

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIX.—MAY, 1895.—No. 5.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—JESUS'S THOUGHT OF HIMSELF.

BY REV. GEORGE CROSS, CARLTON PLACE, ONTARIO, CANADA.

To the minds of earnest men there is nothing in all the range of thought more vital in its issues than the question, Who was Jesus of Nazareth? This claim for Him is warranted by the unique place and power He holds in the world and His matchless personality.

That a man of the despised Judean race, in his childhood and youth an heir to poverty and toil, in his manhood for a short time a teacher and minister to his countrymen in Palestine, and then a victim to a death of shame by public execution, should for centuries have multitudes of followers who were ready to live or to die for love to him, and to-day after the lapse of nearly nineteen hundred years should still be to men of all degrees the perfect ideal of human life and ambition, is the most wonderful phenomenon in history. And when we stand amid the solemn realities of life, with their foreshadowings of the more solemn realities of a life to come, and to the fact of history just mentioned add the reflection that thoughtful men and women are presenting Jesus of Nazareth as a sure and living hope to the multitudes whose interests in life and destiny are as deep as ours, our question becomes a serious one indeed.

Further, if by the side of a doctrine of man we are to have a doctrine of God that will bring to men a knowledge of Him as living and acting, the question has a still deeper significance; for if God is to be to us a *person*, our knowledge of Him must not rest upon the floating wreckage of metaphysical speculation, but upon a personal, self-conscious life. Does not that necessary basis for the knowledge of a living God appear in the historic Jesus? Is not He the revelation of the true God? Or if not, is there a God to be revealed? If such inquiries so naturally spring up around Him, it is plain that the problem of all problems is the "problem of Jesus," and we must ask, therefore, who this Jesus was.

There is only one who can tell us—Jesus Himself. Our independent philosophizings, determined alas! too often by the supposed neces-

sities of a fixed creed or the presuppositions of a system of thought, are sure to be imperfect and faulty. The pure fountain from which our thought of Him must be drawn is His thought of Himself. To the question, "Who was Jesus?" Jesus alone can give answer.

Our study of the testimony of Jesus to Himself proceeds on two assumptions: the first, that the four Gospel records of His words and deeds are statements of historical fact. The reasonableness of this is to most men evident. The second assumption is that Jesus was truly a man. If His life was a real life, with a distinct significance for us and worthy of something more than our mere curious interest, it was a human life. To this wonderful man, then, as He is set forth in the Gospels, we turn and say, "Teacher, if it is Thy will that men should know Thy thoughts, we pray Thee tell us who Thou art. What sayest Thou of Thyself?"

Pontius Pilate asked Him just such a question; so did the Jews, but they received no explicit reply. No more can we. For even if He should say, "I am the Christ, the Son of God," still these words must first be translated into terms of our own thinking before they can convey a clear meaning to us. And, moreover, our knowledge of Jesus, as of any man, must be not merely intellectual but personal, not the result of analysis and definition but the outcome of a living fellowship. Of this Jesus was perfectly aware, and accordingly never attempted to demonstrate the nature of His person by a logical process; for "No man knoweth who the Son is save the Father; and who the Father is save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." Such sayings as this, and there are many of them, show that to the man Jesus, as to every thoughtful man, the question had come, "Who am I, and why am I in the world?" and that He had found His answer. They show that Jesus felt it was a transcendent privilege to know Him, *because He knew Himself.*

It is evident that Jesus thought much on this matter. No subject was oftener upon His heart. He already felt its weight when a boy of only twelve years. That during those eighteen years of silence at Nazareth His thought concerning Himself was maturing in His bosom for public declaration, we may judge from the fact that in the crisis of His life when He decided to come before the people in baptism, *it* furnished the controlling motive; for the voice of the Father from the rent heavens and the voice of the Spirit in the Baptist had meaning to Him, because it was true to His own feeling, as indicated in His words to John; while it is just this self-feeling of Jesus which seemed to offer a foothold to the tempter when he said, "If Thou art the Son of God," in his wilderness attack upon the confidence of the Christ. And if the sayings and doings of Jesus are no mere artificial arrangement of words and acts suited to circumstances, but are rather the natural outflow of His own feelings, then we may gather from the growing emphasis He lays upon the knowledge of His person that His

consciousness was increasingly pervaded with the thought of who He was, and that this thought did not become to Him less fresh and sweet. We see this in the self-reference in His answers to inquirers and promises to new disciples. We see it in His delight at Peter's confession of the disciples' faith in His person in answer to the question, "Who say ye that I am?" We see it in His grief at their darkness of mind—"Have I been so long a time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me?"

Did Jesus, then, understand Himself? Did He comprehend His own nature? Was He in no sense a mystery to Himself? Or were there no chambers of His being dark to Him? By this it is not meant to inquire whether Jesus had answered for Himself the time-worn speculative questions touching the nature of body and spirit, of intellect and will and being, for these seem to have had no place in His thoughts. But we mean: Did He apprehend His own personality and the purpose of His coming into the world? If there were at times dark mysteries to Him through which He had to fight His way in the blindness and tears of childhood, His anxious questionings have not been recorded. Luke tells us indeed that "the child grew" and "advanced in wisdom"; but if His *self-consciousness* was a *development*, no reliable theory of the process can be given, because the facts are wanting. Whatever wrestlings He may be supposed to have had with Himself in the days of His carpenter-life, we know nothing of them; and when at length He comes forth to the people, there is not a trace of doubt or hesitancy in His mind. He feels competent to speak of Himself on the ground of perfect self-knowledge: "Even if I bear witness of Myself, My witness is true, because I know whence I came and whither I go." His very claim to know God is based on His knowledge of Himself: "I know Him because *I am from Him.*"

Hence He confidently sets forth His self-estimate. He claims to be greater than Jonah the prophet, or Solomon the king, or Abraham the patriarch. He is greater than the temple, for His body is the true temple; He is greater than the Sabbath, for He is Lord of the Sabbath; greater than the law, for He is the law's fulfilment; greater than the world, for He is its life-giver and judge; greater than all things, for the Father hath given all things into His hands. His day was the hope of prophets and kings who had believed in ages past, and He unhesitatingly connects with Himself the most gracious and mysterious promises of the Scriptures. As for His teachings He rests their authority on this alone: "Verily, verily, *I say unto you.*" If He confirms this authority by reference to His works, it is only because the hardness of men's hearts so requires. He declares truth, because He is the truth; He gives light to the world, because He is its light; in other words, He feels Himself to be greater than the message He gives.

In character He claims perfection. He cannot be convicted of sin either by error or defect. "He is true, and there is no unrighteousness

in Him." His Father loves Him, and well He may, for He always does those things that are pleasing in the Father's sight. Therefore He feels that men ought to love Him above their dearest friends, and the one who fails to do so suffers just this loss: "He is not worthy of Me." And, moreover, all these professions appear, in the narratives, to have been put forth in the most simple manner natural to men who spoke in sober assurance and sincerity of heart.

Yet to Him these claims did not seem of a lofty sort, but in His mind are rather connected with lowliness and self-renunciation. He feels no work to be too humiliating to Him, and neither claims nor aims at a life of independence. Nay, we may reverently say that He felt more dependent than any of us ever do. "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what things soever he seeth the Father doing, these also doeth the Son in like manner." He speaks only as the Father gives Him commandment. His works are wrought from the Father, who abideth in Him and doeth *His* works. He came to carry out a commission. If He gives men life, if He judges them, if He forgives their sin, if He exercises the power to lay down His own life, it is because He had received this *commandment* from the Father. He says, "My Father is greater than I." In all things He is the obedient and submissive Son of God, who has sunk His own will in His Father's will, and lives by the Father as truly as His disciples live by Himself.

But a little reflection makes it evident that the meekness and lowliness of Jesus (as in the case of all true humility) is pervaded by—nay, has as its very source—a deep consciousness of His own inherent dignity and worth. Jesus is self-renunciating, but never self-depreciating. He knows that in His life here His exercise, both of knowledge and of power, is within the limitations set by the Father's choice of times and seasons; but there is to Him a sweetness in the thought of this, because He never loses sight of the fact that it has been by Himself voluntarily accepted. There is a loving covenant between the Father and the Son. He was not only *sent*, but He *came*. Even when he says, "My Father is greater than I," there seems to be an undertone of feeling that He can say this because (as in truth such a statement implies) in some sense they are equal. He knows He is greater than His office; therefore to Him the title of "the Christ" is expressive of dignity and honor indeed from the human standpoint, but more truly of submission and humiliation from the divine. And was not this the reason why Jesus aimed to communicate to His disciples a knowledge of His person before they were to be given an understanding of His office? Thus the office of the Christ belongs to Him, not He to the office. He is the Jesus whom we know, not because He is the Christ, but He is the Christ because He is Jesus. In accordance with this feeling He avoids for the most part the current titles for the Messiah, because they involve a false conception of His person and character, and chooses for Himself other names.

The expressions, "the Son of Man," and "the Son of God," may be said to hold the self-feeling of Jesus crystallized. These are not theological terms with Him—He was not aiming at a doctrinal system; they are rather expressions of His own feeling, but none the less designedly chosen. He counts Himself the Son of God. Here His thought is retrospective. From His present state of limitation and dependence He looks back to a glory that was once His along with the Father before there was a world; but of that glory He has emptied Himself in coming from the Father to the world. And now He, still the Son of God, has become the Son of Man. Here His thought is prospective. From His condition of humiliation and suffering which He has assumed as heir of the race, He looks forward to a return, as Son of Man still, to the Father's presence and the anti-creation glory. So with His face both Godward and manward, He knows well what His presence in the world means for God and for man, because He knows what it means for Himself.

How came the Man of Galilee so to think of himself? Whence received He this knowledge? Or shall we say it was never *received*? Did the babe on Mary's bosom know all this? Such a babe would be no human child, which Jesus truly was. Was He taught it? But there was none to teach Him, because there was none who understood. Had He learned it from the Scriptures? Even if He had, the question would still remain, How came He so to interpret them? Was it given Him by visions and revelations from heaven? These, too, would need interpretation. Was His view of Himself, then, the result of finding Himself in possession of such wonderful experiences and powers that He could account for them in no other way than by supposing Himself to be such a being as we have seen He claimed to be? Surely not; for this unhuman way of knowing Himself would subject His self-knowledge to the uncertainty which pertains to all induction which does not preassume its conclusion. Shall we say, as a last resort, that Jesus knew Himself to be God-Man, because while He lived a human life of limitation and suffering here, He was still sitting on His throne in heaven, knowing and doing all that is done there? No; for this would render His life here with His growth in knowledge, His surprises and disappointments, His joys and griefs, a part of a double life, an unreal life, not a human life at all. The childlikeness and straightforwardness of Jesus assure us that all His expressions of such experiences were genuine and true.

When we look into the face of a fellow man and enter into communion with him, there rises in our bosoms a conviction, an inexplicable, incommunicable, but invincible conviction that we too are human. When this conviction first sprang up in our hearts we cannot remember. To ourselves we seem always to have known it. It is the voice of the human spirit to itself, and the strength of that conviction it is beyond the power of any argument to weaken or confirm. This

is our "I am," and the "I am" of Jesus must have come as immediately to Him and have been equally understood by Him. He communes with men, and knows He, too, is man; He knows Himself in knowing them; and He knows them in knowing Himself, and naturally describes His experiences as men do theirs. He knows He is one of them; and seeing them in their sins, feels He must need offer Himself in sacrifice for them. He communes immediately with God, and knows Himself, too, to be divine. He knows Himself in knowing God, and He knows God in knowing Himself. He cannot describe His own inner nature otherwise than in terms applicable to God alone, and feels He cannot make God known to men otherwise than by presenting Himself to them. Therefore it was that in the presence of frowning hate and before the very threatening of death, in the perfect calm of a soul all at peace in its knowledge of itself, He used as His own the name of the ineffable eternal—"Before Abraham was I AM." There is that same inexplicable, incommunicable, invincible "I am." This "I am" of Jesus, reiterated in various connections so often in His life, is surely the unutterable self-utterance of Jehovah.

How natural, therefore, after all, sound the words of that twelve-year-old boy in the temple: "Wist ye not that I must be in the house of my Father!" Even at that age the consciousness of who He was is as clear to Him as ours is to us, and He speaks as if it were what He had always known, though that may have the occasion that His self-knowledge was for the first time explicit in His consciousness. Thenceforward, whenever there comes to Him in heavenly message or sacred writings the voice of the Father saying to him, "Thou art," the answer springs up in His heart, "I am," till He hears His own self-feeling echoed and reechoed in the voices of the law, the prophets, and the Psalms.

To us, it may be, a consciousness so divine and yet so human involves a contradiction, and in our enslavement to the forms of logic we set to work to remove the difficulty by ascribing some of His acts to His divinity and others to His humanity, only to awake at last to the discovery that by so doing we have lost sight of the Lord Himself. Whatever difficulties of an intellectual sort Jesus's thought of Himself may bring to us who view it from without, to Him, who knew Himself from within, all was plain. Let us not be wise in our own conceits. Jesus's thought of Himself is a holy temple. Into its inner sanctuary we are not able to penetrate; but with bared heads we may stand upon its threshold and make crude childish attempts to spell out the meaning of the words He speaks to us; and even the little we may understand will be sufficient to teach us to turn, like Thomas, from testing Him as man to worshipping Him as our Lord and our God, while with another we pray the prayer, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief."

II.—JOSEPH MAZZINI: A STUDY OF CHARACTER.

BY COL. RICHARD J. HINTON, BAY RIDGE, L. I.

"I AM but a voice crying for action," wrote Joseph Mazzini to his Italian followers. "Do you wish to destroy my influence? Act, and I shall be no longer of importance!" This was the significant spirit of all the Italian leader's work. He recreated a nationality and died an exile for "having loved Italy above all earthly things." The greatness of his soul was nowhere made more manifest than when an ungrateful monarch refused to lift from his name the sentence of death which the system his efforts destroyed had passed upon him. And the reason is plain for this stupendous ingratitude. "I bow my head," he said in 1860, "to the sovereignty of the national will"—it having been determined upon to place the House of Savoy on the throne of an Italy whose freedom was made possible by Mazzini and his confrères—"but monarchy will never number me among its servants or followers." It is easy to forget a voice when no longer "crying in the wilderness." It is easier still to slander the memory of a dead hero and teacher.*

The man, scholar, leader of liberty, and apostle of nationality, who found a land in the hands of foreign foes and left it under the control of native statesmen; who lived long enough to see a continent of jarring despotisms and petty oligarchies resolved into living states along lines of racial and national forces, largely compelled to yield to liberal ideas while unwillingly striving for other forms and forces; who took the angry passions of the peoples of Europe and lifted them from the black furnace of carbonari conspiracy into the white light of agitation, education, republican struggle, by means secret only because oppression was then able to imprison and murder, can even afford to have memory libeled by an American as an organizer of "political assassination."

Joseph Mazzini was born in Genoa in 1805, and died in London during the summer of 1872. His sixty-seven years can be divided into three distinct periods: childhood and youth, emerging at sixteen into activity as a licentiate of law, and at twenty-one as a recognized writer of scholarship and critical power. In 1830 began that "*apostollato popolare*," which made Italy a nation in its furnace heat, and aided to remold and liberalize Europe also. That epoch practically ended in 1860, when Victor Emmanuel was crowned king of a realm won to freedom by the most spiritually imbued democrat of our century. The last twelve years of this marvelous life were spent in efforts to complete the national edifice by the regeneration of Rome, and in sane and scholarly literary efforts, the execution of which alone should give to Mazzini a great reputation. There are ten volumes of his

* See *Nineteenth Century* for January, 1895, article by W. L. Alden.

writings extant. It is impossible for any one who has not read and studied them to comprehend modern Italy as a historical and intellectual force, or fully to understand the political and social economic development of Europe during the present century.

Mazzini at the age of 25, the child of intellectual and vigorous parents—his father a physician of repute and his mother a woman of learning, high character, and decided public insight—began a memorable politico-ethical career (for in him the two are inseparable) amid conditions that students at present find it almost impossible to realize. He had already been a political prisoner, confined for advocating the unity of Italy. His examination of Dante had led him into opposition to the papacy, and his study of Italian history had made him an unyielding republican. On his arrival at passionate manhood he joined the carbonari—that is, the charcoal-burners, a secret order having roots deep in the peculiar life of the Italian people. It was then growing into European importance out of the conditions that followed the Napoleonic *régime* and the Bourbon reaction. Louis Napoleon was at one time a member; so were the kings of Sardinia—Charles Albert and Victor Emmanuel; Garibaldi and Crispi were both sworn acolytes. Mazzini, however, in 1826 began to shape the "Young Italy" movement. The spirit, not the purpose of carbonarism, he resisted till death, regarding it, with the anarchistic movement in later years, as destructive and atheistical. This fact, borne out in all of Mazzini's writings and known well to his associates, as also to his contemporary statesmen, is a sufficient answer to the latest revival of the story that he was identified with the bomb-throwing plot of Count de Orsini. Mazzini was as safe as Crispi in Paris at the time and afterward, a striking proof that Louis Napoleon knew the facts.

When Mazzini was imprisoned by the Sardinian authorities, in 1830, Italy was divided between seven petty rulers and a foreign conqueror. Germany was rent into thirty-six states. Austria held both Italy and Hungary in subjection. Poland was, as now, divided between Russia, Prussia, and Austria. Turkey held the Danubian valley, Servia, Bosnia, Rumania, and Rumelia all being under the pashas. Greece was just seeking a new life, and Capro d'Istria played in the Ionian Islands at republican government, while Byron had died in her service. Russia was still "chewing her cud." France was sunk into the Bourbon torpor, while Spain was preparing for a savage conflict over the Salic law and her crowned harlotry. England was suppressing labor, fighting the newspaper-stamp agitation, transporting trade-union leaders, and resisting the reform movement. When Mazzini died, 42 years later, Italy was once more a nation. Austria had "given hostages" to constitutional government. France was a republic in form. The Germans had organized on national lines. Turkey was the "sick man" of Europe, and the Danubian Slavonian was pre-

paring slowly for a realization of Mazzini's dream of a federal government in southeast Europe. Greece had been born again; and though a minor power, was still assured of larger destiny. Great Britain had grown along lines of constitutional activity into an assurance of increasing democracy. Knowledge was a breathing giant and education lifted its exalting tones. Freedom of speech was assured on larger lines. Chattel slavery had fallen in the United States, and serfdom was destroyed in Russia. In all of these results Mazzini's intellect was an active force, his soul a vitalizing power, his character a regenerative influence.

Mazzini's political and economic views, with the ethical principles and religious spirit from which they sprang, remain a matter of deep significance. They keep touch in every direction with all the grave issues that impinge so sternly upon modern civilization. He held strongly to the continuity of history, the synthetical aspects of human movements. In his philosophy and action no sympathy was felt or seen with those who break all bonds that do not regard catastrophe as supreme. "Authority" and "liberty" were convertible terms to him, because neither could exist as order and law if not founded on the free consent of a people and under the sovereignty it creates. Mazzini was a sociologist, not merely an economist. No acceptor of the mechanical theory of the Cosmos, he was a profound believer in God, and saw the divine revealed in humanity alone. No incertitude is found in his hostility for all movements structured on a different basis.

This made prominent his objections to socialism as then understood. Mazzini left, however, no criticism on Karl Marx, the philosopher and author of what has been termed "scientific socialism." Perhaps this was because the method of Marx has the merit of being distinctly deductive and evolutionary in character. It is not inductive and specialized, as was the case from Mazzini's point of view with the systems presented by Saint-Simon, Fourier, Cabot, Considerant, and ilk. Karl Marx, personally and by opinion, could have been no stranger to Joseph Mazzini, as the measure of his work was well defined during the last twenty-five years of the Italian's life. During these years Mazzini was a caustic critic of Carlyle and his "strong-man" puppetry of human affairs. He was an uncompromising opponent of such systems as those of Saint-Simon or Fourier. He derided Louis Blanc's views as those of the marionette manager, and he was consistently hostile to Proudhon as one who rejected order and believed only in overthrow. In all these criticisms he was vigorous and clear, making his abstention in the direction of the Marx school still more noticeable. He asked in his famous address to workingmen on "The Duties of Man,"* if we can transform theory into practise, abstract principle into "action on the strength of interest alone." "The earth," he says, "is our workshop. We may not curse it; we are bound to sanc-

*Standard Library, 168, Sup.; Funk & Wagnalls Co., N. Y.

tify it." The remedy for economic evils, through liberty and progress "step by step," will be found in the organization of the "Commonwealth, the union of labor and capital in the same hands . . . under cooperative control," whose only mode of distribution should be directly from "producer to consumer," while "every man should be both," and whose profits or results "shall belong entirely to those who perform." Mazzini's conception was that of the association of labor upon democratic lines. He declared for the division of results between producers "in proportion to amount and value of the work each had produced." This was not incompatible with private property, which he held to have "its origin in life itself." But Mazzini declared that only by the "perpetual development of life and the modification of the elements which manifest the activity" thereof, can we establish the progress of the race, thus leaving open, as an evolutionist must, the way for revision or rejection of any conclusion. For economic theories as such he held no reverence. Life, above all, is a "sacred thing." To maintain its security is the cardinal aim of his writings. Such security must be imbedded in administration and wrought out in institutions ere labor, wealth, liberty, or progress can be made possible or insured as a guiding law. Therefore, "the amount judged necessary for the maintenance of life" must be exempt in the true republican state "from all taxation." He would have created a national credit fund for the labor associations he conceived of by making public property of the "value of all unreclaimed and unused lands"; of the net earnings of railroads and other public franchises, and by reversion to the state of accumulated property descending beyond the fourth generation.

The economists, Mazzini affirmed, err in making the increase of production the only aim of enterprise and industry; the philanthropists err as greatly in striving only to make men moral. Both ignore vital conditions and facts. Economic principles must be so founded in the law of life as to work automatically. His diagnosis made two great questions—the national and political, the social and economic. They should be one, he affirmed. The progress of the conflict has been such as to show that they are inseparable in both form and spirit, to be solved only in and with each other. In Mazzini's day the "nationality of the peoples had no real existence." Since then the nation as a word of regeneration has become a vitalizing possibility.

In the strangely agitated period of Mazzini's largest European activity, that is between 1835 and 1865, there were wide differences and but little apparent crystallization. He told his contemporaries "that we are not the democracy, but only its vanguard, charged to prepare the way." The democracy, when it truly comes, "will do the rest." In other words, Mazzini was an evolutionist, seeking synthetically to weave into one myriad-hued, harmonious whole the great web and woof of human life and movement. "Man," he said, "is one. We cannot allow one of his faculties to be suppressed, checked, cramped, or de-

viated without all the others suffering." Like John Huss and Zwingli, reformers to whose examples he often referred, he demanded "the cup for all"—not for priest or privilege alone. He objected to the materialists, because they substituted the "kitchen" for the "problem" of humanity. There is a special distinction to be made between the Italian *apostollato popolare* and the European leadership of the same idealist and thinker. In the one he served and organized a people; in the other he was a leader among peers—a thinker among leaders, aiming to make secure the future environment and correlation of states. It was from this last point of view that he criticized the Collectivist propaganda. He accused its organizers (especially referring to the French) of seeking to narrow the law, and to imprison the soul "in absolute systems," claiming to "extemporize positive solutions," to be able to give at any "fixed hour" that organization "which can only proceed from the concurrence of all the human faculties in action." In other words, they offered for him a substitution "of the solitary for the general." The natural consequences of the doctrines he criticized so strenuously were, he declared, "a disposition to accept all dominant and ruling facts, without hoping or endeavoring to modify them."

The Italian thinker gave a solemn expression to his faith in God and of the destiny of the human race. He was ideally, spiritually, ethically, a republican, because only thereby could he see the growth of divine justice and love. Addressing the "friends of Italy" in 1852, he said, "Right is a mere assumption, unless it springs from the intended accomplishment of a duty." The nationalists of Italy, he affirmed, "want to accomplish an act of creation, to elicit life—collective, progressive life—for the millions through the million." "Who shall persuade the man believing solely in the theory of rights that he is bound to strive for the common good and occupy himself in the development of the social idea?" And who, he urges, can make of the "pursuer of happiness" only the sacrificial soul that labors to uplift his race and his time. The consciousness of right does not alone "produce curable progress," nor does the mere "laboring to live" evolve a right education. In addressing these workingmen, Mazzini urged on them that "they should be first among all who contributed to the good of all; that their strongest weapon should be the firmness, not the menace, of their speech." "God exists," he said. An attempt to prove this "would seem as blasphemous to Him as the denial appears to be madness." Every advance in religious belief was attended by a "corresponding social advance in the history of humanity." And this declaration touches the very marrow of the Italian's philosophy. He believed in religion as a pervading force, and in the divine as "the breath of man's nostrils." The social, political, and economic growths, which fail to reflect these attributes, were surely marked for final overthrow. "Every strong and earnest faith," wrote Mazzini,

"tends to apply itself to every branch of human activity." Humanity is one "sole body." Individuals are "its members." All must seek to "render the whole harmonious." The pagan knew not the word "progress." Man as an entity is a conception that comes from the early Christians, who taught human "oneness" and the unity of the lowly. "Conscience," wrote Mazzini, "grows with capacity." Its guide is the intellect of humanity, not that of the individual alone. He is "insufficient to acquire a knowledge of the law of God. . . . Humanity is a being, . . . the result and sum of all human faculties." It is ever advancing in wisdom and morality with an eighteenth-century thinker. Mazzini accepted humanity as a "man who lives and thinks forever." We must maintain the "tradition of humanity, through and in the council of our fellow men." Its "consent" must go with one's own conscience. Such consent makes us "certain of the truth; . . . we learn one more line of God."

Mazzini, then, believed in equality of both woman and man. "Cancel every idea," he wrote, "of superiority over woman. There is none whatever. Education is the bread of the soul. It belongs to all. Individual life springs up like the flower. Inferior beings can live alone, man cannot; he is created for association. The family is the heart's fatherland; the angel therein is the woman. The true country is a community of free men and equals bound together in fraternal concord to labor for a common end. Liberty is but a means; it is not the negation of authority." It is only representative when it embodies "the collective aim of the nation." "Education teaches how to use liberty; association is the means, and human progress the aim." This can only be reached by respecting in all others "those rights which spring from the essential characteristics of human nature." Education "must be common to all citizens," and it should "be obligatory on all." Individual opinions "are transmissions"; the collective views are "connective of their limits." The only true government is that "of the social weal," and "its sovereignty" descends from God "as revealed in humanity." "Revolutions," said Mazzini to the European republicans, "to be legitimate must mark a type in the ascending scale. Despotism and anarchy are equal foes to education; . . . the first cancels liberty; the second society. We want to educate free agents for a social task." He believed fully, and lived up to his belief, that "the formation of a nation is a religion." In one of his masterly appeals (1852) to the Italians, he declared that "we believe in God the Father," that all "are children of one God, issue of one stock, governed by one providential law—members of humanity, living by that, learning by that, progressing by that."

Mazzini was always true to his ideals in demanding that the "statecraft" idea—that is, "the weakening of all that does not appertain to self"—should find a substitute in the demand for "the amelioration of all through all, the progress of each for the advantage of

all." In one of his earliest political papers, when residing in Geneva, after his first imprisonment by the Piedmontese Government, he used almost the exact words of the exalted formula of republicanism which Abraham Lincoln made so immortal at Gettysburg, when he declared that in view of such sacrifices as were there embodied, "Government of the people, for the people, by all the people" would not "perish from the earth."

It was Mazzini's earnest devotion that alone made possible an imposing scene, witnessed at Naples on that August day in 1860 when Garibaldi appeared as "liberator" on the balcony of the Palazzo Reale. The incident was told the writer by one who witnessed it as a staff-officer of Garibaldi: On the morning of August 18th the General was missing from his camp headquarters. He was in the habit of going to a height within their lines overlooking the city and bay, attended only by an aide and orderly. This morning the aide galloped fiercely back to camp bearing the report that the General, with only an English boy of sixteen serving as orderly, was then on his way into the city. The staff was wild, for up to that moment it was still supposed by them that Bomba was in possession. The American chief of staff, William de Rohan, threw himself into the saddle, ordered a forward movement of the whole force, and with the bodyguard of fifty horsemen at once rushed into Naples, dashing at full speed down the Via Corso, scattering the populace as they sped, until they drew rein in the great space fronting the palace, which holds the crescent-built city, the brown and somber-hued heights, the vaulted amethyst above, the sapphire waves of the bay below, and the red-tinged smoke of Vesuvius, in one wide and marvelous panorama. The dethroned king was on his fleet sailing out beyond Capua. Not a gun was heard, not a sound of strife; stir of enthusiasm, cheers of joy, were the greetings. As the panting horses and the excited riders wheeled at the palace-front, there was a shout and then silence. Garibaldi suddenly appeared, bareheaded, red-shirted, knotted silk handkerchief at the muscular throat, his left hand on sword-hilt, form erect, right arm outstretched over the waiting multitude. He looked a moment with an absorbing, mystic glance, which saw all yet did not seem to observe, and then raised his right arm aloft to its full length. The fist was clenched except the index finger, which in symbolic rigidity seemed to cleave the ambient air. Hundreds of arms were instantly upheld in the same way, as the General's resonant voice smote all the listening ears with "*Viva Italia! Uno!*"* That was all. The city rocked and roared with reply. It was the sign and watchword of Mazzini's revolutionary order—"Young Italy"—a proof of triumph; a demand for further efforts.

Mazzini's relations then to his times, covering actively as they did and in the molding of Italian life most potentially the period of

* "Hurrah for Italy! One!"

forty years—that is, from 1825 to 1865—are among the most interesting and even intricate of any personality that moved upon the European chessboard. A scholar of exquisite capacity, he became, by the conditions of his native land, a revolutionist of daring type. A dreamer and idealist, with as distinct a religious basis to his subjective life as that which distinguished Rosmini among Catholic thinkers and priests, he was forced to be a political conspirator for the emancipation of Italy and the republicanization of Europe, as history holds a record of; a mystic and seer like unto Dante; a Puritan and reformer of the Savonarola school; a thinker as broad as Bruno, and a critic and moralist as unflinching as Laménais, Mazzini became the terror of kings and the inspiration of an oppressed continent. Out of a dismembered people he molded a nation. It was Mazzini that inspired Italy. The Sardinian Cavour made a kingdom from an awakened congeries of enslaved communities; but it was Mazzini that inspired the divine fragments until they became a unit, and it was he who breathed into them the breath of hope and the fire of endeavor, from which at the forge of statecraft Cavour and his successors molded and welded a dynasty whose continued life is still a matter of doubt.

III.—THEOSOPIY AND CHRISTIANITY IRRECONCILABLE.

BY REV. C. R. BLAUVELT, PH.D., CORRESPONDING SECRETARY OF
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

IF we are to accept the claims put forth by its advocates, theosophy surpasses all rival systems in its breadth, charity, and catholicity.

It is not a new system, indeed it claims to be as old as the race. It is not *a* religion, but rather it is RELIGION; "it is the essence of all religion and of absolute truth, a drop of which only underlies every creed."

The great sages and teachers of all time and of every land are claimed as theosophists. Not only Buddha, Confucius, and Christ, but also the heroes of Old-Testament history—Abraham, Melchisedec, Moses, and Solomon—were eminent adepts; and it is positively affirmed that St. Paul was at least an initiate.

This claim, absurd as it seems, is quite in accord with the emphatic and oft-reiterated declaration of the broadest catholicity and the most positive non-sectarianism. As "a universal religion," Colville says, "it is utterly non-partizan and non-sectarian"; "it does not seek to overthrow any creed"; "it does not require of any one who embraces it a surrender of the Christian religion, so far as its basis in the New Testament is concerned." The members of the Theosophical Society, Mme. Blavatsky assures us, "may profess whatever religion or philosophy they like, or none if they so prefer."

This lack of exclusiveness is put forth as one of the strong points of theosophy, and, to show that it is not mere empty boast, we are reminded of the fact that the Theosophical Society has "received as brothers, with equal cordiality, Hindus, Jains, Parsis, Buddhists, Jews, and free-thinking Christians"; indeed, "all sects and denominations" are said to be represented within its membership; and these representatives are not confined to the laity, "but some conspicuous members of the Christian clergy" are to be found in its ranks.

Now, all this is supposed to prove conclusively that theosophy is in harmony with all other religious systems, and that Christianity is no exception. We presume to question the proof, and undertake to show from theosophic works that not only is there a total lack of harmony between Christian. and theosophy, but that they are fundamentally and irreconcilably antagonistic.

At the outset it is important to notice that theosophists do not agree with evangelical Christians as to the meaning of the term Christianity. They contend that genuine Christianity does not exist today, at least in the evangelical Church. They continually present a fanciful theory of that system which they suppose Christ to have founded, in contrast with the faith and teaching of the Apostolic and Christian Church, describing the latter as "Creedal Christianity," "Creedism," or the "Conventional belief of the day"; and affirming that its author is not Christ but his disciples, who misinterpreted his teachings.

It is unnecessary to show that this position is wholly destitute of any warrant, or to justify our use of the term in the ordinary and natural sense. Christianity stands for the truth taught by a historic person, a person who is revered not only as a divine human leader, but as a Saviour, and as the only possible Saviour of men; whose life is the ideal for all men, and whose teachings are the authoritative guide of faith and conduct. It is scarcely needful to add that we have in mind throughout only evangelical Christianity.

It is also to be noted that no appeal can be made to any authoritative statement of theosophic belief. It glories in the fact that it has no creed. "The Theosophical Society itself formulates no creed, and is not bound down to any doctrines." We can only compare the writings of eminent theosophists and accept the tenets in regard to which they agree as fairly expressive of the system. It is not a little significant that, while affirming sole responsibility for the opinions expressed, each author professes to tell us what theosophy *is*, not what he *thinks* it is. We seem justified, therefore, in regarding leading theosophic writers as sufficient authority for theosophic beliefs.

We shall limit our discussion to a few points, in regard to which there is unanimity among all evangelical Christians.

Firstly, theosophy assumes that all religions are alike true, and favors an eclecticism based upon a comparison of all. It is said that

the purpose of theosophy is "to show the truth in all religions, not to hold up one religion as so much truer than all beside it." "Hence it urges, not a mere benevolent toleration, but a persistent inquiry into the original of all faith and hope, such inquiry to eventuate in the recovery of primal truth, the repudiation of later mistakes, the reunion of man on one common ground of universal fraternity and good-will." Colonel Olcott states that the Theosophical Society requires that "none of its members should even mentally assert the exclusive sanctity of his own religious denomination."

But it is precisely this exclusiveness that makes Christianity unique among religions. While it recognizes truth wherever it is found, yet it claims to represent the only complete revelation ever made by God to man. It recognizes no competitor, it knows of no other gospel, it proclaims the one only Name whereby man can be saved. In this respect it certainly cannot be regarded as in harmony with theosophy.

Secondly, and akin to this, is the contrast between theosophic and Christian views of the BIBLE. The theosophist does not ignore the Bible nor does he deny its value. He quotes it frequently, misinterpreting it to suit his own ends, but it is to him only one of any sacred books, entitled to as much, but no more, respect than all others. "It is full of theosophy, so are all Oriental Scriptures." It is held to be essential "to deal with all as with the one, and with the one as with all; to handle the Vedas, the Bhagavad-gita, the Lalita-Vistara, the Zend-Avesta, and the Kabbala, with the same reverence as the Old and New Testaments, and to apply the same critical touchstone as to those."

With such a conception of its character, it is not strange that much of its history should be resolved into allegory; that many "inaccuracies, contradictions, and interpolations" should be discovered; or that its doctrines should be described as "for the most part either intrinsically absurd, or common to systems yet more ancient." Kingsland indeed admits that the Bible is a revelation, but it is a revelation by the divine hierarchy of initiates.

We need not stop to show the incongruity of such an estimate of the Bible with the Christian doctrine of a sole infallible revelation from the one only God, the explicit declaration of the Divine Will and the one authoritative rule of faith and practise.

Thirdly, the theosophic view of DEITY shows a striking contrast with Christian doctrine. Upon this point it is very difficult to give a clear account of theosophic belief, for the statements of leading writers are by no means consistent. If we should say that the theosophic view is atheistic, or agnostic, or pantheistic, it would be easy to produce evidence in support of each assertion. And yet the statement would be hardly accurate, as all three forms of belief are found in the writings of a single author.

T. Subba Row affirms, in *The Theosophist* that "the Arhats call themselves atheists, and they are justified in doing so if theism inculcates the existence of a conscious God governing the universe by his will-power; and many of Mme. Blavatsky's assertions imply at least practical atheism."

And yet there is a very pronounced belief in an unknown principle, to which no name can be given, of which no qualities can be postulated, and which is described simply as IT or THAT.

Just as positively is it affirmed that this unknown and eternal IT, which stands for Deity, "is everywhere, in every atom and divisible molecule," so that "God is the substance of existence. Be that substance what it may, it still is God."

Theosophists frankly admit that these views are antagonistic to Christian truth. In answer to the question, "Do you believe in God—the God of the Christian?" Mme. Blavatsky says: "In such a God we do not believe. We reject the idea of a personal, extracosmic and anthropomorphic God, who is but the gigantic shadow of man, and not of man at his best, either. The God of theology, we say, and prove it, is a bundle of contradictions and a logical impossibility." And Sinnett says: "It is no exaggeration to say that the wondrously endowed representatives of occult science . . . never occupy themselves at all with any conception remotely resembling the God of churches and creeds."

At the risk of unduly extending this part of our subject, we ask attention to one phase of the theosophic idea of Deity which seems to us especially significant. We refer to the emphasis which is placed upon the logical corollary of its pantheism, namely, the divinity of man. We unhesitatingly express the opinion that, notwithstanding all their talk about the Absolute, the Divine Mind, etc., practically theosophy knows no God other than man himself. Mme. Blavatsky says: "The inner man is the only God we can have cognizance of. . . . We call our 'Father in Heaven' that deific essence of which we are conscious within us, in our heart and spiritual consciousness, and which has nothing to do with the anthropomorphic conceptions we may form of it in our brain or its fancy." Again, she says: "This 'God in secret' is not distinct from either finite man or the infinite essence, for all are one." In "The Perfect Way" we read: "God is nothing that man is not, and what man is that God is likewise"; and Judge says theosophy "makes of man a god."

We might add to these explicit statements many others, showing that divine attributes are ascribed to man—*e.g.*, eternity. Thus Judge says: "Man never was not;" and Kingsland asserts: "Our real self, our immortal spirit, is divine and eternal. To give it eternal life hereafter, but not heretofore, is a philosophical and logical absurdity." So of creation. "Man is strictly his own creator"; "within ourselves lies the creative power, it is there resides the 'God' who

creates the heavens and the earth." Omniscience is ascribed to the Mahatmas, and so also is perfection; and Colville affirms the latter to be true of all men: "The divine soul of man . . . is perfect in purity."

In concluding this point, we venture to suggest that such success as theosophy has achieved may be due, in part at least, to this phase of it, a phase which seems especially prominent in recent works. The primal temptation contained in the assurance "Ye shall be as gods," has not ceased to be real and attractive to unregenerate man.

Fourthly, the theosophic views of CHRIST—His person and work—are hostile to Christian truth. The contrast is positive and striking, notwithstanding the fact that the statements of theosophists are by no means clear or consistent.

In how far the Christ of the gospels is regarded as historic by theosophists generally we are unable to say. It is common to make a distinction between Jesus and Christ; and how far that which is predicated of the one is held to be true of the other is not clear. Again, the Gospel Christ is spoken of as merely an ideal, and sometimes it is plain that this ideal is not regarded as having any historic basis; but whether this is the view always held we are unable to decide. Colville asserts that "it is clearly impossible to either verify or disprove a literal history of a personal Christ or Buddha"; and Kingsland affirms: "There cannot be a historical Christ; . . . but we have a historical Jesus, and every one is at liberty to believe what he likes as to that historical character being already Christos, the perfect Man, or Initiate." Again, "'Christ' is primarily not a person, but a process, a doctrine, a system of life and thought." These latter words have reference to what theosophists call the "Christos principle." It is affirmed that "the gospels are the histories of an inward regenerating principle, called the only begotten Son of God," and "the personal Christ" is only a "helpful expression of the Christ idea." This Christos principle is not essentially distinct from man, but is, in fact, only another name for the Higher Self.

Christ's character and teaching are often spoken of in terms of the highest praise. We are told that His life was "a model; a pattern life, of matchless purity and devotion to duty," and He is conceded to have been "a faultless type of man." But this perfection was attained in that way in which all men may attain it, through the experiences and discipline of previous incarnations. So, too, He is admitted to be divine, but only in the sense in which divinity is ascribed to mankind. "The divinity of Christ" is said to be "as certain as the humanity of Adam. The one completes the other. If Christ was not divine, then humanity is not divine. . . . If humanity is not divine, then there could have been no Christ." "Between the man who becomes a Christ and other men there is no difference whatever of kind."

Christ's teachings are spoken of with great respect by Colville, Judge, and Mme. Blavatsky; and it is declared that His doctrines were misunderstood and misrepresented by His followers. But He does not hold any distinctive position among great teachers; indeed, Judge places Christ upon a lower plane than Buddha, whose doctrines, he claims, influenced Christ in his teaching: "The teachings attributed to Buddha and Jesus are identical;" and a similar comparison is made between Christ and Confucius. The aim of all the great teachers has been identical. All that they "have done for man is but to teach him what man is able to be in himself by bearing, each for himself, that cross of renunciation which they have borne."

It scarcely need be added that Christ is never recognized as a Saviour, a lack which will fully appear in the consideration of our next point.

From our study of the theosophic view of Christ, the conclusion is inevitable that the Christ of the Gospels, the Christ of history, the Christ who constitutes the light and life and hope of evangelical believers, is not the Christ of theosophy; indeed, there is not even a remote resemblance.

Lastly, the Atonement. In regard to this vital Christian doctrine, there appears to be absolute unanimity among theosophists. With the greatest clearness and in the most emphatic manner they avow their unqualified hostility to everything in any wise resembling this important Christian truth. A few brief quotations will show the theosophic attitude.

We are told that "sin can be outgrown, but penalty is never canceled"; "sin produces suffering, and suffering wipes out the sin." For every word and thought every one must answer: "none can escape, either by prayer, or favor, or force, or any other intermediary." Theosophy knows "no such thing as pardoning, or 'blotting out of evil or wickedness already done,' otherwise than by the adequate punishment therefor of the wrongdoer, and the restoration of the harmony of the universe that had been disturbed by his wrongful act."

The doctrine of the Atonement is declared by Olcott to be "not merely unthinkable, it is positively repulsive." Kingsford regards it as an "idolatrous travesty of the truth," "derogatory to God and pernicious to man." It is frequently spoken of as a violation of strict justice; and Mme. Blavatsky asserts that the prevalence of crime in Christian lands—and she affirms that there is vastly more crime in Christian than in heathen lands—is due to the fact that this doctrine is so largely held and is so influential.

Furthermore, we are told that every man is his own savior. "Man makes his own heaven or his own hell." There can be no 'Saviour' of mankind, except as every one is a savior who helps to save, and a 'final judgment' is superfluous when judgment is momentarily going on without intermission."

But this doctrine of the vicarious atonement of Christ and of salvation only through acceptance of his perfect sacrifice, so persistently opposed by theosophists, is vital to evangelical Christianity. With antagonism here, how can there be harmony between the two systems?

IV.—CHURCH MACHINERY.

BY JOHN H. EDWARDS, D.D., NEW YORK CITY.

THE Christian Church in its human relations takes color and incidental form from each successive age. Its rock foundation never changes; but its superstructure is built of new material in each generation, and must necessarily feel the influence of the dominant ideas and tendencies of the current period.

We are living in the dynamic age. This is the century of machinery. Taking the Chicago Exposition as an exponent of the chief characteristics of the nineteenth century, we note that the greatest buildings and the larger part of the scheme of exhibits were devoted to machinery and its products.

A correlative fact of greater import is the extension of the same proclivity into the social realm. This is an age of organization. Society was never before so highly differentiated. Mechanization and organization are distinguishing features of the present time.

The Church of the period inevitably partakes of the prevailing tendency. It is becoming organized to a bewildering degree. It is full of wheels and belts, and levers and pulleys. Inter-church organization covers the globe. The local church is involved in a network of ecclesiastical mechanism that reaches all lands. This field would be too large for examination in any limited space, and we will confine ourselves mainly to the Church machinery commonly found in the local parish. The point aimed at is this: The danger of degrading the spiritual life of the Church by mechanical methods of religious work.

Organization is divine: mechanization is emphatically human. The Church is the *body* of Christ; and a body is an organism, not a complex mechanical device for utilizing the push and pull of combined forces. Diversity of correlated parts is necessary, indeed, to organic perfection. The higher the organism the more numerous and fully differentiated will be the component parts. The long lists of offices, gifts, and "administrations" found in the New-Testament descriptions of the Apostolic churches show how soon the at first almost homogeneous body developed its latent or bestowed capacities in a multiplicity of mutual ministries conducive to the welfare and growth of the whole organization. Yet the danger was foretold of "not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment min-

istered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Unity, growth, and life depend on the vital connection of each part of the body of Christ with the divine Head. Sever this and only a dead piece of mechanism is left, capable, perhaps, of galvanic movements, but not a living organism.

Both results are found in the history of the Church. The process of differentiation went on apace in the first Christian centuries. The Church was gradually organized after civic and imperial patterns, till the visible framework of the kingdom of Christ on earth had the complexity of an Oriental court. So long as organization was for Christian work and the members held fast to the divine Head the forces of indwelling life were manifest and effective. Consecrated power of all kinds found its specific function, and fulfilled it the more efficiently for being concentrated on a given object. But when connection with a human head of the Church took the place of vital union with Christ the true life was lost. Mechanical religion triumphed over spiritual. The immense power of compact and disciplined organization is seen in the history of the Roman Catholic Church down to this day. Macaulay described it well when he said that this Church is the most perfect machine the world has ever seen—if it only had angels to run it! As such it has a lesson and a warning for us. Happily, truth and the Spirit of God are mightier than any human machinery.

The organic tendency of the time has struck most of our churches. The various ecclesiastical bodies still retain their distinctive shapes under the three general divisions of episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational organization. But within the old, familiar contours they have got so filled up with religious, semi-religious, and non-religious machinery that they suggest the mechanical department of a world's fair. Societies, associations, committees, boards, guilds, bands, leagues, clubs, brotherhoods, brigades multiply till there is an office for everybody and a fee for every day. The pastor of an average church in a small city counts twelve treasurers in his congregation. The unceasing demands for cash and more cash actually keep some good people of moderate means and exacting expenses out of church fellowship.

The benefits of thorough organization are undeniable. Combination of forces, cumulation of influence, and concentration of power are indispensable to the highest efficiency of any large body of men. The Church of Christ is made up of individual disciples of Christ, and cannot attain a higher degree of spiritual power than its separate members possess; yet, even so, it is under the law of organic life. It is a collective body, an army. Its success will be in proportion to its wise organization and well-ordered energy.

The early Church recognized from the first the economic value of division of labor. The words of our Lord, "to every man his work," contain the germ of all subsequent diversities of office and function

among his true followers to the end of time. A happy result of the better organization of the working forces in our Churches is the bringing out of the latent ability of many who would otherwise be only lay figures. It is the office of machinery to develop, convey, regulate, and apply power. A machine is an agency for turning power into force. Whatever ecclesiastical mechanism will bring out the "not dead but sleeping" energy of the Church is most desirable.

Education and discipline are direct results of practical organization. A churchly spirit, subject to the divine Spirit, is much to be desired. This, in the form of local *esprit de corps*, is a motive force fruitful of good. Akin to this and springing from it are the social ties and influences so needful to make the church one body indeed. Those who might occupy neighboring pews for a generation without real acquaintance can hardly help knowing each other if bound together in some benevolent league or society for special religious work.

The pastor of a well-organized church can multiply himself tenfold if he is a good general, knowing how to pick his aids and deploy his forces. This is a branch of pastoral praxis which should be taught in the seminaries. If the average minister cannot "run" the more or less simple machinery of an average church, he will soon be literally as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness."

But the difference is world-wide between church or pastor running the machine and the machine running church and pastor. The dangers attending the multiplication of ecclesiastical machinery are as positive as its advantages.

Organization shackles as well as disciplines individuality. Whenever it does not help but hinders the development of the best there is in man or woman, it is overdone. Mechanism versus spirituality is a possible condition of things needing to be guarded against. Christian living is the great force to be sought and employed in all our associated religious work. Routine is not religion. Power is not as quantity. Multiplication of machinery may be subtraction of spiritual energy. The principle involved in conservation of force rules in things religious. Mind-strength and heart-power, equally with muscular and nervous vim, that go into church suppers, picnics, concerts, sociables, bazaars and the many colored *fiestas* or other devices in vogue for raising money cannot be transformed into spiritual force. It is gone, too often without any religious equivalent. The secular may be transmuted into spiritual light and life by the alchemy of the Holy Spirit's influence, but when spiritual potentiality is disintegrated into secular and sensual activity the loss is irreparable.

Music in the house of God may be wings to the soul or soulless wind. It more and more assumes to dominate the services of the sanctuary. Prayer and sermon are sometimes mere interludes between anthems, chants, offertories and long-drawn responses. One feels occasionally the aptness of the coincidence which occurred in a liturgical

church when a literary friend was acting as lay reader. The choir had executed a prodigious anthem, and when the last thundering pedal notes reverberated among the arches and were silent, the young laic went to the lectern and began the thirteenth chapter of Acts: "And when the uproar had ceased." Just then he remembered that he had not said, "Here beginneth," and paused in some confusion. The congregation were struck by the fitness of the description and audibly smiled. But then again the choir has its turn, as when at the end of an almost endless sermon the solo from the Elijah was sung, beginning, "It is enough, O Lord; now let me go!" Who has not felt in sympathy with President Finney in his plainspoken prayer after an unintelligible opening piece: "O Lord, Thou dost doubtless understand what has been sung, though we do not. Whatever it was, we pray that Thou wouldst accept it and bless it to this waiting congregation."

Thankfully acknowledging all that the music of the sanctuary has been and can be in the public devotions and to the spiritual life of God's people, we ought to emphasize the certain fact that unintelligible, undevout, unconsecrated music is unfit to have any place in the Lord's house. It is a serious question as to the real effect of the recent large expansion of the musical part of church services being what it commonly is. Earnest and intelligent Christian workers are convinced that in some churches, where each service partakes of the nature of a sacred concert, the music, rendered in more or less artistic fashion, is a positive hindrance to religious impressions. It must always be such when performed and listened to with supreme reference to its esthetic value. Entertainment is not worship.

Touching the relations of the pastor to the multiple machinery in the modern church, it is evident that a new clerical type is demanded and is being evolved. The Highland Church session that advertised for a pastor who, among other qualifications, must be a good "lipper," described the ministerial candidate in popular demand among the pushing, competitive churches of the day. The term indicated the ability often necessary to the pastor of some mountainous parishes in Scotland to use skilfully the leaping-pole in visiting his scattered flock among the swollen streams and unbridged gorges of the Highlands. If ever a man needed a similar accomplishment, it is the minister of a fully organized American church, with its innumerable demands for his presence, and with its social risks and difficulties. He must be spry indeed, and should be, according to the prayer once made for a new under-shepherd, "a man with all the modern improvements." His two shoes carry about a whole cathedral chapter. He has to combine in his single person the three functions of a complete government—the legislative, judicial, and executive—often with not a shred of authority to back him up. Whatever else he lacks, he must possess executive ability sufficient for a railway president. If in charge of a

thriving city church, his "study" will have much the air of a downtown business-office. The typewriter secretary is present, ready to lend a hand, an eye, an ear, and, some do slanderously affirm, the filling up of a sermon, to the busy pastor. The assistant minister or ministers; the paid missionaries, visitors, messengers and choristers; the officers of church, Sunday-school, and numerous societies, committee people, agents and ax-grinders from everywhere, cranks and crank-turners, besides callers and applicants from the congregation—all have their turn or take it. Paul himself might have hesitated between the "care of all the churches" and a call to the care of a single metropolitan church at the end of this century.

What time and strength is left the pastor is necessarily put into sermon-making, with the literary helps, in books or boots, so easily accessible in our day. If he is the oratorical head of a large ecclesiastical business-house, where will be his leisure for profound study, meditation, and prayer? By his acquired skill in manipulating second causes he doubtless gains great practical efficiency and can turn off manifold more work than pastors of the olden time. Yet it must not be forgotten that the hiding of the Christian minister's strength is where it was in Luther's day, in study, prayer, and trial. The Pauline rule, "This one thing I do," is better still for the making of strong men in the ministry than the reversed motto, *multa non multum*.

If the pastor's spiritual life, intellectual vigor, or bodily health suffers from the accumulation of cares caused by hyperorganization of church agencies, his people will suffer with him. They will not be fed with the finest of the wheat well kneaded, but with hot cakes and puff-paste. Their time, money, thought, and strength will be scattered among a multiplicity of more or less useful enterprises, till the one thing needful is practically forgotten. After a period of religious drought the really loyal hearts will be aroused to the spiritual poverty of the church and the sad condition of the impenitents around. The faithful bodyguard will respond to the call for a special campaign of evangelism. A new driving-wheel is now added to the church machine, and it is set to work at a feverish rate to turn out a grist of converts. Well will it be for that people if they escape the insistent presentation of a mechanical Gospel warranted to furnish salvation to all who will raise their hands for it, or sign a card of good resolve. The old sinner who wanted an arrangement by which he could "drop a nickel in the slot and git religion" might be accommodated in some of our mass-meeting revivals. Not a word is intended against any tried or fit methods for bringing the Gospel of Christ to men, but only a caution lest, with all the improved patents on old ways, we fail in bringing men to Christ.

Just one other word of caution: It will be an unspeakable loss if, through the mechanization of church life, with its distracting time-

consuming calls of numberless major and minor societies for all manner of objects, the Christian home shall become decadent, and cease to be the nursery of piety and of pious generations yet to come.

Wise and thorough organization is invaluable. The tremendous opening vision of Ezekiel is prophetic proof of its existence in the coming kingdom of our Lord on earth. But that strange combination of four-faced cherubim and mysterious machinery—wheels within wheels—full of eyes—was remarkable for one supreme fact: the wheels were *alive*. "The spirit of the living creature," or, as the margin reads, "of life," was in the wheels, and they obeyed the cherubim in every movement. "Whithersoever the spirit was to go they went. When those went, these went; and when those stood, these stood, and when those were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up over against them."

Lifeless machinery clamped to the earth can effect nothing spiritually. According to a noted scientist, all the mechanical agencies in the universe combined could not generate power enough to move a single grain of sand. Our Churches, our ministry, and all our religious wheelwork can accomplish absolutely no spiritual good except as they are endued and imbued with power from on high. This power was promised by our Lord before He left the world. The Holy Spirit was His legacy to a bereaved Church. Where the Spirit is there the Church is, alive in all its organic parts; and there alone is power, the power of God unto salvation.

V.—LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TEXTS FROM RECENT DISCOVERIES.

BY WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D., NEW YORK CITY.

THAT BLOODY CITY.

THE Prophet Nahum gives a description of the destination of Nineveh such as might have been written by an eye-witness. It is a vivid, realistic account of the siege and capture of an ancient Oriental capital, such as we could not understand except from the pictures of such scenes which we find on the palace-walls of Nineveh itself. Some recent studies of the history and capture of Nineveh, accompanying a running commentary on the second and third chapters of Nahum, by two German scholars, Colonel Billerbeck and Dr. Jeremias, may give occasion to gather some facts about Nineveh not easily accessible to the English student. One who can read German will find Colonel Billerbeck's discussion of the military problems involved, the methods of defense and attack, and the constitution of the Assyrian army, exceedingly interesting, illustrated, as it is, by maps and by pictures of fortifications, battering-rams, soldiers' armaments, chariots, etc. It will be found in the third volume of the "Beiträge zur Assyriologie."

Nineveh was probably founded as a trading-post by Semites from Babylonia, at a convenient spot where the Choser river emptied from the east into the Tigris; and a trading-mart it continued to be till the time of its destruction. For many years there was a bitter struggle between Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, on the Tigris, and Carchemish, the capital of the Hittite kingdom, on the Euphrates, for the control of the carrying trade from the Mediterranean to Baby-

lonia and Media. The worship of Ishtar, or Venus, must have been established here at a very early time, as the Ishtar of Nineveh is mentioned in an inscription of Gudea, about 2800 B.C.; also an inscription of Dungi, the second king of Ur, being about 3700 B.C., has been found in Nineveh and is now in the Louvre.

Nineveh is twice mentioned in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, found in Egypt, and which are of a date of about 1500 B.C. In both cases the city is mentioned as the seat of the worship of Ishtar. Tushrattu, king of Mitanni, writing to Amenophis III., makes mention of "an image of Ishtar of Nineveh," which had been carried to Egypt; and in another letter from Mitanni, Ishtar of Nineveh is mentioned under the Hittite name of Shaushbi.

Shalmaneser I., who lived about 1300 B.C., tells how he had repaired the temple of Ishtar at Nineveh, which he is good enough to tell us was built by Samsi-Ramoran I., son of Ismi-Dagan, who is dated 1821 B.C. It must not be supposed, however, that Nineveh was yet an important city. The capital of Assyria was farther south, at Ashur, the town which bore the same name of the national god and the nation itself. Yet the temple of Ishtar gave Nineveh some prominence, and his successors, Mutakkil Nusku and Assurris-isi (about 1150) made further repairs to the temple and other constructions. It may have possessed at this time little more than its temple, a trading factory, and such arsenals and barracks as were needed to protect merchants. Sennacherib speaks of it as having been a wretched place before his time.

A son of Tiglath-Pileser I., by the name of Asur-bel-Kala, made Nineveh his capital. But it retained this dignity for but a brief and not glorious period, as the great King Assurnazirpal, about 840, built Colah, from whose ruins the great Assyrian slabs in half a dozen college museums in this country were brought. But Sennacherib, the same who besieged Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah, went back to Nineveh, determined to make it a capital greater than Babylon. In place of the old, miserable palace on the bank of the Choser, which had been half-washed away by floods, so that the very graves of the kings had been exposed, he raised a high mound and built on it a magnificent palace, half in the Hittite style of architecture, and half in the Assyrian style. It still lies imperfectly exposed under the great mound of Neby Yunus. Very justly did Sennacherib call it the "palace without any equal." He connected with it a "paradise" or park for plants, trees, and animals, both a botanical and a zoological garden, making it, for its time, the wonder of the world. Among other important constructions were the walls, a treasury, a "regal street," and a bridge over the Choser. The successors of Sennacherib, Assurhaddon, and Assurbanipal strove still further to increase the grandeur of the city whose sovereignty under their reign extended south to the Persian Gulf and west so as to include Egypt. It was now the worthy capital of the whole civilized world. This was the city of unequalled magnificence, of which Nahum said: "The river gates are opened, the palace is dissolved; take ye the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold, for there is no end of store, the glory of all costly furniture." It was an ephemeral city, wonderful in grandeur, but maintaining its glory for scarcely more than a hundred years. It had earned its fate as being the cruellest of all cities in the world's history. Not the Jews alone hated it, but every nation that had been subjected. It was "the bloody city," the den of lions, the feeding-place of the young lions, where the lion "strangled for his lionesses, and filled his caves with prey and his dens with ravin."

But the end of Nineveh's glory was at hand. It was in December, 681 B.C., that Sennacherib was killed by his two sons in the Temple of Nusku or Nisroch. The Bible does not tell of the occasion for this bloody act, but we conclude from the monuments that it was in revenge for the act of their father, who had preferred their younger brother, Esarhaddon, as his successor. The Chaldeans and the Elamites attempted to seize Babylon. From the north and northwest there

came down a horde of Cythians, and the Persian power, under the Medes, began to develop its sway, destined to cover all the West. Ten years after the capture of Thebes, mentioned by Nahum when he asks Nineveh, "Art thou better than No-amon, that was situated among the rivers?" Assurbanipal's stepbrother, Samassumukin, who was viceroy of Babylon, invited all the farther east, Elam and Arabia, to join with him in rebellion; and although he was overthrown, and the power of Nineveh seemed established, yet it had suffered a severe shock. But if Assurbanipal had been victorious, he aroused the deepest hatred by those cruelties described by Nahum when he utters, "Wo unto the bloody city!" Princes of Kedar and Arabia were exposed in chains to the view of the people in iron cages by the east gate of Nineveh. The head of King Teumman of Elam was brought in a wagon to Nineveh, hung on a tree during a drinking bout, and tied about the neck of a captured Gambulian prince by the name of Dunanu. Then it was stuck on a pole by the city gate, and near by the king flayed alive the Gambulian prince.

It was a bloody and brilliant evening of Nineveh's century-long day. Assurbanipal made Nineveh the treasure-house of the arts and sciences; he gave it the greatest library in the world, and he filled it with all beautiful objects and wealth gathered from all the known world, from Elam, from Arabia, from Babylon, from Phenicia, from Palestine, and from Egypt. But he was scarcely in his grave when doom settled about his capital. His successors reigned but two or three years each, and by 606 B. C. the Egyptians, the Elamites, and the Babylonians had completed the sack of Nineveh, and in 605 B. C. occurred the great battle of Carchemish. Nineveh may have existed a little longer as an inferior town, but its brief day of glory, surpassing that of all other cities on the globe, was ended, and Lucian could say almost with truth that not a vestige of it was left. It remained for the Frenchman Botte and the Englishman Layard to rediscover the capital on which had been fully visited the curse of Nahum.

SERMONIC SECTION.

THE SUCCESS OF FAILURE.

By REV. B. GWERNYDD NEWTON,
[WELSH CONGREGATIONAL], PLYMOUTH, PA.

*Why seek ye the living among the dead?
He is not here, but is risen.*—Luke
xxiv. 5, 6.

THE chapter of our text opens by introducing the "day," the first day of the week, and the first day of the spiritual life of the disciples, after the long dark night of the crucifixion of their Lord.

Some of us have enjoyed the inexpressible privilege of spending a night, in solemn solitude and eloquent silence, upon one of the majestic mountains of God to witness the rising of the sun. We reached the summit as the

"shades of night were falling fast" and beheld the firmament draping itself in suggestive black, and the heavens wearing appropriate mourning apparel. How sad the scene; how solemn the funeral service! We mingled our tears with the dewdrops, the tears of night for the departed light, and with the night we became dumb, for it showed unto us knowledge too saddened for speech. The eloquence of the day was exchanged for the profound philosophy of the night, and with sadness and awe we entered the temple of darkness, where amid the gathering gloom we witnessed on the stage of solitude and silence night, characterizing death. We turned our eyes downward, and how like a grave was the earth! We looked around us, and

how like a shroud was the darkness! We gazed upward, and how like the arched vault of death were the heavens! How wearily the time dragged on, but how active were those dark clouds! They moved together like a trained army. Verily they be warriors of the night. Who could number the ever-increasing force or ever hope to conquer them? We feared their prowess, and mournfully asked, Is not the throne of night secure, its supremacy and sovereignty asserted, and the reign of darkness eternal? While these questions flooded our minds and filled our eyes with tears, we were suddenly awakened from our nightmare dream by the sound of our own voice asking, "What was that?" A shining arrow, thrown by the sun-archer with his bow of light, had pierced the heart of night, and we beheld it bleeding there—or rather a pencil of light with which the sun wrote in letters of fire, "war," on the dark scroll of the clouds. The portals were opened, and from the sun's heart rushed a flood of light, like a noble army with shining, dazzling spears, covering the heavens, to do battle with the powers of darkness. How brief the fray! The army of night was quickly routed; darkness retreated, light was hot in the chase until the spoils of war filled the sky; and after the battle the sun, in his glorious apparel, clothed with the glow and glory of youth, majestically ascended his throne in the heavens, the acknowledged crowned King of Day. And oh! what a transfiguration and transformation then took place! A miracle of life seemed wrought amid the tombs and vaults of death. Everything was brimful of life. The balmy breezes breathed love; the birds took up their sweet interrupted song; the flowers of the field blushed and glowed as they kissed and embraced the warm rays of the sun, and all nature was like a sweet instrument, filling and flooding the morning air with sweetest music. Man received his inspiration; life seemed sweet and precious; joy and gladness filled his heart

as the water floods the sea and fragrance fills the flower.

In the preceding chapter we have a record of the strange experience of the disciples in the night of soul they spent on Calvary. We find them in sorrowful silence and solitude witnessing the gathering gloom. The light of hope is declining; the day of faith is in the agony of death; the sun of their life is setting fast. It goes down, down, as low as the grave, and they despair of its ever rising again. How gloomy the general aspect—how sad the scene! Keen their suffering, sorrowful their hearts, and terrorstricken their spirit. Despair is clearly written on each feature, and agony furrows the soul. The life of their life is dying; their Saviour is slain; their God is dead. Can any darkness be greater? Can the night cast a darker die? They look downward: what is the earth? A garden. True; but with its heart ripped open to form a grave for their Lord. They look around them; and behold! dark doubt is busy burying their dead faith. They gaze upward. What are the heavens but the dwelling place of mystery and the home of dark despair? They live—nay, they but exist—in the Valley of Death. The night moves on, and with it they are carried unto greater darkness. Standing by the open grave, they are forced to enter the chamber of death; and oh! what a sad spectacle meets their gaze! There, motionless, lifeless, lies the body of Jesus buried in the grave, and their hope—yea, and heart—lies buried with Him there. They turn away their gaze lest their eyes bleed to death, but already they are blinded by the blood-tears of heart, and they leave the grave and lose sight of their dead Saviour. Let them seek solace anywhere—yea, everywhere—but all the springs of gladness and joy are dry. Life is but a wilderness, barren and burning. Oh, that sleep, the angel of the sorrowful night, should rock them in his arms unto sweet repose! But no; harassed, and tortured on the rack of despair, they are

kept alive to the presence of death. Surely this is the darkest night of their life and the darkest hour of that dark night. No; night brings night, as sorrow breeds sorrow. The darkness deepens. They struggle back to the grave, and there the climax is reached. The night of night sets in; the body of Jesus is missing! Here is sorrow upon sorrow. Now there is no hope, for hope is not only dead but buried and the reign of despair eternal.

Suddenly, like a flash of lightning, audible like a peal of thunder, the revelation of heaven in the words of the angels burst upon the soul. The eyelids of the dawn are opened and from the portals of light, like a bridegroom coming forth from his chamber, appears truth and authoritatively declares that the day has dawned and the reign of despair terminated in the precious words, "He is not here, but is risen." But as light had to battle with darkness for supremacy, so despair makes war with hope, for the words appeared "like idle tales" unto them; but truth persistently opposes unbelief, until ultimately all doubt vanished as the darkness disappears on the dawn of day; and behold! faith in splendor and glory ascends the throne of the soul, sweet confidence fills the heart, midday light floods the heavens when the risen Lord appeared unto them and said, "Peace be unto you."

But we have to stand a while with the disciples in the shade of night and endeavor to analyze the deep shadows that constituted it before we can appreciate and pass on with them to enjoy the day. The night was born when they lost the living Jesus among the dead; its shadows deepened when they lost the dead Jesus from among the dead. They saw the first ray of light when they heard the words "He is risen," and God turned the shadow of death unto the clear light of day, and they basked in the warm smiles of the noonday sun when through the empty grave they were enabled to see the risen, living Christ.

They failed to find Jesus where they expected to find Him, "among the dead," but they found Him where they did not expect to find Him, among the living, and they found Him among the living because they failed to find Him among the dead; so that our subject is:

I. The Failures — unfound where sought; that is, "among the dead" in the grave. We have in these words a record of an unsuccessful attempt to find Jesus. Mark the question asked is not, Why do ye seek Jesus? or Why do ye not seek Jesus? No, they did seek Him, and it was right and natural that they should. But why seek Him, "the living" among the dead? It is because they sought Him where he was not to be found that they were thus interrogated.

Why did the disciples seek Jesus among the dead in the grave?

(a) Because their love constrained them to seek Him. They could not live without Him. If they cannot have the living Christ, they must then get near the dead Jesus. Though faith had lost Him among the dead, yet love kept Him enthroned in the heart.

(b) They wanted to show their attachment and affection, therefore came they to embalm His body.

(c) They had either misunderstood His references to His resurrection, or forgotten or failed to believe them.

(d) Because they knew not where else to seek Him. It was here they expected to find Him, for here they had lost Him.

This was the greatest loss of their life, and apparently the most unredeemable. When they buried Him, they buried their faith and heart with Him. Faith gives place to doubt and confidence to fear. They lost the living Jesus in the dead Jesus. This was so unexpected that they had not calculated on the death of Christ. "This shall never happen to Thee," was the confident assertion when once he referred to His death. Had He not more than once robbed Death of his prey—yea, redeemed men from the very jaws of

death? Who would anticipate His death? But how great was their disappointment! They had faithfully followed Him throughout His public life, full of faith. He was their all, and their all had they left for Him. Amply were they repaid in their increased confidence, peace, and love until they suddenly lose Him in the grave. The grave is the world where man still suffers his heaviest losses. Here the child loses the parent and the parent the child. Here the tie that binds is severed, and love loses sight of the loved. The disciples here lose their Saviour and their heart. There are many still who follow Christ faithfully throughout His life until they come to the grave, and there they lose Him. They worshiped with the "wise men" at His cradle, they watched with eager eyes and soul-admiration His miraculous power; they basked in the glow of His love and shouted "Hosanna! behold the King!" when they beheld His triumphs and glory; they followed in silence and awe to the garden of suffering; to the mock trial went they with bleeding hearts; they lingered, looking upon the crucifixion, and were nailed with Him to the cross. Faith, though frail, fought bravely against despair, expecting to the end that He who saved others would "save Himself"; but when He was laid quietly in the grave, their faith lost its hold on Jesus and died.

The grave is one of the enigmas of experience, the birthplace of one of the greatest mysteries of life, and the death-bed of many a faith.

Placing the Creator of the world to lie in a manger, the mighty God becoming a helpless babe, the humiliation of Deity, is a mystery that paralyzes many a hope and destroys many a faith; but a slain Saviour—a dead Redeemer—He who laid the foundations of the world, placed to lie in the grave! The dead God is the mystery of mysteries; and many behold Him there, and while beholding lose Him, and like the disciples, turn from the grave, leaving

their Jesus there. But though faith dies, love lives on; it is immortal and they are still seen coming to the grave to seek Jesus, to show their respect for His body; though to them the Christ be dead, the memory of the dead Jesus lives and is precious; but in coming they only meet with disappointment. They never find the body of Jesus. Like the disciples of old, all they find is an empty tomb. Failure is always the fruit of this search. And this brings us to another loss.

If the disciples had never thought of losing Jesus in the grave, much less had they expected to lose Him out of the grave. They followed to the grave and there lost Him; now they follow into the grave and yet lose Him. They filled their soul with sorrow and despair, and made their loss complete. Before they had His body, and that was a rich legacy. They would not have parted with the dead body for much more than Judas sold the living Jesus; but now nothing but an empty tomb!

Many are still like the disciples, full of sadness and disappointment while they stand by the empty grave and gaze on the place where Jesus lay, because they behold Him not. They see angels, but not Jesus. They hear the sweet voices of the celestial beings, but much more would they prefer to listen to the dumb speech of His wounds—the pierced side, torn brow, and wounded hands. What are the words of angels to them now? But little they are heeded; their grief is too great. What is an angel without Jesus, much less in place of Him? Better far a dead Jesus than a host of living angels; yea, better far Jesus in His death-shroud than angels in the glorious robes of the world of light. But Jesus, though thus sought, cannot be found; and many fail to find Him not because they do not seek, but because they seek Him where He is not to be found. Let us mention some of the seekers for the living among the dead.

The scientist who seeks the origin of

life in nature, and accounts for and explains mind by evolution, while banishing God from His own universe seeks to make blind, dead law responsible for all the creative genius of the universe, "seeks the living among the dead." He who seeks the origin of the religious instinct in example and education, the cause of religious revival in the excitement of the emotional nature, "seeks the living among the dead." He who seeks the origin of Christianity in Judaism, and the explanation of the Bible in the delusion or fraud of the authors, "seeks the living among the dead." The positivist, who seeks the inspiration to virtue in humanity; the rationalist, who would account for the Christ by the Jesus, the supernatural by the natural; the atheist, who makes nothing bring forth everything; the ritualist, who seeks life in formality; the literalist, who looks for spirituality in the letter of the creed or of the Bible; the Papist, who expects to find salvation through dogma, church, Mary, or pope—"seeks the living among the dead." He who seeks eternal life anywhere but in Christ, sanctification in any way but through the Holy Ghost, "seeks the living among the dead." These find nothing but sad disappointment; and their failure, with the disciples, verifies our first statement that Jesus is unfound where sought.

But we are forced to ask: If not here, where may He be found? Let the experience of the disciples further instruct us, for we find that they found Jesus where they did not expect to find Him.

II. Success—unsought where found, among the living, out of the grave.

The disciples, though they lost, found Jesus, and this was the greatest discovery of their life; they had lost Him from the world and found Him in the grave, now they have lost Him from the grave and found Him in the world; yea, "among the living" only was He found, and He may always be found among the living. We will mention three places where the Lord was found

of the disciples after the resurrection, because they are typical of the places where He is found to-day.

He was first found in a garden—near the grave, by the empty tomb. Mary, with sad, sorrowful heart, stood riveted by love to the spot where He had lain. She knew He was not there, yet the place was sacred; He had been there. Fast flowed her tears, and through her tears she was destined to see her Lord, for she wept on until Jesus stood transfigured before her. Many, like Mary, have stood weeping by a grave until the miracle of resurrection is wrought and the risen Lord appears. I am glad that it was in a garden He was first found. It seems so natural to meet with Him there. It was in a garden He died through self-sacrifice and secured the victor's crown. In a garden was He buried and enjoyed His well-earned, triumphant rest. In a garden He rose again from the dead, and in a garden was He first found as the risen Lord.

I like to think of Him sleeping there, with beautiful flowers surrounding His grave; everything so sweet and fragrant, so full of rest and life. That garden was never so rich or full of life before, for buried in its heart is the Lord of life. The earth, with its grave, is but a garden, beautiful where the Saviour has slept. The Garden of Gethsemane and the garden of the grave, the garden of suffering and the garden of rest, the garden of death and the garden of life, correspond so closely that I believe they are the same. Am I mistaken? Then let me alone. The thought is my own and my heart is full of rest. It was not unnatural that Mary should have taken Jesus for the gardener, for we always meet him in nature's paradise, dressing and keeping it. Yea, we can always find Him in the garden, especially in the morning, training the trees, opening the eyelids of the lily, giving fresh beauty to the flower, and clothing the rose in royal robes full of fragrance.

Let us meditatively and devoutly

stand in nature's garden. Though a grave be near us, yet shall we see the risen Lord.

Home,—this was another place where the Saviour was found after his resurrection: amid the family circle, sitting at table, partaking of the humble evening meal. This is very beautiful and suggestive.

He joined two sad, solitary disciples in their quiet meditative walk, and conversed with them on the burning question of the day. They listened with rapt attention, and had more insight into theology that day than they had ever possessed before. Their hearts warmed within them with admiration, reverence, and love—yet they knew Him not; but when they had entered the home, at table, in the "breaking of the bread," then they knew Him. How very precious we have often met Him in our walks in the fields of theology! And though we were made glad by His words of light, life and love, yet we knew Him not; but in the every-day experiences of life, in the Galilee of humiliation and suffering, we found and knew Him. It is always so. We know Him best not in theology, but in life; not in the miracle of truth, but in the simple manifestation of love. When He is most human, then He is to us most divine. Thank God, we have oft seen Him blessing, breaking, and giving bread for humanity. We have met Him in the humble homes of the poor, and in the breaking of bread we knew Him.

Upper chamber—this was another place where they found Jesus. When the disciples had gathered together for meditation and prayer in that humble, unostentatious building, where probably the Last Supper was eaten, in the ordinary but earnest soul-service of worship, Jesus stood in their midst and blessed them. It is always so. Have we not found Him in the service of the sanctuary, though the temple outside was old and mean? In the plain but earnest prayer, in the hallowed devotion of heart and the communion of

saints, have we not received His benediction?

Thus Christ is found among the living, in the garden of nature, sanctifying toil; in the home, like a father, sanctifying and supplying wants; in the Church, like a priest, sanctifying by his presence and words of love the service of soul. The first is nature, the second providence, the third grace.

But to the disciples was He not unsought when found? Yea, verily they would have expected Him on the throne of David rather than in a garden; in the palaces of kings, partaking of royal feasts, rather than in the home of the poor; amid the grand ritualistic services of the temple, rather than in the unadorned service of the upper chamber. But no; wherever there is a soul in sorrow, as in the garden; soul in solitude and suffering, as in the home; soul in service, as in the upper chamber—the risen Lord is there indeed. But Jesus had to appear, manifest Himself, to the disciples before they knew Him, and that for one reason, because He was unexpected and unsought where found. Mary did not know Him in the garden; He had to speak before he was known. The disciples at Emmaus did not expect Him; He had to open their eyes before they knew Him, and He was hardly expected in the upper chamber. The doors were locked, and when He came they took Him for a spirit. But He never, be it remembered, reveals Himself unless there be a desire, a search, though blind, for Him. The proof of the desire to see is the search, the reward of the search is to see; so that no one need fail to find Jesus. The spirit of God takes the place of angels and points out the how and where to find Him. So have we learned that He is unfound where sought, and unsought where found. And this brings us to our last division.

III. Success of Failure—found where unsought because sought where unfound.

The disciples failed to find Jesus in

the grave, and this failure was the greatest success of their life. They found the living Christ because they failed to find the dead Jesus, and because they sought Him where they did not find Him did they find Him where they did not seek Him. Nobody seeks Jesus anywhere without ultimately finding Him, but nobody finds Jesus anywhere without seeking for Him somewhere; and wherever He is found it must be through the grave.

The death of Christ proved the death of many a faith; so the resurrection of Christ must be the life of every faith. They who seek the living among the dead find nothing but the empty tomb, but there they are guided to the living Christ. It is impossible to find Jesus but in this wise. Christianity is well said to be founded on an empty tomb. The disciples sought to keep Jesus from the grave, then they sought to keep Him in the grave, then they kept Him in spite of the grave—yea, because of the grave are they enabled to keep Him. These are but necessary stages in the development of faith and life. They who lose Jesus because of the grave must, because of the grave, find Him. Follow Him into the grave, then you lose Him; follow Him out of the grave, then you find Him. This is the one and only way of finding Him. Jesus is within the grave when the disciples are without. He is without the grave when they are within; but as soon as love leads them into the grave, life leads them out to Jesus. When we fail to see Him in the grave, then shall we succeed in seeing Him out of the grave.

All who lose Jesus in the grave do so in sorrow, because of unbelief and forgetfulness; all who find Him through the empty grave do so with joy, because of faith. They are sorrowful because they lose Him in the grave, sorrowful because they lose Him out of the grave, but now they are glad that they lost Him in and out of the grave. Thus their greatest loss is their greatest gain.

He who conscientiously seeks Jesus among the dead will ultimately find Him among the living, for God always rewards honest inquiry with success; and, therefore, seeking Christ among the dead is better than not to seek Him anywhere, for by the empty tomb we have visions and the guidance of angels into the mysteries of the resurrection and to the living Christ. To those disciples who sought Him in the grave Jesus first appeared, and that in the order in which they came. Mary was the first at the sepulcher, and the first to see Jesus; John seems to have been the second, and the first, without seeing Jesus, to believe the resurrection. Thus is faithful devotion and conscientious seeking rewarded of God with realization of truth. The one need of the world to-day is to behold the living Christ, and it is fast becoming convinced of this, and we are glad to believe that it is earnestly seeking, although we fear often among the dead. The work of the Church to-day is to echo the words of the angels, "He is not here, but is risen."

Show the world the way to the Saviour. We cannot do this unless we have found Him. Have we found Him? Yea, thank God, we have found Him in the garden, the paradise of nature; in the home, the paradise of hope; in the Church, the paradise of love, and in heaven, the paradise of God. Thus have we exchanged doubt for faith, despair for hope, and death for life, and have safely passed with the disciples through the discipline of the gloom of night into the clear light of day, from starlight to sunlight; and we bask in the light of the noonday sun of faith, for "He is risen," and we have found Him. We are clothed with joy and gladness, as the lily is clothed with beauty and purity. We are fanned by the balmy breezes of Zion, and breathe love in the atmosphere of heaven. Our souls are beautified with the beams of God's holiness, and illuminated with the radiant smiles of

His countenance, for "He is risen," and we have found Him.

We are filled with the wisdom of God, for we have the "Mind of Christ." We are nourished by God's love; Christ dwelleth in our hearts. We nestle in God's bosom in all peril, for our home is the eternal heart of the divine, and our life is hid with Christ in God. Our inheritance is infinite. Wealth, truth, light, love, and life is it, for "all things are ours," and "when Christ our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory." Arrayed in luster bright, clothed in garments of light, we shall exchange sunlight for God's light and in that effulgent light spend an eternal day; for "He is risen" and we have found Him.

PERSONAL INFLUENCE.

BY N. D. HILLIS, D.D. [INDEPENDENT], CHICAGO, ILL.

And Saul sent soldiers to take him; and when they saw Samuel standing as appointed over them, the spirit of God was upon the messengers of Saul. And Saul sent soldiers again the third time, and they prophesied also. Then the king went thither; and he prophesied before Samuel in like manner.—
1 Sam. xix. 20.

THE genius of this event concerns the atmosphere a man carries. His personality is represented as exhaling influences; he is pictured as a storage battery charged with moral energies. Man is a force-bearer and a force-producer. In measuring Mazzini's influence over the multitude that thronged and pressed upon him, the historian says: "We must reckon with the orator's physical bulk, and then carry this measuring-line about his atmosphere." Business men understand this principle; those skilled in promoting great enterprises bring the men to be impressed into a room, and create an atmosphere around them. Artists express the idea by the halo of light emanating from the divine head.

Scientists now speak of "the magnetic circle." He who spake as never a man spake called man "a light"; but a candle is one part flame, but the larger part beams, beating back the darkness. All nature's forces carry their material atmosphere: the sun gushing forth light unquenchable; coals throwing off heat; violets, larger in influence than bulk; pomegranates and spices crowding all the house with sweet colors. Thinking of the evil emanating from a bad man, Bunyan made Apollyon's nostrils emit flames; and Everett insists that Daniel Webster's eyes during his greatest speech literally emitted sparks. Had we tests fine enough, we should doubtless find each man's personality the center of outreaching influences. He himself may be utterly unconscious of this exhalation of moral forces, as he is of the contagion of disease from his body. But if light is in him, he shines; if darkness rules, he shades; if his heart glows with love, he warms; if frozen with selfishness, he chills; if corrupt, he poisons; if pure-hearted, he cleanses. We watch with wonder the apparent flight of the sun through space, glowing upon dead planets, shortening winter, and bringing back birds, leaves, and fruits. But that is not half so wonderful as the passage of a human heart, glowing and sparkling with ten thousand effects, as it moves through life. The soul, like the sun, has its atmosphere, and is over against its fellows for light, warmth, and transformation.

Consider the incident. The king sent his officers to arrest a seer who had publicly indicted the tyrant for outbreaking sins. But when the soldier entered the prophet's presence he was so profoundly affected by the majesty of his character that he forgot his commission and his lord's command, asking rather to become the good man's protector. Likewise with the second group of soldiers: coming to arrest, they remained to befriend. Then the king's anger was exceedingly

hot against him who had become a conscience for the throne. Rushing forth from his palace like an angry lion from his lair, the king sought the place where this man of God was teaching the people. But lo! when the king entered the brave man's presence his courage, fidelity, and integrity overcame Saul, and conquered him unto confession of his wickedness. Just here we remember that stout-hearted Pilate, with a legion of mailed soldiers to protect him, trembled and quaked before his silent prisoner. And King Agrippa on his throne was afraid, when Paul, lifting his chains, fronted him with words of righteousness and judgment. The great writers have each had their incident of the atmosphere their hero carried. Carlyle says that in 1848, during the riot in Paris, the mob swept down a street blazing with cannon, killed the soldiers, spiked the guns, only to be stopped a few blocks beyond by an old white-haired man, who uncovered and signaled for silence. Then the leader of the mob said: "Citizens, it is De la Eure; sixty years of pure life is about to address you." A true man's presence transformed a mob that cannon could not conquer. Montaigne's illustration of atmosphere was Julius Cæsar. When the great Roman was still a youth, he was captured by pirates and chained to the oars as a galley-slave; but Cæsar told stories, sang songs, declaimed with endless good-humor. Chains bound Cæsar to the oars, and his words bound the pirates to himself. That night he supped with the captain. The second day his knowledge of currents, coasts, and the route of treasure-ships made him first mate; then he won the sailors over, put the captain in irons, and ruled the ship like a king; soon after he sailed the ship as a prize into a Roman port. If this incident be credible, a youth who in four days can talk the chains off his wrists, himself into the captaincy, a pirate ship into his own hands as booty, is not to be accounted for by

his eloquent words; his speech was but a tithe of his power, and wrought its spell only when personality had first created a sympathetic atmosphere. Only a fraction of a great man's character can manifest itself in speech, for the character is inexpressibly finer and larger than his words. The narrative of Washington's exploits is but the smallest part of his work. Sheer weight of personality alone can account for him. Happy the man of moral energy all compact, whose mere presence alone, like Samuel the seer, restrains others, softens and transforms them. This is a thing to be written on a man's tomb: "His presence made bad men good."

But, after all, this mysterious bundle of forces called man, moving through society, exhaling blessings or blightings, gets its meaning from the capacity of others to receive its influences. Man is not so wonderful in his power to mold other lives as in his readiness to be molded. Steel to hold, he is wax to take. The daguerrean plate and the eolian harp do but meagerly interpret his receptivity. Therefore, some philosophers think character is but the sum total of those many-shaped influences called climate, food, friends, books, industries. As a lump of clay is lifted to the wheel by the potter's hand, and under gentle pressure takes the lines of a beautiful vase, so man sets forth a mere mass of mind; but under the gentle touch of love, hope, ambition, peace, war, soon stands revealed in the aspect of a Cromwell, a Milton, or a Lincoln. Standing at the center of the universe, a thousand forces come rushing in, report themselves to the sensitive soul-center. There is a nerve in man that runs out to every room and realm in the universe. Only a tithe of the world's truth and beauty finds access to the lion or lark; they look out as one in castle tower whose only window is a slit in the rock. But man dwells in a glass dome; the world lies revealed on every side. Every fact and force out-

side has a desk inside man, where it makes up its reports. The ear reports all sounds and songs; the eye all sights and scenes; the reason all arguments; judgment each "ought" and "ought not"; the religious nerve reports messages coming from a foreign clime. Man's mechanism stands at the center of the universe, with telegraphic lines running out into every direction. It is a marvelous pilgrimage he is making through life while myriad influences stream in upon him. It is no small thing to carry such a mind for threescore years under the glory of the heavens, through the glory of the earth, midst the majesty of the summer and the sanctity of the winter, while all things animate and inanimate rush in through open windows. For one thus sensitively constituted every moment trembles with possibilities; every hour is big with destiny. The neglected blow cannot afterward be struck on the cold iron; once the stamp is given to the soft metal it cannot be effaced. It was Ruskin who said: "Take your vase of Venice glass out of the furnace and strew chaff over it in its transparent heat, and recover that, to its clearness and rubied glory, when the north wind has blown upon it; but do not think to strew chaff over the child fresh from God's presence and to bring the heavenly colors back to him—at least in this world." We are accountable to God for our influence; this it is "that gives us pause."

Gentle as is the atmosphere about us, it presses with a weight of fourteen pounds to the square inch. No infant's hand feels its weight; no leaf of aspen or wing of bird detects this heavy pressure, for the fluid air presses equally in all directions. Just so gentle, yet powerful, is the moral atmosphere of a good man pressing upon and shaping his kind. He who hath made man in His own image hath endowed him with this forceful presence. Ten talented men, eminent in knowledge and refinement, eminent in art and wealth, do, indeed, illustrate this.

But proof also comes from obscurity, as pearls from homely oyster-shells. Working among the poor of London, George MacDonald went to the funeral of an applewoman. Her history makes the story of kings and queens contemptible. Events had appointed her to poverty, hunger, cold, and two rooms in a tenement. But there were three orphan boys sleeping in an ashbox whose lot was harder. She dedicated her heart and life to the little waifs. During two and forty years she mothered and reared some twenty orphans; gave them home, and bed, and food; taught them all she knew; helped some to obtain a scant knowledge of the trades; helped others off to Canada and America. The author says she had misshapen features, but that an exquisite smile was on the dead face. It must have been so. She "had a beautiful soul," as Emerson said of Longfellow. Poverty disfigured the applewoman's garret, and want made it wretched, nevertheless God's most beautiful angels hovered over it. Her life was a blossom event in London's history. Social reform has felt her influence. Like a broken vase, the perfume of her being will sweeten literature and society a thousand years after we have gone. The Greek poet says men knew when the goddess came to Thebes because of the blessings she left in her track. Her footprints were not in the sea, soon obliterated, nor in the snow, quickly melting, but in fields and forests. This unseen friend passing by the tree blackened by a thunderbolt stayed her step; lo! the woodbine sprang up and covered the tree's nakedness. She lingered by the stagnant pool: the pool became a living spring. She rested upon the fallen log: from decay and death came the snowdrop and anemone. At the crossing of the brook were her footprints; not in mud downward, but in violets that sprang up in her pathway. O beautiful prophecy! literally fulfilled two thousand years afterward in the life of the London applewoman, whose

atmosphere sweetened bitter hearts and made evil into good.

But wealth and eminent position witness not less powerfully the transforming influence of exalted characters. "My lords," said Salisbury, "the reforms of this century have been chiefly due to the presence here of one man—Lord Shaftesbury. The genius of his life was expressed when last he addressed you. He said: 'When I feel age creeping upon me I am deeply grieved, for I cannot bear to go away and leave the world with so much misery in it.'" So long as Shaftesbury lived England beheld a standing rebuke of all wrong and injustice. How many iniquities shriveled up in his presence? This man, representing the noblest ancestry, wealth, and culture, wrought numberless reforms. He became a voice for the poor and weak. He gave his life to reform-acts, and corn laws; he emancipated the enslaved boys and girls toiling in mines and factories; he exposed and made impossible the horrors of that inferno in which chimneysweeps live; he founded two-score industrial, ragged, and trade schools; he established shelters for the homeless poor. When Parliament closed its sessions at midnight Lord Shaftesbury went forth to search out poor prodigals sleeping under Waterloo or Blackfriars bridge, and often in a single night brought a score to his shelter. When the funeral cortège passed through Pall Mall and Trafalgar Square on its way to the abbey the streets for a mile and a half were packed with innumerable thousands. The costermongers lifted a large banner, on which was inscribed these words: "I was sick and in prison and ye visited me." The boys from the ragged schools lifted these words: "I was hungry and naked, and ye fed me." All England felt the force of that colossal character. To-day at that central point in Piccadilly where the highways meet, and thronging multitudes go surging by, the English people have erected the statue of Shaftesbury; the

fitting motto therefor, "The reforms of this century have been chiefly due to the presence and influence of Shaftesbury." Oh, that God may hold back our beloved city from injustice and anarchy and bloodshed until Shaftesbury the peer, and Samuel the seer, are duplicated in the life of great men, who shall stand forth to plead the cause of the poor and weak, fulfilling the sentiments of the singer beyond the sea:

"I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall the sword sleep in my hand
Till I have built Jerusalem
In England's fair and happy land."

But man's atmosphere is equally potent to blight and to shrivel. Not time, but man, is the great destroyer. History is full of the ruins of cities and empires. Innumerable paradises have come and gone; Adams and Eves many, happy one day, have been miserable exiles the next; and always because some Satanic ambition or passion or person entering has cast baneful shadow o'er the scene. Men talk of the scythe of time and the tooth of time. But, says Ruskin, "time is scytheless and toothless; it is we who gnaw like the worm; we who smite like the scythe. Fancy what treasures would be ours to-day if the delicate statues and temples of the Greeks; if the broad roads and massive walls of the Romans; if the noble architecture, castles, and towns of the middle ages, had not been ground to dust by blind rage of man. It is man that is the consumer; he is moth, and mildew, and flame." All the galleries and temples and libraries and cities have been destroyed by his baneful presence. The marble would have stood two thousand years in the polished statue of Phidias, as well as in the Parian cliffs; but thrice armies made an arsenal of the Acropolis, ground the precious marbles to powder, and mixed their dust with his ashes. It was man's ax and hammer that dashed down the carved work of cathedrals and turned the treasure cities into battle-fields, and opened galleries to the mold of sea winds.

Disobedience to law has made cities a heap and walled cities ruins. Man is the pestilence that walketh in darkness, the destruction that wasteth at noonday. When Mephistopheles appears in human form, his presence falls upon homes like the black pall of the consuming plague—that robes cities for death. The classic writer tells of an Indian princess sent as a present to Alexander the Great. She was lovely as the dawn; but what especially distinguished her was a certain rich perfume in her breath—richer than a garden of Persian roses. A sage physician discovered her terrible secret. This lovely woman had been reared upon poisons from infancy until she herself was the deadliest poison known. When a handful of sweet flowers was given to her, her bosom scorched and shri eled the petals; when the rich perfume of her breath went among a swarm of insects a score fell dead about her; a pet humming-bird entering her atmosphere shuddered, hung a moment in the air, then dropped in its final agony. Her love was poison, her embrace death. This tale has held a place in literature because it stands for men, of evil all compact, whose presence has consumed integrities, exhaled iniquities. But, pleased be God, the forces that bless are always more numerous and more potent than those that blight. Saul, the tyrant, is less than Samuel, the seer.

As a force-producer man's primary influence is voluntary in nature. This is the capacity of purposely bringing all the soul's powers to bear upon society. It is the foundation of all instruction. The parent influences the child this way or that. The artist master plies his pupil. The brave general or discoverer inspires and stimulates his men by multiform motives. The charioteer holds the reins, guides his steeds, restrains or lifts the scourge. Similarly man holds the reins of influence over man, and is himself in turn guided. So friend shapes and molds friend. This is what gives its mean-

ing to conversation, oratory, journalism, reforms. Each man stands at the center of a great network of voluntary influence for good. Through word-bearing gesture he sends out his energies. Oftentimes a single speech has effected great reforms. One man's act deflected the stream of the centuries. Full oft a single word has been like a switch that turns a train from the route running toward the frozen North to a track moving into the tropic South. Not seldom has a youth been turned from the way of integrity by the influence of a single friend. Endowed as man is, the weight of his being effects the most astonishing results. Witness Stratton's conversation with the drunken bookbinder, whom we know as John B. Gough, the apostle of temperance. Witness Moffat's words that changed David Livingstone the weaver into David Livingstone the savior of Africa. Witness Garibaldi's words fashioning the Italian mob into the conquering army. Witness Garrison, and Beecher, and Phillips, and John Bright. Rivers, winds, forces of fire and steam are impotent compared to those energies of mind and heart that make men equal to transforming whole communities and even nations. Who can measure the soul's conscious power? Who can measure the light and heat of last summer? Who can gather up the rays of the stars? Who can bring together the odors of last year's orchards? Neither are there mathematics for computing the influence of man's voluntary thought, affection, and aspiration upon his fellows.

Man has also an involuntary and un-
purposed influence. Power goes forth without his distinct volition. Like all centers of energy, the soul does its best work automatically. The sun does not think of lifting the mist from the ocean, but the vapor moves skyward. Often man is ignorant of what he accomplishes upon his fellows, but the results are the same. He is surcharged with energy; accomplishing much by plan, he does more through uncon-

scious weight of personality. In wonder words we are told the apostle purposely wrought deeds of mercy upon the poor; but through his shadow falling on the weak and sick as he passed by, he unconsciously wrought health and hope in men. In like manner it is said that while Jesus Christ was seeking to comfort the comfortless, involuntarily virtue went out of Him to strengthen one who did but touch the hem of His garment. Character works with or without consent. The selfish man fills his office with a malign atmosphere; his very presence chills like a cold, clammy day. Suspicious people fill all the circle in which they live with envy and jealousy. Moody men distribute gloom and depression; hopelessness drains off high spirits as cold iron draws the heat from the hand. Domineering men provoke rebellion and breed endless irritations. Great hearts there are also among men; they carry a great volume of manhood; their presence is sunshine; their coming changes our climate; they oil the bearings of life; they make right-living easy. Blessed are the happiness-makers; they represent the best forces in civilization. They are to the heart and home what the honeysuckle is to the door over which it clings. These embodied gospels interpret Christianity. Jenny Lind explains a sheet of printed music; and a royal Christian heart explains, and is more than a creed. Little wonder, when Christianity is incarnated in a mother, that men worship her as though she were an angel. Some one has likened a church full of people to a box of unlighted candles: latent light is there; if they were only kindled and set burning, they would be lights indeed. What God asks for is luminous Christians and living gospels.

Another form of influence continues after death, and may be called unconscious immortality or conserved social energy. Personality is organized into instruments, tools, books, institutions. Over these forms of activity death and

years have no power for destroying. The flying steamer and the flying train tell us that Watt and Stephenson are still toiling for men. Each foreign cablegram reminds us that Cyrus Field has just returned home. The merchant who organizes a great business sends down to the generations his personality, prudence, wisdom, and executive skill. The names of Jacquard and Arkwright are now on moldering tombstones, but their busy fingers are still weaving warm textures for the world's poor. The Salem farmer who in old age wished to do yet one more helpful deed, and planted with elms the roadway leading into the historic town, still lives in those columnar trees, and all the long summer through distributes comfort and refreshment. Every man who opens up a roadway into the wilderness; every engineer throwing a bridge over icy rivers for weary travelers; every builder rearing abodes of peace, happiness, and refinement for his generation; every smith forging honest anchors that hold great ships in time of storm; every patriot that redeems his land with blood; every martyr forgotten and dying in his dungeon, that freedom might never perish; every teacher and discoverer, like Judson and Livingstone, who has gone into lands of fever and miasma to carry liberty, intelligence, and religion to the ignorant—still walks among men, working for society, and is unconsciously immortal. This is fame. Life hath no holier ambition. Some there are to whose hand skill with the chisel hath been denied, but their heart and purse have sent some poor artist boy to Paris, and brought him back to fashion immortal marble. Others have sought out those ambitious to learn, and, educating them, have sent their own personality out through publicists, jurists, or merchants they have trained. Herein is the test of the greatness of editor or statesman: Has he so incarnated his ideas or methods in his helpers as that, while his body is one, his spirit had many-shaped

forms; so that his journal, or institution, or party feels no jar or shock in his death, but moves quietly forward because he is still here living and working in those into whom his spirit is incarnated? Death ends our single life, but our multiplied life in others survives; and when the last memory of us has been erased by time, the energies that issued from us shall leap along the years, and our increasing selves go scattering blessings along the furrows of the generations.

But the supreme example of influence is Jesus Christ. His was a force mightier than intellect. Wherever He moved, a light ne'er seen on land or sea shone on man. It was more than eminent beauty or supreme genius. His scepter was not through cunning of brain or craft of hand; reality was His throne. "Therefore," said Charles Lamb, "if Shakespeare should enter the room, we should rise and greet him uncovered; but kneeling, meet the Nazarene." His gift cannot be bought or commanded; but His secret and charm may be ours. Acceptance, obedience, companionship with Him—these are the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Evermore we grow like those we love. If great men come in groups, there is always a greater man in the midst of the company from whom they borrowed eminence—Socrates and his disciples; Cromwell and his friends; Coleridge and his company; Emerson and the Boston group—high over all the name above every name. Perchance in vision-hour, over against the man you are, he will show you the man he would fain have you become; thereby comes greatness. Remember value is not in iron, but the pattern that molds it; beauty is not in the pigments, but the ideal that blends them; strength is not in the stone or marble, but in the plan of architect; greatness is not in wisdom, nor wealth, nor skill, but in the divine Christ, who works up these raw materials of character. For evermore the secret of eminence is the secret of the Messiah.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PEOPLE FOR THE CHARACTER OF THEIR RULERS.

BY HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D. [PRESBYTERIAN], NEW YORK CITY.

Now therefore behold the king whom ye have chosen, and whom ye have desired! and behold, the Lord hath set a king over you.—1 Sam. xii. 13.

THUS Saul in Israel, and Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon, and Nero in Rome, and William the Silent in Holland, and Philip the Second in Spain, and George the Third in Great Britain, and George Washington in America—all the powers that be, or have been, were ordained of God, and yet in every case the forces that created them, and the causes that have exalted them, are to be sought in the character of the nations over which they have ruled. God ordains the powers that be, but He ordains them to fit the people they are over. A tyrant for slaves, an inquisitor for bigots, a sovereign tax-collector for a nation of shopkeepers, and a liberator for a race of free men, the ruler is but the exponent of the inmost thoughts, desires, and ambitions of the ruled. Sometimes they are rewarded, sometimes they are punished. Therefore, subject to those limitations and exceptions that are always understood among intelligent people when they speak in broad terms, we advance the general law, which is the theme of this discourse: The people are responsible for the character of their rulers.

There are some complications which exist in a monarchy, an empire, or an oligarchy. A hereditary crown, a transmitted power, gives the opportunity to misrepresent or extend unrepressed power; and yet even here a keen, clear eye can observe the people in the sovereign. Napoleon never could have raised his empire of conquest cemented with blood unless there had been a prepared foundation in the heart of France, unless it had been filled with the lust of military glory.

George the Third never could have obtained the power to nominate his own ministers, incompetent and arrogant, to carry out his own pleasure, had not the spirit of Toryism fallen into a contemptuous indifference for the rights of all men; but in a republic this truth is distinct and vivid, so that a child might read it. The rulers are chosen by the people and from the people. Therefore, in the long run, the people of a republic must be judged by, and must answer for, the kind of men who rule over them. When we apply this truth to the dawn of our history, it gives us ground for gratitude and noble pride of birth. George Washington is the incarnation of the spirit of '76 and the conclusive answer to your calumniators of the American Revolution, on whichever side of the water they may happen to be born—no wild fanatic, no socialist or anarchist, but a simple, sober, God-fearing, liberty-loving gentleman, who reckoned uprightness as the highest honor, law as the greatest safeguard, and peace as the greatest good, and who was willing to die to defend them. This is the typical American. He had his enemies, who accused him of being an aristocrat, a conservative, a friend of the very England he was fighting, and who would have defamed and cast him down if they could; but the men of the Revolution held him up; and why? Because he was already in their hearts. God ordained him as a power because the people desired and chose him to be their leader; and when we honor his memory, we honor that brave, famous band and our fathers that begot us.

But shall our children, and our children's children, have the same cause to thank and honor us? Shall they say of us, in years to come, as we say now of our fathers, "They were true patriots, who loved their country with a loyal, steadfast love and desired it to be ruled by its best men"? That depends on one thing, and on one thing only: not on chance, not on the necessity of a revolution, not on the coming of a na-

tional crisis. The obligations of patriotism are perennial, and its occasions come with every year; in peace or war, in prosperity or in adversity, the true patriot is he who maintains the highest ideal of honor, purity, and justice for his country's laws, rulers, and actions. The true patriot is he who is as willing to sacrifice his time, and strength, and property, and reputation to remove political shame and reform political corruption as he would be ready to answer the bugle-call to battle against a foreign foe. The true patriot is he who works and votes with the same courage that he would fight, in order that the noblest aspirations of a noble people may be embodied in the noblest rulers to be found. But after all, when history completes the record and posterity pronounces the verdict, it is by the moral quality of their leaders and representatives that a people's patriotism must be judged. It is true that the sharp crisis of war flashes light into the judgment and brings it out. In the crisis of liberty we see Washington as the truth that the revolution was for justice, not for selfishness; for order, not for anarchy. In the crisis of equality we see Lincoln as the truth that the Civil War was not a triumph over the South, but to deliver the captive and let the oppressed go free. Those two men were figures in crises; but the causes which produced those two men were hidden in the secret of the people's life and working through years of hopes and preparation. And when the third crisis comes, the crisis of fraternity, in which it shall be determined whether a vast people of all sorts and conditions of men can live together in liberty and brotherhood without standing armies or bloody revolutions, without unjust laws which discriminate between rich and poor and crush the vital force of individuality and divide classes irretrievably in liberty and fraternity—I say, with the greatest security of life and property and freedom, and the least possible interference of government with the development of

the individual man, when the imminent crisis comes in which this great and trying hope of our forefathers must be destroyed or fulfilled, the leaders who shall reccho it, and the ultimate results of that mighty conflict, will simply represent the moral character and the moral ideals of the American people.

Now, the causes which control the development of character are threefold: domestic, political, and religious—the home, the state, and the church. The home comes first, because it is the nursery and seat of virtue. A noble nation of ignoble households is an impossibility. Our greatest peril to-day lies in the decline of domestic moral discipline and piety. The degradation of the poor by overcrowding in great cities, the enervation of the rich by seclusion in luxurious palaces, threaten the purity and vigor of our wholesome old fireside American family life. If it vanishes, nothing under God's heaven can take its place. Show me a home where the tone of life is selfish, disorderly, or trivial, jaundiced by arrogance or by envy, frivolized by fashion or by pride, poisoned by moral or religious skepticism; where success is worshiped and righteousness ignored; where there are two consciences, one for public and the other for private use; where the boys are permitted to believe that religion has nothing to do with citizenship, and that their object must be to get as much as possible from the state, and to do as little as possible for it; where the girls are suffered to think that because they have as yet no votes they have therefore no duties to the commonwealth, and that the crowning glory of an American woman's life is to marry a man with a title, and very little else—show me such a home and I will show you a breeding-place of enemies of the Republic.

It has not hitherto, even in this favored land, seemed fit to that almighty Being who rules over the universe and presides over the destinies of nations, to entrust the responsibility of suf-

frage to the hands of women, but it may be to test and qualify them for its coming years, or it may be to more than compensate them for its absence. He has given to the Daughters of the Revolution a far higher trust of training great men for their country's service. A great general like Napoleon may be produced in a military school, or a great diplomatist like Metternich may develop in a court, but a great man like Washington can only come from a Christian home. The greatness parental love cannot bestow, but the manliness, I honestly believe, is most often a mother's gift. Teach your sons to respect themselves without asserting themselves; teach them to think sound and wholesome thoughts, free from prejudice and passion; teach them to speak the truth even about their own political party, and to pay their debts in the same money in which they were contracted, and to prefer poverty to dishonesty; teach them to worship God by doing some kind of useful, wholesome work in this world, to live honestly and cheerfully in such a station as they are fit to fill, without wasting all their strength in trying to climb into one which they are not fit to fill, and to love their country with an honorable love—then, though they may not all be Washingtons, they will be such men as will choose a Washington to be their leader in the path of duty and the way to glory; and in the coming conflict between capital and organized labor, if come that conflict must (which Almighty God forbid and avert!)—if come it must, such men as these will stand fast as the soldiers not of labor nor of capital, but of that which is infinitely above both labor and capital, the commonwealth of peace, and law, and order. They will be men of the spirit of that last-named hero of the Sons of the Revolution, the young captain in the Twelfth Regiment of the National Guard of the State of New York, who marched out but the other day with hundreds of the best youth of this city—golden youth, not gilded youth—to de-

fend the peace and liberties of a demoralized sister city, where the chief magistrate hesitated to do his duty, and who lost his life through exposure and accident on the field of danger—Captain Frank Roosevelt, as true a martyr patriot as though he had fallen at Bunker Hill or Gettysburg.

But the character of the people is not only molded by the tone of domestic life, but by the tone of political life, by the ideas and standards which prevail in the conduct of political affairs. And here, it must be confessed, our political standards have undoubtedly swerved somewhat from that position in which Washington placed them—from the principles of morality. Take, for example, the governors of certain States, who excuse and defend the destruction of life and property because it is committed not by one man, but by great unions of men, which control public sentiment and vote. Take, for example, the unblushing audacity of legislators who propose that the Government shall pay a debt of a dollar at forty-six cents, and ask that the public worship not a golden calf, but a calf of silver. Take, for example, the undisguised rapacity of a law which makes an exorbitant tax upon a single class of the community whose only offense is that their industry has been successful. Take, for example, the system of giving public offices as the party spoil. Let me pause here, if you will, and speak plain Anglo-Saxon. I say, without hesitation, that the spoils system in politics is an organized treason against the Republic, and a wilful transgression against the moral law. It is a gross and sordid inequality. The country in which it prevails should not have the eagle for its emblem, but the pelican, because it has the largest pouch. The spoils system shamelessly defies three of the ten commandments. It lies when it calls a public office a spoil; it covets when it desires to control that office for the benefit of party; it steals when it converts that office from the service of the commonwealth

into a gift to reward a partizan; and for how many indirect violations of the other ten commandments the spoils system is responsible let the rings and halls which it has made in the history of this country make a sufficient and shameful answer.

But it is an idle amusement for us to denounce the ring and the boss while we approve, sanction, or even for a moment tolerate the vicious principle, "To the victor belong the spoils." The ring does not coin itself out of the air; it comes out of the system like other diseases. A boss is simply a boil—an evidence of bad blood in the body politic. Let it out, and it will soon disappear.

The Sons of the Revolution kindle their indignation honestly by contemplating the arrogance of the tea tax and the Stamp Act which a British tyrant attempted to impose on free men. I will tell you, if you will listen, of two more arrogant iniquities nearer home. The people of the greatest city in the Union made a law that their civil service should be taken out of the hands of spoils and controlled by merit and efficiency. A committee appointed last year to investigate the working of the law reports that it has been systematically disregarded, evaded, and violated by the very government elected and commissioners appointed to carry it into execution, so that the number of offices distributed as spoils has steadily increased, and the proportion of appointments for merit and fitness has decreased twenty-five per cent. in a year and a half under a law provided to do away with that very evil. That is the first instance; and the second is like it.

When the people of the largest city in this Union, regardless of party, started a wave of reform, they elected a chief magistrate pledged to administer the affairs of the city on a business basis, without regard to partizan influence. To this chief magistrate now appears a man from the rural districts, like Banquo's ghost, but without a

crown, and with plenty of speculation in his eye, demanding that his counsel shall be taken, and his followers rewarded, and his faction placated, and his party harmony preserved in the distribution of the offices of this great city, of which he is not even a citizen. I say that he is as tyrannical as George the Third and his ministers ever were toward their American colonies.

But who is responsible for it? I will tell you who is. The corporations, from whom the boss gets his gains in return for his influence; the office-seekers, one and all, who go to the boss for a place for themselves or for their wives' relations, and the citizens who, by voting or by not voting, have, year after year, filled our legislative chambers with men who were willing to do the boss's bidding for a consideration.

"Oh, but," you say, "this year it is not going to work. This year we have found, as the poet says, 'the still, strong man' who is going to give us a clean government." I thank God it looks as though that were true; but if this cleansing is to be radical and permanent, if it is to pervade the entire Federal Government in State and nation and city, it can only be by burning up and eradicating and casting out the whole irresponsible and haphazard system of appointment to office. It has gone far toward killing our best men, like Harrison and Cleveland; and has gone still farther in corrupting our worst men. Let there be substituted for it the system of appointment to office under this Government for merit and fitness to exercise wise and just rule, which is the true spirit of a great republic, with our whole service of the nation, State, and city, open on equal terms to every citizen who can prove that he is qualified to serve.

Think for a moment of what we have gained, and what we have still to gain in this direction. There are two hundred thousand places in the civil service of the United States. In Washington's day they were counted by a few hundreds, and yet Washington

groaned over the task of having to distribute them. Of these places, 47,935 have been classified under the rule; but, although since 1893 8,164 have been added to the classified list, there are still 164,848 which are outside of the classified service. It should be the desire and object of every patriotic American to remove these places as rapidly and as completely as possible from all chance of capture by the spoils system. Burn the nests and the rats will vacate. Let it be understood that our general elective offices in nation, State, and city are no longer to be turned into positions to feed place-hunters, and it will no longer be difficult to get the most conscientious men to serve. Let the people repudiate and denounce the spoils system, and then the spoilsman and the boss, the ring and the hall, shall disappear.

But what has all this to do with religion? Just this: A free church in a free state must exercise and direct a dominant moral influence upon the tone of domestic and political life. If not, if a free church in a free state does not exercise that influence on political as well as domestic life, then may God have mercy on such a useless charity as church Christianity.

The Church is set as a light for the world. Let it not be changed into a dark lantern. Set it on a candlestick, that it may give light unto all that are in the house. Let the Church set the light of warning and reproof upon the immoral citizen, upon the dishonest captain who uses part of his gains to purchase political protection and his good reputation, upon the recreant Christian who denounces the corruption of Herod's government in Judea and ignores the same corruption in the United States, and the lawyers who study the laws in order to defend their clients successfully in evading them, and upon the officials who profess to serve the state and then add, "the State! that's me." And above all, let the Church shed the light of honor and glory upon the Christian heroes of the

Republic, in whatever walk of life they may be found—the great soldiers, the loyal citizens, the pure statesmen—that men may know that the Church recognizes these deeds among her people, and these men as servants of the most high God, because they were in deed and in truth the servants of the people. Let us not forget how the Church bore her part in the Revolution, inspiring and blessing the struggle for justice and liberty; let us not forget that she has a duty no less sacred and no less important in these later days in which we live, to encourage men in the maintenance of the liberty which has been achieved, and in the reform of all evils which threaten the purity of private and public life; to proclaim that our prosperity does not depend upon the false maxims of what is called “practical politics,” but, as Washington says, upon religion and morality—these great pillars of human happiness, these firm props of the duties of men and of citizens. When the Church evades or neglects this office of public prophecy, from whatever reason or under whatever excuse, when she gives her strength to theological subtleties and ecclesiastical rivalry and clerical millinery, and stands silent in the presence of corruption and indifferent to the progress of reform, her own bell will toll the death-knell of her influence, and her own sermons will be the funeral dirges of her power, and her own music will be the processional to the grave of her honor; but when she proclaims to all people, without fear or favor, the necessity of a thoroughgoing conscience and a regenerating Gospel in every sphere of human life, the reverence of men, even though they do not profess to be Christians, and the favor of God will crown the hills of Sinai with perpetual and living light.

As the servant of a Church that has been loyal to this ideal in the past, and as the messenger of Almighty God, the ruler of all rulers and the master of all peoples, I deliver this day the Word of

the Lord to the Sons of the American Revolution. Say not within yourselves, “We have the Revolution to our fathers,” for I say unto you that God is able of these stones and these foreigners that come to our shores to raise up children unto the Revolution. Be the children of the Revolution, not after the letter only, but after the spirit; be true to the principles of your forefathers and to the responsibilities of your citizenship, which they fought with their blood. Hold fast to their great patriotic faith: the greatest possible liberty for the individual, the equality of taxation and representation, the purity and simplicity of republican government, and adherence to the moral law of God as the only basis of national security. And remember, brethren, as we to-day judge and honor our fathers by their choice of Washington to be their commander, even so will our children measure and esteem us by the character of the men whom we desire and choose, and whom God, therefore, ordains, either as our reward or as our punishment, to be the rulers of this great and free Republic; and may God bless this commonwealth and save the State. Amen.

THE SACREDNESS OF SECULAR WORK.

BY THE REV. JOHN MACLEAN, PH. D.
[METHODIST], PORT ARTHUR, ONTARIO, CANADA.

Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.—Col. iii. 23, 24.

THERE is an eternal movement in the world through which God is gradually unfolding His thoughts to men, the old order giving place to the new lest one good custom should corrupt the whole, whereby harmony is secured, and men are instructed in the progressive lessons of divine revelation. Mental stagnation leads to spiritual stagnation and

the gradual loss of divine power, which ennoble life and develops manhood. There have been successive stages of revelation from the childhood of the human race onward, and in the supreme revelation given to man in the coming of the Man of Nazareth to dwell a while upon our earth there are successive conceptions of His character and work and of man's true meaning of life.

Ever since the religion of the new life was introduced there have been varied conceptions of its meaning, one aspect of Christianity being emphasized in one age, to give place to another at a subsequent period in the history of the Church. Ever striving after the ideal in religion, men have found how far short the actual Christian life has fallen; and yet in these failures they have wrought out new conceptions of Christianity which have been made a blessing to the world. Failures must ever come in the line of progress; and in the struggle after the ideal there is always hope and light, although we sometimes suffer through contention and longed-for peace.

Christian socialism is one of the leading conceptions of the latter part of the nineteenth century induced by the conditions of society, and the struggles of earnest men to apply the principles of the Gospel to the needs of the age. Earnest and devoted men are no longer content to sit at ease in their churches chanting the praises of God, and forgetful of the wants of the poor, the education of children, the care of the criminals and outcasts of society and the relation of the capitalists to the working classes. Religion in the minds of these men applies to the bodies, intellects, and souls of individuals, the constitution of society, and the political life of the people. There is no divorce between religion and the welfare of the people, and whatever interests man is of permanent interest to him who is guided by the principles of Christ, who always sought the good of every man.

In the Christian religion there are

found the principles needed for the upbuilding of society so broad that they can be adapted to the needs of every age and the peculiarities of all peoples. The first teachers of this religion proclaimed in the face of strong opposition the doctrines of liberty, equality, and fraternity, and these are being enforced anew with almost apostolic eloquence, and with an earnestness begotten of the spirit of intrepid reformers. A new and wider meaning is given to life in the application of these doctrines to the masses who form the backbone of society, and in the earnestness with which they are being taught there is manifested a spirit of revolution which is necessary at times to awaken us from our indifference to the needs of our fellow men. In this intense struggle we are apt to forget the spirit of the Master, who first taught these doctrines, and to lose the benefits of the truth by the methods we employ in obtaining it.

In all our work there is a humanness which hides the divinity which is in man and the sacredness of our work. We are apt to forget in the struggle of our lives that there is a Master who claims all mankind as his children, ruling over us, deeply interested in our welfare, sympathizing with us in our sorrows, and who will make the truth that is in us and our work prevail at last. It is this consciousness of the presence of God in our lives which gives emphasis to religion. The aspirations of man stamp him as a religious being and make him anxious to please the Master of his life in the duties of every day. Man is so shortsighted, however, that instead of following his religious instinct, guided by revelation, he confounds the material and spiritual elements in religion and makes the Church stand for Christianity. The expectation of the Messiah awakened in the minds of the Jews the hope of a material kingdom which evinced the practical ideas of the people; but when the Christ had come and fulfilled His mission, leaving a spiritual earth-kingdom and a hope of immortality, there

was begotten in the minds of some of his followers a yearning after the kingdom in the after life, and a hatred of the things which belong to this world. Then men began to think of prayers and forms of religion as the essential things, and a spirit of other-worldliness was developed which separated men from each other. They took no interest in matters relating to the state, as their thoughts were all centered on a preparation for the larger world of eternity. The thoughts of the joys and glory of heaven made earth seem sensual, and it was but a step to think lightly and even hate the things of this world. Some even courted martyrdom as an easy means of gaining an eternal inheritance and getting rid of the encumbrances of the flesh. A hatred of this life begat and developed the idea that the body was an enemy to spiritual life, and men mutilated their bodies, lived in isolation in the fastnesses of the mountains and deserts that they might gain spiritual illumination through crucifying the flesh. Instead of looking upon their bodies as the temple of the Holy Ghost, and the Gospel as proclaiming salvation for the body, they wore garments of coarse cloth, stood uncovered for long periods under the burning sun, and lived sad and lonely lives. They made religion to consist solely in a hope of immortal life, and they were eager to get rid of this garment of flesh that they might enter the new world of bliss. Religion was to them in many instances an adherence to forms, and a hatred of this life, with a hope of the other life, became the sum of their spirituality.

By this separation of life into religious and secular there followed naturally the distinction of men into secular and religious, and from that the exaltation of the ecclesiastics over the laity. Already there had been that distinction among the Jewish people and emphasized in the Pharisees; but instead of seeking for the exaltation in the possession of piety, they sought and found it in the position and not in the

spiritual power of the men. Artificial distinctions of men consist in positions emphasized by dress and a conventional language, and this is seen in the false classification of men into secular and religious men. There is a threefold classification which relates to that which is spiritual in man and is real. The men who consider the temporal superior to the eternal, the material to the spiritual, comprise the first class; those who are slaves to their senses, walking through life as dreamers, having a confused recollection of the divine idea without any intense earnestness or real purpose, are included in the second; and the last are the men unto whom life is a serious thing, a real tragedy, who, burdened with the thought of the every day of judgment and the responsibility of living, are sustained with the consciousness of the presence of the Eternal and the assurance that true life is never lost. The priest may be a secular man and the artisan a religious man. It is the spirit which makes the man, and not the position. Religion is a spiritual force. It is not a matter of forms, but a thing which belongs to the spirit and the life. It has its material aspect as well as the spiritual, for the material is an aid and an expression of the faith which makes the man. Religion is the aspiration of the soul after the unseen. In its practical aspect, "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

Forms are necessary as aids to the spiritual life of the individual and the community. In our Protestant opposition to certain dogmas we have been aroused to make war against forms which may prove helpful to the faith and yet may be abused; but the evil lies not in the forms, but in their associations and in substituting them for faith itself. There is no virtue in postures, but the spiritual in man must have some form of expression or it will die, and devotional habits are culti-

vated by a proper use of forms in religion. A proper attitude in prayer will help the man who prays, and attendance on the public and social means of grace is necessary for him who desires to grow in grace. We are not born with habits of reverence, and we must therefore cultivate them. If we refuse to attend the means of grace, or our attendance is irregular, we need not be surprised if our spiritual life is very low, and we have few or no desires to unite in fellowship with those who meet to worship God. Religious forms are necessary for the development of a strong religious character, but we must not depend upon them for the saving of our lives. In "Wilhelm Meister's Travels" we read of three wise men going to Goethe to discourse on the function which transcends all others in building up the young generation. The eldest speaks of one thing which no child brings into the world, and without which all other things are no use. Wilhelm asks, "What is that?" The eldest replies, "All who enter the world want it, perhaps you yourself." Wilhelm says, "Well, tell me what it is." "It is reverence—*Ehrfurcht*—reverence—honor done to those who are grander and better than you without fear; distinct from fear." Reverence is "the soul of all religion that ever has been among men, or ever will be." He then distinguishes reverence for that which is above us as the soul of all pagan religions; reverence for that which is around us; reverence for our equals, which exercises great influence in the culture of man, and reverence for what is beneath us, recognizing in pain, sorrow, and contradiction a priceless blessing; and this is the soul of the highest of all religions, the Christian religion.

There is a divineness in all true work apart altogether from the position which men occupy and the sphere in which they toil. All true work is God-given. The Master of men is the universal worker, and He assigns to men their real tasks in life; and it is

only when they engage in work antagonistic to the character of the Master that they depart from the divine work. All real work is spiritual; all true work is sacred. Man has no right to work for himself: the only right he has is to work for the eternal Master of men. We are employees of God; stewards, not proprietors. We bring no material into the world, and we take only our character and the influence of our lives when we go out of it. The divineness of work is a spiritual, not a material, distinction. We are in the world, yet not of it. Our lives and our work belong to Him, and when we engage in any toil for Him we are engaged in spiritual labor.

The distinction, then, between sacred and secular labor lies not in isolation or forms, but in the spirit with which it is done. Sacred work is all work done for God in any sphere in life. In the humblest walks of society the uncrowned kings, with horny hands toiling for the alleviation of pain, struggling for their daily bread by the honest sweat of their brows, and the queens of the nursery, training infant statesmen, artisans, farmers, and merchants to guide the destinies of the nation and lay the foundations of peace in plodding industry, are workers for God and are engaged in sacred work. Secular work is all work done for self in any sphere. The soft-tongued ecclesiastic proclaiming the story of the Cross in eloquent numbers for the applause of the multitude or the handsome salary, and the men who sit in religious or political assemblies that they may receive honor from men, are engaged in secular work. That which men falsely call secular is sometimes essentially sacred. Manual labor may be divine. Was not Adam put in Eden by God to dress and keep the garden for God? Is not this the true spirit of life? When Adam began to think of himself without taking God into his thoughts, then the bond of the infinite was broken. Then was introduced the distinction between sacred

and secular work. God calls every man to the complete consecration of life and its activities to his service. All honest occupations are a part of divine service. When we are laboring for food, clothing, and home comforts we are learning the progressive lessons which God is giving to us. We are not outside of God's service when we are seeking these things, for in the striving after them and in their use we may be serving God. The world is made to supply our wants, and we are in the divine order when we are toiling for them. We are learning one of the Master's lessons in the training which comes from the struggle. Every man is called to some form of ministry in the earth-kingdom of God. Religion does not belong to Sundays and Churches, but applies to every relation of life, exalting it, and giving glory to the humblest service. The mother is working for God and is engaged in spiritual labor who recognizes the importance of her calling as one of the educators of the race; and as she cares for the clothing of her children, their food and childish pleasures, as well as in teaching them to call God their Father, the smile of God rests upon her. The merchant behind the counter, the doctor in his daily rounds among his patients, the politician in the legislative hall, the man of literature in his study, the artisan at his anvil or bench, and the busy housewife at her domestic duties are glorifying God and engaged in spiritual service when they toil for their Master in their honest occupations. Religion belongs everywhere and makes all life sacred. The true priests of God are the men who do His will in every rank and in all kinds of work. Wherever there is a man doing a great work for men, with the spirit of dependence upon his Master, there is a worker for God.

Go ye out, then, to work for God in the duties of every day, wherever your duties call you, and there you will find the Master Worker recognizing your toil and ready to encourage you

in every struggle. When you are tempted to be faint-hearted, remember that though men may never recognize you in your humble position and much of your work may be unseen, no simple task will be overlooked or unrewarded by Him who has sent you into this world to do your own duty. Workers for God you will be in the humblest ranks, whether you toil with hand or brain, if you accept your toil from Him who has sent you into the world, and you labor earnestly as ever under your great Taskmaster's eye, doing your service honestly for Him and not for self alone. Whatever, then, you do in life, do it heartily as unto the Lord and not to men, and you will not fail of abundant compensation in the growth of your own character, and the greater reward which awaits you in the divine recognition in the eternal years.

THE WORKINGMAN'S PSALM.

Psalm lxxvii.

THE Messiah of Humanity. Riches and power come to Him, "the gold of Sheba" (15), "dominion from sea to sea" (8), "kings bring presents" (10) and homage (11). Yet the real glory of all is that He cares for the poor (4); "He shall judge the poor of the people" (do them justice—the very demand of the workingmen now, "justice, not charity"); "and shall save the children of the needy"—of course a Hebraism, yet rightly applied to the children of our poor, with houses that are not homes, foul streets for playgrounds, too ill-clad, or too early put to work, for any education worthy of the name—the real kingdom of Christ shall revolutionize all for them; "and shall break in pieces the oppressor." The Son of Man is against the corporation or the capitalist that beats down the wages of the poor for selfish greed. (Compare Matt. xxiii. 14, and James v. 1-4; also Col. iv. 1.) He will give the poor thoughtful consideration as well as justice, going beyond absolute necessity of care (13, 14); "He shall spare

the poor and needy"—give them reasonable hours, fairly proportioned work, not seek to make one do the work of two; "He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence"—no extortion with club and bayonet behind it; no tenement-house rack-rents; no saloons licensed to absorb their earnings; no gambling-houses nor gambling race-tracks; no lotteries nor policy-shops. All the modern movements to suppress such devices are a part of the coming kingdom of Christ. "Precious shall their blood be in his sight"—no true, no Christian political economy, that does not rise to this high thought, and hold the flesh and blood of the toilers, their lives and souls, "precious." With that spirit there is hope for humanity. The crowning triumph is prosperity and blessing for the multitude (16), the mountain-tops fruitful, and "they of the city" to "flourish" like the innumerable blades of grass in summer's greenness over hill and field; the rejoicing earth full of praise to "His name" (17, 18).

GOD'S FAR-REACHING PURPOSE IN AFFLICTION.

That the works of God should be made manifest in him.—John ix. 3.

BORN blind. Born before a deliverer from such calamity had ever been heard of; "since the world began, and it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind" (32). Twenty years or more of desolate affliction; "He is of age" (21). A burden to himself, a distress to his parents, shut out of the world's industries as well as its delights; "he that sat and begged" (8). All for reasons absolutely inscrutable to men; "who did sin?" (2), yet a purpose of God antedating his birth, that he might sit by the wayside helpless, "as Jesus passed by," and "the works of God be manifest in him" by the amazing contrast of his healing. What comfort for those in mysterious affliction! Some faraway purpose of God to be an-

swered, and "the works of God made manifest" in them. What caution against a rebellious, murmuring spirit, the desperation that gives up to sin because life seems spoiled, or bitterly flings away the smitten life itself. Such a spirit would have put the sufferer out of the reach of Jesus's triumphant healing.

WORLD-CONQUERORS.

Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?—1 John v. 5.

CHRISTLESS men have conquered the world—Alexander, Caesar; have mastered the physical world as explorers, discoverers, inventors; the financial world—Rothschild, Gould. But who has ever overcome the world in the sense of emancipating himself from all its allurements and evils, and subjecting it to a spiritual dominion, except those who have believed "that Jesus is the Son of God"? How those men have overcome—apostles, martyrs, pastors, evangelists, missionaries, reformers—Paul, Polycarp, Luther, Knox, Wesley, Carey, Judson, Gough!

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. One God and One Humanity. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself."—Luke x. 27. Prof. Edward A. Ott, Des Moines, Iowa.
2. Rear Guards. "They shall go hindmost with their standards."—Num. ii. 31. Rev. Luther R. Dyott, Newark, N. J.
3. Things that are God's. "Then saith Jesus unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."—Matt. xxii. 213. Joseph Parker, D.D., London, Eng.
4. Two Deposits. "For the which cause I also suffer these things; nevertheless I am not ashamed; for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. Hold fast, therefore, the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which are in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us."—2 Tim. i. 12-14. William A. Holliday, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
5. Preparations for a Revival. "Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make His paths

- straight."—Isa. xl. 3. Rev. A. M. Hills, Chicago, Ill.
6. The Christ of the Gospels Brought Back. "The life was the light of men."—John i. 4. Brooke Herford, D.D., London, Eng.
 7. Ephraimites, Ancient and Modern. "The children of Ephraim, being armed and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle."—Psa. lxxviii. 9. James W. Gilland, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 8. Self-Denial the Law of Discipleship. "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me."—Mark viii. 34. J. B. O. Lowry, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.
 9. Commandment vs. Tradition. "Ye leave the commandments of God, and hold fast the traditions of men."—Mark vii. 8. Canon Charles Gore, London, Eng.
 10. How Life is Laid Down. "Hereby perceive we love, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."—1 John iii. 16. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 11. The Power of Other Worldliness. "The power of the world to come."—Heb. vi. 5. Rev. John Watson, M. A., Glasgow, Scot.
 12. The Power of Conquest. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."—1 John v. 4. "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith, nothing wavering."—Heb. x. 23. George A. Ford, D.D., Constantinople, Turkey.
-
- Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.**
1. Looking for Faults. ("And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the Sabbath day, that they might accuse him."—Mark iii. 2.)
 2. Christ and the Law of Heredity. ("Wherefore ye are witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets."—Matt. xxiii. 31.)
 3. God as Near as Trouble. ("Be not far from me, for trouble is near; for there is none to help."—Psa. xxii. 11.)
 4. The Numberlessness of God's Kindnesses and Man's Sins. ("Many, O Lord, my God, are thy wonderful works which thou hast done, and thy thoughts which are to usward; they cannot be reckoned up in order unto thee; if I would declare and speak of them, they are more than can be numbered. . . . For innumerable evils have compassed me about: mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of my head: therefore my heart faileth me."—Psa. xl. 5, 12.)
 5. The Church's Treatment of Its Ministry. ("And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake."—1 Thes. v. 12, 13.)
 6. God the Foe of Sickness and of Sorrow. ("For indeed he was sick nigh unto death: but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow."—Phil. ii. 27.)
 7. Christian Joy in the Salvation of Sinners. ("But they had heard only that he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me."—Gal. i. 23, 24.)
 8. Divine Refinements. ("Thou putttest away all the wicked of the earth like dross: therefore I love thy testimonies."—Psa. cxix. 119.)
 9. Keeping the Eyes Open. ("He that observeth the wind shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap."—Eccle. xi. 4.)
 10. The Snakiness of Pharisaism. ("But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?"—Matt. iii. 7.)
 11. The Influence of Faith on Thought. ("To think soberly, according as God hath given to every man the measure of faith."—Rom. xi. 3.)
 12. The Protective and Preparative Efficacy of Prayer. ("Strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; that I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea; and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints; that I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed."—Rom. xv. 30-32.)

LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TRUTHS FROM RECENT SCIENCE AND HISTORY.

BY REV. GEO. V. REICHEL, A.M., BROCKPORT, N. Y., MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

"TREASURES HID IN THE SAND" (Deut. xxxiii. 19).—This refers undoubtedly to the manufacture of glass, and is one of the earliest references to that industry in literature. The 18th and 19th verses of this chapter of Deuteronomy relate to the possessions of

the tribes Issachar and Zebulun, and it is well known that upon the banks of the little River Belus, which flowed through Zebulun's territory, the discovery of glassmaking was first made. Pliny (verse 19) and Tacitus (Hist. V.) both mention this fact.

To-day, we need not go outside of our own State of New York nor beyond the bounds of New England to witness the perfection to which the "treasures" once hid in Belus's sands have been utilized. To say nothing of those magnificent translucent mosaics, which Professor Henderson calls the very crown of workmanship in glass, on exhibition daily at Tiffany's, we note with pride the production by skilled Americans of the finest and largest telescopic lenses the world has ever seen. Prof. E. E. Barnard, the famous astronomer of the Lick Observatory, says, "What Americans cannot do in the way of great glasses by the Clarks and by Brashear, and what mechanical difficulties they cannot overcome in mounting these great glasses through the genius of Warner and Swasey, is certainly not worth while undertaking elsewhere."

"TO THE JEW FIRST" (Rom. i. 16). —Yes, "to the Jew first," history gives some of the world's choicest distinctions in the domain of wealth, of fame, of brilliant achievement. For example, many of the physicians attendant upon royalty are Jews, notably his Excellency, Elias Pasha, attending the present sultan of Turkey. The Rev. C. Frey, the founder of modern missions, was a converted Jew. Bible students acknowledge that the best "Life of our Lord" ever produced is the work of the learned Jew, Giuseppe Mezzofanti. So also the greatest church history ever written is that of the Jew Neander, while two of the greatest authorities on textual criticism were Tregelles and Ginzburg. Somewhat earlier history records the attainment of Disraeli to the premiership of England, and of Herschell to the high office of lord chancellor: not forgetting such illustrious names as that of Meshullan, and of De Lyra, besides many others, all of the "chosen race."

"AND I WILL MAKE ALL MY MOUNTAINS A WAY" (Isa. xlix. 11). —This

prophecy of Isaiah has more than once found literal fulfilment in the successful tunneling of great mountains in various lands.

In 1870 railroad engineers witnessed what was then called the mightiest railroad enterprise of modern times—the completion of the Mont Cenis tunnel, and which was 42,145 feet long. But ten years later the Gothard tunnel, measuring 49,148 feet in length, was finished, and in three years more the wonderful Arlberg tunnel was ready for traffic. Now, however, American and European engineers are talking of what will be the eclipse of these previous efforts, and which will present the longest tunneling enterprise the world has ever heard of. This is the proposed Simplon tunnel, which, when completed, is to be over twelve miles long.

W. G. Triest, Jr., tells us in *The Railroad Gazette* that this great project, thoroughly approved by the Swiss Government, will traverse the famous Mont Leone in the direction northwest-southeast, and will cost over thirteen millions of dollars. The first single-track section must be completed in five and a half years, and the time of the construction of the second section is limited to four years. A fine of \$1,000 a day is fixed "for each day that the work is delayed beyond the stipulated time, and an equal bonus will be paid for each day gained." As several experts declare, the Simplon tunnel will offer no particular difficulties in its course of construction.

"CHARIOTS SHALL RUN LIKE THE LIGHTNINGS" (Nahum ii. 4). —This prophecy is familiarly applied to the achievement of the modern steam engine. A new mode of fulfilment may with equal aptness be shown in that latest of locomotive inventions, the automobile bicycle, "which," says *La Nature*, "is about to enter the Bois de Boulogne."

This machine in appearance is much like an ordinary lady's wheel, only of

larger dimensions. Two features attract the eye in its mode of construction. The hind wheel is solid and formed of two metal disks, and the whole machine is lower than the present style of safety. The rider, seated upon the saddle, his feet resting upon stationary pedals, has only to remain seated quietly and guide the machine, which is operated by a gasoline motor, sometimes furnishing as high as two and a half horse-power. The speed, regulated by a button placed under the thumb upon one of the handles of the bar, is from three to twenty-four miles an hour, though the machine weighs altogether, when equipped for a long ride, over one hundred pounds. All the essential parts of this bicycle are in the inside of its frame, thus being fully protected against damage. While the machine is not yet perfect, the inventors are hopeful of soon having it so. Their success already is such that over fifty of these wheels have been in daily use in Germany for some months.

OPPOSITE IN CHARACTER, YET MUTUALLY CONVERTIBLE.—The well-known chemist, Dr. T. L. Phipson, tells us that the two chemical substances, ammonia and nitric acid, "though opposite in character, are readily convertible one into the other." In a recent experiment made by him, he dissolved a piece of zinc in diluted nitric acid and produced liquid ammonia; then reversing the process by certain manipulations, converted ammonia into nitric acid. "In seeking, therefore, to discover the origin of nitric acid in nature, we are compelled," says this learned authority, "to ask, What is the origin of ammonia?"

Thus, in seeking the origin of certain traits in human character, we are likewise compelled to ask, What is the origin of yet other traits? For example: Grief may be converted into joy, and again, joy into grief; yet, while we ask, What is the origin of grief, we are compelled to ask, What is the origin of joy?

MONEY IS A DEFENSE (Eccl. vii. 12).—No one denies this statement, in this country especially, for, according to the *Revue des Revues*, "wealth in the United States is more equally distributed and less centralized than in any other country on the globe." The *Revue* further says: "About 250,000 in Great Britain have an annual income of \$1,000, and 2,000,000 have an income of \$500. Thus it would appear that only one Englishman out of every five is capable of supporting a family. It is to be borne in mind that \$500 a year amounts to only \$1.37 a day, which is not very much for a family of four persons. On the other hand, there are in the United Kingdom 123,000 families having an annual income of about \$3,000, and 5,000 families with an income of more than \$25,000.

"In the United States, according to statistics compiled by T. G. Shearman, we have 400,000 families (or about 2,000,000 of people) whose annual income amounts to about \$2,000, and more than 10,000 families having an income of more than \$25,000.

"Taking into account the difference in population between the United States and Great Britain, it still will be evident that not only can America boast of a greater number of rich people than the United Kingdom, but that her wealth is more equally distributed."

THERE WAS GIVEN TO ME A THORN IN THE FLESH (2 Cor. xii. 7).—Reading the whole verse, we observe that Paul acknowledges the great spiritual benefit derived from this affliction.

Every well-informed botanist knows that the thorns upon growing plants prove, without question, of actual benefit to them.

M. Henri Coupin, in *La Nature*, informs us that thorns on growing plants are a recognized protection. Thus, in the spring of the year, tender foliage-bearing plants are kept from being eaten by foliage-loving animals. Again, many thorns contain a cell

structure intended to convey the sap throughout the various parts of the plant, so supplementing the sap-conveying function of stem, leaves, and roots. Again, in some forms of plant structure, thorns become the originating points of new branches, thus transforming, extending, multiplying the plant life in many ways. Many times, too, upon certain plants thorns bear the perfected flower.

It has also been observed that many thorn-bearing plants which grow in thickets or in hedges are supported in upright positions by the thorns which grow upon their lower stems or exposed portions of their roots.

Finally, there is a class of plants known as zoophiles, bearing thorns, which disseminate their seed by means of passing animals, the thorn carrying the seed, hooking itself into the animal's hair or fleece, and so carried about from place to place until by some means the seed becomes detached and drops to the ground.

THE ATTRACTIVENESS TO CHILDREN OF BIBLE STORIES ABOUT WILD ANIMALS.—Who does not with fond recollection bring back, time and again, those days of childhood in which our devoted fathers and mothers, and perhaps even elder brothers and sisters, entertained us through many a long hour with wonderful stories from the Bible about the exploits of wild animals? And of them all, none lingers more closely in memory than the story of Samson's conquest of the lion, whose carcass the wild bees afterward used as a storehouse for their honey. And who can ever forget the blood-curdling story of the terrible bears who ate up the naughty children as a punishment for scoffing at the bald-headed old prophet?

Professor Brewer, of New Haven, in a recent article attempts to give the reasons for this interest of children in such stories, especially such as deal with bears or wolves.

"I have experimented," he says, "on

my own and other people's children regarding their special interest in these two animals, and have pursued inquiries among my friends. I could never excite much interest over any story about lions or tigers, or other rapacious animals I had read about, nor about panthers I had met, but a bear story would always interest, no matter if it was a second-hand story and not told as a personal adventure. Tell a lion story and the child soon wants another, but a bear story never grows old from mere repetition until the child grows old and wants more and new amusement.

"Let me illustrate what I mean. When camped near Carmelo Bay, on the Pacific coast, bay-whaling was pursued in the vicinity. A whale that was mortally wounded but not captured was cast up among the rocks near our camp, and a large grizzly bear came down to the shore on moonlight nights to feed upon the carcass. A few weeks later, while visiting in the family of a friend in town, I mentioned this while talking about the whaling industry. A year or more later I chanced again to visit this family, and immediately a little four-year-old boy climbed upon my lap and began to question me about the bear. I did not understand what bear he was asking about until the mother explained, half-laughingly: 'Ah, professor, you little know what a task you put upon me by your visit last year, when you told about a grizzly bear eating a dead whale. Every blessed night since I have had to tell that story over again, and wo me if I left out the slightest part.'

"Now, why this special interest by our children in these two animals? There are two explanations. The first is that it is entirely a matter of education with each child; that the conservative traditions of children have preserved more stories about wolves and bears; that parents and nurses talk more about them, and that these animals have a larger place in the literature of children: hence the interest.

The other explanation concedes that education is a factor, but that the interest is intensified by instinctive suggestion. I am convinced that this is the true explanation. No other theory explains so well all the phenomena. And if instinctive, then its origin is a matter of much scientific interest, for the origin of the instincts is now a mooted question among naturalists. The fear inspired by these animals—the bear and the wolf—during the long ages of the childhood of our civilization, and

the education of the many successive generations of our ancestors in this fear, descends to us as an inherited memory, or, in other words, an instinct. While not strong, it is of sufficient force to create that kind of fascination which stories of bears and wolves have in childhood, before the instincts are covered up and obscured by intellectual education. The great shaggy bear appeals more strongly to the imagination of children; hence its superior value to play 'boo' with."

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

Marginal Commentary: Notes on Genesis.

GEN. XXII. Further on Abraham's *Trial of Faith*, it may be well to suggest:

A comparison of this narrative with its divine commentary, in Heb. xi. 17-19.

Note also:

1. The law of sacrifice.
 - (a) Self-sacrifice for God.
 - (b) God's sacrifice for man.
2. God's proving Abraham.

Comp. James i. 12-14.

"Take now thy son,

Thine only son,

Isaac (laughter, rejoicing),

Whom thou lovest,

And offer him."

Natural religion prompts man to give to God. Supernatural religion reveals God as giving Himself to man.

Note in verse 6 the three emphatic nouns: The *wood*, the *fire*, the *knife*. How suggestive! How pathetic!

On the idea that God commanded Abraham to *offer*, i. e., present Isaac as an offering, comp. Psa. xl. 7, 8, Rom. xii. 1, and Lange *in locis* and introduction, 79, 80.

God gave to Abraham to act a parable, illustrating sacrifice:

1. Of self unto God.
2. Of our dearest unto God.
3. Sacrifice of God Himself for our redemption.

Christ at once God's Son of promise and the lamb of atonement.

Again, Abraham's trial illustrates:

1. The reward of surrendering all to God.

We are unfit to have, hold, use, or enjoy any gift of God until after it has been yielded back to Him in entire surrender. What we give up we get back (Matt. xvi. 24, 25).

2. The vicarious sacrifice of Christ.
 - The double nature of the God-Man.
 - The humanity of Christ perishing.
 - The true Son snatched away at the crisis into the bosom of the Father.

Note the climax in verses 9 and 10:

Abraham built an altar.

Laid the wood in order.

Bound Isaac his son.

Laid him on the altar.

Stretched forth his hand to slay.

Is not the name Jehovah Jireh a play on the name Moriah or Morijah? Vision or manifestation of Jah?

The mount of sacrifice is a mount.

1. Of vision of God.
2. Of provision by God.
3. Of compensation.
4. Of revelation.

Obedience reaches its last act and comes to its great crisis before God interposes and the revelation is complete.

17, 18. The prophecy in these verses is yet to be fulfilled. Manifestly there are promises to Israel which are yet to find in history their complete realization.

XXIII. 1. *Sarah was a hundred and seven and twenty years old.* This is the sole instance in which a woman's age is given us in the Word of God, probably because she was the mother of the promised seed, and so of all believers. It is also doubtless to emphasize the supernatural conception of Isaac, for, as she died thirty-seven years after his birth, she was ninety years old at that time.

2. *Abraham came to mourn for Sarah.* This does not imply his absence from home at the time—it may mean his entrance into her tent in the capacity of a mourner or his formal assumption of mourning, of which Oriental nations make much even to this day.

4. *I am a stranger and sojourner with you.* Note again the emphasis on the pilgrim character: a stranger, because the land he sojourned in was a strange land—a sojourner, because in it he tarried but as a pilgrim for a night. Thus he plainly declared that he "sought a country" (Heb. xi.).

There is something pathetic in the fact that the first actual possession Abraham had in the land was a *burial place*. That is the only permanent abiding place for any of God's saints on earth. We never find rest but in the grave.

This is the first mention of burial or a burial place. And accordingly we may expect, according to the rule which we have seen so often exemplified, that this first mention shall be the type of all the succeeding references to death and burial.

Observe, therefore:

1. Burial is a season of natural mourning and weeping.

2. It makes emphatic the pilgrim

character of God's saints, as strangers and sojourners.

3. It makes necessary and proper a burial place. The care of the body of the dead is proper, natural, and consistent. Affection demands it.

4. We must bury our dead out of our sight. The grave is the appointed receptacle. Sanitary laws and every sensible and rational consideration require this. The earth is the natural and most safe repository of the bodies of our departed. Modern science begins to reveal that even *burning* is not so safe as *burying*.

5. Note as yet no emphasis is laid on the *unseen life*, which death does not destroy or interrupt, for the revelation of that life is gradually to be made clearer. A thousand years later David says: "I shall go to him but he shall not return to me." And another thousand years, and Paul teaches us that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord. But the first mention of burial presents only the apparent facts—death, mourning, and interment out of sight of the living.

6. Is it not significant that this first mention of death with burial is with regard to the mother of all believing souls, and in the family of the very man who received the promises?

5-20. The remainder of the chapter is taken up with the *details of the bargain* whereby the sepulcher became the property of Abraham.

The narrative has a charming verisimilitude, which to one familiar with Oriental life is quite amusing for its naturalness.

The extreme courtesy of the children of Heth, and the apparent offer of a place of sepulture, free of cost and without restrictions of mercantile sort, is simply a part of the formal politeness of the Orient, and means nothing more than the everlasting compliments of the Chinese: "Your honorable self," and "my unworthy self"; "I attack your honorable king's pawn with my contemptible king's knight," etc. Abraham knew too much to accept any pres-

ent, for its acceptance implied presents of even more value in return. He weighed the compliments for their exact worth and then weighed out the full price, current money, about 50 guineas (or about \$250), counting the shekel as about two shillings and sixpence, English money. If the Hittites were addicted to idolatrous rites, it might have compromised Abraham's loyalty to God to use their sepulchers and so identify himself with their customs.

The mosque now built over the supposed site of these graves has been visited by travelers, but it is doubtful whether the actual sepulchers are within its walls. No certainty can be attached to traditional sites in the land of Palestine.

XXVI. Here we find the first mention of *marriage* with details of arrangement, and it is full of suggestion.

1. *Parental responsibility* comes to the front. Abraham was now 140 years old and Isaac was consequently 40. Note the solicitude of Abraham lest the son of promise should wed a Canaanite and so become implicated with the idolatry, iniquity, and licentiousness of the inhabitants of the land. A solemn oath in adjuration is required from the steward Eliezer.

2. *Heredity* is here plainly put before us; the promised seed must be kept pure of the admixture of the Hamitic races.

3. *Residence* is emphatic. Abraham had been called out of his country, and his family was embraced in the law of separation. The steward is charged not to compromise this principle.

4. *Identity of religious faith* is kept prominent. In fact, all else is done with reference to the preservation of that monotheism and what Dr. Saphir called Jehovahism which distinguished the chosen seed.

This chapter is the first glimpse we get of ancient *stewardship*, which suggests many of the most important practical duties of the Christian life.

Here we have a servant, who is entrusted not only with the care of prop-

erty, but with his master's domestic affairs; a subordinate, and yet, like Joseph in Egypt, practically the administrator of the family life (verse 10).

The notion of *tithes* is as old as that of stewardship and is its legitimate outgrowth. For, as the property in care of the steward was only his in trust, he was bound to render the revenues and profits of the estate to the owner. An unfaithful *steward* was in effect a *robber*.

Again, if a steward was in charge of property at a distance, where his master had no personal supervision, some arrangement would have to be made for the rendition of the fruits or products of the property. Now, in the most unfruitful years to send a *tenth of the yield* to the master, reserving nine tenths for himself and his family, would be considered a liberal allowance for the steward's wants. Hence the *tithe*, which of course represented a *minimum* not a *maximum* return. To account the tithe as fulfilling all obligation of the Lord's stewards, whether they have much or little, is too absurd to be considered seriously. Obviously there is a vast disproportion between a tenth part of a thousand dollars and a tenth part of ten thousand dollars as representing what God's steward shall devote to his Master; for there is a vast difference between reserving nine hundred and nine thousand dollars for one's own wants.

The study of stewardship, with its relations and obligations, will correct a thousand misconceptions of duty and adjust countless matters of personal obligation.

Verses 10-67. The latter part of this narrative, which details the steps whereby Rebekah was obtained as Isaac's wife, is intensely and vividly Oriental (see Thomson's "Handbook," 592). Some features deserve mention:

1. *The prayer at the well*. The steward had learned the secret of the true faith, and though himself a Damascus, recognizes Jehovah. How simply and in how childlike a fashion he asks for

guidance and seeks a sign from God that he is heard!

2. *The immediate answer.* While he was yet speaking, Rebekah comes to the well and exactly fulfils to the letter the prayer. How beautifully God shows His hand in the adjusting of every minute detail!

3. *The presentation of the jewels.* No wonder Eliezer has been regarded the type of the Holy Spirit, wooing and winning the bride for Christ by the display of the jewels of the Master.

4. *The choice of Rebekah.* She leaves father, mother, and household, and

country to become Isaac's bride, and there is no needless delay.

5. *Isaac's prayer at eventide.* For such seems to be the force of the word "meditate" in verse 63. His life was very tranquil and reflective, and fitted for the type of Him who is described in Isa. liii., Matt. xiv. 23.

6. *The indirect testimony* to the veracity of the narrative, in its exact and yet unconscious and evidently undesignated correspondence with the Oriental habit. Had this been a production of forgery, its verisimilitude would have been forfeited.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

MAY 1-4.—HINTS OF THE BEYOND.—
Mark ix. 2.

Most profound impression, this tremendous scene of the Transfiguration made upon the three favored disciples, upon whose dazed and wondering eyes it flashed.

Two of them make subsequent and special mention of it. John: "And we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Peter: "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."

Using this majestic scene of the Transfiguration as a most clear lens, I am sure we can descry through it hints of the beyond.

(a) Hint of contrast.

Do you remember Raphael's picture of the Transfiguration? He has told us of the scene in form and color as the Scripture has in words.

There on the top of the mount, there is the glory--the companionship of Moses and Elias; the burning of the heavenly brightness; all the darkness which makes our earth sad and gloomy swept away.

But down there at the foot of the mount is a scene piteous enough--of trial and impotent struggle with suffering. There a father has brought a son possessed by a demon. The boy, every now and then, is seized with terrible convulsions. He lies there on the ground and wallows, foaming.

Is there no help for him? The father has brought him to the disciples. They have attempted a cure, but the demon is too strong for them. The boy must go on tormented, falling now into the fire, now into the water. The father must go on helping the poor boy as he best can, but crushed under his child's suffering, himself impotent toward his cure.

Do you not see the contrast? Above the brightness, beneath the gloom; above the joy, beneath the sorrow; above the victory, beneath the defeat.

Is there not here furnished a most precious hint of contrast? Heaven is not below earth. In the glory in which Christ now dwells suffering is not; disease is not; the sovereignty of evil is not; impotence toward the help of those we love is not; a burdened heart is not. Heighten the contrast further by some such blessed words as these

from other Scriptures: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." "And there shall be no night there." All tears of any sort; of disappointed hopes, of unmet longings, of wearied hearts, of loneliness, of consciousness of failure. All nights of any sort—of temptation, of black doubt, of poverty, of helplessness to succor, of death. These are *here*, but they are not *there*. That glory streaming out of Christ there on the mountain brightens and blesses Peter, and James, and John, and Moses, and Elias. In that glory into which Christ has now risen and of which this upon the mount was but a specimen and ore-gleaming—in that glory where He now dwelleth and to which He is bringing His redeemed, there are no shadows. Above pain into peace; above darkness into light; above defeat into victory. The glory on the summit, the sorrow and the struggle at the mountain's base; the difference between these is the difference between our earth and that heaven into which our loved have gone.

(b) A hint of continued and unsleeping consciousness beyond death.

What comes with the dissolution of the body? There shall be a resurrection of the body. "The time is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man." But do not think that there shall ever be a resurrection of this exact fleshly organism. That can never be. This blood, these muscles, these bones, these shall never rise again. That cannot be. In the ceaseless commutations of nature, the particles that go to form these bodies must enter into other organisms. The flesh with which I am clothed to-day is not new matter. There is a constant yielding up of matter in one form that it may assume other forms. The mineral soil yields its force to the grass, the grass its life to the cattle, and they sacrifice theirs to man, and the man as to his body, of the earth earthy, is not beyond the jurisdiction of the earthly law. That which was formed of dust returns to

dust, and as dust is again laid hold of for other uses. The grass grows green above human graves.

Yet there shall be a resurrection, for somewhere within this material organism sleeps the seed of the spiritual body. Out of the body of to-day shall somehow spring the spiritual body of the future exactly fitted for the uses of the soul in its highest sphere. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Then when the resurrection morning breaks shall be the consummation.

But for all the time that may lie between this present and that future—during all this period of separation between soul and body—what is the soul's state, then? Must we look forward to a period of dreary sleep? When death strikes us, does it exhaust consciousness as well until the Resurrection morning breaks? Are all the properties of the thinking principle, remembrance, imagination, love, conscience, volition, yielded at the beck of death into a desolate inactivity and wane of being? Is the future state but a huge dormitory of sleeping souls waiting the awakening of the Resurrection?

No! We cannot believe this to be the case when we gaze into this brightness of the Transfiguration. Fifteen hundred years before, upon the top of Pisgah, Moses had died. Whether any change analogous to that of death had passed upon Elijah we cannot say, for he was caught heavenward in a chariot of flame. But we are distinctly told that Moses died and was *buried*. Yet, now see, he comes with the freshness of eternal youth upon him to talk with Jesus on the mount. He certainly is not slumbering. There is no look of a dreary unconsciousness about him. He is clothed with heaven's brightness. He is the same Moses who had died 1,500 years before. His personality is intact. His identity is pre-

served. We can learn no lesson of unconsciousness after death while we tarry with him here upon the mount.

No! The soul is in all its parts and powers alive, alert, in the future state. Death, which does dissolve the body, cannot touch the soul. There is before the soul no horrible abyss of vacancy. Death cannot condemn the soul to slumber.

(c) A hint of recognition.

"Two little waxen hands,
Folded soft and silently;
Two little curtained eyes,
Looking out no more for me;
Two little snowy cheeks,
Dimpled, dented, never more;
Two little trodden shoes,
That will never touch the floor.
Shoulder-ribbon softly twisted,
Garments folded, clean and white:
These are left us—and these only,
Of the childish presence bright."

Can we sing no better song than that? Does death rob us so wholly? Is that all we may have left? Only the memories of the past? Only the flowers, faded so quickly, laid upon the coffin? Only the little shoes pressed into such dainty shape? Only the playthings consecrated by that touch? Is the future altogether vacant? Are there no dear places of sweet home-privacy beyond?

Are the many mansions but one vast gathering-place common alike to all, special to none? When the heavenly is put on, does all that is human drop away? Are the ties of familyhood forever sundered when death cuts them? Does friend know no longer the face of friend? Yonder, does the parent forget the child and the child the parent? Shall we know each other there?

Look into the brightness of the mount. See there Jesus, Moses, Elias, they talk together; they are recognized of each other. There is surely recognition on that mount.

(d) A hint as to the way of entrance.

After the glory fades, the disciples see "Jesus only." He is the way of entrance. He is the way, the truth, the life.

MAY 5-11.—DUTIES TO OTHERS.—Rom. xiv. 7.

One day a man was plowing his land close under the shadow of the Rocky Mountains. He would plant that year a crop of potatoes. They flourished, and his land was overspread with the thicket of the green vines.

But there was a wild plant indigenous to that region called the *Solanum*—very much like the potato-plant. This plant was the home and thriving-place of the insect now known as the potato-bug. From this *Solanum* to the cultivated potato, so much like it, the insect migrated. It found the potato even more congenial. And from thence, upon the bridge of the potato-vine, the bug began his march across the continent. Not legislation nor utmost effort has been able to hold him back. It is wonderful how that first planting of the potato there under the shadow the Rocky Mountains has touched and troubled the potato-fields throughout the wide world.

It is wonderful how things are interrelated.

This interrelation is as true in the realm of persons. We are inextricably interwoven each with each. Out of these intricating relations spring duties. These interrelations are the mothers of duties.

Think of some of these duties, springing out of the relations binding us together, we owe others.

First, consider some of the duties we owe our fellow beings *generally*.

(A) *That we respect their rights.* This general right-respecting duty divides itself into three sorts of specific duties.

(a) We are to respect the rights of our fellow beings as to their *personal liberty*. Every man has the right to the free use of himself up to the point where his free use of himself does not invade or damage the right of others to the free use of themselves.

(b) We are to respect the right of our fellow beings *as to property*. "Nature provides by instinct for the defense of this right, as it does for the

right to life. In truth, property is in one sense a part of life. Since it is only by property, one's own or another's, that life is continued, in organized and civilized communities the whole force of the civic power is pledged to protect it. But only individual conviction of the inalienable right of every other individual to his own honestly acquired possessions can give to property even in the best governed communities its security." This is the evil of an anarchic socialism, that it denies this right of property.

(c) We are to respect the right of our fellow beings as to *reputation*. This does not exclude legitimate criticism. It does exclude a scandalmongering and rumor-starting false-witnessing. A good deal of church gossip ought to stop gossiping. One's reputation is a very precious possession. To pilfer a good name is to lend one's self to the meanest sort of stealing.

(B) Another great general duty we owe to our fellow beings is to be *honest* toward them. "The darkest hour in any young man's life," says Horace Greeley, "is when he sits down to plan how to get money without earning it." Honesty is the foundation of all credit, and so of all business.

(C) Another great general duty we owe to our fellow beings is to be *truthful* toward them. Truthfulness is another side of honesty. Truthfulness is the basis of all right interrelation.

(D) Another great general duty we owe to our fellow beings is to set them a *good example*.

"He was indeed the glass
In which the noble guests did dress themselves."

Such mirror we ought all of us to be. Nothing is more powerful than example. We owe it to our fellows that we lift them by what we are and do.

(E) Another great general duty we owe to our fellow beings is that of *benevolence*. The real idea of possession is that of stewardship, not so much that of ownership. And the real need

of our fellows is a claim on us for right and wise helping.

Second.—While all these general duties clasp there are the *specific duties springing from the relations of the family*. Such as these:

A right husbandhood, wifehood, parenthood, filialness, brotherhood, sisterhood, etc.

Third.—Some of the duties springing out of relationship *in the state, e.g.:*

(a) On the part of the citizen, obedience.

(b) On the part of the executive, a faithful and impartial enforcing of the law.

Of course I have only indicated in this study, and necessarily in the briefest way. I am sure we do not enough think in our prayer-meetings of this ethical side of our religion. It would not be a bad idea to devote several prayer-meetings to the consideration of such duties toward others as I have here indicated. The field is very wide, as this glance shows, and surpassingly important.

MAY 12-18.—SERVICE IN HARD PLACES.—Rom. i. 7.

Our Scripture gives answer to three questions concerning service in hard places: Where? Who? How?

First, *where?* "To all that be in Rome." Think of that Rome a little. It was the Rome of Nero. As such it was the place of a universal *paganism*. There the Pantheon flung open its hospitality to the idol-gods of all the nations Rome had conquered. Also this paganism intricated itself with every turn and phase of the daily life—in the streets images were borne in procession, in the courts of justice idol images were set up, in the market-places, everywhere, and custom demanded that the knee be bowed to them and incense burned to them. No Christian could so much as appear in the street and not have to stand against such constant and wide custom of the recognition of idols. Besides, the emperors were lifted to the place of deities.

Their images were everywhere. Constantly must both knees be bowed to them and the pinch of incense flung upon the altar standing hard by. To refuse to do this—and the Christian must refuse it—was to subject one's self to the charge of treason as well as of irreligion.

Besides, this Rome was the place of the worst possible *social structure*. The historian Mommsen tells us that out of a population of about 1,610,000 there were in Rome at this time only 10,000 senators and knights, 60,000 foreigners, 20,000 soldiers in the garrison, 320,000 free citizens, with their women and children, and 900,000 slaves. Three fifths of the population were slaves. These slaves were the absolute property of their masters; they were in utmost poverty; they were utterly despised. And many of the Christians were among these slaves.

Besides, this Rome was the place of the *utmost cruelty*. There were 320,000 idle free citizens who must be amused. Julius Cæsar caused 320 pairs of gladiators to fight to the death. The good Titus held a series of such shows for a hundred days. Trojan set 5,000 gladiators slashing at each other. Domitian, for a new sensation, had exhibitions of deadly fights between dwarfs and women. It became a "kind of study to watch the lines on the faces of the dying" in the arena. It is easy to see how such diffused cruelty would issue in the awfullest of persecutions without shocking any one.

Besides, this Rome was the place of an indescribable *worldliness* and *wickedness*. The first chapter of the Romans gives hint of it. Such was the place *where*—this Rome.

But pass to seek answer to the second question, *Who?* "To all that be in Rome, *beloved of God, called to be saints.*" So that, even amid the paganism, and awful slavery, and persecuting cruelty, and whelming worldliness and wickedness of this Rome, there were some who were peculiarly beloved of God because they were saints—separated to God and

to His service, and who preserved their sainthood strong, distinct, clear, growing. In the 16th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans we have a list of some of these heroic ones who were saints and kept their sainthood even in so hard a place for sainthood as this Rome. It is a good thing to study this list of saints, especially in the Revised Version, and mark their service, sacrifice, and love. That 16th chapter of this epistle seems to exhale the fragrances of sainthood as a garden does perfumes of flowers, though the garden be planted in soil and amid environment, apparently hostile to such celestial growths. Such as these in this list of saints in Rome are the who.

Third, seek answer to the third question suggested by our Scripture—*How?* And our Scripture to this question makes reply, "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." This was how they kept and sustained the service of their sainthood even in this Rome, viz., by a divine strength ministered to them through the Lord Jesus Christ. Deadly as Rome seemed to sainthood, Rome proves that "nothing is deadly to the Lord Jesus Christ." What does regeneration mean? New ideas? Yes, but more. New likings? Yes, but more. It means the presence with one and in one of the Christ Himself through the Holy Spirit.

Thus does our Scripture teach that Christian life and service are possible in hard places.

Learn:

1. Your circumstances may be hostile, but they are not so hostile as were those surrounding these early saints. Courage, then, and hope, and a strong heart against opposing circumstances.

2. We can grow into sainthood, as did these saints in this hard and hostile Rome, by contact with hard circumstances.

3. Since they did, we can triumph over circumstances.

4. Our way of triumph must be their way, through grace and peace

from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

MAY 19-25.—DESPONDENCY.—1 Kings xix. 4.

I have read that when in 1806 General Rapp was returning from the siege of Dantzic, he had occasion to speak to the Emperor Napoleon the Great. Walking into his private room without being announced, he found the Emperor in such a profound state of abstraction that for some time his presence was altogether unperceived. Seeing the Emperor for so long thus motionless, and fearing he must be ill, General Rapp made a slight noise. Napoleon, instantly turning his head, seized the General by the arm and pointing upward exclaimed, "Do you see it up there?" The General, hardly knowing what to say, remained silent; but the Emperor repeated the question. The General was obliged to reply that he saw nothing. "What," said the Emperor, "you do not see anything? You do not see my star shining before your eyes?" And becoming more and more animated, the Emperor went on to say that the mysterious star had never abandoned him; that he saw the star through all his great battles, and that he was never happy but when he was gazing at it.

Only illusion, you say; only the pleasing figment of an ambitious imagination; only the apparent bodying forth of Napoleon's inner thought about himself. And doubtless you say truly.

And yet how true it is that we must all of us see with the inward eye an inner star, if we are to be at all strong, courageous, conquering. As Carlyle says: "It has been well said, man is based on hope; he has properly no other possession but hope; this habitation of his is named the place of hope."

And it is an experience not uncommon that this inner star of hope does for a time at least, and now and then, quite cease its shining. With his inward eye one can see no more of it than

General Rapp could Napoleon's strange star of destiny. The whole horizon is gray with clouds or black with midnight. Despondency is the man's master. Our Scripture is the picture of a great, true man in such plight precisely. Under a poor bit of brush-broom, way off in the desert, the great, strong, conquering prophet Elijah is lying, wailing out, "It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life."

Concerning this juniper-tree, this place of despondency, ask first, *What often puts men under it?*

(a) *Momentary triumph of perhaps unexpected weakness.* The strongest men, even on their strongest sides, are not always and altogether strong—e.g., the faithful Abraham lying about his wife in Egypt; the self-controlled Moses speaking unadvisedly; the intrepid Peter denying his Lord; the courageous Elijah scurrying from Jezebel and the priests of Baal.

(b) *Reaction* sometimes flings us beneath the juniper-tree. Elijah is now in the reaction from the great strain of the contest with the priests of Baal.

(c) *Physical weariness* sometimes causes despondency. Elijah had had a long journey into the wilderness and was physically worn out.

(d) *Apparent failure* sometimes flings us beneath the juniper-tree. To Elijah's thought nothing had come of all his strain and contest. "I only am left," the solitary follower of Jehovah—thus, just now, it seems to him.

Ask a second question: *How does God treat His children when they are under the juniper-tree? Kindly*, as the whole record shows, not harshly.

(a) With the kindness of adaptation to bodily necessity (verses 5-7).

(b) With the kindness of adaptation to spiritual necessity. Elijah thought God *must* work by storm. God shows him His power in the still small voice, in secret and retired processes.

(c) With the kindness of the disclosure of his real success (verse 18).

(d) With the kindness of recall to duty (verse 15).

(e) With the kindness of refusal to answer his despondent prayer. Elijah vied to die. God translated him (2 Kings ii. 9-12).

(f) With the kindness of companionship for him. God gave him Elisha.

Ask a third question: *How may we get out from under the blighting shadow of the juniper-tree?* By doing as Elijah did, putting renewed trust in God and going back to duty.

"Is it raining, little flower?
Be glad of rain;
Too much sun would wither thee,
'Twill shine again.
The clouds are very black, 'tis true;
But just behind them shines the blue.

"Art thou weary, tender heart?
Be glad of pain.
In sorrow sweetest things will grow,
As flowers in rain.
God watches, and thou wilt have sun,
When clouds their perfect work have done."

MAY 26-31.—DELIVERANCE.—John i. 29.

In the southern part of Montana, a little to the west, and just outside the Yellowstone National Park, stand close together three distinct and singular mountains called the Tetons. They are way-mark mountains. They give the clue to the paths of travel for all that region. Once seen, so peculiar is their shape they can never be forgotten. If, amid the deep and dangerous defiles, or if, upon the vast and dreary sand-plains stretching thereabouts, a hunter or a traveler being lost, can once gain vision of these Tetons, he can place himself, recover his missed trail, set his course toward safety.

The memory of these mountains came to me as I set myself to thought about our Scripture. Our Scripture seems to me to hold in itself three great way-mark tracks for all weary and troubled travelers through this tangled life. If but these three truths be seen and seized, a man must go safely; he shall miss the danger of the eternal loss, he shall surely find the heavenly home and safety. These are the three great way-mark truths:

First—The Lamb of God the sin-bearer.

Second—The Lamb of God the sin-bearer for the world.

Third—Behold Him.

First, then, the Lamb of God the sin-bearer. The words, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world," were spoken by John the Forerunner. On his lips they can have but one distinct, clear meaning. Had Plato said them, they might have carried another significance. Had Cicero or Seneca uttered them, they might have borne a meaning different still. But on the lips of John the Baptist they can hold only one certain and precise meaning—a sense sacrificial and atoning.

All language is the result and flowering out of the training to which those speaking it and their ancestors have been subjected. These words on the lips of John the Baptist could have only a sacrificial and atoning meaning, because his training and that of his ancestors for 2,000 years had been a training which attached such significance to a lamb. And when John said, "Behold the Lamb of God," that designation necessarily carried over to and hung the Lord Jesus about with the sacrificial meaning the idea "lamb" had held for such multitudes of generations.

Consider: There was the Lamb of the Passover.

Consider: There were the various offerings of lambs, goats, doves, for the special sins of the people.

Consider: There was the offering of a lamb, twice each day, in the temple for the sins of the people.

Consider: There was the solemn yearly offering of the day of Atonement.

Turn now to Isaiah. You find in him prophetic speech concerning the Messiah in terms borrowed unmistakably from these ceremonies of the sacrificial lamb and the scapegoat (Isa. lii. 4-7).

Now, it was with all this sacrificial

and atoning training with which his thought was saturated that John, seeing Jesus, exclaimed: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world." What could he mean? We know perfectly well what he meant. He could have meant nothing other than that Jesus was *the* lamb of God, *i.e.*, God's sacrifice and God's atonement for human sin; *the* Lamb of which all these ceremonial lambs were shadows, types, prophecies; *the* Lamb upon whom was to be laid, for their atonement, the iniquities of all.

And thus Jesus, *the* Lamb of God, God's sacrifice and atonement for human sin, takes away, bears away, our sin:

- (a) Into *blotting out* (Isa. xlv. 22).
- (b) Into *distance* (Psa. ciii. 12).
- (c) Into *forgetfulness* (Micah vii. 19).

Second great way-mark truth—the Lamb of God the sin-bearer for the world.

It is for us to preach no narrow Gospel. It is in a redeemed world we are living.

Third great way-mark truth—*Behold Him*. This is a truth and duty of personal appropriation.

(a) Behold, look upward and outward, not downward and inward. Richard Baxter says: "I was once wont

to meditate most on my own heart, and to dwell all at home. I was poring over either my sins or wants or examining my sincerity. But now, though I am greatly convinced of the need of heart acquaintance and employment, I see more the need of higher works, and that I should look oftener on God and Christ and heaven than upon my own heart. At home I can find distempers to trouble me and some evidences of my peace; but it is *above* that I must find matter of delight, and joy, and love, and peace itself. I would, therefore, have one thought at home, on myself and sins, and many thoughts above."

(b) Behold, and do not think that great sacrifice can be repeated (Heb. x. 12-14). That is the blasphemy of the Romish mass, that it attempts to repeat the sacrifice offered once for all.

(c) Behold, and do not wait for feeling.

(d) Behold, and do not speculate about a second chance beyond the grave.

(e) Behold *now*, and do not think about it, but actually do it.

(f) Behold, for probation wastes and death is coming.

Thus beholding, you shall surely find deliverance from both the guilt of sin and the power of it.

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

St. Paul's Pastoral Counsels to the Corinthians.

By PROF. W. GARDEN BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D., EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

(Continued.)

III. *Questions connected with marriage* (vii.).

THE questions submitted to Paul on the subject of marriage have on the face of them a local and temporary aspect; but though cases precisely similar are not likely to occur now, impor-

tant principles are laid down bearing on a subject of great pastoral interest—the contact of the Christian Church with "the world."

A case had been submitted to the Apostle for his judgment by some of his Christian friends at Corinth. In reference to marriage, the Corinthian Christians were between two fires. On the one side were the Jews, whose influence was very strong on the side of marriage; for a Jew to have reached the age of twenty and contracted no

marriage was looked on as strange. On the other side were the pagans, with views as decided in the opposite direction, regarding the married state with disfavor. Marriage was regarded as too great a restraint on freedom, and as entailing too serious obligations and responsibilities. Yet, again, there were Christians who condemned marriage on very different grounds. Inheriting the ascetic spirit of the Essenes, they denounced it as in itself evil and unwholesome; Christians ought to renounce an institution which, as it gave pleasure to the flesh, must in its very nature have a corrupting tendency.

In reference to marriage, the Apostle's friends at Corinth desired his guidance on three points: 1. Ought marriage ever to be contracted by Christians? 2. Ought it to be maintained when one of the parties became a Christian? 3. Ought Christian fathers to allow their daughters to marry, or ought they to devote them to a life of virginity?

1. Is it right to marry? The answer is, in certain circumstances, yes; but not in all. The unmarried state was one of greater freedom, and greater adaptation to such a life of divine service as the Apostle himself was leading. It was also exempted from many special trials which the spirit of persecution and other evil things of the time entailed. "For the present distress it is good for a man so to be." In one case it is obviously better to marry, where great temptation would arise from being unmarried. For anything is better than sin. It is clear that the Apostle does not profess to discuss here the question of marriage *on its widest basis*. It is only marriage in its local and temporary bearings at Corinth that is before him.

If he had been discussing the whole question, he could not but have had much to say on a relation which he elsewhere compares to that of Christ and his Church (Eph. v. 25). No doubt he understood well the purifying and elevating influence of true love,

and the numberless blessings that have their origin in the Christian home. Often the Apostle smiles complacently on the family. In one of his finest prayers, when he bends his knees to God (Eph. iii. 14, 15), it is as "the Father, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named," that he appeals to Him, and supplicates His blessing.

2. His next inquiry is, Ought the marriage-tie to be continued when one of the parties becomes a Christian? Certainly, says the Apostle, if the other party be willing for the continuance. But is it not highly undesirable to be unequally yoked with an unbeliever? Undoubtedly it is a great evil; and in another place he urges that such a connection is never to be entered into with open eyes. But the case is different when the connection has been formed in the days of darkness. The reason for continuing it is that, perhaps, the Christian partner will be the means of converting the unchristian. God may bless the connection when it has come about providentially, but not when it is contracted at the expense of a good conscience. The distinctions of the Apostle are not metaphysical subtleties, incomprehensible to ordinary minds; but broad differences, easily apprehended, and commending themselves readily to common-sense.

3. In reference to the destination of his daughters by a Christian father, the case is decided in much the same way as the first. On general grounds he prefers that they remain virgins, but he admits exceptions, to which he is quite ready to give effect.

Cases such as those of this chapter are not likely to occur in a modern ministry. What is most important to be noticed here, in a pastoral point of view, is the careful discrimination of the Apostle in dealing with them, and his solution of them not by cast-iron rules but by general principles. He does not apply the same rule to all; he sifts and sorts his cases, and treats them differently according to their different natures. They are delicate points for

being handled in public, points which young ministers are not called to discuss except under very special circumstances. St. Paul was well advanced in years when he wrote this epistle. Yet marriage in its moral and Christian bearings is a subject that ought to have an important place in every Christian ministry. Itself one of the most momentous steps in life, and with an influence literally incalculable on men's weal or woe, it is often contracted in utter levity, or it is the outcome of mere sensual passion, or of unmitigated greed. To elevate the popular conception of marriage, in its antecedents, in itself, and in its after course, would be no insignificant or unworthy result of a pastor's labor.

There is one modern question akin to the subject here discussed by the Apostle of no small concern in more than one quarter of the globe. We refer to the marriage relations of Kafirs, Chinese, and other polygamists who, at their conversion to Christianity, are the husbands of two or more wives. To determine what ought to be done in such cases has been a great difficulty to missionaries. In the great majority of cases the rule has been laid down that the convert must dismiss all his wives but one, the one that he married first. It has been found to be a rule hard to

follow. In many instances very promising converts have apostatized because they were unable to keep permanently aloof from a wife to whom they were specially attracted. It has required of many a young convert a sacrifice which in his feebleness he has not been able to make. Is there no guidance for such marriage in the Apostle's way of treating the second case here submitted to him? The principle on which he proceeds in that case is that it may be right to continue what it would be wrong to commence. It is right to continue the marriage-bond between an unbeliever and a Christian in cases where both were unbelievers at the time of marriage. But it would not be right to enter into such a marriage when one party is a believer and the other an unbeliever. Applying this principle to cases of polygamy, we should obtain this result: that where a man had a plurality of wives before his conversion, he should be allowed to retain them afterward, if they were unwilling to go, but that no Christian should ever be allowed to marry more than one wife. This would make provision for polygamy dying out as Christianity advanced, while it would also be a testimony against the practise, and a token of its belonging to a dark and barbarous age.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

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

With the Specialists.

ARE we up to the ancient heathen standard? Hobbes declared that the Greek statesmen recognized virtue as the only bond of union in a state, while those in his day spoke of nothing but industries, commerce, finance, and similar things. And in our own day? Our statesmen have become politicians, and many of these make their base personal affairs more supreme than even

the material concerns of the nation, while apt to forget altogether the great intellectual and moral interests.

We are undoubtedly making progress. From Adam Smith and Ricardo until recent times, the problem of political economy with respect to laborers has been how they can secure a wage that will enable them to provide for the physical needs of themselves and their families, or at best to raise their

standard of living. The leading economic writers in our day are far, far beyond that in their demands. They have added an ethical purpose to the welfare of the body. The laborers are not only to live and to live well, but they are also to share in culture and to take part in pushing humanity forward. The cry has been, "What can be done for laborers?" It is rapidly changing to this: "What can laborers do to purify and exalt society, and to ennoble life?" All along they have been preeminently producers; now they are to become the producers of what is highest and best.

—

This was written in England, but it applies with equal force to America: "When money becomes the test of success, and I am held to have proved myself a better man than you are if I have earned more, then the signs of wealth are held the proofs of merit and ability, and display becomes the first object for men of means. There is not one class in England at this day that is not infested by this taint. It corrupts the life, mars the comfort, poisons the social gatherings, destroys the simplicity of men and women from the cottage to the castle. It fills this world with ugliness and discomfort."—*Hobhouse in "The Labor Movement."*

—

The above is a specimen of a spirit which has become quite common in works on the great economic problems of the day. Morality is emphasized because its need is so keenly felt. May we not also hope that there is a reaction against the gross tendencies of the day? The following reveal the same spirit—both are taken from works on political economy. Cohn thinks it one of our serious problems, how the endless development of desire and the chase after gain which it incites can be checked. And J. S. Nicholson says: "It is a saddening truth, repeated over and over again in history, that the acquisition of wealth and authority by any society has generally sufficed to

make it forget its original duties and to cause to spring up all those evils of selfishness and inhumanity which it was expressly designed to combat. Such was the fate of the great religious societies, and such was the fate of the guilds and industrial organizations."

—

Some of the questions connected with labor are well stated by D. F. Schloss, in his "Methods of Industrial Remuneration," in the following quotation: "Of all the questions which press for an answer at the present moment, none is fraught with weightier issues than the labor problem. The wealth of the world grows apace, and in its creation the labor of the industrial classes fulfills functions of very great importance; but the share of this wealth allotted to the workingmen is considered by them to be unjustly and intolerably insignificant. At the same time, concurrently with the demand of the working classes for an increase in the amount of their remuneration, there has arisen a widespread resentment against the character of an industrial system under which intelligent citizens are, in many cases, subjected to the capricious tyranny of harsh and exacting taskmasters, and are, almost universally, deprived of any voice in the organization of their own industry. Nor will thoughtful persons, no matter to what class they may themselves belong, decline to admit that these complaints are, in a great measure, well founded."

—

We hail with joy civic leagues and good-citizenship associations for the study and reform of our political institutions. They excite most hope when they become permanent organizations for investigation and work, and do not disappear so soon as a little perfume has been sprinkled in the Augean stables of the ubiquitous Tammany. The rage of the age for the exposure of far more ills than it can cure is making significant revelations of conditions prevalent in our proudest cities. The following item, referring to Chicago, is taken

from an account given by Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House, in that city :

"The policy of the public authorities of never taking an initiative and always waiting to be urged to do their duty is fatal in a ward where there is no initiative among the citizens. The idea underlying our self-government breaks down in such a ward. The streets are inexpressibly dirty, the number of schools inadequate, factory legislation unenforced, the street-lighting bad, the paving miserable and altogether lacking in the alleys and smaller streets, and the stables defy all laws of sanitation. Hundreds of houses are unconnected with the street sewer. The older and richer inhabitants seem anxious to move away as rapidly as they can afford it. They make room for newly arrived immigrants, who are densely ignorant of civic duties. . . . The Hebrews and Italians do the finishing for the great clothing manufacturers formerly done by Americans, Irish, and Germans, who refused to submit to the extremely low prices to which the sweating system has reduced their successors. . . . An unscrupulous contractor regards no basement as too dark, no stable-loft too foul, no rear shanty too provisional, no tenement-room too small for his workroom, as these conditions imply low rental. Hence these shops abound in the worst of the foreign districts, where the sweater easily finds his cheap basement and his home finishers. There is a constant tendency to employ school children, as much of the home and shop work can easily be done by children. . . . One of the most discouraging features about the system of tenement-houses is that many are owned by sordid and ignorant immigrants. The theory that wealth brings responsibility, that possession entails at length education and refinement, in these cases fails utterly. The children of an Italian immigrant owner do not go to school, and are no improvement on their parents. His wife picks rags from the street-gutter, and laboriously sorts

them in a dingy court. Wealth may do something for her self-complacency and feeling of consequence ; it certainly does nothing for her comfort or her children's improvement, nor for the cleanliness of any one concerned."

Honest pay for honest work is often better than charity. Just now there is special demand for Christians, for churches, and for charity organizations to see to it that those who in any way serve them receive full compensation for their toil. Not from the side of infidelity, but from a devout believer, Father J. O. S. Huntington, we quote the following :

"There are many shams in our modern religionism. I know of few more loathsome than the hypocrisy of the lady managers (what a singularly suggestive title!) of an orphan asylum worth a half a million of dollars, who expect a hired nurse-girl to be content with less than a private family would pay, because she is working, as they say, 'for the Lord,'—so afraid that she will not lay up sufficient treasure in heaven that they rob her of half her wages on earth; and, while they tell her in unctuous phrases that 'it's all for the good of the dear little children,' neglect to print her name among the benefactors of the 'institootion,' though the proportion to the income of what she performs contributes entitles her to head the list."

It has become common to denounce competition as if irremediably evil. Yet it develops the greatest energy, is the mother of enterprise, leads to invention and discovery and progress, and has been fruitful in improvements during past ages. Would not the destruction of competition hinder aspiration? If the strong are not to compete with the weak, then the weak become the standard for the strong, and a worse social state could hardly be imagined for the weak as well as for the strong. Instead of the cry, "Cooperation instead of competition," a much better

economic rule is, "Competition for the sake of cooperation"; that is, let honest competition develop the best powers of the individual and the best methods and systems, and let the results be used cooperatively for the best interests of society. The watchword ought to be, "Compete nobly, compete cooperatively."

The strength of the German Social Democrats is in the cities, particularly the manufacturing centers. Some four years ago it was resolved to make especial efforts to win the agricultural laborers. In order to make the propaganda the more successful the agitators were advised to have regard for the religious convictions of the people, which are stronger than among the laboring classes in the cities. The orators were advised to use certain passages of Scripture referring to labor, to the poor, and to the rich, because it was thought they would be most effective. The following advice was also given: "Do not attack religion. If the pastor is at a meeting, he need not be handled tenderly. The country people distinguish between religion and the preacher; he associates too much with the landlords. . . . The people are generally religious, but they do not esteem the pastor. They go to church and listen to him; they say that it is his vocation to speak. But the laborers will all rejoice if the preacher receives some hard raps."

Blessings by being perverted are transformed into curses. So much may be done for a child that nothing is left for it to do for itself, and then parents wonder that worthlessness is the result. Those who are so perpetually taught by teachers that they do not teach themselves may learn much, but, as the Germans say, they *can* nothing. The strong and vigorous do not want to be subjected and enslaved by having everything done for them, but they want the conditions to develop their native strength by its proper exercise.

How can the weaklings, who are unable to help themselves and depend on the service and strength of others for their being and well-being, be regarded as the favored of humanity? They are the real slaves, no matter what their fortune. As all indolence is the mark of degradation, so self-help and the help of the needy mark the hero and the conqueror.

"Educate, train the masses!" this has become the cry in many quarters. Make the most of their powers, give them the best opportunities for culture, and teach them such things as will make them masters of their situation and exalt them into better condition. The philosopher Fichte said: "Since Pestalozzi gave the mighty impulse it has been generally admitted that only through an improved education of the masses can the conditions be found for overcoming completely the manifold evils in the state, in society, and in the family life, and for securing a better future for coming generations. Still more generally can it be affirmed that the destiny of a people, their prosperity and their decay, depend ultimately on the training which the young receive. It follows from this as an axiom that the people which possess the deepest and the most manifold culture down to the lowest stratum of the population will also be the mightiest and happiest of the peoples of that generation: invincible to neighbors, envied by contemporaries, and a model for imitation."

A writer who quotes this passage adds the significant testimony of a French officer, who attributes the recent victories of the Germans to their education. In a letter to a friend the officer says: "If you had lived, as I have, in Prussia, you would understand how much truth there is in the saying, 'The German schoolmaster won the battle of Königgrätz.' . . . Never shall I forget how, when I was with Bismarck at Varzin, in 1869, the chancellor, ac-

accompanied by his two sons and myself, took pleasure in visiting the school-master of a small neighboring village. Think of the effect of such an evidence of appreciation for a modest teacher on the part of a man like Bismarck!"

Societies for the study of social themes and for the solution of the social problem are in order. Their need will be the impulse to their creation. *The Nation*, January 17, states that a Society for Social Defense and Progress has been formed in Paris, which aims to make a stand against the growing perils of socialism. It does not favor traditionalism or stagnation, but hopes "to vindicate all that is excellent in the present social order, at the same time that it shows sympathy for all rational and feasible reform. The league is for advance movements as well as for defense. . . . Strong as is its conviction of the worth and necessity of such a social organization as we now have, "it will not commit itself to blind and indiscriminate praise of existing institutions, but will admit their weak points, and work as heartily as any other for improvement. All it insists upon is that the whole structure shall not be destroyed under the name of improvement."

An excellent article on "Economics in Elementary Schools," by Prof. S. N. Patten, appears in *Annals of the American Academy* for January. He holds that political economists have concentrated their attention on technical discussions and disputed topics, but have "overlooked the more obvious economic laws and phenomena which are of general interest." In order that economics may be introduced into the elementary schools, he advocates a return "to those first principles which lie back of all discussion. These principles are of so general a character and of so simple a nature that they enter naturally into a child's world and can be illustrated by many striking examples based upon the experience of children.

While the actions of the adult are much more complex than those of a child, the motives in the two cases are not so different as might be supposed. It is possible, therefore, to use the material of a child's life to prepare him for the more intricate economic world with which he will become familiar when a man."

Professor Patten emphasizes the theory of utility as the basis of political economy, declares it the aim of economics to discover how to increase our utility and reduce our cost, and that the theory of utility must be developed in all its phases if we wish to get at the economic forces operating in any community. Such is the importance of the theory of utility that it should be taught the children in the school and the family.

There is a growing demand for a more general education in political economy. Even in cultivated circles its elementary principles are but imperfectly understood. There has been prejudice against it as a dismal or brutal science, and the confusion and disputes among specialists have not helped its study. But the great progress in political economy has explained many obscure points and made it a more humane study. For the home and for business it is essential; and if its indisputable elements were better understood by laborers as well by the other classes, the agitations would be more rational and the hope of solving the labor problem brighter.

The Root of the Matter.

It is not so much isolated evils we must fight as evil itself, a compact and mighty system, in the form of principalities and powers, enthroned upon high places, and embodied in institutions and dominating the hearts of men. Our worst foe is that regnant evil which unconsciously possesses the spirit and becomes the essence of the age itself; perhaps it is the devil posing as an angel of light. Every deeper

study of the situation leads to the conviction that the ax must be laid at the root of the tree.

Cohn states, in his "Political Economy," that as early as 1819, Sismondi affirmed respecting Americans: "Gain has become the first and the highest thought of life; and in the freest nation on earth freedom itself, compared with gain, has lost its value." How much has the love of gain been extended and intensified since that time by the marvelous development of our natural resources and our industries?

Economic value is the standard of excellence. So long as this fact is not recognized, our usual efforts at reform are doomed to failure. Our various pursuits inscribe on their banners, "Will it pay?" And the inscription means whether the income in money will justify the required effort. This is self-evident in agricultural, industrial, mercantile, and commercial pursuits; and only in a moderate degree less so in politics and education. In these ambition for fame has a place, but it is mainly for fame which wealth gives. In many places the man who lives for ideals which bring no pecuniary gain is deemed deserving of compassion, because not quite normal. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is ridiculed, as fit perhaps for an antiquated German idealist, but unworthy of advanced American scholarship. The laugh of these wiseacres implies that they have no conception that the mind itself hungers; that its deepest need is the solution of its own problems, and that the satisfaction of its own inherent craving is the condition of all rest and peace. An education which ignores the quenching of the soul's thirst as its first aim is fundamentally wrong, and too shallow to appreciate what is deepest in thought and best in history, and most promotive of national exaltation.

So long as money is the standard of energy, of merit, of success, every one who has money is naturally regarded as a superior being. It is altogether

secondary how he obtained it. Lying is policy, fraud is dubbed business shrewdness, unscrupulous cunning passes for sagacity, the pile a man inherits confers dignity and merit without a stroke of labor, and to fail in the scramble for wealth means incompetence, imbecility, worthlessness. The man who devotes himself to pure scholarship, who tramples on policy in order to rise to the principles of statesmanship, who is absorbed by the pursuit of a great ideal, who lives for human enlightenment and social progress, but has neither the inclination nor the knack of a money-making machine, runs the risk of being classed with fools and cranks. As things are valued by what they cost, so men are valued by the money they accumulate.

This is the light in which modern life must be read. It is admitted, as if it were axiomatic, that the chief impulse in the choice of a profession is the desire for a livelihood, the hope of economic advantages. The exceptions are those usually found to general rules. Such an exception has strenuously been claimed by the writer for the study of theology, on the plea that those who engage in it are dominated by the love of truth and the salvation of souls. He has, however, been assured that in this respect he is not up to the times; that the past ideals in the study of theology have been brought from heaven to earth; that these ideals are now the exception, and for proof he has been referred to the spirit in our theological seminaries and to the eager conversations of their inmates about the salaries in their future charges. We are not prepared to believe that the ministry is usually or often chosen on account of its worldly advantages, but leave the matter open for further inquiry. But there is no doubt that among the usual reasons for seeking an education and entering a profession the mercenary ones are very strong and frequently decisive. In the United States the bread-and-butter studies, as they are called in German

universities, seem constantly to be gaining greater ascendancy over the ideal interests. In order to appreciate how completely materialism dominates us, we need only consider the subordination of the love of God and man to the love of money. This we know to be the root of evil, none the less the root because deep and hidden and so universal as to be deemed a matter of course.

We speak not of a class, but of the characteristics of society itself, of those pronounced good as well as of the bad, a spirit in the Christian home, in the college and seminary and church, as well as in the saloon, the gambling hell, the brothel, the thief, and in our Tammanies. We are on the wrong track, and all our pursuits lead us farther and farther in the wrong direction. The cumulative energy and constantly growing force increase the difficulty of turning round and retracing our steps. Our hope of a change consists first of all in realizing how materialistic we have become; how the hearts of men are petrified through sordid treasures, and how the very eye with which alone we can behold the light of God has become evil, and therefore the whole body is full of darkness. When what gives humanity its worth has vanished, men cease to ask whether life is worth living; they know that it is not.

Air and light have no economic value; they are so abundant as to come to us without money and without price. Yet they are the conditions of all being and well-being, the support of all life, and the source of all beauty. So the objects of highest interest to the soul are above economic estimate. Religion cannot be bought; there are no scales to weigh love, faith, and hope with gold; the price of virtue is determined by equations of character; compared with all earthly objects, peace and joy are inestimable. Men need but come to themselves to learn that spiritual objects are not only incomparable with gold, but that the love of Christ passeth knowledge, the peace of God

passeth understanding. The professor and preacher need salaries, but they have missed their callings if the salary is an equivalent. The sermon, the pastoral visit, the anxiety, the love, the sacrifice, the prayers, of a true pastor can no more be paid by a check on the bank than can a mother's love. Those who have shame left feel the humiliation of making the money value of a preacher the standard of divine service. So in the realm of intellect there are ideal values incommensurable with economic standards. Kant's "Kritik of Pure Reason," which has affected human thought as few other works in the whole range of literature, was in danger of being sold as waste paper. As a pecuniary speculation philosophy does not pay. Raphael's Sistine "Madonna," Shakespeare's "Hamlet," Goethe's "Faust," are beyond price, pay for them what you will. People pay up to the level of their appreciation; hence what is popular commands most money. But how about that which transcends their appreciation? To them it is worthless. What is highest in intellect is for the few whose estimate is superior to economic values. Whoever gets pay for his best is sure to miss what is best in life. In the pulpit, in lectures, in journals, in books, an effort is made to meet the rage for what is popular; yet there is an especial need for what is too deep and too lofty to be popular, which is for the few who have passed from the crowded valleys to the lonely summits, who behold the past and the future from an elevated standpoint of the present, and who become the teachers, the reformers, the interpreters, the prophets, and the leaders of humanity because they have risen above the ordinary level. We are sure that progress is the destiny of humanity; next century will have gone beyond us. How amazing that, with this belief in a rising humanity, men do not see that those who are only on the popular level of to-day will be below the average level of the coming generations.

America is regarded by foreigners as the land where the average level and the popular appreciation are made the supreme standard because the reign belongs to the majority. Some foreigners think this supremacy of the majority the dominion of vulgarity, especially since money is declared to be our chief deity. It is worth while to reflect whether a materialistic spirit has not seriously lowered our ideals. That the trend of our national life is vulgar, however, can be admitted only when the masses level all distinctions, when popularity swallows individuality, when the thinkers think in herds, when the prophets prophesy to please, when the wishes of the people become the holy of holies for the priest, and when money becomes the end instead of the means of life.

In theology the cry has been raised, "Back to Christ"; in philosophy, "Back to Kant." Has not the time come to turn back to the ideals, to give economics their proper place, and for that reason make them subordinate to the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual interests which give them their true value? Men are groaning because made so exclusively beasts of burden weighed down with crushing loads of material things. Especially is it time to consider these things when political economy preaches that the trend has become too groveling; that we are losing the personality, that we must put ethics on the throne, and must make humanity supreme.

Social Contrasts and Culture.

DOES the growth of culture involve the development of painful contrasts between the conditions of men, so that some must be poor that others may be rich; that some must work excessively that others may be idle; that some must be slaves that others may be lords, and that the masses must be doomed to un-culture that a few may be cultured? Many have regarded the magnifying of these contrasts a necessary element in

progress so long as the present social order continues. They think that the modern division of labor means the exaltation of a small number at the expense of the degradation of the masses. It is the return to the old Greek view of Plato and Aristotle, that manual labor must be committed to slaves in order that the citizens may be cultured and fit to attend to the affairs of state.

The contrasts mentioned are not new, but have always existed. Master and slave, lord and serf, rich and poor, capitalist and laborer, the cultured and the illiterate, are contrasts which characterize all the ages. There probably never was a period in which the average of culture and prosperity was as high as is now the case in the leading nations. Even Athens in its palmyest days had a mass of slaves whose subjection was the most complete, and whose degradation brought the condition in many respects to the level of the brute. This was also the case in Rome. But our modern ideas of human liberty and equality, and our convictions of the rights of the personality and of the mission of the exalted to the lowly, impress these contrasts on us more deeply and make us feel their injustice more keenly. The awakening which has taken place sees the different social conditions in a new light; what was formerly regarded right and necessary we pronounce unnecessary and wrong. We lament the degradation of the masses which was formerly thought to be the natural order and providential arrangement. Then, we have learned the possibilities of the toilers, of which the past had no conception. We have beheld men arise from the lowest condition and most unfavorable circumstances, even from the ranks of slavery, to wealth and scholarship, and to positions of honor and influence. Ways have been opened to toil and poverty by means of freedom, which were barred to them in former ages. Our new ideas and aspirations respecting humanity make intolerable those degraded conditions which were formerly

viewed with equanimity, and were even deemed essential for human culture and progress.

With our views of the dignity of the personality, of human rights and possibilities and equality, we cannot persuade ourselves that the masses must be the footstool of humanity in order that the rest may sit on thrones. Men are not equal, and cannot be; but the inequality which nature produces differs from the inequality which is the product of a social arrangement, for which men are responsible and which men can change. There must be manual laborers; but there is no necessity that they be made mere "hands" or machines; that they be overworked and poor, and that they be deprived of culture and become brutalized. The relief and exaltation and enlightenment of this class are among the most weighty concerns of the present. There must be men who devote themselves to scholarship, whose life is absorbed by the pursuit of truth; but their specialty is for the advantage of all—they are but pioneers, clearing the way and building bridges for others. There are capitalists; but need "high life" mean low culture, ease, luxury, haughtiness, insolence, degrading pleasures? The manual laborers work for all, being the bearers of severe burdens for the relief of the whole of society. Are the favored to be less useful for society as a totality? They are favored in order that through them all the rest may be favored. As the farmer raises grain that society may live, so the scholar learns and thinks in order that the farmer may be exalted, and the capitalist attains advantages in which laborers share. All classes are recipients from one another and all are givers; and it is self-evident that those who receive most must give the most.

The conviction has become quite general that we live in a transition era. One of the changes now in process pertains to the relation of the different social classes. That one should be dependent and the other independent is

wrong and involves conditions rapidly becoming intolerable and impossible. Things, machines, brutes, are dependent on men; but one man dare not degrade or enslave another. There are degrees of authority; but there is no authority for human debasement. Men are mutually dependent, yet all are independent. Humanity is a tree with large limbs and small twigs, but with no place for destructive parasites. There must be social contrasts, but only such as promote the perfection of society as a whole. The growth of social culture means the growth of the individuals who compose society—not of one individual or class at the expense of another, but of all, each helping the other, and all growing together in symmetry toward social perfection. Instead, therefore, of looking on the painful social contrasts as a necessity of nature or society, they are conditions to be overcome; they are evidences of a false culture from which we are to be saved by true human and Christian culture.

For the Thinker and the Worker.

If a corporation has no soul, what brutes the individuals must be who constitute the corporation!

I am a part of society; it is only by ignoring myself that I can ignore the claims of society.

The more deeply we get into the social problem the more fully we realize the application of Christ's saying, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone."

Everybody knows that money is the means of existence; but very many, by unreserved consecration to the making of money, pervert the means so as to become the end and thus lose the essence of life.

The highest social worker belongs to that select class of men who ever ap-

proach a goal which they never reach. They may be solitary and obliged to say with Schiller, "This century is not ripe for my ideals; I live a citizen of those that are to come."

A good many years ago Frederick Douglass addressed a colored Sunday-school and church in Springfield, Ohio. To the surprise of the writer, at that time superintendent of the Sunday-school, Douglass placed the strongest emphasis on the accumulation of money as the means for attaining respectability and influence. He knew too well the dominant passion not to know that money is one of the most influential factors in society; and he felt that the colored people must learn economy and thrift if ever they are to get the conditions for rising into better social relations.

Douglas Jerrold at one time met a boy coming from a graveyard, "carrying away, with exulting looks, a skull in very perfect preservation. He was a London boy, and looked rich indeed with his treasure." To the thrice repeated question, what he wanted to do with it, he simply answered, "I know." "Come, here's sixpence. Now, what will you do with it?" The boy took the coin, grinned, hugged himself, hugging the skull the closer, and said very briskly, "Make a money-box of it." Douglas Jerrold adds: "A strange thought for a child. And yet, mused we as we strolled along, how many of us, with nature beneficent and smiling on all sides—how many of us think of nothing so much as hoarding sixpences—yea, hoarding them even in the very jaws of desolate death!"

Count Tolstoi was not the first Russian nobleman of means who shared his goods and his life with the poor around him. Accounts are given of similar instances among his own people. This is not surprising; it is rather surprising that such cases are not more numerous. Noble souls revolt at the display and

luxury of wealth in the midst of a world of misery and actual starvation. Suffering humanity has a marvelous fascination for a large heart that enters deeply into its unutterable tragedies. This our great novelists know; hence they turn from the froth on the surface of society to the pearls buried in the mire at the bottom. The mother whose loving toil and sacrifice support a family on a few dollars a week presents a spectacle of more thrilling interest than the speculator whom cunning and fortune give fifty thousand a year. The former has stirring heroic elements; the latter may have a flavor of vulgarity.

General Booth took the American Athens by storm. His advent was heralded by the pulpit and the press, the Mayor of Boston welcomed him to the city in Faneuil Hall, the Governor of Massachusetts presided at one of his meetings and spoke highly of his work, he preached to crowded houses, the number hearing him on Sunday being estimated at 20,000 or more, he gave an account of the principles of the Salvation Army at Mr. Cook's Monday lecture, delivered a special address to preachers, addressed enthusiastic audiences of students in Boston and Harvard universities, and a reception was tendered him in Trinity Episcopal Church, one of the most aristocratic churches in the land. It reads like a miracle in these skeptical times. Boston forgot its cold reserve, its finical criticism, and its destructive negations. Not long since, the Army whose general he is was received everywhere with jeers and hootings, if not with mud and arrests. Why the change? The genius of practical achievement has taken the place of poetry and oratory, and Booth stands for a grand achievement. Then, the world admires the man who goes into the slums; who there does the work of Christ which the Church may be able to do, but surely does not do, who saves the outcast and abandoned, and is not soiled as he draws them out

of the filth, and who thus accomplishes the most needed and most hopeless task in Christ's name.

What Our Pastors Want.

RECENTLY a busy minister said: "What we pastors want is a practical knowledge of the social problem. We are too much occupied to become specialists in it; therefore we are thankful for such information as will help us in our work." This was said in grateful recognition of the helpfulness of this department in *THE REVIEW*. We are glad to have the need of pastors stated so explicitly, for it will aid us in meeting their demands.

The same need is felt by theological students. A number of them after listening to a lecture on the social problem gathered around the lecturer, asked questions on various parts of the lecture, and requested a list of books that they might further pursue the subject. It was interesting to notice their intense desire to come into direct contact with the living forces of the day, and their appreciation of the social movement as the best means for doing this. They realized that in order to have practical efficiency their studies must culminate in a discernment of the times and in a knowledge of the truths and methods that will meet their demands.

The following suggestions on the social trend are offered as worthy of especial consideration in connection with the practical needs of the ministry:

1. The prominence given to social themes does not involve a depreciation of the individual or neglect of the means which aim at his salvation. The value of the individual is heightened by making him a social factor and a social force. The individual left to himself becomes a savage; as he receives his culture through society, so he can exert his best powers only by influencing society. The society which is composed of individuals exists for individuals no less than the in-

dividuals exist for the society whose members they are. But the demand is imperative that the individuals be socialized, that their personality be cultivated for social relations and duties, and that the passion for humanity be so developed as to destroy the base elements of selfishness and egotism. The true view is that which seeks the culture of the individual in the culture of society, and the culture of society in the culture of the individual.

2. The social movement is constructive. If heretofore it has been strong in its exposures of evils, and critical and negative in its attitude toward existing institutions, the reason is that heretofore its work has been chiefly of a preparatory character. The rubbish is removed for the sake of laying the foundation and rearing a new structure. So far as the social trend is healthy it conserves whatever of truth and goodness and beauty the past has evolved into the present; it is preeminently cumulative. But by holding fast what we have, we are also taught to stretch forth into that which is before. It emphasizes society; it beholds in it a realm for new explorations; it claims that there are forces unused and possibilities unrealized; and it asks that what belongs to society shall be given to society. Social progress is the watchword, but a social progress which involves the progress of all the social factors and forces.

3. The social trend has brought into prominence certain subjects which no man who wants to work most efficiently for the age can afford to neglect. The social differences are thrust on our attention everywhere. They must be explained and justified or removed. There is no alternative between justification or eradication. Poverty has become a burning question, and society is becoming conscious of its responsibility in the matter and of its duty for the removal of the causes. Wealth has likewise become a problem of vast importance. Is it a summit which keeps the sunlight from flooding the valleys,

or is it a beacon for the illumination and guidance of humanity?

4. It may not be possible for our busy pastors to become sociological specialists, but they can appropriate the valuable results of specialists. No apology can be made for a pulpit which attributes to Divine Providence the crimes and evils which are due to social neglect and social arrangement, and for which society must be held accountable. As well attribute to God the depravity of man. The rich social teachings of the New Testament lead us to expect our pastors and churches to be in the van of all good and true social movements. Political economy has overcome the brutal theory that business is subject wholly to natural law, that men are slaves of its necessity, and that fate itself is to blame for the selfishness which dominates industrial pursuits. It has shown that the whole man enters business, that his personality can be free and dominant in economic affairs, and that he can use his occupation for the noblest personal ends. What shall we say, in view of this, when a minister rises before a religious body of high intellectual standing and declares that the production, distribution, and exchange of wealth are subject to "laws founded on selfishness," and that these are as "inevitable and inexorable as laws of planetary motion"? This is surprising in the light of the progress made in economic science since the middle of the century, and it is astounding that the audience had the heart to cheer the statement. In *The International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1895, Hon. Carroll D. Wright says: "Political economy has undergone almost a revolution in the changes which have been brought into it from the standpoint of ethics. . . . The recognition of the power of moral forces in all that pertains to the accumulation and the distribution of wealth is recent, and with three or four exceptions the writers of this country, as well as those of England and the Continent, are sha-

ping their views to take on the higher thought, stimulated by ethics."

5. The preacher who wants to meet the needs of the awakened social consciousness must bring Christ's social doctrines and ethics into direct contact with human affairs. Our dark earthly relations need the bright light of the Gospel. The theory of Christian brotherhood, the doctrine that he is most our neighbor who needs us most, and the kingdom of God as the unity and fellowship of all believers, must be made a reality and actuality. "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren."

Papers on Social Science and Comparative Religion.

BY REV. B. F. KIDDER, PH. D.

X.—THE SOCIAL EVIL AND THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE IN FRANCE.

SHALL we speak out; or, with a weak sentimentalism, sometimes mistaken for modesty, must we hold our peace while the leprosy is spreading in the social body? The social evil is a leprosy whose rot is deeper and whose contagion is more to be feared than any other whose walking representatives were ever compelled, in the interest of public safety, to shun the wholesome streams and to cry, "Unclean! unclean!" Christian sociology cannot remain silent in the presence of this evil.

The question, however, is not what would be an ideal condition of society, but what does society owe, in a practical way, to its present and its future constituency? Various answers have been given to this question by different (nominally) Christian States.

The attitude of the French Republic toward the social evil, which we are to consider in this paper, is not unique. The same position is held by other countries of Continental Europe, and is not without its advocates in America. But France stands as a foremost representative of the policy, and her social life shows its fruit in the most unmistakable way.

The policy, in a word, is that of tolerance and State supervision. Under this régime, any woman who so chooses may abandon herself to immorality. Under certain restrictions, she may, with the full consent and protection of the State, entice any man to debauchery. The law requires that "every woman who gives herself *notoriously* to prostitution shall be considered a public maid and registered as such." This enrolment is usually voluntary, but it may be compulsory in the case of those who are manifestly living in debauchery, or who have several times been arrested for immoral conduct, or who are affected with contagious maladies.

The most important of the regulations to which the women of this class are subjected is that which compels them, at least once every two weeks, to submit to medical examination. When one is found to be infected with a loathsome disease, she is placed in the hospital for treatment. The obvious and avowed purpose of this policy is not in any sense the suppression of social vice, but its regulation, with special reference to the general public decency and the checking of contagious disease.

The redeeming feature of this State brothel is generally supposed to be its sanitary regulations. And it is this feature which has led certain so-called "liberals" in social sentiment to urge its adoption in our own midst. But there are many phases of this policy.

1. The ultimate results of this system, even from the sanitary point of view, may be gravely questioned. The terrible vengeance which nature metes out to promiscuity does not lightly turn aside at the beck of medical skill. As a matter of fact, loathsome contagions prevail in spite of State supervision—possibly to a lesser degree than otherwise would be the case, although the friends of the system have been unable to show that the opposite is not the rather true. The greater prevalence of vice, because made easy and apparently safe, is a factor of tremendous import. Mr. Alfred S. Dyer,

of London, is authority for the statement that private diseases rapidly increased among the English soldiers in India after the introduction into camp of licensed harlots, although these women were under the strictest supervision of the army medical staff. For example, in 1871 there were 196 diseased men to every thousand soldiers, and in 1885 the proportion had risen to 342 per thousand.

2. The chief of the bureau having in charge the licensing of prostitutes is authority for the statement that the total number of *filles publiques* at Paris is from 5,000 to 5,500. When I asked him if these were all the harlots there were in the city, he of course said no. There is not the slightest reason to believe that they number one fifth of the professionally immoral women in the French capital. They simply represent the lower class of the professionally evil. And whatever may be the advantage of their periodic inspection by State physicians, it is certain that the measure provides for only a mere fraction of the whole number of those whose "feet take hold on (physical as well as moral) hell."

3. Many, both men and women, commit uncleanness when the way is made easy who would be saved from it if the way was hedged up and the ideal of a pure life was kept constantly before them. No sane man can say, "It makes no difference what laws you pass, about so many people will be vile." The pernicious influence of obscene literature is alone sufficient to prove that vice is not a fixed quantity. No conflagration is capable of spreading with greater rapidity or more terrible consequences than that which is kindled by human passion.

No fire department was ever yet able to prevent fires altogether; yet its service to the community has been invaluable. Licensed prostitution dismisses the fire brigade and puts the match into the hands of the incendiary. It says, practically, to the man who would make himself vile: "You have the

State's permission to consort with vile women to your heart's content. We have reduced the danger of contracting disease to a minimum, and have done all in our power to make the way of the transgressor easy." It says, in like manner, to the vile woman, "You have the State's permission to corrupt her sons."

4. A still more serious charge must be brought against licensed prostitution. Not only the welfare of the immediate transgressors, but also the moral welfare of the whole community is at stake. While it is true that political and social institutions, at least in a republic, are an expression of the general intellectual and moral average of the people, it is also true that the sentiments of any people are shaped largely by their established institutions. The man who was reared in the South before the war believed in slavery. Why? Not because slavery was right in itself, but because the State had made it right, and had incorporated it into the very warp and woof of Southern society. He nursed pro-slavery milk at his mother's breast. He breathed the atmosphere of pro-slavery sentiment in the home, the school, the church. He saw slavery in operation on every hand, and his moral sensibilities were blinded to its horrors. He ridiculed whoever would not hold slaves. He grew desperately angry when told that he must not hold them. France furnishes the dark counterpart of this picture in the realm of morals. The State has given its sanction to that against which nature (nature's God) has pronounced a curse. The children of France grow up in the shadow of the temple of lust—licensed immorality. They breathe its atmosphere; its example is ever before them. They come to regard it as a part of life's program.

Is this statement too strong? Is the picture overdrawn? The half has not been told. In the French capital, moral lapse on the part of young men is regarded by "society" as "matter of

course," and so-called "best families" stand ready to give their daughters in marriage to men who are known to be impure. In the language of a gentleman in high official position: "*Een adultery is no hindrance to a man's social standing, if there is no public scandal connected with it.*"

There are of course noble exceptions, but they are comparatively few. One member of the Chamber of Deputies has had the moral courage to raise his voice in behalf of social purity, but he has suffered endless ridicule and persecution. The general public conscience seems to be "scared with a hot iron."

France does not stand altogether alone, although perhaps no other country in times past ever went to quite such lengths in attempting to rule God out of the social body. It is significant that those other States which have pursued the same general policy with France in regard to the social evil have reaped similar results of a degraded moral sense. It may be said that a deadened moral sense has the rather given rise to the licensing of vice. It would be, in a measure, true to say that the two have slumped into the quicksands of hell together, each pulling the other down.

Those countries which outlaw vice also have their plague-spots; but they have a *conscience*. It is no more a declaration of Scripture than of the universal moral consciousness that "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." The moving of that Spirit in the human breast is conscience, the mightiest safeguard of individuals and of nations.

We may not secure ideal conditions. The great question is, What practical policy should society pursue? What does the State owe to her own present and future well-being as touching the social evil? The general answer must be: *It is the duty of the State to make manhood and womanhood as secure as possible.*

To be more specific:

1. *The first great duty of the State toward her children is to treat them impartially.* The crying injustice and shame of boasted civilization, not only in France but in every other country of the world, is that society has created a double standard of morals, one for men and another for women. The prime reason for this is that woman, as yet, has been only partially liberated from her old pagan bondage.

Her assumed inferiority has given rise to many a double standard, one of the most practically cruel of which is her unequal wage for equal service. This alone places her at a terrible disadvantage in the struggle for existence. She often seems to have no alternative except to starve and let those dependent upon her starve, or to sacrifice her honor. And the diabolical selfishness of lust may safely be classed among the motives which operate against granting her a just wage.

Society's obligation to impartiality does not end with the matter of demanding for woman an equal wage for equal service. That is but one of a thousand particulars. Society is also recreant to justice when she treats an erring daughter any more severely than an erring son. A female leper is no more dangerous to the community than a male leper; and, when the taint is moral, the male leper, being the stronger of the two, should be the object of the greater loathing. And why does not such a condition of affairs exist as a matter of fact? Partly because men make the laws and manage affairs in the interest of their own selfishness, and more largely because the general moral sense has been demoralized by false standards and by ages of woman's degradation and semi-slavery.

2. It is the duty of society to cooperate with nature in every possible way by putting the highest premium on right conduct and by hedging up, as far as possible, the way of transgression. Fornication should be kept under the curse where the Creator has

placed it; but honorable marriage should be encouraged.

I do not know how far the severity of the marriage laws in France may operate against marital unions, but their influence must be considerable.

3. Whatever it may or may not be possible to accomplish as an immediate result in the social body, it should be the State's first concern to keep right ideals before the minds of its youths. By a universal law of the human mind, a man's ideals shape both his character and his destiny. The State recognizes this law in at least one of its operations. Treasonable speech or conduct is nowhere tolerated. Every country seeks to cultivate, as absolutely essential to its perpetuity, the highest patriotism in its youths. It does this by keeping the highest ideals constantly before their minds. Promiscuity, fornication, prostitution, is treason against society's citadel, the home; treason against society's very walls and bulwarks, righteousness; treason against nature, treason against God. Wo be to that community which deliberately sacrifices the flower and ideal of social purity, without which not only can the State's fairest fruit never be realized, but its very stock is doomed to rot.

It is not usual with God to leave His people frequently to relapse into enormities . . . yet He does leave His choicest ones frequently to relapse into infirmities. . . . And though gracious souls strive against, complain of, and weep over these, yet the Lord, to keep them humble, leaves them oftentimes to such relapses; but they shall never be their bane, because they are their burden.—*T. Brooks.*

A TRUE believer is righteous by the righteousness of another; he lives by the life of another; he is acted on by the spirit of another; and, therefore, he, of any man in the world, should have least of self in him.—*Erskine.*

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

Fair Play for Catholic Christians.

BY JOHN TALBOT SMITH, NEW YORK CITY.

[It has always been the aim of the HOMILETIC REVIEW to be absolutely accurate in its statements and fair in its criticisms. Great care has invariably been taken to render its assertions reliable. On the basis of what was regarded as credible information certain declarations were made in the January number to which exceptions are taken in the article published herewith. Truth is the first essential. What we want are facts. We therefore cheerfully give to our correspondent the space necessary for the presentation of his side of the case, simply stating that under no circumstances will we consciously permit in our pages any statement not strictly true.—*Editors.*]

It is an admitted axiom in controversy that each party is entitled to fair play from its opponents, which means that its arguments shall be heard and its case examined by the rules of truth, not prejudice. This fair play has rarely been extended to the Catholic Christians of the United States by those who have thought it their duty to denounce them and their faith. In the immense amount of criticism poured upon us from pulpit, press, and platform, the percentage of falsehood, misrepresentation, and misunderstanding has been very large—so large, in fact, that its size can only be explained by the supposition of meager preparation for criticism on the part of the critics. Intelligent and honest criticism has a beneficial influence, and we Catholics have not shrunk from it, but rather invited it. We are more than certain of our ability to withstand any test it may bring; certain, too, that the more honest and searching it is the more friendly will be the critic to us thereafter. We have never suffered from the people who know our beliefs, standards, achievements, for we secure their respect and admiration, even where they cannot accept our doctrines or admit our contention of having the perfect faith of Christ. We

consider that we have seldom received intelligent criticism from the Protestant Christian leaders in this country, who in spite of their admission that we form, in their theory of Christianity, an integral and important part of the Christian religion, have rarely treated us with the consideration demanded by their own theories.

The bitterness of an opponent can be excused when he is dwelling upon the actual points of difference or antagonism between him and his adversary. Were all controversy in religious matters confined to the real, the disputes would be very few. Catholics do not fret over disputes concerning the form of government in the Christian Church; they insist upon its being a concrete thing, and they are prepared to be opposed by Protestant theologians. What does irritate and amaze us, however, is the eternal controversy over things which have no existence; the everlasting iteration of lies that have been exposed a thousand times; the learned expositions and essays on things supposed to exist in the Catholic body, but existing only in the fancy of essayists. As an illustration of their frequency and variety, take the January number of the HOMILETIC REVIEW. In the extracts from the journal of Dr. Philip Schaff, printed under the title, "Rome Fifty Years Ago," we find the following paragraph: "The Catholic has more of the historical element in his faith and ritual, but he needs very little to be a Christian. The mass suffices. He holds unalterably to the fact, has trusting assurance that at the moment of consecration the miracle of transubstantiation takes place and his sins are forgiven." Dr. Schaff would hardly forgive himself at this moment for these sentences were he living. He fell into three errors of fact. Very much is demanded of the individual Catholic to be a Christian; the mass

does not suffice. No Catholic believes that his sins are forgiven at the moment of consecration. These are the very contradictories of his statements in the journal, yet Mr. Schaff was a conscientious man, and had in his later days a high esteem for Catholics.

In the article by Rev. Joseph Bradley on "Honor to the Holy Ghost," the singular statement is made that "the coming of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost has been completely ignored, as worthy of stated and particular memorial, by the greater part of the Christian Church." The author may have had in his mind simply the Protestant Christians, in which case his entire article would be open to the charge of deficiency, because the entire body of Oriental and Western Catholic Christians observe the feast of Pentecost with a solemnity second to none. In the rituals it is a feast of the first class, with an octave two of whose days are also of the first rank; and as it falls on a Sunday, the Church celebrations are of the grandest. These errors of Dr. Schaff and Mr. Bradley, cited at random, are the errors of honest men, who at the moment were not arguing a case against the Catholic body. What, then, must be the blunders, misrepresentations of those who enter the field of criticism and controversy to conquer and slay without having prepared themselves for a conscientious battle? They cannot be said to have studied the people and the things they are about to attack, for the errors they make are too often patent even to the least informed among the people criticized; and their charges are so vague, so cloudy, such a mixture of truth and error, that brushing away fog with a fork would be a more pleasant task and more profitable than replying to them.

These reflections were forced upon us by the editorial, "Romanism in America," which appeared in the *HOMILETIC REVIEW* for January. Five charges were made in this article

against the Catholic Church in the United States, which it would take a volume to sustain, which have never yet been sustained, and which in our honest belief can never be proved, no matter how clever and convinced may be the special pleader who shall undertake the case. They have been repeated a thousand times, have been denied regularly, have never succeeded in convincing any honest mind of their truth; and yet they never die, never surrender, but run away with the intention to fight another day. We are weary answering them. We assert our innocence in vain. At the same time they give us a certain consolation: if no better case than these charges indicate can be made out against us, we are forever safe. They give us also a certain suspicion that our opponents need these things for the destroying of a legitimate interest in our doctrines. We have confidence in our religion, we feel certain it would attract; but we know it will never attract the American while he believes it the enemy of the American Government. These five charges are:

1. With steadfast persistence and increasing success, Rome has been seeking to obtain master-hold upon the Government of the United States.

2. She has used her ecclesiastical power to control the votes of her members, and thus secure official position for those who support her claims.

3. She has laid her hand upon municipal, State, and national treasuries, and enriched herself at the public expense, coercing those who are hostile to her into an unwilling support of her institutions, educational, eleemosynary, and other.

4. In not a few cities her great cathedrals and churches, her protectories and hospitals, stand on ground for which she has paid nothing, or but a nominal price.

5. In New York City six Roman Catholic institutions received, from 1883 to 1893, fifteen times as much

money as all the Protestant institutions together.

Let us now examine these five charges as closely as limited space will permit. They are all taken for granted by their author, as if the case had been settled by the Supreme Court; but Roman Catholics enter a flat denial to each and all, and ask for the proofs, which no living being has ever yet seen. They are fictions or visions.

1. We deny that Rome has been seeking to get a master-hold on this Government. Where is the evidence? We are one seventh of the population, and by right we ought to have one seventh of the representation in the legislatures, State and national; one seventh of the official positions, foreign and domestic; one seventh of the educational offices, one member of the cabinet, and one out of every seven presidents. If there were no thought of Rome at election times, as there is no thought of the Methodist bishops or of any other religious body, we might have that representation. If we had been seeking to get a hold on the Government at any time within the last ten years, we might now be near our lawful proportion. Perhaps we get one place in twenty out of all positions in the gift of the people and the Government: these we are compelled to earn. For the most part all high executive offices are closed to the Catholic; so are the foreign missions. Had we more than our share—had we one place in six, for example—men might find color for a charge of power-grabbing; but while for our faith we are deprived of our lawful and natural representation in the government of the land, this particular charge is ridiculous. But let the accusers bring on the proofs.

2. We deny that the Church has used her ecclesiastical power to control the votes of her members, and thus to secure official position for those who support her claims. It has been very clear to the public for the last few

years that no body of clergymen has such a record for non-interference in politics as the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church. Neither in the pulpit, nor in the press, nor on the platform have they favored any man's candidacy, or any party platform. Had they done so in all parts of the nation, steadily and regularly, we might now have a just share in the Government, and Catholic Christians might be filling the places now held by atheists and blatant Ingersollites, who are so often preferred before us. The clergy have carefully refrained from interference, even when attacked unjustly, as in the recent Constitutional Convention. They left it to the laity to defend the interests of the Catholic body, and suffered much injury rather than offend their own traditions. Let the accusers bring on the proofs.

3. We deny that the Church has taken anything not her own from the public treasury, or enriched herself at the public expense, or coerced her opponents into unwilling support of her institutions. Where is the evidence? On grounds of conscience, we have built up a school system for our children which educates a million children. We pay for them, and the treasury is thus much in pocket. We pay again for the support of the public schools; therefore, it is we, not our opponents, who are coerced into unwilling support. In New York State our schools save the public treasury \$32,000,000 annually, and we are taxed besides for the public schools. We have built up a charitable system, at immense expense and labor, which looks after at least one hundred and fifty thousand needy souls; we have saved the country the expense of supporting them. In a few cities like New York, few and far between indeed, the State or municipal government has graciously deigned to recognize the work of charity by financial aid, which has

never amounted to more than one third of the sums expended for the needy. Having thus saved the city of New York \$16,000,000 in five years, not counting the cost of buildings, we are accused of rapacity because the said city gave us back five and a half millions of it. This is the explanation of the fifth charge, and the answer to it. It is easy to print the statement that six Catholic institutions of New York in five years received fifteen times as much money as all the Protestant institutions put together. We answer that by the countercharge that every public institution in the State is a Protestant institution as far as the Catholic is concerned. These public refuges do not minister to any Catholic need; the Protestant service is used in all their public sacred offices; the chaplain, paid by the State, is always and only a Protestant minister; it is only by official favor that a Catholic priest exercises any Catholic function therein. It is of no use to tell us that these are non-sectarian institutions; we cannot see the *non* through the prominence of the *sectarian*. Consequently we do not recognize the comparison of six Catholic institutions with the few charitable corporations under Episcopal or other control as legitimate; and if these few corporations refuse State aid, our contention would be still as lawful and strong as at this moment.

4. We deny, finally, that our cathedrals and churches in not a few cities, our protectories and hospitals, stand on ground for which little or nothing has been paid. This is an allusion to an old lie that has been tramping over the land for years, and has all the brass, vitality, and raggedness of the American social and psychological puzzle, Weary Watkins. In New York City, its particular form is the charge that the site of St. Patrick's Cathedral was slyly stolen from the municipality. Again and again this story of robbery has been paraded in the public eye, and as often exposed as a lie. The

history of the cathedral site is briefly this: One Robert Sylburn bought it from the city in 1799 for £405; the same Sylburn in 1810 conveyed it to one Francis Thompson by deed; within a month Francis Thompson conveyed it by deed to Andrew Morris and Cornelius Heeney; these two owned it for eleven years, and then conveyed it by deed to Dennis Doyle, with an encumbrance in the shape of a mortgage to the Eagle Insurance Company; this mortgage was foreclosed in 1828 by a decree of the vice-chancellor, and sold to one Francis Cooper for \$5,500, by a deed dating from November, 1828; nearly two months later Francis Cooper transferred the property to the trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral and the trustees of St. Peter's Church for a like sum, plus the interest for two months. Thus thirty years elapsed from the time the city relinquished ownership of the site to one of its own citizens until it came into the hands of Catholic ecclesiastics as Church property. In the mean time it had passed through the hands of five owners, and each had paid the price asked, demanded, or accepted by the previous owner. All this is on record, as the corporation counsel, Mr. Henry Beekman, recently testified; and the first promoter of the falsehood had only to go through the public records to have saved himself from a crime.

From the above statements it can be seen that we Catholics have suffered not a little from the hardness or carelessness of men who believe, with us, in the divinity of Jesus Christ; who recognize, with us, no salvation except through Him; who call, as we do, upon the names of the ever-blessed Trinity; who hope for everlasting life, with all the elect, in the presence of God. Fair play for Catholics is, therefore, in order, and we demand it as Christians. There is plenty to differ about without taking up the lies and misrepresentations sent abroad by the ignorant, the foolish, or the malicious. The enemy

that now threatens man, and society, and religion, is atheism and anarchy. Is it not time to turn the strength of Christianity on this foe, and let controversy end at least until the danger is gone by? And if discussion must still continue, why not confine it to the essentials, to the real and true differences? The cause of truth is not served by charging one's neighbor with crimes of which he is innocent, and then building up a denunciation of him on that false foundation.

Church Work in England—The Social Question.*

BY GENERAL WILLIAM BOOTH, FOUNDER OF THE SALVATION ARMY.

THE condition of the English Church, generally speaking, is very much the same as the condition of the American Church; but, taking the same Church membership, I am inclined to think that there is a better profession of religion in the United States than there is in England—a much more vocalized acknowledgment of the theory and application of Christianity. But when you come to that which, in my estimation, constitutes the essence of religion—*i. e.*, the life of God in the soul of man manifested by a holy life, a true spirit of devotion and self-sacrificing effort in the interest of the kingdom of God—I should say that there was quite as much religion in the churches of England as there is in the churches of America.

There is a great deal of church work being done by the Church of England. It is at the front in every manner of religious energy, and in its efforts to utilize its spiritual power among those who come under its ministrations.

In that branch of the Church of England called the "High Church" there are two sections: there is a ritualistic and worldly section, and there is a self-denying, ascetic section, whose leanings you might imagine (though that is not for me to say) are toward

the Roman Catholic organization. But in this class you will find some of the most self-sacrificing, laborious servants of humanity, workers among the poor and unfortunate, that can be found in the whole of England.

The great tendency of the Church in my country, as in America, I should say, is toward a theory of religion: "Go to church and believe the Gospel as it is laid down to you by the clergyman, but you can do as you like when you go out into the world." In other words, the Church is tainted very much with worldliness.

I think that the great want of the churches everywhere is a realization of the spirit of Jesus Christ, and the manifestation of it in the lives and souls of men. Such a spirit would lead us all out to be soul-savers. Such a spirit prevailing universally among Christians would, spiritually speaking, turn the world upside down. Animated by this spirit, the Christians could take possession of the world at once. My mind runs largely in the direction of the constructive. I believe that Christians should apply their belief to the practical concerns of life. Let one man live the right life himself and then induce some one else to do the same.

The sermons given by our English clergymen, I should think, as far as ability and intelligence go, were on a par with those delivered by the clergy in America. But my opportunities for judging as to this matter are quite limited. I only know, with any degree of intimacy, the British leaders; but I have no doubt that the average preacher in England is up to the standard of the average preacher in America.

Comparisons on this subject, however, might be taken to be unfair, because you must remember the enormous quantity of ground that has had to be covered in the United States. No doubt you have often had to make use of very raw material to start the religious force in certain parts of your great land, and this was very useful before

* Interview with George J. Manson.

the more finished product of a higher standard came to hand. According to the ordinary Church method of viewing the ministry, a man must have a certain amount of intellectual ability before he can call sinners to repentance. According to my idea, let a man be full of the Holy Ghost, understand that he is to preach Christ, and then let him pour out his soul in his work of bringing sinners to the Saviour. Small difference it makes whether his language is according to the most approved style, or his sentences formed in compliance with the rules of grammar.

Among the nonconformist churches in England there is a great deal of activity on the lines of church activity in this country. There are all kinds of societies, like the Christian Endeavor and imitations of the Salvation Army. In organizing these last-named bodies some of the preachers think that they have got the good qualities of the Salvation Army and left out what they consider objectionable features. They seem to think that they are going on to perfection, leaving us far behind. Of course I hold a different opinion.

It occurs to me that what the churches ought to do is to help me. Instead of appropriating my ideas—instead of copying the methods of the Salvation Army—why not help me in the work in which I am engaged, which is beyond a doubt enormous in character, and which certainly requires all the strength and ability that one or a dozen leaders can bring to it? Many of the clergy have treated me like a Christmas turkey on a spit—they have turned me round and round, and have simply looked on admiringly while I was cooking.

In regard to the social question, it may be said that a spirit of discontent has existed among the poorer classes in England about as far back as I can remember. This spirit has been steadily growing, and it is now in a transition state. The great army of the discontented is traveling toward the

goal of organization. When this vast body becomes thoroughly organized, under able leaders, I can only prophesy that unless society does something to satisfy the demands of these people, there will be such an upheaval as the world has seldom seen. It is singular how quiet the great mass of people are in view of the present social condition and the demands of the poorer classes. The mass of people in all countries have not only become aware of the fact that they have wrongs which require redressing, but they are determined to have them redressed. It will be a sad day for the peace of society unless the various governments institute legislation which shall ameliorate the condition of this class of people. But the great mass of citizens seem to have no gift of foresight: they seem to be living in a fool's paradise. In nearly every land they have put the power of governing in the hands of the people. It only remains for the people to learn how to use it.

It is to be feared that the right, or privilege, of universal suffrage will land them so far ahead toward the accomplishment of their wishes that, when their natural rights have been attained by this method, after that will come—the Deluge. They will get beyond the voting stage and they will come to use force. While they stick to votes not very much harm will come. The mere placing of a social democrat at the top will not matter so much; but when you come to put the aristocrat, the refined and wealthy republican, at the bottom, that will be a very unpleasant change for society. Still, as long as you stuck to votes, that would not mean the destruction of society. The trouble is that in all such movements in the past, as I read history, they have gone beyond that. If they had done nothing but vote in the French Revolution, it would probably have soon come to an end and without any reign of terror.

The cause of the social trouble is poverty. As I have said elsewhere:

"Here is John Jones, a stout, stalwart laborer in rags, who has not had one square meal for a month, who has been hunting for work that will enable him to keep body and soul together, and hunting in vain. There he is in his hungry ruggedness, asking for work that he may live, and not die of sheer starvation in the midst of the wealthiest city of the world. What is to be done with John Jones?" Society, by its peculiar methods, is breeding the submerged classes, the destructive classes. You put Jones in prison if he steals a loaf of bread, but he had no notion of committing the deed until his necessities forced him to it. While he is in need of something to eat he sees men

about him living in ease and luxury. The conditions to which I have just alluded are very much stronger in foreign countries than they are in the United States. The conditions of working and living are far better in America than they are in England and on the continent.

If the rich did their full duty to the poor, they would not be so rich and Jones would not be so poor. The rich would give away more of their wealth. A man should make all the money he can honestly, and save all he can with due regard to the necessities of others. He should give away all that he can to those who have not been favored as he has been.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

Lying in the Pulpit.

HARD words? Is it ever done? Well, what *shall* we call it when a man deliberately states as true what he is perfectly aware is not true?

The writer heard a preacher tell this story:

He [the story-telling preacher] was attending a little boy in his last sickness. The end was near. Heaven was beyond, but great mountains between. The little sufferer pleaded, "Who will carry me over the mountains?" and no one answered. The child turned his face to the wall, and in a little while turned back with a sweet smile and said, "Mamma, Jesus will carry me over the mountains."

Now the first question is, what were that minister and that mother (a lovely Christian woman, of course) about, to let the little boy struggle through unaided while they stood by (bathed in tears) and *neither of them mentioned the name of Jesus?*

But the second point is that the story is older than the man who told it, hav-

ing been printed in a tract of respectable, if not venerable, antiquity. When a man appropriates an ancient incident to his own personality and says, "I was there, and it happened to *me*," when he knows perfectly well that he was *not* there, and it did *not* happen to him, I consider it lying—and the worst kind of lying, because uttered in the most sacred place.

I have actually known a young preacher to defend this kind of thing. He thought it "made the incident more lifelike." Well, Jesus never thought so. He was content to say, "A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho," "A certain man had two sons," and what have the ages found those matchless stories to lack?

But this dishonest impersonation has grave dangers. A respectable man told me the following incident: "I went," he said, "to hear a certain revivalist, and he told a story of his own experience, that when he was a boy he fell into a well. His father let down a rope to him, which he caught, and pulled him up till he nearly reached

the plank platform which projected inward, and over which his hands could not be drawn without losing their hold of the rope. The father reached one hand over, and said, 'Let go the rope with one hand, my boy, and take my hand, and I will save you.' Sequel: mental struggle, *faith*, and deliverance.

"I was very much impressed," said my informant; "but in the afternoon of that same Sunday I went over to another town and heard another evangelist, who told the same story of the same thing happening to *him* when *he* was a boy. Then I made up my mind they were both liars, and I wanted nothing to do with either of them."

In these days of rapid communication the thing is even unsafe. Let us "dare to be true," and hold it good pulpit oratory to be as impersonal as the Master when we relate an experience not our own.

TRUTH-LOVER.

The Dusty Books.

As I sit in my study-chair and look at the case of books before me, I cannot but notice some standard works that have dust on them. They are on the higher shelves, which often escape the notice of the dustcloth. Every minister who reads this article will be able to tell the reason for the dust. It is because I have not the time to read as much as I should like and do justice to the many details of an active ministry. There is dust on some of the volumes of Schaff's "History of the Christian Church." Certainly such a work should be read by every minister many times. I am reading it when opportunity is afforded for the purpose of preaching a series of evening sermons on the life and progress of the Church. But two hours a day to read, in addition to study for sermonizing, is too little for the mastering of such an excellent work.

A little dust on the works of John Owen. I know many ministers are not fond of the above-mentioned author. At times he is very dry and verbose. But I like John because he goes to the

bottom of a subject and leaves it. It is easy to put the top on a subject.

I notice a little dust on the works of Charnock. They are good for a minister to read. The author was a fine student, and gives an excellent explanation of the subjects treated. Such reading makes one fat.

A little dust on the Hebrew Bible. There is no question that if one would obtain a knowledge of the Old Testament, he must be a student of the Hebrew. Those who have studied the language know that it is one of the most charming. I will keep the dust from it by using it more than ever.

The Greek Testament has a little dust on it. Some say that it is more important to have a knowledge of Greek than Hebrew. I cannot assent to that. I think that one is just as necessary as the other. Happy is the man who has the time to read both.

Strange to say, there is no dust on my working Bible. A minister's Bible, above all others, should be kept free from dust. I am very fond of outlining the books of the Bible and making references of different kinds. While many other books get dusty and remain so for a time, this one is kept clean. No active minister of the Word can read as much as he would like: all he can do is to read what he can and let the rest go; but time should always be found for the reading of God's Word, for the study of that Book. From it we get, or should get, our sermons. It is the rule of life. The more we keep the dust from it by hard study the easier it will be to prepare sermons and deliver them, the more joy we shall find in God's service, the more satisfaction in life. Dear brother minister, let no dust be found on your working Bible. Get one that you can use, and use it. A wide margin is the best.

CHARLES L. PALMER.

OAKLAND, N. J.

The Free-Few System.

I SEE by the press that Rev. Dr. Lindsay Parker, rector of St. Peter's

Church, Brooklyn, gives up the fight in favor of the free-pew system, after having tested it for nine years. Dr. Parker, in announcing the failure of the plan, took for his text Psa. lxxvi. 1, "We are like them that dream." He said: "We have dreamed our dream and had our vision, and now we have awakened to the hard and unmistakable and most cruel fact, and we are willing to acknowledge it, that it is all a dream and is not to be fulfilled. Our cherished ideal is not possible to realize."

Is it then true that the free-pew system is a failure? Can we not have an "exchange of views" in THE HOMILETIC, in which ministerial brethren in different parts of the country who have tested the free-pew system and found it a success will participate? Will not these brethren tell us just how they made it succeed? This talk of Dr. Parker's seems to me like turning the hands back on the dial of time. There must be a way by which the Church will stop its drifting toward the Fifth Avenues of our cities, and farther and farther away from the Five Points. The poor heard Christ gladly; and that was the evidence that he gave

that He was the Christ, and that His Gospel was from above. Year by year it is becoming truer and truer that the rich hear the Gospel and the poor are hearing it less and less. Let us have an exchange of views along this line.

A CLERGYMAN.

The Financial Credit of Ministers.

RECENTLY I noticed the statement in one of our daily papers that legal action was contemplated by the creditors of a certain minister in order to compel him to pay his debts. If this is not mere idle rumor, and there is any good basis for the statement, then is the case a shameful one, and one that is a reproach to the ministry at large. Sensitiveness in the matter of financial credit cannot be too fine. Indifference here betokens a condition of honeycombed morals. No man can expect other men to put any confidence in his word as a preacher of righteousness who gives them ground to fear that they can have no confidence in his promise to pay his debts. The place for a repudiating minister is certainly not in the ministry.

A DEBT-PAYING MINISTER.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

The Divorce of Capital and Labor.

BY REV. LYMAN EDWIN DAVIS,
ALBANY, N. Y.

The eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you.—1 Cor. xii. 21.

In the building of the pyramid of Khufu 360,000 men were worked for twenty years, and their only remuneration was the food they consumed while engaged at the great task. Three hundred and sixty million days' work and

no wages! No agitation then about higher pay and shorter hours, for the labor market was as yet only the slave-market. And the relations of capital and labor appear very plainly in the fact that ancient historians ignore the individuality of the workman, computing the cost of the pyramids not from the pay-rolls of the taskmaster, but simply from the cost of feeding the myriad slaves who performed the work. Who shall write the tragedies which underlie that most ignoble of world-wonders, an Egyptian pyramid?

And what was the purpose of all the

heartless sacrifice? The story is told by the finding of one narrow crypt, hid beneath this mountain of rock, six hundred feet below the apex and some thirty feet above the level of the Nile, and in that narrow cell the dishonored dust of a forgotten king. The one man, claiming ownership of men and things alike, trod upon the prostrate millions in his vain effort to reach after a historical and carnal immortality.

But that Egyptian extreme was, after all, only a slightly exaggerated type of the conditions which prevailed throughout all the ancient world. In all nations capital wore the crown, wielded the sword, boasted the jewels, ate the viands; labor bore the lash, the burden, the yoke, the shame.

All relations are changed, however, with the coming of the Christ to the hearts and enterprises of men, and

"Labor is a curse no more,
Since He whose name we breathe with awe
The coarse mechanic's vesture wore;
A poor man toiling with the poor,
In labor as in prayer fulfilling the same law."

The aim of capital is to create wealth; but we must not forget that all wealth is the pro-creation of capital and labor. In the typical community, therefore, we find capital going forth into all the markets of humanity seeking an alliance with labor, and always finding labor on the threshold in the attitude of offering itself to capital. The immediate aim of labor is self-preservation, all that labor can get in most countries being simply enough to feed the laborer to-day and make him equal to the work of to-morrow. But when labor is educated to the higher interests and the higher privileges of civilization, as in these times, the laboring man will show a laudable ambition for the creation of wealth; first, because the greater the amount of capital, presupposing a sense of security and a spirit of enterprise, the greater will be the demand for labor and the higher its reward; but preeminently because the laborer hopes, by industry and frugality, to acquire a little capi-

tal for himself by and by. How sweet the reflection, how honorable the hope, indulged by every child of toil that he, too, may have a few hundred days' labor bottled up in the shape of a few hundred dollars, and that, in misfortune or old age, he will have only to pour out this embodiment of labor and enjoy it! And every one who saves enough money to buy the labor of a single day instead of having to do it with his own hands is to that extent a capitalist, for capital is nothing more than accumulated labor; it is muscular energy and nerve-force stored up for future outlay. For this reason philosophers who have gone to the depths of the subject have vividly defined capital as being simply "abstinence."

And now, remembering the tumultuous controversies of the past, what will contribute to better understanding, what will bring about a permanent alliance, between these component forces of material civilization? It is always easier, of course, to approach the problem negatively and shake our heads at whatever does not afford a solution of the problem. Idle covetousness will never solve the problem: covetousness is simply theft unrealized for want of opportunity. Envy will not relieve the situation: envy is simply violence unrealized from fear of punishment. Vanity is the most impotent of all passions: vanity is only oppression unrealized for want of power.

In considering four of the many conflicting remedies proposed, let us take them in the order of social development from the plane of human opinion to the heights of Christian thought; and we then have *the commune*, the *strike* of the trade-union and the *trades-union*, the *law of cooperation*, and the *gospel of obligation*.

Let us see what communism will do, beginning with its proposed redistribution of property. Here is a group of men representing all the degrees of fortune and misfortune running through

human society. The banker comes from Wall Street with \$100,000 in hand, and by prearrangement he meets the lumber merchant from Albany who brings \$50,000, and the farmer from Long Island who contributes \$30,000. These three men convene in the Board of Trade rooms and organize a commune and resolve to restore the equality of nature by dividing their capital, which leaves them \$60,000 each. But just as they are about to disperse with feelings of philanthropic pride, three Knights of Labor come in and say: "We too belong to this fellowship of nature. We have no capital to bestow, but bring our contribution of brains and muscle to the commune, and we claim another redistribution." As sincere apostles of their own theory, the charter members of the society must acquiesce, and the six adjourn with \$30,000 apiece. Down by the police station, however, they meet six tramps, who clamor for another redistribution. "We are not very creditable in appearance and we belong to the non-producing class," they say; "but we are nevertheless members of society. Divide up!"

And so the circle of membership and of redistribution enlarges. The rich make their mutual agreement, and the toiling poor present their righteous claims; the idle vagrant makes his insolent demand; the wicked highwayman appeals to the law of force, and so vested rights and industry must admit indolence and crime to the same general partnership.

That is communism; and it is impracticable as well as pernicious for three reasons, among others. First, the same law which would compel the capitalist to share his fortune with the Knight of Labor would also compel the laborer to share his day's wages with the tramp, would even compel the tramp to share his beggarly crust with the midnight robber. Again, capital represents not only the genius of wealth-creation, but ancestral generations of industry and frugality, the

basis of almost every fortune resting back at last upon the daily manual toil of some remote grandfather of the heir, who hoards or righteously uses or squanders it to-day. Once more, if a just and acceptable distribution were temporarily made, the problem still lies as before, for one of the community will discover or develop a genius for money-getting, and somehow in convolutions of society this art of wealth-creation will beat down all barriers and absorb the property of others. And even the man who displays a wealth of manhood, whether it is the industry typical of the French, or the commercial tact peculiar to the English, or the frugality exemplified by the Germans, or the enterprise which takes hold of all nationalities in America, those who manifest superiority will doubtless claim the rewards of excellence.

The trade-union represents a higher phase of development than the commune, and the strike, sustained by the mutual sympathy of the toiling multitude, may sometimes solve the problem of a moment and be a just rebuke to injustice and a timely relief to the oppressed.

But it grows out of conditions which should not obtain in a Christian community. Labor says to Capital: "In this work of wealth-creation you are getting more than your share of the reward. Wages ought to be so increased that when you go from comforts to luxuries I may at least go from bare necessities to comforts. And if you will not accede to my demands, I will muster all my forces out of the market. Your wheels shall stand still in every engine-house and every water-course, and you shall realize how entirely dependent you are upon me."

"But the whole scheme of wealth-creation is mine," Capital replies; "and the governing intelligence ought to have a proportionate reward. And my contribution to this enterprise represents long years of industry and economy: it is the accumulated profits of

labor, standing for the care, the intelligence, the vital energies of many generations, while your investment is only of to-day, incidental, transitory, irresponsible. Finally, I have the advantage over you, for in the event of the failure of our joint enterprise, I have only to pour out my capital, my bottled-up labor, and holding it forth in the market-place, can say to one man, 'Come,' and he will come; and to another, 'Go,' and he will go; and to my servant, 'Do this,' and he will do it. In a word, you wait supported by resolution and want; I wait supported by resolution and plenty."

And then, with all human passions stirred up, the conflict goes on with the same ultimate record of disaster. But worse, if possible, than the oppressor is the professional agitator, the man who, without sympathy for the toiling people, makes merchandise of their sentiments and of their needs by stirring up unnecessary and unfruitful opposition between these allied interests. The agitator is related to the workingman about as indirectly as the visiting strangers to the hodja in the Oriental story.

A stranger presented the hodja a hare, and, having been warmly thanked and sumptuously fed, departed. By and by, he came again; but, a long time having intervened, he was not recognized. "Why, I am the man who brought you the hare," cried the stranger. "Ah, indeed," said the hodja, "come in." Afterward a large company of men presented themselves, and, in answer to the official's puzzled look, exclaimed: "Why, we are the neighbors of the man who brought you the hare." "Oh," said the hodja, "come in." But after these were departed, sumptuously fed by the good man, a great multitude appeared. "And who are you?" cried the hodja. "Why, we are the neighbors of the neighbors of the man who brought you the hare." "Hu-u-u-m!" said the hodja. "Come in!" But instead of the plentiful feast they anticipated, their host set before them goblets of

clear cold water. "This man is a miser," cried the multitude of guests, "to provide such entertainment as this." "Nay, gentlemen," said the hodja, "you are the neighbors of the neighbors of the man who brought the hare, and this feast is the broth of the broth of the hare."

The agitator is too often only the neighbor of the neighbor of the workingman; and following his leadership into conflicts wherein all the odds and probabilities are against them, the knights of labor have only the broth of the broth of the money-feast.

There remains a policy which is at once more beneficent and more Christ-like. The law of cooperation, so well exemplified in all other departments of life, has never been fully applied nor thoroughly tested in the industrial world, although cooperative industries have existed in an isolated way for many years and in all the industrial centers of the earth. Let us put the plan concretely by an imaginary case, into which all the essential features of the philosophy can be crowded.

Deacon Greathart has \$50,000, which he desires to invest in a paying business; and when the enterprise is well under way he discovers that many of the fifty employees are discontented. In his keen discernment of motives and sensibilities, he realizes also that their dissatisfaction comes not from the meager wages alone, but from the melancholy stagnant sameness of them—from the fact that the heart is never lifted above the dead level of life by the exaltation of hope or the joy of an unexpected fortune. And so he calls the fifty knights of labor around him and makes a speech something like this:

"Fellow men and brothers, I am not only a capitalist but a Christian, and I desire to be more the last than the first. The \$50,000 invested in this enterprise represents not only ownership but stewardship, and I must render account to God for every turn this fortune makes in the little round

of human life. Now, I wish to take you into partnership with me, that you may share at once the obligations and profits of the business. You receive as wages each one thousand dollars, and my risks will not justify a direct increase. If you will return one tenth of your wages as an investment in the enterprise, I will continue the same wages and receive you into partnership at once, paying you at the end of each year the proportionate dividend represented by your investment; and at the end of ten years you will have paid a thousand dollars each, and your aggregate interest will be equal to mine. This will bring us into that human sympathy which should obtain between Christians even in business; this will

enlist your minds and hearts as well as your hands in the common enterprise; this will bring even into the marketplace the recognition of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

But no theory however progressive, no philosophy however ideal, will bring about a permanent reconciliation and alliance unless our theory is founded upon the principle of obligation. Individual Christian obligation, felt as a sentiment and realized in outward philanthropy, is our only hope. When every Christian, whether capitalist or knight of labor, shall make the good of all mankind and the glory of God the ultimate end of life, then and only then shall we see the prevalence of peace and contentment in all the paths of life.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Sunday Saloon Opening.

THAT the attitude of the clergy as a body on the various questions that arise from time to time involving social morality is apt to be right has again been shown by the ringing protest of Protestant Episcopal clergymen in the city and State of New York against Sunday saloon-opening. The fact that two metropolitan rectors, W. S. Rainsford, D. D., and J. H. Rylance, D. D., conscientiously, no doubt, but most unwisely, had advocated such opening during certain hours of every Lord's Day aroused their brethren to this action. Thus out of evil good has sprung. To say nothing of the proposed desecration of the day, why add to the power of that evil which has already so strong a hold upon the people of our land? Is it not enough that, in a year when the voice of complaining was heard in all our streets, complaining more bitter than at almost any time in our nation's history, very nearly one thousand millions of dollars were squandered in strong drink? That the squandering and the complain-

ing bore, in some measure at least, a logical relation to each other needs no affirmation. Would that the protests of clergy and laymen, and the resolutions of ecclesiastical bodies from time to time, the cries and the prayers of men and women the land over, might but crystalize in ballots that would bury the iniquitous traffic where no resurrective power could reach it!

"Oncers."

In an interesting contribution to *McClure's Magazine* for March, Mr. Gladstone discusses the question, What is the nature and amount of the religious observance due to the Lord's Day? In the course of it he queries, "Is the demand of duty, is the religious appetite, satisfied by the resort (be it more punctual or less) to a single service, by thus becoming what an old friend of mine wittily calls 'a oncer'; or can our bounty stand the drain on attention, and on available hours, of two regular services of the Church?" In his inimitable way he argues for the development of such a spirit as shall

lead to the regard of the services of God's house not so much as the obligation of duty as the natural craving of a renewed nature. No one can lay down the law of Sabbath observance for another. In these days, when so large a proportion of the membership of each congregation is engaged in one or another kind of religious work, absence from the second regular service may well find excuse in the physical and mental weariness consequent thereupon. But there are not a few the only manifestation of whose interest in spiritual things is the attendance upon one service of God's house weekly. These might receive no little profit from the perusal of Mr. Gladstone's timely and helpful words.

The Bible as Literature.

MR. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, in "The Editor's Study" of *Harper's Magazine* for March, calls attention to the lamentable ignorance of the Bible exhibited by many college students, an ignorance "inconceivable to any person a generation ago." This ignorance manifests itself in an inability to comprehend many of the allusions of current literature to the most familiar truths of Scripture, history, and biography. Some months since an article appeared in *The Independent* from the pen of a college president calling attention to the same fact. Questions were put to members of an advanced class with reference to Scriptural allusions in the writings of Tennyson, the answers to which betrayed an almost incredible unacquaintance with facts that are as familiar as the alphabet to the members of the primary class in any Mission Sunday-school. Mr. Warner shows that this ignorance is due to either or both of two causes: the discontinuance of the use of the Bible in our public schools, and a decreasing appreciation of it in the family; and declares with emphasis, and, we believe, with truth, that any college student who does not have a "fair knowledge" of the Book

of all books "is an ignoramus and is disadvantaged accordingly." He pleads for a greater fidelity on the part of parents in teaching the truths of Scripture to their growing children.

It is a pleasure to have a layman of Mr. Warner's influence emphasizing this duty, and believe his words cannot fail to stir up some to an added interest in the matter. Preachers will do well to second his plea, and urge upon their hearers the importance—not from a religious standpoint merely, but from an educational one also—of an acquaintance with that book which is becoming the first of all books among all the peoples of the world.

The Time-Period of Creation.

The utter futility of the attempt of geologists and physicists to reach a satisfactory conclusion regarding the time-period of the creation is again most ably shown by Sir Archibald Geikie in a recent address. He said: "In scientific as in other mundane questions there may often be two sides, and the truth may ultimately be found not to lie wholly with either. I frankly confess that the demands of the early geologists for an unlimited series of ages were extravagant, and even for their own purposes unnecessary, and the physicist did good service in reducing them. It may also be freely admitted that the latest conclusions from physical considerations of the extent of geological time require that the interpretation given to the record of the rocks should be vigorously revised, with the view of ascertaining how far that interpretation may be capable of modification or amendment.

But we must always remember that the geological record constitutes a voluminous body of evidence regarding the earth's history which cannot be ignored, and must be explained in accordance with ascertained natural laws. If the conclusions derived from the most careful study of this record cannot be reconciled with those drawn from physical considerations, it is

surely not too much to ask that the latter be also revised. It has been well said that the mathematical is an admirable piece of machinery, but that the value of what it yields depends upon the quality of what is put into it. That there must be some flaw in the physical argument I can, for my own part, hardly doubt, though I do not pretend to be able to say where it is to be found. Some assumption, it seems to me, has been made, or some consideration has been left out of sight, which will eventually be seen to vitiate the conclusions, and which, when duty is taken into account, will allow time enough for any reasonable interpretation of the geological record."

These words are not only those of a high authority, but delivered, as they were, before a recent gathering of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, were received by them with the profoundest consideration. His last sentence is especially worthy of attention.

The Individual Communion-Cup.

As an illustration of the readiness of large numbers of people to be carried away by every new idea that may be suggested, or to adopt every new fad that may be advertised extensively, the demand for the individual communion-cup stands well to the front. No money-making device ever had a better gratuitous advertisement. We suggest the formation of a new denomination, to be known as the Church of the Anti-Bacilli or the Bacilli-photists. We would propose as one of the first laws to be enacted for its government that every cup to be used at a given service of communion be subjected to a microscopic test, and that subsequently to its use it be compelled to submit to a process of sterilization. It should also be rigorously demanded that the person preparing the bread for the service be subjected to a careful examination as to her innocuousness, and that the knife used by her be sterilized, say by a bath in carbolic acid and water, be-

fore the bread is cut by it. Of course the bread might not be so palatable; but who would not be willing to endure a little temporary discomfort for the sake of the well-being of a community?

Progress.

THE tremendous progress that is being made against the liquor traffic is becoming more and more apparent not only in this country, but in Europe. Even in Paris the agitation has spread and is bearing fruit. Before the Academy of Medicine, Dr. Lancereaux summed up the results of the great growth in the consumption of alcohol as follows: "A mortality greater than that from the greatest epidemics, the ruin of labor, the steady diminution of riches, and—what is already startlingly evident in France—the diminution of the very population of the country by the extinction of the family." This we quote from the Paris correspondence in the New York *Tribune*, March 25. Let no temperance agitator grow weary. Victory is certain.

Slips of Tongue and Pen.

"WE come confessing of our sins." The *of* is redundant, *confess* taking the direct objective. We *partake* of refreshments, of which we take but a part in association with others. *Admit* is used with and without *of* according to the sense. The entrance *admits* to the grounds, the porter *admits* the visitor, the mind *admits* an explanation; but a difficulty *admits of* explanation, and could not be said to *admit* it.

"I have no *i-de-a*." Always and only *i-de-a*. So, too, *i-de-al*, not, *i-d-al*, or, still worse, *i-deel'*. *Or-de-al* is frequently mispronounced, by a contrary error, *or-de-al* (even sometimes *or-deel'*); *or-de-al* only is allowable.

THE word of God is continually showing us that power is not always where it seems to be, but very often where it seems not to be.—*Clemance*.