

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XVI.—SEPTEMBER, 1888.—No. 3.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES: HOW AFFECTED BY RECENT CRITICISMS.

NO. IV.

BY J. B. THOMAS, D.D., NEWTON CENTER, MASS.

RECENT criticism has busied itself especially with questions as to the accuracy of the Bible in its scientific statements, and its integrity and veracity as a history, reaching conclusions more or less radical, but even in their moderate form seriously reducing its trustworthiness in both particulars. That no grave peril to the Christian faith is to be apprehended from this quarter is, however, earnestly maintained by many of our comrades in that faith. The matters involved, as they remind us, affect the human form and not the divine elements of the revelation; they belong to its accidents and not to its essence; its motives being religious and ethical, and not in any sense historic or scientific—to teach us “not how the heaven goeth, but how to go to heaven”; and, furthermore, our faith rests on Christ, and not on a book. Others cannot so easily poultice their fears. It seems to them that facts and tendencies already manifest discredit these assurances, even if the constitution of the human mind did not forbid their acceptance. To map out the human as discriminate from the divine, that in surrendering the one the integrity of the other may not be invaded, seems a venturesome experiment for purblind creatures, who are forbidden even to attempt to distinguish and pull up the “tares,” lest in their ignorance they root up also the wheat with them. Our Lord himself, divine in nature, was human in form. How long would His divine authority survive His human veracity being gone? Can divine holiness be counted less scrupulous than human morality, in its utterances or agencies? Shall we assent to the insinuation that He who is “the Truth” has resorted to “pious frauds” to accomplish His ends; that He who has said “no lie is from the truth” has employed “forgers of lies” as his elect representatives:

It is evident, as stated, that the ultimate end of Scripture is religious and not secular. But while its peculiar mission is not to teach science

or history, it does teach both, as a matter of fact. It must not be forgotten, and can scarcely be counted accidental by those who believe in any form of divine supervision in the production of the Bible, that it alone among the sacred books of the world can be fairly said to commit itself to such specific statement in these realms as to subject itself to, and even challenge, criticism. Nor can it safely be ignored that as to the particular points in dispute—the supernatural origin of the earth and man, the primeval revelation of God to Israel and the providential training of that people—these concrete and categorical affirmations of the Old Testament form the essential substructure of the doctrine and argumentation of the New. It will be of small avail to surrender the scientific and historic, in hope of retaining the ethic and religious, to a scheme of philosophy whose essential postulates are in their inevitable implications as hostile to the latter as to the former. The same hypothetical processes that demand the displacement of the Mosaic cosmogony and the disintegration and practical evaporation of the Mosaic narrative, not only actually but necessarily imply the emergence of the ethical system of Israel through natural processes out of slow experience, and the gradual filtering of primeval polytheism into a later monotheism. Still more sophisticated is the suggestion that assaults upon the integrity of Scripture may be regarded with comfortable equanimity, because “our faith is not in a book, but in Christ.” In what Christ do we trust, if not the Christ made known to us in the book? A “liberal” preacher not long since enlightened his congregation with the announcement that not Jesus alone, but “Moses, Isaiah, Paul, Savonarola,” are “the Messiahs of the race”—“Berthold Auerbach being the divinely inspired man of the nineteenth century.” He preached in the “church of the Messiah,” but did not have the grace to tell the waiting world to which of these “Messiahs” his church was dedicated. The world will be equally baffled to discover a historic Christ of whom there is no history, and unwilling to trust an ideal Christ to whom no reality corresponds. “We have not a painted sin,” said sober-minded Martin Luther, “and cannot be satisfied with a painted Saviour.” Paul staked the fate of Christianity itself on the concrete actuality of the resurrection, re-enforcing his own testimony with a reference to that of more than five hundred witnesses, most of them still accessible. “If Christ be not raised,” said he, “your faith is vain.” But if we are to retain faith in the Christ of the New Testament, we must frankly accept Him as He is there presented, and as the New Testament itself represents Him as choosing to present Himself; environed with miracle and prophecy and claiming the performance of the one and the fulfilment of the other as legitimate and competent credentials of His Messiahship. The “common people,” who “heard him gladly,” could hardly have inferred from His answer to John’s disciples that He knew the miracles to

wh
En
exp
self
old
“tj
suc
cha
cha
divi
to
only
or c
deg
fai
ther
ism
stat
His
stro
four
noxi
Of
fensi
the
The
inary
natu
quiry
It
the s
sions
new
or w
that
from
howe
obser
procl
the w
their
secul
physi
thetic
the a

which He referred them to be illusive or insignificant; nor would the Emmaus disciples, when "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself," have guessed from His conversation that there was no part of the old Scripture that could be safely attributed to "Moses," nor that the "things" referred to as prophetic were so only to a vagrant fancy. Had such methods been attributed to Him by His friends in that day as are charged upon Him in ours they could with ill grace have resented the charge, "Nay, but he deceiveth the people." "If Jesus was not divine," said Lessing, "He at least said a hundred two-meaning things to lead the people to believe Him so." Was He, then, less candid or only less sagacious than the nineteenth century critics, that He did not or could not emancipate His docile followers from their traditional and degrading faith in the supernatural? In either case why should not faith be transferred from Him to them as more trustworthy? That there was progress in revelation from the callow "childhood" of Mosaism to the riper life of the new era, the Scriptures themselves distinctly state. Our Lord clearly intimated that His doctrine was advanced as His disciples were "able to bear it"—"milk for babes," "meat for strong men." But immaturity or incompleteness are not to be confounded with falsity, nor wise reserve with uncandid acquiescence in noxious error.

Of course there is danger in pertinacious effort to defend the indefensible, but there is equal danger, or greater, in too soon abandoning the defensible, under the mistaken impression that it is immaterial. There is abundant room, therefore, for caution and patience in preliminary inquiry on the part of those who cling to the old faith as to the nature of the issues involved, and the validity of the methods of inquiry adopted by the new criticism.

It would be of course impossible, even to recount in so brief an article the specific conclusions [if they can with any fairness be called conclusions, diverse as they are in detailed feature, and changing with each new essay] of current criticism. No effort will here be made to count or weigh actual results, but only to inquire as to the validity of the claim that results obtained through such agencies and such methods must from the nature of the case command prompt and unhesitating assent, however unpalatable or revolutionary in themselves. For it will be observed that the "great swelling words," made familiar by the orotund proclamations of the oracles of physical science, warning theologians off the whole domain of natural phenomena, promising to abstract from their usurping clutch all "the works and ways of man," claiming for secular discussion the exclusive monopoly of metaphysics as well as physics, leaving to theology only a certain, or rather uncertain, hypothetical field of "hyperphysics;" these are quite in consonance with the autocratic tone of many of the recent utterances of the "higher

criticism." Though greatly averse to a "paper Pope," its votaries seem to see no impropriety in the assumption of infallibility on the part of a linguistic theorist—an infallibility so absolute that merely to hesitate in allegiance is to risk excommunication from the guild of scholarship.

These unique and imperious assumptions are based upon the fact that the so-called "higher criticism" is in the hands of trained specialists, that it is based on palpable facts and conducted on rigorously scientific principles, and with the bloodless impartiality of the scientific spirit. The judgments so reached are confidently affirmed to have almost the authority of mathematic demonstration.

As to the first of these particulars, it is not always sufficiently recognized that the critical and the judicial functions are by no means synonymous; and that the very specialization which by narrowing the field of study and sharpening the discriminating faculty may pre-eminently qualify for the one, may to the same degree disqualify for the other. It is proverbial that the good advocate makes a bad judge; bad in the latter capacity in proportion as he was good in the former. Perhaps no class of thinkers have been more frequently the victims of intellectual stampede, more extravagantly credulous on the one hand or gregariously skeptical on the other than specialists. The enthusiasm of original research, the disproportionate expansion of the subject of vision under steady gaze, the fear of discredit through ultra conservatism, class pride, these and other motives operate unconsciously often to precipitate toward ill-weighed conclusions. That in the purely literary aspects of the questions here considered the opinion of literary experts may have special value seems a reasonable claim. But what is a "literary" as distinguished from a linguistic expert? Clearly the terms are not used as synonymous, and ambiguity at once arises. Linguistic laws are reasonably definite and accessible, and verification of accuracy is possible. Not so in the case of the "literary" decisions, which are supposed to be the utterances of a certain refined and exquisite faculty whose verdicts are beyond review or criticism by ordinary scholarship, being subject to no definite canons. It is hard to understand how an acquaintance, however minute, with Hebrew philology, or a literary taste, however subtle and acute, can alone supply fitness, exclusive fitness especially, for the solution of problems that sweep around the whole horizon of human history and human thought.

It should not be forgotten by those who are summoned to surrender their "traditional" conception of the Pentateuchal narrative, at the bidding of the new criticism, that the very epithet which aims to stigmatize the current view as effete and discredited, does in fact suggest an argument in its behalf. Even "tradition," although of itself inadequate, is yet actual evidence in favor of that which it indorses; evidence that,

weak as it is ordinarily esteemed, must, in the absence of rebuttal, be reckoned conclusive. But tradition does not stand alone in its testimony to the integrity and veracity of the Mosaic record. The figures and philosophy of the New Testament, the direct testimony of our Lord and His apostles, the symmetry of Scripture and of the Pentateuch itself, the affirmations and inevitable implications of the record—all demand the books substantially as they now appear, and lend corroboration, direct as well as circumstantial, to the explicit word of tradition. There is thus a solid body of affirmative and hitherto unassailed evidence on which the current faith reposes.

Against all this there is offered no direct testimony whatever, and no necessarily incongruous circumstance; but mainly internal features alleged to be suspicious or equivocal, with certain conjectural explanations inimical to the integrity and Mosaic authorship of the books.

The weakness of this method of dealing with such a topic is manifest. Every presumption is in favor of the genuineness of a document that comes from proper custody, is consistent in itself, and free from extraneous ground of suspicion or suggestion of motive for mutilation or interpolation. The recognition of occasional apparent blemishes must be so construed as, if possible, to save the integrity of the instrument. If this rule be reversed, the conjectural is at once lifted to equality of credence with the actual, fancy takes the place of judgment, and rational certainty of result is destroyed. Still more unreasonable is the repudiation of such presumption, when it is buttressed by positive testimony and confirmatory circumstances, in behalf of an ingenious and plausible hypothesis, welded out of carefully culled fragmentary items—equivocal, but not irreconcilable with the integrity of the document—a hypothesis which remains, at the best, however widely accepted and greatly applauded, conjectural only. The history of the Darwinian theory thus far may remind us how strong and seemingly conclusive a case may be made in behalf of a proposition, primarily too preposterous to find a patient hearer, by a skillful assortment of facts out of the boundless wealth of nature, woven into consistency by the convenient help of the pliant possibilities of immeasurable space and infinite time. The headlong enthusiasts who, in Prof. Huxley's phrase, were in their eager adoption of it, "like colts let loose in a pasture," are, or at least many of them are, moving at a much slower gait to-day. Surely, if the phenomena of nature afford perilous opportunity for the misleadings of a subtle fancy, the more subtle and arbitrary phenomena of style furnish a still more congenial field for its vagrant play. The detection of idiosyncrasies in the use of words, or apparent incongruities in the tone or texture of the narrative, doubtless imply some possible explanation; but to assume that we may with any confidence, by the help of so slender data, hope to determine which of many conceivable explanations is the true; and, above all, to leap to the conclusion that the only

tolerable explanation is one that tears the record to tatters, reverses the belief that has come down from the neighborhood of the facts themselves and presumably rests on them, and which loosens the bases of subsequent revelation—this is adventurous indeed. Many suggestions might occur, as explaining the translation by King James' revisers of the same Greek word by divers English words; but among the least likely to occur would probably be the explanation which they themselves give, viz., that they "would not seem to put too much honor on a single word." It would not be hard to show that some "redactor" had imposed upon the world, under Emerson's name, a literary pudding-stone, out of which might be picked material to reconstruct divers documents, some polished, some uncouth in style, some theistic, some pantheistic in tone, some clear and continuous in flow, some jagged as the lightning flash. If the incongruities of the text were reckoned real and not apparent, however, their survival in it would seem rather to negative than suggest a "redactor's" hand.

There is still another and more cogent reason for thorough distrust of the conclusions of the new criticism. Not only does it, like the physical scientists, having claimed and received credence as adhering exclusively to the verifiable, surreptitiously transfer its discussions to the realm of the "scientific imagination," assuming equal authority there; it borrows from that same shadowy range its fundamental postulate, to which its whole constructive processes are thenceforth shaped—a postulate that makes surrender as to the ultimate question a condition essential to the discussion of the preliminary one, of what avail will it be, having first consented to the unreality of the supernatural in any case, to engage in discussion of the characteristic of the Pentateuch as bearing upon its alleged Mosaic, and so incidental supernatural origin? It is not claimed that all who accept or defend the new theories of the "documents" or of composite authorship repudiate the supernatural, by any means, but that the originators and chief exponents of the theories in question have been from the beginning saturated with, and their whole scheme and method dominated by, the old Lucretian formula, as revived in our day, that "Nature does all things without the intervention of the gods."

The science of historic criticism is yet new and immature. Recent research and discovery have done much toward reversal of its sweeping evaporation of all early history to myth. The reduction of the fact of history to a scientific order, and definite law, is still further from accomplishment, even if it be practicable at all. The attempt to reconstruct any ancient record by the help of collateral circumstance, supposed canons of natural development, and keenness of literary instinct, subjects all "speculative historians," as Sir George Cornewall Lewis calls them, to the charge of assuming to themselves a certain "occult faculty of divination," demanding thereupon for their utter-

ances a confidence as superstitious as that they are seeking to destroy. When it is proposed to "treat the Bible like any other book," it is lawful to inquire, not only how other books are to be treated, but whether the Bible is, according to its own claims, and in fact, like any other book. Let it be assumed that there is a definite and ascertained law of human progress under natural influences, and that the grade of moral and intellectual attainment so reached at any period may be confidently determined; this will be irrelevant in Bible analysis unless we are prepared in advance to admit that Israel and the Bible came to be what they were and are wholly through natural agencies. This is, in fact, assumed by those who dismember and redistribute the sacred record according to what, as they conclude, must have been the stages of progress reached by Israel in the natural order of growth and enlightenment. Revelation and miracle are, *ex hypothesi*, excluded and prophecy made retrospective or contemporary.

The Bible is not like any other book—in its products, in its insight and foresight, in complex unity of doctrine, in its central and informing Christ, whose testimonies and life-features thrust themselves back, like the genealogic records that introduce His biography, through all the strata of the old record, touching and holding them in place. Israel is as unique as the Old Testament, to which it lingers as custodian, in a kind of posthumous life; the prophecies of that Old Testament being as curiously fulfilled in its dethronement and scattering, because of the repudiation of the Messiah foretold therein, as in the exaltation of the Gentiles who accepted that Messiah and the New Testament *régime* which He brought.

Biblical criticism has its function, and is serviceable in its proper and modest sphere. But "the bumble-bee's theory of the universe" is not likely to reverse Copernicus, and a vagrant and fantastic pencil-point is not likely to puncture hopelessly the faith of men in a supernatural Bible.

II.—SACRED DISCOURSE.

BY PROF. T. W. HUNT, Ph. D., PRINCETON, N. J.

As Theremin, among the Germans, and Pascal, among the French, would insist, all discourse is, in a true sense, sacred. Its ethical element is supreme over all others, mental, emotional or æsthetic. Whatever it may be, as the expression of thought, feeling and taste, it is, above all, the verbal embodiment and expression of character and experience, of that sum-total of an author's being which we call his personality. In this respect, the sermonizer stands on high vantage ground, and homiletic science has to do with the noblest possible form of human composition and address. If Quintilian is correct when he tells us "that the orator is the upright man who understands speaking" we may assert that the sermonizer is the upright man who

understands sermonizing—his uprightness of character, method, nature, and final purpose being an essential condition of his success. It will be our purpose in the present paper to determine, if possible, the essential elements of such an order of compositions. Regarding all the forms of discourse as governed by the same fundamental laws and disclosing the same salient features, we may select the sermon as eminently evincing such laws and features in their generic unity.

I. *Instruction.*—We may speak of this essential under various names. We may call it the intellectual element; the philosophical or logical element; the expository or didactic element. Expression is, first and last, the revelation of thought. The very term “subject” assumes and involves subject-matter. The only demand for authorship, in any sphere, is the possession of ideas sufficiently original and weighty as to demand expression. “Better be dumb,” the old Welsh writer tells us, “than not to be understood.” Better be dumb, we add, than not to be enlightening. Silence is preferable to uninformative utterance. The first thing in authorship of any kind is sense, common sense and educated sense, the communication of knowledge or of truth to those devoid of it or desiring fuller measures of it. The primary position and function of the discourses is that of a teacher of truth. In First-English phrase, he is a *sóp-bora*—a truth-bearer, having a kind of apostolic commission to disciple the nations. From the vast amount of indifferent, negative, unintellectual productions in secular and sacred authorship, one is driven to the conclusion, either that such authors are incapable of high mental work, or are utterly unaware of the responsibilities of their self-assumed functions as teachers of men.

Hence, the need of this substantial element in our writing, so that what we say shall be something more than “from the teeth outward”—a veritable deliverance of our best intellectual selves, in the most trenchant and telling manner—if so be the reader may be enlightened. If we apply this essential of instruction within the area of sacred composition and to the special form of what we call the homily or sermon, we shall see that it admits of no exception. Whatever other features the sermon may rightfully possess in order to its fullest result, it lies, in the very nature and purpose of it, that it must possess the didactic or teaching quality—the distinctively intellectual feature. It must be thoughtful—full of thought, full of mental meat—a veritable food to the hungry reader or hearer. A rapid, senseless sermon, all verbiage and fustian and tinsel, is not only a disgrace to the pulpit, but a contradiction in terms. It were far better for a sermonizer to err on the side of the didactic than on that of the sentimental and effervescent; far better to write as learnedly as did Bishop Butler, or Dr. Barrows, or Nathan L. Rice, than to deal in platitudes and “airy nothings,” and thus unite the judgments of God and of good scholars. If it must be

so, it is far better to be dry and dull than to foam at the mouth or "tear a passion all to tatters."

It is scarcely necessary to say that such an instructive type of sermon must be scriptural. Taking his theme from Scripture itself, the composer must, in the language of the old divine, "hug" the Bible closely. However he may deflect, right or left, from the given line of inspired truth, he is well aware that he must always keep within reach of it and sight of it, and make every sentence that he writes dependent on it and explanatory of it. Instructive sermons, in the sense now contemplated, are such because biblical in phraseology, time and object, and even in their most secular portions are surcharged and permeated with the spirit of the Holy Book. The spectacle that we so often see nowadays, of sermonizers aiming to be "wise above that which is written," or exceptionally smart, is enough in itself to awaken our pity and to express anew the claims of scriptural instruction over those of "science, falsely so-called," or those "of philosophy and vain deceit." The names of Albert Barnes, of Dr. Charles Hodge, of President Mark Hopkins, of John Howe, and John Owen; of Philip Doddridge and Dr. South, occur to us, as we write, as illustrious examples of instructive sermonizers. However the sermons of these respective writers varied in their excellence, they were always full of matter, scriptural, substantial and mentally strengthening. As we read them we feel quickened and uplifted, and look in vain for a paragraph or a sentence that is meaningless and shallow. The leading element in all discourse, we repeat, is thought, so conceived, formulated and expressed that it is made intelligible to the recipient mind, and when it enters the mind at once adds to its stock of knowledge, its stock of truth, and, above all, increases its capacity and ability to seek and secure still larger measures.

II. *Vitality*.—We touch here upon what might be called, in the best sense, the emotional or impassioned element in discourse. Some writers might prefer to call it the oratorical or forensic element. Critics of style would speak of it under such terms as energy, force and cogency. At this point impression is somewhat more prominent than instruction, and the question above all others is, How can the writing be made to have its strongest possible effect upon the mind addressed? The word that we use is the one that we prefer—vitality. All true expression, oral or written, essay, address, dissertation and sermon, should be interiorly vital. It should be full of life-living and life-giving, pervaded with quickening energy, impulsive and expulsive, proceeding from opening to ending, with an ever-accelerated momentum, and so fixing itself in the innermost heart of the reader and hearer. All genuine discourse is possessed of the *vis viva*. It is spirited and inspiring, stimulating all dormant faculties and feelings

and ; because full of the very spirit of life itself, sending the pulsations of life throbbing through the souls of men. Here, again, how we rebuke, in this essential, much of the secular and sacred discourse of the day, in its lamentable lack of vital force ! How much mechanical, artificial, soulless authorship ! How much unnatural and unpardonable lethargy in the composition of pulpit productions ; manufacturing discourses, as we say, rather than composing them under the best and strongest impulses of the heart, when feeling is at its fullest, when "the fire burns" and we must give utterance to that which is in us.

On the secular side the one quality or principle that will best express what we here mean by vitality is, personality. A writer is vital when he expresses himself in his full measure and in his own way. He may lack this or that, may pass to this or that extreme, but he will never fail in such instances of being cogent and impressive. The bane of much of our discourse, at this point, is servility. We think in the thoughts of others, and therefore artificially. We speak in the words of others, and therefore dependently. Mere interpreters or automatons, we surrender what identity we have, and are therefore impotent. Personality is power. On the sacred side this quality comes to its best expression in Christian personality, in character, in spirituality. Other things being equal, that sermonizer is the most vital who is the most spiritual. Sermons that are characteristically spiritual are thereby living. It is the spirit of power that is in them and in their respective authors as they pen them. Given the presence of this divine agent in the heart and the presence of a distinctively saintly character in the man, what limit should be placed to that specifically vital quality which the sermon should exhibit ? It should fairly beat and throb with life, while those who read it and hear it should be spiritually kindled and fired, and incited to all that is good. In the light of such a homiletic essential what a goodly list of names confronts us ! We note but a few : Knox and Latimer, Whitefield and the Wesleys, Baxter and Payson, Larned and Summerfield. These men were, in the best sense, possessed ; on fire with zeal for God and the truth ; writing, as they wrote, from the soul out ; and, with all their faults and shortcomings, never guilty of the sin of lifelessness.

General authorship and, most of all, sacred authorship is in need of this element. What the French writers call *unction* is one of the expressions of this vitality. It is an outpouring of soul upon the page and, in open address, by the voice. It is a self-revelation and deliverance, not for the sake of self, but for the sake of the truth. No form of composition can less easily dispense with it than the sermon. The Word of God is "quick and powerful." The messenger of that Word should be all alive and aglow with a sense of its value and of his duty in defending and diffusing it.

One of the objects of the poet Cowper's righteous scorn is an indifferent preacher of the Word. The true herald, as he indicates to us in his "Task," must be alert and alive :

" Much impressed himself,
As conscious of his awful charge,
And anxious mainly that the flock he feeds
May feel it, too ; affectionate in look,
And tender in address, as well becomes
A messenger of grace to guilty men."

III. *Attractiveness.*—In this essential we are referring to the artistic or æsthetic side of discourse, to its external structure rather than to its inner character and quality. As distinct from the elements already discussed, the intellectual and the impassioned, this is specifically literary, having primarily to do with form and finish. Its leading object is so to present the truth in hand, secular or sacred, as to secure to it the best outward embodiment in the best of good taste. At this point, the instructiveness and vitality of the production being already secured, the composer is chiefly concerned with its attractiveness. Hence, he must be substantially familiar with the well-established principles of literary criticism ; must know the demands of written expression as one of the fine arts ; must be able to distinguish between an idea in its crudest essence and such an idea made æsthetically attractive, so as to satisfy that "sense of beauty" to which the late Matthew Arnold so often referred. Nor is such a quality to be underestimated. Conceding, as we must, the rightful priority of the other essentials, it is not to be forgotten that this also is an essential, having its place and claims, and without the substantial presence of which no written production can be said to be classic and complete. Literary finish has its function, and because often carried to an extreme, as in the pages of Dr. Nott, Jeremy Taylor and Dr. Guthrie, is not to be condemned and ignored. Intelligent and, especially, liberally educated laymen are not slow in calling our attention to the lack of literary execution on the part of the clergy. They tell us that such an order of finished homiletic product as that given us by Frederic Robertson of Brighton, William Ellery Channing of Cambridge, James W. Alexander, Drs. Sprague, Kirk, Chapin, Adams and Bishop Simpson, should be more frequently manifested in English and American pulpit address, and they tell us rightly. We are not speaking now of homilies of the laity, nor of types and modes of discourse that generally obtain among evangelists and exhorters, and which, in their proper place, have a mission. We are speaking of the higher grades of sacred discourse as the product of a well-trained clergy when we say that much of this criticism is in point, and that in the light of the advancing intelligence of the day the ordained expositors of the truth must see to it that the truth be conveyed

in comely and cultivated forms, so that a man's literary taste may not be offended before his conscience is reached. We owe it as sermonizers to the large body of professional men in our more representative churches to address them in terms of taste, and even in the smaller towns and suburban parishes of the land the general culture of the people is so progressing that the pulpit must take note of it. As we have insisted elsewhere, the Christian ministry has, as an important part of its office, the best literary culture of the people, the promotion of their taste, the direction of their reading and the determination of their literary standards. We are not to be misunderstood here as exalting the literary above the mental and spiritual, or as giving it a place which it does not deserve. We are, however, assigning it a place above that accorded it by popular and even clerical criticism, nor can the ablest and the best of us afford to write and deliver our discourses in violation of the acknowledged principles of artistic expression. The English sermonizer should be so well versed in the general content of English literature, so conversant with the best uses and requirements of his vernacular speech, so familiar with the fundamental qualities of English style and the accepted canons of æsthetic criticism, that those for whom he writes should be thereby disciplined in taste and sentiment.

The model sermon is instructive, vitally impressive and always in good taste. There is no virtue whatever in graceless diction, in unfinished structure, in confused imagery and in the open violation of style, and it is reserved for our divinity schools to press with greater emphasis than ever the need of the humanities in homiletic discourse.

We have thus alluded, in brief, to the three great essentials of written expression, especially as exhibited in sacred address, and we have stated them in the order of their relative value. Each is essential, and yet essential in different degrees. The master homilist is he who apprehends them in their true relations and so expresses them. The English and American pulpit has not been *without* such masters. The names of Robert Hall, Thomas Chalmers, Addison Alexander, Drs. Hitchcock and Bellows, and Bishop Stevens are enough to indicate the character of the catalogue, while even now there are among us not a few who evince, in all that they write and speak, that organic union of intellect, sensibility and taste which is as philosophical as it is potent, and which always marks the master-workman. In all discourse, sacred and secular, written and oral, the head, the heart and the hand must interact to a common end. There must be conception, impression and execution; light, heat and color. To realize the fullest possible expression of these elements in separate and conjoint action is the work of the discourseser.

III.—CRITICISMS ON SOME OF THE ABLEST REPRESENTATIVE PREACHERS OF THE DAY.

BY AN EMINENT PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS.

NO. VII.—REV. JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D.

PART II.

I HAVE thus far dealt wellnigh exclusively with the general traits of Dr. Broadus's preaching, and found nothing, or almost nothing, except praise. Is Dr. Broadus, then, a faultless preacher? my readers will be ready, with sage incredulity, to ask. I can fancy the "slow, wise smile" with which the subject himself of this criticism would gently reprove even a confessed eulogist whom he should hear making the preposterous claim of freedom from fault on any preacher's behalf. No, Dr. Broadus has his faults, or rather his imperfections. I make this distinction, for with his ideal of preaching I am delightfully contented; but his attainment falls short at points. To begin with, his style is not all that it should be. It is a good style, it is a very good style; but it ought to be better. Clearer it could not well be; clearer, that is to say, than in general it is, for an occasional sentence leaves even him something to be desired. Take this for example:

"Just a little while after he [Paul] uttered these words [about divine predestination], from which men want to infer that the man who believes *it* need not feel concerned for his salvation or for the salvation of others, just a little after, came the passionate words of the text ['For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren']. Nor is that all, for you will find just following the text, where he speaks of Esau and Jacob, that God made a difference between them before they were born, and where he says of Pharoah that God raised him up that he might show his power in him, and that God's name might be declared throughout all the earth."

In that prayer the italicized pronoun *it* is not readily referred to its proper antecedent; it even *appears* to have been carelessly misemployed for "*them*" to represent "*words*." ("His salvation" should probably be "*his own* salvation.") But it is the last sentence of the quotation preceding that I find to be singularly obscure. The only clearing of it that has occurred to me involves the looseness in syntax in making the clause "where he speaks of Esau," etc., the object of the verb "find." The construction is no doubt simply an infelicity of extemporization not corrected in the course of revision for the press.

It is proper now to remind ourselves that any fair or wise appreciation of Dr. Broadus's style in preaching must be an appreciation of it, regarded as spoken, and not as written, style. For Dr. Broadus is an extemporary preacher, and these printed sermons of his bear, the most of them, inseparable internal marks of remaining still very much in the same form of syntax and of rhetoric in which, having never been

written, they originally flowed from the speaker's lips. This fact duly considered, the style is remarkably free from faults. Faults, however, it has; and its faults are precisely such as extemporization naturally, almost necessarily, engenders. The virtues of it much more than compensate; and of its virtues, too, it may be said that they are precisely those peculiar to extemporary discourse—naturalness, directness, familiarity, ease. But these virtues might conceivably exist without the faults which are so apt to accompany them—negligences of various sorts, looseness in construction, grammatical slips, ill-chosen words, and so forth. Careful note of the sentences just quoted will find several illustrations in point. Gleaning here and there through other pages we light on an occasional sentence like this: "None of our divisions of sect, of country, or of race, is half so hard to overcome as was that question of the junction of Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian." "To overcome" a "question" is of course hardly a defensible form of expression. An occasional negligence of the sort is certainly excusable, it is perhaps scarcely avoidable in extemporary discourse; but Dr. Broadus would have been warranted in correcting thoroughly enough not to let such appear in the printed volume. What is noticeable, and in the highest degree commendable, is that the *thought* with this preacher is never negligent, never hasty, never crude. He does not *think* extemporarily.

Let me dispatch at once my finding of petty faults in Dr. Broadus's style. "Among his remarkable combination of mental qualities" is certainly not good English. "With all his abilities and inspiration, men often heard [Paul] without heeding" is a sentence in which the first clause has no proper syntax. "It" is without antecedent, and the antecedent for "them" is ambiguous in the following sentence: "I am trying to ascertain what books they were which Jesus and the apostles declared to be divine, and I learn beyond a doubt that the Jews who heard *them* understood, without fail and without exception, that *it* meant precisely what we call the Old Testament." "May be" is repeatedly used for "it may be," in the sense of "perhaps." The Scotch form "proven" for "proved" occurs. "Gotten" seems to be preferred to "got." "Cranky" is an adjective rather graphic than in proper taste. "Poor sticks" is a colloquialism of which the same may be said: "It is just wonderful" condescends too much. "Right hard" does not displease, but it is, I suppose, to be regarded as a provincialism of the South and Southwest.

Dr. Broadus deals sparingly in quotations from literature, although wide reading and fine culture on his part are made evident enough. Addison's generally misquoted line, "The wrecks of matter and the crush of worlds," Dr. Broadus gives in its ordinary inaccurate form, "The wreck," etc. "Wreck of matter" expresses a different thought from the thought of Addison, and one too metaphysical for poetry—if

rather, indeed, it be not properly an unthinkable thing, "the wreck of matter." There might be the annihilation of matter; but matter wrecked is still matter, and that it was, and strictly nothing else than matter, before the wrecking. There may be wrecks of matter, that is, wrecks consisting of matter; but a wreck of matter collectively considered is impossible to thought. The moral of all which metaphysics is: Be accurate in your quotations.

But a more serious example of negligence in this regard on Dr. Broadus's part occurs in a passage adduced by me, some pages back, in favorable illustration of his manner. In that passage he quotes Lord Bacon as follows: "Truth from any other source is like water from a cistern, but truth drawn out of the Bible is like drinking water from a fountain, *immediately there it springeth.*" Here the agreeably archaic and individual expression which I italicize is absolutely the only phrase, and it is almost the only word, accurately preserved by the preacher from his original, which, condensed, reads thus: "This divine water . . . is first forced up into a cistern, and from thence fetched and derived for use; or else it is drawn and received in buckets and vessels *immediately where it springeth.*" This fresh, fountain-like phrase Dr. Broadus remembered, and no wonder. The rest he evolved, as he had a perfect right to do, especially since for his own present purpose he improved upon the original. (He might, I am bound to say, have improved a little upon his own improvement, for instance, by saying, "But truth out of the Bible is like water drawn from a fountain, *immediately there it springeth.*") What I now point out as constituting negligence, on Dr. Broadus's part, not to be commended, is the *printing* of the passage in such a way as to credit Bacon with language that Bacon never used. The express quotation might have been limited to the one picturesque phrase actually reproduced. The remainder would then have stood for exactly what it is, namely, Dr. Broadus's free and effective report of Bacon's observation—which, by the way, is to be found near the end of the "Advancement of Learning."

After these "small tithings" of criticism, I must guard myself against being misunderstood. I would not by any means have the preacher a purist or a precisian in speech. On the contrary, let him enjoy his freedom. His rightful latitude is just. I have instanced negligences such as I think ought to be avoided. Now let me show an example or two of negligences such as the preacher may feel at perfect liberty to indulge. Here is a sentence, admirable for its meaning, and admirable, as I think, for the preacher in form with which the meaning is expressed:

"People don't know about believing the preacher nowadays, and a great many people don't know about acknowledging the authority of a church as they once did; but the people who come to hear the gospel, if you bring them something right out of the Bible, not a broken, dead fragment, but a

part of the living whole, full of the true, divine life, and show them its meaning as God has taught it, and lay that meaning, explained, upon their hearts and lives, the people everywhere respond to that; they like it; they feel that that is good."

Another example:

"When the various writings of inspired men had all been completed and began to be thought of as one collection, complete in itself, and when men began to know that singular and beautiful harmony which pervades so wonderfully all this great collection of books, written by so many men, through so many long centuries, perceiving that it was not only a complete collection of books, but that they were all in harmony with each other, then the idea grew upon the Christian mind that this was really one book."

The foregoing sentences would not be admirable as specimens of written style; but as specimens of spoken style they are, it seems to me, notwithstanding their inelegant verbal repetitions, and their somewhat formless syntax, worthy of praise. They serve at least to show by contrast what sort of negligences in form I, for my part, would hold to be fairly admissible in extemporary preaching. Such discourse as these quotations exemplify is exactly in the nobly permanent of utterance commended to the lover of good oratory by the use and example of great masters, like John Bright in the art of popular harangue.

I feel obliged once again to redress my balance of praise and objection. Dr. Broadus, even in his more elaborated careful discourse, discourse which may be supposed to have been written beforehand, with studious pains, does not show himself quite so heedful as he might properly be to meet the instinctive demand of the ear in the matter of rhythm and harmony of style. Take this following sentence for example, it occurs in an academic discourse delivered before the Society of Alumni of the University of Virginia; one wonders how the writer should not have shunned the shock to the ear of the "now" here twice occurring in similar places, so near to each other, of pause and emphasis:

"It is a thought not strange to the bosom of any reflecting instructor, a thought tending to humility, and yet to honest pride in the true power of his calling, that centuries to come men may recognize as his chief claim to their gratitude, the influence he exerted upon another; yea, that highly and as deservedly honored as he is *now*, posterity may remember him at all, only for having been the teacher of one who sits *now*, a modest lad scarce noticed among his pupils."

Charm is present everywhere in Dr. Broadus's discourse; but it is seldom a charm carried to the last, the consummate degree, by exquisite rhetorical form. You constantly feel that the orator is too intent on what he will say to be quite sufficiently solicitous as to how he will say it—excepting always, or almost always, that he will say it in a manner to have it instantly understood. The supreme mood of feeling will, however, sometimes usurp the man, and nature then will snatch a grace in expression beyond the reach of art,—as witness the pathos and

honesty of the following passage from a memorial discourse on a young colleague of the speaker's, fallen from his side in the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky :

"Eight years ago we buried with the deepest sense of loss our oldest professor, who had been with us from the beginning. What a shock, that the next to pass away should be our youngest ! We cannot but feel like parents grown gray when called to bury a son in all his youthful prime. It is a mournful experience. God help us. And can I more say ? Three years ago the orange blossom, and now these flowers, that vainly essay to smile upon a scene too full of sadness. O pitying heavens, drop down the dews of your consolation ; O pitying angels, doubtless ye care, but ye know not, O angels, the sweet, sweet human love, the bitter, bitter human sorrow. O sympathizing Saviour, thou didst weep with sisters beside a brother's grave, and thou knowest, thou knowest, O Saviour, that here is a grief still harder to bear. O Holy Ghost, the Comforter, come now and comfort. O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort, the father of the fatherless and the widow's God, come quick and uphold one who strives to be brave and calm as she leads forth into life the tottering steps of her fatherless little boy."

There is a tradition that Æschines, banished from Athens after his defeat by Demosthenes in the famous contest of eloquence between the two orators, read to his pupils at Rhodes his great rival's oration on the cross, and on their applauding and praising it, generously said, "You should have heard the rascal deliver it himself !" And if the readers of this paper think the passage just shown them beautiful in print, I can strongly say, "You should have heard it from the lips of its author !" There is a strand of pathos in tone braided inseparably into the speech of Dr. Broadus which must have given a peculiar, all-subduing effect to such a passage of eloquence as the foregoing.

Concerning the structure of the sermon in Dr. Broadus's hands, it may be said generally that it is excellent, judged, as of course the structure of sermons ought always to be judged, with reference to the particular object had in view on the particular occasion. That object is usually well chosen, and it is usually sought with oratoric wisdom. Now and then there seems to be matter introduced which, though valuable indeed in itself—Dr. Broadus's matter is always valuable—does not belong closely enough to the present specific main purpose to be served. An instance of this occurs in the sermon entitled "Ask, and it shall be given you," where a page of introduction is devoted to demonstrating the absurdity of Professor Tyndall's "prayer-test," so-called. Such a digression in a sermon, vivid in interest at the proper moment, belongs among the things that perish with the perishing original occasion. Again, the introduction to the sermon on "Worship" is one which would be equally appropriate to a sermon on any other subject than the actual one suggested by the Saviour's conversation with the woman of Samaria—the introduction consisting of a luminous and interesting comment on the Saviour's conduct of the interview, a com-

ment which might perhaps better have been given in connection with a preliminary pulpit reading of the chapter.

The progress of thought is in general manifest and uninterrupted from the beginning to the end of a sermon. I note, however, what seems to be an exception. Occurring in the sermon entitled "Let us have peace with God." The preacher closes with the exhortation of his text repeated as still applicable even in the face of things that might seem to make obedience to it impossible: "Let us," he says, "have peace with God notwithstanding our unworthiness." This is enlarged upon, and then the preacher continues: "Again, let us have peace with God, though we are still sinful and unholy." If there is true progress here certainly the progress is not so obvious as it ought to be.

One receives the impression in reading the contents of Dr. Broadus's volume collectively, that the author has made the sermons and addresses here published, perhaps in some measure, a repository for the ripest and best results of a lifetime of experience, observation and thought. The sermons do not read quite like a selection of sermons produced in the course of ordinary pastoral labor. They are rich in intellectual and spiritual worth, but they do not make you feel sure that the author could publish volume after volume of sermons approximately as good. The question of fecundity on the orator's part remains an open question in one's mind. You are clear as to the quality of his production; as to the quantity of it, that might or it might not reach a correspondingly high mark. This consideration, joined to the consideration that it is charm rather than power which makes itself chiefly felt in Dr. Broadus's eloquence, alone gives me pause in pronouncing the subject of the present paper a peer in the peerage of the world's greatest preachers. A few more volumes of such sermons as he has published—such, but with the pulse of power somewhat more unmistakably in them—and his title to his rank would be complete. Already, if doubtfully as yet among the greatest of preachers, he is something better than that, unquestionably among the best.

IV.—WOMAN AS A FACTOR IN AMERICAN POLITICS.

By PROF. JOHN BASCOM, D.D., WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.

THOUGHTFUL American citizens feel that we have on hand in this nation a social and political problem most difficult and most critical. If a favorable solution is not impossible, it is yet one that will tax to the utmost the wisdom of the wise and the goodness of the good. Its chief danger lies—or is thought to lie—in universal suffrage, taken in connection with the lack of intelligence and moral strength in large numbers of our citizens. It is not strange, therefore, that many look with apprehension at the effort to extend suffrage to woman. They

regard it as adding difficulties to difficulties that already threaten us with defeat.

While our duties as American citizens are very grave, and demand on our part constant recognition and faithful performance, we have this encouragement, that what we do is done in support of an advanced principle, and that our success carries with it the fundamental conditions of general social well-being. It is no makeshift that we are defending, no temporary position that we are holding. If we win, we lay the unmistakable foundations of a true national life. The intelligence and virtue which are the conditions of progress will grow by progress, and, if we hold this advanced outpost of liberty, many other gains will fall readily into our hands. If we have a large work to do, we have also the most comprehensive motives for doing it.

In the rapid extension that is now being given to the political action of woman, we do but carry our principles to their inevitable outcome. There is additional safety in this very completeness and consistency of our attitude. We cease to set up any defense against any class of citizens by depriving them of common privileges, and enter the open arena of universal rights determined to make good our cause on pure grounds of reason. The political power of woman will not be to us an additional embarrassment, but an essential term in the freedom of a free community. We may hope something from the very fact that our political activities cover the entire field and are open to all its actions and reactions—its corrections within itself.

We apprehend more evils and anticipate more gains from changes in social and civic forms than usually belong to them. These forms are not altered till a very considerable modification of feeling and action has prepared the way for the new method, and the change thus expresses but one stage in a protracted and fundamental movement. No more marked transformation has taken place in American society in the past thirty years than that indicated by our present estimate of the duties, influence and education of woman. That man would be very obtuse in observation and backward in thought who should even doubt that this very radical alteration of feeling had not been in a high degree useful. Political influence and universal suffrage are but one phase of this growth. They complete it and remain themselves to be completed by it. We can hardly look with alarm at the progress of a tendency which has brought with it at every stage so much light and power. Nor will this later gain separate itself from those that have gone before with any violent and pronounced change. We shall have simply taken one more step forward when all our steps have been in that direction. The national safety will still remain to be achieved by wisdom and virtue, though all the forces involved, good and bad, will have been made a little more urgent, a little more fluent. We believe the forces working for our prosperity will receive, on the

whole, by the presence of woman in our political action, a distinct increase.

The faulty externals of politics, caucuses called in saloons, boisterous and profane speech, unsuitable places for the polls, the uncleanness and disorder of legislative bodies, will receive a decisive check by the presence of woman. These improved accidents will help to correct the inner temper which they in part express.

Corruption in politics arises chiefly from a slow growth in power of a political class with which moral sentiments are weak and personal motives are strong, and which retains its influence by complicated political machinery, and by the indifference and indolent concession of good men. Anything which breaks uniformity in political sentiment, weakens the cohesive force of parties, renders political machinery less effective, tends decisively against corruption, and brings once more into the foreground the real reasons of action.

There is a clear line of division between the ways in which men and women look at the same questions. The two poles of thought are sexual. Natural tendencies, more or less distinct, and a distinct discipline, have confirmed this separation of intellectual methods. Conventional sentiment has unreasonable force with both men and women, but it is in the two cases conventional sentiment of a somewhat different kind. A man will regard some things impossible, socially impossible, impossible under claims to which he readily submits himself, which a woman will think not only may be done, but ought to be done. Men, in gaining and using power wrongfully, whether in politics or in business, fortify themselves against attack by these moral defenses of conventional feeling, by what is customary, familiar and approved in method, by what smacks of honor. These cobwebs of the mind have, with men once subject to them, great binding power, and it is by means of them, very largely, that politicians, without inner soundness, maintain their hold on politics and their influence in the State. Reason and conscience in good citizens run in the grooves prepared for them, and rarely take up, in independent thought, first principles.

Add to this conventional way in which men regard familiar political facts the sentiments which sway the minds of women, and we shall find that the two will give us new occasions of reflection, and open up the various subjects of action to more fundamental discussion. It is not necessary to suppose that the current element in the convictions of women is any better than that in the convictions of men. It is different, and out of this difference grows the opportunity for more profound consideration and bolder action. A political slate will be more readily broken, and a sagacious calculation of political chances will be, from the very outset, less possible. It is the ruts in the political road which put it into the possession of political teamsters, and these are formed by the narrow force of habit. Widen the spiritual and social

area, and it will be correspondingly more difficult to assert and maintain corrupt control. An unsophisticated man or woman may make some strange assertions, but they may also break easily through barriers which unwisely rule more sagacious minds. The independence of women, growing out of a diverse form of experience, will tend in politics to interpose a new and perplexing obstacle to those approved methods by which the corrupt win power and hold it. They will constitute a less manageable element than do good men in politics. They will bolt more readily and firmly a policy they do not approve.

Just here may be raised again the familiar objection that we are about, by this enlargement of action, to destroy woman, to lose one beautiful type of character in domestic life instead of winning an additional one in political life. Those who make this difficulty and cherish these fears have a much slighter estimate of the force of sexual differences than do those who approve this free participation of all in the common fields of thought and action. The sexual distinction is so radical, so pervasive, so entirely beyond the reach of the will, that it is sure to assert itself at its own value. Because of this, its inscrutable and authoritative assertion, is it that we need its presence everywhere in a life that is so strictly common in its duties and its enjoyments. We fully believe in the supplementary forces of the life we lead, men and women, and, therefore, we believe that it is not good for either sex to be alone in things which concern them both. The power of women to correct politics lies in their ability to take a different view from men of political relations, their inability to take precisely the same view.

This native difference in tendency is further fortified by the fact that the interests of society bear diversely on the two sexes. Sex goes far to define the direction of work; while it is in this direction of one's labor that his practical knowledge and experience accumulate.

Some reason against the participation of women in politics because of the diversity of duties which belong to them, while it is this very fact of peculiar and important offices, primarily committed to them, which especially qualifies them to have a voice in public matters. If they did but give a feeble echo of what is more loudly spoken elsewhere, this participation would be less urgent.

This is especially seen in the relation of woman to the household. It is a fundamental feature in human society that we are set in families. The family is the first organic unit. Its improvement must go before all social progress. Relationships, with the duties and liabilities and pleasures that spring from them, must be first discussed, understood and practically enforced in the home. Here is found the divine discipline of the moral nature under the strongest, most constant, most tender incentives. The germinant points of social growth are developed and brought forward in the family. Men are less aware than women of this cardinal fact, and less effective in shaping it.

In the strong tendency of our time to individuation, to purely personal rights, we fail to give the home that adequate and loving oversight which belongs to it. If the natural affections are insufficient, society and law, for the most part, miscarry; and utter want and desolation are allowed to enter and scatter the household. In the masculine mind, the freedom of trade often goes for more than the freedom of life, and the State is thought to owe more to property interests, already under the guard of bearded men, than to personal well-being, from the nature of the case, subject to the caprice and violence of others. The helplessness of childhood, the burdens of injury that are to fall on the next generation, plead less with them than do the immediate opportunities of money-making. This folly can hardly overtake women, whose life is in the household, who are its guardians, and whose vision outward over the world starts from and returns to this true center of human welfare. It is not fitting that men, who more frequently inflict the wrongs which the home suffers, should, uncounseled and unaided by woman, determine the extent and nature of the protection cast over the home by the State. Women on this subject are as much wiser than men as they are nearer to the heart of humanity and the grace of God.

Any law which touches the formation of the home, or which in any way defines the rights of its inmates, like laws of divorce, or which determines the education of children, ought to come under the criticism of women. No woman can create a home or bear it prosperously forward who is not full of the wisdom of tenderness and authority, and able to aid in defining its outer relations as well as its inner force. The success of civic law turns very much on this very fact—a recognition in their true character of all the interests intrusted to the household. Some, at least, of these interests cannot be fully voiced save by the women to whom they immediately pertain.

The value in political counsel of this diversity of duties is farther enhanced by a quicker response to spiritual impulses on the part of women than on the part of men. This more ready activity of the moral sentiments is due to a richer endowment of affections and to a discipline less closely bound to conventional ideas, more especially those which institute and control the all-pervasive struggle for wealth. All are immersed, but men are more deeply immersed than women, in current life. There is great difficulty in recognizing the moral forces operative in the present, and in forecasting their results. Especially is this true when the evils under consideration are subtle and pervasive. As a rule, society, involved in vice, passes on and is punished. Every man and woman that helps to disclose the forces that underlie the world and rule it is a divine gift. Many of these words of wisdom we have incontinently smothered, because they have come from the yearning motherhood of the race. Contempt of this oracle of God passes

from the boy to the man, and neither our lives nor our politics will be purified till we are led reverently back to it. The wisdom that is learned at a mother's knee, the wisdom that issues spontaneously from the deep-seated and pure affections of the human spirit is never truly understood unless it goes with us as a divine presence all through our lives.

We are not to look on politics as something alien to our social life. It is this sentiment which is the constant occasion of perversion and corruption. Politics only represent the simpler and stronger principles which run through that life, and bind it together. Women will purify politics, because politics will strengthen and broaden women. The social and the political phases of thought will, by their intervention, blend more fully, and more fully correct each other. Results will be judged, where they are to be judged, in their effects on the complex life we are leading in households and communities.

Social life means unity more than anything else, the strengthening of each interest by all interests, the limitation of personal action by the general welfare. The seclusion of women is the great barrier to this organic development, is the artificial line of division on which many of the moral forces of the world break and are wasted. Our admiration of woman is admiration not sufficiently sustained by respect; our reverence, a reverence not raised to the limits of fear. The imperiousness of manhood, brutal or willful or uncorrected by moral wisdom, needs the restraint of purified and commanding affections. The tenderness of womanhood, weak or unwise or distrustful of its own rights, calls for that enlargement which comes with the sense of power. Because men and women are complementary, not in one relation only, but in all relations, they must, in all relations, work together, if they are to attain that fullness of life which is purity of life.

V.—THE LOVE OF THE SPIRIT.

BY ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.

PAUL is closing that letter of love no less than of law to the Romans. He begs their prayers that he may be delivered from evil men, accepted in a special service for Jerusalem, prospered in a missionary journey, and returned to them in joy. "I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, that you strive together with me in your prayers to God for me."* The motives urged seem to be of equal honor as sources of power. What is this love of the Spirit? What is its value in spiritual life and service? The scope of the Spirit's work viewed in relation to our Bible, our Lord, and His church, may answer these questions.

The Bible, whether history, law, poetry, devotion, prophecy, expe-

* Romans xv : 30.

rience or doctrine, in the fragrance as of holy oil, the sweetness as of honey, or the power throughout as of the living God, in its revealings or hidings, its writers or years of preparation, is one book, the work of one mind. "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit."

If left to their dim light, fitful memories and many prejudices, what would they have written? Eleven men after three years' training would begin to preach Jesus and the resurrection. What they remembered of Him would be a treasure, but yet a very different book from the New Testament. With little love for Gentiles, none for Samaritans, and blind to the spirituality of His kingdom, they stumbled at His going away and were ever slow of heart to believe until the Spirit opened their eyes.

To revive the truth from the grave of forgetfulness in the apostles' minds is hardly less important than the resurrection of the First-begotten from the dead. Our history of redemption is in words which the Spirit teacheth, who nothing changed, or shaded, or weakened, of all that Jesus said to friend or foe. Hence, it is the Spirit's gospel also, for what Jesus heard from the Father He fully taught, and what Jesus taught the Spirit faithfully preserved. The earth-born find much written in cipher; those born from above, in Jesus the book-opener, find the key to every secret.

To prove Jesus is Lord, believe on Him, confess His name, quote His words, sum up His life, or find His place in the world, we can do nothing without the Spirit. "No man can say Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Spirit." Jesus preached, wrought miracles, taught His disciples and was declared to be the Son of God by Him.* Every bit of fixed truth about our Lord, the Spirit gives us under His hand and seal. Viewing the teaching, serving, suffering life as a whole, it is written, "Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself to God."

Jesus left neither books nor MSS. Facing death weighted with truths even the beloved John could not bear, He made the Spirit guardian of His reputation, and sole executor of His last will and testament. The Spirit of Truth will perfect the Holy Book and will glorify the Holy Man. The living, the dying and the reviving, the enthroning, the interceding and the coming again will be "justified in the Spirit."

To trace His love in those who are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit, whose very bodies are His temples, we must begin with men as blind, leprous, dead—terms we dare not change. These bodies of death must be born from above and become holy to inherit the throne of glory. Spiritual life has its source in the Holy Spirit.

Andrew, finding Simon, brought him to Jesus. Who kept him? When expedient that Jesus should go away, the Spirit abode with Peter. "In all Israel's affliction He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them." In all their journeyings the Spirit journeys with

* Luke iv : 14; Matthew xii : 28; Acts i : 2; Romans i : 4.

the sheep, and the love of the Spirit restores them to the fold. The kindled light failing, the Spirit in love feeds it, until the Peters and the Thomases become stars and suns in the universe of truth. To follow the wanderer, cling to him, wrestle with him as in a duel, ward off a legion of demons, and draw him with the cords of a man back to God, is a labor of love to the Spirit. John Owen well says, "The principle or fountain of all His actings for our consolation is His own great love and infinite condescension. He willingly proceeded from the Father to be our Comforter. He knew who we were and what we could do, and what would be our dealings with Him. He knew we would grieve Him, provoke Him, quench His motions, defile His dwelling-place, and yet He would come to be our Comforter. Want of due consideration of this great love of the Holy Spirit weakens all the principles of our obedience. We lose both the power and the pleasure of our obedience for want of this consideration."

His work varies; now He destroys, now restores, now reveals wondrous things, now endues with special gifts, now confirms unto eternal salvation. Regeneration, justification, adoption, illumination, intercession, renewal, sealing, sanctification, resurrection are ascribed to Him. Proof texts would take more room than this article. Consider one doctrine only.

Reconciliation to the mysteries of the divine nature, the sovereignty of the divine will, the exclusiveness of salvation, and to God's providences is not a little thing. Men have been so unhinged through one or more of these as to lose the spirit and part with the very form of piety, even. Rejecting such truths rids one of more than mystery, for with them drop off the fear of perishing, and the need of regeneration, of a sacrifice, and of a sanctifier. The deceitful heart can hail the divine wisdom in nature and hate it in grace, track it through creation with fervor and trample on it in redemption with contempt, laud it in a star and scorn it in the Sun of righteousness. Except the Spirit love this blind man and open his eyes he cannot see the King in His beauty.

You search the Scriptures to trace the life-offering as a scarlet thread; here, too, in streams of water clear as crystal runs the love of the Spirit. Whitefield, as a sharp, two-edged sword, Grellet, as the dew of Hermon, had both extraordinary power. They recall the two object-lessons which illustrate the Spirit's being and work—the dove, or gentleness and love, and the tongue of fire, or power and love. The last page of Grellet's "Journal" may show how, despite bigotry and tradition, he drew so many to the truth. He had formed the habit of "keeping a single eye to the putting forth of the divine Spirit."

Teach the love of the Spirit to emphasize His equality with the Father and the Son. His mission, like Christ's, is to the world. Paul going to Spain, sought prayer by the Lord, and on account of His love, by the Spirit also. Do missionaries so plead to-day? Do pastors and

secretaries, in raising funds, urge the love of the Spirit? Who kindles with zeal and hope for men when His love is named? It is written, "God is love"; we all say, "Jesus is love"; but who says, "The Spirit is love?" As God's love is illustrated by deeds, and not defined, so the Spirit's love appears in works. The Acts of the Apostles might be called the Acts of the Holy Spirit.

While Jesus's work widely differs from the Spirit's, they cannot differ in the will or the love with which each works. He, in human form, must live as a servant, suffer shame, and die; but the Spirit has no manger with its lowliness, no Gethsemane with its bitter cup, no Golgotha with its deep darkness and heaven-rending cry. Humility, agony and desertion show His love, who, bringing many sons unto glory, is made perfect through sufferings. Sent by the Father, not one jot of the royal freeness with which He came is abated. Sent forth by the Father and the Son, the Spirit fully and freely gives Himself, with like royal heartiness, to dwell in the church and in the believer.

Showing the Son's does not dim the Father's love, nor will the Spirit's love hide Christ's. Two extremes threaten peril—God's love exaggerated, the atonement becomes a panorama, sentimental and horrible; the Spirit's gifts exaggerated, both Father and Son are robbed of power and honor. A true doctrine of the Spirit bars out both errors and keeps the balance of Scripture. What the Spirit saith is as much the power of God to guide the soul as what Jesus suffered is God's reason for pardon. Inspiration is threefold—God speaks in the prophets and in the Son; Jesus speaks as never man spake; then the Spirit, in a book and on human hearts, with a better than an iron pen or the point of a diamond, writes the Truth, to abide forever.

It is the culmination of the truth. He completes the work of God. He brought order out of chaos, garnished the heavens, formed the second Adam, and descended to finish the new creation at Pentecost. The eleven at Olivet gazing into heaven for an ascended Lord seem orphans indeed. Even they who were so long with Him cannot say "Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit." The only words of Christ written down as He spoke them, perhaps, are in the Revelation. The Alpha and the Omega closes His seven letters, not with the "I say unto you" of the gospel, but saying, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches."

God is love! God is a consuming fire! To blend and complete these truths, write between them, "God is Spirit." As we need the light of the sun to see the sun, so we need the help of God to find God, the gift of Christ to give ourselves to Him, and the love of God's latest gift, the Comforter, to be kept in the love of God, reserved unto endless life. "The succession which is indicated by the words, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is neither nominal nor accidental, it is a philosophical progress and culmination. Any transposition

of this order would be felt to be violent, unnatural, and self-destructive."

Is it said that power, not love, is the word most used of the Spirit's work? True, "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee"; "God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and with power." Power emphasizes what He does, or the energy with which it is done; but love reveals His nature, the source of His power. Variable, power ebbs and flows like the tide. It leads Elishas often to wait, silent as the grave, until the mantle of their ascended Lord falls upon them. Smiting difficulties vigorously for a season it is then carefully folded away, and another period of silence ensues. The love of the Spirit, freer than air or sunlight, is nearer and steadier than either. As the ocean pressing upon the shore enters into every bend and turn of the coast, so the Spirit presses into the intellect, into the affections, into the will, until the whole being is bathed in the full sway of his loving purpose. When Jesus says rivers of water shall flow from those who receive the Spirit, He must mean love, not power. Who thinks of men raised to the highest degrees of power and left therein? But we can think of love swelling as a river, always abounding in works of faith and labors of love. Theodosius, thinking angels asked him of his life, dying, cried aloud: "I have lived! I have lived!" and John the beloved was unto the very last saying, "Little children, love one another."

I believe in the Holy Spirit. To adopt another thought: I expect to see saints as holy as any named in the Bible, because I believe in the Holy Spirit. I expect to see preachers as mighty in the Scriptures and to sway men as ever shook the multitudes of Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Corinth, or Rome, because I believe in the Holy Spirit. I expect to see churches as full of the works of faith and the labors of love as ever Thessalonica was, because I believe in the Holy Spirit. I expect to see towns and cities swept from side to side, and from highest to lowest extremes of society, until righteousness shall reign in the streets, because I believe in the Holy Spirit. I expect to see the dark regions of the earth clothed with light, and the waste places blossom as the rose, because I believe in the Holy Spirit. I expect to see the day when another Julian shall declare, "Behold, how these Christians love one another," because I believe in the Holy Spirit.

There is much light yet to break out of the Word of God. More and more is sure to be known of the Holy Spirit and of His work. It is needful to the proper balance of Scripture, and is to be expected in this day of the ministration of the Spirit. An antique seal shows the effigy of a burning candle, with this inscription, "I give light by being myself consumed." The great want of the world and the church to-day is not more grammars or critics, not more editors or evangelists or pastors, not more churches, or schools, or missions, or

bethels, not more eloquence, or argument, or pathos, or logic, not even more truth, but more love, as illustrated by and made accessible to us in the Holy Spirit. He is willing to be as One unknown or consumed to glorify Jesus. There is yet more light to break out of this love of the Spirit than men have ever focussed in their creeds and confessions.

VI.—THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MINISTRY OF TO-DAY.

BY REV. A. McELROY WYLIE, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

A GENERAL survey of the difficulties confronting the ministry of to-day prepares us to estimate more justly the requirements and furniture needed to meet the issues before us. The age we live in, among all the ages, is peculiar. Our country, our government, the character of our population, drawn from many nations and many parts of the earth, and our cast of civilization, are all peculiar. The educating powers of press, platform, and public schools; the general diffusion of intelligence, which, as a little learning to most, sharpens the mind to an abnormal critical alertness, adds to the problem. The marvelous facilities for locomotion, working high standards of comparison in the minds of nearly all hearers—because each one has heard the great orators of the world, in pulpit, or on platform, or in council halls, or in courts of justice (not to speak of Fourth of July and centennial occasions)—increase the difficulties before us.

The unstratified nature of our American society, in which the smart and showy phenomena of *externalism* passes for worth, and so puts on more than the demands of worth, is another element to be considered. The unparalleled facilities for making money, and we may add, also, the unparalleled facilities for taking possession of hoards that the man never earned—the *auri sacra fames* vastly increased, because in the absence of a titled and hereditary nobility, the possession of wealth alone lifts a man into a prominence and power that wealth alone could never secure him in any other land or age—confront the pulpit. So, following upon this fact, the building up a *plutocracy* in every American community, with its slides made easy and very steep, toward gambling and drink, and gluttony, and sensuality, and avarice, and supercilious independence, and a Pharaohism or Philistinism that resents with indignation any attempt to draw the conscience before the tribunal of an impartial and uncompromising righteousness, presents another most formidable difficulty. And what human language can depict the ravages of the Drink Traffic, pouring its Dead Sea of waste and ruin over the land, transcending in its ravages war, pestilence, famine, and commercial crises combined!

Over and besides all these, look at the postulates of materialism (not to speak of anarchism), look at anti-Sabbathism, the dogmas of an economicism that takes the field of knight-errantry for *rights*, but has

neither voice nor hands for *duties* in this tremendous conflict: all these, open-eyed toward personal claims and pirated honors, but blind-eyed toward the righteous claims of one's country and his neighbors;—look at these, and say whether the fierce tides are not rising yet fiercer still against the pulpit!

Add, again, the general prorogation of family government, where scarce one of the three legs of the tripod on which successful child-training rests, namely instruction, example and discipline, is not clean broken down or cut away. Then, close upon this laxity of home government, look at the laws allowing easy divorce, and, per consequence, all the divisions, animosities and lusts, destruction of children that follow and add to the evils crying for correction.

Again, we see marshaling before us the tyrannical demands of fashion—in education, dress, food, living, amusements, etiquette, and even in religion—laying her cruel edicts upon mind, soul, body and estate; perverting, harassing, dwarfing nature, nerves and stature.

Add, again, the deluges of licentious literature, pouring forth from authors and press, devoid of conscience and steeped in lust. And, hard by, we see that dilletanteism, which, from its soft and perfumed decay, is incapable of holding a nail driven by the Master of Assemblies; as, on the other hand, the granite of materialism is impenetrable, and so *both* are rejected and rejecting. Then add the rapidly advancing sensationalism of art, that deals in the subtlest fallacies, which culture knows so well how to ply for the undermining of spiritual religion—these fallacies that make culture an end rather than a means. This dilletanteism would take all the armorial elements of the divine panoply into the artist's studio and refine and polish and decorate at such degree of time and cost that helmet of salvation, breast-plate of righteousness, shield of faith, sword of the Spirit, would never get to the battle-field at all.

In this age, too, science musters forth her facts, but, too often, will mix in her more than modicum of conjecture, brooded in the scientific imagination, if there be any such thing, and is not this pre-eminently ill? The age, too, is fraught with inventions, and every new invention means more noise, and smoke, and dust, and display, challenging the sense, even when the sense, in almost despairing cry, calls for rest. This scientific age, which by dint of continual din, by dint of day and night street display, keeps a man forever at the windows, fairly compels consciousness to make its rest in the senses. Thus the demand grows up for the education of the senses, the absorption of the attention in material things under the calliope screech of utilitarianism. So we discern an increasing drift *away* from the education of that part of man's nature that holds capacity for the abstract, the unseen, the spiritual, the eternal—all these, to extend our analysis no further—all these tend to complicate the requirements of the ministry of to-day.

There be those who insist that the changes, the age, place, people, government, general environment, have nothing to do in requiring a change in the methods of the ministry. Judging from the phenomena in many churches, we may be tempted to ask if development and modification of means have ever yet penetrated into the vicinity where Rip Van Winkle has his family.

These questioners ask, "Is not the Bible truth one and unchangeable? Is there any such thing as development of revelation? Is not the Saviour whom we preach "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever?" Does not salvation turn on the same conditions as it did 2,000 years ago? and is not human nature the same in its corruption and rebelliousness as it was of old? Has there been any modification of the conditions propounded to mankind?

May we not rebut these questions by other questions? Is not Nature the same that she was 2,000 years ago? Are not the sunshine and rain and dew and air the same, and equally necessary now to foster the growth of grass and plant and tree? Are not all the elements in nature precisely the same as they were 2,000 years ago, and ages before chemistry was born? Granted; but does the sameness of nature and the continuity of the laws of nature exclude the expediency of new and varied methods? We see at once the propriety in the domain of nature in introducing new methods and newer means. And we may ask whether there is anything in the kingdom of Christ that forbids a modification of requirement in those who serve at the sacred altars? Grant that knowledge and discretion, and truthfulness, and gentleness, and forbearance, meekness and humility, firmness, blamelessness, zeal and devotion remain the same to-day, just as the truth is conceded to be unchangeable, yet is there to be no wide-eyed opening toward the conditions of our age and field, and no reasoned-out adaptation to those conditions? Is it rational to expect that the manner and methods in time of St. Augustine or Chrysostom, or even in time of Luther, will be equally successful to-day?

Note the course of the greatest of all the apostles, and see what lessons can be read from his footsteps as he passes from one country to another! Was his method the same with the Jews as it was with the Gentiles? Did he preach in the same manner at Jerusalem, at Ephesus and Philippi, at Athens and Corinth and Rome? Did he write in the same manner to Jews and Gentiles, Romans and Galatians and Thessalonians? Take, too, the whole Revelation—is there not a unity of truth throughout the entire Scriptures? But note the vast range of method and presentation between the Old Testament and the New Testament, between the different books, between the Gospels of the synoptists and John's Gospel, between Gospels and Acts, between Acts and Epistles, between Epistles and Apocalypse.

Well, all this will be readily conceded. The ministry of to-day has

the whole Old Testament and the whole New Testament, but is that all? It has immeasurably more. It has the history of the Church for near 1,900 years. A wise investigation starts an electric glow along that entire historic path, and the light from the past may serve as a lantern for our present steps. In these days of revamped heresies and antique fallacies re-galvanized, the preacher needs to stock his armory from the great historic discussions, and hold up the warning effects against these same old mischief-working causes. But we must pass on.

Put your left hand on the daily newspaper and your right hand on the Bible. Your left hand is on the table at which the world daily feeds—the variety is fabulous, and almost every dish is poisoned, and there is as great a variety in the poisons as there are dishes. All kinds of devils dance in our daily papers, and each devil advertises his elixir of life, which the world does not know is really the worst broth of witches that the pot of diabolism ever brewed. Now, under your right hand is the dispensary of a divine government to provide the *antidote* for every poison. But what one man can tell us, be he spiritual apothecary never so skilled, all that is needed for the compounding of the right prescriptions that will prove effective antidotes for all the cases of poisoning on the left! The prescription for the poisoned scientist will miscarry if given to the poisoned artist, and the prescription prepared for the poisoned sensualist will fail if administered to the poisoned philosopher; and the prescription compounded for the Pharisee will have no effect if given to the libertine, etc.

In a different age and another country a monotonous sensuality drew men down into a common level of sottishness, and the problem was less complicated; but it is different to-day, and pre-eminently different in our own country. The late Mr. Gough remarked to the writer, after long personal observation in England, that the demands upon the ministry in the United States were far more exacting than in Great Britain; that the standard of preaching here is far higher than in the old country; that there the style of pulpit ministrations is more like our Wednesday evening talks, and he added that the average pulpit efforts in England would not be tolerated by even our plainest people. We, as ministers in America, are put in the midst of a great many concentrating fires. The demands for both defense and assault are many and varied.

If any one still insists that the primitive methods are quite sufficient, there is, we think, a short-cut answer found in the examples of those who are the most successful men of the day. Do they preach the gospel? They certainly do. But look at their variety of methods. Almost the greatest preacher our country has produced, and the most successful, Dr. Chas. G. Finney, was continually assailed for his new

methods. He was wont to remark that the fault he found with nearly all preachers was that they took too much for granted; that as a lawyer, when he listened to sermons, he soon lost interest and could not follow with any compelled or even any assenting conviction, because they did not begin far enough down and prove as they proceeded. The case of Rev. Robert Cecil in London is well known. What does all this teach us to-day?

1. We need to remember that in the long run the human soul will and *must* act logically from the premises it has admitted as axioms or postulates. If a man insists that property is robbery, he will become a robber himself. The logical sequence of denying that there is any worth in good works is that the man will drift into Antinomianism, and so on.

2. Our ministry must man a fort that shall face toward every point of the compass. It must stand to its guns when science, falsely so-called, musters for the assault, and it must be ready to pierce the bloated assumptions of an obtrusive materialism when its champions put on the warriors' masks to frighten the keepers of the citadel. Well, this requires no little study, and the preacher must remember that if there be one man in the congregation who believes a miracle is impossible on scientific grounds, he can't reach that man until the scientific falsehood is shot from under him. If there be a man next to the former who believes in the law of necessity, he can't awaken him to a sense of responsibility until he has shot away that granite lie. The ministry must understand the whole false philosophy concerning art and culture and religion, and be able to pierce the fallacies of the false, and present the true logic of Revelation. But time forbids any attempt to glance at the whole circle of assault.

3. The ministry of to-day must insist upon the entire range of the practical humanities. Atheism will erect its guillotine in presence of your Notre Dame, and Madeleine, and Tuilleries of art, but your *fau-bourgs* surrender in the presence of those gospel humanities which, in plain and working garb, seek to bring sympathy and help to the sinning and sinking orders of society. These, after all, are the world's means of interpreting Christianity, and the ministry must keep the fruits before the film-covered eyes of a purblind world.

The ministry of to-day, if it needs not the fifty heads, certainly has call for the one hundred hands of Briareus. He must be a true son of both "Cœlus [Cœlum] and Terra." He must be expounder, preacher, intercessor, pastor, general bugle-man for all the ethical agencies and benevolent societies, and in himself he must be apex and climax of moral and spiritual excellence to the whole mass of the society in which he is placed. He must be a very large lump of salt in this corrupting whole.

4. He must be expounder. The best scholarship of the world and

the highest geniuses have subsidized their learning and gifts to pour light upon the languages, the grammar, the rhetoric, the styles, the geography, the ethnology, the history, the poetry, the prophecies, the proverbs, the parables, the miracles, the precepts, the types, the symbols, the manners, customs, usages, the doctrines, inspirations, promises, warnings, laws, revelations, destinies, which are involved in this vast domain of the sixty-six books of the canon of Scripture. What equipment is needed for a stout encounter with the thousands of questions which present their bold fronts and demand solution over this vast area of human knowledge and speculation and inquiry!

5. He must be preacher. The department of preaching is quite distinct from that of exegesis and exposition. While in the one case it is the office to display the meaning and illustrate the instruction, here it is a great deal more. It is hard to define a sermon. It is easier to say what it is not. It is not an essay, it is not an oration, not a discourse, not a lecture, an address, a talk, appeal or exhortation. It is all these combined. It may climb to the grandeur of an oration; it may mount Sinai and thunder with the law, then rise in company with the choir of angels and join in the overture of the skies. It may move lucidly on the way of the essay, then warm into the heart of exhortation. It may speak directly by an address, then it may seize the tongue of allegory and parable, decoy the man into a trap set for his sin, and cry, with index finger leveled at his conscience, "Thou art the man!"

The sermon is a sort of spiritual menagerie, where the preacher must be such a skillful trainer that he can sway at command all the creatures of his collection. He must send the retrieving eagle after the renegade thoughts of his hearers, and bring them back to sit before the real issues of life. He must call to use the speed and instinct of the carrier-pigeons to bear his God-dictated messages to far-away, retrograded souls. He must command the crowing of the cock to awaken his hearers. He must let loose, at times, the lions and tigers upon the robbers who prowl for the lives of his flock. He must call on the very owls to help him see in the dark, and drag out the noxious things that undermine and eat away the very support and nourishment of human souls. But we are not sure there is any place for the monkey, the kitten or the clown; no legitimate place for the parrot to chatter repetitions learned second-hand from the experience of others, and no place for the hyena to dig up the bones of the Pharisees and spread an unprofitable repast of long gone by issues and buried speculations.

He must have, over all and ever at hand, the dove to carry the olive-branch of proffered peace to every one who will accede to the gospel terms of reconciliation. Gathered before the preacher are all classes and conditions—old and young, male and female, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, wise and foolish, the cultured and rude, the friendly and the hostile, the earnest and the trifling, the devout and

the undevout, even the virtuous and the vicious. Contrast the attitude of the preacher here with the position of the professor, teacher or lecturer before his class. That class have been trained up and schooled to take in what the teacher has to say, and they receive it when delivered in a style that would not be sustained in the pulpit for a day. Before professor or teacher are those who are acted upon by the most powerful motives drawn from self-interest, rewards of approbation, honor, great prospective worldly profits, while behind them is the vehement urgency of parents, guardians and friends, and around them immediately is the all-enveloping atmosphere of school, college or institution, with its pressure of *esprit de corps* stronger than public sentiment can be.

6. He must be intercessor. He must be a man of prayer, bearing the burdens of the people to the throne of grace. In order to have power to prevail with God on behalf of men, and to prevail with men on behalf of God, he must be a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost, and we may well exclaim with Paul, "Who can (come up) to these things!"

7. He must be pastor. Pastor! Flock! Where shall we begin or conclude? What volume was ever written to set forth the cares and duties of a pastor's life? He must touch the top and bottom of the whole scale of human experience. But we cannot enlarge, for space does not permit.

VII.—CLUSTERS OF GEMS.

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

NO. VIII.—PRAYER.

[Continued from page 129.]

Mr. Spurgeon says that the efficacy of prayer is with him not a matter of faith, but of knowledge and every day experience. He could no more doubt it than doubt the law of gravitation. He points to his Orphanage: to keepit going entails an annual expenditure of about £10,000. "Only £1,400 is provided for by endowment. The remainder comes to me regularly in answer to prayer. I do not know where I shall get it from day to day. I ask God for it, and he sends it. Mr. Müller of Bristol does the same on a far larger scale and his experience is the same as mine. The constant inflow of funds—of all the necessary funds to carry on these works—is not stimulated by advertisement, by begging letters, by canvassing or any of the usual modes of raising the wind. We ask God for the cash, and He sends it. That is a good, solid, material fact, not to be explained away.

Spurgeon's Witness.—Some two years ago a poor woman, accompanied by two of her neighbors, came to my vestry in deep distress. Her husband had fled the country; in her sorrow she went to the house of God, and something I said in the sermon made her think I was personally familiar with her case. Of course I had known nothing about her. It was a general illustration that fitted a particular case. She told me her story, and a very sad one it was. I said, "There is nothing that we can do but to kneel down and cry to the Lord for the immediate conversion of your husband." We knelt

down, and I prayed that the Lord would touch the heart of the deserter, convert his soul and bring him back to his home. When we rose from our knees I said to the poor woman, "Do not fret about the matter. I feel sure your husband will come home; and that he will yet become connected with our church." She went away, and I forgot all about it. Some months after she reappeared with her neighbors and a man, whom she introduced to me as her husband. He had indeed come back, and he had returned a converted man.

On making inquiry and comparing notes we found that the very day on which we had prayed for his conversion, he, being at the time on board a ship far away on the sea, stumbled most unexpectedly upon a stray copy of one of my sermons. He read it. The truth went to his heart. He repented and sought the Lord, and as soon as possible he returned to his wife and to his daily calling. He was admitted a member, and last Monday his wife, who up to that time had not been a member, was also received among us. That woman does not doubt the power of prayer. All the infidels in the world could not shake her conviction that there is a God that answereth prayer. I should be the most irrational creature in the world if, with a life every day of which is full of experiences so remarkable, I entertained the slightest doubt on the subject. I do not regard it as miraculous; it is part and parcel of the established order of the universe that the shadow of the coming event should fall in advance upon some believing soul in the shape of the prayer for its realization. The prayer of faith is a divine decree commencing its fulfilment.

Answer Long Delayed.—When Captain K— of Philadelphia sailed on his last voyage from America he left a prayer for his infant child, written on a paper, and sealed up in an oaken chest. He died at sea. His widow locked up the chest for the use of the child when he should have grown to manhood. The child grew up, dissipated and dissolute. The mother, on her dying bed, gave him the key of the chest; but he was afraid to open it, for his conscience suspected that there was something in it to trouble him. When he was fifty-six years old, he determined, one day, to gratify his curiosity, and opened the chest. On the bottom of it he discovered a carefully-folded paper on which was written: "The prayer of M— K— for his wife and child." He opened the paper, read it, and then putting it back, resolved that he would never unlock that chest again. But the arrow of conviction had entered his soul. His distress became so intense that the woman with whom he was living in guilt thought him deranged! He cried to his father's God for mercy, and repented of his sins as in dust and ashes. Faith in Jesus brought peace to his conscience, and a new and purer life to his home. He married the woman he had wronged, made a public confession of Christ, and served faithfully his father's God to a ripe old age.

Apparent Denial.—When Augustine, a great champion of the faith once delivered to the saints, was a young man, his habits were very dissolute. When he avowed his purpose to go to Rome, his mother, Monica, prayed earnestly that he might be prevented, apprehending that in so corrupt a city he might be led on by surrounding temptations to utter ruin. Notwithstanding all her entreaties, her son went to Rome; and thence, on the recommendation of a friend, he passed on to Milan, and was there converted to the truth under the ministry of Ambrose. "Thou, O my God!" he says, "didst give her not what she asked *then*; but by refusing that, didst give what she was *always* asking."

Prayer, daily Food.—"I know the temptation of the pastor. I am the pas-

tor of a church of eleven hundred members, and the head of a large orphan asylum, and know full well we are tempted to feel we have not time for our own private meditation, prayer, and reading of the Scriptures; but this is a great mistake. The more work I have to do in a day the more time I must take for prayer and meditation before I begin it. I must have a good morning meal for my own soul before I can venture upon the day's work." "Pray for results, expect results, work for results!"—*Geo. Müller.*

"*In My Name.*" John xvi: 23-24.—This is a new law of prayer. "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in My name," etc. The truth of the believers, unity with Christ was new. By this identity Jesus himself becomes the suppliant when the believer asks in His name. This was a truth no Old Testament saint knew. Before this there had been prayer *in dependence on another's merit*, but not until Christ came and unfolded this wonderful truth that every believer is a member of His body and accepted in Him, could there be prayer in His name. Compare John xiv: 20; xv: 7, 16; xvii: 21-26; xvi: 26-27.

Agreement in Prayer.—Matt. xviii: 19:

1. Agreement of the *understanding, i. e.*, definite harmony of subject and object. A specific blessing consentaneously sought. On that one thing those who agree to pray must know and think alike.

2. Agreement of the *heart.* Disciples before Pentecost—all of one accord in one place, one desire, feeling, motive, a mutual yearning of soul. Husbands and wives are exhorted to live together as common heirs of the grace of life, that their prayers be not hindered. Where is such a natural basis for heart agreement as between a truly wedded pair?

3. Agreement of *faith*, believing and trusting together, pleading the same promises, resting in the same conscious oneness with Christ, and therefore right to ask in His name.

4. Agreement of *will and work*, uniting in effort for same results.

LATIN PRAYER OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.

O Domine Deus!	Desidero te.
Speravi in te;	Languendo, gemendo,
O care mi Jesu!	Et genuflectendo
Nunc libera me.	Adoro, imploro,
In dura catena,	Ut liberas me.
Ig misera pœna,	

Geo. Müller on Prayer.—Luke xi: 9, 10.—Our Heavenly Father loves His children with the same love that He has for His own Son.—John xvii: 23.

The Lord Jesus loves His disciples as He is loved by the Father.—John xv: 9.

The Father in His infinite love, knowing our trials, difficulties, temptations, etc., gives us great and precious promises, 2 Pet. i: 4; that we may be led to cast our cares and burdens upon Him.—1 Pet. v: 7; Psa. lv: 22.

Jesus, also knowing from His own experience our needs, gives us the precious promise regarding prayer—Luke xi: 9, 10. We could not frame a more comprehensive promise if it were left with us to frame one. He, however, gives certain conditions necessary to acceptable prayer.

1st. Ask such things as are necessary according to His will—2 John v: 14, 15.
2d. Ask in the name of Jesus—John xiv: 13, 14. The merits and worthiness of Christ must be our only plea, but see Psa. lxxvi: 18. 3d. Ask with full faith in the power and willingness of God to answer prayer.—Mark xi: 24. Remember Rom. viii: 32. 4th. Continue waiting upon God—Psa. lxxii: 5.

He may defer answering our prayers:

a. To try or test our faith—Matt. xv: 21-28.

b. To try or test our patience—Mark v : 22-36.

c. To add to His glory—John xi : 3, 15, 40.

d. We may not be ready for the answer—Acts i : 6-14.

Act upon the injunctions found in Phil. iv : 6, 7, 8, and Psa. lxxii : 8.

Pitt's dying Testimony.—Mr. Pitt on his deathbed felt and deplored his own neglect of prayer. When told of his imminent danger, and invited to prepare himself by prayer for appearing before God, "I have too long neglected prayer," said he, "during life to have much confidence in its efficacy on my deathbed. But I throw myself on the mercy of God through Jesus Christ." This he uttered with a fervency but humbleness of devotion which was most touching.

Eloquent Prayers.—Prayers need not be fine. I believe God abhors fine prayers. If a person asks charity of you in elegant sentences, he is not likely to get it. Finery in dress or language is out of place in beggars. I heard a man in the street the other day begging aloud by means of a magnificent oration. He used grand language in very pompous style, and I dare say he thought he was sure of getting piles of coppers by his borrowed speech; but I for one gave him nothing, but felt more inclined to laugh at his bombast. Is it not likely that many great prayers are about as useless? Many prayer-meeting prayers are a great deal too fine. Keep your figures and metaphors and parabolic expressions for your fellow-creatures; use them to those who want to be instructed, but do not parade them before God. When we pray, the simpler our prayers are the better; the plainest, humblest language which expresses our meaning is the best.

SERMONIC SECTION.

WHO IS GOD, AND WHAT IS HE?

BY A. S. HUNT, D.D. [METHODIST],
NEW YORK CITY.

Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.—
John xiv : 8.

A CORRECT knowledge of God is the basis of all true religion. A failure here is fatal to the whole system. An intelligent conviction of the fact of the existence of God, and some clear perception of our relations to Him, are necessary in order to constitute Him an object of worship. As wide as we acknowledge the gulf to be between an infinite God and finite man, yet there is no being so near us, after all, as God, nor one with whom we have so much to do.

We sustain various relations in society. Some of them are known by terms of kinship, such as father, mother, child, but we sustain no relation to an earthly friend so near or dear as the relation we sustain to God. God the Father is much more

nearly related to us than an earthly parent. He loves with more than paternal affection, and requires us to recognize with filial love His paternal care and claims.

We sustain certain relations of dependence upon society. We are dependent upon government, upon the care of friends in the time of sickness, in childhood upon the care of parents, but upon nothing around us do we depend so much as upon God. Hence, from whatever standpoint you look to or look toward God, you find your relations to Him are more intimate and more multiplied than those toward any created being.

It is, therefore, natural for us to inquire, "Who is God, and what is He?" The first conception that any of us had of God was that He is a great man. I know that in my childhood—I can remember it still—I thought God was a great man, larger than my father, and I thought that would constitute Him a great

being. My first conception of God was that He was a material being. I could, perhaps, form no other at the time, but the conception of matured intellect is, too often, that of a God who is Himself material. This is because we are liable to fix bounds to Him; we are liable to suppose that where there is power and intelligence there must be something of such personality as requires materiality. Yet, if God were a material being, He would have location, and having location He could not be everywhere present. He could not be or act where He was not. There would be bounds to His being if He were a material substance.

Everywhere, however, men have said, "Show us the Father; let us see Him in some way. Let us have a demonstration of a divine person and power that we can understand; then we shall believe in Him." Men who have been destitute of revelation have adopted a substitute for God in the creation of images, or some kind of an embodiment. Something that they supposed represented the greatness that belonged to God. Idolatry, much as we condemn it to-day, is the result of the human mind groping in the dark. Groping after a material God, and because it has no revealed description, or no revealed idea of a spiritual God, it therefore selects the sun or the moon or some great object before which it may bow, as the embodiment of its comprehension of God.

It is on this account that God would teach men the spirituality of His nature by forbidding all forms of idolatry. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," was made necessary because men were prone to embody God in a material form, and yet this is but natural. In many cases, perhaps, it was the very best thing they could do. Now it is generally supposed that the heathen world and the pagan world must be very low and degraded, and that idolaters must,

from the very necessities of the case, be of a very low grade of intelligence. Yet nothing is further from the truth. The most intelligent and refined of many ages were those who were worshipers of idols, and who constructed temples for their worship. These very men furnished the classics that are used in Harvard and Yale to-day. They furnished architecture which this age cannot fully imitate. Hence, it is a very great mistake for us to say that these persons, because they were idolaters, were the very lowest and most degraded class of mankind. Look at the literature which they furnished: the writings of Homer, Virgil, Xenophon, Socrates, Plato, Cicero. These men were idolaters. Socrates, it is said, once made the remark that he believed that some time God would reveal Himself more clearly than He is revealed in nature. His words were prophetic.

Look at the architecture that those men of ancient times produced, and then say if the declaration that they were a low and degraded class is borne out. When men paid out large sums of money for temples I think we may come to the conclusion that they were sincere. Men may give a project temporary aid, but when they contribute of their means largely for a permanent institution, it shows that they must have more than a mere temporary or spasmodic interest in the object to which they devote their time and means. Vast expenditures show sincerity of belief. In the history of this world more means have been expended for idolatrous temples than for Christian churches. What immense edifices they constructed. Take for example the Temple of Diana at Ephesus; 425 by 420 feet in dimension. It required 200 years to build it. There were 127 columns, each 60 feet in height. There were specimens of work produced in ancient times that no modern skill has ever devised or

modern knowledge explained how the work was done. For instance, suppose it were required in this age to produce a solid block of granite 12 feet square at the ends and 60 feet in length, solid, well-wrought, and yet such a block of granite remains today as a monument of the invention, skill and architecture of the past, and also as a defiance to the skill of modern times. This block of stone, too, was brought from a long distance and wrought with such agents as no modern skill has been able to imitate.

What does this prove? Simply this: that the highest and best cultivated intellect that could show itself in the production of the classics that for two thousand years have been acknowledged as standing in the front rank of literature, and of architecture which the boastful skill of modern times cannot compete with or imitate, was not sufficient to destroy God; that with all this intelligence, and with all these powers, there was not ability enough in the human intellect to furnish a clear outline of the divine existence such as the Bible shows. It shows the utter inability of the human mind to discover a spiritual God. I assure you those men were not ignorant, except it be in the knowledge of God. Yet here they were most profoundly ignorant, because they lacked the information furnished of Him in His own Word. These grand temples of the olden time, dedicated to Jupiter and to the other gods, show an earnest and perhaps a sincere body searching for the Father, and in the absence of the true Light setting up a false one. They were not ignorant men, except in their lack of knowledge of the true God and of His religion. They attained the highest degree of skill and power attained by the human intellect, and yet their utter incapacity to discover God shows how needful is revelation, and how utterly impossible it is to dis-

cover the Father without it. Their error was the very common one of regarding God as material, as having form and substance, and therefore He must be limited.

It is not necessary to know all about God in order to know Him at all. We do not expect this in anything else in life. We acknowledge life, and yet who knows what life is? How many mysteries are there in every portion of our path that we cannot comprehend? Yet we readily accept such truth as is clear to us, and which we can understand. We know very little of ourselves, of attraction or growth. If we must comprehend and know everything fully, our knowledge here would be very limited indeed. I grant that we cannot know all there is of God. We cannot sound the depth of this ocean, but we may stand upon the shore and hear the music of the waves as they sing of His praise and of His eternity. We may stand in the presence of the mountain which is a proof of His power. We cannot understand how long the mountain has remained there, but there it stands a symbol of eternity. We might add description to description, we might pile Alps upon Alps, and our language might tower like those mountains, and yet God rises above our conceptions, the Blessed forever.

We ought to feel a deep sympathy for those who, having great intelligence in other respects, are groping in the dark, seeking after a Father. Such is the condition of a great share of mankind to-day, and such has been the condition of the large portion of the earth that has been destitute of revelation. Sometimes when I have seen one that was lost I have thought what a symbol he was of that part of humanity that have lost the Father and the knowledge of Him. Oh, what desolation there is in that word "lost!" I once saw a lost child upon the streets of Buffalo, and a more forlorn-looking little ob-

ject I never saw, It cried and screamed for its mother. The police and the crowd could not pacify that poor child. It cried out "Mother! mother! mother!" It was lost, utterly lost and frenzied.

You may have read the story of the young Japanese who, some years ago, found a little slip from the Bible that told about God. He went back to Japan, and one day he asked some one if he knew where God was. This person directed him to a dock where there was an American ship, and told him that the Americans could tell him about God. He asked the captain, who was not a Christian man, but the owner was, and the captain sent him to the owner. The latter said that he could not tell him much about the matter, but if he would ship with him as a sailor he would take him to the United States, and place him in care of a man who believed in God and would tell him about Him. The young man went with the owner to Boston, and his search for God was so earnest that the owner placed him in an institution for education. He is now one of the most distinguished teachers in Japan. How earnest was that young man's search!

I have thought how much sympathy Socrates, and some of those great men of ancient times, deserve. Instead of looking down upon them as if they were hardly worthy of our attention, they look to me like people groping in a cellar and inquiring, "Where shall I find Him whom my soul desires?" As they are walking through the darkness I think their eyes are directed toward a lamp, and as they are drawn toward it, they see that it is held up by a pierced hand. A voice says, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me." "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Jesus Christ, the fulness of the Godhead bodily, tells us, "No man hath seen the Father at any time, the

only begotten Son hath declared him."

There are two classes of passages that we need to read and understand in the light of experience, or we shall find them apparently contradictory. Take this, "No man hath seen God at any time." On the other hand, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Here, then, is a power of comprehension, a power of perception, and eyes given to the blind, by which they are enabled to see what Socrates and Plato and the most distinguished men of ancient times could not see—a spiritual perception looking upon a spiritual God. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The natural man, we are told, perceives not "the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Now, I will not enter upon a disquisition of a metaphysical character at any length this morning, but there is nothing unphilosophical in supposing that the soul should have power to see what the natural vision cannot see. You do not expect the eye to hear or the ear to see; the eye is made to see and the ear to hear. Each faculty has its own special design and peculiar power. Through the eye impressions are made upon the soul. Dare any man say that God is confined to these five senses that we usually say are the channels to the soul and from the soul? That God cannot communicate of his own nature and direct even without the aid of those natural and material senses? There are a great many forces in nature that you never saw. You never saw electricity, and yet you do not doubt its presence. We never saw attraction, and yet we feel its power. Shall we therefore deny that there may be surrounding us forces in every air we breathe, and that space is filled with the God whom the natural eye cannot see. There is nothing unphilosophical in this; it but harmonizes

with our experience in other respects.

We have different faculties which direct to different objects, and yet these become objects of perception to us, and we perceive, the more clearly it may be, with our reasoning faculties when our eyes are closed. We shut our eyes in prayer that the world may not distract our minds. We separate ourselves from the world that we may pursue the mathematical reasoning of a great question which is purely mental, and yet we are not questioned. There is nothing unphilosophical in the declaration, He that loveth God is born of God and knoweth God. He may not have the knowledge of a philosopher, he may not be able to comprehend the various languages in which the Old or the New Testament was originally written; he may not be acquainted with a thousand facts that are comprehended in the curriculum of education, but he has the knowledge that is higher, grander and deeper than them all, the knowledge of God. He that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. When it was required of Christ to "show us the Father," we suppose that He understood that revelation which God can make to human consciousness, and which is manifest only to the true believer. There is a recognition of the father by the child. We may not understand it; we cannot explain it any more than we can explain many other things, but we can see its operation. Have you ever noticed a great flock of sheep under the care of a shepherd? There may be a thousand sheep and a thousand lambs, and the lambs may spread themselves here and there, but by instinct each lamb knows its own mother. We cannot understand how they do so, but they make no mistake. If there is an instinct by which animals can accomplish this, is it unreasonable to suppose that there may be a power in the human soul to recognize its God, and in that God to

see a Father? When that Father is revealed, is it surprising that we should know and understand Him? Shall a Christian be less intelligent than a lamb guided by instinct alone? If man, who has the boasted intelligence of the age, is not able to rise above what instinct accomplishes, then humanity is poor indeed. These are the answers to those skeptical objections which are raised from time to time against the spiritual knowledge and perception by which men understand and acknowledge the Father.

One other point is worthy of attention: by the knowledge of the Father we have a clear understanding of our own origin and of our own destiny. How much blood has been shed in order that men may assert and prove their right to royalty, because consequent upon royalty there may be a crown! How much to prove their rights to a certain lineage, and because they belong to a certain lineage they understand what is before them in the future! O, what wealth there is to that man who knows that he is a child of God; that he belongs to a family higher than that of Queen Victoria—a family whose center, it may be, is in heaven; whose paternal center may be there, but whose branches extend over the entire universe! To be able honestly to call God "My Father!" It brings the whole universe together, and the church above and the church below constitute one church. "Father" implies sonship, and sonship in this case implies inheritance. How much there is of importance, then, that we comprehend the relations which we hold to our God. This has tended directly to classify men, and place them in their positions in this world. Without this knowledge of God, Paul would have been the very first man among the Ephesians to cry out, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" Luther and Wesley would have offered sacrifices to Jupiter, if they

had lived in the age in which he was the only god. The change of circumstances involves the relation we hold to our Father, and proves the importance of the relation that brings God as the Father of those who believe. A Father revealed makes the world akin, and brings the universe into one harmonious whole. Here we find the relations that unite us one to another, as well as those that unite us to God, "in whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." We are in sympathy with those who are in accord with this theory.

We come from our homes this morning to this temple to worship the Father. We worship the same Father that some members of this church did who formerly sat here—the same Father that they now worship in heaven. One family, we dwell in Him; one church, around, above and beneath. Though now divided by the stream, the narrow stream of death, we are one family of the living God. Part of the host have crossed the flood and part are crossing now. One family above and below. What dignity this gives to Christian worship, that we, this morning, with angels, with Gabriel, with the archangels, may worship the God they call their Creator. We worship Him as our Father and our King. The highest glory the Christian church can attain in this life is the representation in the Church of the First-born on high, and the golden bond of union between the church in heaven and that on earth is found in the fact that God is the Father whom Jesus shows to us. From England's queen there will descend no crown of such splendor as that which will adorn the brow of the poorest child of God. No Rothschild has an estate like the inheritance of a saint in light. A new Garden of Eden has been prepared by the Father's skillful hand, prompted by the Father's loving heart. Here are no forbidden fruit, no tempting ser-

pent, and upon every archway and every portal of this Paradise is inscribed, "This is heaven, and heaven is eternal." Earthly temples decay and crumble, but the house not made with hands is eternal in the heavens.

When the final grand revelations of the Father are made you and I will be there, although we were not with the disciples when the demand in our text was made of Jesus. Will He acknowledge us as little children? When Christ, through whom the Father is revealed to the world, shall introduce us to "Our Father, who art in heaven," will He greet us as sons, and daughters, and heirs, and say, "Welcome to the city of gold, to a crown adorned with jewels whose luster will never fade, and to all the joys of this heaven which is to be your eternal home"? Then will we understand the depth and fullness of the Father whom Christ revealed, and the heavenly choir will chant, "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be glory, and dominion, and power forever and ever!" Then, we are assured, our happiness shall be consummated in an eternity of rest.

THE KING'S APPEAL.

BY REV. CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER
[EPISCOPAL], BROOKLYN, N. Y.
Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.—John xviii: 37.

MANY men in their quest of divine truth rely wholly upon reason. By this process of marching from premises to conclusions they think to traverse, conquer and make their own the entire domain. By this process of logic they say they approach Christianity. On purely rational grounds, they claim, it must stand or fall.

Now Christianity is far from being unreasonable. Let us protest against the notion that the Christian revelation addresses itself to sentiment only, and not at all to the intellect. It combines sweetness and light. It

centers in light that no man may approach unto; but the light approaches unto men. Its effulgence shines out far and wide "to make all men see." It visits and enlightens the minds of men. That is not the Christianity of Christ which would abjure the use of mind. Men ought not to believe things that contradict the reason or are any wise unreasonable. Christianity is never more misrepresented than by those who make it their office, in its defense, to decry the use of reason, and say that you must stop thinking where you begin to believe. Let no one be misled by any such caricature of the gospel demand for faith. It was a call for reasonable trust.

Truly considered, the Christian revelation is never irrational; it is never arbitrary. It answers to the nature of things as they are. It is throughout characterized by reasonableness. It does not set reason at defiance, nor reduce it to protesting submission. It says: "Prove all things." It recognizes how needful to every man is "a season of the hope that is in you." It recognizes the intellect, the faculty that knows—"Ye shall know the truth." It furnishes to philosophy its crown and consummation. The furthest reach of the intellectual faculty finds ever before it the thought of this revelation like a distant goal for the utmost ambition of knowledge—"then shall I know even as also I am known."

When, however, men summon Christianity to trial by reason, they must be reminded that, in this great trial, the court is not ready to hear the case; all the judges have not taken their seats. For in its appeal Christianity does not plead solely before the intellect, sitting alone as supreme judge of a final court. In other words, to judge of the gospel it is not enough to be simply a clear and clever reasoner. Christianity is a revelation to humanity. It must correspond to humanity as it is. But,

if it appealed solely to reason, it would not be in accord with the nature of humanity. Men are not composed of intellect alone. They are not convinced by intellectual processes simply. Back of reason lies the region of conviction, where, though beaten in argument, one may remain of the same mind still. This region may be quite undisturbed by all debate, like the central depths of ocean remaining tranquil while the storm lashes the surface to foam. Logic sometimes fails to convince, because with some persons logic can furnish no premises whence to proceed.

Further, the intellect is influenced, often dominated, by some other portion of the nature. Some report is believed by A, disbelieved by B, when precisely the same evidence is before each. B will call A credulous, A will think B skeptical. So men of equal intelligence will pronounce opposite judgments on the same political question. It is plain reason works not alone, but joined with, biased, and determined by, something else. Men are not, in most cases, impartial thinkers. Their judgments of many things, social and political as well as religious, are affected by their interests or their temperament, their likes and dislikes, emotions, passions and prejudices, tastes, desires, hopes, or, as we say, their general disposition. They accept what they are thus inclined or predisposed to believe, what they want to believe. They think according as they are. Indeed, the idea that Christianity appeals to reason alone proceeds from an inadequate conception of Christianity itself. In former days there was prevalent that misconception. Its champions represented that Christianity came offering its external credentials, that the reason was to sit in judgment upon those evidences, and, after the trial, pronounce the verdict upon the revelation. This was a misconception in supposing that there was need of

other light upon Christianity than the light that shines in it. It was like expecting through a pound of candles to throw light upon the sun and show that it is the sun. But there is needed no candle, for the Lamb is the light thereof; as the sun is self-luminous and manifests itself by shining, so this revelation likewise manifests itself. It is light. It needs no illumination upon it to make it manifest. It shines by its own inherent luminousness. It carries its evidence in its own light and glory. It does not depend upon what are known as "external evidences." That illumination is an internal manifestation. It shines in our hearts. The best evidences are such as convince there, internal evidences, "He that believeth hath the witness in himself."

The conception, moreover, is not in accord with fact. In the vast majority of instances men have believed, not because their reason had thoroughly examined and pronounced favorable decision upon the evidences of Christianity. The multitudes of the poor, the young, the ignorant, the very busy, have believed, certainly not on that ground. Nor do men disbelieve because they have judicially tried, impartially weighed, or sifted completely, those evidences, and found them wanting. It is something else that, in all except the very rarest cases, makes men believe or disbelieve.

And now Jesus says: "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." When Jesus appeals, the condition of hearing implies not merely to speak truth, not merely to think truly, but to be of the truth. "Every one that is of the truth" means every one that is truth's man, belongs to truth, has given himself to it, lives for it and on it. The appeal of Jesus recognizes not only the intellectual, but also and chiefly an element that is moral. It recognizes the affections. It shines in our

hearts. If the heart has no affinity with light, the light shines in darkness, and the darkness comprehends it not. Love "adds a precious seeing to the eye." One that is of the truth is one who loves truth for truth's sake. It is an appeal to the conscience. He that is of the truth is a true man, who is loyal to the bidding of the still, small voice within him telling him of righteousness and goodness. The appeal also recognizes the will. It addresses the volitional, determining factor of personality—where the man chooses what to accept, to do and to be. It recognizes purpose. Sometimes men do not believe because of a lack of purpose, a lack of earnestness, a moral indifference. If any man *wills* to do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine.

To this moral element the appeal lies. The intellect has not sole jurisdiction in the case. If the heart be false or past feeling, if the conscience be seared, if the will be weak or perverse, the intellectual faculty is biased. Logic, then, is powerless for the truth; indeed, may be turned against it. Logic is, after all, an instrument, like an axe. It is keen-edged and mighty when wielded well, but it may be used at least as easily to split into fragments as to hew into shape. It all depends on how it is used. It all depends on who is using it. Thus, back of this keen intellectual instrument is the moral factor *how*, and behind it is the personal factor *who*. This personal factor Christianity also recognizes. The appeal is to the person, not merely as he thinks, not even as he feels, but as he *is*; not in his reason alone, or conscience, but in his entire personality, his soul, his character, what manner of man he has come to be. The appeal is to his thinking, but to his thinking as it is tinged with the personal color that has been fused into it through all these years of his living.

The appeal, moreover, is not only thus personal in its application, it is also personal in its source and authority. "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." It is the voice of a Person whose mission it is to bear witness to the truth. It is a personal witnessing. He testifies that he has seen. He knows whence he came. The appeal is transfused with the personal quality. That personal quality transfigures with light and life any message. There is the power of the eloquent preacher, not in the golden mouth but in the kindling soul. But here is more than testimony to truth. This voice is more than the voice of a messenger delivering his message. It is the voice of one who says: "I am the Truth." It is the voice of truth itself. Truth crieth without and uttereth a voice in a purely personal appeal.

Thus, again, there is unity in the appeal. It is not the appeal of this separate proposition, or that detached maxim, one man receiving one truth, another man receiving another, as the fragments of truth may happen to strike one and another. It is not truth in pieces, abstract truths. It is truth in its entirety, centering and summed up in One. It is the whole truth appealing to the whole man. It is, moreover, the truth alive, throbbing with intensity and fulness of personality, that appeals to the living man, in the fullness of all the faculties of his nature. It is the revelation, not of a series of propositions to an intellect, not of sentiments to a heart, not of a system of ethics to a conscience, not of rules and regulations to a will. It is a living Voice speaking to, and thrilling through, a living soul. It is a Person appealing to a person; His love in all its moving language of tender word and gracious gesture, and healing hand, and arms outstretched as they were on the cruel cross, touching and taking hold of a heart; His purity, in all its unsullied whiteness, holding a man's

conscience under a spell of awe; His majesty of character, in all its sublimity, towering up before a will with the imperative bidding: "Follow Me!"

We thus come to the royalty of Jesus. The governor, in what is half query, half irony, says: "Art thou a king, then?" And the Prisoner replies: "Thou sayest it, for I *am* a king;" born a king, nay, came a king into the world from a higher and more august realm, that He should bear witness to the truth. His royalty is bound up with His truth. But it is not merely that He brings truth. That might make Him a herald of royalty, but not himself a king, as He says He is—"A king am I." It is in His eternal and divine personality come into the world, that His royalty lies, and in His character, so perfectly witnessing to the truth that He can say: "I am the Truth."

We see that His kingdom is a kingdom over persons. He is King of truth, He is also King of men. He spake as one having authority over men, and not as the scribes, who were mere guardians of the sacred books. He appeals to-day by sovereign right to living men. Thus He appeals to you, to each man and woman before me. Behold thy king cometh unto thee. He appeals to your generous loyalty, will you reject your king? This is the question. The question confronts each one. It is a kingdom over *persons*; and there is no respect of persons. *Every one* that is of the truth is its leal or loyal subject.

We see, further, *His* power is a kingdom of the truth. It is no political or quasi-political empire He establishes over men. It is not physical, it is spiritual. It is not of local and temporal government. It is the reign of truth eternal. It is a realm of thought, and every thought is to be brought into captivity. But it is more than intellectual, as man is more than intellectual, and it is a

kingdom over men in their entire personality. Only they who are or would be of the truth in their whole nature, will own its sway. Men's minds, but also men's hearts, men's consciences, men's wills—to these comes the royal summons. Here is the region where, and here the reason why, the King is not owned.

In this dramatic scene the King's appeal comes to Pontius Pilate. Standing before him a poor prisoner, but exalted above him in essential royalty of person, Jesus pities the poor worldling, Jesus yearns for the man, and in that pity and yearning He utters this last appeal.

We feel like exclaiming: "O, Pilate! To-day if you will hear His voice, harden not your heart!" For the hour is come when Pilate might hear. He is laid hold of by divine magnanimity, He is appealed to by the divine love. But the appeal falls on a deafened ear; He does not hear that voice because he is not of the truth; he does not belong to truth; he has not given himself to the truth; he owns no allegiance to the truth; he does not believe in truth; he asks, "What is truth?" His query does not echo the Saviour's word, "*the truth*." He says: "What is truth?" It is not a question. It expects no answer. "And when he had said this he went out." It was not a question seeking for further light. It was an exclamation to dismiss the whole topic. It was a sneer at the very existence of any truth that could be known.

The King's appeal encounters to-day like scornful rejection in the attitude of men who say they are agnostics, *i. e.*, know-nothings. They do not deny the King's claim *may* be true. Perhaps so, perhaps not, no one knows; no one can know, no one need greatly care to know.

And to day Jesus stands and cries. He sometimes seems to stand like a very prisoner on his trial before men for acceptance or rejection. But He

is really a king issuing His summons. To each one comes that royal summons. Why is it not heeded by all? Why are there any who refuse to hear the King's appeal? It is not so much that the message is not plain, nor the evidence of Christianity convincing to the intellect. That is not the real reason. The reason is rather that this heart is not in love with truth, and so does not beat quicker at the sound and leap to greet the accents of that voice of Him who is true; this conscience is not true as steel to the magnet, and so does not turn responsive at His approach, and obey that holy influence; this will is not loyal, and so does not own and bow to that mastery. The reason is that this man, as he has let the long years slowly mould him, or as his great sin, or his mean habits have debased him, is incapable of judging of Christianity. He is deaf to the King's appeal, he does not hear His voice, because he, the man himself, in his personality and character, in all the direction of his nature, is not of the truth, he does not belong there, and so does not recognize and take his place there. It is because the man is as he is.

Some moral affinity is necessary to the recognition of Christianity. He said, "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep. . . . My sheep hear my voice."

Many a man needs not so much help to solve the intellectual difficulties we hear about, as he needs to get down on his knees and pray earnestly to be delivered from that moral unworthiness, that condition of a soul that does not take up the cross and follow after Christ, because it is not worthy of Him. It is the loyal souls who hear and heed the King's appeal. Heard the first time it may be strange to their ear, but it comes home to their heart, and the heart makes answer: It is the King!

And we all need to be reminded that the faith demanded by the Christ

is not the victory wrested from the thick of the fight of arguments, but comes of childlike trust, submission to the mind of Christ, and harmony with His Spirit of truth. The process of learning Christian truths is not by the proof of logic driving to a right conclusion, but by the inspiration of a Spirit guiding into the whole truth. Men come to truth as children learning of the Father: "Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me." "Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him. Come unto Me." There is the voice of the King claiming submission to Himself as the condition of rest in the truth. "Come unto Me. Take my yoke upon you. Learn of Me. And ye shall find rest unto your souls."

That rest is fraught with the possibility of unending progress. He that says, "Come to Me," says also, "Follow Me." To recognize the King in His beauty is to be led by Him ever forward toward the ideal that is very far off. His desire is that His may be with Him where He is and behold His glory.

Thus looking unto Jesus, keeping near to Him, drawing ever closer to Christ, ever more loyally devoted and more wholly belonging to the King, and so more truly of Him who is the truth; you shall hear His voice ever plainer and clearer, you shall grow used to His tones, and recognize His pleadings, and learn to listen for His words, and love His gentlest bidings, His mute monitions.

This is the law of progress into divine truth, not by abjuring reason, and yet not by intellectual investigation alone; but rather by moral harmony, by allegiance of soul, by spiritual assimilation of the whole being to the blessed Christ, following Him because knowing His voice, while His Spirit guides into the whole truth.

Thus the more entirely and loyally you are of the truth, the more fully you shall know Him who is true. The soul, true to its best self, truthfully hears the truest voice that ever spake, saying always, "Follow Me."

The soul heeds that royal voice. It listens, longing to know more and better. It cries, "Master, where dwellest thou?" And His answer is still a bidding onward and upward: "Come and see!"

GOD'S HOST.

BY REV. WM. H. RANDALL [BAPTIST],
SAXTON'S RIVER, VT.

And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him. And when Jacob saw them, he said, This is God's host: and he called the name of that place Mahanaim. — Gen. xxxii: 1, 2.

THE text calls up a picture: Jebel, Osha, or Mount Gilead; on its very top a great rough stone set up like a pillar, and a cairn near it; the slopes below covered with flocks and tents. Jacob comes forth from his tent, gives an order, and all is at once activity of preparation for a journey. Jacob himself ascends to the pillar he set up single-handed the other day, offers his personal morning worship, then gazes down under the starlight, his back to the glimmering gray dawn, over the shadowy valley of Jabbok and away to the dimly shining line of the Jordan and the heights of the Promised Land. Imagine his thoughts: a share of Abraham's faith was in him, yet what fears; his forethought intent as though all depended on him, and yet his increasing prayer as though all must come from God.

The camp is broken up, the little army in motion descending toward the Jabbok, and the patriarch turns to rejoin his company. What is this? the skies around him are full to his vision with moving armies of angels, as the young servant of Elisha beheld them around Dothan. Jacob

exclaims, "This is God's host," as though breaking camp for some heavenly expedition. "And he called the name of that place Mahanaim," that is, The Double Camp.

1. Here is one immediate lesson for all: that still the path of common duties in daily life is the best and surest way to heavenly visions.

Speak first of a different scene that morning, far southward. Esau's four hundred men setting out from Mount Seir; no women and children, no flocks or herds with them, but martial music, pomp and circumstance. Far prouder than Jacob's armed but peaceful retainers; yet the Lord is not with Esau, but with Jacob. See in these brothers the types of social systems opposed still: Mahomed and his successors true sons of Esau, while from Jacob has followed the still advancing civilization of Israel and Christendom. Contrasts, too, exist within the latter: Spain is like Esau, England like Jacob; and to-day that difference is felt in crossing the ocean from Europe to America; or even in passing from the Southern to the Northern States. Jacob's vision is a sign of the victory remaining at last with the armies of peace.

Come right home. Here is great encouragement for all who tread life's beaten, dusty road: heaven is nearest to them. A deceiving fancy touches us all at times, that in better circumstances we might enjoy more of divine favor; that means and leisure, choice of friends, release from unavoidable contact with evil would lift us. Men and women are saying, "It is too late; I am in the treadmill, and too hard pushed; if I were somewhere else, I might feel like trying to serve God." But those favored so in worldly fortune do not care more for the blessing of heaven, nor is any place less likely (among good, honest places) to enjoy heavenly visions than in the midst of the noise and dust of a drove of cattle. But it was "as Jacob went on his

way" the angels of God met him. Faithful, but weary laboring man or woman, heaven is nearer with blessing to you than to some whom you may be tempted to envy.

Jacob's track lay downward to the deep valley, and through its shadows to the fords of Jordan. So, if our life is led downward through toil, and care and sorrow, heaven may open as freely above it as on the hill-tops. All know how the proof of a soldier is given on the march as much as in battle; and it is so in common life. But in spiritual application there is a difference: the rewards of men are won only on the field; but our divine commander observes and honors equally those equally faithful in the daily march, in farm, or shop or household, or in the "shut-in" camp of sickness, those "faithful in that which is least." Address each one who needs such a word; only be true; be sure then that the hosts of heaven, your allies, are near you; and even if the vision is deferred it will open at the fording of the Jordan.

We may also draw a grand lesson about "spiritual manifestations": the only way to obtain them. God is here, yet none can "by searching find him out"; angels may surround us now, yet no price can buy any glimpse of them. All the dreamers are imagining strange ways of getting visions of the unseen; all the visions that are given come in common ways of duty. It is no use trying to call up either spirit or angel; no use living to attain something wonderful of spiritual experience. Rather seek for duty to do for the Master's sake, and choose a daily path leading by the mercy seat of prayer. There is no place or time for true sense and apprehension of the spiritual world like the ordinary "means of grace."

All things change, and so God changes His dealings with men. No vision of angels is likely to greet us,

but if fewer visions, we have better vision. Principles endure, however, while methods change. It may be "the eyes of your understanding" alone that are opened; the sense of divine presence may be all within the soul; and yet, whatever the revelation, it comes in pursuing faithfully the daily path of duty to God and man. And the messengers of God—"angels," "ministers"—take many forms besides such as Jacob saw. "In the old days there were angels, who came and took men by the hand and led them away from the city of destruction. We see no white-winged angels now. But yet men are led away from threatening destruction; a hand is put into theirs which leads them forth toward a calm and bright land, so that they look no more backward; and the hand may be a little child's."—*George Eliot*. We cannot possibly lift the veil of the unseen; but we can do our duty, and let God lift the veil, and reveal to us what He will.

2. Here is one more lesson, greater than the former, in the text, for all: God's care over those that fear Him: "the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." And the text does more, it teaches God's way of appearing for man's help.

Look before and after, to complete the lesson. Recall Jacob's deceit and its long entail of trouble; his present dread of Esau; the return of his scouts, reporting the approach of Esau on the other side of Jordan. Jacob encamps that night beside the Jabbok, and prays in great distress, not sure that those angels were for his help at all, rather than for Esau. Next day, how sagacious is his policy!—but after all have successfully crossed the Jordan, a most critical step from every point of view, he returns and passes the night in prayer by the Jabbok alone, until his mighty earnestness is met by the revealing of the Mediator as a man.

On Him Jacob seizes, and the Almighty suffers Himself to be overborne. At daybreak the wondrous scene closes with a blessing.

Pause a minute to contrast those brothers again: Esau, never one who would lose sleep for praying; his case the fairest, but he shows no sense of duty any way, only impulses, first to revenge, and then, under divine influence, softening to condescending kindness; Jacob, a born deceiver, yet growing, in spite of that most hopeless of traits, into sincerity and moral dignity (as Esau never did) because a true faith and fear of God were in him. Just so with men to-day. Natural disadvantages are continually being reversed by humble faith; "there are last which shall be first; and there are first which shall be last."

The two visions, at Mahanaim and at Peniel, make the lesson complete: at the former Jacob learned what God *could* do, and at the latter what He *would* do. Come right home now. What we first need is to appreciate God's help; we must meet God's host when we ourselves are in distress. A child's first question is what he can do; he manifests no thought of higher than parental help. It is more than doubtful if there is any inborn thought or impulse toward the invisible God. Soon that thought is implanted, that impulse felt, perhaps always and inevitably with awakening intelligence; and yet, in manhood so often we are utterly careless of God. One may have a full belief in deity, and yet neither fear nor desire aught beyond this world, until some time when the heart is tender, or in trouble, like Jacob, or when Death is passing by, but then the vision comes and he cannot evade it. Some time, some way, this arousing of the man to his position before God is sure to come. Familiarity may renew indifference worse than the former, yet the stamp is ineffaceable. Some wake

gradually, others like a flash; some begin with the deepest consciousness of guilt, others arrive at that more slowly; but to every one that awakening must come. We have never yet lived, only dreamed, if we know nothing of Jacob's feelings at Mahanaim.

No more sound sleep returns after such awakening of soul. No use trying to be care-free as the brutes; the man in us (if we have any left) demands satisfaction that God and His hosts are on our side. Take example from Jacob: no hesitation in him (as we have so often shown) about praying; instead, he is more and more determined every moment to win assurance of divine mercy and blessing in his time of need. We want the same. A far more terrible reckoning than his beyond Jordan is awaiting us beyond the deep, returnless river. We all need the personal assurance that he gained at Peniel, that there is peace between us and the Almighty and Holy One. Soul awakening means soul trouble. Have you learned, as at Mahanaim, what God alone can do for you? There is no quiet for you until you prevail to hear your own name spoken, as Jacob did at Peniel. There is struggle, wrestling; but the wonder of grace is, that the Lord invites us and pledges Himself to yield to us. He is not, indeed, our real antagonist—it was Jacob wrestling against Jacob, even as, in the Epistle to the Romans, it was Paul against Paul. Let us engage with reverent earnestness in such wrestling with the Lord our Friend, before we cross the river, for there His aspect will change as He summons us to judgment. Who of us has learned the first of these great lessons, but not the second? To-day the Lord is before you, the Friend of sinners, the Saviour. Let Him not go until He gives you the answer of peace.

BEARING ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS.

BY BISHOP H. W. WARREN [METHODIST], ATLANTA, GA.

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

I: A LAW IN HUMAN HEARTS.

IN everything there is one underlying principle which is the groundwork of existence. Marble is held together by the principle of cohesion among its particles; water, by the chemical affinity of two gases; the flying worlds are held in place by gravitation, and in like manner we find in individual men a principle of life guiding and developing them.

One man is controlled by the desire to enjoy, another by the desire to achieve power, even though he wade through human blood to attain it; another wants wealth, and cares not if it is wrung from the very hearts of the poor.

Where these things have been the controlling principle, men have not succeeded. The whole world has become a graveyard of nations because of these. There has been only one man whose life was a perfect success, and that was He who gave this law and who fulfilled it perfectly Himself. He could say, "I have finished the work that thou gavest me to do."

But man was made to keep this law, and though sin has come in and made him selfish, his heart is still ready to be touched by the feeling of others' infirmity. We find this illustrated in the field of literature. What is it men like to read?

There is an English author who writes of wealthy men, snobs and so-called noblemen, but his works do not begin to be read as much as those of another, who wrote of the sorrows of the race, of poor little Nell, and Oliver Twist, the orphan boy. Men's hearts love to be made to feel.

A few years ago a book was published, for which it took eight presses running night and day to supply the

demand. Three millions of copies were sold in three days. Why was this? Why did the hungry heart of man insist upon having that one book? Because its keynote was the perfect tenderness of God to man; because it treated of the lives of the poor and lowly, showing that the heart of man is ready to be touched by the sorrows of humanity.

II. A LAW OF THE UNIVERSE.

For years men have been trying to find some deep principle which binds all the universe together. At one time they said it was "harmony with our environment"—the perfect adaptation of the birds, fishes, and everything for their conditions of life.

Again they said, "the great principle is the survival of the fittest." The strongest and swiftest animals catch the most food and get away from the most men, and they are perpetuated. And now they tell us that a new principle of the law of being is the law of mutual help. By it the bees, the ants, the birds, the beavers and all such things live together in communities, and make themselves wonderful homes which it would be impossible for any one individual to make, working alone. In this we see the first gleam of that great law of Christ, "Bear ye one another's burdens." It points toward that higher life in which there are principalities above principalities and rank above rank, all glorious in their order, but all *ministers*; not one of them but would fly to the far-off gate of a rich man to take from it a Lazarus and bring him to glory rather than stay idly even in the presence of God. We know that the Son of God, who, though rich, for our sakes became poor, humbled Himself and took upon Himself the form of a servant that He might minister to us. And of the infinite Jehovah, whose omnipotence handles the world, it has never been said at any time that He is *strength*. We know that He is infinitely wise, but

it was never said, God is *wisdom*; but it has been said, God is *love*. This is His essence.

So, whether you take the character of man in its highest aspects—that of the waiting angels, that of the Son of God on earth, or that of the Eternal Father, one principle pervades them all—that of loving ministry, burden-bearing. Christ came to show us that the law of Heaven must be exercised on earth to preserve the race.

III. FULFILLING THE LAW.

Who would not rather be thus a minister than to be some shriveled soul, needing the ministry of six, ten or a dozen others? Let us be *kings*, with large gifts for men, and, above all, with gifts of love, so that, wherever we go, burdens shall be lightened and men shall be lifted by our efforts to higher being.

1. See how this applies in the family life. Where the husband's thought is only of self, he lays all the burdens on the shoulders of his wife, and she in turn drops it or passes it on to the children or hurls it at the servant; and if there is any place on earth which is not only a type of hell, but which is a hell itself, that home is the place.

On the other hand, when helpfulness is the motto of the home; when the husband lifts every burden with so much love that he gains strength from so doing, and the wife sings for joy; when the children come up, each striving only to see who can help the other most—if any place on earth is the type of heaven that home is the place.

2. You say that will do for the family, but not for the great bustling world where the business of everybody is to try to get ahead of everybody else. It is the devil who says that. In every one of God's worlds God's laws must prevail. There was once a factory which, for no apparent reason, did not prosper. The dividends grew smaller, the stocks kept

going down, and everybody said that it was sure to fail. At last a new superintendent was employed. He did not inaugurate any radical changes in the conduct of the business, but he began to make the homes of the employees more comfortable. He fixed up a reading-room with flowers and pictures, and by-and-by the people caught the spirit of it, and they began to take more interest in their work. They were more faithful and careful, and by-and-by the stocks began to go up. And then the hands took their savings out of the bank and bought stock, and the dividends went up to forty per cent. And all of this came about by the application of the law of Christ, "Bear ye one another's burdens."

3. Not only the family and society, but the nation also will prosper by keeping this law. We, as a nation, are learning this lesson. The time was when we were heaping burdens on men's shoulders, but that has gone by—we have taken the shackles off of a burdened race. Again, at the time of the famine in Ireland, we practiced this lesson. We know that the rich government on the other side of the channel was abundantly able to stop all that terrible suffering, but it did not do it, and we roused ourselves to send succor. We took the very ship that had been sent against us loaded with cannon and sent it to Ireland filled with food!

Slowly we are learning this great doctrine. May it fill our hearts more and more until all burdens shall be lifted from off sore and suffering shoulders, and the law of Christ shall prevail throughout the whole world!

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

By J. A. BROADUS, D.D. [BAPTIST],
LOUISVILLE, KY.

*Therefore, my beloved brethren, be
ye steadfast, unmoveable, always*

*abounding in the work of the Lord,
forasmuch as ye know that your
labor is not in vain in the Lord.—
1 Cor. xv : 58.*

THE Christian doctrine of the resurrection of all men from the dead is a remarkable one, awakening no little questioning and doubt. All the researches of biology fail to give to man the dignity that comes from this doctrine. It gives us the very highest conception of the life beyond the grave. If this be so interesting a question it would seem to be worth the while to look over Paul's line of argument on the subject.

Here in Corinth there were some who denied the doctrine. There were some who probably held to agnostic views on the subject. But Paul meets these objections to the doctrine of the resurrection, first, by reminding them that Christ rose from the dead. "For I delivered unto you first of all," he says, "how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he arose again the third day, according to the Scriptures." He was seen of Peter, then of the twelve, afterward of about five hundred brethren at once, by James and all the apostles, and last of all by the apostle Paul himself, "as one born out of due time."

This epistle was probably written in the year 57, only twenty-seven years after the event of Christ's resurrection occurred, and the occurrence was fresh in the minds of many. How vivid in the minds of many of you are the events of the late war, twenty-seven years ago. No skeptic denies that Paul wrote this letter. The resurrection of Christ is one of the world's historic facts. If I do not know, as a student of history, that Christ rose from the dead, what do I know? A noted German rationalist declares that it will not do to deny the unquestionable fact that Christ rose from the dead. The apostle says, "If Christ rose how can it

be that there is no resurrection?" Notice the language, "*no* resurrection." Many to-day require a great amount of evidence to prove the truth of miracles, but a denial of the miraculous power of Christ cannot hold for a moment. The denial of the resurrection is a denial of the very foundation of Christianity.

But there are two other results which must follow the denial of the resurrection of the dead. First, "they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Five years before he had written that those who fell asleep in Christ should be raised again. But another result is summed up in his exclamation, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," or, as the new version has it, "most pitiable." All the sacrifices for this hope are for naught. Give me no delightful delusion. Christianity is a religion of truth. "I am the way, the truth and the life."

Christ is so connected with His people that His resurrection implies the resurrection of His followers. Paul believes in the resurrection of all men, but he is speaking in this connection of the resurrection of Christ's people. As in Adam all died, so in Christ should all be made alive. All authority is given unto Christ.

And again he asks them, "What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?" Paul does not in any way justify the practice, evidently in vogue among some in that day, of baptizing the living for the dead, but he uses this argument to show their inconsistency. Why should they baptize for the dead if the dead are never to be raised? In what way would it be of possible benefit to them? He stops the mouths of these men by arguments from their own beliefs and practices. In like manner he adds, "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" What advantage was

it to him that he should fight with wild beasts? Why should he sacrifice so much? Why not "eat, drink and be merry" if to-morrow we die? But, he adds, "Be not deceived. Evil communications corrupt good manners." If no one believed in a future life what would be the state of morals in society to-day? There may be some who profess not to believe in a resurrection whose lives are not vicious, but there is all around them the influences of Christianity, just as in climbing the Alps tourists are tied together so that each may hold the other from falling, so these are held up by the power of the lives around them. What would become of morality without a belief in the resurrection!

But he is reminded of another objection. Some one asks what kind of a body it shall be that will be raised? And he answers merely because the objection is evidently not honest. He calls him a fool. Does he not know that there are different kinds of bodies? You don't sow a plant with all its leaves and stalk and roots, but God giveth it a body. And in a true sense it is the same body. The body that shall be raised in the resurrection, may be in many respects a different body, and yet be the same. What if our bodies are taken up by plants? What if it was discovered that an apple tree had taken up the remains of Roger Williams? Do I mean that it is to be only a spiritual life? No; in a just sense it will be our same body, only glorified and fitted for its new existence.

But last he is asked what are to become of the bodies of those who are still living when Christ comes again. "Well," he says, "we shall not all die, but we shall all be changed." Our bodies shall put on immortality. Death shall be swallowed up in victory. "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" For "the sting of death is sin: and the

strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

"Therefore, my brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as ye know that your labor is not in vain." Here are two exhortations. First, to be firm in religious conviction, and then to be active in religious duties and work. Are there any here who once were full of faith and into whose hearts doubts have come? Notice the connection here. It is only as you work, are busy in doing good, that you will besteadfast. Go to work!

And then he adds this encouragement, "Ye know that your labor is not in vain." You serve a risen, living Redeemer. Your is a cause sure to succeed, and in the end you shall have your eternal reward.

THE LESSON OF A SONG.

BY CHARLES S. ROBINSON, D.D.
[PRESBYTERIAN], NEW YORK CITY.
Woe is me! for I am undone.—
Isaiah vi: 5.

ISAIAH'S experience, it must be acknowledged, looks very queer. It is a vast surprise. It is unexpected and illogical. We might suppose that he would have been delighted at such a sight and such a song; that such a supernatural vision would have at least elicited his adoring praise, but we do not understand his feelings. What are they? Not jubilant, surely. He is not exactly scared, yet he is confused, off his balance, prostrated in dismay. He is convicted of sin, and says, "I am undone," or cut off, pierced through or pricked in the heart as with an arrow, even to the conscience, as were the hearers of Peter at Pentecost. He is startled at the view of a holy God. In this pure light his heart is seen to be exceedingly sinful. A human face differs in appearance as seen in artificial or in solar light. The former may

flatter, or at least conceal, defects, but the sunlight is pitiless and thorough in its revelations. It does not make the blemishes, but it reveals them. The light of a holy being does not make, but it shows the corruption of a sinning soul. Isaiah does not say, "I have *done* wrong," but "I *am* wrong, through and through; I am undone." We are registered at our weakest point. Our moral reckoning is fixed right here, "unclean lips." It is not an act but a condition which is signalized. To lie is to be "a liar." Conviction of sin, then, is the first point.

Again notice the phraseology, "I am a man of unclean lips." In vision the prophet sees the throne, beholds the seraphim, listens to their song, the *Trisagion*, "HOLY, HOLY, HOLY!" Prompted to join in the august anthem that leaps from their lips, he at once realizes that it ill becomes him to speak that thrice uttered word, for he was unholy, he stood in his own way, he was too wicked to worship, and all about him were wicked, too.

I knew a collegian who was educated, but profane. His vocabulary of oaths was copious, but he, as every swearer has, shunned the prefix "holy." It is a terrible word. It means whole. It expresses integrity, completeness, and is a vocable that bad men shun. It is rarely used by any of us in speaking of the dead. We may say of the departed, "He was good, amiable or honest," but none, unless it be the clergyman in pulpit discourse, says, "he was holy." Swearers shun the word. It is a gun that kicks more than it shoots. Yet we are told to "follow holiness" as a vocation, a business, if we would hope to see God. Holiness is everything or nothing.

Again, notice the almost fatal despair of the prophet. "Woe! I am undone." He dreads judgment. The movement of his mind seems illogical. Our minds are affected by the

magnificence of the scene and worship. There is, perhaps, to us nothing in it condemnatory, yet the aim is evidently to humble. It is not the power of God or His authority merely which is revealed, but His immaculate purity. This is the lesson of the song: God's holiness, man's sinfulness. Hear those seraphim, What do they sing? Hark! "HOLY, HOLY, HOLY." My lips cannot repeat those words. They are unclean lips. I am undone forever!

The practical truth before us is this, a disclosure of the holiness of God's character and person is the surest method to produce conviction of sin. So was it with Manoah, the father of Samson, when he beheld the angel of the covenant ascend in the flame of sacrifice. He says, "we shall surely die, for we have seen God." The theophany alarmed him. So with Job. When to the hearing of the ear was added the sight of the eye, he abhorred himself and repented in dust and ashes. So, too, did Peter fall and cry, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man." What had the load of fishes to do with his fear? How could Christ depart but by another miracle? Illogical again, but he felt that he was in the presence of a holy being, his Saviour God, and could not but feel the appalling contrast of character.

Now, as to the method of applying this doctrine, we must reproduce this vision; in a word, we must see God in order to see ourselves. "Thou hast set our sins in the light of *thy* countenance." Supposing you, accustomed to profane expressions, had been in the presence of the British Queen at the recent semi-centennial, and had incautiously let fall an oath with your expressions of wonder, an oath that arrested her ear and turned her eye on you, how would you feel? A friend afterwards says, "I hear you were present at the jubilee." "Don't speak of it," you at once rejoin, for the memory of it stings your

soul. Your sin is set "in the light of her countenance!" Inadequate views of sin mean inadequate views of God's holiness. Talk of little sins. You might as well talk of a little God, a little heaven or hell. They are all great. If you don't see this, your heart needs broadening. O! if you only saw the King in His beauty, this holy God the seraph's song adores, you would repent in dust and ashes.

Finally, the most certain and Scriptural method of producing the sense of sin in a sinner's heart is not by appeals to animal emotion, but by the presentation of the holiness of God. I knew of a Sunday-school scholar to whom the teacher read the Ten Commandments, and showed him how guilty of disobedience he was in each and all. The lad was in tears, but added, "It is just so with you, too, teacher." Promiscuous pelting will not elicit the humble, penitent prayer for pardon. The first response, very likely, will be, "Who told you that I was such a sinner?" and the second, "You're another!"

Let us realize that we all are alike sinful, old and young, strong and weak; we dwell among a people sinful by nature and practice, and that we each need a coal from off the altar, which the seraph will haste to bring.

There is a hymn of Newton, eight stanzas, "In Evil Long I Took Delight," which I call "Two looks." The stanza, "I saw One hanging on a tree," introduces the first. The other is introduced by the words, "A second look He gave," and the lyric concludes in these words—may they express your happy experience:

"Thus, while His death my sin displays
In all its blackest hue,
Such is the mystery of grace
It seals my pardon, too."

THE SHIPWRECKED APOSTLE.

BY REV. H. M. GALLAHER, D.D.
[BAPTIST], BROOKLYN, N. Y.

When Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks, and laid them on the fire, there came a viper out of the heat, and fastened on his hand.—Acts xxviii : 3.

WE will not tarry to study the geography and history of the island which forms the theater of this shipwreck, but pass at once to examine the lessons taught. These are apparent, for Luke puts the personality of Paul before us with great vividness. He was the foremost of the apostles.

1. Notice this conspicuousness of Paul in its many features. As a preacher of the gospel, he was peerless; in formulating the truths of the gospel into doctrines he was foremost; and also in planting the churches of Christ everywhere he went. More than this:

2. The personal qualities of Paul. He was a born leader, a many-sided man. Not only in work distinctively religious and apostolic did he take the materials and organize as the mason takes the ashlar furnished him and makes the house, or the engine-builder unites the parts of an engine, but Paul seemed at home in an emergency. He was a tent-maker, and probably had had no training at sea; yet in the midst of the alarm and confusion preceding the shipwreck he is calm, bold and alert. He detects the ruse of the sailors, who pretended to lay anchors, but were deserting the ship. He cries out with authority, "Avast there! Cut away that boat! Don't one of you leave the ship!" A little fellow he was, and very likely he had to get up on something to be seen, but he was respected and obeyed. God puts great force into little men. Napoleon was small in person, and so, too, Sheridan, whose famous ride is remembered. Paul orders the sailors, and they obey; this, too, without a single oath. This must have amused them

and the captain as well. He tells them to eat, and they did eat, when he had given thanks.

Again, we notice that with this promptness, readiness and power of controlling circumstances there is also a cheerfulness of spirit.

Some look only on the dark side. They seem unwilling to admit that the moon itself has a bright side. Some preachers preach hell, and bid men to walk with a rope about their neck, as if sure of being hanged. I would preach salvation. We are saved by HOPE! David too often is full of moans. Elijah sits under the juniper tree, and says, as did Jonah, "Let me die." Solomon cries, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" But the gospel means good news. Duty is not a harsh necessity. Reason and philosophy alike teach us to cultivate hopefulness, which, like charity, believeth and beareth all things. Sadness dries up the bones, but cheerfulness is a medicine. The so-called Christian scientists are wise in saying, "Keep up your courage," although irrational in saying, "There is no rheumatism." They can't come it on me that way. I know that there is pain. But I know that smiles rub out wrinkles, as gloom makes them. We need to pray, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation." Of course, some are born with more cheerful natures than others, but all can do more to cultivate a hopeful temper. Grandparents pet their grandchildren more than they did their own children. Remorse may perhaps lead them, in part, to this tenderness, to atone for past indifference to them.

Paul's cheerfulness is contagious. He tells the men that they will be saved. He does not sit down and fold his hands, saying, as some unamiable wives do to their husbands, "I told you so," but he says, "Be of good cheer. There shall be no loss of life." The bird in his bosom sings in the storm as sweetly as in the sunshine, in sorrow as in joy, when

growing old, when the grasshopper is a burden, as well as in the gladness of youth, this hopeful spirit lives in the heart that truly loves God. It is not the fruit of nature so much as it is of grace, of prayer and self-discipline. The face of Keat wore the radiance of an angel. Lord Holland each morning looked as if he had just received good news. I think that they must have prayed, "Lord, lift thou the light of thy countenance upon us." Brethren, do not neglect this, one of the lesser duties, as we regard it, which embellishes life as truly as do the primary duties that shine like suns in the sky. "Forgetting the things that are behind," the troubles that happened long ago, which, if we nurse, we shall be always wretched, let us pick up the roses to-day and leave to the morrow our grief. Though smarting, bleeding, hungering and oppressed, Paul was always rejoicing in hope and making others glad.

3. The usefulness of St. Paul is seen in his building a fire. He gathers a bundle of sticks. He is foremost in service. He does not say that this is the work of a servant, a soldier or a sailor, but he goes himself and ministers to the needs of those below him. The higher a man is the more a minister he comes to be. Nobility obliges. His exaltation imposes new obligations. He regards physical necessities. An empty stomach is an unreasoning thing. The cold, wet, hungry ship-wrecked ones need warmth and food. He does not preach to them, but gathers fuel. He is useful when away from home. He is so busy with the needs of others he forgets his own, as did Wilberforce, who told the impertinent man who asked "How's your soul," that he was so occupied with the needs of the slaves that he had not time just then to think of self. Occupation nourishes carefulness. Workers are not grumblers. Grumblers are not workers. A bullet goes

through glass without splintering it, and a tallow candle through an inch plank without having time to double up. Let us walk in the Spirit and we shall not fulfill the desires of the flesh.

See how this usefulness worked out. The barbarians—that is, "the bearded people," as the shaven Greek looked on the unshaven foreigner—"showed us no common kindness."* Paul healed the sick among them, and yet said that he was debtor to them. In doing good you reap a benefit. It is more blessed to give than it is to receive. As he put the sticks on the fire a viper, warmed by the heat, clung to his outstretched hand. The men at once said, "He is a murderer." Mankind universally connect sin and punishment, wrongdoing and penalty. Conscience always tells of judgment. This comes from the light within every one that cometh into the world. Your sin will find you out. Sin itself is a terrible punishment. Burns was unchaste. His sin "hardened all within and petrified the feeling." Milton makes the convicted one say, "Which way I walk is HELL!" Our mistake, however, is this: We sometimes connect a providential event, a casualty, as when the tower of Siloam fell, with supposed wrongdoing on the part of those who suffer. Some people said that Lincoln was punished for being in a theater on Good Friday. Such reasoning is faulty.

The viper is flung off. No harm is felt, and the pendulum swings to the other extreme. "He is a god!" No, some angel wrought a miracle for him. God's physicians cannot heal themselves. Not one instance ap-

* Dr. Brewer, in his "Dictionary of Phrase and Fable," says, "Barbarians is certainly not derived from the Latin *barba*, beard, as many suppose, because it is a Greek word and has many analogous ones. The Chaldean *barbar*, from *bara*, means abroad. The Greeks and Romans called all foreigners *barbarians*, outsiders.—EDS. HOM. REVIEW.

pears where prophet or apostle wrought a miracle to furnish himself with health, wealth or deliverance. It was the angel that led out Lot. Angels were round this wreck. God stood on the deck. It was the Lord who stated the viper's pang.

Finally, see the terrible irony of life. The hands are stretched out for warmth, and poison enters. We look for good, and behold evil is ours. This is the sarcasm of life. Hezekiah has the added years he prays for, and finds in them added sorrow. Samson carries off the gates of Gaza that vainly held him, but comes eyeless and woe-ful into a Philistine prison at the end. Abraham has a son, but is told to slay him. David has the crown, but weeps over the treason of Absalom and finally over his dishonorable death. Christ himself weeps in Gethsemane, for to the holy here as well as to the sinful comes this mysterious experience. O, what shadows are we all, and what shadows do we all pursue! If this be the only life we live, the game is not worth the candle. You rejoice at the election of Lincoln and of Garfield, but to what a death was each elected! Nebuchadnezzar felt the glory to be his, and was smitted with insanity and thought himself a beast. Belshazzar was weighed and found wanting. Goethe put Mephistopheles into his story of Faust. Enoch Arden returns to find his wife another's. Napoleon ends his career at Helena, and the son of Napoleon III. falls at the hand of the Zulus. Life everywhere is full of tragedy. No man is sure of life! Be sure of eternal life. We may never meet again, speaker and hearer. Be ye ready. If your life be hid with God in Christ all will be well. There is a life and glory unfading. There the lament of David will no more be heard. There the viper's venom will be no more feared. All things are new. Mysteries will be cleared up. God vindicated, and each redeemed soul will lie upon God's breast, "and

the wicked cease from troubling and the weary be at rest."

A MIDSUMMER SERMON.

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

There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.—Heb. iv : 9, 10.

GOD spreads before us a table in the wilderness not alone when we reach Canaan. He makes our cup overflow now, while he is leading us to the land that "floweth with milk and honey." Let us retire from the hot and dusty highway of traffic and lie down a while under His shadow, breathe the balmy air, and eat the refreshing fruits of a Christian's summer rest. We sing

" Sweet land of rest, for thee I sigh,
When will the moment come
When I shall lay my armor by
And dwell with Christ at home ?"

But it is our privilege to dwell with Christ now as under the shadow of a great rock. Christ was the desire of ancient Israel and of all nations, but they, through unbelief, did not enter into the promised rest. The spirit of the Jew's piety was cheerful though he only dwelt among shadows; how much more ours who have the joyful, living substance? Christ stands before us and says: "I will give you rest." We have but to turn from our toilsome efforts to build a righteousness of our own and come unto Him.

I. This rest is essentially like the rest which Christ has entered into, even as His rest is like that of the Father's, the repose of the divine nature. As God closed the work of creation and had His Sabbath, so Christ, closing the work of redemption or the new creation, stepped from the grave to the throne and sat down in His rest. Strictly speaking there is no disturbance or weariness in the eternal tranquility of God. His nature is sublimely complete, harmoni-

ous, self-sufficing; thought, feeling, action, flowing on in unruffled majesty and beauty without passion or change. In studying Christ's character, also, we are impressed with its profound calm and serenity. Yet here they are spoken of as entering into rest after their special wonderful works. It is an accommodation to our conditions. There is a high sense in which it is true. Christ "rests in his love." The apostle teaches this to be our privilege, the heritage of faith. Rest from the burden of sin and the toil of constructing our self-righteousness. Rest from the conflict of our will with God's; the rest of a fixed heart, knowing one object; the rest of an assured hope and a love that has no fear in it.

II. How may we enter into it? Not by struggle. It is a gift. Great the search for rest by the lantern of earthly wisdom. One says found in prosperity and power, another in the grave; another in surrendering conscience to the priest, that is the rest of the stagnant pool, repressive not repose. There are two conflicting desires in man, a longing for progress and a yearning for quiet. This rest is healthy action without effort. God working in us to will. Our peace then flows like a river. Not the eagle with clipped wings, submitting to its cage, but the royal bird with wide pinions sailing the upper air.

III. We enter into this rest by *Faith*, a faith that works by love and purifies the heart. A faith that commits not only the soul but every earthly interest to God's care. You may take repose, therefore, amid great anxieties, letting God think for you, as a child does a father; when the problem is too perplexing, the tangle of events inextricable by human wisdom, lay the tangle in God's lap. Praise him for all that is past; trust him for all that is to come. Leave your prosperity and success to him, simply being faithful to present duty and thankful for present help.

IV. The rest here is a prophecy and foretaste of the final and eternal repose. The blessings predicated of the one belong to the other, only in higher perfection. Rest in action here, so heaven not an idle place but of untiring achievement, noble obedience. His servants there "rest not night nor day" in the sense of dreamy inaction, but share in the glorious divine plans there as here, workers together with Him and resting in His love and tranquil satisfaction.

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Connection of Consecration and Confirmation. "Certainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain."—Ex. iii: 12. J. M. Ludlow, D.D., East Orange, N. J.
2. The Sabbath and the House of God Married and Not to be Divorced. "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord."—Lev. xix: 30. Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
3. The Known and Unknown of God's Revelation. "Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways: and how small a whisper do we hear of him! But the thunder of his power who can understand!"—Job xxvi: 14. Rev. A. J. Turkle, Hillsboro, Ill.
4. Not Sentimental Piety, but Practical Efficiency. "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins," etc.—Isa. lviii: 1-12. President Hyde of Bowdoin College.
5. The Suggard's Farm. "I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; and, lo, it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down. Then I saw, and considered it well: I looked upon it, and received instruction."—Prov. xxiv: 33-32. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, London, Eng.
6. The Son of God the Revealer of the Father. "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."—Matt. xi: 27. Geo. D. Armstrong, D.D., Norfolk, Va.
7. The Danger of Unoccupied Minds. "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man," etc.—Matt. xii: 43-45. A. T. Pierson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
8. The Sorrow of Gethsemane Accounted for. "And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy."—Matt. xxvi: 37. J. L. Withrow, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
9. The Unwilling Cross-Bearer. "They compel one Simon, a Cyrenian, who passed by . . . to bear the cross."—Mark xv: 21. J. I. Witherspoon, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
10. The Consciousness of the Divine Presence the Unfailing Refuge and Resource of the Christian. "And he that sent me is with

- me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him."—John viii: 29. Wayland Hoyt, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
11. Not Mad but in Earnest. "I am not mad, most noble Pestus; but speak forth the words of truth and soberness."—Acts xxvi: 25. B. M. Palmer, D.D., New Orleans.
 12. Strength in Weakness. "For when I am weak, then am I strong."—2 Cor. xii: 10. Rev. J. B. Thompson, Li Man Chuang Shansi, China.
 13. The Structural Growth of the Church. "All the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth."—Eph. iv: 16. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in Westminster Abbey, at the opening of the Lambeth Conference.
 14. The Glorious Church. "That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."—Eph. v: 27. F. L. Patton, D.D., Princeton, N. J.
 15. Penitent Believers Alone are Safe. "For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"—Rev. vi: 17. T. W. Chambers, D.D., New York.
- SUGGESTIVE THEMES.**
1. Training the Young for the Service of Mammon. ("And Pharaoh's daughter said unto her, Take this child away and nurse it for me."—Exod. ii: 9.)
 2. The Silent Eloquence of Church Buildings. ("What mean ye by these stones?"—Job. iv. 6.)
 3. The Religion of the Hand-grip. ("Give me thine hand. And he gave him his hand."—2 Kings x: 15.)
 4. The Marring and Mending of Human Life. ("O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thine help."—Hos. xiii: 9.)
 5. "See Thou to That." ("I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, See thou to that. I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see you to it."—Matt. xxvii: 4, and 24.)
 6. Night of Failure—Morning of Faith. ("Master, we have toiled all night, and have taken nothing; nevertheless," etc.—Luke v: 5-7.)
 7. Transfiguration through Prayer. ("And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered."—Luke ix: 29.)
 8. Sincerity of Heart the First Condition of Christian Service. ("And when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren."—Luke xxii: 32.)
 9. Sacreligious Covetousness Driven Out with a Scourge. ("And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple," etc. John ii: 14-16.)
 10. Many Folds—One Flock. ("Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd."—John x: 16.)
 11. The Revealing Word and the Rapturous Answer. ("Mary!—Rabboni!"—John xx: 16.)
 12. Is Christ Divided? ("Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?"—1 Cor. i: 12-13.)
 13. Spiritual versus Carnal Exhilaration. ("And he not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit."—Eph. v: 18.)
 14. Faith Rooted in Darkness. ("By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."—Heb. xi: 8.)
 15. The Faith of Moses and the Faith of Christ. ("By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter," etc.—Heb. xi: 24-26.)

PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By J. M. SHERWOOD, D.D.

AUG. 26—SEPT. 1.—HOW TO ATTAIN HEAVEN.—Matt. xix: 16-30.

No question is oftener asked, or asked with greater concern. No believer in a future life thinks of missing heaven. All hope to get there at last, some in one way and some in another, but all expect in the end to get into paradise. The means, the methods, the roads are almost as many and diverse as the minds and characters of mankind. And yet there is but *one* road, *one* entrance-gate, *one* character that leads thither and finds admission into the Celestial City. All other roads, though seemingly sure and thronged with travelers, lead away from it; all other entrances will be found shut and barred; all other characters will be repulsed and refused admission. How

sad is the thought that after so much seeking and expectation, the multitude miss the true way, the narrow gate, the required fitness, and so are finally disappointed!

The seeker in the text was confident of heaven. He came to Christ in full assurance of life. He had kept all the commandments from his youth up: what lacked he yet? If he is not sure of attaining heaven, who can be? And yet Christ found him essentially lacking. He applied a single test of His spiritual kingdom, and his radical deficiency became painfully apparent. "He went away sorrowful," because, really, his heaven was his earthly riches, and he probably perished in them. He sought heaven by the way of personal righteousness, and lost it.

Others seek it in the way of *religious observances*. Like the Pharisees in Christ's day, they render a strict, punctilious obedience to the rituals of religion. They conform to all that the church requires, and what lack they yet? Outwardly, they are clean, obedient, righteous, while the regenerating grace of God has never touched their hearts.

Others, again, give the fruits of their bodies for the sins of the soul. They give liberally; they abound in church activities; they are foremost in every good cause: and what lack they yet? And yet the spirit of Christ is lacking in their hearts, and the principles of His kingdom do not actuate their lives. A far less severe test than the Master applied to the young ruler would disclose their utter insufficiency. And so we might go round the circle of human seeking and experience and come to the same result. The young ruler was a type of the utter hopelessness of salvation save in the one way of the gospel. Inspiration selected the fairest possible character, lacking supreme love to the Christ and trust in Him, and in a moment demonstrated the impossibility of its attaining heaven.

The one true and only method of attaining heaven may be stated in few words. On these conditions, and on no other, heaven is sure.

1. Faith in Jesus Christ as the appointed and all-sufficient Saviour of mankind.

2. A hearty and thorough renunciation of all personal merit as the ground of salvation.

3. Supreme love to Christ and allegiance to Him as Master and King.

4. A life of holy obedience to the gospel and entire consecration to the kingdom of God.

SEPT. 2-8. — THE TRANSFIGURATION.—Matt. xvii : 1-12.

That was an hour of blessed mystery which the three disciples were privileged to pass with their Master

on the Mount of Transfiguration. The ecstatic words which fell from the lips of Peter were in keeping with the sublime scene: "Lord, it is good for us to be here; let us make here three tabernacles." It was a foretaste of heavenly vision and bliss.

They never forgot that scene on Tabor. The wondrous words they there heard rang in their inmost souls all through their subsequent lives. John, many years afterward, when writing his Gospel, remembered the joyful hour: "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John i : 14). And Peter testifies, "We were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the mount." (2 Peter i : 16-18.)

"Jesus was transfigured before them; His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light." For a moment the veil was lifted, and the astonished disciples saw Jesus in His heavenly glory, and heard a voice out of the bright cloud that overshadowed them proclaiming His divine sonship.

We know not the full purpose of this supernatural revelation; nor are we able to comprehend the full significance of its lessons.

4. "The transfiguration of Christ," says Bishop Porteus, "was intended to remove the inveterate prejudices that prevailed among the apostles and the Jewish converts in general: (1) in regard to His sufferings, which they conceived to be inconsistent with his dignity; and (2) with regard to the ceremonial law, which they were persuaded was not done away with by the gospel. This prejudice continued for many years after our Lord's resurrection. Paul tells us (Acts xxi : 20): 'Several thousand Jews

believed and were all zealous of the law.' The mention of Christ's death by such men as Moses and Elias, without any marks of surprise or dissatisfaction, was of itself sufficient to cause a great change in the sentiments of the disciples respecting those sufferings. Christ's assumption of this glorious appearance at the very time was a *visible* and striking proof to His disciples that those sufferings were perfectly consistent with the dignity of His character and the highest state of glory to which He could be exalted. The other great purpose of the action on the mount was to give a figurative signification of the abrogation of the Mosaic law and the commencement of the Christian dispensation, upon which it was to be established. Moses and Elias, as the representatives of the law and the prophets, acknowledged the accomplishment of all their prophecies, and that the Messiah's kingdom was established on the law and the prophets, and God himself proclaimed, This is my beloved Son—HEAR YE HIM. Moses and Elias instantly disappear, overshadowed by the bright cloud, and Christ alone remains, the undivided object of all their worship. But besides this primary design of the Transfiguration, that event answered other purposes of great utility. It afforded a striking additional proof of the divine mission of Christ; for here was one of the few occasions in which God himself was pleased personally to interpose, and to make an open declaration from heaven in favor of His Son. And further, a particular attestation was given on the mount to two of the principal doctrines of Christianity: a general resurrection and a day of retribution. The visible and illustrious representation of these doctrines in the glorified appearance of Christ, and Moses, and Elias, is appealed to by Peter, who saw it, as one convincing proof, among others, that "he had not followed cunningly de-

vised fables, when he made known he power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—*Butler's Bible Work.*

SEP. 9-15. — FOLLOW ME. — Matt. viii : 22 ; xvi : 24 ; John xii : 26.

How frequently do we find this injunction in the New Testament. On how many occasions, and to what a great variety of characters, did the Master solemnly and imperatively say, "Follow me." To the man who said, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," Jesus said, "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead." To the young ruler, who inquired the way of life, the answer was, "Sell all that thou hast, and come follow me." Walking by the sea of Gallilee he saw Peter and Andrew fishing, and he said unto them, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." And again, "If a man serve me let him follow me."

WHAT IS IT TO FOLLOW CHRIST?

1. To become His *disciple*. That is, to receive Him as a Teacher, sent from God; to honor His authority; to accept and obey His teachings; to sit at His feet as a docile learner. He spake as never man spake. He is the Truth absolute. We must come to the Scriptures for enlightenment and guidance, and implicitly follow where they lead. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" Can a man be a Christian and sneer at the sayings of Jesus Christ? a Christian and prefer reason, or philosophy, or science, or "wisdom," to the truth taught in the sacred oracles of God? Impossible.

2. To become His *servant*. He calls to *service*. Christ himself came to serve—to work out a mighty redemption for man. And He has a *work*—a great, important, life-long work—for every disciple to do. Discipleship involves a high calling. Peter and Andrew were bidden to leave their nets and become "*fishers of men*." The Master wants no idlers. He hires men and puts them into His

vineyard, and fills their hands with work of the most responsible kind.

3. To walk in His *footsteps*. He went about doing good. He thought not of personal ease or enjoyment. Every day was a day crowded with acts of kindness and mercy. His life was a ceaseless source of beneficent ministration. He calls to us to "follow" Him in the lowly vale of poverty, in gentle ministries to the sick, the friendless, the outcast, and in kind, earnest efforts to save the lost. To follow Christ is to be as active, as loving, as pitying, as unceasing in doing good as He.

4. To "fill up the measure of His *sufferings*." His path lay among thorns. It led to Pilate's judgment hall, to Gethsemane and Calvary. We can't follow Him and escape the cross. The high calling is a fierce conflict with sin, Satan, the world and all the forces of hell. To shrink from self-denial, and sacrifice, and crucifixion, even, for Christ's sake, is to refuse to follow Him.

To-day Jesus Christ stands in the highway, in the sanctuary, and along all the avenues of human life and seeking, and utters with the authority of Divine Majesty the imperative, "Follow Me!" Who will heed His words? Who will leave all, as Peter and Andrew did, and go after Him, and cling to Him, and be glorified with Him?

Sept. 16-22.—TAKING CHRIST AT HIS WORD.—Luke v : 1-11.

Simon has toiled all the night and caught no fish. Nevertheless, at the bidding of the Master to launch out into the deep and let down his nets, he unhesitatingly obeyed, and inclosed a multitude of fishes. He might have said, "It will be useless; I have tried it all night long and caught nothing." But he wisely took Christ at His word; put His implied promise to an immediate test, and was rewarded.

This humble fisherman teaches us

all a lesson of infinite value. Simple, unhesitating faith in the Master's word prompting to immediate obedient action, is a golden rule. But it is rarely observed. There is a world of mental reserve in our faith. We exercise faith in general, but not in the particular, specific instance. God calls us to some high experimental test of our faith, as He called Abraham to offer up Isaac, and we hesitate or withhold; not because we have no faith in God, but our faith is not equal to this emergency; we object, we reason with our faith; we say we "have toiled all night and caught nothing"; can God do this great thing? and so we lose the blessing.

God, in His Word and by His Providence, is saying to His Church to-day: "Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught." By a long series of wondrous providences and supernatural agencies, He has been preparing his people for a mighty ingathering among all the nations of the earth. The hour has come. The long night has passed and the morning breaks. Only the faith of Simon is wanting to inclose such a multitude of souls as that the church could not contain them; an army of teachers, missionaries, helpers, would be needed to gather them in. But, alas! that faith is lacking. Our ships are afraid to launch out into the deep and let down the great nets. *The faith of the Church is not equal to the demands of the hour.* The openings of Providence, the work of the Spirit all over heathendom, and the miracles already wrought in mission fields, outstrip the Church's faith; and so the grandest opportunity afforded since the apostolic age is at best but partially improved.

The same principle applies to the *individual church*. Here is a church that has passed through a long night of depression and fruitlessness. It may have toiled hard and long, but has caught nothing. A sudden voice,

born of the Spirit, or spoken by providential signs, cries to it, "Launch out into the deep and let down your nets." Obey that voice promptly, unhesitatingly. Break away from old moorings. Push boldly out from the shore. Get away from old fears, and dead hopes, and lifeless forms, and stale methods, and take fresh hold of God and the promises, and fearlessly venture all, and put Omnipotence to a new test, and *expect* a grand catch; and you will see the salvation of God; the nets will break with the multitude of fishes. It is these bold, seemingly audacious ventures of faith that bring God out of His hiding-place and arm the Word with superhuman power.

Just so with an *individual Christian*. Cease lamenting over wasted efforts. Cease fishing in shoal water and hugging the shore of timidity and non-success, and by a bold, fresh and heroic push launch out into deep water and strive with larger expectations and a mightier faith, and your soul shall attain to deeper and richer experiences of the grace of God than you had ever attained to before, or perhaps thought possible in the flesh.

SEPT. 23-29. — FAITHFUL UNTIL DEATH.—Heb. x: 38-29.

The promise of everlasting life is conditioned on one "enduring to the end." "If any man draw back"—no matter how far he has gone in the way of the gospel, or how wonderful have been his experiences—"my soul shall have no pleasure in him." That very many do enter upon the Christian life and run well for a season, and finally "draw back to perdition," is made certain by the testimony of Scripture and by observation.

There is nothing *unreasonable* or *hard* in such a condition. The principle involved in it is one that is generally recognized and acted upon in matters pertaining to this world. The farmer looks not for his reward

till he has reaped and garnered his sheaves. The seaman does not boast till his voyage is completed. The business man counts not on success till all his far-reaching plans have matured and been accomplished. The general claims not a victory till the fight is over and the enemy routed. The racer looks not for the prize till the goal is passed. In all such cases—indeed in all human effort and expectation—to draw back, or even to falter, is to forfeit all advantage and ignominiously fail.

And just so in the Christian life. It is not for a season, but for the whole term of natural life. At every step, down to the very moment of death, we have foes to face, conflicts with sin to wage, temptations to resist, sacrifices to make, duties to perform and praying and striving to maintain. Working out our salvation is a *lifelong* undertaking; it will be on our hands till Christ crowns us with victory in the moment of death.

"A charge to keep I have,
A God to glorify;
A never-dying soul to save,
And fit it for the sky."

Perseverance unto the end, or no crown.

THE MOTIVES TO FAITHFULNESS UNTIL DEATH ARE INFINITELY WEIGHTY.

1. Christ loved us unto death, and shall we stop short?

2. Life here is short and the salvation of the soul from sin and ruin is a work vast and difficult enough to tax an angel's strength through all eternity.

3. To stop short in the race or draw back is to leave unfinished and of no worth the mightiest and grandest enterprise that ever enlisted Omnipotent grace.

4. To forfeit the infinite benefits of redeeming love and grace after coming to see and acknowledge their worth and learn something of their sweetness by a personal experience will only enhance the disappointment and bitterness of their final

loss. It had been better not to have begun in the way of life than to draw back to perdition from the heights of Zion.

By all that is at stake in the final victory, and by all that is involved in failure, let us resolve to be faithful unto death.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

WHY CALLEST THOU ME GOOD?—

Matt. xix : 16-22.

BY REV. J. M. McNULTY, D.D.,
WOODBRIDGE, N. J.

THE grandest and holiest men of all time have ever attached the greatest importance to right beginnings in religion, and beginning early. Nor could any spectacle, we are bound to believe, be more beautiful in the sight either of angels or the Saviour of men, than that of young manhood intensely alive to the question: "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

Matthew xix : 16-22 and Luke xviii : 18-23 is a remarkable instance of this.

Every reader of the Gospels is familiar with the striking picture. Jesus is on the way to Jerusalem. Out of breath from "running," a young man of high standing, character and wealth, dashed suddenly in on the little company to ask Jesus the question already indicated. He introduced it by the epithet "Good Master," and received for answer, first of all, another question and statement: "Why callest thou me good? there is none good save one, that is God."

While some Christians have been troubled by the thought that a portion of this interview teaches salvation by works (though no such inference can by possibility be fairly drawn from it), more serious perplexity has been induced in the minds of others by the assertion on the part of the opposers of Christ's divinity that this opening answer of the Saviour favored their position. By false glosses this text has been abused (v. 17) for the support of error. While one party, that teaches we are justified in the sight of God by personal obedience, intrenches itself be-

hind the declaration: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments"; another, unwilling to recognize Christ's divinity, seeks a stronghold in the words: "Why callest thou me good? There is none good save one, that is God."

At present we wish to analyze the bearings simply of the latter. The followers of Socinus tell us that Christ in that forcible question proved the young ruler by emphasizing the pronominal "me," and suggesting a *strong contrast* between Himself and God; making the epithet "good" as the peculiar attribute of His Father, and repudiating all claim to it Himself, and therefore to the divinity it implied,

Plausible as this statement may appear at first blush, as an argument two or three considerations should certainly deprive it of that power.*

1. It is always both suspicious and dangerous to contend for an essential article of belief, by basing it upon a word of general and indefinite signification. "Good" is a word of that kind. We can determine its particular sense in any given case only from its connection and subject. Here, we are ready to grant, it evidently designates the infinite excellency of the living God. The occasion, the subject, and the unqualified manner of the declaration, all intimate a designed reference to the excellence of the Divine Being. Yet all that contains no impeachment of the proper divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; for in Psalm cxliii : 10 we have David exclaiming: "Thy Spirit is good!" applying the word in all its latitude of meaning to the third person of the Trinity. If the deity of the Father

* The writer is indebted for some suggestions to an article in *The Christian Magazine*.

is demonstrated by the absolute and unqualified ascription of goodness of the Son and the Spirit; the same unqualified ascription of goodness to the Spirit, equally demonstrates the deity of the Spirit, to the exclusion of the Father and the Son. There is no possibility of avoiding this conclusion on the principle of the opinion we oppose, yet the conclusion is both absurd in itself and destructive of Socinianism.

2. The Greek word *εἷς* (one), we are told by those who would argue in the same direction, being in the masculine gender, necessarily denotes but *one person*, and therefore that Jesus designed to teach in the passage that there is but *one person* in the divine *essence*, therefore renouncing any pretension to deity both for Himself and the Holy Spirit. Then further we are told that, in order to admit a plurality of persons in the Godhead, the Greek particle should have been in the neuter gender, *ὅν* (one being).

A sufficient answer to that is the statement that *Θεός* (God) is the general name of *the divine nature*, and *that* being in the masculine gender, it requires its adjective to be masculine also.

3. The argument we are controverting takes for granted that the Lord Jesus really restricts, in this passage, the ascription of goodness to His Father. This is not entirely clear. He does not say, as the Socinian would make Him, "There is none good but one, that is" *my Father*. Had he so limited it, he would have contradicted the Psalmist when he affirms: "Thy Spirit is good." He simply restricts his assertion to the *divine nature*: "None is good save one, that is *God*."

4. Coming now to what seems to be the honest and manifest interpretation of the passage, so far as the Saviour, even by implication, from denying His own divinity, His declaration and His conduct, here as well as elsewhere, tend to confirm it.

"Good master" was an epithet or title of peculiar meaning in the mouth of a Jew with reference to the teachers or rabbis. It was much more than a character compliment, as when we speak of one being a "good man," or a "good citizen." They addressed it to those who expounded the law to the extent of making it of none effect by their innumerable traditions. Such a manner of address recognized them as invested with judicial functions— that they had a perfect right to determine what was good and evil, what was sinful or righteous, what could merit eternal life and eternal death. This was their generally recognized prerogative, and its effect with the masses of the people was to virtually neutralize divine authority. When the teacher determined a point, they did not go behind that to inquire what God said. So that the rabbi came virtually into the place of God. The Saviour brings this out very clearly in His reported conflict with the Scribes and Pharisees, as in Matt. xv: 3-6. They are there distinctly charged with annulling the fifth commandment. Honor to father and mother, he argued, involved support as well as respect; but these teachers had inculcated the idea that if a parent required support at the hand of a child, and that child took the amount necessary for such support and gave it to the support of religion, or religious teachers, he was released thereby from all parental obligation.

Now, under this popular belief, the young man came to Jesus as a "master in Israel," to ask the important question which he did. Both the form of his question and Christ's response shows that this mistaken idea of the teacher's prerogative was his conviction. A teacher of teachers and of truth, would it have been honest on the part of the Saviour to indorse the evident and perverse mistake under which this young man was laboring, as indicated in his very words? He corrects, therefore, first

of all, this ruinous mistake about the teacher's authority "Why callest thou me good?" The point of the question is in the word "*why*." Plainly he reproves the ruler, but not because he calls him "*good*," but because of the ignorant manner in which he used the term. The revised version shows this more clearly: "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?" Why do you give me, or any other rabbi, this title? What is your meaning? What warrants you in this use of the epithet? Do you call me good merely because you view me as a teacher or master in Israel, and view me as a mere man on a level with your other teachers; if so, you are grossly wrong. To apply goodness to a mere man, in your sense, is idolatry. It is giving God's attributes to a creature. God only has authority to pronounce what is good and what is evil; what will merit eternal life and eternal disaster. On the other hand, do you view me in my true character, God as well as man, and do you give me this title as expressing your faith in my godlike goodness and supreme authority. Then you are right in giving it to?

me. I claim that prerogative, and as evidence of my divinity and my right to decide the question of eternal life, I will answer at once the appeal you make: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," etc.

Considering, therefore, the Saviour's words and conduct, and the evident misapprehension of His interrogator, we see no such thing here as a denial, but a most manifest assertion of His own divinity. The fact and the manner of His answering the question implies unequivocally that He claimed to be God. Otherwise, He allows His words to be contradicted by His act. One moment He would assert that no man has the right to acknowledge the appellation and answer the question but God, and the next moment He seizes the divine prerogative and answers the question proposed. If Christ is not God, this conduct was certainly misleading to the ruler with regard to his claims, and between the words and the action there would be manifest contradiction. But we believe both the words and conduct declare unequivocal divinity.

EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

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

CURRENT THOUGHT.

The Preacher a Prophet.—"Jesus is the prophet. In His Word His voice is still heard to-day. Wherever His Word kindles, conquers, communicates eternal power, there He is the one who does it. But in the same breath in which He says, just before His ascension: 'Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,' He also says: 'Ye shall be my witnesses.' There must everywhere be witnesses, in order that the light may appear. In Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, there were prophets and teachers. Is it in order for a congregation to be without a prophet? No, it is con-

trary to order. Is it too much to ask that every preacher be a prophet? Can it be said to be too great a demand in view of the words, 'He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' Whoever has seen and heard of Jesus cannot but speak of what he has seen and heard. And he must testify as a witness of what he has seen and heard. The mystery of godliness has been revealed in order that it may henceforth be revealed constantly. Indefiniteness must cease in our congregations; the proclamation must be made that life can alone be found by faith in the Saviour of sinners.

If the congregation so hears from the pulpit words that cannot be misunderstood, to the effect that Christ accepts sinners, that He really receives them, then a prophet stands in the pulpit. Sermons grappling with souls, hitting the center—these are needed more than our daily bread. May the Lord deliver us and all the brethren from sermons which are above all things interesting, the product of the newest homiletic disease of the age. Such sermons please too much the natural man. War must be waged with the old man in order that he may resolve to be saved. . . . As by means of the sermon the congregation is to be wrestled with, so in preparing for the pulpit the preacher is to wrestle with his sermon. The wrestling is to be to the effect that the depths of the Word may constantly be more thoroughly penetrated, that on our knees God may be persuaded to teach us how to reach souls. This is not possible without that spiritual emotion which affects spirit and soul, marrow and bone. Every homiletic meditation is a life process. Sermons thus wrought out are preached by prophets. This life process is performed by means of meditation, prayer and supplication, by research and pastoral care, by striving to bring one's own self under the Word, by new experience of salvation in one's own soul, by realizing inner need, and inner free and joyful courage. When something is produced which is not manufactured but has grown, then it will manifest itself in the delivery as original, as a gift from God, such as He bestows on prophets. Theology also needs prophets."—*Superintendent Holzheuer* in "*Luth. Ev. Kirchen-Zeitung*."

Jesuitism.—"It is treated by novelists as a fact that the Order of the Jesuits is mightiest where the people have ceased to believe in its existence. Therefore, the Order seeks to create the impression that it is no

longer to be feared; if its existence cannot be denied, it is claimed that it is no longer what it was in the past. In a liberal *salon* an arch-Jesuit once exclaimed to a lady, 'Heavens! is it true that there are still Jesuits?'"—*Dr. B. Spiess*.

Family Training.—"The home is the garden of moral character. If the will and moral character are not nourished and strengthened here, they will fare but ill when transplanted into the more artificial surroundings of school life. In the home the whole life is in a manner brought under the supervision of the educator. Not only so, the strong and close affection which grows up between the parent and the child gives a unique character to the home discipline. On the one side, the mother is solicitous about her charge as the teacher cannot be, and is far better able, as well as much more strongly disposed, to study his moral peculiarities. On the other side, the child's feeling of dependence and his love are strong forces, tending from the first in the direction of obedience. Here, then, the foundations of character have to be laid, if they are to be laid at all. The relations of home, moreover, serve to bring out and exercise *all* the moral habits, not only the rougher virtues of obedience, veracity and sense of right and justice, but the more delicate virtues of sympathy, kindness and self-sacrifice."—*James Sully*.

New Religions.—"We are certainly a mystery, dwelling in the midst of mysteries, moral, material and spiritual. It is natural that men should go on guessing about these riddles, and natural that their guesses should follow and resemble each other. Just as the belief in official religion is waning in Europe, just as the Christian faith, as commonly held, is ceasing to be as powerful as of old in governing the world, people come forward with a variety of fresh proposals and patent religions. The

peculiarity is that they satisfy the persons who introduce them, and the peculiarity of the persons who introduce them is that they think this an adequate proof of the correctness of their ideas."—*Saturday Review*.

An Age of Contrasts.—A German writer says: "It is one of the signs of the times that the horrible powers of the abyss, which attempt to destroy all existing things, namely, the altar, the throne, the family, property, fatherland—these powers are continually gaining in influence, and that at the same time an independent, self-conscious Christianity has become common, manifests faith, practices love, conveys regenerative powers into all forms of life, and fills the whole earth with the joyful message of the gospel."

The Masses.—"It is a sad fact that, as a rule, a large part of the parish cares little for divine services. Frequently whole villages are found which have gradually become estranged from the church, so that on Sunday scarcely any persons attend service. In the forenoon the people lounge about the house or work in the field; in the afternoon the peasant's drive to their friends and relatives, or go to the saloon. In the town the people go to the country or to bowling-alleys. The inhabitants are prepared for much on Sundays, but not for religious services."—*Ev. Luth. Kirchen-Zeitung*.

The Press.—The character of the newspapers is exciting much attention in different countries. While it is admitted that the press has an influence unparalleled, and that it might be the mightiest elevating power, it is found in many cases to have a demoralizing effect. A paper started merely as a business speculation is naturally apt to partake of a character which will secure the most money. It is consequently not so much a leader of thought as it is led. The readers make the paper as much as the editor does; he simply studies

their taste and caters to it. Hence, if the age is to be studied, look but at the papers in which the age expresses itself. The communities which support a vile sheet do so because they find that sheet congenial to them.

But papers otherwise excellent are also found to give an unusual amount of space to unworthy matter. While they undoubtedly meet a wish on the part of many readers, they greatly offend others. The demand for the sensational element grows in proportion as the demand itself is met, and in order to meet the increased demand, facts must be perverted or even invented, and the most must be made of crimes, of indecencies, and of trials that should never be reported in a family paper.

In a recent sermon before the University of Cambridge the Bishop of Manchester deplored the condition of the English press, and pronounced its moral tone inferior to that of the press in the colonies. Some of the English papers devote two or three columns to races, besides lengthy reports of divorce cases and other criminal and sensational items. The Nonconformist ministers of Sheffield have also protested against the encouragement given to gambling and other evils by the publications of the newspapers. By publishing the lives of murderers and other noted criminals the press makes crime the avenue to notoriety, and against this protests are also being raised.

Tendencies Toward Rome.—*The Tablet*, an English Catholic paper, complains that Anglican clergymen abroad "enter the Roman Catholic churches, use the holy water, attend mass every Sunday, join in processions when able, and sing litanies of invocation." It is naturally expected that when they go so far they should take the next step and go to Rome.

The English Churchman says that at the Oxford Mission, Bromley, East

of London, the vicar had a crucifix over the pulpit, and altar lights in broad daylight; that he gives popish wafers at the communion; that the stations of the cross are on the walls of the church; that the popish banners and cross are carried in procession; that the hymn-book used is full of idolatrous mariolatry, and that the "manual" for confession contains the repulsive Romanist suggestions.

EMPEROR WILLIAM II.

NOT long since pictures were seen all through Berlin representing four generations of the imperial family—Emperor William, his son, grandson, and great-grandson. Of these "four emperors," as they were called, only the two youngest are left. While the world has sympathized with Germany in its deep affliction, it was necessary to be in Berlin in order to know how keenly the loss of the two emperors in such quick succession was felt. William I. was universally revered and generally beloved; but his great age made his death seem natural. Still the nation mourned profoundly, and when the veteran was known to be no longer at the head of affairs many hearts looked with serious apprehensions into the future.

The reign of Frederick III. lasted ninety-nine days. What a tragedy! He ascended the throne a dying man, and his reign of suffering and anxiety is full of pathos. He was the hope of the Liberal party. His past utterances led them to believe that he would break with the still-existing remnants of the feudal ages, and would inaugurate an era of tolerance, of freedom, of fraternity, and of progress. It was expected that he would again exalt on the throne the humanitarian principles of Frederick the Great. But he inherited an established order of things which could not suddenly be changed, and he was too sick to propose and carry

out radical innovations. During his reign Bismarck remained at the helm and continued the policy pursued for many years. Still the spirit of Frederick revealed itself in various ways. He dismissed Puttkammer, the minister most obnoxious to the Liberals, announced that all should be protected in their religious views, and gave various indications that he favored a more liberal policy than had been pursued in the past. He had taken occasion repeatedly to denounce the wide-spread opposition to the Jews. If Frederick the Great had proclaimed, on account of religious indifference, that in his kingdom each might be saved according to his own fashion, those were evidently mistaken who had expected an equal indifference on the part of Frederick III. His faith and trust in God were repeatedly emphasized. But he did not want any special homage to be paid to himself in the churches because he was emperor. He declared that before God we are all alike sinners; and in prayers for himself he wanted to be designated simply as a servant of God. All exaltation on account of the fact that he occupied the throne he wanted avoided in the churches. It is customary, in the Dom in Berlin, the royal church, for the minister to bow toward any royal personages who may be present when he ascends the pulpit. Frederick III, however, ordered the preacher whose services he usually attended when in Potsdam, while crown-prince, never to show him such deference, declaring that whatever distinctions of rank may prevail in the world they must not be introduced into divine service. He also adopted the words of Frederick II, that he regarded himself as the first servant of the state.

These liberal views by no means pleased the conservatives and the aristocracy. But he won the hearty and even enthusiastic admiration of the Liberals; and in proportion as they admired him they dreaded the

accession of the present emperor to the throne. If the spirit of tolerance manifested by Frederick had gained the sympathy of other nations, reports detrimental to the character of his son and successor had been sedulously spread both at home and abroad. It is hard for persons abroad to understand how the party spirit is intensified in Germany. The new emperor was regarded as extremely conservative, and this was enough to repel the Liberals. But a man may be one thing as a crown-prince and very different after ascending the throne; therefore his first public utterances were looked forward to with great anxiety. Both at home and abroad it excited serious comment that his first proclamations were to the army and navy, not to the people. He had the reputation of being eager for war, and this seemed to confirm that reputation. Prussian princes are first of all trained to be soldiers, then as statesmen. William was so suddenly called to the throne, and at so early an age, that his training had been predominantly military. His proclamations to the people, to the Imperial Parliament, and to the Prussian Legislature, however, placed such marked emphasis on the preservation of peace that he has effectually dispelled the view that he has a predilection for war. But those proclamations also gave unmistakable evidence that if war is forced on the nation it will be prosecuted with the utmost vigor.

Some newspapers which place a premium on sensational articles have done their best to excite prejudice against the emperor. I do not propose to enter into details, but give the following statements on unquestioned authority. During his father's illness his position was a most trying one; the disputes between the doctors agitated court circles and the nation. But it cannot be said that he was lacking in filial affection or that his course was calculated to make

him a partisan. His public utterances reveal deep affection for his father, and his relation to his mother is said to be cordial. His father's reign was too short and too much hampered by sickness to have left a model for him to follow: nevertheless he declared his adherence to the great principles of his father. He was an ardent admirer of William I., and is an enthusiastic friend of Bismarck, and these two personages will no doubt exert the most decided influence on his reign.

Much has been said about his religious principles. It was charged that he was hostile to the Jews, but this he has denied. He has given assurance that all religions shall be protected in his state. He has never, indeed, manifested for the Jews the same friendship as his father did; but this is no evidence of real hostility to them. He and the empress are warm friends of court-preacher Stoecker; but this seems not to be based on Stoecker's anti-Semitic tendencies, but on his work in behalf of city missions. The emperor has manifested especial interest in efforts to leaven the masses with the gospel, and thus win them back to the church. He recognizes Stoecker as having done a great work in this respect, and consequently has been attracted by him. Much has been made of a meeting at Count Walderssee's at which the emperor, then crown-prince, was present, and also Stoecker. The aim of that meeting was simply to promote evangelical principles among the masses. Count and Countess Walderssee are very influential, and are highly esteemed by the emperor and the empress. They are deeply interested in the work of evangelization, and their influence in imperial circles should be hailed with joy by Christians. Countess Walderssee is an American lady, very benevolent, and is an earnest Christian, with a most lovely Christian character. She is an honor to

our country, and a most worthy representative of our Christianity.

Just now the papers are discussing the relation of the emperor to the Masonic Order. The Hohenzollern princes have been among its warmest friends, particularly Frederick III. But it is claimed that William II. is not friendly to the Masons, and that his opposition is due to religious scruples. The orthodox hail this attitude with pleasure, but the liberals, while not daring openly to attack the views of the emperor, are doing their utmost to defend the Order.

William II. is a man of decision and of positive character. There are indications that his reign will be marked by firmness and strength. Although young and of limited experience, it must be remembered that Bismarck is his prime minister, and that the voice of the nation is heard through Parliament. He is an evangelical Christian, and he boldly avows himself as such. And while all religious views will be amply protected, there is no doubt that the Evangelical Church will be the object of his especial regard and fostering care. This, at least, is what the present signs indicate. Great changes often occur on thrones, and we cannot afford to prophesy. But we are warranted in cherishing the best hopes for the reign of William II.

INNER MISSIONS.

THIS term is of recent origin, and is used to designate a class of Christian activities which have assumed vast proportion in Germany. It is not synonymous with what is termed "Home Missions" in America, but includes a much more extensive range of labors. To Inner Missions, in the German sense, belong all those Christian efforts which are not part of the regular work of the church as an organization, but which are carried on by individuals or associations in the spirit of Christianity. Thus all labors of voluntary associations

for the purpose of promoting religion among the people are included, such as city missions and Y. M. C. Associations. But besides the efforts at evangelization, all benevolent enterprises carried on in a Christian spirit are included, their aim being humanitarian, yet with a view to further Christ's kingdom. The work of the deaconesses is of this character. They wait on the sick, but are intent on the spiritual as well as on the physical health. Included in Inner Missions are also Christian labors in behalf of the poor and neglected classes, the education and training of the weak-minded, the rescue of the fallen, the help of the unfortunate and the purification of literature. Besides the purely or distinctively Christian element, it is thus found that humanitarian elements are prominent—just such as Christ connected with His religious instruction.

Much of the best activity of German Christians is devoted to this work of Inner Missions. Here they have full play for their faculties, not being subject to the restraint which hampers activity, especially that of laymen, in the state church.

It is sometimes asked whether Americans can learn anything of practical importance from the activity of German Christians. American and English theological students usually come here for learned lore, and not for practical theology. They find the practical work of the churches at home so much greater than in Germany, that most of the means used here perhaps seem of little value to them. And yet, while the American and English churches are more active and more practical than the German, they can in some respects learn from the latter. The Germans are less quick and less demonstrative than their brethren across the channel and the Atlantic. But they are more systematic—their military system has left its impress on their Christian organizations. Thus there

is one head to manage the Berlin City Mission; under him are three inspectors; under these are thirty or forty lay missionaries. In the division of labor and in the supervision of the work there is an element of military exactness. The Germans are trained to law and order, and are disciplined into obedience; hence there is less arbitrariness and less individualism than with us.

While the Germans are not as ready or as quick as the Americans, they are often more painstaking and more thorough. They lay great stress on special training as the necessary condition for entering particular spheres of work. The training of the deaconesses is most thorough, even those who belong to the nobility being obliged to prepare themselves by the humblest kind of labor. So there are different institutions in Germany to train persons for the various departments of Inner Missions. It is not only labor but skilled Christian labor that is sought.

In quiet, faithful, sacrificing labor many of the German Christians are models. The emphasis of faith, in distinction from the Catholic doctrine of works, has the effect of making the piety inner, perhaps even to the neglect of the fruits before the world. Sometimes the busy activity of Christians in other lands is deprecated, and contemplation, meditation, and concentration of thought are emphasized. As a consequence, there is modesty in Christian work, quiet faithfulness, and an earnest effort to make especially prominent the cultivation of the inner man, and to let the outer life be but a manifestation of the heart's devotion. For the demands of the times it must be admitted that many German Christians are too much given to mystical contemplation, too little to zeal in behalf of others. But a predominantly practical people may learn from one more contemplative in their faith.

German Christians have been

aroused to a consciousness of the spiritual needs of the day by the estrangement of the masses from the church, by the dangers of socialism, and by the aggressions of Catholicism. Largely these needs must be met by other than the ordinary agencies of the church; and hence a wonderful impetus has been given to the work of Inner Missions. Indeed here, more than in any other department, do we see the best evidences of the life of German Christianity. Much of the best religious literature is devoted to this subject. The discussions of the subject are characterized by thoroughness and scripturalness. It is the most practical department of German religious life, and yet the whole subject is permeated with thought. One of the journals devoted to Inner Missions lies before me. It is a monthly, with substantial articles on Christian work at home and abroad. Among its editors are two theological professors, and leading preachers. Its aim is to make the Scriptures the living seed whence the practical Christian activity adapted to the needs of the age grows.

THE PROCESS IN THE GROWTH OF CHRISTIAN ORGANIZATIONS.

A GERMAN writer claims that this process is as follows: 1. Some individual discovers a local need and makes efforts to relieve it. 2. Others become interested in the new idea, and find that the need is general. 3. For the removal of the need voluntary religious organizations and institutions are created. 4. The new organizations are found to be indispensable, become permanent, and receive ecclesiastical aid. 5. The organizations become part of the church.

This is an important generalization, and history proves that it indicates the general tendency and process of religious organizations. It is worthy of especial note that great movements begin with individuals, not

with the masses, not with the church as a body. This ought to be self-evident, and yet it is generally overlooked. Even if a conference or church inaugurates measures, the initiative must come from some individual. Usually an individual is, first of all, especially impressed with the need of a certain work or institution. His interest in the object leads him to make it a special study and a hobby. For a long time he may stand alone, and may even be laughed at and pronounced visionary. But if what he has discovered as a demand of the times is real, others will also discover it and come to his aid. He is a pioneer, but he prepares the way for a multitude to follow. A few like-minded persons will at first join him in voluntary efforts, then associations will be formed, and institutions, if required, will be erected, and the church will become interested and give its sympathy and aid. Whether the work can be wholly absorbed by the church will, of course, depend on the nature of the work. It may be such that the church can incorporate it, as the Sunday-school and missionary enterprises; or it may be of a character that it can best be promoted by voluntary agencies, with the help of the church.

Individuals—separate, lonely, misunderstood, abused—are the creative factors in new religious movements. The prophets from Moses till John the Baptist are witnesses of the truth of this statement; and in the Christian church we find the same confirmed by the history of Christ and His apostles, and by the great movements inaugurated in the church during the Middle Ages and in modern times. The crusades, the founding of the religious orders, the origin of the Society of the Jesuits, the Reformation, all testify to the creative energy of individuals. So in more recent movements, as the great missionary efforts, Sunday-schools, orphan asylums, and various organi-

zations for evangelization and charitable purposes, we find some individual as the leader. The names of Raikes, Francke, Wishern and Fliedner are familiar, and the work which they began alone has gained vast proportions and secured the interest of millions.

Times of agitation, of peculiar needs, and of great emergencies are also times when new creations are demanded and inaugurated. Crises arouse and concentrate thought, lead to special study, and develop special energy to meet the requirements of the day. When we consider the intellectual development of our day; the struggle of thought to gain clearness and definiteness and certainty respecting fundamental problems; the efforts to overthrow religion and to undermine morality; the estrangement of the masses from the church; the threatenings of anarchical socialism; and the amazing revival of Catholicism, we cannot but realize that we live in a period when the forces and movements of centuries culminate, and when new methods must be inaugurated to meet the new needs.

Individuals with prophetic insight and foresight, and with apostolic faith and zeal, are needed for this creative work. The inaugurators of great religious reforms have by no means always been men of unusual general intellectual power. Perhaps intense absorption in one purpose prevented mental breadth. If it had not been for the great work they started, Francke, Pestalozzi, Wishern, Fliedner would probably not have been mentioned on the pages of history. Much in the labors of such men looks like inspiration. They seemed to be possessed. Impelled by a force akin to instinct they labored on because they could not help themselves, labored with dogged perseverance when others were hopeless. Religion is not a product of genius; but there is no reason why religion

may not develop and use genius for its highest purposes.

The creative work of individuals was at first local, always on a small scale, insignificant in the eyes of their fellow-men and perhaps in their own eyes, and required the accretions of time in order to assume great proportions. Sympathetic study in a narrow field and with limited opportunities may lead to creations which shall prove to be of general interest and of permanent value. The age is everywhere, and everywhere it leaves its peculiar impress. Its deposits may vary somewhat with localities, but everywhere they are the deposits of the age and bear its marks. Hence, even in a limited sphere of observation, what is typical and characteristic may be discovered, and what meets a local need may be the very thing required by the exigencies of the age itself.

Original thought, a deep appreciation of the present, the readiness to stand alone and to be solitary in one's cause, are the conditions for the creative work needed. Petty envy leads us to seek the attainment of what others have, even if insignificant, for fear they may be regarded as our superiors. Thus we lose our individuality and peculiarity, and miss the peculiar mission given us, and perhaps peculiarly needed by the age in order to meet its peculiar needs. Our religion does not encourage mannerism or eccentricity, but it promotes independence and peculiarities. It makes no two apostles alike, and yet each has his especial sphere and work.

Ranke somewhere says that men who accomplish a great work thereby render themselves superfluous. The work is started, others are won, the result is assured, and so the originators can depart from the scene. In other words, the process indicated in the beginning is followed. First one man, then two, then numbers, then organizations and institutions, then

ecclesiastical help, and, perhaps, absorption by the church. The individual inaugurates a new movement which makes an epoch; the movement attracts multitudes, gains in depth and breadth, and becomes a permanent historic factor in the religious life of nations.

NATIONALISM IN RELIGION.

THE Slavs, the Poles, and the Catholics of the Romanic nations speak of Protestantism as German. This designation is not merely intended to indicate its origin, but also its character, and the intention is to excite prejudice against Protestantism as a national religious movement, and as unfit for other people than the Germans. Catholicism, on the other hand, is lauded as international or supernatural, and the Pope is proclaimed the spiritual ruler of Christendom. But even in Protestant countries there are decided tendencies toward nationalism in religion. Where there is an established church, there is a tacit understanding that there is an essential connection between that church and the national life, and when this connection ceases, the church, whatever it may be in name, can no longer be regarded as really the state church.

According to English law every Englishman is regarded as a member of the Church of England. There are not a few in that church who regard it as a breach of faithfulness to the nation to withdraw from that church, so that dissent is branded both as national and religious treachery. The very term "Anglicanism" is used for adherence to the English Church and for partiality to England.

In Germany it is common to hear the Evangelical spoken of as the German Church, thus giving it the stamp of nationality and the limitations of that nationality. German scholarship has made historic studies prominent, and much emphasis is placed on historic development. The

conservative element is very strong in Germany, and is said to be on the increase, particularly among young men. It is common in religion as well as in politics to make the appeal to historical development and to tradition final. Just now the appeals to the authority of Luther and of the Reformation are especially powerful. Where a church moves within the limits fixed by state authority, and where its grooves are definitely worn by the processes of historic growth, we naturally expect rigidity in the forms, and the exclusion of foreign influence. There are in the German Church strictly conservative elements and also decidedly liberal tendencies; but it is by no means generally admitted that there is a conservatism which is at the same time progressive—which adheres tenaciously to the old so far as true and adapted to the age, and eagerly seizes whatever is true and valuable in the new that is offered.

Since 1866 and 1871 the feeling of nationality has been remarkably developed in Germany, and its effect is also seen in religion. It is a common saying here that it is a peculiarity of the Germans to drop their own characteristics and assimilate those of other nations, and Bismarck has stated it in Parliament as a fact. If this was true in the past, and if it is true in a measure of Germans away from the Fatherland, it is certainly not true respecting many of the tendencies in the Germany of to-day. With the feeling of nationality there has been developed a spirit of exclusiveness, and in some instances even of hostility to what is foreign.

Instead of learning from religious movements in other lands, and adopting suggestions of weight which come from abroad, there is a general disposition to treat them as subversive of the peculiarity of German Christianity. In many circles the condemnation of a cause is certain if it is shown to have had its origin or

inspiration in a foreign land. Movements in America and England are watched with jealous eye, and in addresses and journals the preachers and people are warned that these movements are foreign to German Christianity. The introduction of the Sunday-school was opposed because it was regarded as an American and an English institution, and for the same reason certain Y. M. C. Associations meet with bitter opposition. When the lay activity in America and England is mentioned the effect in certain quarters is to oppose its introduction into the German church, for fear its peculiar genius might be destroyed by such foreign innovations. Likewise, certain methods of evangelization are opposed, because, instead of springing from the soil, they are imported. The observance of Sunday and temperance are also discussed with a view of carefully excluding all foreign views and influences. Indeed, there are prevalent views which seem to regard the gospel as having been written for the state church, and as especially committed to its keeping.

Even where but two per cent. of the people attend divine services, and where the churches and ministers are wholly inadequate to meet the spiritual needs of the people, religious help and influence from abroad are depreciated. One of the standing and stale subjects of religious journals is the sects which come from America and England to work among the neglected masses. Papers teem with articles on the sad condition of the church and on the inability of the present forces to meet the religious needs of the day; and these are followed by articles denouncing the sects, and calling on preachers and people to take up arms against them. It is evidently thought to be more religious to leave the masses as they are than to let the Methodists and Baptists gain an influence over them. One common argument against the so-

called sects is astounding: it is argued that they are immeasurably inferior to the state church, and then they are charged with gathering into their fold the most energetic workers! Strange that the worst attracts the best!

Another effect of an exclusive nationalism in religion is seen in the reports given of churches in other lands. Some of the religious journals I regularly read surprise me whenever they give favorable reports of religious affairs in America outside of the German churches in our country. These surprises do not, however, occur very often. What is exceptional in our religious life, and for that reason is striking, is frequently emphasized as if a universal characteristic. If eccentricities and excesses occur, the most is made of them, although the instances may be isolated and abnormal. I read lately in one of these journals that Americans, in their religion as well as in secular affairs, have a preference for the theatrical. As a consequence, the people here have strange notions about our religious life, and the most ridiculous questions are asked of Americans. I lately astonished a German audience by stating that for many of our religious sects we are indebted to the Old World; and that Mormonism, which is indigenous, recruits its strength from Europe. Many regard us as religiously in a kind of chaotic condition, each denomination trying to devour every other. They cannot comprehend it possible that there is more real unity between our leading denominations, than in their own distracted state church, in which the extremest confessionalism and the most negative rationalism carry on a war of extermination. Not a few think the hope of America is in the German churches. They are to promote German thought, the German language, and German Christianity. I listened not long ago to a father who gave

the charge to his son as he was ordained a missionary to the United States. Especial emphasis was laid on the German tongue, German views, and German practices, as if their preservation in America was the main thing.

There are, of course, earnest Christians here, who welcome all means that are proper, whether foreign or native, to carry on the great work of Christ. To observing men of all parties it is becoming evident that foreign influence cannot be wholly excluded. This influence is felt through the religious movements in Germany, which are supported by American and English Christians. Besides, there are translations of sermons of eminent American and English preachers, and also of works in the department of practical Christianity, and by these means the character of our religion and churches is becoming better known. And there are evidences that the number of those is increasing who regard with favor our free churches, the activity of our laity, the influence of our religion on public life, and the practical character of our Christianity. I know, too, that there are those who would gladly so enlarge the nationalism of the German Church as to permit the introduction of some of the foreign Christian elements from America and England.

My study of religious tendencies in Europe has convinced me that the two countries most favorably situated for rising above a narrow nationalism in religion are America and England—in the latter country particularly the non-conformists. The commingling of nations and the variety of denominations in these countries give them a cosmopolitan character which also leaves its effect on the religious life.

Query.—Is not the remarkable awakening of the spirit of nationalism, extending from Russia, Poland and Hungary to Ireland, and from

Scandinavia to Italy and Greece, to be interpreted as a reaction against the cosmopolitanism promoted by the greater increase and the increased commingling of the nations? The

conditions of thought and life are such that an exclusive nationalism is doomed. Does not this fact for the time being arouse and intensify a bigoted nationalism?

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

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

I.

SCIOLOGISM IN THE PULPIT.

SOME months ago the conductor of this department contributed a signed article, which was printed in the first section of the HOMILETIC REVIEW, discussing the subject of "Better Training of Candidates for the Ministry." That article elicited from friendly correspondents some communications, one or two at least of which contained matter adapted to be of general interest to our readers. The particular point on which the communications now alluded to had their bearing was the subject of sciolism as displayed in the pulpit. Our correspondent, after kindly saying, "I shall look with great interest for the supplement" [to the present writer's first paper on theological education], frankly continues:

"If I was to write it, I should modify some of the ideas advanced in the present article. You speak as if a 'little knowledge' in Greek and Hebrew is especially dangerous, as tending to inflation, etc. Is a smattering of Greek any more dangerous than a smattering of English? My observation causes me to fear that, in the public exposition of the Bible by so many young men who know nothing of Greek, and but very little of English, and less of the principles of interpretation, there is likely to be gendered a weak and sickly religion that will not produce a Carey or a Judson. I don't know how the young men of Northfield impress you, but they certainly seem to me to speak upon matters of interpretation with *great assurance*, when really they are only declaiming what they have heard their teachers say in a fortnight's course. . . . One who knows but little of Greek should not 'impose on others' what he knows not himself. This is as true in English as in Greek, and ten times more common, according to my observation. I don't believe in elective studies in our theological seminaries to so great an extent as you do. When we come nearer to the millennium, and 'there is more of humility and less of pride, elective studies may be the rule. I don't expect to live to see this 'good time.' You

may. Pardon me for this expression of my views."

The foregoing expressions seemed to the present writer in the main so sound and so just that he was more than willing to lay them before the readers of his article of some months ago. Asking, accordingly, permission of his correspondent to make such use of his letter, he was accorded the privilege desired in a supplementary note, from which he now ventures to present the following instructive extract:

"I have an illustration of *your view* of the Greek side and also of *my view*, too. Three weeks ago I attended the funeral of a young lady who had been a member of my church for some years. The living members of the family were Unitarians. I read and commented on the 11th of John. After I closed, the Unitarian minister spoke. He never loses sight of himself. I don't think there was any one present who knew the Greek alphabet but the two ministers. However, in his remarks, he took the opportunity to say: 'Many of you, I fear, do not understand the full meaning of the word *resurrection*. You have read Xenophon's "*Anabasis*." Here we find the origin of this word *resurrection*—a going up, or ascending into a new and higher life.' I don't give his exact words, but very nearly so. Now, it was a comfort to me that I knew enough of Greek to know that *Anabasis* is not *Anastasis*. You see this illustrates both sides of the question."

Yes, the evil and the good of a "little knowledge"—our correspondent's modest claim supposed admitted of "*little knowledge*" in the matter of Greek—is well exemplified in the incident related. If, on the one hand, that sciolistic hermeneute had known nothing whatever of Greek, he would hardly have been exposed to the temptation which overcame him. If, on the other hand, our correspondent had known nothing whatever of Greek, he too, with the rest, might have been im-

posed upon by that extraordinary display of Greek learning.

On the whole, we may, we think, safely dismiss the point as now sufficiently guarded, on both sides, by what our correspondent has wisely suggested. If we should ourselves suggest anything additional, it would perhaps be this, that crude young men might *better* be trusted to retail Scripture interpretations furnished ready to their hand, even in a summer school, by competent scholars, than be sent out, having been equipped, in whatever school, with a mere smattering of Greek, to excogitate for themselves such exegesis as our correspondent heard solemnly delivered on that funeral occasion by his associate minister.

Still the use, mischievous or otherwise, that will in any case be made of a "little knowledge" is, after all, chiefly a matter of individual personal character. A thoroughly genuine man will rarely either be injured himself, or be misled to injure others, through the possession of a "little knowledge." It generally requires some admixture of pretense to work the harm.

II.

PASTORAL VISITING—HOW TO DO IT.

WE are perhaps in no danger of making the impression—an impression certainly it would be as false to our own convictions as injurious in tendency of influence—that we rate the pastoral care above the pulpit in relative importance. But in taking up again the topic of pastoral visiting, to submit hints for doing the work fruitfully, we must, even if gratuitously, guard ourselves at this point. Let it then be laid down, as a maxim of self-evident wisdom, that pastoral visiting should be so done as not to encroach, or as least to encroach, upon preparation for the pulpit. On the other hand, we do not say—we will not say—that the pulpit should be paramount, and pastoral care secondary. This, however, is true, that

if, in any case, the pulpit suffers through lack of preparation for it on the part of the preacher, then, in that case, the pastoral influence suffers, and suffers equally from the selfsame cause. The usefulness of the pastor in pastoral visiting depends largely upon the credit with the people enjoyed by the preacher in his preaching. The transcendent and peculiar advantage belonging to the pastor for pastoral work springs from the fact that the pastor is also the preacher. The preaching office and the pastoral office could not be disjoined without serious loss to both offices. As we have said before, we say again, the two offices need to unite in one and the same man. To use the language of mathematics, they are reciprocally functions of each other. Each gains, each loses, as the other. Poor preaching is a deduction from the value of the pastoral work. Poor pastoral work is a deduction from the value of the preaching. So, too, on the other hand, if you preached a good sermon the preceding Sunday, your pastoral call during the following week is enhanced in potential effectiveness accordingly; while, also, if you have done a good week's work as pastor, the next Sunday's preaching will be the more useful in accurately corresponding proportion. We do not say, then, neglect pastoral visiting, if necessary, for the sake of pulpit preparation. That may not be best, even for the success of your preaching. What we do say is, neglect neither pulpit preparation nor attention to pastoral work. Remember that the one is, on the whole, as the other. Therefore plan your pastoral visiting so as not to interfere with your preparation for the pulpit. On necessary occasion, the one office may borrow time from the other. But neither the one nor the other is to be a privileged and preemptory borrower. Keep the relation between them equal and reciprocal.

In accordance with this general principle, it may safely be said that the time for study work is morning, and the time for pastoral work is afternoon. On the strength and in the joy of a good conscience, at peace over a forenoon that has been well employed in your study, go out at a suitable hour of the afternoon to visit your people. Be sure always to do this with prayer offered beforehand for a special divine blessing on that particular visit or round of visiting. Do not trust to prayer offered silently on the way, though that, too, is well and not to be neglected. But remember that the state of mind which we call prayerfulness is created and maintained by separate acts of prayer. The Valley of Baca springs into wells as you go because reserves of water are stored in the hills. Pray, then, specially before each occasion of going forth for pastoral visiting. But prayer is not enough. You should meditate, premeditate, and plan. Napoleon said men attributed his swift right decisions in moments of emergency to the inspiration of genius. They were, he said, due to nothing of the sort. The simple fact was, they resulted from his deliberate forethought. He accustomed himself to conjecturing in advance every possible conjuncture of circumstances, and to resolving what, in each case, should the case actually arise, he would do. He anticipated with laborious and self-tasking forethought. Perhaps the capacity to do this is genius. If so, we do not see why every pastor should not possess genius. Certainly every pastor may, if he will, forecast to a considerable extent the turn which things may take upon occasion of a pastoral call. To some extent, probably, you will, like Napoleon, create circumstances. But we do not mean that you should so preconceive the course of incidents as to attempt the actual coercion of circumstances into a predetermined

channel. Have plenty of alternatives thought out. Give room thus for easy, elastic self-adjustment.

Do we recommend that every call you make as pastor be strictly religious? No, and yes. Religious, in its conscious purpose on your part; but perhaps not perceivably religious in its adoption of means, Unquestionably a pastoral call, as distinguished from a personal call, should be religious in its character. But wise religiousness in purpose on the part of the pastor may often exclude apparent religiousness of behavior. Augustine said, Love, and do what you will. We say, be religious in purpose when you make a pastoral call, and conduct the call as you please.

This answers the question which we have been asked, Ought I to offer prayer on every occasion of pastoral calling? Not necessarily or invariably by any means, though we are bound to say, on the other hand, that a pastoral call which has succeeded in making it seem natural, and easy, and, as it were, unavoidable, to have a prayer offered is presumably a better call than one in which this has not occurred. Better, simply because in any case such an incident as the offering of prayer ought, in the conduct of the call, at least, to have been prepared for in some degree; otherwise the call tended to no religious issue. And if the steps leading toward prayer actually led quite to prayer, why evidently more progress was secured and a better call was made. It seems not to be a question admitting of different opinions, the point thus assumed, that prayer would be a natural, almost necessary, incident of the ideal pastoral call. That you should talk about God, with a definite religious purpose in your mind, and not talk to God—this would seem to imply something false in your conception of your feeling concerning God.

Of course, however, occasions of

pastoral visiting vary indefinitely among themselves. You are not to pray as priest. Carefully, religiously avoid that. You are not even to pray as spiritual guide or teacher. You are to pray simply as a fellow-creature, having in all respects like passions with those in whose company you pray. Accordingly, it may not unfrequently be better that the other pray, and not you, or that you both pray as brethren standing on a perfectly equal footing before God. Shun everything like sacerdotalism, mediatorship.

We have not wished to speak of this point so as to make the impression that the mere circumstance of prayer during a pastoral visit is of very serious moment. We do not so esteem it. But surely it is of serious moment that a pastoral call be so conducted as shall tend to make it seem easy and natural and appropriate for prayer to take place. That it actually should take place is not the chief thing. That room and opportunity should be made for it is highly desirable. In short, we would have the pastoral call religious. That is really all. For prayer is simply the instinctive language of religion. You may safely enough test the true religiousness of the call that you make by asking yourself the question, "Would it have seemed natural for prayer to occur in the course of it? How nearly did I succeed in bringing about such a situation as would have suggested prayer?"

Entirely similar suggestions may be made concerning the reading of Scripture. We would not recommend making the reading of Scripture in a pastoral call a necessary and invariable practice. Such a practice would almost inevitably degenerate into a mere piece of ritualism. It would have the effect of sacerdotalism. It would seem to imply that Scripture was a kind of spell or charm to be used in pastoral incantation. Scripture is nothing of the

sort. It is a communication of God's thoughts, purposes, wishes to men. If you speak about God in a way to bear practically upon life and character, why nothing could be more natural or more proper than at some point of your conversation to say, "Let us see exactly what it is that God teaches us here." You then open the Bible, as you would any book, and read just so much as throws light on the topic under discussion. Such reading of Scripture we strongly recommend. But the producing of a Bible in a solemn and ceremonious manner, the spreading of it out on the table or on your knees, the clearing of your throat in preparation, the intoning of a chapter in miniature pulpit style—all much as if you were a priest performing some kind of rite that had a mysterious meaning, and was supposed to work a mystical effect, no one dared guess exactly how—this we would have the pastor shun and eschew. It is not very different, either in spirit or in result, from the motions through which the Romish priest goes in the eyes of his gaping congregation.

The capital maxim, then, briefly expressed, for pastoral visiting is, Make it religious in purpose. This implies, of course, that you use your best efforts to make it also religious in fact and in effect. The purpose of pastoral visiting is a matter of conscience. How to effect the purpose is a matter of wisdom—and it is a matter of great wisdom. You must study human nature, you must meditate, you must pray. God will give you wisdom for your asking. It will never be safe for you to venture out on pastoral errands without previous special prayer. Suspect yourself of sin, if you make mistakes. For will not God keep us from making mistakes if we obey Him? There is danger of enthusiasm, of fanaticism, here, but it would be wrong to suppress the truth for fear of the danger.

And the truth is, the blessed, the solemn truth, that God will guide you, if you will but let Him. Beware, however, of persuading yourself that you *are* guided. Believe freely that you *will* be guided, *if*. But hold the "if" concerning yourself in trembling doubt. Never doubt that God will guide you if you obey Him. That is beyond doubt. But guard yourself against believing too certainly that you do obey Him. The heart is deceitful above all things. You may be mistaken about yourself. But He abideth faithful. He cannot deny Himself. It is enthusiasm to believe with absolute conviction that you are, at any given moment, in any given action or opinion, guided infallibly by God. It is faith to believe that you will be guided, if you obey. Shun enthusiasm, hold on to your faith. Concern yourself to obey; be not over sure that you are obeying.

What we have last said is a law for us all, applicable everywhere in the whole round of our Christian life; but the extraordinary spiritual difficulties and dangers besetting the pastor in his pastoral office make it especially fit for us thus to have recalled it here.

III.

"Ought a minister have a hobby?"

To show the sense in which our correspondent uses the word "hobby," and besides to bring out the scope of his question, we quote further from his letter:

"At first I did not have one. I now have one. For the first ten years I had none. I have had one for the past five years. My hobby

is Natural History. I do not let it 'ride me.' At least I try not to let it. In the opinion of others, my friends, I am very successful in my attempt. I do, however, find it, to say the least, distracting at times. In fact, I find after many trials, that I cannot use my hobby so that it will not be to some extent distracting. Yet I find it a great relief to my mind, being an intense student. My hobby carries me often out of doors (*e. g.*, to botanize), and so I find it also healthful to the body.

"Is this distraction the small necessary evil connected with the greater good? Sometimes I think so. I am perplexed. Others may be in the same condition."

Our correspondent's question is essentially twofold, namely: 1, Ought a minister to have diversion? and, 2, Ought he to enforce diversion upon himself? We answer, "Yes," to both counts. The only limitation is, let it be diversion strictly, and never "distraction." When diversion rises to the degree of distraction, it has already ceased to be diversion, and become a seriously rival employment. Your work is your vocation; your diversion is an avocation. Keep this relation inviolate. Cease diverting yourself from the moment when your spring has first completely recovered its elasticity, and, is therefore able to bear its burden of work. Up to that point, ride your hobby; then dismount and send him to pasture. We suspect our correspondent has managed to get up in his chosen "hobby" so lively a healthful interest that what he now needs is merely to exert his moral strength and resist temptation to hobby-back exercise enticing him even when he is abundantly well enough to settle down in his study to work. Hence his "distraction."

THE STUDY TABLE.

CONDUCTED BY JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

Pastor's Drawer.

CREED TESTS—Continued.

QUESTION: "Are not our evangelical churches injured, in respect to both membership and ministers, by the retention of the doctrinal standards of past generations?"

In a previous article I endeavored to answer the first part of this question, that relating to lay membership in our churches. I think it was shown that, as a rule, no person who gives evidence of having recognized Christ as Lord and Saviour, with

whatever dimness or peculiarity of faith, will be excluded from evangelical communion in any church of his choice. It is hazardous for one person to speak "by the book" of other denominations than his own; but I am convinced from letters received from various representative men that any mistake made in this estimate is to be corrected from the side of greater, rather than less, liberality. The following letter, written by a Presiding Elder of the M. E. Church, South, will illustrate this:

You "represent correctly the position of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but not of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The latter, which now has a membership of over 1,100,000, does not require its members to assent to the Twenty-five Articles of Religion. The Apostles' Creed is its sole doctrinal standard of membership. C. H. BRIGGS.

"INDEPENDENCE, MO."

II.

THE second part of the question relates to the assumed limitation of the NUMBER OF MINISTERS by reason of the creed subscription required.

Doubtless some persons *might be induced* to enter the ministry were it not for the doctrinal tests. A mixture of motives generally leads us to any course of action; and candidates for the sacred office are not always impelled by the single "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." Ecclesiastical associations, social attractions, taste for theological study, love of public speaking, combined with a general purpose of doing good, are strands in the cord that binds some excellent men to the pulpit. If certain of these inducements should be wanting, the young man might not enter the sacred office. He would become a minister in the Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal or any church in which he was reared and retained his associations; but would not leave his environment to find fra-

ternity elsewhere. In this case—and the case is a common one—inability to subscribe to his own denominational test would divert him from the ministry altogether. Mr. A—— is the son and grandson of eminent Presbyterian clergymen, of rare gifts and scholarship himself; but early departure from Calvinistic views led him, against very strong inclinations, to turn aside from the career made illustrious by his ancestry. He is to-day an upright Christian lawyer, a worshiper in the Presbyterian communion; but I do not know that he ever even meditated entering the ministry of any other than his ancestral church. There are many such who might have been induced or allowed to follow the preacher's craft had the peculiar subscription been dispensed with.

This leads to another query, viz.: *Are such persons qualified in spirit* for the sacred office? Should not the impulse for ministerial service be so strong as to overcome all social and other predilections? Is not the disposition requisite for the home pastorate the same as that needed for missionary work in the foreign field—a readiness to go anywhere, do and be anything, for the ministry's sake? In the case cited, granting that the young man could have been so Calvinistically persuaded as to assent to the Presbyterian confession of faith, could he honestly assent to these other questions prescribed for ordination—"Have you been induced, as far as you know your own heart, to seek the office of the holy ministry from love to God, and a sincere desire to promote His glory in the gospel of His Son? Do you promise to be faithful whatever persecution or opposition may arise unto you on that account?" If unwilling to follow the ministry except under certain conditions of neighborhood, social relation, etc., should one be allowed to follow it at all? To adorn the preacher's profession is one thing; to fulfill

a gospel ministry is something vastly wider and deeper. Granting then, that the *number* of ministers may be lessened by terms of subscription, I doubt if the ministry is injured in respect to morally true vigor and efficiency, by the absence of those who prescribe for themselves any particular denominational *associations* as the condition of their entering it.

But it may be asked, *Are there not some, otherwise qualified for the work, who would fail to find a creed to their minds in any denomination?*

To this it may be replied that the *creeds of Christendom are as various within the limits of the Catholic faith as are the results of sanctified scholarly thought.* There may be some minds so rarely gifted with analytic power, that they can see solid beams of truth in the interstices of ordinary theological thought; but one who should declare that he found nothing to his mind in all the days between Irenæus and Frederick D. Maurice would shut us up to the alternative of believing him either a new prophet or a crank. One can readily find intellectual affinities if one will look far enough around. As a rule they who feel themselves lonely in their faith should suspect that they have either not read largely or not thought strongly. The dust of the controversy conceal from them the giants struggling in the arena of theology, whose conflict has not been merely historic, but is continued until to-day. It will be easy to find the colors of one's hero—but it may be inconvenient to wear them. One brought up a High Church Episcopalian may not like the Quaker gray, but there it is for him if he believes that doctrine; and the Presbyterian blue awaits the ultra-Arminian whom the discoveries of secular science have convinced of a Calvinistic reign of law in the moral as well as material universe. Speak out your creed, and some sect will shout Amen. But if one does not like the society of his intel-

lectual tribe, he must not on that account complain that he is excluded.

But granting, again, that a certain gifted man cannot find a ready-made creed to his satisfaction, we may raise the question, *Does not that fact disqualify him,* in certain respects, from ministerial service? The clerical office is not confined to the advocacy of certain opinions, however true; its great work is the excitation of individual men to righteousness, and the combination of good men in an assault upon the world's wickedness. The proclamation of a peculiar doctrine, diverse from that of any body of Christians, would exhaust the energies of the preacher in controversial discourse, and, just to the extent of his success in advocating it, would make him a divisive, rather than a unifying, force among good men.

This suggests the fact that the *great creeds of the denominations were framed and adopted in the interest of Christian unity.* Their diversity does not militate against this statement, although at first view it might seem to. They were designed to be rallying standards for those of like minds; the first stage of the process of bringing order out of intellectual chaos. The history of the men and movements which produced them show the creeds to be, not challenges, but compromises, within the broad limits of system; the essential results after the elimination of non-essential differences. Under these creed banners men found themselves to be one who previously thought themselves to be many; to be marching on, converging rather than on diverging lines. The standards of Augsburg and Westminster, the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church and the Twenty-five Articles of the Methodist Church, the New Hampshire and Philadelphia Confessions of the Baptists, have brought men together in great corps, and made the church to be an orderly

host instead of a horde. If we can predicate duty in a matter of opinion, it is our duty to endeavor to see alike rather than independently; and creeds illustrate this movement of the Christian conscience beneath the faith.

Consistent with this Catholic purpose in creed-making, the *terms of subscription in nearly all denominations are extremely generous, and the practice even more liberal than the written terms.**

The Episcopal Church in this country does not require subscription even to the Thirty-nine Articles previous to "taking Orders." It assumes to itself, as a peculiar mission, that of emphasizing catholicity in dogma, however it may defeat that purpose by its insistence upon forms, and, therefore, presents only the most ancient creeds, those adopted before the modern mind displayed its powers of philosophical dissection. It is difficult to imagine a phase of Protestant theology—or indeed of Romish, excepting those which are the immediate outcome of the Papal claim—that is not held by some among the Episcopal clergy. I once traveled with two clergymen of the English Church, one of whom kissed the casket holding the alleged blood of St. Jannarius; the other was as thorough going a Puritan as was John Knox when he acted as one of the chaplains of Edward VI. I confess it required all my Presbyterian equanimity to keep the peace between them.

Our Methodist brethren still live in the spirit of Wesley, who required of his preachers evidence of the spirit of total consecration as paramount to everything else. Experience of Christ is, among the followers of Wesley, more than opinion about His language. The Twenty-five Articles are intentionally general. Admission or rejection might depend upon the sentiment of the Conference applied to, but the standpoint would be that of

* I quote at random.

the unity of the work of the Methodist Church, rather than any dogmatic formula. Every denomination must see to it that there is such an agreement in general system of belief among its preachers, that the congregations shall not be taught diverse doctrines under the authority of the same church. That is simply an application of the principle of self-preservation. And, unless I have mistaken the language of various leaders of the Methodist Church, that is the limiting purpose of an examination in theology throughout that body.

Of the Presbyterian Church I may speak more at length, as it is generally regarded as among the strictest in its doctrinal requirements. Perhaps there is some popular misapprehension of this matter. The early trials of Presbyterians gave the denominational features a firmness akin to rigidity. Their fathers in Scotland and Ireland, and their Huguenot ancestors in France, learned to speak concisely, if not sharply, when they had to debate, with the edge of the headsman's axe and the crackling flames. Having been for generations the chief defenders of the faith in Great Britain against Romanism, they made the strong sayings of the early reformers, Calvin and the Westminster Assembly, their breastworks. But breastworks are not the country they are erected to defend, and Presbyterians do not to-day recognize their mission to be the exaltation of any creed language. This will be shown by the history of the clause in the subscription formula required, "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the confession of faith of this church, as *containing the SYSTEM of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.*" The emphatic word of this sentence in the minds of the men who in Synod adopted it, is "system," as opposed to the idea of requiring the acceptance of the standards in their detailed language. Many of the

fathers of Presbyterianism in America, such as Dickinson, first president of Princeton, and the Tennents, for a long time opposed the adoption of any uninspired formula of doctrine. But the necessity of having "preaching unity" kept the question of a confession before the church. Should they make some brief and general statement upon which all could agree? Wise men that they were, they foresaw the difficulty of arranging any run of words that would be sufficiently general without being vague, or sufficiently concise and definite without creating debate. They, therefore, fell back upon the expedient of accepting one of the great historic standards, but with utmost liberality in the terms of subscription to it. Their catholicity was displayed in the elasticity of the tie, if not in the creed. But one voice was raised in the adopting synod for literal acceptance of the confession; all ultimately agreed upon receiving it for "system of doctrine" only. The language of the Adopting Act (1729) is as follows: "Although the Synod do not claim or pretend to any authority of imposing our faith on other men's consciences, but do profess our just dissatisfaction with, and abhorrence of, such impositions, and do utterly disclaim all legislative power and authority in the church, being willing to receive one another as Christ has received us to the glory of God, and admit to fellowship in sacred ordinances all such as we have ground to believe Christ will at last admit to the kingdom of heaven; yet we are undoubtedly obliged to take care that the faith once delivered to the saints be kept pure and incorrupt among us, and so handed down to our posterity: and do therefore agree that all ministers of this Synod, or that shall hereafter be admitted into this Synod, shall declare their agreement in, and approbation of, the Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Di-

vides at Westminster, as being in *all the essential and necessary articles, good forms of sound words and systems* of Christian doctrine, and do also adopt the said Confession and Catechisms as the confession of our faith. . . . And in case any minister of this Synod, or any candidate for the ministry, shall have any scruple with respect to any article or articles of said Confession or Catechisms, he shall, at the time of making said declaration, declare his sentiments to the Presbytery or Synod, who shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry within our bounds, and to ministerial communion, if the Synod or Presbytery shall judge his scruple or mistake to be only about articles not essential and necessary in doctrine, worship or government." There are expressions in the Confession of Faith which are acceptable to few Presbyterians, notably those relating to the papacy as anti-Christ, and to marriage with a deceased wife's sister. These things evidently do not pertain to the "system" of doctrine. What the system is cannot be defined in so many words. We can imagine different courts at different periods giving slightly variant decisions upon doctrinal points that might be raised. Some have maintained that the general system of evangelical doctrine would be all that is needed to meet the requirement; but probably no Presbytery would be satisfied with less than the so-called Calvinistic system in its general outlines. One must believe in the inspiration of Scripture, but he may recognize errors that have come into the text in the process of transcription, and that, notwithstanding the Confession says that "God, by His singular care and providence, has kept it pure in all ages." The absolute divinity of Christ must be confessed; but one may hold that our Lord was at times unconscious of His Godhead. The fall of man through Adam is essential doctrine; but the

relation of men to Adam, which involved them in his fall, is a matter upon which Presbyterians disagree, some holding, with the realists, an actual participation by every child of Adam in his father's transgression, others holding only to the transmission of sinful nature. All shades of opinion respecting election that recognize the persistent sovereignty of God are within the system, as also all opinions concerning human ability which recognize the necessity of the work of an ever-present Spirit.

Neither the Presbyterian nor other denominations assert for themselves any monopoly of truth by prescribing their Confessions; they only recognize the necessity in the human mind for seeing truth, if it sees it at all, under systematic forms. It is with the intellectual as with the spiritual vision: the observer must select a standpoint, yet no object is seen perfectly from any single point of view. The eye cannot take in the whole circuit of a tree. The branches that stretch out at right angles to the line of vision will appear in full length, while those projecting on the line of vision will seem to be foreshortened. The foliage will take luster or lack it according to the play of light upon its leaves. Yet the observer has no choice; he must take in the foreshortenings as well as the light-play. So systems of theology are stand-

point reproductions of God's truth. They are necessarily inadequate representations of that truth, as its full harmonies lie within the divine mind. Indeed, they fail to meet the impression of that truth in its richness and variety, which is awakened by the uninterpreted pages of Scripture. However clear the light that is in the creeds, they lack what we may call the actinic power in the sunshine of actual inspiration.

Reverting to the original form of the question, "Is the ministry lessened by the retention of the doctrinal standards of *past generations*?" I am inclined to give a negative answer. The denominations are not bound to-day by the utterances of their founders. The prevailing theological opinions and spirit provide the real subscription test for candidates. Churches of the Congregational order—including the Baptist—may be said to have no prescribed creed. The mind of the examining council will be the standard of doctrine, biased, undoubtedly, on the one hand by past precedents, and, on the other, by their own liberal disposition. It is, as we have seen, practically the same in churches adhering to their historic documents. If a candidate is not in general agreement with the denomination, he should not ask for its ministerial fellowship.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Christ's Prayer in the Garden.

AFTER reading the sermon on "Christ's Prayer," and the two criticisms in July number of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW* on Dr. Hovey, I feel much impressed with the explanation these brethren make concerning the *object* of Christ's prayer in the garden, since none mentions a word about the real object for which Christ prayed that it might be removed. Dr. Hovey alludes to the "*agony* in

the garden," which was upon Him *already*, and after the angel had strengthened Him "He prayed yet more earnestly," and the same words over again; hence this cannot be it only, if it be included at all. His sweat as great drops of blood shows the terrified distress which had come upon Him, either from the internal suffering of the world's sins upon Him or the effects of his earnest praying for the removal of "this cup,"

which burdened his soul. To suppose He prayed for removal of that world's sins, agony would be inconsistent with His nature to pray for the removal of that which He came into this world to suffer. It could not be prevented according to the divine decree, and Christ knew it. But soon His enemies, with Judas at the head, would come to take him captive; His strength was gone, His body weak, His knees clattered together for want of physical power; now, so to meet the traitor, and company, so feeble to fall into their hands, like a dying man who taught that He was God! This was a bitter cup for Him. The Father must help Him, "if possible," to meet the enemy in strength, firmness, bold as the Lion of the tribe of Judah. The angel gave nourishment, strength came; and Christ asks them first, "Whom seek ye? They answered, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And . . . they went backward and fell to the ground." John xviii: 4-6. His words shock them; it is the divine current of omnipotent power. He spake—they fell. Now, they did not take Him, but He gave Himself.

This was the full answer to His prayer. His father made Him strong to withstand the enemy in spite of His physical weakness in the garden. In this line Christ's words to the disciples need not be changed, but stand correctly when coming to them, "*The hour is come*"—which He dreaded—but feels now no restraint because His prayer is answered; and well says Dr. Hovey: "Thenceforward Christ was calm, tranquil, firm, until the last bitter agony on the cross."

"When duty whispers low, 'Thou must!'
The soul replies, 'I can!'"

HERMAN H. THOREN.

MANHATTAN, ILL.

Another View of John iii: 5-7.

I AM much interested in the Exe-

getical Department of the HOMILETIC, and derive pleasure and profit from it. The exegesis of this passage in the July number is certainly interesting; but I think the solution of the difficulty about this "much misunderstood passage" lies in another direction than that suggested by Dr. Wolf.

The true meaning of the passage has doubtless been much obscured by its pre-emption by error during the early twilight of Bible study, which its unfortunate adoption into the ritual connected with the ordinance of baptism has served to perpetuate. Our Lord's theme is *birth*. This naturally suggests parentage; but parentage is always, so far as we know, dual. In this new birth one parent is the Holy Spirit. Who is the other? If literal water, then, indeed, we have the foundation laid for baptismal regeneration; and without baptism there can be no new birth, no salvation—which lands us in Rome. But is there not an uttermost incongruity in the thought that Jesus, when speaking of the wonderful work of regeneration, should associate, in terms of equality, the third person of the Trinity and one of the elements of nature. Another, and a fatal, objection to this view is, that of the many Scripture references to the new birth, this is the only passage that seems in the remotest degree to favor it; while several plain passages show that the other parent in the new birth is not water, but the gospel. Thus, John i: 13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." With James i: 18: "Of his own will begat he us with the *word of truth*." Also 1 Peter i: 23: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth for ever." That the word of God is a chosen agent in the great change was known to the Old Testament saints, for David wrote,

in the nineteenth Psalm, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul."

This new birth is not merely a generation, but a *re-generation*; therefore there is an old life to be cleansed away as well as a new life to be imparted. So we read of the "washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. iii : 5). But what is the agent in the "washing"? Not baptism, but the gospel, as we see Eph. v : 26: "That he [Christ] might sanctify and cleanse it [the church] with the washing of water by the word." With this corresponds the statement of our Lord to the disciples, John xv : 3, "Now ye are clean *through the word* which I have spoken unto you." This view harmonizes with the whole trend of Scripture teaching, which is that men are saved by the co-operative action of the Holy Ghost and the gospel. And, further, this view finds support in the fact that the figurative use of water as a symbol of the Holy Spirit and of the gospel truth, is one of the most common forms of expression, both in the Old and in the New Testaments. We conclude, therefore, that there is no reference in the text to water baptism, but that our Lord employs water here as a figure of the Word, just as He does in the fourth chapter, in the conversation with the woman of Samaria.

H. E. JOHNSON.

GREENVILLE, PA.

Criticism and Query.

IN the July *Homiletic*, under Hints at the Meaning of Texts (p. 94), an exposition of Acts xxvi : 28 (erroneously given as xxi : 20) is given, which we think is erroneous. The writer has followed the A. V., whereas the R. V. gives a very different rendering of the text. The question I would like to ask is: Where the Revised Version shows an essentially different rendering from the old version, ought the latter to be used? In

this passage, according to the A. V., Agrippa is represented as being almost won over to Christianity by Paul's preaching. He is brought under conviction, yet not yielding, at least this is the common exposition, and he is made a type of the undecided of to-day.

But in the Revised Version no such lesson can be drawn. It warrants no such teaching. Agrippa is made to say: "With little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian." Not that he was any way inclined to be a Christian; but that Paul would fain make him one, with the little persuasives he was then using. If this be the correct translation of the words, then it is wrong to hold Agrippa up as a type of a convicted man, almost ready to embrace Christianity, instead of one who tells the preacher he will have to use greater persuasive force before he catches him, and rather wonders that he should think to make him a Christian with but little persuasion.

With this view of the question the second, third and fourth divisions of the subject treated from this text are open to objection.

R. V.

Get a Typewriter.

HERE is a bit of experience and some suggestions that may interest my brethren who are thinking about purchasing a typewriter.

After consulting with several who use typewriters, and an examination of the "Remington," "Hammond" and "Hall" machines, I bought a "Caligraph," list price \$85, from which a discount of ten per cent. is given to ministers. This machine is very simple, durable, and it may be said never to get out of order. I have no interest, however, in recommending one in preference to another. They are all good, and each has peculiar advantages not possessed by the others. I do not think that quick writing can be done on the Hall, as only one hand is used in the manipu-

lation of the keys ; aside from this it is a good instrument, and can be got at a moderate price.

I purchased the "Caligraph" on the 3d of July, spent the whole of the "glorious Fourth" in practicing, and have used it every day since then for all correspondence and other writing, including two sermons. Although my friends consider me a rapid penman, I can, after using the machine three weeks, write faster and, of course, more legibly than with a pen. I have no doubt after a few months' practice, when the striking of the keys becomes automatic the speed can be doubled or even trebled. This will be no small gain.

But there are other considerations. The posture in operating the typewriter is easier and healthier than sitting over a desk, as one has to do in writing with a pen. Writing is no longer the intolerable slavery that nearly all who use the pen feel it to be, but becomes a positive pleasure and a relief from the strain of study ; particularly is this the case when a minister is able to write shorthand, and uses the machine simply to transcribe. For written sermons for pulpit use it is a very desirable helpmeet. The preacher has fewer sheets of paper to handle, the page is clear, can be readily seen, and one objection that is urged against manuscript—a hesitancy and fumbling for the place—is removed. He sees the composition in print (perhaps the only time it ever will be), and this contributes to literary exactness. It may be that in some ministers' households there are those who can manipulate the machine for him, and serve as an amanuensis in preparing literary matter. The most of us can think better if freed from the mechanical work of writing, whether it be done with machine or pen.

By using the carbon paper prepared for the purpose the typewriter can manifold from three to five copies, and with the "hektograph," or a gela-

tine pad that any minister can make at trifling expense, twenty-five copies can readily be had if the ordinary copying ribbon is used, and from fifty to seventy-five copies from the "hektograph" ribbon prepared for this purpose and procurable anywhere. The minister can use the "hektograph" in connection with the typewriter to great advantage in many ways needless to name.

I have used a typewriter only three weeks, but never can be induced to go back to the slavery of pen-writing, for this is the "more excellent way." I will say to my brethren, as a well-known minister, who had used the machine over three years, said to me: "From what I know of the machine and its inestimable advantages, I would certainly take the first good opportunity to secure one, and could I not get another I would not part with the one I have on any account. You may rest assured that you will make no mistake in getting hold of a machine and putting a tithing of your perseverance upon the task of learning to manage it. Time was never better invested, and you will always bless in your mind the man that ever gave to the world this convenient marvel of the century."

FRANK L. WILSON.

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

"Can Two Walk Together Except They Be Agreed?"

IN the European Department of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW for July (p. 74), in an article, "Unity in Diversity," it is said: "This question is so often asked that it deserves more thought than it usually receives ; indeed, the question itself is regarded as an end of controversy, a negative answer being regarded as self-evident."

Certainly two persons cannot walk together unless they agree—to walk together. But they do not need to agree upon everything else. Indeed, the pleasure of the walk and the con-

versation might be rather limited and stale if there were no differences of opinion, no diversities of view, and each were the exact counterpart of the other.

The question, as it stands in Amos iii:3, has no apparent reference to the subject of Christian union. It is the first of several queries intended to suggest the universal connection between cause and consequence. "Will a lion roar in the forest when he hath no prey?" *i. e.*, if his roaring is heard, it is inferred that he is pouncing on his victim. So, if two persons are seen walking together, the natural conclusion is that they have agreed; or, as it is in the margin of the Revised Version, that they had an appointment.

In order that Christians may unite and walk together or work together, it is essential that they should be agreed—so to do; but it is not essential that they should be in perfect agreement on everything else.

As when two persons journey together they must find out how, either to sink their differences of opinion or else to discuss them with good temper and mutual concession and kindness, so the practical problem in regard to Christian union is, not how to be exactly agreed in all things, but how to regard our mutual diversities with mutual kindness and forbearance, while together holding the essential truth that makes us Christians, and working together in the service of our common Master.

The Saviour prayed for His people, "that they may be one in us, that the world may believe" (John xvii:21). We are, then, to find the bond of Christian union in Christ, in our common union to Him and His Father. And if Christian people, who are known to differ in many respects, are yet seen to be so united in love and service to their Lord that they can worship and work harmoniously, notwithstanding their differ-

ences, that will convince the world quite as effectually as if they were all of one intellectual pattern, and no differences were possible.

C. W. C.

IN the May HOMILETIC "Study Table," p. 462, J. A. C. asks the question concerning Matt. vii:12.—"*Do I do violence to transpose verse 12 to place of verse 6?*" May I be permitted to add a remark or two to the very apt and valuable suggestions of Dr. Ludlow?

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matt. vii:12). The difficulty is to find the connection of this verse with the previous lesson on prayer. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you," and especially with verse 11, where the exceeding readiness of our Father to answer our prayers is set before us. I believe the connection is the following: Since our Father in heaven is ready to answer all our prayers, according to each and all degrees, asking, seeking, knocking; since He is ready to give unto us forgiveness of all sins, a new heart, a new mind, a new nature full of all the graces that adorned the character of Christ, and without which there is no possibility of doing unto others what we would that others should do unto us—therefore He urges His hearers, with overwhelming force of argument, to fulfil "the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." In the whole range of Scripture there is no "therefore" that is more strongly and infinitely backed than the above. No man can keep this royal law; no one has ever kept it; but God in Christ is ready, in answer to *asking, seeking* and *knocking*, to fill every man with all the powers which are necessary to live as we ought.

In contemplating this Sermon on

the Mount, and reflecting upon the grand character so fully delineated in it, the question forces itself upon every thoughtful reader: How are we to attain to such a height of perfection? And as far as I can see there is no answer given in the sermon except in this portion of it on prayer, and in the opening beatitude: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." And poverty in spirit is the founda-

tion and base of all prayer. Be poor; ask, seek and knock, and that instant all the powers of God's everlasting love, Christ and all His redeeming work on earth and in heaven, and the Holy Spirit, are ready to operate upon us to make us new men—men who look into the perfect law of liberty, and continue therein, and who keep the royal law, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

MANCHESTER, IA. OWEN JONES.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

HINTS AT THE MEANING OF TEXTS.

Christian Culture.

The Saviour Our Song.

The Lord is my strength and my song, and is become my salvation.

—Psa. cxviii: 14.

A SINGING Christian and a singing church dear to God, and a ministry of blessing to men. Christ is the perennial and exhaustless theme.

I. His mission, words, works, sacrifices, resurrection, triumph over the powers of darkness, all subjects of the song.

- II. (a) A song of deliverance.
- (b) A song of the pilgrimage.
- (c) A battle-song.
- (d) A triumph song.
- (e) A song of harvest and home.

III. He the theme of the Eternal Anthem—a song of memory, of present felicity, of joyous hope.

IV. A song that only the redeemed can sing.

Let Christ be the cradle-song for the children, and the requiem for the dying.

J. S. K.

A Crowned Virtue.

This is the victory that overcometh the world, even your faith.—1 John v: 4.

GREAT prominence given in the New Testament of the importance and difficulty of perfecting Christian character—exhortations, commands,

examples of success, warnings against failure, summonses to struggle, promises of reward abundant.

I. Survey the struggle. It is with the "world," not in its material, but moral character. Splendid results of genius, science and patience in overcoming the material world. A higher duty and privilege in overcoming a world in rebellion. Comprehensive—all the influences that war against soul and body. Unselfish—it is for the glory of God and the good of men, as well as for our personal well-being.

II. The victor, Faith—*your* faith; not the traditional, historic faith of the church; intense individuality in the struggle. Faith in Him who is invisible—in the essential rightness of our cause, in the actual efficient aids of the Spirit of Christ. "Lo, I am with you!"—in the glory of the result, and in the divine promise of victory.

III. The coronation. Now, in the eyes of men, by their confessions and confidence in the conqueror. At length, before an assembled universe—confessed before angels—receiving a crown of life, a seat upon the throne, power over "the nations," "ten cities," "made a pillar in the temple," etc. See Rev. ii. and iii.

J. S. K.

Negative and Obstructive Powers in the Church.

Very able men for the work of the service of the house of God.—1 Chron. ix : 13.

A GREAT array of mighty men in this and the connected chapters. But when the enumeration is complete the very next announcement is, chap. x : 1, "Now the Philistines fought against Israel, and Israel fled before the Philistines." So to-day with the Church. No deficiency in numbers and talents, but

1. Much unconsecrated ability.
2. Much inefficient, unharnessed, unorganized, untrained ability.
3. Much misdirected ability.
4. Paralyzing inconsistency of life.

J. S. K.

Revival Service.**The Silence of Jesus.**

But Jesus held his peace.—Matt. xxvi : 63.

It was not the speechlessness of guilt, nor even of grief, but it was no part of His mission to defend Himself, but to die. He takes upon Himself in our behalf all that of which He is accused.

He had spoken His message and the time for silence had now come. To have spoken would have done no good.

The last refuge of suffering innocence and wounded love is silence.

It was an ominous silence. They would have been glad had he spoken. It told of their utter degradation. It said, What more can I do for my vineyard. It shows seared hearts bent on ruin. Application :

(a) Learn the beauty, dignity and eloquence of silence under false accusation.

(b) Be alarmed if you no longer hear Christ pleading with you.

J. S. K.

The Song at the Well.

Spring up, O well; sing ye unto it, etc.—Num. xxi : 16-18.

DESCRIBE the scene and occasion.

I. The Well of Salvation choked up with rubbish of superstition and ignorance, technical theologies, dry dissertations, dogmatic controversies, etc.

II. The Well of Salvation cleared out. A princely and noble work. Luther, Wickliffe, Wesley, etc., did such work in their day, and we are drinking.

III. The work of opening up the Well of Salvation to men should be done with joyfulness. Tendency to dwell on dark features, to elaborate ruefully on sin, dissect corruptions of the heart, and forebode doom. The value of cheerful, sunshiny, praiseful preaching, teaching and testimony on the part of ministry and church. Praiseful Christianity victorious.

IV. The old doctrines more full of real joy than any brand new theories, ambitious of painting out the shadows of the picture.

J. S. K.

A Startling Question.

Wilt thou be made whole?—John v : 6.

A STRANGE question at first glance. Its very strangeness starting deeper reflection.

I. Christ's object comprehensive—to make whole. Not a relief or reformation merely, but complete restoration. Whole, *i. e.*, "holy," Salvation must not stop short of sanctification. "Your whole body, soul and spirit." Tendency to rest in partial restoration.

II. Function of the will in the matter. Man's will enfeebled by long disuse, perverted by long alienation. Have you *will* enough left to respond to the call of God? Will is not desire but resolution, not longing but obeying.

III. Decision of the will essential to salvation. All God's power and preparation in vain without it. Persistent will needed through the long process of the soul's warfare against the flesh.

J. S. K.

Funeral Service.**The Close of Summer.**

The summer is ended.—Jer. viii : 20.

I. A fact in nature.

Procession of the seasons never comes to a halt. Moving panorama of nature's miracles shifts its scenes. Summer's work and its fruits past.

(a) The summer has its own beauty, joy and use—never fails. Always essentially the same. Yet the same summer never returns.

(b) A time of glowing sun and growing crops. The spring time and the autumn cannot do summer's work.

II. In human life. Its summer has closed with some special opportunities, brightest, most genial influences for religious growth and usefulness. Autumn at hand. Should show ripened fruits. If you have sown in tears during the summer, you may be sure of reaping with joy in the autumn. Is harvest ready or only withering leaves? The days grow briefer.

The Life Most Worth Living.

I am . . . the Life.—John xiv : 6.

HUMAN lives differ greatly in value. There is one that is best. Its model we shall seek in vain for till we stand before the man Christ Jesus. He is the *Son of Man*; not man in broken fragments, but "man at his climax."

In Him we see :

- (a) Life's true aim realized.
- (b) Its true use displayed.
- (c) Its true joy experienced, and
- (d) Its perfection attained.

Keeping His life-history in view, we note :

1. The life most worth the living must be dedicated to God and righteousness from the first.

2. It must be spent unselfishly for others' good rather than our own aggrandizement.

3. It must be fed and cultured by influences from the upper world.

J. S. K.

For Communion Service.**The Saviour's Steadfastness to His Sacrificial Purpose.**

He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.—Luke ix : 51.

THAT meant death : it meant entrance into the fiery jaws of hell, to fight our battle with infernal spirits and win our victory forever. Observe :

I. He knew his mission was to die—to die in ignominy and agony incomparable—while yet a young man, with everything to live for. He was not weary of life, for it had been one of active benevolence. But he set his face toward the cross, because it was the natural close of a career of self-sacrifice, the goal he had set before him, the best, the only way to secure our salvation.

His love nourished the purpose, and also his obedience. What a mercy to us ! What if he had wavered ?

II. His work was complete—"It is finished," etc. The letter was written. It was time to sign and seal it. We have been reading it ever since.

III. In one way we are called to meet hours of trial with such steadfastness of purpose. Our Calvary before us a gateway to resurrection to a higher life for others.

Tempting voices would hold us back, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Must dare to go forward and take what comes of it. Heroic conduct is the simplest, a straightforward course the easiest if the heart is true and the will resolute. Christ looked at the joy beyond—so we.

J. S. K.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

How Far is the Saloon Responsible for Our Criminals?

Make a chain: for the land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence.—Ezek. vii: 2.

At the twenty-eighth convention of the United States Brewers' Association, held at St. Paul, May 30 and 31, Mr. G. Thomann, head of the brewers' "Literary Bureau," read a paper which purported to be a record of crimes in this country, as reported in the daily press, with a study of the causes which led to their commission. As might be expected, Brewer Thomann discovered that intemperance cuts a very small figure in the history of crime. Of 859 murders, the causes of which Brewer Thomann says he traced in the daily press reports, he finds only 98 due to liquor. And so of many other offenses.

Brewer Thomann's "investigation" and his conclusions therefrom have been taken up and reiterated by a number of our semi-religious and would-be philosophical journals in a manner that would seem to one unacquainted with the facts to utterly annihilate the theory of the saloon as a cause of crime.

In order to learn the opinions of those who *have most to do* with our criminal classes, with reference to this important subject, the relations of crime to the liquor traffic, we sent out to prison officials all over the United States the following questions, replies to which have been received from officials in forty-five different State prisons, penitentiaries and reformatory institutions:

QUESTIONS.

1. How far can you indorse the sentiments of ex-Chief-Justice Noah Davis, of New York, when he says, "Of all the causes of crime intemperance stands out the unapproachable chief?"

2. About what proportion of the prisoners confined in your institution have been drinking men?

3. In your opinion, what per cent. were brought there, either directly or indirectly, through the influence of the liquor traffic?

4. Is it not true that a very large majority of the crimes of violence may be traced to the influence of the saloon?

5. What would be the probable effect upon our penal institutions should every dram-shop in the land be forever abolished?

Of forty-three answers received to question No. 1, thirty-four *fully* indorsed the statement of Judge Davis; four more are in substantial agreement with him; three regard the use of intoxicants as the *occasion* rather than the cause of crime; while of the remaining two, one answers, "Of crimes against the person, yes." The other, "Intemperance is the cause of more evils than any other cause."

Of answers to question No. 2, one says "all"; one, "very nearly all"; one, "ten-elevenths," four report as high as nine-tenths; one, seven-eighths; one, 85 per cent.; three, four-fifths; five, three-fourths or more; two, two-thirds; one, "nearer 70 than 65 per cent.," one, 65 per cent.; one, "very large"; one, "one-half or more"; one, 48 per cent.; one, 251 persons out of a total of 375; another, 762 out of a total of 1,360; another, 1,892 arrests for drunkenness alone, out of a total of 5,155; one can give no statistics, and another says that 20 per cent. of the boys in the industrial school have been drinkers.

The answers to question No. 3 indicate that the number of prisoners that have been brought to these institutions through the influence of the saloons is as large, and in many instances larger, than the actual number of drinking men among them. The answer of the chaplain of the Kentucky Penitentiary is, "ninety-nine one-hundredths," while the answers from the Arizona Penitentiary, the California State Prison, the Nebraska Penitentiary and the New York Industrial School are each 90 per cent.

Forty-three of the answers to question No. 4 are emphatically in the affirmative. One says, "a large number of crimes result from the use of liquors."

In the answers to question No. 5, "What would be the probable effect on our penal institutions should every dram-shop in the land be forever abolished?" there is no consolation to Brewer Thomann. Never have we seen a more powerful arraignment of the saloon as a cause of crime than the answers of these prison officials. We give them all below, as follows:

Chap. Arizona Penitentiary: "A criminal decrease of 75 per cent."

Chap. Arkansas State Prison: "Gradually pass into innocuous desuetude."

Chap. California State Prison: "One-half the present number would be amply sufficient."

Chap. Colorado Penitentiary: "Many jails and prisons would be empty two-thirds of the time."

Chap. Connecticut State Prison: "Would soon be wellnigh depopulated."

Foreman Town Farm, Waterbury, Conn.: "Good, without a doubt."

Chap. Joliet, Ill., State Penitentiary: "Could get along with less than half present facilities."

Chap. Chester, Ill., State Penitentiary, "Crime greatly diminished; perhaps over one-half."

Supt. Pontiac, Ill., Reform School: "Diminish number of inmates."

Chap. North Indiana Prison: "Inmates would be materially reduced for a time."

Chap. Iowa State Penitentiary: "If prisoners decrease in next five years as in past two under Prohibition our penitentiaries will be to let."

Supt. Eldora, Ia., Industrial School: "Would reduce inmates at least one-third."

Chap. Idaho U. S. Penitentiary: "Number occupants would be reduced at least 75 per cent."

Chap. Kentucky State Penitentiary: "In ten years nine-tenths of our criminals would not be here."

Chap. Maine State Prison: "Jails would be very much thinned. Prisons not perceptibly changed. Pauperism would almost disappear. Reform schools would be almost vacant. Poor-houses would be unknown."

Chap. Massachusetts Reformatory: "Suppose the millennium might be almost at the door."

Supt. House of Correction, Lawrence, Mass.: "Would soon be closed."

Chap. Deer Island Institution, Mass.: "Nineteenth shut up for want of inmates."

Chap. Michigan State Prison: "Greatly reduce number of arrests and commitments."

Chap. Minnesota State Prison: "Evidently greatly reduce number of inmates."

Chap. Missouri State Prison: "Rid of more than one-half present number of convicts."

R. L. Kelly, Penitentiary, Deer Lodge, Mont.: "One would do for the United States."

Chap. Nebraska State Prison: "Need but few indeed."

Chap. New Hampshire Industrial School: "Our penal institutions might be closed up."

Chap. Snake Hill, N. J., Penitentiary: "Closed up."

Supt. Newark City, N. J., Home: "The 'Reform School' could be abolished."

Chap. Sing Sing, N. Y., State Prison: "In ten years institutions for the punishment of misdemeanors would be practically empty. Prison population would be decreased 60 to 75 per cent."

Chap. Auburn, N. Y., State Prison: "But little use for prisons."

Chap. Rochester, N. Y., Industrial School: "Greatly diminish inmates."

Chap. Kings Co., N. Y., Penitentiary: "Close them up."

Eric County, N. Y., Penitentiary, C. B. Armstrong: "Reduce very greatly number of commitments."

Supt. Reform School, Elmira, N. Y.: "Probably diminish prison population, but doubt if it would be permanent."

Chap. N. Y. Juvenile Asylum, N. Y. City: "Greatly reduce number of inmates."

Chap. Ohio State Penitentiary: "Reduce prison population in few years 40, if not 50, per cent."

Supt. Lancaster, O., Boys' Industrial School: "Would in all probability abolish the institution."

Chap. Eastern Penitentiary, Pennsylvania: "Would not be much use for either jails or penitentiaries."

Chap. Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary: "Very large diminution of crime against person and of common larceny."

Supt. House of Refuge, Philadelphia: "Number of delinquent children would be greatly reduced."

Chap. State Institution of R. I.: "Unquestionably there would be a rapid and sustained decrease of numbers. Crime against the person would largely cease. Many institutions would be empty."

Chap. South Carolina State Penitentiary: "Reduce the number three-fourths."

Chap. Texas State Prison: "Convicts would diminish at least one-half."

Supt. Wisconsin State Industrial School: "Few would be needed."

Chief Guard U. S. Prison, Laramie, Wyo.: "Reduction of from 50 to 75 per cent."