brave preacher of sternest truth, in a time of fearful moral corruption, to those who occupy the pulpit of to-day.

IV.—PSYCHOLOGY FOR PREACHERS.

NO. III.

THE PSYCHIC CULTURE OF THE PREACHER.

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

IN spite of the predominance of material interests, the minister's position has not lost its ideal elements. The universal priesthood of believers exalts him because he occupies the foremost place among those who are all kings and priests unto God. As God's ambassador, he is called "the divine," and he is supposed to be the embodiment of spiritual excellencies which few mortals attain. The standard by which he is measured corresponds with the ideals connected with his position, and with the majesty and responsibility of his work.

We are not now considering the training of theological students, though that largely determines the character of the future preacher ; but we cannot suppress the query whether the student is not apt to lose sight of the real culture of his soul amid the efforts to acquire knowledge, and whether he is not in danger of regarding himself merely as a means to help others, rather than as an end in himself according to the divine purpose. What he becomes himself is of infinitely greater primary importance than what he is to others, for the simple reason that he can only be to others what he is *per se*. Neither is it our con-

* Essays, Vol. I, p. 401.

cern to concentrate attention on the studies of the minister, so often treated as of first importance. Our subject lies deeper, being the soul itself that is to be affected by the studies, and whose state is to determine the fruit of those studies. Here, as in treating of the hearer, we deal with what is fundamental to all psychic operations.

The theme is so fruitful because our state is much more in our power than is usually supposed. Much that has been pronounced *a priori* is evidently the product of culture, and the mind has been held to be under the control of the laws of association, when, in reality, reason itself was the supreme law. James Sully justly remarks, "There has been a tendency in English psychology to undervalue the active side of intellection." The disposition to study man in the brute, rather than in man himself, has made him so absolutely the product of heredity and his environment that the supreme energy of his will has been neglected, and consequently paralyzed. By proper effort a voluntary psychic culture is possible which determines the character, the tendencies, and the development of the soul.

A thought is produced and then forgotten, though the mind can never again be just what it was before it had that thought; but a real purpose or resolution of the will endures. Let us call it the Persistence of Purpose. I determine to prepare a sermon on a certain text, and that purpose controls the entire process of preparation, though I may not once again think of the fact that I purposed. I purpose studying in Germany, and that purpose domineers and shapes my course for years. The whole of life may be enfolded in a single purpose, as the tree in the seed.

The purpose which here interests us is that of soul culture with a view to the special work of the preacher. Many things which are essential must here be taken for granted as so evident that they need no special mention. Among these is the appreciation of the exalted nature of his work and a hearty love or real passion for its performance. "Whatever we have to do that is not altogether mechanical is ill done unless we lose ourselves in the doing of it." Love works unconsciously, as well as consciously, to adapt the powers to a chosen calling; not indeed supplying the place of knowledge, but using and applying the knowledge gained. The love for an object is also a revelation of character; it may not show what has been attained, but it indicates the soul's aspiration. Herbart says, "What and how a person loves reveals the first essential element of character." The absence of heart for the calling is unmistakable evidence of unfitness for the ministry. Evident as this is, it is often difficult to discover just what the tendencies of the heart are. The root of the difficulty is found in the fact that the emotion present in consciousness is made the test of the state of the heart; and because there happens to be no lively feeling there the heart is thought to lack love. This is a source of much use-

less grief to believers, and even leads to questioning the existence of faith.

An author in writing to a friend stated that he loved him sincerely, and yet at that moment was not conscious of any affection for him. Do parents love their children only when they actually experience that love? We must again discriminate between a mere phenomenon and a permanent state. Love as a conscious emotion must be distinguished from love as an abiding attribute or state of the soul. Affection may be so deep and constant that it shapes the whole life, while its possessor is but rarely conscious of any special manifestation of its presence. Just because it is so constant and is the character itself, it may manifest itself peculiarly only in particular emergencies, or when the object of affection is in danger or is taken away. It is a well-known psychic law that the first impressions are most lively; repetition may so weaken them that at last they fall below consciousness. A tendency to adjustment and equalization runs all through our conscious life, and what at first agitates may at last become commonplace. But while repetition and custom thus destroy the liveliness of an affection, they tend to deepen it, to strengthen its basis, and to make it a permanent element in life. In other words, frequent exercise makes feeling a habit, a reserved force, a controlling factor in life, a state, but diminishes liveliness. The reason is plain: vividness of consciousness depends on freshness and contrast; but what is constant cannot be new, and forms no contrast with our usual state. Again, the law of change, so important for consciousness, prevails. Hoefding, the Danish psychologist, says, "Difference and change are necessary in order to awaken consciousness and to keep it alive." Not mere feeling as a passing phenomenon, but emotion becomes his ruling character, and forms that state which is required for the preacher's work; a heart for his calling is developed which directs the life even when he is not conscious of its existence. Only those love truly who love more than they know.

But how about ministerial freshness? Can it be retained till old age? The word is unfortunate, and its literal sense misleads us in its figurative use. I may prefer the old to what is fresh, the mature to the green, the habitual to what can come but once. By freshness we really mean vitality, unabated vigor. These are qualities of the soul itself, and therefore manifest themselves in its operations. The quickened soul manifests vitality in its actions, and the secret consists in keeping the spirit itself vigorous, not in attending to this or that manifestation. The subject is important, but too large for this place. Proper work and enough of it develops the vigor, so that it grows with maturity until the powers in general begin to fail; indolence lets it die. The volume which Ranke wrote after he was ninety is full of life. While hard study, with occasional change of subjects and avoiding the beating of straw already threshed, promotes vigor, it is worry, the

gnawing at the heart, which consumes life. In order that the mind may be vigorous in its presentations, it must be vigorous in its apprehensions of thought. It must be kept moving if it is to retain the power of motion. For this not only wise and strong intellectual exercises are necessary, but also careful attention to the physical basis. Other things being equal, the hardest worker and most exhaustive thinker will develop and retain longest the greatest vigor of soul.

I shall attempt to group under three heads some of the most important hints on the psychic culture of the preacher.

1. As in considering the preacher's work the soul of the hearer was emphasized, so in his own culture *the soul* is the centre of attraction. It has been reserved for our age to propose a "psychology without a soul;" and there is a large class of writers who describe mental phenomena but hesitate to affirm the existence of a mind or an Ego. This is equal to that abstraction which has motion without anything that is moved. We may be as ignorant of the essence of mind as we are of the essence of matter, and yet may behold in certain activities manifestations of mind, just as we do in others manifestations of matter. We may be sure that where there is a phenomenon it must be a manifestation of something real.

The first demand on the preacher is that he not merely seem to be, but that he shall really be what he professes. And he must be what he would make others, or at least must honestly strive after that perfection which he presents to others as the goal of Christian aspiration. It has indeed been claimed that a child is to be so trained as to become better than its preceptor, and often this is very essential. When he had drunk too freely Basedow referred his pupils to himself as a warning! But Palmer of Tuebingen well remarked: "I cannot give what I do not possess, and I cannot teach others to do what I cannot do myself." It is an axiom that the preacher's greatest efforts at training must be directed on his own soul. The mystics spoke of the believer as a flute on which the Spirit plays; but Scripture regards him as a character in and through which God reveals himself. If God used bad men as prophets, the exception is no more a rule than that an ass should speak. Becoming and being, and then manifesting what he is; doing the truth he has become, is the minister's law. That he must give what he is ideally, but truly in the Lord, not what he is in himself, requires no special mention. What does preaching as testimony mean unless it is the giving of God's word as it has become life in the preacher?

The personality, then, is the essence. When Bismarck speaks, it is Bismarck that crowds parliament and absorbs attention—the man, the mighty Chancellor, not his words. Another might utter the same words in a much better way, and speak to empty benches. It makes all the difference in the world that *Bismarck* speaks. When men like

Tholuck and Neander are mentioned, as exerting a powerful influence, it is not their learning merely that is considered, but their personality is emphasized. Julius Mueller was much more philosophical than Tholuck; but when in the meshes of doubt he met Tholuck, it is said that Tholuck's personality made so deep an impression on him that it won his heart and helped him through his conflicts. Seneca affirmed that it is not the virtues that please, but the spirit which possesses them. And who does not know that it is the preacher's character which gives weight to his discourses? No wonder it is so often said of the influence of preachers: It is not what he says, but it is the man himself.

It may be hard to define personality, just as it is to define spirit; but we know what is meant. It means reality, in distinction from mere appearance; and sincerity, in distinction from hypocrisy. A spiritual personality means that the truth of God has been so wrought into the being that it has become personal, so that we may question a particular act and yet know that at heart a man is true. Character is eternal, but acts may be exceptional. Now it is this essence of man himself—this reality, this character—which requires supreme attention, just because it determines all and is all. This *being*, as we have seen, does not merely determine the doing, but also the apprehending of truth. The mind assimilates on the principle that like seeks like. That is what Anselm means when he teaches that we must believe in order to know; that is, there must be in us something analogous to the thing we would know, and there must be a tendency of the will toward it. Prejudice and hate always pervert.

2. *Tact*. The heart is to be the seat, not the grave of piety. A man's real power in the world is proportioned to the measure in which he is enabled to express his real being. Not merely Christian work, but skilled Christian labor, is the need of the day. In the pulpit the preacher seeks the fullest possible manifestation of the power he is.

Tact is power working as instinct. In it the nature bodies itself forth and adapts itself to the occasion, doing the right thing at the right time, in the best way. It is spontaneous rather than the result of reflection, working similarly to what is called reflex action in physiology. Tact has been defined as a feeling which guides us quickly and safely in critical moments as well as on ordinary occasions; but tact is not a mere feeling, and it is better to define it as the immediate and spontaneous adaptation to the requirements of the occasion.

The word is here chosen because it marks the culmination of many important processes of psychic culture. While repetition weakens the liveliness in the manifestation of feeling, it cultivates the power of the will. "Practice makes perfect;" that is, perfect in the thing done and in the manner of doing. All wrong practice tends to make perfectly wrong; all right practice perfectly right. Experience may correct the

practice, and thus the wrong be righted. Repetition in doing tends to form and develop the whole nature for the doing, so that the doing becomes the focus into which all the power of the being is concentrated. Because its moulding influence is so great the value of doing a thing right consists not merely in the act, but also in the tact it helps to form. Hence the importance of right doing at the start, for the first time may determine the character of all the repetitions.

There is no other psychic law for the development of tact than doing the thing we want to learn to do perfectly. Right doing is of course meant. What is called genius is, in many instances, tact; not an inheritance of nature, but something which a man forms by becoming the heir of his own past. Not foreign rules, not deliberation, not a conscious effort of any kind makes tact; but, like genius, it is a law unto itself, and works because it cannot help it. All tact is not genius; but in the highest realms and most perfect forms tact is always genius, namely, the genius of adaptation.

Into the culture of this tact all the best powers of the mind enter. Knowledge of things, but still more of persons, is required; the occasion must be understood as well as the truth and the act to meet its requirements; there must be quickness of apprehension, a lively imagination and hearty sympathy, as well as readiness of adaptation. And in all these there must be such development that they will work instinctively, intuitively. With these in active operation, and with a genius for work, he that is what he should be will also learn to do what he ought to do. But again let us emphasize: the worth of a deed is not merely in the act itself, but also in its permanent effect on the actor. Our doing may not affect others, but it never fails to affect us.

The above will enable us to estimate aright the demand for nature in the pulpit. Grace is always welcome, but nature may be abominable. It depends on the what and the how. Art is nothing but nature, though it may be perverted nature. Whose nature but his own does the affected preacher express? All expression is a true manifestation of the state at that time. If Homer nods it is likely Homer that nods. Analysis teaches that when we say "she is unnatural," we mean that a woman does not express what she wants to express; but we do not mean that she does not express her true self. The veriest hypocrite always expresses himself—namely, a lie. What we term art or affectation is always nature, but it may not be what the actor wants it to be.

Nature developed into tact is art in the form of perfected nature; and that is what we want in the personality of the preacher. Crude nature may be a desecration of the pulpit. We agree with Bain: "It is common to remark that if a man himself feels, he can make others feel; but this takes for granted that a man has an adequate power of outward manifestation—a thing wherein human beings are far from being alike. It is true that Kean, Kemble, or Macready, when affected

by strong emotion, could so express themselves as to kindle a corresponding flame in those about them ; but it is not true that a Dorsetshire plowman could stir the fervors of an assemblage of people merely because his own emotion was strong and genuine." Emotion may always move, but it may move in a direction opposite to the one intended.

3. *Growing in sympathy for the Masses while growing in intellect and seeking the highest Culture.* In this day of socialistic agitation, the preacher is above all others expected to be an embodiment of the spirit of Christ toward the suffering and needy. But we cannot enter upon the discussion of the subject.

The above must suffice, though it is but an introduction. The cultivation of particular powers of the soul is a fruitful theme for the preacher—as the imagination, for instance, with its varied combinations and new creations. New combinations of old truths may be as effective as new truths. Of the power of seizing truth from our surroundings nothing has been said ; yet how important ! Men as well as books must be the preacher's study. This drawing of thoughts from the living environment is a secret which the successful orator must learn. To the testimony of numerous preachers respecting the value of this kind of knowledge, I want to add that of Goethe : "What else is genius but the ability to seize and utilize all that affects us ; to systematize and quicken all the materials which present themselves to us—here to take marble and yonder brass, in order to construct from them a lasting monument? . . . I have gathered and utilized all that I saw and heard and observed ; I have appropriated both the works of nature and the products of men. Each of my writings was brought to me by a thousand different writings, by a thousand different things ; the scholar and the illiterate, the wise man and the fool, childhood and old age, all have added their contributions."

But even if every natural endowment is developed into a *charisma* by the Holy Spirit, the preacher cannot always expect to be successful. Pestalozzi held that his method would in every instance accomplish its aim without fail. He seemed to forget that in all human training we deal with persons, not with machines. If Jesus wept over Jerusalem, the preacher now may also find abundant cause for grief, even with the most perfect psychology as well as the highest truth. He casts his bread upon the waters, some of which may return after many days, and much of it may never yield the return he desires. But personal soul culture always yields a return in divine growth.

V. — HOW WAS ADAM THE SON OF GOD?

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

OF our Lord Jesus Christ the New Testament offers us two lengthy genealogies. One is written in Matthew's Gospel, the other in Luke's. One descends in its course from father to son; the other ascends, step by step, from son to father, through a series of names, growing august and venerable, some strange, some familiar, until at the last we reach, "Enoch, which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Maleleel, which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God."

We have pictured this distinguished creature, this first man belonging to our race, as possessed of the highest prerogatives, created, alone of all living things, in the image of his Maker. Here in the table of Jewish pedigree and ancestry we find that the race culminates a degree higher than the highest; one prodigious stride across the chasm of eternity suddenly plants us in the very habitation of the Almighty. Adam had no earthly lineage; he was the beginning of his kind. And in one sweep of language of unparalleled sublimity, he is called "the son of God." What can this mean? That is our present question. We must start some honest hypothesis of interpretation, and then we shall find ourselves ready to test it with an application to the particulars.

I. It is plain that any supposition on this subject will have to grow wide enough and elastic enough to make some intelligible disposal of scientific fact, of historic statement, of exegetical difficulties, and, most of all, of theological doctrines which are clearly revealed.

1. Our earliest hint of help is found in a verse written by the apostle Paul. In one of his letters to the Thessalonians he says this: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." These words are quoted with no reference to their connection or local significance, but merely because they seem to present the entire human constitution, the common nature of man, in what has been termed a tripartite character. A perfect creature of this class consists of body, soul and spirit. The body, everyone understands. The soul means the mind, the will, the appetites, desires, and sensibilities—indeed, the whole intellectual nature. The spirit denotes that part of one's being by which one is fitted, and is able, to know, serve, and worship God—including his conscience, and whatever is called his moral nature.

I need not attempt now to present or defend this division of the elements of our common humanity. I accept it at once, for the sake of making a supposition, and of helping my readers to understand it clearly. An animal has a body; he may be conceived to possess one as complete and as perfect as our own. Some animals have a mind, and reason not contemptibly within certain limits. But no animal has a spirit. Neither in the Scriptures nor out of them is there any hint that God ever made a brute that cherished the slightest notion of divine worship.

Here, understand, I do not assert that, in the Bible, these three terms are always and invariably employed in their strictest sense, and with absolutely accurate discrimination. But the royal preacher says, when he speaks of bodies: "All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again;" and then he adds an inquiry to intimate a clear and important dis-

tion in the case of souls: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" There is something in a human being which does not reside in any animal. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Much of this we have rehearsed before, but it needs refreshing just here. There is in our constitution that with which the Holy Ghost is able to witness as being in correspondence with our Maker in person; there is that quality or characteristic with which God the Eternal can hold communion.

2. Now let us go on a step further in our construction of a hypothesis. Remember, it is a mere supposition, made in the hope of help to come from it in the end. Let us imagine that our divine Creator, in the creation of the world, saw fit to develop insects from monads, animals from reptiles or insects—continually, through long ages of time, introducing new elements of perfection, until at last the highest rank and order of bodies was reached. Then let us imagine that He changed mere brute instinct to intellect, and began to unfold and perfect mind and taste and feeling, so that in process of time reasonable animals were also disclosed. We might suppose, without violence, that by and by a form of living beings, resembling men in body and in some of the intellectual characteristics peculiar to our race, would be found living on the earth. They would look like men and women; they would think or argue, speak or laugh, behave and act like human beings. One can imagine, even, that if he were to be suddenly set down among such creatures, he would actually mistake them for real men and women. Only, if he were to be with them long, he would notice very painfully that they knew nothing about God, nothing about immortality, and that they had a perfect ignorance of even the first conception of right or wrong; they showed no habits of prayer, no sense of worship, any more than if they were simply orang-outangs, chimpanzees, or educated gorillas.

Just then we can conceive, still further, that the Almighty God might determine to bring into being a race that would love and worship Him. How could He do this? He would have either to start again and produce an entirely fresh pattern of creatures, or choose one of these already created, and give to him an entirely new element in his nature that should enable him to hold the notion of a God overhead. That is, He would have to bestow upon him a spirit in addition to his body and his soul—a spirit which would possess moral character, and be able to become acquainted with Him. This, certainly, would be equivalent to a positively unprecedented order of being, an addition to the creation.

Be sure that you are keeping it clear that I do not propose this as a fact, but only as a supposition which I wish to use for a purpose in our explanation of some passages of the Word of God. I can imagine that, when Adam was put into being, there may have been any numbers of people that looked exactly like men, having bodies and minds. And, if even I did not believe him, I certainly could understand a person who told me that the all-wise Creator selected one of such people, and determined to give him the new attribute of a resemblance to Himself, to put upon him His own image, after His likeness; and then if the person went on to tell me that God created man in just this way, male and female created He them; that He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul; I say I could understand such observations, and I should be interested in them, even if I did not know how just at once to accept them as altogether true.

Now, we can all be clear in our minds that a fresh race of creatures was introduced in an easily recognized period upon this planet. Before that period

it was impossible to find one of them; after that period, any number could be met anywhere. Beings with bodies and mind, on this supposition, might have been plenty; but never before this fixed period could even one be found with body, soul and spirit. And if this theory were proved now to be true, then the act of creation would consist in the giving of an immortality to a mortal individual, and in the bestowal of a religious nature upon a being who never before had in him the wish to worship God.

3. This, then, is the hypothesis. Is there anything abhorrent and dangerous in it? Yet you will ask me, perhaps impatiently, Is there a hint of it in all the Bible? Is it not just made up out of nothing?

Let us turn for a little to the exact phraseology of the passage we have just quoted; and, in order to its better explanation, let us lay alongside of it another passage, to which a passing allusion has been made:

"This is the book of the generations of Adam: In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him: male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth: and the days of Adam after he had begotten Seth were eight hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters: and all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died."

Concerning which we remark, as one of the chief peculiarities, that in one of the verses Eve is called "Adam," as well as her husband; indeed it is intimated that this pair, this husband and wife together, were a unit, a race, by themselves; they, taken as one, were the "Adam" which God made and named. "Eve" was the name which Adam gave to his bride a long time after, when both had sinned and been turned out of the paradise they had lost; it is a human word, and means "living:" he gave it to her because she was "the mother of all living." Out of all this it appears that this man and this woman commenced the new race on one and the same plane of close and affectionate relations to their Creator.

But note, furthermore, what our English Bible will not suggest. In these two or three chapters of Genesis the name "Adam" occurs nineteen times; and yet it is in almost every case accompanied by the definite article; it is written generally "the Adam:" that is, Adam, this man, and Eve, this woman, are together the *Adam*. And in all the books of the Old Testament, where this word appears, it is never used in the plural number. When the inspired writers wish to say *men*, they take a different word, or else say "sons of Adam;" they never say *Adams*. The name seems often used to describe or denote the whole human race; never is it grammatically declined, nor does it accept of those idiomatic suffixes by which, in the Hebrew language, pronouns are indicated. It is a very peculiar word, standing out distinctly, firm and alone. And hence, some of the greatest scholars in the world inform us that if we were to insist upon it that this name Adam means the whole race as often and as actually as it means the individual, there would be no reasonable objection to be made to it, for facts would bear it out.

Notice, also, that, if we lay Luke's genealogical list beside these verses, several of the names mentioned are the same in both. The genealogy pushes straight on through Enoch, and Seth, and Adam, and then it leaps across the chasm, and pronounces the final progenitor to have been God. Jesus Christ had no earthly father; Adam had none. The first Adam was the son of God, because God was all the Father he had; the second Adam was also the Son of God, because God was all the Father He had too.

II. So much, then, for this hypothesis: it is high time now that we test whether it will fit the present necessity satisfactorily.

I still desire to state plainly that I am not so driven by pressures of science or of anything else as to depart altogether from views in which we have been educated from our childhood. But if I am driven to the wall at any time, by objectors from any direction, I certainly should take this theory of a class of morally imperfect creatures existing previous to the creation of our first parents, rather than surrender this old Bible, or give up my entire faith in any one of its verses.

1. That is to say, if scientific men ever prove that skulls have been found among those rocks which were laid down before Adam's history began at creation, I should reply that they were undoubtedly skulls of people who had a body, a soul, but no spirit, in the sense in which these terms have been defined; they never belonged to the chosen Adamite race that descended from the one pair which God directly made out of dust on the sixth day. And further, if they insist that Adam also, like the animals before him, was developed, not created, I should certainly answer that his body, and even his mind, may have been *like* the other minds and bodies, which were developed by processes of evolution and the survival of the fittest; but neither his mind nor his body was the product of any such work; they were created on that sixth day, exactly as Moses says they were. And then I should raise my eyes far above the atmosphere of all the grand nonsense, and insist that "the image of God" was given to this "son of God" as a new, peerless, inimitable thing, never known or heard of before in any living creature: a glorious originality in the day when God made a man, and, out of his rib, a woman—the only man ever made with no father, the only woman ever made with no mother, no matter who finds skulls in the geologic millennium: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

2. Then, finally, when the inspired Scriptures say in the epistles written by Paul and the others, and force us to put into our quiet systems of theology, that, as Adam was the head of a race of new beings, so Christ is the head of a new race of believers, I see my way joyfully and perfectly clearly. Adam's chief characteristic was his spiritual nature. This was corrupted by the fall; and then the image was, in judicial terms, forfeited; but Jesus Christ came to meet the claims the law of God was enforcing. He opened the way to pardon by an atonement made upon the cross. Then the image was restored to such as accepted and trusted this Redeemer from sin. As in Adam all who were represented in Adam died, so in Christ all who were represented in Christ were made alive. What is said of man in all such passages must be accepted as true only of man as a tripartite creature—perfect, as having a body, a soul, and a spirit. In that lies our future hope of heaven: "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

VI.—CLUSTERS OF GEMS.

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

NO. II.—DEATH.

Statistics of Death. The yearly mortality of the globe is 40,000,000 persons. This is at the rate of over 100,000 per day. Each pulsation of the heart marks the decease of some human being. The average of human life

is 33 years. One-fourth of the population die at or before the age of seven; one-half at or before 17. Among 10,000 persons one arrives at the age of 100 years. One in 500 attains the age of 90, and one in 100 to the age of 60. Married men live longer than single. Professions exercise a great influence on longevity. In 1,000 individuals who arrive at the age of 70 years, 43 are clergymen, orators, or public speakers, 40 are agriculturists, 33 are workmen, 12 are soldiers or military employes, 29 advocates or engineers, 27 professors, 24 doctors.

Empty Honors. The old Scythian custom, when the head of a house died, was this: he was dressed in his finest dress, and set in his chariot, and carried about to his friends' houses; and each of them placed him at his table's head, and all feasted in his presence!

Strong in Death. Mrs. L—, who died not long ago in College avenue, New York, made a singular request on her death-bed. She was passionately fond of dancing, and her death was hastened by an over-indulgence in that amusement. When she realized that she was about to die, she requested that her remains might be laid out on a board instead of in a coffin, and that she should be dressed in her new ball dress of flesh-colored satin, with white slippers. She also asked that a fashionable hair-dresser should be employed to dress her hair in the latest style, and that her head should be turned to one side after death, to show the hair to advantage. Her desire was complied with, excepting that a basket was substituted for the board. After the remains were arrayed for the grave, the corpse was placed in a chair, the head turned to one side in a life-like position, and the picture was perpetuated in a photograph. The circumstances of her making such a request of course drew a large number of curiosity-seekers to the funeral.

The Death of Strauss. At Ludwigsburg—where Strauss was born, and where also he died and is buried—a gentleman, one of his personal friends and admirers, told the following, of which he claimed to have been an eye and ear witness: Strauss had a daughter, whom he had, strangely, sent to a pietistic school, while he was separated from her mother. She was educated a pious girl, and subsequently married a physician. She was called home when her father was about to die, and was deeply affected. When he saw her weeping, he took her hand in his and said: "My daughter, your father has finished his course. You know his principles and views. He cannot comfort you with the assurance of seeing you again. What your father has done will live forever, but his personality will forever cease to be. He must bow to the unchangeable law of the universe, and to that law he reverently says, 'Thy will be done!'"

A Lesson from Death. Edmund Burke, when his rival at the election in Bristol died, in the midst of a hot and exciting chase for honor and promotion, said, "He who has been snatched from us in the middle of the contest, whilst his desires were as warm and his hopes as eager as ours, has feelingly told us what shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

A Costly Burial. There is a tomb in the famous Milan Cathedral, in a subterranean chapel, which is the richest sepulchre in Europe. Here the visitor comes in contact with the most distinguished and wealthiest dead-head in the world, the lamented St. Charles Borromeo, who died 200 years since. "None knew him but to love him; none named him but to praise." He was a cardinal, Bishop of Milan, and good to the poor, and for his many virtues was canonized. His remains lie in a rich coffin of silver, and through the crystal sides you see the dead and withered skull grinning in the midst of rich robes, rare jewels and flashing gems. The coffin is hung with costly offerings, and the ceiling of the chapel is covered with bas-reliefs, in solid silver,

representing events in the saint's life. In this little chapel 10x12, 4,000,000 francs have been lavished. In the coffin hangs a gold cross containing seven emeralds, each as large as a chestnut, incrusting in diamonds. This little ornament is worth \$100,000.

Death-bed Reflections. Mr. P. T. Barnum said, after recovering from a severe illness, speaking of his feelings and thoughts when confined to his bed: "I looked back and could hardly recall a benefit I had rendered to my fellow-men in all my life. The folly, the stupidity of fooling away the few years given us here in childish strifes, bickerings and differences, occurred to me so strongly that I resolved that the sun would never go down on me cherishing malice in my heart against a single fellow-being."

The Death of the Aged. Of Enoch it was said, "He was not, for God took him." The death of an aged saint borders on a *translation*. So far as the Departed is concerned, there is nothing to mourn. He has, 1. Passed the ordinary limit of life; 2. Begun to feel the infirmities of age; 3. Life's mission is fulfilled; 4. Character ripened and matured; 5. Immediate translation to glory, with scarce any experience of dying. Mourning is occasioned in such instances simply by the wounded hearts of survivors. Ties cannot be sundered without pain. Must not confound the grief of nature with the hopeless and rebellious sorrow of despair, etc.

Hengstenberg's last words were: "I was right."

Couper's Prospect. "If I am ever enabled to look forward to death with comfort, which I thank God is sometimes the case, I do not take my view of it from the top of my own works and deservings; though God is witness that the labor of my life is to keep a conscience void of offense toward Him. Death is always formidable to me, save when I see him disarmed of his sting by having sheathed it in the body of Jesus Christ."

Egypt, the unknown land to the patriarch, is like the unknown land beyond death. Joseph is like Christ, the forerunner, who sends for his saints to come thither to Him. The saint rejoices to go when Jesus sends for him, as Jacob did to go to Joseph.

Contrasted Views of Death.

"While man is growing, life is in decrease,
And cradles rock us nearer to the tomb:
Our birth is nothing but our death begun.
As tapers waste, that instant they take fire."

—*Young's Night Thoughts*, v. 717.

"Death borders upon our birth, and our cradle stands in the grave."—*Bishop Hall*.

The Christian faith becomes an *interpreter of death* and reads in it a different lesson. The true believer may say:

"While we are dying, life is on increase,
The sun is rising on sepulchral gloom.
Our death is nothing but our life begun;
The hour of birth is when the saints expire."

The Superiority of Christianity.—Unlike all other founders of religious faith, Christ had no selfishness, and His system, unlike all other systems of worship, was bloodless, boundlessly beneficent, inexpressibly pure, and—most marvelous of all—went to break all bonds of body and soul, and to cast down every temporal and every spiritual tyranny.—*W. Howitt*.

A German Princess, Marie Dorothea—let her name live with her saying!—took leave of a Christian missionary with these words: "Christians never see each other for the last time—Adieu!"

SERMONIC SECTION.

**THE BLEEDING HEAD OF A PROPHET;
OR, THE EVIL FRUIT OF EVIL
SOWING.**

By THEO. CHRISTLIEB, D.D., PROFESSOR AND UNIVERSITY PREACHER AT BONN, GERMANY.*

But when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask. And she . . . said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger. And . . . he commanded it to be given her.—

Matt. xiv : 1-12.

SCARCELY a passage in the Gospels awakens so much horror as this. Here sin is represented in its most alluring form, throughout its whole extent, with all its ramifications, and in its most appalling results—an illegal marriage, hardening of heart against the testimony of truth, abandonment to lust, vanity, ostentation, wanton frivolity, an overweening desire to please, arrogant speech, a blasphemous assuming of vows, distraction of conscience, and murder; the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, undue assumption of authority, and pride are manifested here, and form a frightful chain that drags one evil deed, one curse, after another, until all ends—in the head of a prophet dripping blood! The greatest born among women in the hands of a frivolous tyrant becoming a sacrifice to a wanton caprice—this is one of those dark manifestations of God's way and permissive will, is such a distressing occurrence, that a faint-hearted, superficial disposition would hasten to dismiss it and attempt to console itself with thinking, Happily

*Translated from the German by Mrs. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, of Berlin, Germany.

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

for us, such a thing would be impossible in our day!

And truly a passage like this from the Gospels may well teach us to thank God for the protection of law and for Christian rulers. But let us leave details out of consideration and confine ourselves to the central thought of this passage: the bad fruit shooting up so rapidly out of the evil seed, the way of the flesh constantly descending until it brings about a crime that cries to heaven, and the awful chain—one sin producing others, one curse linking another to itself—are these things that are altogether unheard of, without example, in our day? Does not one of our own poets say, "It is the curse of an evil deed that it must go on bringing forth evil"? Are not similar experiences traceable through the entire history of humanity, even through modern Christianity, at times under greater concealment, at other times more clearly manifest—a glaring fact? Is not the complaint only too well founded that in just these recent years of increasing lack of restraint and of pleasure-seeking, and of growing alienation, in fact, hardening against the testimony of the prophets and apostles, the amount of crime has everywhere increased at an enormous rate? And does not a large proportion of this crime occur on Sunday, very frequently in connection with every form of pleasure-seeking and wantonness? Is not too often this the course even in Christian lands: first the lust of the eyes, then the lust of the flesh, a merry drinking bout, a dance, and finally murder—blows ending in death?

And if here among our number carousals are seldom carried so far, still this Gospel has erected a warning

tablet on the broad way, so that all who experience in themselves an inclination to evil and frivolity, who feel annoyance at the sting of truth, who by reason of their vanity and self-parade cannot keep their tongues in check, who train up their children in finery and an overweening desire to please—the victims of a false idea of honor and of a perplexed conscience—these are all temptations in relation to which even those ought to examine themselves whose transgressions seldom attain the character of the coarser sins and crimes.

At the same time, let us not forget that this gloomy picture is set in a frame which is not, after all, devoid of its ray of light. The narrative begins with a report about Jesus that has triumphantly penetrated Herod's castle fortress and brought trouble to his heavily-burdened conscience; and it ends with the coming of John's disciples to Jesus, indicating that even this occurrence was overruled by Him who has His wise reasons for permitting evil, and that He can convert even the most perverted doings of mankind, without lessening their guilt, and make them subserve His holy purposes. Then let us approach the picture without fear, but also devoid of self-righteous pride. Here we have lying

The Bleeding Head of a Prophet, or the Evil Fruit of Evil Sowing.
We take for consideration—

1. The Evil Seed;
2. The Evil Fruit;
3. God's Wise Overruling here.

Sowing evil was an heirloom in Herod's family. It was Herod's father who murdered the children of Bethlehem. The son puts to death the forerunner of the Lord. Look at the evil deed from which this iniquity sprang:

(a) The root of it was impure lust. "For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife." He had repudiated his own wife and taken unto himself that of

his living brother, a woman lusting after the king's title. According to the law, this was forbidden—was adultery. O! these illegal marriages, that are neither entered upon nor consummated in the right disposition or spirit—what an infinite source of sin and misery they are apt to become! And what is usually their incentive? Sensual lust, ambition, frivolity, or selfishness. Just so here. She lusted for his royal crown, he for her charms, in spite of the fact that it is written, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's—let alone thy nearest neighbor's, thy brother's—wife! This was the beginning of the evil sowing. With David it was the same. How lust in an unguarded moment drew him into her toils, making of him an adulterer, even a murderer, just as in this case! Adultery and incest easily lead on to blood-guiltiness, impurity, to quarrels and to cruelty, to untruth and murder. Not merely the story of so many child-murderesses, but also of innumerable unhappy marriages which are never brought under the jurisdiction of a judge, have their chief cause in impure lust; for it bears a closer relation to discontent and to quarreling than many people dream. Jas. iv: 1—"From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence even of your lusts that war in your members?" O! how necessary, then, that the beginnings be withstood, by looking to the All-seeing God for help, and by avoiding opportunities that incite to evil; that the eyes be cast down to prevent lust from kindling—it springs up so quickly! But let us look farther.

(b) It germinates in spite of the warning. God permits no one to rush into ruin without warning. With Herod also there was no lack of admonition. "For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her." Behold here a court-preacher who does his duty: his last word a courageous rebuke! For a servant of God is obliged to testify to the truth, whether it be sweet or bitter, no mat-

ter what becomes of him. Herod usually attended to what John said on other topics, and "heard him gladly" (Mark vi : 20); but on this essential point, with reference to his principal guilt, he had no ears. Nevertheless, that "not lawful" would keep pricking his conscience. He is frivolous, extravagant, a man of the world, superstitious, cowardly, treacherous—that is why Jesus called him "that fox"; besides, he is high-handed, heartless, and cruel. How does he take God's warning? His frivolity becomes defiance, he hardens his heart and throws his troublesome monitor into prison. Adultery incites him on to deeds of violence. So one sin draws another in its train. The bad seed keeps on germinating. Murderous thoughts were already taking their rise in his wife (Mark vi : 19), and within his own breast. The lust of the flesh develops into the lust of murder. He considers this testimony of the Baptist dangerous to the State, and trembles for his throne. "And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet." Look at this wretched man, distracted with passion and fear. John has no fear of the tyrant, but he of the defenseless John! Truth is power even over the unjust. Herod desires to rule, and yet he is subject to a number of influences conflicting within him. On one side he is entirely under the management of his wife; on the other, afraid of his subjects. He would like to consider John a fanatic or a monomaniac, whose life does not amount to much, and whose riddance is required by state policy. But the impression received from the earnestness and the moral severity of this man had been too deep, and the popular feeling among his subjects was another factor with which he had to reckon. What takes place now? Non-acceptance of the truth after its sting is felt leads to hatred of the one from whom it came.

Beloved friends, where frivolity

and sin control a life, there is no desire to hear preachers who are in earnest! Where, perhaps, they may be willing enough to listen to some of the non-essentials, but will not tolerate a word that is essential, the blessing that might have been received from such a preacher becomes a curse, because the listeners hide from his testimony. Are you capable of hearing bitter truth while your deeds are being laid bare and called by their right name—"not lawful"? Have you never in such a case experienced any inner hardening? Behold, every instance that was allowing an evil root to germinate was making progress on the downward road! Start a ball rolling, and the powers of darkness will busy themselves to deepen the fall. To the lust of the flesh and inner defiance, the lust of the eyes and a life of display now associate themselves, and as these evil roots spring up—

(c) They branch off into a variety of new temptations and sins: "When Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask." (Mark: "unto the half of my kingdom.") What a serpent's nest of frivolous pleasure and sin! His anniversary arrives, a festival commemorating his birth—reason enough for gratitude towards God. But the day is not consecrated by prayer. Herod does not appreciate the fact that rejoicing in the Lord is the most glorious enjoyment we have in this life. Here there was nothing but sensual pleasure, parade, jollity, allurements, and pride. On this occasion the merry-making gives promise of an unusual flavor: the young princess is to dance before the assembled court. What a training for a child! But what better could you expect from such a mother? Poor creature! Contrary to all custom among Israelitish women, she, like a heathen, dances amid specta-

tors, courting their commendation and applause. How admiringly, perhaps passionately, their gaze follows her movements! How many trifling thoughts in the dancer, and at the same time what carnal suggestions are aroused in the beholder! O! how true that sin begets sin—one quickly multiplies tenfold and becomes bad seed for a hundred hearts.

The mother looks on well satisfied, and probably reaps abundant flattery from the courtiers. Those who do not look to God for honor always seek it the more anxiously from men. But Herod is quite carried away; and in order that he may reward this paltry pleasure right royally, and at the same time parade his princely liberality, he permits his giddy mood to draw him into a promise which, through the treachery of his wife, entangles him in a snare. He swears an oath to fulfill any petition this child may make, and for very wantonness stakes, at the caprice of a silly girl, the half of a kingdom!

O! the vanity in this excessive desire of pleasing. What lamentable parental joy, and what a foolhardy father promise! How disgracefully thoughtless! But, alas! how many a Christian mother will deck out her daughter beyond all sense or fitness, especially for festival occasions, thus poisoning her heart by feeding her vanity and her reprehensible desire to shine! How many a light-minded father considers much that he beholds in his children, even the maddest pranks of his son, a matter for laughter, instead of the grief and shame he ought to feel! How seldom, if ever, large pageants, merry-makings and balls take place without sins of vanity, without imposing all manner of burdens upon the conscience of most of those who participate! How the lust of the eyes and pride shoot to the heart! How we like being conspicuous and seeming important among people! How we court worldly applause by means of artistic skill, agreeable gifts of

conversation, boasting, and display of wit! Alas! how little care we bestow upon our words when the spirit of vanity gets hold of the soul! As if it were not written, "Every idle word that men shall speak they shall give an account thereof." These are often the times and opportunities when much bad seed is sown broadcast and received by others.

But before this destructive seed begins to sprout we find combined with it at the last

(d) *A wicked yielding and hardening of the heart.* He who is a murderer from the beginning has always been on the watch to direct affairs in such a way that the witness for truth will be obliged to keep silence forever. He derives his greatest advantage from our frivolity, and in this matter he found in Herodias an officious instrument: "And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger." What a mother! What her hatred must have been to outweigh half a kingdom! She induces her child to murder, makes her little girl an executioner! She, such a beautiful dancer, but how appalling to hear her talk! The bold wench proffers her request, never even trembling! O! how much inner vulgarity we find in spite of all exterior parade and culture! How much cruelty toward others, notwithstanding all the amiability among friends! The more self-indulgent a man is, the harder he will show himself toward others. First, merry trifling, feasting and drinking; afterwards, a quarrel and thrusts from a poniard for a bloody dessert—how often this is the history of the crimes brought daily to our knowledge by nearly every newspaper!

The sparkling repartee at the table round suddenly ceases, the courtiers begin to take sober second thought, and have some presentiment of the danger hovering over their own heads. As for Herod: "And the king was sorry; nevertheless, for the oath's

sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her." Behold here the mistaken leniency and the final hardening. He is taken unaware, startled — what will his people say? Will it not occasion revolt? His conscience also is somewhat aroused; he is sorry; he becomes aware how reprehensible his frivolity; he wavers for a moment; various influences are at conflict within him: the esteem felt for John—but then the vow he uttered; God's command "Thou shalt not kill"—but then his own honor in the opinion of men! The situation was bad: either he must incur guilt or break his word; no happy termination to his parental joys. Accordingly, he is sorry. A passage in Sirach xxx:8, 9, applies here: "A spoiled child will create mischief; indulge a child, after a while it will give you occasion for fear; trifle with it, and it will finally give you cause for sorrow." Alas! the evil influences prove too many—his wife, his oath, his honor among these guests at table, all carry him away. It seems to him that his vow is binding; as if he could be obliged to give what, according to God and the right, did not belong to him—the head of a prophet. His *conscience is distracted*, so that he has no clear recognition of his chief duty toward God and his neighbor, and can discern nothing but what is nearest him, this vow he had sworn, which, expressed in such general terms, was of itself an act of sacrilege. And here again, one wrong deed compels another. If he were now to acknowledge that he had no right to dispose of John's head, it would force him to admit that imprisoning John was a misuse of power. He is not inclined to admit that; hence he commands this deed of blood.

Obligations undertaken thoughtlessly or from a mistaken idea of honor are the frequent occasion of confusion of conscience. How much these mistakes with regard to what is honorable prevail among youth,

especially our university students! What a disgrace that dueling is still in vogue among us! What is the source of this barbarity, of which our nurseries of science ought most of all to be ashamed? It is the false conception of honor, often also the distractions of conscience, from which cause one often feels more bound by ideas of honor among students than by the word of Him who said, "Love your enemies, pray for them that spitefully use you; whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,"—just as if this were not obligatory upon all Christians, young as well as old; or as if true superiority did not consist in forgiving and benefiting our enemies! Alas! that Christian young men should permit themselves to become entangled in these toils of Satan, which may become a humiliation, or even a hindrance to all blessed work throughout their entire career! Under all circumstances, how frequently worldly honor and worldly pleasure overpower the witness for truth in us; how they bedim our clear perception of the one supreme decisive obligation toward God and His will! Friendship with the world is indeed enmity against God. Anyone yielding to it will rapidly mature the evil seed

2. to Evil Fruit. Behold

(a) The external fruit of a long state of guilt and final infatuation—blood-guiltiness! How sudden its appearance! "And he sent and beheaded John in the prison. And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel; and she brought it to her mother."

A few frightful minutes elapse, when the servants of the tyrant return, and in the bleeding head of a prophet we find the evil fruit of an evil seed displayed to the horrified guests surrounding his table. The young girl does not hesitate to receive her ghastly reward for dancing into her hands and to carry it to her mother! At sight of that pallid head how

the lewd woman must have rejoiced over the success of her undertaking! That earnest eye before whose power her self-accusing glance was obliged to turn away is now fixed, its light extinguished. That fiery tongue behind those pale lips, before whose cutting words she so often trembled, will never move again. But its message, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" has not returned to him empty. True, the exasperating monitor is silenced now; but the blessing has also departed. The man sent from God to awaken their conscience and to point out the way to salvation is now dead!

And how many were influential in maturing this frightful fruit, so similar to David's case! Pre-eminently Herod—"he beheaded John." God holds him just as accountable for it as if he had accomplished it with his own hand. His wife first suggested the plan of murder; her intrigues spread the net that entangled Herod. John's head wanders into her hand—she originated the evil deed. The daughter, who consents to be the instrument to accomplish the murder; and also, to a certain degree, the guests and the people of the court—they kept a cowardly silence, although it was on account of their presence that Herod felt constrained to keep his word; and, finally, the servants who executed the bloody command. Consequently this deed entailed general guilt upon the royal house, and has added to the sacrilegious deeds already accumulated upon it, and drags it down to ruin; also upon Israel and the nation to whom afterwards the reproach was sent, "Woe unto thee, thou that killest the prophets"—"upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth!"—Matt. xxiii. That which ye sow ye also shall reap: lust, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin. Alas! how easily we can partake in another's sin! How often we are impelled into the guilt of other people; how often the wrong deed

of one individual becomes general guilt!

(b) Let us look for the inner fruit. What has Herod gained? An evil conscience dogging the man with terror at every step. John is dead, but Christ appears. Now will He avenge His forerunner? "At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus; and said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him." Look at that superstitious terror; that is because his conscience torments him. Like every other murderer, the miserable man has forfeited his peace, and henceforth wherever he goes the ghost of his victim haunts him! Just as with the first murderer, Cain, so with him; soon he loses favor with the Emperor, and is then obliged to keep wandering constantly, fleeing from land to land!

A bad conscience is and will remain the perpetual fruit of sin. What gall to the sinner's after life! He expected pleasure and profit from his sinful act, and has inner misery instead. What poverty it entails! What if you drive away the word of truth which stings you with such pain! It will continue nevertheless to pursue until you are overtaken by it and delivered to judgment, bringing to light the evil fruit of all your evil sowing!

3. In what way? The saints of God, are they so wholly at the mercy of the caprice of a tyrant? Why, not a hair of their heads can fall without God's permission, much less can the head be severed from the spine. This all transpired under *God's care and wise permission*; and until we arrive at this consolation, let us not turn away from this frightful narrative.

(a) For *John*, it was a wise providence. He dies a martyr, never flinching in his witness for the truth, and his last word is a fearless sermon unto repentance, as his first had been

—at the right time. The sun was risen; now the morning must pale. His mission was accomplished, his work complete. His remaining longer in public activity might have done injury to the cause of Christ, might have confused the people. Now he departs in peace, before the people's esteem for him is on the wane. The fact is, his honor gains by means of his death; his memory becomes sacred. And in proof that here also "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints," at least his body was permitted to rest in peace: "And his disciples came and took up the body and buried it, and went and told Jesus."

(b) And they must have found consolation and satisfaction in Jesus, and a much more glorious Master. Hence this ruling of God was also wisely provided for the *poor disciples of the Baptist*. Did not Christ himself afterwards say to His disciples, "It is expedient for you that I go away"? So John's departure at this time was a benefit to his disciples also. They seemed to be losing everything; yet they were really not losing anything, but gaining everything; when they advanced to faith in Jesus and entered His band of followers. By this means they became a warning to *Israel* also, henceforth to cling only to Jesus. Their misfortune became their salvation, their painful deprivation drove them to the source of all consolation. How very distressing cases of sudden death often appear; and yet they are so *wisely ordered!* No one dies prematurely; no one too late. The Lord of life and death exercises this holy right of decision with perfect wisdom. Not only for the one called away, but also for the relatives, God's appointed hour is the right one. His sudden chastenings shake to the very depths; but what blessings they become if they lead to a more earnest seeking after peace closer to the Lord! Just this knocking away of all earthly support makes it necessary to cling the more closely

to the One who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. O! if your heart seems distracted with pain after some bitter loss or rude experience of ingratitude, faithlessness, or the world's cruelty, *come and tell it to Jesus*; pour your heart out before Him! He is a master in the art of healing, and promises to the sorrowing, "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you," and you will find rest unto your soul.

(c) Finally, this whole matter was wisely shaped for God's great *economy of mercy*. Carrying this bleeding head of a prophet around the table was also an earnest prophecy of the approaching fall of the Herodian house and of Israel. The guilt Herod's family inherited from his father was gradually to attain complete measure, when this event was to hasten their downfall and that of the nation. Again, this downfall was to contribute to the transmission of God's kingdom to the heathen, acquiring thus a much broader foundation on which to build. Therefore, when events are mysterious we ought to look upon the divine side, and not only upon human guilt. God often permits one evil in order to circumvent a greater. He is constantly following up His divine plans of mercy, directing everything so that all must contribute to His kingdom and the best good of His children. Even the evil men do He can direct so that it will promote good.

Therefore, from even this dreary picture let us turn our gaze within, and afterwards lift it towards Heaven with praise and adoration. What kind is the seed we are daily strewing? Should any of my hearers, like Herod, be inclined to yield to passion and luxury, I wish I might lay the bleeding head of the prophet in their way, not on a platter, but in this book, that they may behold the fruit of the seed of the flesh and take warning; and that all may remember that in the moral world everything soon or late brings forth fruit. Whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also—that

he must—reap. Everything either avenges or rewards itself. May the Lord in His mercy protect us from a sinful career like that, and from such horrible fruit of sin! May His good Spirit lead us over a level path. But should any of you discover that your career is already tending downwards because of your much service of vanity, *come and tell it to Jesus*, the great physician of sin, before it is too late. Penitently beseech Him who promises us, not the half of His kingdom, but the whole of it, to help you to self-control through the power of His grace and the renewing of His Holy Spirit, so that whatever you think or do may finally sow unto the Spirit, and produce those beautiful fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v: 22), love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, hope, meekness and purity. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting (Gal. vi: 18). O Lord, help us to sow in wisdom, so that finally we may reap in joy, and not in disgrace! Amen.

CHRISTMAS SERMON.

BY WM. A. SNIVELY, D.D. [EPISCOPAL].

And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.—Luke ii: 10.

THERE is an old English carol which begins with the couplet:

“The world itself keeps Christmas day,
And Christmas bells are ringing;”

and the keynote of the song seems to have been caught from the universal penetration of our Holy Faith into the life and civilization of England, as expressed in the English Church and the English Home. The parish churches are decorated with holly and evergreen: and the fragrant aroma of fir-tree and pine mingles with the incense of a spiritual devotion which is borne upon the wings of the English Liturgy to the throne

of God. And the English home is made brighter by the return of the festival, as the scattered members of the household meet again under the old roof-tree to exchange their mutual congratulations and to indulge in feasting and song, and the church bells' merry chime mingles with and echoes back the English carols, and waits which are sung throughout the parish, to welcome the anniversary which celebrates the birth of Jesus Christ.

And the daughter Church in America, catching the echo of the Christmas song and following the long custom of the English centuries, gathers the fir-tree and the pine from the forest to make glad and beautiful the place of His sanctuary; while in unnumbered homes the Christmas Day is hailed as the fairest and brightest which the household knows in the course of the entire year.

The Christmas Tree, with its plentitude of mutual gifts and the brilliancy of its lighted tapers, is a German custom, rather than an English one; but it is ours by inheritance also, as we in America to-day stand in the forefront of the world's long progress, whose pioneer is the Anglo-Saxon race. And as the streams of many nationalities meet and mingle in the strong current of our American civilization and life, it is but natural that we should discern, here and there, the characteristics of the varied elements which make up our complex and elaborate whole, and, when it suits our purpose, adopt them as our own.

But the caroler sang truer than he thought when he tuned his lyre to the strain which I have quoted—

“The World itself keeps Christmas Day.”

For that is true, whatever interpretation we may put upon this word “world”; whether we find in it the idea of universality, which is, doubtless, its primary meaning; or whether we find in it also that domain which lies beyond the pale of the church, and which refuses to acknowledge allegiance to the Saviour of men.

In its first sense, its universality, it is true; for Christianity comes to bless all men, everywhere. Its mission is as wide as the race. It has no geographical limit; no bar of local or ethnical distinction; no confinement to nationality, or color, or social rank. It brings its benediction alike to the king and the peasant, to the nobleman and the slave; to the rich and the poor; to the capitalist and the laborer; to the old and the young; and the message of the Saviour's birth is the one historical fact of all time which bears this universal benediction to men.

It gave a new beauty to childhood, even though its infancy awoke to being on the earth unsheltered by the sacred amenities of a home, unprotected even by the temporary domicile of an Oriental inn, and it breathed its first human breath and uttered its first helpless human cry in the rude shelter of a manger, and amid the oxen of the stall.

It touched the buoyant period of boyhood, and became the model of obedience to the usages of the Temple and the parental authority of the home, as "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." It consecrated the carpenter shop at Nazareth, and gave a dignity to honest toil which the world never knew before; and so it became related to every mechanic and workman, to every toiler, whether by brain or hand, who has ever trod the earth since. It dignified poverty, even, with a sacredness which made it forever the representative of the Son of God. It gave a new significance to wealth as that homeless Teacher mingled with Publicans and Pharisees at their great feasts, rebuked their trust in riches, and asserted the stewardship of men in the bounty with which God blessed them.

And so, all through the Incarnation, from the manger to the cross, from the cross to the sepulchre, and from the sepulchre to the Mount of the Ascension, wherever it touched human

life, it elevated and ennobled it, and gave it a new significance and beauty. Its announcement is a message of glad tidings of great joy to all people, and it takes a wider range still in the world's life, as that lonely birthplace in the manger at Bethlehem was connected both with the prophecies which preceded it and the history which was subsequent to it. The first promise of a Messiah, which was given to the patriarch Abraham, included this idea of universality, when it assured him that in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed, and the birth of Christ was the direct fulfillment of that promise. And it was equally universal in its scope, as the great commission sent the apostles into all the world, to preach the gospel to every creature, and to gather from every kindred and tribe and tongue the future members of His holy church. In both cases, prophecy and history alike, it was good tidings of great joy to all people.

II. But the singular anomaly of the power of the gospel is the fact that its message is a benediction even to those who do not care for its precepts, who disregard its obligations, and who resist and scoff at its claims. It is not strange that the birth of Christ should be celebrated in His holy church. It is perfectly natural that the Bride of Christ should decorate herself with the garments of gladness to celebrate the birthday of her Lord. It is fitting that in sermon and sacrament and song we should welcome the return of its recognized anniversary; that children should sing their carols to swell the chorus of its joy, and that Christian homes should be brightened by the mutual exchange of gifts, by feasting and merry-making and song. But its larger triumph is that, wherever its message has been borne, it sheds the light of its benediction upon "all people," whether they profess and call themselves Christians or not. The brightness of its joy is not con-

fined to the church alone : its secondary blessing also brightens the life of the community, the nation, and the world.

There is many a Christmas gift given and received without any distinct remembrance of the one great fact which inspired the custom : God's gift of His Son to be the Saviour of the world. There is a generous Christmas dinner in many a home where there is no altar of family prayer and whose members are indifferent to the services of the church which celebrate the true significance of the Great Birthday. And the meaning of this fact is not hard to learn, since it is a distinct foreshadow of the ultimate triumph of the gospel in all hearts and its gradual approach to the victory which yet awaits it when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This gradual interpenetration of human life by the influence and power of the gospel is a partial fulfillment of the angel song ; and even though there be those who wear the Cross as an ornament to the person who never wear it in their hearts, nor bear it in their lives ; and though there may be those who sing the Christmas song of the ages without rising above the transient festivity which the season brings, yet even to these Christianity is a benediction whose power is incalculable, at least in the secular amenities of our human life. There is not a home in Christian lands, whether it be a home of prayer or a godless household, which is not made brighter by the Christmas joy. And just as the weekly Sabbath of rest is a boon to toiling millions who never enter a church during its sacred hours, so the illumination of the Christmas tide is a benediction to unnumbered homes in which no deeper and truer recognition of its claims is found.

III. But it is not merely the secondary influence of Christianity which is spoken of by the angels here. These secular and sentimental and

social observances of Christmas Day do not fill out the programme of the promise of the angel song. There is a deeper truth underlying it still. And that deeper truth is the fact that this Divine Babe came to earth and was born of the virgin mother, in order to claim it as His own. And the work He accomplished, as the Saviour of men, bears a distinct relation to "all people." Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man ; and, in the light of that truth, this world is a redeemed world ; and the men and women who make up its generations belong to Him, by the double title of creation and redemption. Whether men recognize their obligation to Christ or not, they are His by the costly purchase of His own most precious blood. The good tidings of great joy had its fulfillment in the completed work of Christ ; and the message of the Gospel, as it is borne to all nations, is at once the repetition and the fulfillment of the angel song. In the light of its earliest promise ; in the light of its historical fulfillment ; in the light of a toiling, struggling church through all the centuries, this world belongs to Jesus Christ, and He rightfully claims the nations as His own.

And we may gather a hint of the onward progress of our holy faith toward its universal dominion, in every instance where the spirit of the gospel has overflowed its institutions and has entered into and beautified the life with which it has come in contact. It has been said that if all the thoughts in the literature of the world which have been inspired by the Bible were to be omitted from the books which men have written, there would scarcely be a volume left undisturbed. And it is equally true of our Christian civilization that, even in its secular aspects and elements, there is scarcely a beautiful sentiment which has become dominant in the lives of men, nor a social amenity which lessens the harsh friction of human intercourse, nor a

philanthropic enterprise, nor a benevolent institution, nor an aggressive idea, which does not find its root and inspiration in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The message of His Birth is a message of good tidings of great joy to all people. And in God's own time it will be realized in its perfect completeness, when the world shall be subdued to the obedience of Christ, and the earth, purified from its sin, shall be a holy temple unto the Lord.

Of that supreme consummation these services of sacrament and sermon and song during the Christmastide are the prophecy, as of the historical Birth they are the echo. And each year erects another mile-stone in the long pilgrimage of the Centuries which connects the Nativity in Bethlehem with the judgment of the Great Day, and which clasps together in the unity of a divine purpose the Manger, the Cross and the Throne.

RELIGIOUS COASTERS.

BY REV. THOMAS KELLY [METHODIST], PHILADELPHIA.

From land, but as it were two hundred and fifty cubits.—John xxi : 8.
Launch out into the deep.—Luke v : 4.

PERHAPS no imagery more vividly represents the possibilities of grace than the symbols of the sea. How inspiring to think of the Christian as not only under divine care and guidance, but compassed about by the mercies of God, as a bather is compassed by the sea! How delightful to think of God's redeeming love as an ocean, broader and deeper than the Atlantic, where the vilest are invited to drink and live, to wash and be clean—in which all may revel, and dive for those gems of purity and jewels of saintly character which shall shine and sparkle in the heavenly world, and add new lustre to the Redeemer's crown!

I simply take these texts as suggestive of what I wish to present—the first, as indicating the spiritual whereabouts of the class I wish to describe :

the second, as suggestive of the cause of much failure in Christian work.

Jesus said, "Launch out," etc.

It is just possible, although the disciples had been fishing most of the previous night, that, like many Christian workers in our own day, they had been fishing too near the shore. We know not how much we lose in Christian efficiency by constantly minimizing the possibilities of attainment. Alas! how we limit the Holy One of Israel in His work in our own hearts, and in others, through the labor of our hands!

Brethren, why submit to the dangers and privations of a shallow Christian experience, when God urges us to "Launch out into the deep"? So long as you remain coasting about the shore, your labor must be unsatisfying, and your life a comparative failure. However enthusiastic and earnest you may appear to be, you are not in full working trim, and you know it. In point of efficiency, you are below the mark. You are toying with fire-crackers, when God would have you hurling thunder-bolts! The heavy artillery and Gatling guns of gospel truth and Holy Ghost power are never limbered with such telling effect as when manned by spiritual warriors far out at sea.

I. RELIGIOUS COASTERS. "From land, but as it were two hundred and fifty cubits."

There are thousands of hardy and experienced seamen who, though they could not be induced to ply their vocation within the narrow limits of canals and rivers, yet confine their sailing almost exclusively to the coast. So it is also in the religious world. Indeed, it seems that the majority of professing Christians are only religious coasters. Notice some points of resemblance between religious and sea coasters.

1. *The sea coaster has all the appliances necessary to cross the ocean if he felt so disposed.* He carries chart and compass, log and lead; but he trusts himself only to the guid-

ance of buoys and beacons, lights and land-marks; he does not call into requisition his sea-going apparatus. So it is with the spiritual coaster.

The great majority of Christians take no stock in religious canalling. They have discovered a "more excellent way." They have cut themselves loose from the tow-lines of priestcraft and ecclesiastical bigotry, and refuse to be held within the narrow channels of an unscriptural orthodoxy. They have sailed out into the broad bays and rivers of truth, and have even been cruising in the open sea; yet they are not *sea-going* Christians: they are simply *religious coasters*.

They profess to be living a life of faith, and yet it would no doubt alarm them if they saw how little they really trust God, and how much they depend upon human helps and inspiration in their religious life. What gives strength and victory to a life of faith is that it trusts God at all times: trusts Him in the darkness as well as in the day; where it cannot trace Him, as well as where it can. This blessed, abiding rest of faith is unknown to the religious coaster. He may think he has it when the sun shines and the goings of the Lord are traceable. But sunshine and divine footprints are not the best things to test the reality or strength of the Christian's faith. Much of what passes for faith is not worthy of the name. It springs more from the seen and temporal than from the unseen and eternal. It very much resembles the faith of the old lady who was in the carriage when the horse ran away. She said her faith never wavered until she saw the lines break. "Then," she said, "I knew we were done for, and gave up in despair."

The religious coaster depends more upon his feelings, and what he calls his evidences, than he does upon the Word of God. He must feel his way at every step, or he would not dare to take it, even on the authority of

his Maker. Like the sea-coaster, he never goes beyond soundings, and seldom beyond sight of land. When he does, it is always caused by fog, never by distance.

2. *No class of seaman is so constantly in danger, or needs to be so much on the lookout, as the coaster.* A sudden landward squall, a sunken rock, or an unsuspected sandbar, may bring him to grief. So with the spiritual coaster.

No class of Christians meets such disastrous storms or is in such constant danger of making shipwreck of faith. What multitudes of them founder and go down! How many go to pieces on the rocks of sensuality and sinful pleasure! And how many on the shoals of commercial fraud and dishonesty! Alas! how the shores are strewn with the ruins of once gallant barks, upset and dashed to pieces by the land squalls of worldly ambition, or the blinding, simoom sweep of an insatiable desire to be rich!

Brethren, religious coasting doesn't pay. It is but a barren and dangerous life at best. The very elements about you, and *even in you*, tend to set you back toward the shoals and shallows. The Christian is more or less under the alluring influence of the world so long as he remains a coaster. It is said that when the island of Ceylon is being approached the "spicy breezes" waft the odor of its fruits and flowers out over the waters. Whether that be fact or fancy, it is a fact that the land breezes of Satan's allurements, laden with the odor of the flowers and spicery of the world, the flesh and the devil, are wafted out over the religious coaster, in order to lure him back to the world.

One of the bad effects of religious coasting is that it tends to produce the impression on the mind of the coaster that God has provided nothing better than that kind of life for His people. It is strange that it should be so; but is it not a fact that the very persons in our churches

who live nearest the shore are the first to denounce as cranks or hypocrites those who profess to have "launched out into the deep"? But few of the wiles of Satan effect the growth and efficiency of the church so disastrously as this. It is this Satanic wile that makes thousands of Christians so fearful of being religious overmuch that they are scarcely religious at all, and yet are ready to brand as hypocrites and deceivers those who profess to have more religion than themselves.

This is the reason why so many Christian people, who ought to know better, are skeptical on the subject of heart purity, or the Higher Life: indeed, in many instances are so opposed to it that the mention of the subject is the red jacket at sight of which their blood begins to tingle, and they are ready at once for a pitched battle. Nothing so effectually paralyzes hope and puts an end to all progress in any department of human endeavor as the conviction that the goal is already reached.

Ne plus ultra—"Nothing beyond"—are fearful words for any man to write, even in thought, on the pillars of his attainments. These words were written on the Pillars of Hercules, and they sounded the death-knell of human progress, and became the palsyng foe of civilization and commerce for a thousand years. Are we not exposed to a danger analogous to this in the religious world? Are we not in danger, even as ministers, of getting the impression that the standard of piety among our upright, warm-hearted people is, after all, not so far below the mark, and about all that can be expected in this imperfect state?

God raised up Columbus to enlarge human conceptions of man and his dwelling-place, and to emancipate the world from the fatal spell of a delusion which had paralyzed the spirit of enterprise and progress for so many generations. And as he gazed out from the Spanish hills

upon the sunlit glories of the summer sea, his aspiring soul was thrilled with the inspiration of the conviction, *Plus ultra*—"Something beyond." So, in spite of public opinion and abuse, in spite of contempt and ridicule, in spite of false accusations and loss of friends, and the old lying inscription, he "*launched out into the deep*," and God crowned his sublime faith and heroism with the priceless trophy of the Continent of America.

Oh! for a Columbus in every church, in every community, to arouse a sleepy Christendom to the meagreness and poverty of a shallow, coast-bound Christianity, and thunder in the ears of religious coasters everywhere—"Something beyond"! In this age of doubt and rationalistic audacity, nothing but the *presence of the supernatural* can meet the demands of the hour. The theories and errors arrayed against Christianity spring not so much from the head as from the heart. Therefore the most candid discussion and logical reassuring cannot meet the case. Is it not a waste of time to try to reason errors out of men's heads which reason never put into them? How can you reason out what was *never reasoned in*?

In order to successfully grapple with the situation, we *must have more Pentecostal power in our churches*; and, in order to this, we must have not only educated, but *Holy Ghost men in our pulpits*—men who not only point to heaven, but lead the way; not simply religious coasters, but men inspired with gospel conceptions of the geography and resources of the great religious hemisphere; men who not only say, *Plus ultra*, but who, Columbus-like, sail out, and under the inspiration of an all-conquering faith take possession of it in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

THE STRENGTH OF THE HILLS.

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

The strength of the hills is his also.—
Ps. xcvi: 4.

It is a very noticeable fact in the constitution of the Bible that it not only presents spiritual truths to man's moral consciousness, but it adapts itself to man's whole being. In minor matters, as well as in essential principles, it addresses all man's faculties and tastes. It appeals to all peoples, of every clime, condition and environment. It is not a scheme of philosophy in the air, not a mere system of doctrine, but it attaches itself to earth at a multitude of points, alluring our love and interest because of the strong local coloring it has. We are accustomed to this characteristic of the Bible, as we are to the brightness of summer skies, or to the cool, crisp air of an autumnal day like this; yet it is well to reflect upon it. The Scriptures were written in a temperate climate, yet where there were great extremes and sudden changes; a land of heat and cold, ice, snow and rain; where there were orchards, fruitful fields and arid deserts, the rushing river, the mountain, and the bordering sea. The Holy Land is indeed an epitome of the whole earth. How different would the Bible have been if it had been written in Egypt, where one river dominated the land; or in Assyria! But all the features of nature, as seen in Palestine, find their echo in the truths of the Bible. Again and again during the past summer have the words of the text come to my mind as I have sojourned among the hills.

First, recall the immense power involved. "The strength of the hills is his also." We read of the hanging gardens of Babylon and count them among the wonders of the world. Yet in magnitude they were insignificant compared to the everlasting hills. We climb a range of mountains and find building material

sufficient for a hundred cities. It exceeds the power of arithmetic to calculate, and it surpasses the power of language to describe, the colossal greatness, power and wealth of which they are the embodiment. How easy are miracles to Him who built the hills! Only grant the existence of the Builder and a proper motive for the forthputting of His power, and miracles are but the idiom of His speech, easy as the motion of His finger. So also can He destroy them and turn them to airy gases with the same ease. The whole creation takes credibility, and its removal by the same power becomes a possibility as we reflect on these facts.

How terrible it is to live in a world of such energies, unless we are loyally obedient to Him who can create and can destroy, and who is as wise and benign as He is omnipotent!

In the second place, think of the dainty and marvelous beauty of the hills. Their loveliness images the beauty which exists in the mind of the Builder. We are first awed by the power and then charmed by the beauty to which it is wedded. In form and outline and altitude, here in round or undulating lines, there in abrupt and jagged peaks, here lofty and there in lowly elevations, there is constant variety. So, too, in the relation the mountains bear to each other. Some stretch along in terraces and some in continental ranges or chains; some tower up apart and alone; still others tumbled together in confusion, but everywhere bringing refreshment to the vision of the beholder who is alternately awed and delighted.

The verdure that covers their slopes, from the beech and birch below to the evergreen of the higher slopes, with the wild flowers between the splintered crags or the mosses and lichens that cling to them, and the changing color of the verdure as autumn touches it with brilliant hues—all teach us God's wonderful and

eternal love of beauty and lift our thoughts to that city above which He is to make the crown and consummation of beauty eternal. The morning light that greets their summits and the evening glow that lingers there in transfiguring glory also add to the variety and opulence of beauty with which God clothes the hills.

Again, besides the power that awes, and the tender beauty that wins our heart, we are reminded of the utility and the helpfulness of the hills. They are rich in their stony or metallic materials, and in the forests that clothe them. Mountains influence the temperature, cooling in summer and protecting us from the rigor of winter. They are great hospitals for the sick, for some diseases cannot exist 2,000 feet above the sea. The springs that run among the hills unite to form the rivers that in turn pour their waters into the sea.

There are moral as well as physical benefactions. The mountains teach us to face difficulties and to overcome them, inspiring strength to labor, perseverance and patience in toil and trial. Poverty is not to be conquered by an artificial distribution of wealth, but by manly struggles and wise endeavor. As I recently saw a farmer laboriously clearing a field of root and rock to make grass land for his children's support, I was taught anew the lesson that God nourishes the spirit of toil and noble endeavor by the very conditions and limitations of life.

The hills are helpful in stimulating the love of liberty, quickening great thoughts and poetic inspirations. The mountains have sheltered the persecuted people of God, and there the bones of His slaughtered saints have been sometimes laid. Not only are our poetic sensibilities stirred as we witness the sublimity of storm and tempest, thunder and lightning or the tender beauty of the mountain lake, shimmering like silver, but devout feelings are here quickened. It

was to the mountain Christ retired to pray; it was on a mountain He was transfigured; it was on a mountain He delivered that matchless discourse which will inspire men as long as time lasts. It was into "a great and high mountain" that John was carried, in the spirit, from which he saw Holy Jerusalem.

Mountains are earth's spires. We build spires a hundred feet or more, but these spires are lifted up miles in height toward heaven, pointing to Himself and clothed with pure, white, awful majesty, as if to remind us of the great white throne of judgment which is to be revealed.

Again: The littleness of man is another lesson of the hills. We feel this occasionally, as when at sea we are caught in the grasp of the tempest, or look up at evening to the distant stars; but emphatically and continuously we are impressed by the conviction as we stand beneath the imperial, overshadowing mountains. The impression infiltrates our whole being. Men may tunnel the earth and lift magnificent bridges, but with all their wealth and force they can neither build nor level the Alleghenies and the Sierras. God alone has reared them, and at His word they will vanish as a dream when one awaketh. "What is man that thou art mindful of him!"

Once more: How beautiful is the revelation of God in Jesus Christ! The mountains tell us nothing of His mercy and grace toward sinful men. They tell of inexorable power, but not of forgiveness. It is in Christ alone we learn this: He who built the mountain opened the eyes of the blind, and blessed the little children. The Bible is the great moral mountain of the world. Why is it that men are unwilling to receive it? If we receive Christ, no miracle can stagger our faith, for Christ is the greatest of miracles. Wondering and awed by miracles of power in the natural world, shall not I see the truths of the Incarnation, Resurrec-

tion, Judgment, and Immortality to be in harmony with the same—a part of one great system of divine wisdom?

Finally: How perfect and satisfying is the joy when we see Jesus Christ and accept him, saying, "My Lord and my God!"—when we become His sons and daughters. There can be no more terrific doom than to be under the frown of Him who "settest fast the mountains, being girded with power"; alienated from the God who hung the stars and builded the hills. This need not be. You may each now come and say, "O God of the mountains, I behold Thee on that low hill outside the city gate. I accept that sacrifice, and yield myself to be henceforth Thine own alone; be Thou my Lord and Saviour forever." Otherwise you will be ready to cry to the mountains "Cover us!" and to the hills "Fall on us!" in the day of His wrath. As to the vision of Habakkuk, the eternal mountains to you will be scattered and the everlasting hills will bow, and you will see "the fiery bolts" that go forth at His feet as He goes forth "in indignation to thresh the nations in anger." But blessed are all who put their trust in Him. If He be our strength and life, of whom shall we be afraid? If we be reckoned in the book of life, we shall stand with unblemished feet on the mountains above, and from our immortal tongues shall rise and swell songs of rejoicing forevermore.

THE MESSAGE TO SMYRNA.

BY PETER STRYKER, D. D. [REFORMED], MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write, etc.—Rev. ii: 8-11.

SMYRNA was an ancient Ionian city. Having lain waste 400 years, it was rebuilt on another site, and at the time of John was one of the most attractive cities of the East, called by some "The Lovely," the "Crown of Asia." Through many changes it has since passed, but it still exists,

and is improving in appearance. It is the home of 130,000 people, of whom there is a score of thousand Greeks. Most of the citizens, however, are Turks and Moslems. The American Board and other societies have stations there. The candlestick is not removed. Why is this?

1. Much of praise and no complaint is spoken of Smyrna by Christ. "I know thy works and tribulation and poverty, but thou art rich." It is believed that the faithful Polycarp was the angel or minister of this church. He was a martyr in 186 A. D., at the age of 86. He served them long as *episkopos*—bishop or pastor. The commendation given to his flock is noteworthy.

2. The epithets applied to Christ are significant. The believers were weak and needed exalted views of their Lord as an Eternal, Everliving Helper. He is called "The first and last, who was dead and is alive." He was to be their prevailing Intercessor and their final Judge. Those who remained faithful, though persecuted to death, should receive with Him life eternal.

3. The trials of Smyrna. Jesus saw their poverty and tribulation, their weakness and temptation, and He sympathized with them in all these experiences. Many may have been born poor and others became poor for Christ's sake. "I know thy poverty, but thou art rich." A man whose god is this world, who lives for self and sensual pleasures, the slave of appetite or of ambition or of avarice—how poor, though possessing millions! What is his condition beyond? Having sown to the flesh, he reaps corruption. Having deliberately rejected Christ in this world, he is lost forever! I remember such a one thirty-five years ago. He then lived like a king. Ten years later he died in poverty and wretchedness, having no hope and without God. On the other hand, the child of God, though houseless and homeless, ragged and starving, despised and forsaken, is an

heir of life, a temple of God, and will soon be clothed upon with the glory to be revealed. His is a home in the skies, rest, bliss and gladness eternal. I saw a Christian die in a New York garret. Though in extreme want, her last words indicated a desire to enjoy the communion service. When assured that she would soon sit at the table of her Lord above, she sweetly smiled and breathed her last.

Like Agur, we may pray for neither extreme; but if you were compelled to choose, which would you take? Wealth without God, or God and poverty?

"I know the blasphemy"—that is, abuse of Christians and their religion—"of them who say that they are Jews"—that is, claim to be religious, truly devout—"but are the synagogue of satan"—hypocritical and corrupt. Though called Israel, they really are heathen at heart.

4. Notice, now, the comfort given in view of the future. "The devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried, and ye shall have tribulation ten days." This evidently indicates a fixed period, which shall be brief. Weeping at night is followed by joy in the morning. To-day the cross, to-morrow the victor's palm and crown. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." The cross is to be purified in the crucible of persecution. Satan may torment; but if we watch and fight and pray, if we follow Christ in an aggressive as well as in defensive warfare, our reward is assured. Brethren, we are in the hottest of the conflict. Sleep not on the field! Activity, vigilance and prayerfulness are indispensable. The truth will prevail. One shall chase a thousand, two put ten thousand to flight. We have much to encourage. Even the secular press discusses religious truth and scatters its teachings. We, too, are to go forth to personal, hand-to-hand work. Neglect not the call; for

Finally, notice the imperativeness

of the summons: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." It is a call to this church—to you as an individual. It is not my message, but my Master's. What is your work? Delay not in finding it and doing it at once. "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death." Heed, then, the call of God. Keep your eye on that "crown of glory bright" which is revealed to the vision of the believer. He who cometh will come, and not tarry. So shall we be forever with the Lord.

THE CHRISTIAN THE WORKMANSHIP OF GOD.

By T. EDWIN BROWN, D. D. [BAPTIST], PROVIDENCE, R. I.

We are his workmanship. — Eph. ii: 10.

PAUL had just uttered a most elemental truth, that salvation is not of works but of faith in Jesus Christ. He always laid great stress upon this initial fact. He was swift to prick the bladder of self-conceit wherever he saw it expand. Why? He thoroughly understood that in the account of the universe the debt stood on man's side, the credit always on God's. The picture does not create its own beauty, the violet its perfume, nor stars the glory of their rhythm and order and movement. As Addison has said, the planets are forever singing, as they shine, "The hand that made us is divine." Shall the Christian boast his character and his works? Yes; if he alone made that character, and is the sustaining force of those works. But if we are God's workmanship, ours shall be the humble tribute of the saints above, "Unto Him who hath loved us . . . be glory forever." Yet all this is in harmony with human responsibility. Ye are His workmanship. Created after what type or law? "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works." To what end? "Which God hath before ordained, that we shall walk in them." No master of language could

pack into a sentence more cogent logic, more profound reason, or more gladdening gospel than this. God's grace does fashion the central substance of man's character into the glorious likeness of Jesus Christ.

1. This fact meets us at the outset: the universal moral discontent of all thoughtful men. Our own ideals of life are unattained. We are not what we would become. We find a permanent, inherent defect. The sculptor detects a stain or flaw in the block of marble on which he works. He chips away, but still it stays. At last he is convinced that the defacing flaw or blemish runs through and through the whole mass, and so he abandons the block as useless for his purpose. So with human character. There is a taint which runs through it. Heredity is a law, and yet we may not lay the blame on our ancestors for tainted blood and weakened will. This will and blood are ours. We are still responsible for their action. The poets and philosophers, from Euripides and Plato to Shakespeare and George Eliot, all breathe forth the same notes of need and discontent. We wish that we could live over again our life, under new conditions and amid new surroundings. Only the gospel, however, can fit into this discontent. Let us not indict God, but recognize the stream of purpose, action and life which we ourselves have created, our own conscience bearing witness to it. If we are ever taken up out of this turbid stream it will be by the grace of God. He has created a new race-type, a new stock. We have made a failure of ourselves, but He can and will make a success. "We are his workmanship," not the result of environment. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The same power raised Jesus Christ from the dead. Both these mighty works are paralleled in the re-creation and ennoblement of dead souls.

2. Christ is the head type, the stock of the new life. He is the vine into

which we may be grafted. He has given a name to this new family. He is the king of this new realm. It is His life which is to re-create us. Paul at Damascus did not fully realize these truths, but they were gradually revealed in his progressive experience. Young converts to-day do not fully know at first the riches of this renewing grace. We must distinguish between the fruits of life and the roots of life. Life expresses itself in forms, and so religion will show itself in conduct. Righteousness which is of Christ will be organized in us and fulfilled by us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.

3. Now, what are the fruits of this Christ-likeness? The gospel is a gift for all. This is a path which all weary feet may tread. Its transforming power is seen in the commonest as well as in the most conspicuous duties; in the shop, the home, in social and in civic life. This is the path which God hath ordained for us. The blessed results are certified facts. In palace and in hovel, in church, in school, and in the slums as well, we find living illustrations of the grace of God. Are we not ourselves witnesses? May we not tell what the Lord hath done for our souls?

But some one may ask, "Why has not this work been carried forward with more rapidity to the end? Why is not this Christ-likeness more perfectly realized now?" You might also ask why was primeval fire-dust fashioned into a world with no voice or herald. God is not in haste. The seed, the blade, the stalk, and then the full corn in the ear—that is God's method in nature and in grace. The world has not yet seen a full spectacle of what Christ can do. "He is," as one has strangely put it, "yet in His baby clothes." We have but the alphabet of His grace. What Christ has done is but the husk to the ear. Gustave Doré, in his "Triumph of Christianity," puts the genius of the gospel on a throne; Jupiter's crown falls into a

pit that is fathomless, and his face is averted in terror. The artist of the future will make a grander picture, and paint all the evil spirits—the injustice, avarice, impurity, slander, intemperance and false philosophies that have ruled and enslaved the race—as terror-stricken and fleeing before the Crowned One who sits upon the throne. This may be a vision, an ideal, but we are to look for it, work and pray for it. Then heredity will be purified; art, science, literature, commerce and statecraft will be pervaded and baptized by Christ; then we shall see the potency stored up in the forces of civilization by means of the Gospel of Christ.

This is an ennobling conception. Man is not a mere producer and distributor of material gain. He stands in the centre of God's purpose and plan. The gospel is nothing if it be not ethical. From Eden till now, through all the ages, God has been fashioning humanity into a divine epic, a poem expressive of His own august, glorious thought. In our weakness we need this new power interpenetrating us, that of the Holy Ghost from heaven. In our hunger, unrest, discontent, He is everything to us. We must submit to God's workmanship. We must open our hearts to this celestial life till our hearts throb in unison with Him whose stock, whose subjects, whose children, we are.

DOING MORE THAN OTHERS.

By REV. J. T. L. MAGGS, B. A.
[METHODIST], HIGHGATE, LONDON.

What do ye more than others?—
Matt. v : 47.

LET us understand the Master's question. It is not, "Do ye less than others, or as much as others?" but "Do ye more?" You are not to be censorious judges. You are not to take your life as the standard and others at the minimum. The ordinary level of living it is easy to keep. It requires no climbing, no self-denial to do just what the world does—to

love those who love you, to reciprocate kindnesses enjoyed, to lend to those from whom you expect to receive again, to maintain the polite conventionalities of society—for the heathen, publicans and sinners, anybody and everybody, do these things. The gospel requires excellence. This is its motive and end; not doing as the world, but more and better. Christianity brings the vilest and the most debased to pristine purity and power. Its purpose is to do more for man than other systems do, both in its intellectual, ethical and spiritual relations to the race. To man's benighted nature it brings the light of life and immortality, satisfying his highest instincts and aspirations. The vast field of revelation is like the firmament bespangled with starry constellations. There are the great truths of the Trinity, of redemption and the future life, august and inspiring to the mind. The gospel also comes to the moral nature in a sweeter, more memorable and effective manner than any other system of religious thought. It is more searching and discriminating. It shows that lying, murder and impurity lurk in the thought and heart of man before expressed in word and deed.

It places love and obedience in a stronger light, and gives a deeper significance and solemnity to the sanctions of law. Spiritually it does more than others. It at once encourages the active and meditative functions of the Christian life—gentleness and manliness, patience and valor, subtlety and sagacity; in fact all the gifts that enrich and the graces that adorn a true believer—so that each may say, "I can do all things through Christ Jesus, who strengtheneth me." His grace is sufficient. Imitators of Him, as dear children united to Him by faith, and holding communion through prayer, we co-operate with the Lord in the perfection of spiritual character. How unapproachably grand is the gospel in purpose and result! It imparts nobler thought,

purser emotions and richer experience than all else; and Paul was right in saying, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." It is indeed an embodiment of the wisdom of God and of the power of God.

Recall also that the highest motives are supplied by the gospel. We see truth in the best light, and feel its mightiest leverage. I am old-fashioned enough to believe in an endless life of joy or of sorrow and loss. I believe also in the indwelling of God in the heart that welcomes Him there to work out the problems of his grace, and to establish his kingdom of grace and power. The restraint imposed is the gentlest of all—that of love. The example put before us is that of Jesus in his unimpeachable sinlessness, and in his serene and patient submission to the Father through his life of poverty, toil, a misunderstood ministry, and a death of agony and shame. The gospel bids us walk in Christ's steps. It gives us more than the example of Jesus: the power as well. Through the inworking grace of the Holy Ghost we are made strong, wise, victorious.

We see from this line of thought how reasonable is the service that is required of us. The gospel requires of us a higher style of living because of our superior privileges. Pagan civilization, as represented in classic nations, furnished men strong in physical nature, intellectually furnished, and cultivated in political, commercial and artistic relations, but skeptical, unchaste and godless. Hinduism has its minute and continuous restraint over its devotees; Islamism its ardent motives, and Buddhism its parables of resignation and of other virtues; but we see the results of these forms of refined heathenism. Christianity is infinitely exalted by the comparison. But the personal appeal of the text comes to us, "What do ye *more* than others?" How few rise above the conventional level, in thought, in morals and in work! In-

deed, the level itself seems sinking. How is it about trade, politics and morals as compared with earlier days? Is not the rule "Get all and keep all" too common? Is the relation of Christian landlord and tenant any fairer because each is professedly Christian? What do YE more than others? Remember who ye are, ye who stand in this 19th century, with a rich historic background in your rear, with a rich and vital experience of gospel truth to study in the noble men who have lived before you. Ye sit in a Methodist chapel and sing Methodist hymns, and many here are born of Methodist parents. Ought ye not to show more devotion to the church of your fathers! It is a church that aims at the cultivation of a higher Christian life. We have a matchless, spiritual ancestry. John Wesley, the preacher; Charles Wesley, of lyric power; the godly Fletcher and other eminent saints are ours. All things are ours; the heroic grace of early martyr and later missionary; the grace that wrought in Augustine, St. Bernard, Luther and men of more recent day; all is ours, and yet we seem to live as though these had never lived.

Finally remember, to *do* more we must BE more than others. A pure, clean heart is needed for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. When healthier and holier we can do more. Let us claim our privilege. Let the divine life have its sway. Of what use is the eloquent tongue, or the mighty arm, if the nerves that should stimulate them are paralyzed? Quench not the Holy Spirit, but yield heartily to His gracious and ennobling influence. Become His instrument, and then will your life and labors excel all others in their beneficent, abiding and immortal power.

THE LIFE BENEFICENT.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

Who went about doing good.—Acts 10:38.

THE life of Christ was a life benefi-

cent. He is for men the example. No life is a true life which is not beneficent.

There is in this scripture furnished for life a test, an enterprise, a habit.

I. A TEST. Christ went about doing good. By precisely this question, whether your life is beneficent, are you to test your life.

1. Test your *speech* by it. Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying.

2. Test your *amusements* by it. Do they do you good in the way of recreating you for better toil; do they exert no harmful influence upon others?

3. Test your *business* by it. Is the general outcome of your business beneficent; and do you carry it on in beneficent fashion?

4. Test your *use of time* by this question. Are you putting your time to high and holy uses?

5. Test your *position and culture* thus: Are you the readier to serve the higher you get up?

II. There is here suggested an ENTERPRISE for life. Christ *went about* doing good. He *personally* did it—did not content himself with doing good by proxy. Christ went after the chance of doing good; did not simply wait for the chance to come to Him.

III. There is suggested also here a HABIT for life. Christ was not intermittent in this matter. It was the habit of his life to go about doing good. O for Christians of such pithy pluck that they will habitually keep hold of duty!

ENTERTAINING SAINTS VS. CONVERTING SINNERS.

BY CHARLES H. PARKHURST, D.D.
[PRESBYTERIAN], NEW YORK.

Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come.— Luke x: 1.

THE Gospel is a volume of inspired

polity. Not only the message is declared, but also the way and means by which it is to become the universal possession of the world. The aim of the narrative of the mission and return of the seventy is to give a far-reaching hint as to the methods to be pursued in evangelizing the world. These seventy were no doubt Christianly green and immature, and yet in sending them Christ gave concrete emphasis to two facts:

1. Christianity is emphatically a missionary religion. It is to have a movable frontier.

2. Not what goes into a man alone sanctifies him, but also that which goes out. Living the Gospel is the best method of acquiring it.

To the second of these facts attention is called. To my mind, a radical change has got to be made in methods of church work before the Church comes up to her high ideal in the evangelization of the world.

The Church is an army, not a club. Club-life, which is so large a feature in modern times, has found its way into the church. With some the church is a place where men and women get together to have a good time. Men frankly say that the reason for their attendance upon the Lord's day in God's house is that they like what they hear, and like what they see. Many upon their advent in a large city select a church with the same governing motives that influence them in the choice of a hotel—because they like it. The consideration of the question, "In which church can I be the most useful?" never once enters their minds.

There are people in this congregation who, if it should by a decree of society become proper to attend the theatre on Sunday morning, would forsake the pew here for a box there. They use the same faculties here that they would there, and are pleased in just the same manner. To them the house of God is a spiritual theatre.

Then there is another class of church-goers which love the truth

for the truth's sake, but think that their responsibility ends with attendance upon the services of the Lord's day. For them the church is nothing more or less than a spiritual boarding-house.

The church is full of apologetic saints who are crammed full with spiritual truths but are suffering from lack of exercise. We, as pastors, elders, deacons and people have something else to do than administer a gospel boarding-house and an evangelical restaurant.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT LEADING SERMONS.

1. Affinity in Creation, History and Destiny. "After his kind."—Gen. i: 11. A. T. Pierson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
2. Faithfulness in the Use of Divine Means. "And Moses took the rod of God in his hand."—Ex. iv: 20. Rev. Peter DeBruyn, Rochester, N. Y.
3. The Recognition of God that which Gives Meaning and Dignity to Life. "As the Lord God of Israel liveth before whom I stand."—I Kings xvii: 1. Wayland Hoyt, D.D., Philadelphia.
4. The Fellow-workman's Cheer. "Lo the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, he that smote the anvil."—Isa. xli: 7. T. D. Witherston, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
5. The Traveler's Religion. "I am the Lord thy God . . . which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldst go."—Isa. xlviii: 17. Rev. Louis Albert Banks, Cincinnati, O.
6. The Prophet Hosea on the Cause and Cure of Social Evils. "Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them? for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them; but the transgressors shall fall therein."—Hosea xiv: 9. J. Munro Gibson, D.D., London, Eng.
7. Christ and the Sick. (Hospital Sermon). "Now Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues . . . and healing every disease and every sickness among the people."—Matt. ix: 35. John H. Barrows, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
8. Willing to Obey the Condition of Power to Obey. "Then he saith to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole as the other."—Matt. xii: 13. Geo. D. Armstrong, D.D., Norfolk, Va.
9. "Sitting By." "And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by."—Luke v: 17. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, London, Eng.
10. An Inside View of Revivals. "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord."—Acts iii: 19 [R. V.]. E. McChesney, D.D., New York.
11. Christian Humility Illustrated in the Character of Paul. "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ."—Eph. iii: 8. President McCosh, of Princeton, in New York.
12. Modern Thought: Its Influence on Character. (A Sermon to Young Men.) "That ye be no longer children, carried about with every wind of doctrine."—Eph. iv: 24. T. v. Tymms, Clapton, England.
13. Hindrances to Spiritual Growth. "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment."—Phil. i: 9. Rev. Canon Gregory, London, Eng.
14. Progress the Law of Life. "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before."—Phil. iii: 13. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
15. Progress in Vital Theology. "That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God."—Col. i: 10. J. L. Withrow, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
16. The Immutable Faith of the Church. "Earnestly contend for the faith that was once delivered unto the saints."—Jude 3. A. J. F. Behrends, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
17. Character the Rule of Destiny. "He that is unjust let him be unjust still . . . and he that is holy, let him be holy still."—Rev. xxii: 11. Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

SUGGESTIVE THEMES.

1. No Compromise with Sin. ("There shall not a hoof be left behind."—Exodus x: 26.)
2. The Danger of being Over-busy with the World. ("And as thy servant was busy here and there, he was gone."—I Kings xx: 40.)
3. The Moral Balance Sheet. ("And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done?"—Gen. iii: 13.)
4. Religion a Permanent Investment, Not a Speculation. ("Buy the truth, and sell it not."—Prov. xxiii: 23.)
5. God's Silence. ("These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself."—Ps. i: 21.)
6. Not Doing is Undoing. ("He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it."—Ecc. x: 8.)
7. The Supremacy of the Spiritual in the Battle of the Ages. ("The saints of the most high God shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom."—Dan. vii: 18.)
8. The Memory of God. ("The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works."—Amos viii: 7.)
9. A Problem in Soul Assurance. ("For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"—Matt. xvi: 16.)
10. The Mercilessness of Sin. ("And he would not; but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt."—Matt. xviii: 30.)
11. No Lack of Work or Wages in Christ's Service. ("Son, go work to-day in my vineyard."—Matt. xx: 28.)
12. Private Talks With God. ("He took him aside from the multitude."—Luke xviii: 13.)
13. Christian Socialism. ("In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned one to another; in honor preferring one another."—Rom. xii: 10, R. V.)
14. Wild Oats. (A Sermon to Young Men.) ("Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."—Gal. vi: 7.)

FUNERAL TEXTS AND THEMES.

Is a ministry of many years, in a place where funeral sermons are preached over everybody that dies, from the infant of a day to the veteran of a century, one of the most perplexing questions that confronts the pastor as, from time to time, he is called upon to bury another, and another, and still another of his people, perhaps in quick succession, is, What text shall I use, or what line of thought shall I pursue at *this* funeral? The embarrassment is the greater if the people whom he serves, as is often the case in village and country pastorates, are about all related to each other. In this event, at every funeral, there is present nearly the same congregation of friends and acquaintances, so that, to prevent unfavorable comment, there must be preached a spick-and-span, brand-new sermon. The necessity, then, of cultivating variety in funeral preparation is apparent. As a contribution to this end, the writer here presents to his ministerial brethren some of the texts and themes that he has used.

J. H. LUCKENBACH.

1. Crossing the River. "Then how wilt thou do in the swelling of Jordan?"—Jer. xii : 5.
2. There is No Morrow. "Boast not thyself of to-morrow, for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth."—Prov. xxvii : 1.
3. Not Yet Dead. "And by it, he being dead, yet speaketh."—Heb. xi : 4.
4. Christian Suffering not Comparable with Christian Glorification.—"For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."—Rom. viii : 18.
5. God's Tender Care of Us. "A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench."—Isa. xlii : 3.
6. God's Peace Unassailable. "When he giveth quietness, who then can make trouble?"—Job. xxxiv : 29.
7. Away from Home. "I am a stranger on earth."—Ps. cxix : 19.
8. Tired of Life. "My soul is weary of my life."—Job x : 1.
9. An Appeal for Divine Help. "O Lord, I am oppressed ; undertake for me."—Isa. xxxviii : 14.
10. The Quietness of the Grave. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."—Ps. cxv : 17.
11. Future Events Unknown. "For he knoweth not that which shall be : for who can tell him when it shall be?"—Ecl. viii : 7.
12. Our Coming Departure from this Life. "When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence I shall not return."—Job. xvi : 22.
13. Where We shall Sleep at Last. "For now shall I sleep in the dust."—Job. vii : 21.
14. Hope in Death. "But the righteous hath hope in his death."—Prov. xiv : 32.
15. God's Dispensations Always Right. "Even so, Father ; for so it seemed good in thy sight."—Matt. xi : 26.
16. The Christian's Property in Death. "Death is yours."—1 Cor. iii : 22.
17. The Unchangeable Law of Change. "Thou changest his countenance and sendest him away."—Job xiv : 20.
18. No Permanent Rest Here. "Arise ye, and depart, for this is not your rest."—Mt. ii : 10.
19. A Suggestive Comparison. "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting."—Ecl. vii : 2.
20. The Twins—Death and Sleep. "She is not dead, but sleepeth."—Luke viii : 52.
21. Coming and Going. "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh ; but the earth abideth forever."—Ecl. i : 4.
22. Two Certain Things. "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."—2 Sam. xii : 23.
23. The Divine Healer. "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed ; save me, and I shall be saved ; for thou art my praise."—Jer. xvii : 14.
24. God's Purpose in Sending Afflictions. "That he might humble thee, and that he might prove thee, to do thee good at thy latter end."—Deut. viii : 16.
25. What to Do in Sorrow. "Rise and pray."—Luke xxii : 46.
26. Watch ! Watch ! "And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch."—Mark xiii : 37.
27. A Mother's Grave. "Her grave."—Gen. xxxv : 20.
28. Precious Deaths. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints."—Ps. cxvi : 15.
29. How to Act in Trouble. "Patient in tribulation."—Rom. xii : 12.
30. God's Counsel to the Troubled. "And call upon me in the day of trouble."—Ps. l : 15.
31. The Body a Tabernacle. "I must shortly put off this my tabernacle even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me."—2 Pet. i : 14.
32. Through the Furnace. "When he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold."—Job xxiii : 10.
33. Very Long Life Not Desirable. "The days of our years are threescore years and ten ; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow ; for it is soon cut off and we fly away."—Ps. xc : 10.
34. Death a Necessity. "For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again."—2 Sam. xiv : 14.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY J. M. SHERWOOD, D.D.

Jan. 29 to Feb. 4.—No COMPROMISE WITH SIN.—Neh. vi : 1-9.

NEHEMIAH'S example is worthy of careful study and imitation. He was doing a good, a serious, and a highly important work in rebuilding the

walls of Jerusalem. But Sanballat and other enemies of the Jews sought to deter him from his noble purpose, first by threats, and then by an artful proposal to come together in friendly conference. But, knowing

their evil designs, he would not listen to them for a moment; would not suspend work for an hour; and sent them by letter a heroic and indignant response, and then prayed God to "strengthen" his hands that he might not be "weakened" in his work by any yielding or compromise with the enemies of his people.

Every Christian is engaged in a work similar in kind and spirit to that of Nehemiah. He is assigned to his proper place on the walls of the spiritual Jerusalem which has been building ever since God laid the foundations of His church in Eden. Every man is required to "build over against" his own home or assigned place. The Devil, the enemies of God, and an evil world, are ever on the alert to hinder him in this work; to intimidate him; to draw him away from it; to seduce him from his allegiance to Christ; to flatter or cajole him into sinful compliances, or draw him into hurtful alliances which will compromise his honor and destroy his usefulness as a Christian. And, alas! how often are such devices of the enemy successful! There is no safety for any man, in any station or position, but in closely following Nehemiah's example of prompt, decisive, manly, uncompromising rejection of every overture of the enemy, come in what specious form it may.

1. *He must not cease his work for an hour.* The enemy has gained a great advantage if he induces a Christian to stop his work just long enough to parley—to listen to objections, to hear evil reports, to weigh crafty insinuations, and the like. To cease work at the suggestion of the enemy is to invite surrender or compromise.

2. *He must not be terrified or kept from duty by any amount of opposition, or by any threat from man or Devil.* The fixed policy of the Devil and his agents is to frighten souls out of salvation—to appeal to their fears. But the man *who knows no fear* while in the way of duty, the roar of a legion of lions will not

disturb, for he knows they are *chained* and can do him no hurt.

"Greater is he that is for us than all they that are against us."

3. He must show *the spirit of utmost boldness and uncompromising determination* in all his responses to evil-doers and evil designers. A timid, irresolute, half-hearted policy is almost sure to prove disastrous.

4. Finally, like Nehemiah, the Christian worker, when seducing spirits assail him, must *carry his cause to God, and seek from Him* fresh courage and grace and strength to "resist the wiles of the adversary" and, having done all, to stand firm and unyielding in the day of temptation.

Feb. 5 to 11.—HOW TO DEFEAT THE ENEMY OF SOULS.—Neh. iv: 7-9; Matt. xxvi: 41.

There is just one way, and only one, to do it. Nehemiah understood the secret. When Sanballat, with numerous other foes, heard that the "walls of Jerusalem were made up," they "conspired all of them together to come and fight against Jerusalem." Not in the least daunted, the intrepid builder records, "We made our prayer unto our God and set a watch against them day and night." His one all-sufficient reliance was God—the God of Israel—in this day of imminent peril. The Jews were but a handful, and they were not disciplined soldiers; while Sanballat and Tobiah had mustered a great army of Arabians, and Ammonites, and Ashdodites, and were "very wroth." But the man of God, quietly trusting in the Hearer of prayer, made supplication and "then set a watch against them day and night," that he should not be surprised and the city be captured through negligence. While confident of God's protecting power in the day of so great a peril, he nevertheless used faithfully the means essential to the security of the city. Had he "prayed" and not "watched," or "watched" and not "prayed," his great work for God and His people had been frus-

trated, and Sanballat and his allies had prevailed.

So the Great Master, during the night of agony in Gethsemane, summed up the great lesson of Christianity in two words: WATCH—PRAY—"Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation."

I. WATCH.

1. This solemn injunction implies *danger*. Its frequent reiteration in the Scriptures shows that the danger is actual, constant, imminent. And we know from daily observation and experience that this is so. Danger lurks in every step, every duty, every pleasure, every trial, every relation and circumstance of life, and to every man. The danger is none the less real and imminent because we do not think of it, or see it, or fear it.

2. It implies that *evil agents are on the alert to surprise us*. The Devil "goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." Myriads of evil agents and influences environ our path, continually lying in wait to entice, deceive, lead astray, get the advantage over us.

3. It implies that *sharp, unremitting, faithful watching, day and night, continually, is the price of safety*. To cease to watch is to fall an easy prey. To grow slack in this duty is to invite assault. We may watch at all points save one, and at that one point the temptation will push in and capture the soul.

II. BUT PRAYER MUST GO WITH WATCHING.

If we were to watch every moment of life and neglect to pray, it would not avail. And, on the contrary, if we were to pray unceasingly and fail to watch, we should be sure to fall into temptation. God has indissolubly joined them together. Watching will show us the imperative necessity of prayer, while prayer will emphasize the duty of watching and incite to its faithful performance. Conjoined, they will bring the soul safely through the manifold evils which assail it.

February 12-18.—HOW TO WIN SOULS.—1 Cor. ix : 19-22.

As we understand these remarkable words of the great apostle, he *obeyed the law of adaptation*. He conformed his efforts to the providential circumstances of each individual sinner's case. He adjusted himself and all his efforts to win souls to Christ to the *fitness of things*. He had no iron-cast mode or policy that could not yield to the special condition that each soul presented. He stood not on his "rights," his "dignity," his consistency, even. To the Jew he was a Jew; to the Gentile a Gentile; to the weak in faith and knowledge he became weak: "*I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*" Note the *principle* that ruled him. It was not to gain popularity, or any selfish end—simply and only to gain access to men's minds and hearts, and thus win them over to Christ.

Noble example! So did the Master. But how few, comparatively, imitate them! I honestly believe that the failure to win souls to Christ, on the part both of the ministry and of the laity, is owing to the *lack of wise adaptation of means and personal influence to the end sought*, more than to any other one cause. "*He that winneth souls is wise*"—implying that where wisdom is lacking souls will *not* be won. No honesty of purpose, or intensity of action or desire, will avail. Wisdom has reference to time, and season, and condition, and attitude, and the choice of means—all that enters into the philosophy of one mind influencing another. The closer the contact—the nearer one puts himself into the actual condition and sphere and modes of thinking of another—the readier will he gain power over him. *Paul came face to face, hand to hand, soul to soul*, with the sinners of his day, and that was the marvelous secret of his success. But nowadays Paul would be branded as vulgar, a fanatic, a sensationalist, etc.!

I. THE PULPIT MAY STUDY THIS LESSON TO ADVANTAGE.

After all, it depends very largely on the observance of *the law of adaptation* whether preaching be a savor of life or a savor of death. It is not so much the particular doctrine exhibited, or the ability of the sermon, or the feeling and fidelity shown, as it is whether the theme is well chosen, the mode of presentation the best possible in the conditions—whether the heart and head of the speaker grapple firmly with the individual conscience and life of the hearer, so that he is made to feel the force of *personal contact*. The elaborated, rhetorical, metaphysical, or formal doctrinal sermon, or the polished and learned essay, or the hash of sensational novelties—why, a thousand of them will fall powerless upon a company of worldly-minded, sensual, skeptical sinners! There are no *grappling irons* in such kind of preaching—no coming together of preacher and hearer in actual earnest contest.

II. The lesson is EQUALLY APPLICABLE TO CHRISTIANS IN PRIVATE LIFE.

Their business is to win "souls," just as truly as it is the minister's. And they need the same class of gifts and graces. More sinners are repulsed than won, it is to be feared. Harshness, scolding, rudeness, perpetual hectoring of them, will not "*win*" them. Gentleness, meekness, politeness, attention, "a word in season," winning, loving entreaty, a cheerful, consistent example, prayer—these are the weapons to conquer hearts of unbelief. Do as Paul did, and with his noble Christian purpose: "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."

Feb. 19-25. — WHAT KEEPS THE CHRISTIAN. — 1 Cor. x : 13 ; 2 Cor. xii : 9.

Rightly considered, there is nothing more wonderful than a man whose

nature is essentially evil, who is environed with a thousand corrupt and corrupting influences from the cradle to the grave ; whose path is thronged with spiritual enemies, and who is so susceptible to temptation and liable at any moment to go astray and fall away—marvelous that one so weak and exposed should be held up and carried safely through every danger and evil, and brought off a "conqueror, and more than a conqueror," and put in possession of eternal life. How shall we explain it? On natural principles we cannot explain it. Human virtue and strength are utterly inadequate to such a result. There is but one solution, and the Apostle gives it: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." God himself is, therefore, the Christian's keeper; and he needs no other, and needs to fear no evil.

I. THIS IS MATTER OF PROMISE—DISTINCT, POSITIVE, REPEATED PROMISE.

God has bound himself, even by oath and covenant, to stand by His child and never leave him, or suffer the enemy to prevail over him. There are hundreds of promises to this effect, and He is ever ready to redeem them to the last item. He never goes back on His word.

II. These promises are matter of blessed EXPERIENCE, AS WELL AS OF REVELATION.

They have been put to the *test*, times innumerable—in every age of the world and in every land—on all occasions—in sickness, in suffering, in trial, in the great crises of life, and in the hour of death—and they have always and everywhere held good; such a thing as a failure was never known! The thief on the cross, the tortured victim on the rack, the martyr at the stake, one and all have found these promises like the arms of Almighty Love enwrapping them,

and shielding them, and filling their souls with unspeakable peace and triumph.

III. These promises are WORLD-WIDE IN THEIR APPLICATION.

They cover every moment of life—extend to every need and duty—are equal to any emergency or strait—are sufficient, whatever the temptation, or the sorrow, or the calamity, or the evil. No child of God, however weak, or tired, or unworthy, need be a day or an hour without the comfort and the support of these “exceeding great and precious promises.”

IV. THE SIGNIFICANCE, THE FULLNESS, AND THE ALL-SUFFICING OF THE PLEDGES OF GOD'S FAITHFULNESS CAN BE KNOWN ONLY WHEN WE HAVE PUT THEM TO THE PROOF!

V. NOTE ONE PECULIARITY: “Will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will *with the temptation also make a way to escape*, that ye may be able to bear it.” What Fatherly tenderness and watchfulness! And it shows that we have something to do—to watch and seize on our opportunity, and to co-operate with Providence in working out deliverance for us.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

IS IT “GOOD FOR US TO BE HERE”?

AN EXPOSITION OF MATT. XVII:4.

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

SOME will think it audacious, others cruel, to attack a popular and traditional rendering of a familiar passage of the Gospel. Possibly even the Revisers were not totally indifferent to the prospect of encountering such a judgment. Yet antiquity is not the test of truth. The interpretation of the Fathers is not blindly accepted, and the *vox populi* is no more the *vox dei* in the exposition of Scripture than in the sphere of politics.

Here is a dear and blessed clause of the English Bible—“Lord, it is good for us to be here”—which the Revisers, both English and American, leave untouched and without any marginal note, as if no material divergence from this translation could be offered. The Vulgate has the same rendering, so has the Douai, Seiler, van Ess, and in effect Luther and others.

On the other hand, that the writer may not be charged with presumption, the correctness of this version is challenged by such authorities as Bengel, De Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Paulus, Winer, Meyer, Weiss and Volkmar. In accord with these

expositors is the Berleburg Bible and the Anglo-Saxon version A. D. 995. Could one for a moment dismiss from his mind the sweet and oft-repeated expression “It is good for us to be here,” an expression associated with many scenes of holy devotion, and proceed *de novo* and without bias to reproduce accurately the original into English, it is difficult so see on what grounds he would translate “It is *good for us*,” etc. Ask anyone familiar with the Greek what pronoun he would expect in the original where the translation runs “It is good for us to be here,” and he will reply promptly “The dative, of course.” It is Greek usage, and Latin as well, in expressions of this kind to have the dative follow as the object *to or for* which anything *is or is done*: the dative of interest.

But the dative does not occur in the original. The equivalent for “us” is in the accusative. *καθόν ἰδέναι ἡμᾶς ὡς εἶναι* is the reading without variation in the three Synoptists. The accusative before the infinitive is one of the most familiar forms of Greek grammar; and where is there any warrant in Hellenic or classic Greek for rendering this otherwise than “It is good that we are here?”

What bearing does this have on the sense of the passage? Is there really

a distinction between the phrase "It is good for us to be here" and the expression "It is good that we are here"? Let us see. The sense which is usually imputed to this text makes Peter exult in the glorious privilege which the transfiguration vouchsafed to the three disciples. This was the grandest thing yet. Whatever these three chosen ones had hitherto witnessed or heard, from the scenes of His baptism until now, this transcends all. His face is shining like the sun, His raiment is white as the light, and with Him from the heavenly heights are Moses and Elias appearing in glory. What a spectacle! "How we are favored and honored! It is good for us." And so we, in a joyful hour, when conscious of sitting together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: "Ah! it is good to be here. What a favored lot is ours!"

"Heaven comes down our souls to greet,

And glory crowns the mercy-seat."

Now take the idea which the original seems to convey so clearly, and we are led into a very different line of thought. The sense which is thus brought out does not imply privilege so much as opportunity—an occasion for usefulness. It is a happy circumstance that we are here. Our presence with the Master at this juncture is very fortunate, most opportune. And why? We can build tabernacles. We can be of service. The Lord will have need of us now. The crisis is here. The drama is about to open. The kingdom has come. The Messiah wears the robes of majesty. Ambassadors from the eternal throne, the great historic precursors of His reign, have arrived and are conferring on matters of state.

He had but a little before spoken of "coming in the glory of His Father, with the holy angels" (Mark viii : 38), and of "some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God" (Luke ix : 27). And now the event is ushered in. The hour is at hand. How for-

fortunate our presence! Some temporary shelter is required. Tents will have to be erected. The brushwood standing about here will serve as material. There must be three tabernacles. A king must have his own exclusively, and such princes must each be provided with a separate chamber or independent residence. Let us build three, each of us one—the first for the Master, the other two for these illustrious potentates.

How like the prompt, impulsive, self-forgetful Peter, ever more ready to minister than to be ministered unto; intent upon service rather than on privilege; who could not brook to have the Master wash his feet, or to share with Him an equal honor of crucifixion; who was prepared to follow Him "both into prison and to death," and eager against overwhelming odds to draw the sword in His behalf!

The observation that he knew not what he was saying confirms this rendering of his remark. For if the thought of his mind had been that they were having a blessed experience, then he made no mistake. This was simply true; and if he meant this, he knew exactly what he was saying.

So also the statement of Mark that "they were sore afraid" does not comport with the theory that Peter's expression was an ebullition of joyful excitement over the glorious vision. Rather does it import that they were for the moment overwhelmed by the sudden advent of the crisis, while Peter recognized, as if by ecstatic intuition, that the ministers of the Messianic King were not to be idle spectators of glory, but that the new order of things imposed on them new duties, and the first requisite was the erection of temporary abodes for the Divine King and His glorified associates.

By way of a practical conclusion, it may be added that the particular lesson derived from this interpretation needs to be inculcated upon

Christians to-day more emphatically than the sentiment which is commonly read into this passage. The superiority of service to privilege is a truth that comparatively few have yet accepted. The Son of God "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," and He constantly enforced His example upon His followers, who are only too fond of singing :

"We for whose sake all nature stands,
And stars their courses move."

Not he that receiveth, but he that giveth, a cup of cold water shall in no wise lose his reward. The highest privilege granted to the children of God is the privilege of service, the opportunity of building tabernacles for Christ rather than the indulgence of reveling in them.

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

HUXLEY AND THE BISHOPS.

DURING the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at Manchester, last September, the Bishops of Carlisle, Bedford and Manchester preached three discourses in the Manchester Cathedral, which have been published under the title "The Advance of Science." Professor Huxley reviews these sermons in the November number of *The Nineteenth Century*, in an article entitled "Science and the Bishops." The article contains significant hints on the present status of the conflict between science and religion, and some of its points are worthy of special attention. Only the first half discusses the sermons of the Bishops, the rest being devoted to the consideration of other persons and subjects. Here the points of chief interest in the review of the sermons will be given, and then some comments on those points.

The first thing that strikes us is the gratification of the scientist at the contents of the sermons. "I have read them not only with attentive interest, but with a feeling of satisfaction which is quite new to me as a result of hearing or reading sermons. These excellent discourses, in fact, appear to me to signalize a new departure in the course adopted by theology toward science, and to indicate the possibility of bringing about an honorable *modus vivendi* between the two." This satisfaction springs from the fairness of the Bishops to science

and the scientists. "There is no trace of that tacit or open assumption that the rejection of theological dogmas on scientific grounds is due to moral perversity, which is the ordinary note of ecclesiastical homilies on this subject, and which makes them look so supremely silly to men whose lives have been spent in wrestling with these questions." The Professor's gratification springs from the fact that concessions have been made to science which seem to indicate that henceforth theology is to sustain to science a more favorable attitude than in the past. Thus he praises the Bishops because there is no question, according to their discourses, "that the method of scientific investigation is valid, whatever the results to which it may lead." He thinks there will be no difficulty in concluding a perpetual treaty of peace, "if theologians are henceforward prepared to recognize the authority of secular science in the manner and to the extent indicated in the Manchester trilogy."

The fairness of the Bishops toward science is worthy of all the praise given by Huxley. Instead of attacks on scientific theories, they want all that is eventually proved true to be accepted unconditionally. The Bishop of Bedford thinks that elements of truth may be found in evolution, and that these may some day be accepted by Christians "as freely and with as little sense of inconsistency with God's word as we now accept the

theory of the earth's motion round the sun, or the long duration of the geological epochs." The Bishop of Manchester thinks religious notions have been much cleared by "development," which he pronounces a "potent word, which, as with the wand of a magician, has at the same moment so completely transformed our knowledge and dispelled our difficulties." And for this word we are indebted "to modern science, resolutely pursuing its search for truth, in spite of popular obloquy and—alas! that we should have to say it—in spite too often of theological denunciation."

Even in the relation of science to theology the Bishops have succeeded in winning the approval of Huxley. Thus, the Bishop of Bedford rejects the views of those who say that theology and science "occupy wholly different spheres, which need in no way intermeddle." It is held that they do not move wholly in different planes, but that they have points of contact and are therefore liable to conflict.

While Huxley has nothing but praise for the fairness of the Bishops, he is suspicious that they have actually surrendered too much, and more than science can ask. "For it seems to me that theology under the generous impulse of a sudden conversion, has given all that she hath; and, indeed, on one point has surrendered more than can be reasonably asked." This point refers to the Bishop of Manchester, who tried to overcome the objection to prayer by affirming that the objects of prayer are not physical but spiritual. Huxley thinks the Bishop need not "have been so much alarmed as he evidently has been by the objections which have often been raised to prayer, on the ground that a belief in the efficacy of prayer is inconsistent with a belief in the constancy of the order of nature."

It is surely significant that a professor of science should admit a

ground for belief in the efficacy of prayer which a bishop questions. Huxley proceeds to show that he himself sees nothing in the theory of the uniformity of nature against the possibility of miracles or the validity of prayer. He holds that faith in the uniformity of nature is based only on past experience. Therefore, "since nobody can presume to say what the order of nature must be," it is presumptuous to affirm that there can be no interposition so as to change the supposed uniformity of nature. Since we cannot determine that nature must be uniform, Huxley says: "It is this weighty consideration, the truth of which every one who is capable of logical thought must admit, which knocks the bottom out of all *a priori* objections either to ordinary 'miracles' or to the efficacy of prayer, in so far as the latter implies the miraculous intervention of a higher power. No one is entitled to say *a priori* that any given so-called miraculous event is impossible; and no one is entitled to say *a priori* that prayer for some change in the ordinary course of nature cannot possibly avail."

What he regards as the real question respecting miracles and prayer is evident from the following: "I repeat that it is not upon any *a priori* considerations that objections, either to the supposed efficacy of prayer in modifying the course of events, or to the supposed occurrence of miracles, can be scientifically based. The real objection, and, to my mind, the fatal objection, to both these suppositions, is the inadequacy of the evidence to prove any given case of such occurrences as have been adduced. It is a canon of common sense, to say nothing of science, that the more improbable a supposed occurrence, the more cogent ought to be the evidence in its favor. I have looked somewhat carefully into the subject, and I am unable to find in the records of any miraculous event evidence which even

approximates to the fulfillment of this requirement."

The praise of the Bishops for their concessions is followed by an attack on Christianity, so far as based on miracles; and the acceptance of miracles on the basis of "the evidence produced" is pronounced "immoral." Professor Huxley evidently regards men of science the most competent judges in such matters. They deserve credit, he thinks, for a higher standard of veracity than any other class of the community, their whole training having a tendency to bring "the value of evidence up to the proper mark." He affirms that "in the matter of intellectual veracity, science is already a long way ahead of the churches; and that, in this particular, it is exerting an educational influence on mankind of which the churches have shown themselves utterly incapable." He does not hesitate to predict the fall of Christianity so far as based on miracles.

Professor Huxley evidently deserves as much credit for candor as do the Bishops. His article treats theologians as if all concessions must come from them if there is to be peace, and lauds science and the scientists for their standard of intellectual veracity. The Bishops are ready to accept all that science may hereafter demonstrate respecting evolution or any other point; but Huxley has already decided that a religion based on miracles is doomed. The Bishops agree that certain principles shall hereafter determine belief on points touched by science; Huxley already decides the result of such application respecting miracles. Perhaps we need not regret that the time has come when theologians have learned that scientific caution, slowness and reserve, which are characteristics of all who prefer objective demonstration to subjective opinions.

Those versed in theology will be somewhat surprised at the "sudden conversion" attributed to it. Even

if we put "theologians" for theology, and the "three Bishops" for theologians, we see no evidence of conversion. In the Protestant Church, theology has all along admitted the finality of the demonstrations of science; the dispute has been as to what was really demonstrated. If there have been exceptions, they are significant only as exceptions. There have been ministers who attacked science, but in most cases they probably meant scientists—just as Huxley uses theology for theologians; or, if the conclusions of science were really attacked, that is no ground for throwing the blame on theology itself. Those who have a claim to be called theologians have insisted that philosophical speculations connected with science shall not be endowed with all the finality of science. Thus, it is not what is demonstrated respecting evolution which is regarded as endangering religion, but what is assumed, and is mere hypothesis or theory. In thus demanding that in evolution only what is actually demonstrated shall be applied as a scientific result, theologians simply take their stand with scientists like Virchow and Du Bois-Reymond.

Prof. Huxley's article convinces us of the need of a more careful distinction between science and philosophy. It is evident that the supposed conflict between science and religion is really between philosophy and religion. So we must distinguish more carefully between religion and theology, and between the relation of religion and science and that of Christians and scientists. Christians are not synonymous with Christianity, nor are scientists an embodiment of science and of that only.

The greatest interest attaches to Huxley's statements respecting prayer and miracles. If he is less apprehensive than the Bishop of Manchester respecting the *a priori* possibility of miracles, many a Christian thinker has a more absolute reason for faith in the uniformity of nature

than Huxley has. They believe in the possibility of miracle without resorting to Hume's theory of causation, or to Mill's supposition that somewhere in the sidereal heavens events may happen without cause. As some will not be able to see any evidence of the conversion of theology in the attitude of the Bishops, so they will fail to find anything new in the emphatic and oft-repeated assertion that miracles are possible. Kant, who was a mathematician and physicist, and also the most critical of philosophers, had the acumen to see that the question of miracles is not scientific, but philosophical. He knew full well that no scientific fact or law can ever determine ultimate questions, and he fathomed experience profoundly enough to know that principles lie beyond the ken of empirical science and in the domain of philosophy. And in his book on Religion Kant stated that if anyone declared that revelation and miracle are in themselves impossible, he would undertake to prove the position false. If scientists admit that they do not even have an absolute basis for the uniformity of nature, we may care little about their views respecting miracles, but much about the testimony of philosophers, in whose sphere of investigation miracles lie.

Huxley's position respecting the possibility of miracles is not new among scientists. Thus W. B. Carpenter says, respecting departure from the uniformity of nature through God's interposition: "I deem it presumptuous to deny that there might be occasions which, in His wisdom, may require such departure. I am not conscious of any such scientific 'prepossession' against miracles as would prevent me from accepting them as facts, if trustworthy evidence of their reality could be adduced." But that all scientists do not agree with Huxley is evident from the following from Jevons' "Principles of Sciences": "There are

scientific men who assert that the interposition of Providence is impossible, and prayer an absurdity, because the laws of nature are proved to be invariable. Inferences are drawn not so much from particular sciences as from the logical nature of science itself. Now, I may state that my own studies in logic lead me to call in question such negative inferences. Laws of nature are uniformities observed to exist in the action of certain material agents, but it is logically impossible to show that all other agents must behave as they do." Much more is said by Jevons which indicates his belief in prayer and miracle, and not merely in their abstract possibility; and his testimony is the more significant because he does not make mere experience the law of science, but goes back to the law of logic and the principles of science.

Huxley is not a materialist; nevertheless the following quotation from the address of the President of the British Association at the meeting in Montreal is worth quoting, since it shows that strict science and religious faith are not in conflict: "Many excellent people are afraid of science, as tending toward Materialism. That such apprehension should exist is not surprising, for, unfortunately, there are writers, speaking in the name of science, who have set themselves to foster it. It is true that among scientific men, as in other classes, crude views are to be met with as to the deeper things of nature; but that the lifelong beliefs of Newton, of Faraday, and of Maxwell are inconsistent with the scientific habit of mind, is surely a proposition which I need not pause to refute."

Even if, then, we admit that scientists have a standard of intellectual veracity superior to that of other men, that proves nothing respecting the acceptance of the evidences for miracles. Newton, Faraday, Maxwell, and a host of other scientists, based their faith on evidence the acceptance of which some others may

pronounce "immoral"; and yet those who accept may be as strictly scientific as those who reject. Unless his words have been misinterpreted, Professor Huxley implies that the training of scientists fits them, above all other men, to judge of the reliability of all evidence. The inference would be that they have the best right to judge of theology, religion and the church. Now, the fact is that science trains men for scientific evidence, and respecting that makes them the best authority; but that this training also specially fits them to judge of evidence in other departments is wholly a gratuitous assumption. It is admitted that every subject must be investigated and judged according to its own peculiarities. The general laws of evidence are not, as is so often assumed by scientists, the product of science, but belong to logic, and are given to science by logic. And Wundt declares that students of science have so neglected logic that professors of science have found it necessary to connect instruction in logic with their scientific lectures. In his "Seven Riddles" Du Bois-Reymond laments that scientists have so generally neglected the principles of philosophy, and thus have proved themselves unfit to judge of the profounder problems of science. Haeckel makes the same complaint. Helmholtz declares that science became intent "on the banishment of all philosophic influences," so that at last "no regard was paid to the rightful claims of philosophy—that is, the criticism of the sources of cognition, and the definition of the functions of the intellect." Similar testimony abounds in the works of recognized scientists, to say nothing of the severe charges made by Zöllner, in his book on "Comets," respecting the manner in which scientists apply their superior standard of intellectual veracity.

While thus scientists may be quoted against scientists, are there not others who also have a voice in departments

to which they have devoted lifelong study? May not their special devotion to a subject have made them as great an authority in it as scientists are in their speciality? And may they not be able to judge better of their speciality than scientists are when they leave their peculiar sphere and enter one that is foreign to them? In an age in which the disputes among scientists have become notorious, it is probable that if other than scientific spheres are relegated to their decisions they will hardly agree any better than in their own speciality. And there are no doubt some scientists who will pardon theologians if in points of history, ethics, and biblical criticism they prefer the testimony of those who have exactly the same logic as scientists, and have spent their whole life in applying that logic to the special departments of history, ethics, and criticism.

The objects handled by science are subject to more exact investigation than objects in any other department; and that is one reason why so many scientists make the same demands on ethics and religion which they do on objects in their speciality—and this is one reason why they so often prove themselves blind guides when they leave their speciality. They want to substitute science for faith. That they are really more earnest seekers of truth or have a severer method than others is not necessarily the case. There are philosophers and theologians who are too earnest and too logical to imagine that they have so perfectly fixed the limits of reason and determined the norms of thought that they can henceforth rest on the easy bed of agnosticism. Not a few in our age have struggled through the agony of doubt, from science and philosophy to religion, and they have a right to spurn the insinuation that the evidence accepted by them implies immorality. Perhaps they have learned the full value of the philosophical speculations termed scientific, but also the force of ethical and

religious principles, and the moral basis of faith. If there was a time when theologians arrogated to themselves claims which were false, it is evident that now the time has come when certain scientists claim an authority for themselves individually which belongs only to that particular department which they investigate, not at all to themselves personally.

Harms passed from medicine to philosophy; Lotze, his successor at the University of Berlin, also passed from medicine to philosophy. They were both versed in science, and the latter wrote a number of works whose scientific value is recognized. Both were avowed theists, and both were logicians. Their struggles led them to philosophy, because they found that the sphere to which science limits itself cannot satisfy the human mind. Wundt of Leipzig was also led from science to philosophy. These and other thinkers admit that what is technically termed science is not ultimate, but that for its very laws it depends on logic. Shall we then go for the absolute laws of evidence to those who themselves are dependent, or shall we go to the fountain head? We esteem conclusions of scientists, if proved correct and final, but their *ipse dixit*, particularly outside of their specialty, is of no consequence. We have the same laws of evidence that they have; and if by means of analogical reasoning they want to apply scientific rules of evidence to subjects not within the sphere of science, we know that scientists are peculiarly liable to error. And in making this statement we but affirm what is admitted by the severest logical thinkers.

Huxley's article is valuable in that it gives an idea of what scholarly and scientific demands are made on the theologians of the day. The issues presented are partly those of principle, partly those of application. That these issues must be fairly met on the basis of science and philosophy is no question to the religious

thinker. Nor can there be any doubt that the great religious problems which are presented by philosophy and science can only be solved by going deeper than is usually done by those who attack Christianity.

PROFESSOR VON KIRCHHOFF.

In a recent article in this Review on the University of Berlin, Professor von Kirchhoff was mentioned as one of its chief ornaments. His discovery, in connection with von Bunsen, of the spectrum analysis has made him known wherever science has penetrated, and has given him a fame that is immortal. He died last October, after a long illness. His funeral brought together a galaxy of scientists the like of which could hardly be gathered in any other city. As the coffin was borne into the cemetery it was followed by students with banners, by Helmholtz, Du Bois-Reymond, by numerous other professors, members of the Academy of Sciences, and by other scholars. When the body had been lowered into the grave, Court Preacher Frommel uttered the solemn words, "Earth to earth, dust to dust, ashes to ashes," with each sentence throwing a handful of earth on the coffin. The benediction followed, and then all were asked to unite in a silent prayer. Every head was uncovered and bowed, and then, like the minister, each friend of the departed thrice threw upon the coffin a handful of earth.

The scene was deeply solemn. Science was brought face to face with death and the grave, and could not but feel that here its wisdom ends and its powers of solution fail. Here the ministrations of religion were in place and of supreme importance. Many of the men sadly gathered around this grave were also present a little more than a year ago at the funeral of their colleague in the university and academy, Leopold von Ranke. And as at this grave of one of the most eminent of the world's

scientists religion spoke the last word, how deeply significant the words of Ranke, "How erroneous to suppose that natural science and religion are antagonistic!"

Many of the scientists who paid this last tribute of respect to their friend are venerable with years, and the thought, Who next? may have weighed on many a heart. But the deepest thought of that occasion was this: As long as the stars shall give light to be analyzed so that their substances may be determined, the name of Kirchhoff will live. But while thus his work lives forever, is their author himself all mortal? Or are the workers greater than their labors, so that their works do but follow them?

"So thou hast immortality in mind?
Hast grounds that will not let thee doubt it?"
'The strongest ground herein I find—
That we could never do without it.'"

"ETERNITY," AS USED IN SCRIPTURE.

Dr. Joseph Angus, in *The Expositor*, investigates the "Scripture Terms Expressing Eternity," and reaches the following conclusion: "Every form of words employed in the gospels to describe the everness of the Divine nature and the blessedness of the righteous is employed to describe the everness of the punishment of the wicked." The closing words of the article are: "We may think that Christ's supremacy means that all intelligent natures will be at last lovingly subject to Him, and that the enemies who become 'the footstool of His feet' are among His dearest friends. Finding relief in such an issue, we may be tempted to omit or to tone down or to explain away the sharp, strong, decisive utterances of our Lord addressed so often to the selfish, the impenitent, and the disbelieving. But this temptation we must resist. Christ, who was love and righteousness incarnate, who knew the meaning of all the texts that are quoted in favor of a larger hope, never allowed them to stifle His warnings or to soften His

descriptions of 'the wrath to come.' To preach to sinners a larger hope, *i. e.*, another chance, or the final salvation of all men, is not the message of the gospel. It is without sanction in the appeals of inspired men; and it may precipitate the very ruin it professes to deplore. Fear and love are both among the motives whereby men are drawn to God; and it is at our peril that we cease to use either of them. Surely it is not much to ask that we use Christ's own warnings, and so commend our message to men's consciences as well as to their hearts. To find offense in Him or in His words is not the spirit of faithful servants."

DORNER AND HIS ETHICS.

During the last illness of the eminent J. A. Dörner it was my privilege to be with him repeatedly, and to witness his spirit of meekness and gentleness, his patience and resignation. As he retained his faculties to the last, he was fully aware of his condition; but never did his fortitude seem shaken or his faith to falter. Those who had admired his profound and comprehensive scholarship while in the active duties of the professorship could now learn from him lessons of humble and confiding trust. During conversations with him I learned that he watched with interest the discussion of his views, particularly in America; and he complained of the injustice done him by taking particular doctrines he had announced and making them subjects of heated public discussion, instead of considering them calmly and impartially. It was his view that there are profound theological doctrines which should be settled by Scriptural inquiry and rational investigation, without appeal to popular prejudice and passion. He was a strong advocate of free and thorough research, and cheerfully granted to all others that freedom which he claimed for himself.

On inquiring what he regarded as the

fundamental doctrine of the Church, he answered, "The material doctrine of the Reformation, namely, that we are saved by faith in Jesus Christ." In referring to others who occupied essentially the same theological position, he said that he placed more emphasis on Christ and on our relation to Him. Respecting Christian truth, he held that it has a self-evidencing power; to the sincere, earnest inquirer this truth bears in itself the evidence of its genuineness.

I was particularly desirous of learning his exact view on probation. I wrote down his statement in his presence, and as this was probably his last utterance on the subject, it may be of interest to the readers of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW. He said: "I believe that there is yet hope for those who in this life have not positively rejected the gospel. This applies to the heathen and likewise to those in Christian churches where the gospel is preached, but who have not definitely (*definitive*) rejected the offered gospel." It must be remembered that in Germany the State churches nominally included all classes, not merely communicants; to be in the church here, therefore, means something very different from church membership in America. What constitutes definitive or final rejection of the gospel he did not attempt to define, evidently not regarding it within our power to do so.

Not only the friends of Dörner, but all who know his works, whether they agree with him or not, ought to protest earnestly against the term "Dörnerism" as a designation of his doctrine of probation. So many have held the same view in Germany that it was not at all peculiar to him, neither does it represent the essence of his theology. To treat an incidental view as if a characteristic of his system is a gross injustice, and is calculated to excite prejudice against a theologian whose works abound in profound thoughts which are of special significance in the conflicts of

the day. In connection with other profound scholars, he thought it specially important to mediate between Christianity and modern culture. Like his friends Bishop Martensen, Julius Müller and Richard Rothe, he devoted his most scholarly efforts to this purpose; but he went his own way, just as they did—presented his views for what they were worth: not as final dogmas, but for acceptance or rejection, as Christian inquiry might decide. He took up particularly the problems presented by Strauss and the Tübingen school, and he must be judged by his circumstances, by the demands made upon him, and by his efforts to meet them, and not by what he himself did not at all regard as giving the essence of his views. Those who want to do Dörner justice must view, as he himself did, justification by faith in Jesus Christ as the centre of his theology, and the final acceptance or rejection of Christ as determining the state after death. Whether probation ends here or not was not fundamental for his position.

These remarks are occasioned by the appearance of a translation of Dörner's Ethics. The translators are Prof. C. M. Mead, D. D., and Rev. R. T. Cunningham, M. A. A review is not attempted in this place; but the English reader can be assured that the work of translation is well done, and that the volume is a valuable mine of ethical truth. The original was published after the author's death, under the editorship of his son, Dr. A. Dörner. Professor Mead has made many valuable additions to the literature on various parts of the subject, particularly on the general subject of ethics in the English language.

Among the reasons for rejoicing in the appearance of this translation is the fact that it will give a better idea of Dörner. In England and America he is known chiefly as a speculative theologian; but he was also a thoroughly ethical personality,

and took a deep interest in the practical affairs of the Church. This posthumous work will make the moral element in his character and thought better known to the English reader. The "Translators' Preface," by Professor Mead, who knew Dorner well, gives an appreciative view of the man himself; and the many who were honored with Dorner's friendship know that the high estimate placed on his character is fully deserved. Prof. Mead says: "His was a saintliness in which there was no trace of cant or of coldness. There was that in his whole demeanor which commanded at once confidence and affection. He realized in a rare degree the evangelical conception of the Christian, as one who has become as a little child." Professor Heinrici bears this testimony: "Never have I heard from him a bitter word about persons, even when he gave expression to his 'ecclesiastical pain' and his apprehensions concerning certain tendencies of theological inquiry."

Significant is the testimony of three of his colleagues of the theological faculty of the Berlin University. Professor Kleinst, in referring to the fact that his work on ethics was not quite finished, says: "Beside the torso of his last work stands the image of his life, labor, and suffering, a model for coming generations of theologians to gaze at—on ethics, written [and finished by the spirit of Jesus Christ who redeemed him." Professor Weiss echoes this sentiment, and adds: "Who could ever forget it, who had ever come into contact with him—the power of this Christian personality which, just because in its unadulterated simplicity it made no pretense to be anything, impressed one all the more powerfully?" Professor von der Goltz gives the following as the essential elements in Dorner's theology: "Dorner's theological labors had from the outset two fixed starting points, closely connected with one another in the

idea of personality—the theanthropic person of Christ and justifying faith. Christ the centre of piety, Christ the Head that animates the Church, Christ the centre of the creation of God and of the world's history, Christ the second Adam, as the essential and perfect vehicle of God's condescending holy love to men, and also as the prototype of a permanent humanity destined for fellowship with God and transfiguration in God—this, on the one hand, and, on the other, justifying faith, as the source not only of the doctrine, but also of the life, of the evangelical church; justifying faith, as requiring and finding the authority of God's word which testifies of Christ, and as constituting the perennial source whence is derived the freedom and the dignity of the Christian, the renewal and sanctification of man, and the animation of all civilized life through the divine forces that sustain and train it—these were the two poles between which Dorner's research and production moved." The motto which Dorner chose is characteristic of the man—"Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Various attempts have been made, particularly in Germany, to reduce statistics to an exact science. The difficulties have been found peculiarly great in moral and religious subjects, so many factors entering into them which either cannot be expressed in figures at all or else not with mathematical definiteness. The religious statistics usually given represent only certain general and external phases of religious life, all that is internal and expressive of quality lying wholly beyond the reach of figures. Even the efforts to give the number of adherents to a particular creed are only partially successful. Not only is it common to count children, but also such as are indifferent or irreligious, unless they positively withdraw from

the church. The rule to count communicants only as members does not prevail in state churches, but all who have not united with some dissenting body are regarded as members. Thus Berlin is credited with over one million members of the state church, though actual count has revealed the fact that on Sunday only two per cent. of the population attend divine services.

According to English law, every Englishman is a member of the Church of England—a legal fiction postulated as a fact. Unfortunately the census gives no return respecting the members of the different communions of Great Britain. Perhaps this is due to the fact that England and Scotland have state churches. In Ireland, where this is not the case, the census returns give the religious creeds of the inhabitants. In Great Britain, consequently, we depend on the estimates of the adherents made by the respective bodies and by other collectors of statistics. The figures here given are taken from *The Statesman's Year Book* for 1886.

The Church of England has two archbishops and thirty-one bishops. In 1881 there were 14,926 civil parishes, with 14,573 churches and chapels; the clergy in actual service numbered 21,663. According to an estimate made in 1883, 13,500,000 persons in England (and Wales) were adherents of the Established Church, leaving 12,500,000 to other creeds. The Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, and Presbyterians are most numerous among dissenting bodies in England. The Wesleyans have 13,270 chapels; the Independents 2,603; the Baptists 2,343. The number of dissenting ministers in 1881 was 9,734. The total number of denominations in Great Britain is 180.

In Scotland the Established Presbyterian Church has 84 presbyteries, 16 synods, 1,307 parishes, with 1,587 churches, chapels and stations, and about 1,700 ministers. In 1884 there

were 556,622 members, an increase of 12,653 over the preceding year. The Free Church of Scotland has 1,096 ministers, 325,000 members, while it is claimed that the adherents number 945,000. The United Church has 594 ministers, 559 churches, and about 179,891 members and adherents. The Episcopal Church of Scotland has seven bishops, 220 churches, 255 clergy, and a claimed adherence of 76,939 souls.

The Roman Catholics of Great Britain are estimated at two millions. There are 15 ecclesiastical dignitaries in England, and in Scotland there are two archbishops and four bishops. In England there were in 1885 1,269 chapels and stations, and 2,256 officiating priests. In Scotland there were 305 chapels and stations, and 320 priests. The rapid increase of Roman Catholics in Scotland of late has been due chiefly to immigration from Ireland. The increase of priests in England from 1871 to 1885 was 636.

Although it is claimed that the Church of England has a majority of one million adherents over all other creeds, this claim is seriously questioned by Dissenters. If the actual sentiment of the people were taken, it might be found that in England as well as in Scotland the Established Church is really in the minority.

Until 1871 the Established Church of Ireland was Protestant Episcopal, though it represented but a fraction of the population. At present there are four Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland, and twenty-three bishops. The Roman Catholic population in 1881 numbered 3,960,891. The Protestant Episcopal Church had, at the same time, two archbishops, ten bishops, 1,560 clergy, 1,550 churches, and 620,000 members. There were in the same year 470,734 Presbyterians, 48,839 Methodists, 6,210 Independents, 4,879 Baptists, 3,645 Quakers, and 472 Jews. From 1851 to 1861 the decrease of Catholics in Ireland

was 43 per cent., of Protestants 10 per cent.; 1861-1871 the former decreased 8 and the latter $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In 1871 the Catholics numbered 4,141,933 so that in 1881 there was a further decrease of 181,042.

The Jews in Great Britain number about 70,000, of whom 40,000 are in London.

STATISTICAL ITEMS.

It is claimed that nine-tenths of the inhabitants of Wales are Dissenters. The Quakers in Great Britain, now numbering 15,219, are said to have been constantly on the increase during the last twenty years.

A German authority gives the following as the religious statistics of the world:

<i>Christians.</i>	
Catholics.....	190,000,000
Protestants.....	108,000,000
Greek Christians.....	80,000,000
Other Churches.....	15,000,000
Total.....	393,000,000
<i>Non-Christians.</i>	
Jews.....	7,000,000
Mahomedans.....	85,000,000
Buddhists.....	500,000,000
Hindus.....	190,000,000
Heathen.....	280,000,000
Total.....	1,062,000,000

This makes thirty per cent. of the earth's population Christian, of whom less than one-half are Roman Catholics.

There appeared in Italy, during 1884, 1,298 newspapers. Of this number only 189, or five per cent., favored Catholicism, while the remaining 1,100, or 95 per cent., were hostile to that church and the Pope.

The increase or loss of a church has been found to depend very slightly on conversions from one faith to another, but chiefly on mixed marriages, and on the number of births in the respective denominations. It may almost be formulated as a law that where a church is in the minority its zeal is aroused, but when it is dominant it becomes indifferent. Thus Protestants are most zealous in Catholic countries, and Catholics the most energetic in Protestant lands.

In Saxony it has been found that in the country twice as much interest is manifested in religion as in the cities.

Statistics taken in Germany have established the fact that the criminal classes are recruited chiefly from the young.

Since 1815 the various evangelical missionary societies of Germany have sent to North America 1,271 ministers.

While two-thirds of the inhabitants of Bavaria are Catholic, only 76 of the 167 professors belong to that church.

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

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

I.

AN OPEN LETTER

To the Minister whom it may concern:

THE conductor of the present department desired the publishers of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW to give him some idea, such as their subscription-list would enable them to supply, of the class of ministers to whom this periodical goes. This for his own better guidance in the conduct of his particular department.

We learn that THE HOMILETIC REVIEW is taken, not by a class of min-

isters, but by all classes of ministers. The number of widely-known names on the subscription-list is remarkable. The correspondence of the editors shows that divines and scholars whose fame is as broad as the Christian world read even a department like the present with a degree of watchful heed which admonishes every writer in these pages to weigh well what he commits himself to say.

So much to indicate one end, as it were, of the subscription-list. As for the other end, of course, no mention

of individual names, were such mention proper, could indicate its character. It is made up of thousands of ministers scattered all over the country, and even all over the world—many among whom have never enjoyed the advantage of thorough education in college and theological seminary. For these fellow-ministers of ours we must seek, in their due proportion—and their due proportion is large—to provide. One such minister, for example, recently wrote asking us, “Will you please give an article on the best method of preparing sermons, to *help a beginner*; and a rule for home study?”

If, therefore, we sometimes say things here that the providentially more favored among our readers could very well get on without, let it be understood always that such things are not for such men, but for those whom it may concern. We, writing here, do as preachers have often to do—draw the bow at a venture. We shall trust to that Holy Spirit who knows all and works all to speed our arrows to their mark.

We have it now in our heart to treat the subject of literary culture for the average minister—the average minister, we mean, who is not a college-bred man. This we shall do in a number of open letters, of which we here present the first.

Almost the whole work of the minister, as minister, is done with words. His work as a man is done also with deeds. But the proper distinctive ministerial work of the minister is chiefly accomplished through the use of language. This is self-evidently true, as it is also pre-eminently true, of the preaching work of the minister. But it is likewise true, though less strikingly real, of his work as organizer and pastor.

Nothing more than this need be said to convince any thoughtful minister of the immense importance to him of training in the command and employment of language.

But there is no such thing as right

command and employment of language, except in connection with the possession of ideas. Language is an instrument of expression, and expression implies something to be expressed.

Literature is nothing in the world but ideas expressed. Rhetoric, largely conceived, is nothing in the world but the art of expressing ideas. The way to study rhetoric is to study literature. Treatises on rhetoric are all of them made—that is, all good treatises on rhetoric are made—through study, on the author's part, of literature. Your best way—I speak now to any minister—your best way to study rhetoric is to do as the first-rate writers on rhetoric do: namely, study literature. The most useful system of rhetoric for you is the one that you shall thus have made for yourself. However, treatises on rhetoric are themselves a part of literature; and a very valuable part of literature they are for you to study, in the process of making for yourself a treatise on rhetoric that shall, for your own practical habitual use, supersede every other. I do not now have in mind a treatise on rhetoric to be set down on paper, in black and white, by your hand. Such a treatise, I will suppose, it hardly lies within your leisure and opportunity to make. I refer rather to that treatise on rhetoric—in other words, that system of rules and principles for expression of thought—which, through your own study and attempted following of right examples in literature, you shall have wrought into the almost unconscious habit of your mind. You never prepared a treatise on grammar—perhaps you never studied a treatise on grammar with any great amount of intelligent satisfaction. Still, you now speak your mother-tongue with quite tolerable correctness. How did you learn to do so? By the habit of speaking and of hearing others speak. Very well: that is precisely the way in which you are to go on from

grammar, or correct use of language, to rhetoric, or clear, fine, and forcible use of language; it is by the literary habit, which may be defined as the habit of reading the best authors, and of trying to write as well as they do, or better. If you mean to be a good minister of Christ, you have got to do this to some extent. To what extent you should do it, and will, it lies between your own conscience, your own will, and the great Taskmaster, Christ, to determine. Do not spare yourself any practicable labor to become the best user of words in Christ's cause that he knows you can be, if only you will. William Jay, the author of "Morning and Evening Exercises," studied French late in life that he might read the great preachers of the time of Louis XIV in their own language. Robert Hall studied Italian, lying on the floor with that dreadful pain in his spine, that he might judge for himself whether Macaulay's Essay on Milton compared justly the great English poet with Dante. Daniel Webster spent his odd moments, often, poring over the dictionary to meditate and select those words of his, each one of which was said to weigh a pound. John Bright studied Milton till Milton's style had penetrated his own habits of thought and expression. Demosthenes copied Thucydides—how many times was it?—that he might master that great historian's secret of style. Cicero held that the orator—and the preacher is an orator—should be the most accomplished man in the world.

We propose a postulate—that is, a statement of principle which we may suppose everybody will be ready at once to accept. It is this: Every minister, possible exceptions apart, is bound to know somewhat more, to be somewhat better cultivated in literature, to be considerably more skillful in the art of expression, than the average of the people to whom he preaches, and whom he meets in society. This is putting the standard

at the lowest. But this implies a great deal. The average hearer in a Christian congregation may, for instance, be considered to know something of what is appearing in the current periodicals, at least in the newspapers. This hearer, it may be assumed, has some acquaintance with the principal novelists of the last generation or two. Such hearer has presumably read certain great classic histories written in English. He has dipped into the writings of the various essayists of the language. He has, in some part, read Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Byron, Tennyson, Bryant, Longfellow, among the poets; Huxley and Tyndall, Hugh Miller and Agassiz, have interested him more or less in the "fairy tales of science." Edmund Burke perhaps, Daniel Webster almost certainly, has instructed him in politics, and delighted him with examples of impressive oratorical utterance.

The minister accordingly needs, in all these various departments of literature, with others not named, to go somewhat beyond the limits thus indicated. What others read largely for entertainment, allowing the culture derivable to come incidentally, unsought, the minister is under obligation to study instead of merely reading, and study for the purpose of securing a deeper, a wider, a more intelligent, comparative comprehension. The minister must judge, assay, appreciate. The minister must not only enjoy good literary workmanship; he must, to some extent, learn how good literary workmanship is achieved. He must study the art, as well as admire the results of the art. To do this requires that he acquaint himself more or less with the literature about literature—that is, with treatises on rhetoric, and with criticism.

There will occasionally be a young man or a young woman in the congregation, or in the community, preparing for college, or pursuing a college course of education. To meet

such a person without embarrassment the minister needs withal to have a little information about the literatures of Greece and Rome. This may be gained without studying the ancient languages, through the medium of translations and of various historical and critical introductions to those classic literatures. We have said nothing about art in painting and sculpture. But this, too, is a subject of which the minister cannot afford to be ignorant.

The prospect of so much reading and study required from the minister may at first thought seem formidable. But it is precisely our object to point out the way in which everything really needful may actually be accomplished, and that by the average minister, *while* he is engaged in his arduous work as preacher and pastor. Our directly practical hints, however, we shall necessarily reserve for one or two "open letters" to follow.

THE TRUE SPIRIT FOR THE MINISTER IN SEARCH OF HIS WORK.

Among our readers are many ministers who may, with some qualification, be said almost never to be in search of their work. The ministers to whom we now refer have their work found for them. This is one of the felicities of the episcopal form of church organization—a felicity offset, no doubt, by its attendant infelicity. The balance subsisting between the advantage and the disadvantage we here have no occasion to attempt to strike.

Notwithstanding, however, that ministers Methodist Episcopal or Protestant Episcopal have really sometimes, and nominally always, their problems of where to work settled for them without exercise of responsibility on their own part, still what we propose in the present paper to say will have its application not less to these than to their ministerial brethren of denominations not episcopal. We seek now not so much to give advice in detail as to inculcate a

spirit; a spirit it is which we earnestly believe will be an inspiration, not only to duty but to joy, for every minister of Christ who receives it and who keeps it. The spirit of which we speak is exclusively the gift of Christ.

To every minister, the true view of his work makes the quest, or the recognition, of his work a simple matter. The spirit to obey is a ready solution of most of the practical problems of obedience. Once come to regard yourself purely in the light of a servant of Christ, with absolutely no desire but to know His will and do it, and what room have you left for any anxious thought concerning your future? You know that His service is various enough to have a place that you are fitted to occupy, that His service is needy enough to demand your help, and, finally, that it is resourceful enough to be able to dispense with your help. Such is the state of the case. You are responsible only for being a willing, zealous, industrious servant—intelligent, withal, according to the measure of your talent in capacity and in opportunity. You are in no wise responsible for employing yourself in any particular way or at any particular place in His service, except so far as His providence makes your duty plain. If He chooses to keep you waiting in a kind of probation for a while, before He sets you at work, that is His affair, not yours. Wait patiently for Him. If He puts you at some work other than you would have judged suitable, you have merely to do your best, and you have done your duty. The spirit of obedience always obeys. It makes no mistake. It serves as truly by waiting, if there be no command to go forward, as it serves by hastening when the command to go forward has come. Harken and obey. There is nothing else to be done.

It is not as if you were responsible for accomplishing certain outward results. The case would then be very different. You might then be anxious,

Indeed you could then hardly fail to be anxious. But it is not so with you. You are not responsible for accomplishing any certain outward results. That responsibility is the Lord's, and not the servant's. The servant's responsibility is merely the responsibility of obeying.

Again, if the work to be done were your own work, the case would be very different. Solicitude, then, would, at least, not be impertinent. But the work to be done is not your own work. It is the Lord's. He does not demand solicitude from you, as if the issue were doubtful. He asks nothing from you but vigilance, fidelity, alacrity. Solicitude discomposes and disqualifies. Besides, solicitude is an impertinence, as implying the possibility of failure. In the Lord's work, there is no failure possible. You cannot fail if you are serving the Lord. If you are serving yourself, you ought to fail. Be perfectly calm, then, and restful, and ready shod for any errand with the preparation of the spirit of obedience.

Such an attitude toward your work as this is the master-key to all solutions of questions in duty. Obedience receives absolutely all the wisdom that obedience needs, and precisely so fast as the wisdom is needed. Obedience, in lack of wisdom, asks wisdom of God, who gives it to her, liberally, without upbraiding. So, then, concerning the quest or the recognition of the work that the Lord has appointed for you to do, first of all things you would have you believe that your true source of wisdom is the Lord himself. If only we could all of us receive this in perfect simplicity, as absolute truth! The Lord did not speak to Samuel in the temple more really than He will speak to you if you will but take toward the Lord the listening attitude of Samuel. No possible far forecastings of experience and sagacity would direct you half so wisely as you will be sure, however worldly-ignorant, to walk if you will but commit your

way to Christ, in the spirit of simple trust and obedience. Safely, then, you may say, with the Psalmist, and in the Psalmist's sense: "I have more understanding than all my teachers: for thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts."

Thus much earnestly premised, by way of reminder to ourselves as well as to our brethren that there is a fountain for us, better than any cistern, of wisdom to guide us in all the ways of our ministry, we may proceed, hereafter, to submit some practical suggestions relating to the conduct of the matter of "settlement," as the minister's getting to work is, with a cheerful, unintentional irony, now customarily called. For the present, we limit ourselves to making a single illustrative application in detail of that principle, or spirit, of obedience to Christ in the minister seeking his work which we have here been recommending.

The first condition for the ministerial candidate to fulfill in himself, in order to a useful settlement, is to be free from all improper preoccupations of his mind respecting the place where he will settle. We say improper preoccupations, for we are willing to imply the possibility of preoccupations that are not improper. But, evidently, it is at once some embarrassment to a master's perfect freedom in his disposition of his servants if one among the number be determined beforehand, in his mind, that he will not accept his post, save in some particular part of the field. It is in war a prime necessity of strategy and tactics that the general in command have his forces absolutely at disposal. As a matter of fact, it is, accordingly, the universal rule, we believe, in military affairs, that the commander-in-chief may order any member of the army, whatever his rank, at any moment, to any position within the territorial limits of his authority. The subordinate would

disobey at his peril. Absolute obedience was the principle that gave to Jesuitism its unique and wonderful history. It was a Jesuit—perhaps it was Loyola himself, the founder of Jesuitism—who said that if his spiritual superior should command him to embark, alone, without provisions, in a boat destitute of oar and of sail, on a missionary voyage from Europe to India, he should obey instantaneously, without question or murmur. Such obedience as this, dangerous always and generally fatal when the superior is a man, becomes the rule alike of safety and of power when the superior is Christ.

We lay down then this rule: That predetermination not to entertain a call to some particular geographical region, or to some particular sort of service, is, *prima facie*, proof of imperfect obedience.

Certain necessary qualifications of this rule, qualifications which are explanations rather, we reserve to present on a future occasion. We shall gratefully, meantime, welcome any helpful suggestions on the subject which our brethren in the ministry may be minded to make.

II.

RULES FOR EXTEMPORARY PREACHING, FROM DR. STORRS'S "CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS IN PREACHING WITHOUT NOTES."

DR. STORRS'S book on extemporary preaching, the full title of which is "Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes," consists of three lectures delivered before the students of the Union Theological Seminary, in New York City, in 1875. As fitness required that they should be, the lectures were themselves extemporary utterances. They were stenographically reported, and they are printed substantially as they were originally spoken. We have the distinguished author's own word for it that his revision of them for the press involved only such modifi-

cations of form as are indicated in the following statements:

"Here and there a phrase or a sentence has been changed; a word has occasionally been substituted for another, when that selected at the instant of speaking seemed not the best as more quietly reviewed; and in one instance one unimportant paragraph has been transferred from one part of a lecture to another more fitting."

Evidently, within the limits thus defined, considerable improvements in the printed over the spoken form may have been admitted; but, fair allowance for such having been made, it still remains proper to regard these lectures as specimens of extemporization, and in this light to pronounce them truly extraordinary intellectual performances. Rarely, as we believe, in the history of human speech, has any man expressed himself *ex tempore* on such a subject to equal length and said so well at once so much that was wise and so little that was foolish. The lectures in full are worthy of being studied for their form as well as for their substance.

In Dr. Storrs's case, we are able to transfer to our pages condensations of his admirable advice expressed in the author's own words:

1. "Never begin to preach without notes with any idea of saving yourselves work by it."
2. "Always be careful to keep up the habit of writing, with whatever of skill, elegance, and force, you can command."
3. "Be perfectly frank with your people in regard to this matter of your method of preaching." [The meaning is, Tell your people that your purpose is to preach without notes, giving them your reasons for adopting this plan.]
4. "Discharge your mind of the sermon when once you have preached it."
5. "Never be discouraged by what seems to you, perhaps to others, comparative failure."
6. "Do no violence to your own

nature." [That is, Do not persist in dispensing with notes if, after full experiment, you find that notes are necessary to help *you* do your best work.]

We here suspend our citations from Dr. Storrs, having reached the conclusion of his first lecture. We purpose in due time hereafter to resume them, and finally thus to present the pith of his whole admirable volume. It is to be remembered that Dr. Storrs is treating of *extemporary* preaching, and that his title promises only to give "conditions" of success in the use of this pulpit method.

III.

1. "Is there not a real obstacle to piety in the pursuit of culture by a minister?"

THERE may be. But it is quite a mistake to suppose that necessarily there is in literary and rhetorical culture anything hostile to real spiritual-mindedness. If such were the case, as assuredly it is not, then might this right hand stand paralyzed now on the page, rather than that it should trace one single word further in the way of inciting ministers to gain literary and rhetorical culture. All depends upon the spirit and motive of the individual man. If you seek culture for the sake of being a better minister, and for that only, or at least for that chiefly, then everything you learn in the line of more thought, or truer, and in the line of improved expression of thought, instead of making you a less consecrated man, simply makes you

more of a man to be consecrated. Nay, study pursued with that motive is itself a means of consecration. But that does not yet express the whole fact. Study pursued with that motive is more than a means of consecration. It is itself an act of consecration. Do you not think Moses was a cultivated man? Job, David, Isaiah? And were they not consecrated too? And what shall be said of great, gentle Paul?

2. "Is it not common sense for a minister to seek the best discipline possible for his mind, and dismiss as unprofitable the idea of what some call enduement of the Spirit?"

It is in full view of such questions as the two foregoing, so opposite in spirit, that we have written our "open letter" in the present number of this Review. We believe heartily in the best training for ministers, but we are far from believing that any amount of literary and rhetorical culture will answer as a substitute for the enduement of the Spirit. Nay, verily. Make the machine as perfect as you please; let the locomotive be never so exquisite in the adjustment of all its parts to each other, and of each part to its function; let it glitter with finish and polish—what, after all, is that admirable mechanism good for without the energy of steam to work it? Thus powerless for the particular work which Christ wants of his minister is that minister, however finely cultivated, who lacks the life of the Spirit of God in his soul.

THE STUDY TABLE.

CONDUCTED BY JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

SERMONIC HINTS ON THE LORD'S PRAYER (CONCLUDED).

"DELIVER US FROM EVIL."

I. *A very general petition.* Evils not specified, because

(a) The catalogue would be endless.
(b) Things evil in some circumstances are not evil in others, and therefore could not be classified in set phrases.

(c) That which would be an evil by

itself may work out its own compensation: storms that hasten the ship, sickness that brings the soul to religious faith, trials that have their reward in heaven, etc.

The prayer is infinitely wise as it stands, because it asks God to decide as well as to deliver.

Anything sinful is a real evil in itself; without compensation; its wages death.

II. *All moral evils are one.* "Deliver us" not "from evils," but "from evil;" in Greek with the definite article, "the evil."

All moral evil is from one source; variously-shaped poison leaves, but from same tree; all sorts of wounds, but in same battle, given by same adversary.

Inference 1. If all moral evil is one in its purport and strength, then there is *no such thing as a little evil*, or one that comes from a *venial sin*. That which gave you but a slight conscience twinge had the same prompting as a great crime, that would have blanched your soul in remorse. Timid doubtings of truth, stifling spirituality, are from the same smoke of the bottomless pit that chokes all good impulses, until, in a delirium of hatred to God and all good, infidels and blasphemers drop from the cone into the fires of perdition. The same hand that offers a sparkling temptation whirls another reeling into a drunkard's grave.

Inference 2. If all moral evil is one, then *there is no evil that belongs only to the individual*; it is that which is everywhere, epidemic, "upon the people." You abhor certain people; they are vile, monsters in crime. But as a sinner in any respect you belong to their band. The prurient desire classifies you with the flock of lust; the coveting which is only restrained by fear joins you with robbers; the willingness to cause anyone unnecessary suffering makes you brother of Timour, who made his monument of skulls; your coldness and the villain's hardness are because of the same metal, the steely heart. Therefore our Lord makes no distinction between lust and adultery, hatred and murder, since they come from the same fount.

Inference 3. If all moral evil is one, then there can be *no temporary evil coming from sin*; it is all unending. The tiny ripple of pain which you feel following some irregularity is a part of the mighty tide of sin and

woe which washes all the time-coast and fills with its deep sea currents the ocean of eternity. The compunction which jostles your conscience comes from the same momentum that will dash wicked souls into the final despair.

III. *The power of evil is personal.* R.V.: "The Evil One."

They who object to a personal devil outside of themselves are left to a more wretched faith that they are their own devil.

IV. The unity and personality of evil a *hopeful fact*.

Jesus has conquered that Evil One. When the disciples told how "devils are subject unto us through thy name," Jesus explained it thus: "I beheld Satan like lightning fall from heaven"—"behold, I give you power over all the power of the enemy."

A "roaring lion" will be cowed by the glance of a man who has once thoroughly conquered him. If we are with Christ, the Devil will slink away.

Pastor's Drawer.

A BROTHER says: "I attended the Council of the Evangelical Alliance in Washington. The meetings were inspiring. But I came away with a sad conviction that 'it was all talk,' and that no solid good was gained for the cause. Were others troubled with the same impression?"

Yes; judging from the conversation in several ministerial circles, that impression is quite general. But therein is hope for the Alliance in the future. The generous feeling of brotherhood which it has inspired among evangelical Christians of various denominations must soon find expression in some more tangible bond of union. The Alliance should become a Federation. Its leading defects are, first, that it is not a representative body, and, secondly, and consequently, it has no authority, not even that of the accredited wisdom of the denominations. The speakers at the Conferences, and the

members of the General Committee of Management are selected by a few gentlemen who find it convenient to meet for the purpose. They deserve the thanks of the churches for this gratuitous service; but they have stirred up a desire for something beyond the province of the present Alliance to provide. "Organic union" is in the air, the sentiment for it becoming stronger every day. But we are emphasizing more and more the *union*, less and less the *organism*. There can be no wholesale merging of denominations. Our diversities cannot be swallowed up by our unity.

Some propose an organic union on the *plane of doctrine*, leaving freedom as respects everything else. They ask for a common creed. But how shall we attain a consensus? Some say, by eliminating whatever is merely peculiar to any denomination. But a peculiarity of doctrine is due to the intellectual standpoint from which one views it. It would be like asking for a picture of a tree from no side in particular, in which there should be no effects due to slanting lights, no enlargement of parts because of proximity to the eye, no foreshortening of limbs, etc. Others propose a consensus by fusion of all views—confusion it would be; a composite picture such as is taken of a score of school girls on the same disk, resembling no one of them.

An organic union on the basis of a *common polity* is advocated, but is equally impossible. There are high church Presbyterians to whom "Presbyter is Priest writ large," even larger than Archbishop; and there are Congregationalists to whom a parish meeting is of more significance than the deliverance of a House of Bishops.

Utterly futile is the proposition to belt the churches together by a *common liturgy*. The vast majority of Protestant churches have no fixed liturgy at all, and that from principle. If we get the right survey of the field, there is no church that has

retained a liturgy except where it has been imposed by ecclesiastical authority. The Presbyterian churches have as their heirloom the beautiful service of the Church of England (*vide* Presbyterian Book of Common Prayer, 1661); but, ceasing to be mandatory, it has ceased to be used. We therefore infer that, before a common liturgy could be adopted, there must be created a universal reverence for the same ecclesiastical authority. That is, the band of liturgy is practically only the other side of the band of polity.—There remains then a possibility of unity only in the *field of evangelical work*. This seems to be practicable. We already recognize each other's labor, and rejoice in stacking our sheaves. In many a town there is such thorough unity among denominations that there is no longer clashing, but only healthful emulation in their work. This could be enlarged on the field of city evangelization, of Home Missions in the great new West, of Foreign Missions. Indeed, the foreign missionaries in many places have already practicalized what we are yet dreaming about. The nebula of church union has condensed into a constellation over some heathen lands.

But we have wandered from the question asked. We will close by asking another. Can the Evangelical Alliance pronounce the marriage ceremony over the hands which are now clasped in Christian love?

—

“What dependence should a church place upon extra or special revivalistic services as a means of stimulating religious interest?”

The question is an old one. It is doubtful if much light can be generated by its mere discussion. But we will be profited if we can get reports from brethren whose churches have been blessed by large ingathering, as to their use or avoidance of such special services. As much as seems to have been harvested in some places through extra meetings has

been garnered in other places without them. Few churches have been so spiritually prospered as that lately ministered to by Dr. Kittridge, in Chicago. Nearly 2,000 were added to it within a few years. We are informed that special revivalistic services were never held. Mr. Spurgeon says that his dependence under God is upon the individual efforts of his people. He has a corps of able assistants whom he calls his "hunting dogs," who search for souls in factories, stores and homes, and bring them to his study. Dr. William Adams made great use of private letters to the members of his flock. One of the most successful pastors advises us to depend little upon the drag-net, but to use patiently and wisely the line and hook in fishing for men. We have found much help in what we may call the little hand net—*i. e.*, small meetings held regularly for Christian counsel; one week for the boys, another for girls, etc., who may be willing to come for conversation.

We solicit from every pastor whose work has been especially blessed an answer to this question: *Do you hold extra revivalistic meetings?* If the answers are sufficiently numerous to warrant a judicious inference, we will tabulate them, and give our readers the result.

"My young men are being injured by Ingersollism. Can you suggest some brief, pointed, readable book which will serve as antidote?"

In response we would suggest Dr. Field's "Open Letter to Ingersoll," which is being reprinted from the *North American Review*. It is not closely argumentative; much less is it a detailed reply to all the misstatements of the fluent infidel. Its force lies chiefly in its tone. It is written from that standpoint where men's natural intuitions and the dogmas of Scripture blend. The spirit of the essay, if communicated to the reader, would counteract the infidel dispo-

sition, as spring sunshine destroys winter's chill.

People's Drawer.

THE following questions are taken from our own Question Night Box, the answers being substantially those given by various persons who took part in the discussions.

Question. — *"Having joined the church, what is the first thing for me to do in Christ's service?"*

Answers.—Mr. A.—Do not stand idle with that question on your lips; but do something good at once, however trifling it may seem. Tell others of your new resolution; write a letter in which you shall manage to say something for Christ; "break the ice" by testifying in the social prayer-meeting; "Whatever thy hand finds," etc. I believe that *whatever* a young convert does for Christ in the first impulse of his conversion is especially acceptable to the Master. It has the fragrance of love's first offering. The day after Charles G. Finney's conversion was one of the most potent of his whole life. He says: "I spoke with many persons that day, and I believe the Spirit of God made lasting impressions upon every one of them. I cannot remember one whom I spoke with who was not soon after converted." The first thing to do is to *make sure that you are doing something.*

Mr. B.—One Christian cannot mark the path of duty for another; each must pick his own way, keeping in mind that the Bible is the great light for the feet, and that the Holy Spirit says "I will guide thee with mine eye." If you have really given yourself to Christ and seek His counsel, you will not long be without a field of usefulness. The world is so full of opportunities for Christ's service that I fear the soul's eyes that cannot see them are not fully open. Perhaps our young friend who asks the question should abide for a while yet in the closet of his consecration, as Christ bade the disciples at the very beginning of their career: "Wait

for the promise of the Father. Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Mr. C.—But don't linger too long in the closet of consecration: the road of consecration is just as sacred. I believe in the illuminating power of duty itself. Think of Browning's words, "I see a duty, but do it not: and therefore see no higher." When Paul asked "What wilt thou have me to do?" the Master replied, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." In obeying and going he would find instruction. The outward light brightens by celerity of motion; so soul light for duty kindles in going.

Mr. D.—I will give a negative answer to the brother's question. Don't be content with joining the Society for Christian Endeavor, Y. M. C. A., or any other association for Christian work. These are useful in their spheres, but their spheres do not fill all the space of a soul's responsibility. Every one's chief duty and greatest influence will be that which most draws out one's own personality. Do what you can in union with the brethren, but remember that common duties touch you only at points. I think I know of individual members of our church who, singly, are accomplishing more for Christ than any one of our organizations. Carlyle's satire on our modern method of doing everything by convention is timely. Christ's method was to fill the individual with the Holy Ghost, and then bring him into life contact with those needing spiritual help. The saline quality is in the salt particles, not in the lump aggregate, and the lump must be dissolved back into particles before it salts anything. Be sure to have your own plan aside from the society's plan of work.

Mr. E.—The brother should con-

sult his own ability in deciding upon the kind of work he will do for the Master. Special talent points to special duty. It is a common mistake to consult only inclination. Let predisposition go, and ask only, What can I do best? A prominent clergyman has no taste for public speaking; but he has a good voice and manner, a natural rhetoric, an almost intuitive knowledge of what will most impress a mass of people. His discovery of pulpit ability was to his own mind a call to preach. Some of you modest young men who shrink from saying a word in the meetings are splendidly endowed for just that kind of work. I get more help in private conversation from a brother here who never opens his mouth publicly than from our most frequent talkers. I think that brother sins in not using his gift. The Bible tells us to "stir up the gift" that is in us. Our gifts are often like certain Oriental spices that are odorless until rubbed. We have no business to keep our spiritual perfumes corked in our hearts by modesty.

Mr. F.—An old philosopher once said to a young man who was introduced to him, "My friend, speak, that I may see thee." He felt that he could not be really acquainted with him until he had seen his mind in action. So our young people will never see themselves, as respects their qualification for usefulness, until they begin to do something. Some of the best speakers for Christ discovered that they could speak only by speaking. So I would modify Mr. E.'s suggestion that the young convert should first find out his ability before he begins to work; for he might then never discover his ability at all.

Mr. G.—But the most useful men are often those who have not what either themselves or their fellows would regard as special adaptedness to what they are doing. Moses shrank back in human wisdom from his mission, saying he was not eloquent, etc. But God said, "Who made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or

deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I, the Lord? Now, therefore, go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say." One may have the call, then, without the seeming qualification. Sure of the former, he should trust for the latter. If our young brother sees a thing that should be done, let him take hold of it, and, perhaps, the Lord will *make* him to be just the man who should do it.

Mr. H.—I find that the best work is often done by those least able to do it. The poor people in the mountains of Macedonia paid Paul's salary while he was preaching to the rich merchants of Corinth. The Lord used ignorant shepherds to be the heralds of the Incarnation. Show me a willing heart and I will show you a successful worker every time. The prophecy does not say that the saints will have genius, but that they "shall be *willing* in the day of thy power." Let the young brother pray with Paul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and he will find opportunities opening which will make even his infirmities to be sources of power.

Question.—"Should I forgive one who has offended me before he expresses repentance?"

Answers: A.—Yes, so far as your *feeling* goes. We should never treasure animosity. God's heart must have been forgiving towards sinners before He made atonement. He does not favor us because we are reconciled, but His favor reconciles. The overture for our repentance comes from Him. His Spirit inwardly persuades ours.

B. But while the heart should always be in a forgiving attitude, we should *not thrust* our expression of forgiveness upon one who does not care to have it. This would be to "cast pearls before swine." We should put our pardon, as it were, on deposit, payable to the order of the offending party.

C. We should not wait for a *formal*

apology from an enemy before we tell him of our forgiveness. Pride may prevent the expression of real regret which he feels. We have nothing to do with his pride, except to help him get over it.

D. Make *reconciliation easy*. Watch for slightest indication of a better disposition in the offender and meet it in such a way as to draw it out. In the parable of the Prodigal the father went to meet his son "when he was afar off."

E. Make all *allowance for the estrangement* due to mere misunderstanding; and this is, perhaps, the occasion of most alienation. If we could see into each other's hearts reconciliation would come at once. Give your opponent the benefit of the assumption that he is well disposed toward you, notwithstanding his offense, and until you have full evidence that he is not; for the offense may be due rather to circumstances than to evil intent. One joy of heaven will be the reconcilements that will take place when we "know as we are known."

ILLUMINATED SCRIPTURE.

Psalms v. The first Protestant colony to the New World was that of the Huguenots sent out under the auspices of Coligny in 1555. It settled on the island known still by the name of the captain of the expedition, Villegagnon, just off the site of the present city of Rio de Janeiro, in Brazil. When, in 1557, the little band was augmented by co-religionists from Geneva, the new delegation was welcomed in a hut built in the middle of the island, and their work inaugurated by chanting Marot's version of the Fifth Psalm:

"Aux paroles que je veux dire,
Plaise toi l'oreille prester,
Et à cognoistre t'arrester,
Pourquoi mon cœur pense et sou-
pire,
Souverain Sire."

Psalms civ. Jean de Lévy, one of the early Huguenot missionaries in

South America, was walking with a group of savages in the forest. Its grandeur enchanted him, so that he could not restrain his emotion, but burst out singing this Nature hymn. The savages were thus first

taught religious truth by the overflowing gladness of a Christian soul. Is not this the ordinary agency of evangelization: the gospel well in the heart, bubbling up and dropping its spray upon others?

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

REV. ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D. D.

BY REV. CHARLES PARKHURST.

SEVERAL years ago we were roaming among the alcoves of a large theological library, scanning titles for new books whose future acquaintance we desired to make. A volume caught the eye, entitled "Sermons Preached at Manchester." We had never heard of the book nor the author. We opened by chance and began to read. Surely it was a "find" to us! It brought just the message which we had long needed and had been unconsciously seeking. This was the text (Hebrews xii: 1): "Let us lay aside every *weight*, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." The word which caught me and the thought in exposition of it was the word "weight." The human has weights, infirmities, weaknesses, that are not in themselves sins. The inspired writer makes that distinction, and teaches that lesson, in the words selected. Reared in the provincial environment of the New England Puritan, and fed on the old tenets—robust and pure, but rigid and severe, with no charity for the infirmities of men—we needed the solace of the new truth we had found out of the Word; but the congregation to whom we statedly ministered needed the great truth more. That sermon was read and reread, and wrought a revolution in our apprehension of Christianity and in our preaching. Dr. Maclaren became our teacher. We laid hold of every volume that could be obtained and every magazine and paper which contained his writings or utterances. We are getting the ser-

mons which he preaches weekly now, when ripest and best, in *The Christian Worker*, published at Manchester, England, at No. 5 Norfolk street. We specially mention this fact for the benefit of other American admirers of Dr. Maclaren who would be glad, weekly, to lay hold of his sermons, and to say also that the paper is an excellent Christian publication in every respect, and sustained, for philanthropic purposes, by the noble Christian men of Manchester, without regard to denomination.

When, therefore, we planned to cross the Atlantic, heart and mind were fixed upon this: We will see and hear Dr. Maclaren; and we did it, though we went two hundred miles to accomplish the purpose.

It was July 17, 1887, that we sat in his chapel. It is a beautiful modern church, of brick, seating easily 1,500 people. "We are greatly crowded," the usher said to us, and 2,000 people were packed into the church when we worshiped there. It was no unusual event, however—it is so always when it is pleasant. We were delighted with the congregation—the finest in face and dress that we have seen in Europe. A large proportion are young people. The young are recognized in this church, for in a chorus choir there are several boys and girls, and it is a delight to see the zest with which they sing. While we stand singing, two men have come the whole length of the aisle, hoping to secure a seat, but are obliged to turn about and go back, so greatly crowded is each pew. Chairs are used, and people sit back of the pulpit, where they can only hear, so anxious are they to secure

the service. Surely there is some attraction about the preacher to draw people thus! We walked three miles to-day to hear a distinguished divine in another part of the city, generously advertised in the daily press and on bill-boards, and, withal, a church with not two-thirds the seating capacity of this, and it was not half filled. What makes the difference? The people know who they desire to hear, and they will take the trouble to find the man. How is it?

Dr. Maclaren is in his pulpit. He is tall and spare, with small but most comely shaped head and attractive face. In early years he must have been a handsome man. I can best describe him in look, thought and manner by saying to the American that he is a twin brother of Dr. C. S. Robinson, of New York. Both are Scotch, and there is a striking resemblance between them. In thought, style and manner of utterance they are much alike. Their pens are dipped in the same inkhorn. We read for years, and with very much profit, Dr. Robinson, in his articles in the *Sunday-School Times* of Philadelphia, on the current lessons. Dr. Maclaren now does weekly the same work; but so much alike are they with pen, and so much pleased am I, that I hardly know whether it is Robinson or Maclaren that I am reading.

Dr. Maclaren does not aspire to look clerical. He wears no gown, not even the white cravat. He does not look especially ministerial. He would look in place in a bank or office. We would that he had more years before him. Such men should live as long as the patriarchs—but has God better work for him to do? Somehow, the men over here who have seemed to take most pains to exhibit the clerical have been the men of the least weight in the pulpit.

Dr. Maclaren does not impress you with favor in his preliminary services. To an American, they seem

much too long. He is constrained and artificial in reading his Scripture and hymns, and lifts his voice laboriously into a head tone, to be heard. In prayer there is not that tender, childlike breathing of the soul out to God that you would anticipate. He prays twice and at some length before the sermon. English congregations sing more than the American, and better, and it is considered strange in the worshiper if he does not try to sing. Singing is praise worship. Forty-five minutes Dr. Maclaren has used in the preliminary service. A lady at my side said at the close of this part of the service, "You are to be disappointed." We should have been seriously disappointed if we had left the house at that moment.

His text was Matthew viii: 24-26. As he can be read so easily in *Sunday-School Times*, *Expositor* and volumes of sermons, we shall not give an abstract of the sermon, but a fuller view of the man himself. He had neither manuscript nor notes before him. In a few words he unfolds his text. He tells his congregation clearly how he is to present his theme. His subject possesses him and he is taking fire. Thought transforms him. You would not think him threescore and two. We never saw man in the pulpit whose movement of body and limb could be so agile and rapid. Face flushes, eye gleams, pointed finger and open palm speak to you. His voice has lost all restraint, and is resonant, tender, impressive. It seems as if God was speaking to you. Every person in the house, so far as we can see, is held in solemn and impressive awe as the truth is borne home, the truth of God, to conscience and practical life. That is preaching, we said; and we have not heard the like in Europe. We do not wonder that the church is crowded. We do not wonder that London and other cities offer their best pulpits to this man and beg him to enter them.

What is the secret of such a re-

markable ministry? Can we learn it for ourselves, that the years left us may be more efficient?

1. Dr. Maclaren is a *preacher*. Here is his power. What makes him a preacher? What are his peculiarities? He preaches the Word. He lives in the Word. He believes the preacher is a herald. God has given the preacher a message to declare. He must understand this message, be full of it, and reveal it to men. They tell of him that every day since he began his public ministry he has read one chapter, each, in the Old and New Testament, in the original. Dr. Maclaren is an exegete of the whole Bible. He makes it his business to declare the truth as it is revealed in Christ and apply it to the needs of his hearers.

2. Dr. Maclaren is a man of thought. He has made most thorough preparation on his particular theme. He always says something to his people. He gives them something that will stick. To me this is his superiority over Spurgeon. He thinks more, and better. So thoroughly does he master the text, and make his divisions, and so natural and unique are they, that it seems impossible to you in treating the same text to add to or get away from his abstract. His sermons hold you in an inextricable grip if you are to preach from the same text. You do not intend to be a plagiarist, but unconsciously you borrow from him. The imaginative in him is studiously cultivated, though the use of it is natural, and his rhetoric and style are poetical and most fascinating. He is equipped with illustrations and pointed, practical allusions, which he uses with great effect. In one word, he is *interesting* to the hearer, and all the time interesting. There is no cant, no religious platitude, no iteration of the same thought to tediousness. You are held in rapt attention, and yet eager for more. He does not speculate about systems of philosophy; he does not talk to you about

dogma; ecclesiasticism is not his theme; but he just preaches the words to the intuitions of his hearers, and they sensitively respond. Some one has likened him to Frederick Robertson, of Brighton. We do not see any ground for the comparison. Robertson was a Thomas, and gave frank utterance to his doubts. Maclaren believes with his whole soul, and preaches not doubts but faith. This is not said in disparagement of Robertson, for we have an intense admiration of this unique man, but to mark the unfitness of the comparison. The best lesson which Dr. Maclaren teaches the preacher is the necessity of direct and absorbing work upon the Bible in order to be able to speak with interest and power. If we mistake not, he is working a most happy revolution here in teaching the clergy that the Bible only needs hard, faithful study in order to yield that which will be most fresh, vivid, and interesting, not to say helpful, to our congregations.

3. The earnest directness with which he preaches. Every utterance has a personal application. He means *you*, and it is impossible to parry the truth or give it to the stranger behind you. With most tender, loving sincerity, he sends every utterance home as if you were his only hearer. He preaches to no class; his word is not for the imbruted sinner, but for every soul who does not recognize Christ as Lord and Master. He does not exhort, but he does quite frequently make most direct appeal. His blood is warm, and through him there flashes the truth of God, and in its light you see how unchristlike you are, though he does not tell you so. He never scolds nor rants; he is never pessimistic, but he makes you feel that your ideal is unworthy of yourself, unless Christ be the centre and motive power within you. Through him in his pulpit effort God speaks to you; and that is preaching. There comes over you as you listen the unspeakable and joyous impression that he indeed is a man of

God, he is sincere, he walks and talks with God; and here we touch the secret of his permanent influence and power. He might be everything else that he is, but if he did not thus "abide in Christ" he could not wield with such unction the truth of God.

4. We must gratefully notice, in closing, his gracious catholicity of Christian spirit. He said from his pulpit, "The sacrament of the Lord's Supper will be celebrated at the close of this service; all friends of Jesus who would consider it a privilege to gather with us are kindly invited to

do so." That invitation from the lips of a Baptist sounded delightfully strange to the ears of an American clergyman; but it is characteristic of the spirit of fraternity which Dr. MacLaren always exhibits. We sat with him about the table of the Lord and were refreshed and comforted. We heard Mr. Spurgeon give such an invitation a few Sabbaths since in his own Tabernacle, and men and women of all shades of evangelical faith gladly accepted the invitation. When will our good Baptist brethren in America become thus catholic?

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

The Temptation of Christ.

IN THE HOMILETIC REVIEW (Dec.), a sermon by Josiah Strong, D.D., which ought to command general interest is on "The Temptations of Christ," presenting a view which the author thinks unusual, if not novel. Personal study of the subject led me years ago to substantially the same conclusions, which appear far more satisfactory and significant than those held by perhaps most Bible readers.

One is left to wonder, however, why Dr. Strong fails to apply to the first of these recorded temptations the same interpretation that he gives to the other two. For this appears to be an appeal to precisely the same sentiment in the soul of Jesus as that which gave weight to those; so that, instead of three separate temptations, appealing to as many different desires—the craving of food, the vanity of display, and the lust of power or of property—we really have a single, though threefold, temptation, appealing to one desire and aiming at one result.

Jesus was about to enter upon His life work as the preacher of a new dispensation. He had just come from the baptism at the river Jordan. He had heard the voice of God saying to Him, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." As Dr. Strong says, "Perhaps now,

for the first time, he gained a full consciousness of His Messiahship." It was in the full flood of this self-consciousness that He was assailed by the Prince of Evil.

And the one object for which He had come into the world was *to redeem the world*—to recapture it out of the grasp of Satan and restore it to God. To this strong desire the enemy makes most subtle appeal, the force and cunning of which we are sure to miss except as we view it in the light of these circumstances.

First: "If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread." Perhaps that scene by the Jordan was only a fancy of your excited brain. Perhaps after all you are in no way different from other men, and possess no ability beyond theirs. "Command that these stones become bread;" the result will make it certain whether you are or are not the Son of God.

It is easy to see how there might have been a real temptation in a suggestion like this, with one who would not be moved by an appeal to a mere desire for food, however hungry. The reply of Jesus fits the interpretation now given. "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." As much as to say: I have heard the divine

voice and am satisfied; I have no need to put to the test of experiment the word of God declaring my relationship to Him. When the proper time comes, and for a suitable object, I shall employ my power to work miracles; but I do not propose either to play with it or to use it in testing the truth of what God has said; I choose to trust Him without trying the experiment.

The second appeal was, if possible, more cunningly devised than the first. "If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down" from this pinnacle of the Temple in the sight of all the people. You wish to be received by them as the Messiah; what will be more likely to convince them than to see you descending in safety from this height into the court below? It will be to them a sign from heaven and gain their confidence. Besides, you have the express promise of God that his angels will hold you up; and upon his simple word you profess to rely.

Specious as this plea was, Jesus knew too well what was in man, and understood too well the spiritual nature of the kingdom He came to establish, to allow Himself to be taken captive by this appeal, which has prevailed with many another would-be leader of men. He knew that a following secured by such means would be as superficial as it might be enthusiastic. The empire He would found was not outward and visible, but in the hearts and affections of men; and He replied to Satan: "It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God!"

Then came the third, most fearful of all, and yet most frank, square, downright, business-like offer. If only Satan could be trusted, there was a most subtle and terrible temptation in the proposal that was made: All the world, and all authority over it, with all its power and glory, will I surrender to thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. The very thing which you have come into the

world to secure, and for which you propose to lay down your life, shall be yours, at once and forever, upon compliance with this one condition.

If this proposal were rejected, there was but one alternative: the god of this world, already holding it in subjection, would employ all his resources of cunning and might to maintain his hold and to defeat the enterprise in which Jesus was about to engage. Scorn, indignity, rejection and crucifixion should be His own experience; while His followers must look for nothing better than fierce and unceasing resistance, imprisonment, and in many cases cruel death, and a meagre success. If the end for which He had come into the world could be reached at less expense than this, and without this wearisome delay, ought He not to adopt the easier and speedier path to success? In this thought lay the subtlety of the tempter and the force of his temptation. On one condition (the precise nature of which we do not know) the actual possessor of the world offers to surrender it into the hand of Christ without a struggle. "But Christ saw, perhaps not at once, perhaps only after long and terrible struggle, like that in the garden, that the condition involved homage to evil—that it was tantamount to an act of worship to the devil; then He recognized the temptation and the tempter, and, triumphing over both, He exclaimed, 'Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'"

E. C. EWING.

DANVERS, MASS.

"Art is Long and Time is Fleeting."

The hunting up of the authorship of scraps of poetry and stray sayings seems to me often a waste of time; yet occasionally something of value may be brought out. Respecting Longfellow's line, so often quoted: When President Garfield died, after the long suffering from his fatal

wound, in which the whole nation seemed stretched on the couch with him, Dr. Hamilton, one of his physicians, published a medical history of the case so desperately baffling to the surgeons. The late Dr. Hunt, of the Newark *Daily Advertiser* (one of the most learned, philosophical and discerning of editorial writers, as well as most poetical and graceful in his diction and style), in the issue of that paper Sept. 27, 1881, made the following observations, in which the saying is traced back considerably further, as well as shown to be in reality the professional observation of a large thinker on the limitations of the surgical art rather than a merely poetic conceit:

"Dr. Hamilton tells not much that is new, but he groups the incidents of the case, and leaves it in a clear light as difficult in judgment and impossible in cure. In the aphorisms of Hippocrates, written by a physician some centuries before Christ, the toil of the surgeon was expressed as truly for now as then. He wrote, '*Ars longa, vita brevis; experientia fallax, momentum argens, judicium difficile.*' Longfellow's 'Psalm of Life' is a paraphrase of Hippocrates, or is at least suggested by it; for where he says 'Art is long and time is fleeting,' Hippocrates said, 'Art is long and life is short, experience is fallacious, action is urgent, and judgment is difficult.' That old wisdom was singularly illustrated in the difficulties, or impossibilities, which surrounded the bedside of the murdered President."

It seemed to me the saying would be enhanced if presented in this setting, and less like an impertinence than if given as a bare correction of the notice in your December issue. The aphorisms of Hippocrates are pursued by Galen, who wrote in the second century.

HENRY U. SWINNERTON.
CHERRY VALLEY, N. Y.

A Light that Does Lighten.

IN THE HOMILETIC REVIEW (Dec., p. 544), under the heading "A Light

that Does Not Lighten," a brother quotes from Dr. Crosby's interpretation of John v: 37-44, these words: "And it is easy to believe that the drawing of the Father is the giving of the Father." The writer criticises this, and says: "That may be easy for Dr. Crosby; but it is very hard, I think, for the average mind to believe that two things which are radically different are exactly alike. It seems to me that the learned Doctor's logic here is lame—lame as his logic on Prohibition."

Now, it seems to my "average mind" that Dr. Crosby's critic makes the latter to say just the opposite of what he did say. It seems to me that the Doctor's clear statement is that "drawing" and "giving" are *not* "two things which are radically different," but two *terms* for a thing which is radically the same. And it is just here that the light had been shining in the darkness, which it seems is not quite comprehended yet. But why does the brother knock the good Doctor's theological legs from under him with the "Prohibition" mallet? I cannot see the soundness of this logic. Politics and religion, Prohibition on the brain, and theology on its legs, are *not* "exactly the same thing," but are two "things radically different." And I believe that this is just what the Doctor's logic has been, and still is, on the temperance question; and it can travel yet.

L. P. CUMMINGS.
MORRISANIA, N. Y.

The Prayer-Meeting.

EVERY Christian and every pastor knows that unless the prayer-meeting service of the church be one of life and power, all the other services of the sanctuary will languish; and every now and then spasmodic efforts are made to revive interest in the prayer-meeting. And still the service, in most churches, is all but a dead, perfunctory service. And *why?* There must be a general and powerful reason to explain this. *What* is

it? The low state of religion in the church is undoubtedly the great underlying cause. But there are specific reasons, patent to the eye of a careful observer, that will help to account for the deplorable condition of the average prayer-meeting.

Like everything else, the prayer-meeting follows the law of cause and effect. No intelligent man who frequents these services can wonder that so few attend them habitually, or why they are so dead and formal: *The manner of conducting them solves the problem.*

My own pastor recently from the pulpit said he would like to "receive about seventy-five letters from his people, giving him their reasons for not attending the prayer-meeting, or their views as to the reasons of its comparative failure." A capital idea! I am afraid, however, he got but few letters, and they of a gingerly sort. People had so much rather nurse their prejudices and objections in secret, and find fault with the church and prayer-meeting in a general way, than to come out squarely and frankly and state their views and openly assume the responsibility of their utterance. I am frank to confess that I did not myself comply with my pastor's request: not because I had nothing to say or did not wish to say it; not because the chief reasons for the low state of our prayer-meeting were not clearly apparent to my mind, and had been, and been deplored, for a long while; but simply because I could not conscientiously write such a letter and keep back any part of the truth, or fail to write it over my own signature, and so frank and personal a course might bring me into unpleasant relations with my pastor, I being a clergyman parishioner, and a member of the same Presbytery. So I withheld my testimony.

But it has occurred to me that there are thousands of just such prayer-meetings in the church, and that I might, without being person-

ally offensive, write and give such an open letter to my pastor as might possibly be suggestive and useful to many pastors and parishes. But I will reserve it for another time.

AN EX-PASTOR.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Encourage the Members of Your Church.

THERE is much reason to believe that not a few pastors do not recognize the absolute need of their seizing frequent opportunities of giving timely and tender encouragement to the members of their churches. It is strange indeed that any pastor or minister should be heedless about so self-evident a duty, inasmuch as he himself frequently feels the need of being encouraged by those whom he serves. Many pastors have severely criticised their brethren and sisters for withholding their expression of appreciation of their pastor's labors; but it may be that, if the pastor had been in the habit of distinctly showing a warm appreciation of the manifest interest with which his preaching had been listened to by many, if not the whole, of his church, and the intelligent zeal which a goodly number have continuously exhibited in various forms of Christian service, he would have received, in fit season, a happy return of this kind of personal ministrations. If a pastor fulfill the terms of exemplary leadership, in a broad sense, he needs to take into account the potency of his own example in the matter of giving unfeigned appreciation of the services rendered by his people, relating to both the cause and himself. Let him take thoughtful heed thus to minister to those especially whose native shyness keeps them in the back ranks of church standing and Christian service, and whose existence seems to them, oftentimes, to be practically ignored by more prominent members and workers. Words of sweet encouragement from the pastor have a most stimulating effect upon the modest and obscure

members of the church; and such words succeed in courting this class into a cheerful desire to engage in certain forms of activity which previously they did not suppose they were capable of doing, but which, upon trial, under pastoral encouragement and direction, it was found they were admirably adapted to and qualified for. It requires but little

argument to show that the latent talent of no church can be drawn out to any large extent unless it be through the stimulating ministry of judicious encouragement from some source; and why should not the pastor make proof of his ability to lead and educate his people by special efforts on this line?

A CLERGYMAN.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

Revival Service.

"The First Shall be Last."

Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out.—Matt. viii: 11, 12.

A HEATHEN convert, visiting the United States, expressed his amazement that everybody here was not a Christian. We may press the inquiry why last year the New York Presbytery reported but 7 per cent. addition to its membership, while the Presbytery of Corisco reported 9 per cent., the Synod of India 11 per cent., and the Presbytery of Laos 21 per cent.?

Some hints toward the solution of the problem:

I. Missionaries as a rule are a more thoroughly consecrated class of ministers than those who remain in the home church.

II. The heathen observe a wider contrast between the blessings of the Christian faith and the lack of it than people in Christian countries do. Among us only some degraded wretch in the slums, or some sailor stranded among land-sharks, fails to enjoy a hundred blessings which come to him under Christian civilization, though he does not recognize their source.

III. The attention of people in Christian lands is diverted largely from the essential to the less important phases of religion—*e. g.*, our denominational controversies, church architecture, ecclesiastical ceremon-

ies, church music as an art, rhetoric in the pulpit, etc.

IV. The people at home are gospel-hardened.

V. The heathen convert is compelled to display the heroism of the faith in standing out against the paganism about him; and nothing is more persuasive than the "courage of one's convictions."

VI. The heathen convert, having less of earthly Christian influence to help him, throws himself more completely in dependence upon the Spirit of God, the source of all power in Christian character and work. L.

The Evidence Produced.

And the books were opened.—Rev. x: 12.

Introduction.—The impressive background for the judgment of each soul. "And I saw a *great white throne*, and *Him* that sat on it, from whose face the *earth and the heaven fled away* . . . the *dead, small and great*, stand before God. . . The *sea* gave up the dead which were in it, and *Death and Hades* delivered up the dead which were in them. . . The *lake of fire*." Fittingly the most majestically solemn imagery introduces the declaration of the most majestically solemn event that shall ever occur to a human being.

The books shall be opened—(I) books which each one *shall take with* him containing his own account of his life; and (II) books which are being *kept on our account in heaven*.

I. (a) The book of our *Memory*, in

which all things that ever impressed us are recorded.

(b) The book of *our Conscience*, in which all things are estimated according to the character we gave them as good or bad.

II. (c) The book of *God's Memory*—His omniscience supplementing each man's knowledge of himself.

(d) The book of *God's Conscience*—the divine righteousness applying an infinitely stricter standard than our consciences ever did.

III. The books of each soul's record opened in *the presence of all other souls*: heart seeing through heart. What revelations! what reconcilements! what new enmities!

IV. Another book—of *Christ's Memory and Conscience*—the inspection and judgment of souls in the grace-light of the Cross—no deed of discipleship, however little or humble, forgotten; every name of a confessor confessed before the Father.

L.

The Child Model for the Christian.

Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.—Matt. xviii : 3.

THE child model for the Christian has these among other lines in it :

I. A little child has a *good conscience*; not soiled by actual guilt; a *very little* child : Augustine remembered and bemoaned the sins of his babyhood.

II. A little child has a *good purpose*, before passions have warped it in their heat.

III. A little child has a soul *free from the slavery of evil habits*.

(a) The habit of doing bad things.

(b) The habit of not doing good things.

IV. A little child is naturally *trustful*; has not learned to distrust through experience of the wiles of others, or of the ignorance of self. This trustfulness can be trained Godward.

V. We can become young again but only by being converted. L.

The Condition of Eternal Life.

This is life eternal, etc. — John xvii : 3.

JESUS here sums up and expresses, in one condensed and comprehensive sweep of words, all theology, all knowledge—the science of God, and all the highest possibilities and destinies of man. The evident meaning is this :

Knowledge of God in Christ the condition of eternal life.

I. WHAT IS ETERNAL LIFE ?

Many different ideas. "To the law and the testimony." Explain "life" in the New Testament. There represented by four words (*Ψυχή, βίος, ἀνοστροφή, ζωή*). For an able discussion on their meaning see *The Baptist Quarterly*, October, 1884.)

Note the harmony between these Scriptural definitions of "life" and the scientific definition, viz., "correspondence."

II. HOW OBTAINED.

(a) *The Mode*: It is obtained as a free gift from God.

(1) We are incapable of receiving it in any other way. "The world by wisdom knew not God." "The natural man receiveth not," etc.

(2) It rests with God to grant his presence to whom He will. So an earthly king. How much more the heavenly!

Further, "The wages of sin is death, but the *gift* of God," etc. But He gives it only in Jesus Christ. (John v : 26; xvii : 2; iii : 16.)

(b) *The Condition*: Knowledge of God in Christ.

"This is life eternal, that they might *know* thee," etc., Revert to science. Knowledge is the highest form of "correspondence." . . . Therefore, scientifically and scripturally, knowledge of God is eternal life. But it is knowledge of God *in Christ*—i.e., as manifested in Christ (1 Jno. x : 20).

What, then, is the true position? We should all be disciples—learners—of Christ. "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." J. C. A.

Christian Culture.

Sacramental Meditation.

The king came in to see the guests.
—Matt. xxii : 11.

I. We come as the *guests* of old, because

1. We come at the *King's invitation*; the table spread by no human appointment.

2. We come to *honor His Son*.

3. We come from the *highways* of all occupations, current thoughts, natural characters, etc.

4. We come in answer to a *universal invitation*—"Whosoever will, let him come."

II. The *King* is here.

1. God is here in His *majesty*: let us meet Him with reverence and humility.

2. God is here in His *righteousness*: let us blush for our sins.

3. God is here in His *omniscience*: let us not try to conceal anything by a denying or extenuating thought.

4. God is here in His *power*: a movement of His will can consign us to our eternal destinies.

5. God is here in His *love*: a boundless love; let us rest our souls in it.

III. The king saw *one* man there who was not worthy and excited his wrath—*only one*. Perhaps the proportion of unworthy communicants is ordinarily overestimated.

IV. The king's wrath excited not because the man was of *too low condition*; for he had invited all classes.

The king was not wroth because the man was a *bad character*; for he had invited "the good and the bad."

The king was not wroth because the man had been an *enemy*; for his presence there might have evinced a submissive respect.

The man had not on a *wedding garment*. It was the custom for a rich lord to provide garments or badges for his retainers. Not to put one on was either *intentional disregard*, or *careless disrespect*.

V. But the king met this one intruder with *overture of friendship*, even though he had come with wrong

purpose. "*Friend, how camest thou?*" etc. Though I have come to the sacrament without proper feeling, I need not go away. The king calls me "*Friend*"! Even now I can put on the wedding garment. L.

Who did no sin, neither was any guile found in his mouth.—1 Peter i : 22.

I. There was once a perfectly good man: a *solitary fact*.

(a) Jesus was perfect, judged by the standard of *man's own invention*—no one ever before lived out even Seneca's morals.

(b) Jesus was perfect according to a *vastly higher and rarer standard than men ever invented*: He met the ideal painted by His surpassingly holy precepts.

(c) Jesus's holiness was *beyond the law which it kept*, for it was a power for holiness in others. The light of His purity was not limited to the lantern of the precepts it illumined, but irradiated purity by the outgoing of His spirit to others.

II. The significance of the holiness of Jesus.

(a) Jesus was perfect, that men might have a *perfect model* of character to work after.

(b) Jesus was perfect, that men might have an *Advocate* with God. No sinful person can commune with Heaven. Try to pray while you have some wrong purpose unquenched in your heart.

(c) Jesus was sinless, that He might be a *Mediator*, not only having access, but power with God on our behalf. Did you never forgive one person for another's sake?

(d) Jesus was sinless, that He might make all necessary *satisfaction* to the broken law of God. One criminal could not take the place of another.

(e) Jesus was sinless, that He might be our *Judge* at the last day. "He will judge the world by that man whom He hath ordained."

(f) Jesus was sinless, that *we might believe* Him when He witnesses to us of saving truth. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." L.

Methods of Resistance to Temptation.

Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.—James iv : 7.

I. SUBMIT YOURSELF TO GOD.

II. SO IN SUPREME CHOICE OF HIM, FIND THE POWER OF RESISTANCE.

W. H.

Sermon for Ministers.

Who will bring me into the strong city? Who will lead me into Edom? Ps. lx : 9.

I. THE Preacher's Fight.

II. THE Preacher's Foes.

III. THE Preacher's Victory.

W. H.

Funeral Service.**The Shortening of Life.**

The days of his youth hast thou shortened.—Ps. lxxxix : 45.

THE death of the young specially impressive. It teaches—

1. That God is the Sovereign Disposer of all. Tendency on part of man to free himself from Divine Authority, seen on referring all events to "Law." Personality sunk in Uniformity. A *break* needed to show us Jehovah still reigns. The death of a youth such a break. It is at variance with "Tables of Mortality." Disappointment of expectation

of three-score years and ten. We hope for so much from the "course of nature," but God breaks in—"the one is taken, the other is left."

2. Teaches the "Fear of God."

We are averse to change—dislike to have our plans interfered with. But an uninterrupted flow carries away from God. "Because they have no changes, therefore they fear not God." If everyone were *sure* of long life, wickedness would increase. We would procrastinate more fatally than now. Before the flood, men lived too long for their own good. But the great *change* of Death may come at any time—even in youth. "Prepare to meet thy God."

3. The death of a youth not necessarily calamitous beyond the event. We so look upon it, "What a pity so young!" "Cut down in promise of life!" Language of natural affection. Feeling of Psalmist when eyes obscured with grief: "Thou hast covered him with shame." But though he may have achieved no marked measure of worldly success, he has been sufficiently enterprising if he have worked the "works of God," which is to "believe in Him whom God hath sent." To die young is then to escape the evils of old age.

J. S. P.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.**Licensing Gambling.**

Therefore hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure.—Isa. v : 14.

LAST spring the New York Legislature passed what is known as the "Ives Pool Law"—a measure which legalizes within certain periods the receiving and registering of bets, pool-selling and gambling on all the race-tracks of the State operated by the racing associations. The same law imposes, as a consideration for rendering legal what was before prohibited in the State as inimical to public morals, a tax of five per cent. on the gross receipts at the gate of

the race-track. The friends of this measure legalizing gambling urged as a reason for its passage that "as men will gamble anyhow" it was better to have it carried on under "proper restrictions." So the bill became a law, despite the earnest protests of the moral and Christian portion of the community.

What has been the result of this legalized "restriction" of an act in itself immoral?

Mr. Anthony Comstock, Agent of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, and whose special duty it has been to watch the effect and operation of the law, in a recent

interview with a representative of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, said :

"The effect of the law has been simply to protect gamblers on the race-tracks and not to interfere with gamblers off the tracks. There has not been a single conviction or sentence of a single gambler under the Ives Pool Law, although violations of it are of common, everyday occurrence, well known to the police and other officials. We are all cognizant of these violations, although it is almost impossible to obtain evidence sufficient to convict.

"The moral effects of the law have been practically to vindicate and endorse the crime of gambling. Courts are loath to punish as crimes acts done on one side of a board fence, when the same acts done on the other side are made perfectly lawful by the Legislature. As a consequence, a gambler when caught is let off with the minimum penalty, a small fine, while the punishment under the Ives Pool Law is imprisonment for one year. It has degraded the whole moral tone of the State. The law has been degrading and damning to every one of us."

A Covenant with Iniquity.

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

THE principal argument for licensing or taxing the liquor traffic is that it reduces the consumption of liquors as a beverage. An examination of the Reports of the Commissioners of Internal Revenue and of the Bureau of Statistics will dispel this illusion. From 1863 to 1875, the first 12 years of the Internal Revenue tax, the average annual per capita consumption of distilled spirits was 1.21 gallons; malt liquors, 5.32 gallons; wine, .31 gallons. The tax during this time averaged \$0.9028 per gallon on distilled spirits and \$0.03 on beer. During the last 12 years the average annual consumption has been 1.38 gallons for distilled spirits; 9.29 for beer and .45 for wine. The tax has

averaged \$0.8844 per gallon on spirits and \$0.03 7-31 on beer.

As an example of those who argue for a high license or tax as a temperance measure, Mr. Blaine, in his interview on President Cleveland's message, may be quoted. He declares the consumption of whiskey to-day to be only 40 per cent. what it was 30 years ago, before the application of the Internal Revenue tax.

While it is doubtless true that the per capita amount of distilled spirits withdrawn for consumption is to-day less than 30 years ago, it by no means follows that this represents a decrease in the amount of liquors consumed as a beverage. Quite the contrary can be shown.

In 1865 Mr. David A. Wells, Chairman of a commission appointed by Congress to revise the Internal Revenue system and to inquire into the effects of the high tax on spirits, reported (page 161 of his report), speaking of the decreased consumption of spirits :

"The first, and undoubtedly the largest, element in such reduction has been the disuse of alcohol for the preparation of burning fluid."

The report further states that in 1860 alone 25,000,000 gallons of proof spirits was consumed for this purpose alone. This use of alcohol was entirely cut off by the tax. Extensive disuse of alcohol for "a multitude of industrial purposes other than the manufacture of burning fluid" is also reported. On page 163 of the report he adds :

"In some instances entire branches of business have been destroyed in consequence of the great advance in the price of alcohol."

These facts—taken in connection with the fact above shown, that the per capita consumption of distilled spirits has steadily increased under the application of the tax, and with the still further fact that during the period covered great efforts have been made to foster the brewing industry at the expense of the distillers,

evidenced by the enormous increase in the consumption of malt liquors, being 1.87 gallons in 1863 against 10.69

gallons in 1886—would hardly indicate that a high tax on the liquor traffic operates as a temperance measure.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A Rule for Capitalization.

I HAVE been endeavoring to hit upon some uniform system of capitalization. But I am endlessly bothered by the lack of uniformity in books and papers. Different publishing houses seem to have different rules; nor have I as yet been able to discover a publishing house that adhered uniformly to any one rule. Can you help me out of this difficulty?

A LITERARY CLERGYMAN.

There is certainly very little logic, system or sense in the prevailing customs with regard to capitalization of such words as church, state, court, territory, etc. These words are to capitalization what the words would and should, shall and will, are to grammar—ever-recurring stumbling blocks. For instance, there is the word church, meaning in one case a building; in another case, a society; in another case, a sect; in another case, the universal body of worshippers. In one line it may refer to a particular building, or society, or sect, and in another case to no one of these in particular. The same perplexity occurs in the use of the word state, sometimes meaning a civil division (as Ohio), sometimes the nation as a whole, sometimes civil government in an abstract sense (as, conflict between church and state). All this complexity and perplexity can be avoided by applying to these words the primary purpose of capitalization, which is to distinguish some one object from all others. The chief purpose of capitalization is to designate a *Proper* name—that is, one's own name (from *proprius*)—and nobody else's.

If this conception is held to, we will capitalize church whenever it is part of a proper name, and at no other

time, as Calvary Baptist Church (whether referring to the building or to the society); the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. But we will not capitalize in the following: No church can exist without the spirit of self-denial. Each church in the Methodist denomination is under supervision of a presiding elder, etc., etc. The same rule ought to apply to the word state; e. g.: The State of Ohio (proper name) became a state (not a proper name) in 1800.

It may be difficult to cite authority for this proposed rule. But it has the merit of injecting system where it is badly needed; of applying to these words the same primary purposes of capitalization which are kept sight of with other words; and it is a simple rule, that is easily adhered to, and requires no exceptions.

The following general rule, if strictly followed, will overcome many a perplexity:

GENERAL RULE. — In general all words which are used sometimes alone and sometimes as part of a proper name or title should be capitalized only in the latter case. Examples: The Mississippi River is a river of vast proportions. A committee was appointed to be known as the Committee on Ways and Means. A new territory was organized under the name of Washington Territory. The Methodist Church is a church of 2,000,000 adherents. The State of Ohio became a state in 1800. So of such words as court, legislature, convention, conference, society, county, island, avenue, street, etc. When these words are used with some designating word, so as to refer to a particular court, legislature, etc., they become part of a proper name and should be capitalized. Otherwise not. So of all titles, such as senator, general, doctor, bishop—e. g.: There is no braver general living than General Sherman.