

# THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—NOVEMBER, 1892.—No. 5.

## REVIEW SECTION.

### I.—THE CHRISTIAN A TRUSTEE.

BY PRESIDENT MERRILL E. GATES, LL.D., OF AMHERST COLLEGE.

WITHIN the last few years it has become clear that the thoughtful men and women of our country are applying a higher standard to the use of wealth. The rapid accumulation of vast fortunes, rendered possible through corporations and the organization of capital, has led society to ask itself very seriously the question, "Is the titanic power conferred by these vast fortunes exempt from that law of unselfish service which governs all other forces in the social life of man?" Past generations of men have seen the tacit assumption on the part of the rich that a man was perfectly free to use his own property as he might choose to use it, merely for his own selfish indulgence if he wished. Even in those periods of the world's history when the moral responsibility for the use of wealth was least clearly felt, the underlying law that the possession of money carried responsibility with it found occasional expression in the demand that the man of wealth spend freely for luxurious living, that he might thus employ much labor, and indirectly make his wealth of service to his fellow-men. Such free spending of wealth for personal luxuries was an evasion of the dimly seen law that a man is morally responsible to God and to society for the full use of all the powers of service at his command. Yet the maxim, "The rich man should spend freely," carried in itself a standing protest against the assumption that a man is free to use his property solely for selfish ends. When the closer study of the principles that underlie political economy had made it evident that the free spending of money for luxuries and in luxurious wastefulness impoverished society as a whole, the obligation attaching to wealth became clearer in men's eyes, and could no longer be considered in any sense discharged by the mere spendthrift squandering of the wealth at one's disposal. Men learned that "consumption" in political economy means not the destruction, but the utilization of the products of labor. Society has come to see clearly that men can no longer be left

unquestioned to use their wealth, be it great or small, merely for their own selfish gratification. The unvarying law of God which attaches an obligation to every opportunity, and places a duty over against every right, extends to the use of wealth, as well as to the use of the other powers which are under the control of a man's will. Wealth is power. The possession of wealth gives a man *potential power of service*. By this ability to serve which wealth confers, its owner is bound actually to serve the best interests of his fellow-men. And for the unselfish use of all his powers, every man must give an account to the God who has taught us that no man liveth to himself alone.

This changing conception of the solemn responsibility which attends the possession of property, is to be seen in the fact that men of wealth are coming to be ashamed of their wealth unless they can point to some service which their wealth is doing the public and their fellow-men. The presumption is no longer that the rich man will be respected simply because he is rich. Unless the rich man shows by the use he makes of his wealth that he recognizes the responsibility which wealth imposes upon its owner, he is held in public opinion to be rather disgraced than ennobled by his wealth. It is not long since a man, possessed by inheritance of a considerable fortune, a man whose fine nature thrilled responsively to the higher conceptions of the responsibility which attaches to wealth, said to me: "When I think of the hundreds of thousands my father gave me and see how they have increased, and then compare my own insignificant efforts for my fellow-men with the possible power that is in this accumulated wealth, I feel ashamed of myself by contrast with my fortune." His is one of those cases, happily increasing in number, where a deep sense of the possible power of service which lies in wealth has led first to a sense of shame that this power of service has not been more amply used by the owner, and then to the high and noble effort to make his wealth useful through intelligent schemes of philanthropy in the best sense of that much-abused word.

The more carefully we examine the nature of wealth owned by an individual, and the relation of that wealth to his own personality, the clearer becomes our perception of the fact that the man of wealth cannot escape God's universal law of responsibility and of service. Hegel has said that a man's property is his "objectified will." Mere things, which apart from man are utterly outside of moral and jural considerations, through their relation to the will and the personality of their owner enter into the domain of rights, of justice, of morality. The object into which you have introduced your will, which you have willed and worked to make your own, has become in a true sense a part of you. The man who touches your property touches you. When a man stands in the relation which he ought to occupy to all his material possessions, he so owns and uses them that they all become in a sense a part of the owner and user. The man's property is permeated by his intelligence, its use is directed by his will. One



of the definitions of wealth is, "past labor stored up in portable form." We thus see that the wealth which a man has acquired by his own effort has in it his past life stored up. His wealth thus partakes of his own personality. If wealth has been won by saving, the restricted expenditures, the ungratified desires are stored up in wealth, and what the man has refrained from comes to be represented in the money he has thus saved. Sometimes these restrictions have been very expensive in their effect upon a man's own character. An awful intentness upon one single aim frequently accompanies the passion of money-getting. Noble and unselfish lines of activity such as a public-spirited citizen may properly be expected to engage in during all the years of his life, the winner of wealth by saving has refused to enter on. To all the generous calls to him to join his fellow-men who are engaged in such unselfish effort, he has made one reply: "I have no time; my business claims me; I am determined to win wealth." The wealth which he thus wins, in as far as by these restrictions it has cut him off from useful service to society, lays on him a still heavier responsibility, in the years that remain to him, to use the added power which his wealth gives him in unselfish, helpful service of his fellow-men.

The Romans saw clearly the fact that the wealth a man had won was in many instances his stored-up life effort. This gave significance and currency to the phrase "*pecunia alter sanguis*." In the money your life-effort acquires is stored up the life-blood of your effort; not because gold is as precious as one's life, but because the power acquired by past effort, stored up in money, enables you now, if you will, to set the efforts of others in motion to carry out your own purpose, your own will. If you feel a sense of responsibility as you consider the proportion of your life effort which has gone into money-getting; if before the judgment-seat of your conscience you are condemned as you remember from how much good which you might have done you have refrained in the effort to win money, can you not see how profoundly important for you now becomes the question, "How shall this life-blood of my past effort, this wealth that I hold, be kept pure, be consecrated?" How will you use the power which the wealth you have inherited or won places at your disposal? Your own moral character, your own religious life, will be in no small degree decided by the answer you make to this question.

Christ, our Divine Teacher, has given us many specific and most pointed warnings concerning the subtle tendency in wealth to seek to escape the law of service. The spirit of the Gospel clearly teaches every thoughtful Christian that he belongs to God, body, mind, and soul, with all his powers of service. For the use the Christian man makes or fails to make of every power of body, mind, and soul, he must answer at the judgment-seat of God. No man, no Christian, can escape the fullest responsibility for the use he makes of his property, which is potential power of service. But the Bible is full of texts that are manifestly designed to warn us of the especial temptations to ignore the responsibility that attaches to the

use of property. I assume that the readers of this article believe that the inspired Word of God is designed to direct the daily life of Christians in our own time. We all know that it is possible so to wrest a text of Scripture as to pervert the spirit and the purpose of the Gospel, in the use made of cited texts. But the whole trend of Scripture is so clear upon this matter of the responsibility which attends the use of property by a Christian, that it will be well for us to consider a series of texts like the following :

“The rich man is wise in his own conceit” (Prov. xxviii. 11). “Thou fool ! this night thy soul shall be required of thee. So is he that layeth up treasure for himself and is not rich toward God” (Luke xii. 20). “The deceitfulness of riches chokes the word” (Matt. xiii. 22). “But they that will to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition” (1 Tim. vi. 9). “For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil : which some, reaching after, have been led astray from the faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows” (1 Tim. vi. 10). “Let not the rich man glory in his riches.” “Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly” (the Greek is *duskolos*, meaning, literally, that his diet and his digestion are such as to put his life entirely out of harmony with the heavenly life, which “goes against his stomach ;” before he can enter in he must be fed upon other food)—“shall *hardly* enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. xix. 23). “How hardly shall they that have riches” (the Greek is *chremata*, not necessarily great riches, but possessions enough to trust in) “enter into the kingdom of God” (Luke xviii. 24). “Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in the uncertainty of riches, but in the living God ; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate—that they may lay hold on eternal life” (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18). “Go to, now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you. Your riches are corrupted ; your gold and your silver are rusted, and their rust shall be for a testimony against you” (James v. 1-3). It is *the rust*, not the gold, that is the witness against them. Their means are not used for Christ, and the selfish rust on them “shall eat your flesh as it were fire.” “There is a grievous evil which I have seen under the sun—namely, riches kept by the owner thereof to his hurt ; and those riches perish by evil adventure” (Eccl. v. 13).

Can there be any question that these clear declarations of God cut sharply across the tacit assumptions of many of the Christians of our time ?

The point to be noted is, first, that the parables and teachings of our Lord, time after time, hold up the property relation as the basis of a lesson in Christian living. Nothing can be clearer than that our Divine Master holds every Christian responsible for the right use of all his possessions, however small, however large they may be. For the man who had five talents and the man who had two, Christ has the same commendation, the same relative reward, for each used faithfully the property he had ;

but the awful stress of contrast is laid upon the man who had *but one* talent because he *declined to use* that one for his Master. No Christian can feel that the warnings and responsibilities that attend the possession of wealth do not concern himself. The property that each Christian possesses, the income, however small, that each Christian receives, has in it latent power of service for the promotion of the Master's kingdom.

There is no essential difference in the responsibility that attaches to the use of small means and to that of large means. When we read such warnings from the Bible as have been cited, who does not know the tendency of his own heart to think as he reads, "That applies to those whose earthly possessions are much greater than mine"? Who has not felt the tendency to pass these warnings on to the very wealthy whose fortunes far exceed the means at his own disposal? Yet the essential nature of wealth lies not at all in its quantity, not at all in the amount of money at a man's disposal. When Christ cautions His followers as to the deceitfulness of riches, as to the difficulties that those who trust in riches will find in entering the kingdom of heaven, the essential meaning of the word translated "riches" is *usable values embodied in material things*. The word used is one that lays no stress upon great wealth. It is a word that may properly be used of very small possessions. Whatever possession is capable of standing between a man's soul and a vital dependence upon God day by day, whatever property is capable of giving the comfortable sense of safety that comes from "having means behind you," be they large or small, God warns us that we are to regard with suspicion and to use with fear and trembling as in the sight of a jealous God who has personified this love of property, "Mammon," as His one great rival for the first place in the hearts of men. The god Mammon may be worshipped with a man's whole heart, though his business transactions be petty and his savings small. The poor man is not safe from the temptation to trust in his possessions. But, of course, this temptation is vastly greater for the rich man. The obligation upon the rich man to make very large gifts directly to the work of spreading the Gospel and building up the kingdom of Christ among men, should be very clearly felt and very earnestly prayed about by Christians who have large property. When our Lord sat over against the treasury and bestowed His royal blessing upon the widow who gave the mite, He blessed her not because it was a little gift, but *because she gave her whole living* to the Lord. Let the rich man who is tempted to make a small gift, and to accompany it with a hypocritical allusion to "the widow's mite," ask himself how large his gift must be before he can expect that rich blessing from the Lord which Christ bestowed upon this giver of all that she had.

The Christian who would test his own honesty in the matter of giving the best place in his desires and his purposes to the best things, can easily apply a searching test. The dispassionate study of the phenomena of social life has led to a clear formula for testing the intensity of one's de-

sires for different things. It has become a maxim in political economy that men, as far as their means permit, *uniformly gratify their wants and desires in the order of the intensity with which they feel those wants and desires.* Let the Christian in thoughtful moments apply this test to his desire to see his fellow-men uplifted and brought to a knowledge of Christ. If the mind that was in Christ Jesus is also in us, will there not be an intensity in our desire to see Christ's kingdom advanced that shall insure our giving largely to this end? If we find that the money we use for the cause of Christ is measured out sparingly, is given reluctantly, is *the last line* along which we are lavish, and the first line of expenditure in which we are ready to economize—is there not in this fact a revelation of our own real desires which ought to alarm us? If a friend whom we wish to have believe that he is very dear to us sees that whatever we do directly for him is done hesitatingly, with measured and sparing expenditure of time, or effort, or money, is not that friend quick to draw an inference as to the depth and reality of our friendship? There is a profound lesson in the very simple little anecdote that some of us remember from early missionary literature—the story of the little girl who had two sixpences given her, one to be put in the contribution-box and one to spend for her own gratification. On her way to her home she lost one of the sixpences, and on reaching home, with an unhesitating promptitude which recalls the customary judgments of too many of us who are Christians, she declared that it was “the Lord's sixpence” which she had lost, and that therefore she could give nothing to missions, while she still had her own sixpence for her own private use. Let the sixpences represent hundreds, or thousands, or hundreds of thousands of dollars in the Christian's income or on his balance-sheet, and how much is revealed to us by the quick tendency, of which we are conscious, to cover the losses of the year into the column where the shortage will be taken “from the Lord's money.”

It would be well for every Christian to take a Lord's Day afternoon at least once a year for special communion with himself upon the responsibility of trusteeship for Christ in the use of his property, be his property large or small. To have one's name upon the rolls of a church does not insure one against being led captive by the selfish love of money. Many a church in our land is weakened in its influence, is lowered in its spiritual vitality, yes, is almost dead to good works, by reason of the presence among its members of that phase of blindness to the higher life which I have elsewhere described as the “hypnotism of money-winning.”

The process of hypnotizing is most effective with persons whose will-power is not so strong as is that of the most determined and ambitious victims of the *will* to be rich at any cost. Symptoms of hypnotism, more or less clearly developed, are discernible in most men whose life is immersed in money-getting.

Here are a few sentences describing the phenomena of “hypnotism,” sentences taken chiefly from Carpenter's “*Mental Physiology*,” and not

intended by him to have any bearing upon such a subject as ours. See whether or not they apply to our theme :

"The process of hypnotizing a person is simple." "Place before his eyes, and very close to them, some bright, glittering object (a *gold coin* is often used) in such a way that he will constantly *look up* to it;" and "let him fix his attention on this to the exclusion of all other objects." The results which follow are thus described: "The whole force of the man goes into this concentration of attention and will-power upon the sensorial impression." There is "an entire engrossment of the mind" in "sensory impressions," which are "received with extreme vividness." His view "tends to become narrower and narrower;" "it tends to unity and afterward to nullity." "Through this fixedness of attention upon *one object*," Dr. Garth Wilkinson continues, "the world of sensations" "plays upon" him "as upon an instrument finely attuned." He is now open to every suggestion from the governing will of the manipulator who has brought about this state of self-surrender through the senses. "No doubts or difficulties present themselves to distract the attention." He will undertake impossibilities at a word of command. He cannot take his eyes off the object he is told to see. He refuses to see what lies directly before his eyes unless the master-will bids him recognize it. And all the while the victim fancies himself master of his own actions; and when "he comes to himself," he describes himself as having felt, in his previous condition of pitiable slavery to another, utter obliviousness to, or profound contempt for, any and all sensations and courses of action other than the one to which his master-sensation, induced by the master-will, impelled him.

Have you not known many men who were thus "hypnotized" by gazing at wealth—mesmerized slaves of the Mammon-god? The *will* to do anything else but make money is gone. The keen, incredulous gaze with which such men meet you ministers who preach to them, when motives and aspirations higher than money-getting are suggested to them, shows you that they will not understand and do not believe you. You cannot reach them with your voice. They do not hear you. They are as hopelessly beyond the reach of argument as are the shrewd, keen, wild animals, whose crafty, narrow-eyed intelligence in doing the one thing they plan to do you wonder at, but cannot reason with. In such men's hearts "a strong man armed keepeth the palace," and until "a stronger than he" (even the Mightiest!) "shall come upon him and overcome him" Mammon has sway.

This perversion of all the powers of the man to money-winning accounts for much of what we call the "gross materialism" of our land and of our time. To men thus "hypnotized" by money, sensual delights, material evidences of wealth, luxurious surroundings are intensely *real*. These are the embodiment of what they seek. To the world of ideas, of broad human sympathies, of religion, they are *dead*. They simply cannot see

these great realities. This one thing they do—they *make money!* This one test they constantly and automatically apply to all questions submitted to them, “Is there money in it?”

It was to a shrewd financier of this type, who had just completed large plans for reorganizing his industries and his warehouses on a larger scale, that Supreme Wisdom, when here among men, broke out with the pitying exclamation, “Thou fool!” This typical rich fool had not missed a point in his calculation so far as money-making was concerned. Yet he had really made the blunder, inexcusable in a business man, of leaving out of account altogether the highest present and future values involved in his transactions. Keen money-makers of his class are, after all, deceived in such a childish way. While they pride themselves on their shrewdness, they steadily lose on every bargain. They invest only in securities that cannot be realized on when the day of settlement comes; they make no use of the finest business opening they have in life, the chance to use the power their wealth gives them to serve the world nobly; and the most valuable title they ever held, the title to their own souls, they let slip out of their hands for nothing. What is the real percentage of net profit when you sum up such a life?

With the world about us calling more and more clearly for the blessed message concerning Christ which can be carried to the dark places in our own great cities and to the still darker places in heathen lands only by the voluntary gifts of Christ’s followers; with the demand for co-operative work among Christians throughout the length and breadth of our land pressing upon the Church as never before; does there not come to every follower of Christ an appeal in the very name of the Master to hold all the property God has given him *in trust*, and to use it with a sacred sense of responsibility? As to the specific use to be made by Christians of the property which they hold in trust for God, each Christian must through prayer seek the direction of the Holy Spirit. No one who understands the teaching of the Gospel will attempt to make sumptuary laws for his fellow-Christians. But every one of us is under obligation prayerfully to consider this question of the use of his means, be they large or small, and conscientiously to reach that conclusion which will bear the searching light of the living, personal Spirit of all Truth.

---

## II.—ASTRONOMY AS A RELIGIOUS HELPER.

BY E. F. BURR, D.D., LL.D., LYME, CONN.

IN a former article I endeavored to show that the modern astronomy sets in a strong light the reality, unity, and personal greatness of God. The present paper proposes to mention several other religious facts that are illustrated and emphasized by the same science, especially in its latest advances.



1. *God has an amazing empire.*

Until lately the universe was an exceedingly small thing as it appeared in the thought of the most advanced peoples. To the cultivated Greek and Roman writers, as well as to the popular mythology of their times, the whole *cosmos* was hardly more than the earth ; and the earth itself was a small matter compared with what we now know it to be. The stars were mere spangles or gaseous tapers. When better views came, the heavens were still occupied with only about two thousand worlds. When the telescope of Galileo came, the universe became several times larger ; and from that day to this, by successive enlargements of the instrument, the known heavens have gone on expanding until a hundred millions of suns are within view, implying several times that number of planets. Nor is this the end, though it carries us across a region which light itself could not cross in less than one hundred and twenty thousand years. It is now found that by adding a camera to the telescope an additional host of stars is revealed—especially after long exposure of the photographic plate to the same point in the heavens. This plate is more sensitive to faint light than is the sharpest eye, and, unlike the eye, can accumulate faint impressions until they come within reach of sight—can, as it were, stand on the shoulders of the telescope and command a wider horizon. It is estimated that when the photographic charts of the heavens already agreed upon and in process in several countries and by more than twenty telescopes are completed, we shall have within our observation full twenty times the number of stars now shown by our largest telescopes. This will bring the visible stellar host up to two thousand millions.

Is even this the complete total ? No astronomer supposes that worlds end where happens to end the vision of our best present instruments. On the contrary, experience assures him that a given increase of space-penetrating power in his instrument is likely to reveal new worlds in as large numbers as ever. One familiar with astronomical history does not find it hard to believe that the unseen heavens are fully as mighty as the seen ; he even feels that it would be a safe thing to defy all the researches of the future to reach a district in space where worlds are not. Where is the end ? *Is* there any end to the peopled immensities ? If one gathers courage and awe enough to pronounce that the stellar universe is coextensive with infinite space itself, is absolutely without limit in every direction, science has not a single word to say against it, and several words to say for it.

Such is the universe, the *peopled* universe, which God made, over which He reigns, and to every minute particular of which His providence extends. How an ancient theist, to whom this earth was the whole creation, or the more recent Tycho, to whom this earth was the reponderating centre and metropolis of the sky, would have opened his eyes at such a demonstration as we have of the hugeness of the Divine empire ! How trifling, beyond speech, seems the largest earthly kingdom in comparison with this



all-embracing monarchy ! If there is any awe in a man it will come forth and assert itself on every fresh excursion up and down the tremendous stretches of this celestial empire.

Truly, the King personally so great has a kingdom to match. His sphere is worthy of Him. Thought itself grows faint in its presence. What panting Ariel can put a girdle about it ? What expert arithmetician can count up its provinces ? Behold an empire that never has occasion to dispute over boundaries, for it has none ! Behold an empire that fears no attack from without, for to it there is no without ! Its horizon sweeps about everything—about everything known and unknown. It is the only empire that has no neighbors. We have heard of the empire on which the sun never sets : here we have one within which all suns rise.

2. *God is a great friend to busy and forceful activity—to an executive way of living.*

The first glance at the heavens seems to discover only absolute rest. But as soon as we begin to look narrowly, and to get beneath the surface of things, we find that everything is in motion after a most wonderful manner. Nothing is at rest. Not an atom but is moving and working at a tremendous rate. Incessant and mighty activity is found wherever we probe the sky with our eyes or our instruments. Every world and every particle seems to have a mission, and to be energetically and remorselessly busy in fulfilling it. Enthusiastic work—from it there is no dispensation and no respite. Day and night, summer and winter, the astronomical forces take no holiday. Some motions are more rapid than others ; the planet, or moon, or sun has its varying rates of speed ; sometimes, perhaps, a relative rest may be reached for a while in the contest between equal contending forces ; but even in this case the rest is merely relative to a few circumstances. The centre of equilibrium is itself ever on the move. The hub of the chariot-wheel, while stationary as to the spokes, is all the while flying over the race-course as fast as blooded Arabians can hurry it.

I am not one of those who resolve everything into motion ; yet, beyond doubt, motion is one of the great facts of the physical universe. In astronomy this motion appears in great masses : planets, satellites, and suns rush and wheel so constantly and mightily as to astonish and bewilder us who are so puny, spasmodic, and easily wearied in our action. Tell us of a single object in the sky that stands still. Tell us of a single world that is not travelling faster on its mission than any object that we can impel. From the speed of light to that of Neptune is a large interval ; but even Neptune spins along at an average of twelve thousand miles an hour. In the heavens, as well as on the earth, activity is the condition of health. Were a world to come to a standstill it would perish. So the whole azure plain above us is throbbing and heaving with vitality. Never was battle-field more alive with advancing, deploying, retreating hosts. No battle ever takes place among the stars ; but seemingly all the skilful

evolutions and scientific moves that precede a great battle are there. No earthly workshop, no mart of trade, no hive of industry, no steaming fleets of commerce or war are busier at their work than are the shining fleets that go and come in the blue deeps above us. They make no noise about it—at least none that we can hear—but they are vastly executive for all that. Yet there is nothing that seems morbid about this intense activity. Great forces can do great things without straining; and the great careers that are run above us are so within the limits of sanitation that they can be run forever.

Such is the system which God has established and is sustaining in the heavens. Do we not see there an example of what the All-Wise deems the best ordering of things? Have we not pictured there His ideal of how vigorously powers should be exerted, good careers run, and good missions accomplished? Certainly astronomy is not a science that summons to repose, that says to men, "Sleep on now and take your rest." It summons to industry, to struggle, to achievement. One feels like going to work and working vigorously for very sympathy as he gazes away at the universal and splendid executiveness that reigns and triumphs throughout the celestial spaces. The swift and ever-rushing spheres rebuke his idleness, his languor, his feebleness. In them God has expressed His own forceful nature. In them He has made proclamation that men should do with their might what their hands find to do. It is not the Bible only that tells us that God detests lukewarmness, and loves to see us "zealously affected in a good thing"—the lesson was flaming among the stars long before it was copied into the Book. Both text and copy bid us abhor a vacuum of energy in well-living as nature abhors a vacuum of matter.

3. *God is a great friend of law and order.*

This is one of the plainest and easiest lessons taught by astronomy. Whatever else one may deny or doubt, it is not this. The celestial orbs are bound up in such a scheme of interdependent movement as allows their relative situations to be forecast ages ahead. Invisible bonds hold them to their forms, rotations, and revolutions; to certain times of coming and going; to definite character and limits of change; even what are called "inequalities" and "perturbations" of order are themselves orderly and creatures of law.

"The ordinances of heaven stand fast." Day after day finds the sun running his course without fail. Night after night finds the moon going her historic round. Every watchful observatory knows just where to look for any planet; and from year to year and from age to age looks upon the same constellations shining away in the same orderly groupings and imperturbable quiet. Changes there are, slow changes in position and brightness and color, which in the course of ages amount to much; but they are all the children of law. So the astronomical realm is an object lesson in order. On the earth are many things called *disorders*; many things that defy expectation and computation; many things, like the

weather, and individual experiences, and historic events, that seem at first view free of all bonds ; but in the sky there is at all times the appearance, and, as it were, the proclamation, of persistent regulation and quiet conformity to irresistible statute that is soothing to the beholder. It is restful to look away from the "accidents" and "uncertainties" and inexplicable tossings of human affairs to the immovable calm and eternal fore-ordinations that so eloquently speak from their thrones of amethyst and gold.

In our time there is no disposition to question that at least all physical nature is under the dominion of law. Bible believers and unbelievers agree in this ; they only differ as to the source and character of these laws. The believer attributes them all to God, and insists that in addition to the natural forces that originally came from Him should be counted His own personal activity guiding and dominating the whole. The unbeliever excludes this supernatural element from the sum of forces. This is all the difference between the two. And a very great difference it is.

The laws of light, heat, gravity, motion are all capable of definite statement ; are all definitely stated in our text-books of science ; and the statements once made are good for all time. These elementary laws in their combination with one another give rise to more complex laws which regulate the movements of the heavenly bodies ; give the fixed succession of day and night, the fixed order of the seasons, the fixed periods of planets and suns, the fixed though somewhat elastic secular equations that modify within limits the periods of all the celestial orbs. As far as we have looked into the heavens (and that is now a good way) order *reigns*, order rooting itself in law. Constancy, subordination, government, harmonious co-operation—these are the features that to the instructed gaze are everywhere pushed to the front ; often limned as with a sunbeam, sometimes shaded and faded somewhat, but never disappearing nor becoming cryptograms. No astronomer fails to read them without difficulty in every part of the sky ; and to most they are about as evident though not as alarming as the characters which a Divine hand traced before the eyes of Belshazzar. As far as our researches have gone, law and order sit on thrones which only the hand of the Eternal can overturn ; and we are sure that future researches will reveal nothing different.

Once men were puzzled by what seemed the erratic planets. Their wanderings, apparently, were guided by no law. But the law was there, though it took astronomers some time to find it. But they found it unmistakably at last ; and now by its means we can forecast the positions of all the members of our solar system for ages to come, and at any moment turn our telescope on any one of them. Further, we have come to feel and to know that the astronomic Decalogue which rules in our system is only a specimen of that which rules in every one of the innumerable planetary systems that hide in the remoter heavens.

I do not mean to say that no miracle ever takes place among the astrono-

mies. Law and miracle can co-exist in the same event. You can counteract gravity on the earth for a little and in particular instances ; no doubt God can do the same on a wonderfully grander scale in the sky. He can cast a planet away from the sun as easily as we can cast a pebble into the air. Should He do it there would be a miracle, for there would be an astonishing effect by a supernatural cause. But there would be no suppression of law, only the dominance of one law over another—that is, the dominance of a supernatural force working according to its laws over a natural force working according to its laws. So law and miracle can sit side by side on the same throne and never quarrel.

Surely if ever there was a friend to law and order, it is He who built and maintains the skies. They are an object lesson as to what God desires and proposes in the spiritual realm. As we look at the delicate proportionings and balanced adjustments and orderly ongoings of the systematized firmament, we see a testimony on a magnificent scale that God cannot be tolerant of disorder among any beings, but has given stringent laws to prevent it, which He is bent on upholding and to which men will do well to conform.

4. *God credibly maintains over us both a providential and moral government—maintains them in the interest of order and the general welfare.*

It is now universally understood by astronomers that the numberless suns imply as many systems of planets which they light, warm, and control in the interest of intelligent beings like men ; also that in these vast systems of rational and responsible beings lies the supreme significance and purpose of the visible universe. It exists for their sake. The imposing materialism is for the more imposing and important spiritualism. Houses of all grades, from cabin to palace, are for the sake of inhabitants.

Astronomy shows that God is intelligent and powerful enough to administer an efficient government over these responsible beings (among whom we stand) on both providential and moral lines ; also that He is disposed to do it. For we see that He is disposed to regulate most thoroughly and vigorously the physical universe according to its nature ; and it follows that He must be still more disposed to regulate thoroughly and vigorously, according to its nature, that vastly more important universe of intelligent and moral beings for the sake of which the other was made. Of course God has His wishes and purposes in regard to this supreme department of His empire, as well as His measures for securing the fulfilment of these purposes. The only two possible systems of measures are the providential and the moral. He can restrain, impel, and direct us by vari us appeals to our voluntary and responsible natures, and he can also do it by the pressure of circumstances that do not appeal to the principle of free choice. Whatever His purposes in making us ; whatever the courses He wishes us to take and characters to form, and experiences to have ; it is plain, from what we see on the surface of our astronomy, that He has both wisdom and power enough to bring to bear on us most potentially both forms of

government. On the one hand He can use wind and tide to direct the course of the ship, and on the other hand He can instruct the captain whom He has put in charge. Of course God will set Himself to bring His fleet of moral beings into the port He has chosen for them by all available means. He will press our wills, and He will press all the rest of us toward the point He wishes us to gain. That the author of a vast system of moral beings has a purpose in making them, and suitable means for promoting that purpose, and that moral and providential governments are the only possible means, goes without saying with the man who has looked with wide eyes on the boundless intelligence and power and purposefulness displayed in the heavens. In particular, what astronomer will say that the Being who framed the orderly and law-abiding heavens is not intelligent enough to know and care how men behave, and not powerful and intelligent enough to bring them to account for their conduct, and not purposeful enough to do what He can do and needs to do to best promote His object?

To the instructed eye the sky is too full of intelligent purpose, seeking its ends in the use of adapted means and working these means with endless power and skill, to allow us to think that the same thoroughness and efficiency will not be carried into the spiritual realm. Doubtless the same characteristics which God displays in the one field will appear in the other still more important one. Men do sometimes, on account of their limitations, loosen their girdles and go into vacation as to some of their traits in minor matters, but not even then unless pushed by their limitations. Except under stress of weather no ship takes in its sails. God is never under stress. He has no limitations so far as an astronomer can see.

As to the ends which God has in view in framing and maintaining a moral universe, we are not without some hints of information from astronomical sources. In the heavens God appears to us not only as a great King, loving law and order, and bound to have them at all costs, but as the universal *Father* and *Inventor*. Now, the instinct and general habit of fatherhood is to seek the welfare of the children. Is not God seeking the welfare of His children? Is He a deplorable exception among fathers? The instinct of the inventor everywhere, so far as we can observe, is to value and cherish his invention. Does not God care for and cherish the great system of intelligent and moral beings which He has invented and impaled in the astronomical universe?

His dealing with moral beings, however, is not that of inventor and father only. It is also that of a king presiding over vast realms and interests. No telescope is so feeble as not to disclose this. The one character must be expected to modify to a considerable extent the expression of the other, especially in the case of disloyal subjects. In their case we should be sure of having a government of mingled kindness and severity—sometimes one in which only severity appears; as often happens under human governments, both parental and civil. There never yet has been a monarch who, however much he loved his people, did not

have occasion to do some severe things among them. There never yet has been a father who could afford to be only a father to his family. So, looking into the heavens, where both the Father and the King are so abundantly conspicuous, we should say that in such a world as this severities and kindnesses would be likely to appear side by side and hand in hand. And it would not be at all surprising if, sometimes, the severity should so dominate and overlay the tenderness as to put it quite out of sight to such eyes as ours and pass for unmixed hatred and cruelty. Nor at all surprising if often individual interests would be made to give way to the public welfare. Governments must act for the general good. The man who makes it impossible for the father or king to reconcile kindness to him with kindness to the family or State must expect to suffer under any righteous administration. People must not lay themselves under the wheels of a chariot that must go on. Alas for Sisera when the stars in their courses fight against him!

Certainly the friendship and good offices of a sovereign whose faculties are so mighty as those which appear nightly to every astronomer must be valuable to the last degree. What great things such a God can do for us or against us! There is nothing too great to be hoped from His love, nothing too great to be feared from His wrath. Let the conscious rebel look at the stars and tremble. Let the conscious loyalist look at the stars and rejoice. The man who can unite in his favor both the kingly sceptre and the fatherly heart of God may give the reins to his hopes and triumphant expectations. Surely all things shall work together for his good. He has found the wishing-cap of Fortunatus. Son of the Almighty, all things are yours! The light of morning is behind you, the light of noon is before you, and even when your face is toward the setting sun it weaves out of rainbows an aureole for your silvered head.

On the other hand, defiance of God and His government, or even neglect of them, is, in the face of the majestic heavens, preposterous madness; while, in the face of the majestic heavens, attention, reverence, diligence to glean the Divine will from all available sources, and obedience to that will as far as it can be found or surmised, are matters of supreme policy and prudence. The stars as well as the Scriptures say, "There is no wisdom nor understanding against the Lord." Certainly they who have the loftiest conception of God, who fervently desire the knowledge of His ways, who are ever feeling after Him if haply they may find Him, who are accustomed to invoke the aid and guidance which He can so abundantly give, who, in short, put off their shoes from their feet in the presence of the Infinite—these are the people most in harmony with the teaching of the stars. No other method of dealing with God is "the scientific method" of which we hear so much in these days. Whoever takes his cue from modern astronomy will treat all things pertaining to the Author of nature as full of moment to himself and all men, and will pay God the compliment of assuming that He is good till He has been proved to be bad, of



assuming that He is both a benevolent and a righteous being, and desires the same traits in ourselves.

5. *We need, however, in order to best results, a fuller revelation in regard to some of the foregoing matters than astronomy furnishes; as well as a revelation of many things concerning which our science gives no hint.*

Among the proclamations which the skies make on religious matters is one of their own insufficiency. They speak to us loudly of the power and wisdom of God, and even whisper enough of His character and government to leave us, as the Scriptures say, "without excuse for not glorifying Him as God." At the same time, their language as to the love and righteousness of the Almighty is not as clear and emphatic and easily translated into the world's vernacular as could be wished. A conclusion that lies at the end of a long chain of arguments is apt to be dim. We need to have God affirm it without argument—thus setting it within the focal distance of many near-sighted people. We need such historic examples of His equity and tenderness as the Scriptures supply. We need to see *vividly* what every person ought to see, that our relative insignificance in the universe does not involve our being overlooked or insufficiently attended to by our Creator; and that even our sinfulness does not set up insuperable barriers between us and the Divine favor. We need a minuter itemizing of the Divine will than nature can supply. We need to *know* (not guess) whether there is help for sinners; and if so, to what extent, and in what way. The heavens reveal no miracles. They utter no prophecies. They contain no historic illustrations of the Divine government. They encourage us with no promises. They are forever silent as to Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and the incarnation, and an expiatory sacrifice, and the resurrection of the dead, and a blessed immortality open to all and forfeitable by all. What they tell us, taken in connection with the law written in our hearts and the religious traditions afloat in every land, is sufficient to bind the conscience to a certain faith in God and to a righteous way of living, but not sufficient to be as mightily impressive and authoritative as men need.

In fine, the heavens proclaim the need of further revelation about as loudly as they do the elementary religious facts we have stated. Silence itself has sometimes a loud voice. Whispers in a teacher are better than silence; but strong, sonorous speech is better still. Chirographs decipherable with difficulty by specialists are better than no writing at all; but type-writing so legible that he who runs may read is a much surer instructor and a wonderful saving of time and strength.

---

WHEREVER among barbarous tribes, or nations half-civilized, the Christian scholar chooses now to go, the *presumption* goes before him that in all that contributes to the progress of society and the welfare of the race, he is superior to those to whom he goes.—BARNES.



## III.—THE LATEST PALESTINIAN DISCOVERIES.

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

A FEW weeks ago President Bliss, of the Syrian Protestant College in Beirut, who is now visiting this country, told me that he had learned that his son, Mr. Frederick J. Bliss, in the course of his excavations at the mound of Tel-el-Hesy, in Southern Palestine, had found a cuneiform tablet. The report seemed to me so extraordinary, so beyond hope almost, that I could hardly credit it, and I awaited with the greatest curiosity the fuller report which I knew must soon follow if the fact were as stated. We now have the first authentic announcement of the discovery in a letter to the London *Times* of July 1st, 1892, from James Glaisher, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. He says that Mr. Bliss, who has been continuing the excavations begun at Tel-el-Hesy two years ago by Dr. Flinders Petrie, under charge of the Palestine Exploration Fund, has found in the débris of that ancient mound, previously identified by Major Conder and Dr. Petrie as Lachish, a cuneiform tablet with a number of seal cylinders of a Babylonian type, although evidently made, some of them, in Phœnicia or Egypt. This tablet has been examined by Professor Sayce, who offers a hasty tentative translation, from which, if yet imperfect, we may gather that it contains a message sent to Zimrida, Governor of Lachish, under the Egyptian king Amenophis IV., who claimed authority over Palestine and the Phœnician coast. The following is Professor Sayce's translation :

[To] the Governor [I], O my father, prostrate myself at thy feet. Verily thou knowest that Baya (?) and Zimrida have received thy orders (?) ; and Dan-Hadad says to Zimrida : " O my father, the city of Yarami sends to me, it has given me three *masar*, and three . . . and three falchions." Let the country of the king know that I stay, and it has acted against me ; but till my death I remain. As for thy commands (?) which I have received, I cease hostilities, and have despatched Bel (?)-banilu ; and Rabi-ilu-yi has sent his brother to this country [to strengthen me ?].

It will easily appear that this translation is, in large part, uncertain and obscure, and will be corrected later ; but the important fact remains clear that on the soil of Palestine, in the ancient mound which represents the city of Lachish—if we suppose Tel-el-Hesy to represent Lachish, according to the identification by the scholars of the Exploration Fund, or Gath, if we accept Professor John A. Paine's identification—a written record has been found of a date fifty years before the generally accepted date of the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt ; that in it is mentioned a governor of Lachish called Zimrida, and that Palestine was at that time in a state of political rebellion against the established Egyptian power.

This would be interesting and important enough of itself, but we must show its relation to the more abundant records of Palestine belonging to

the same period of the reigns of Amenophis III. and Amenophis IV., found four years ago at Tel-el-Amarna, in Egypt.

The story of this discovery has been often told, and it is necessary here only to recall the outlines. The period of Amenophis was one of decadence, in which the provinces of Nahrina, Mitanni, and the land of the Hittites, all on the Euphrates, were lost, and it was found very difficult to maintain control even of Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine. This was just before, under the nineteenth dynasty, Rameses II. vigorously re-established the Egyptian power as far as the boundaries of the western Hittites, whose capital was Kadesh, on the Onontes. Amenophis IV. is known for his attempt at a sort of religious revolution in Egypt, which should give prominence to the worship of the solar disk, an attempt which may in part explain the difficulties which beset him. It was at his new capital at Tel-el-Amarna that there were found, in 1888, several hundred clay tablets, written in the Babylonian character, many of them from correspondents of the court at various places along the Euphrates, but most of them were written by rulers of towns and provinces along the Mediterranean coast and in the interior, including Palestine. Among these towns, or mentioned in the letters, are names of places familiar to us from their mention in the Old Testament, such as Gebal, the Greek Byblos on the Phœnician coast, whose governor, Rib-addi, or Rib-Hadad, was one of the more frequent correspondents of the Egyptian king; Askalon, reigned over by Pitia; Zidon, by Zimrida; Lachish, also governed later by Zimrida; Aecho, ruled by Zatatni; and, most important of all, Jerusalem, ruled by Abdi-heba. Besides these, we have mention of Tyre, Arvad, Gaza, and Gath, Keilah and Gezer, and many other towns not so certainly identified.

Now, the very Zimrida to whom a message is recorded in the letter found by Mr. Bliss at Tel-el-Hesy was the writer of several of the letters to Amenophis IV., found at his palace in Tel-el-Amarna. This fixes the date of the new tablet; and, more than that, it will, when more carefully read, so that we know to whom it is addressed, settle the identification of Tel-el-Hesy with the Lachish, of which Zimrida was king—the same city which was besieged by Sennacherib centuries later in the time of Hezekiah, and of whose siege the Assyrian king has left so interesting a pictorial monument. Lachish was then an important place, the capital of a province as far back as 1400 B.C.

But more interesting in its contents to us than either the new tablet found so fortunately at either Lachish or Gath, or the tablets written by the Governor of Lachish to the Egyptian king, are those that were written to the same king by Abdi-heba, Governor of Jerusalem. It is extremely interesting to find that Jerusalem is so old a town; that it was the capital of a province while the children of Israel were in Egypt; and that its old name was not Jebus, but Jerusalem, or Uru-salem, the first element of the two forms, *Jeru* or *Uru*, being identical, and meaning city—the city of Salem. Jerusalem seems to have been the name used to designate both

the city and the province, and, as Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., has lately suggested, the name Jebus may have been an alternative designation of the city to distinguish it from the province.

The Governor of Jerusalem was Abdi-heba. Some very interesting and fascinating conjectures of Professor Sayce, based on his first and hasty translations—for he was, as usual, the first to announce the discovery of the name of Jerusalem on the Tel-el-Amarna tablets—do not seem to be substantiated by the later more careful translations. Abdi-heba, or Ebed-tob, as Professor Sayce called him, cannot be compared with the Melchizedek of the Bible in any special priestly authority. He addresses the king with all the servility proper to a viceroy. His letters open with the formula, "To my lord the king, thus speaketh Abdi-heba, thy servant. At the feet of my lord the king I bow myself seven times, and again seven times." He acknowledges a special fealty to the king; and he says: "As for this district of Jerusalem, neither my father nor my mother gave it to me, but the arm of the mighty king gave it to me." This seems to imply that he belonged to the native royal family of Jerusalem, but that he confessed that he held the power, not by descent from them, but by the grace of the king of Egypt. It is this passage which Professor Sayce misunderstood as if Abdi-heba drew his authority from a god of Jerusalem instead of from the king of Egypt.

There are half a dozen of these letters of Abdi-heba, and they are filled with appeals for help against an enemy that is threatening him, called the Habiri, and with whom he has been accused to the king of conspiracy. The king of Egypt seems to have believed the accusations against him—at least he does not send the reinforcements so earnestly asked; and when we learn that three governors of other provinces had been captured and killed, and that the Habiri were everywhere victorious, we can only conclude that Abdi-heba was either himself captured with his city of Jerusalem or that he made terms with the enemy.

Now, who were these Habiri? Were they Hebrews, as Dr. Zimmern suggests and as Professor Jastrow is almost inclined to believe? The presence of the guttural *h*, *Cheth*, as the initial consonant taking the place of the *Ayin* in the word *Ibrîm*, Hebrews, is not fatal to the seductive suggestion, for *Ayin* is frequently represented by this guttural *h* in the cuneiform script and in these letters. But these letters were written half a century before the Exodus—according to our usual chronology. Besides, the reference can hardly be to the Hebrew invasion under Joshua, for the attack against the Egyptian power seems to have come from the west and the northwest sea-coast rather than from the east, by which latter route there can be no question that the Hebrews, under Joshua, invaded Palestine. Professor Sayce translates the word *Habiri*, "confederates"; but the fact that "the land of the Habiri" is mentioned seems to militate against this translation, and to imply that they were a people bearing that name and having a definite residence.

The supposition that they were Hebrews does not imply that they were Hebrews returning from Egypt, but that they belonged to a Hebrew stock which had remained behind when Israel and his sons, whose descendants afterward took the name of children of Israel, went into Egypt. From a number of different sides the question has lately been raised whether the migration into Egypt did not leave behind a considerable part of the Hebrew race. The term "Hebrew" seems to have a different use from the more common term "children of Israel." The latter was the people's own designation of themselves, in the narrower sense of those who drew their descent from Israel, and came out of Egypt. The other appears to have its origin in the Terahite and Abrahamic migration from Babylonia, and before it became limited to the children of Israel may have included other allied clans which did not go down into Egypt. The supposed discovery of the names of Joseph-el and Jacob-el as Palestinian localities before the Exodus has also served to raise the question as to Hebrews who may have remained in Palestine during the oppression in Egypt.

We may with some confidence draw more than one important conclusion from the fact that the correspondence between Palestine and Egypt was, about the year 1400 B.C., written in the Babylonian script and language. One is that writing was introduced into the Phœnician and Palestinian region by the Babylonian conquerors, who, perhaps, long before the time of Hammurabi (if Hammurabi is the Amraphel of the Elamite confederacy which overran Palestine in the time of Abram) extended their conquests along the coasts of the Mediterranean and even invaded Egypt. The language and writing of Egypt were not natural to Palestine, which spoke a Shemitic tongue like the Assyrian. During this early period, before the time of Thothmes, the Phœnician coast was more vulnerable from the east or north than from the south. So we find that in each of the principal towns along the coast and in the interior there was a scribe familiar with the Babylonian or Assyrian language, although speaking it with dialectic variations, and compelled to use that language because it was the only one, except the Egyptian, reduced as yet to writing.

This implies another important conclusion, that the Phœnician character had not yet come into use in the century before the Exodus; otherwise it is incredible that the native governors under the Egyptian kings would not have made use of their own language and script. The earliest known Phœnician inscriptions are five or six hundred years later than the time of these tablets; but indications drawn from the shape of the letters would show that the Phœnician characters had their origin in a form of the hieratic Egyptian script of a period somewhat earlier than Moses. Of this we cannot be certain, however; but the discovery of these tablets, written in Palestine and Phœnicia, and now one of them found in Palestine itself, and dated about 1400 B.C., gives us a date after which the Phœnician writing must have come into general use.

The discovery made at Tel-el-Hesy by our countryman, Mr. Bliss,

although under English auspices, gives us great encouragement to expect others more important. We now know that Palestine, as well as Egypt and Assyria, may yield its buried history which shall illustrate the history given in the Bible, and in a thousand places fill up the imperfect record. There are many old mounds which ought now to be explored, and we may expect that the Palestine Exploration Fund, which has concluded its surveys, may now devote itself to excavations. There is no reason why David, and Samuel before him, and any of the kings who followed, should not have left behind them records of some sort. Thus far we have found singularly few, the most interesting being the undated Siloam inscription, perhaps of the time of Hezekiah. If they are not found in abundance they will yet be exceedingly precious.

---

#### IV.—CHRIST TEACHING BY MIRACLES.

BY N. S. BURTON, D.D., NEEDHAM, MASS.

THE occurrences to which the term *miracle* has been applied, recorded by the four evangelists, present themselves in three different aspects.

1. They are deeds of kindness performed for the relief of suffering or the supply of need, never performed without good occasion, and never (as so many pretended miracles are) mere prodigies or wonders.

2. They are "signs" indicating and proving that He who performs them bears a Divine commission. The evangelists represent Jesus as claiming this for them. "The works that I do in my Father's name bear witness of me that He hath sent me."

3. They are object lessons teaching and illustrating important truths, intended specially for the instruction and practical training of the immediate disciples who were to be His apostles to preach the Gospel to the world and establish His Church.

Miracles have a special value in each of these aspects, and that value may vary from time to time. To those who received miraculous help from Jesus in their own persons or the persons of friends, this relief would, for the time at least, seem to them the chief, if not the only thing, of value. To those who live in our day this seems the element of lowest value and least importance. Proper and natural as it seems that one having supernatural power coming in contact with suffering in the world should use this power for its relief, we can but feel that there must be some higher purpose to justify the exercise of supernatural power than to relieve suffering resulting from violation of physical law.

Doubtless all believers in the reality of the miracles will agree that their chief purpose, when they were wrought, was to confirm in men's minds their faith in Jesus—that He was what He claimed to be, and that all He said was truth. There is no danger that we shall put too high a value on

the miracles seen in this aspect. That value was not so much in its power to convince the hostile and the sceptical, or even to produce faith in the mass of the common people, as to confirm the faith of the small company of His chosen disciples, and by producing in them full assurance of faith by means of "infallible proofs," to qualify them to be His witnesses to the ends of the earth and the end of time. Men who heard the apostles preach believed on Jesus through their personal testimony rather than through the *proofs* they offered that He raised the dead and Himself rose from the dead; but in order to bear that testimony effectively they must be able intelligently to say, "We believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," and His miracles fixed this faith on a sure basis in their minds and hearts.

Christianity has gained a place in the world, and our faith in Christ may not rest with much weight on the record of His miracles. They may be regarded as the staging needful for the erection of the walls, but useless after the walls are built. However that may be, viewed in the third aspect named they have lost none of their value, but are as full of teaching power to-day as they were to those who witnessed them. Has not the time come when this aspect should be made more prominent? Holding in abeyance, in some measure, the questions which their unique character suggests, a careful study of them as we study our Lord's parables would discover in them treasures of instruction not inferior to those in the parables.

It may not be easy to fold the question of the supernatural quite in abeyance in studying these records; but may it not be possible to approach this question in another direction from the more usual one? Let us suppose that we have no data except the records contained in the four Gospels. We raise no question as to the writers of these remarkable books—who they were, when they wrote, or what corroborating evidence exists to confirm their statements, but simply accept the universally admitted facts as to the existence and character and condition of the Jewish race and their possession of the Old Testament books.

We shall not be long in discovering that not only is Jesus Christ represented as performing wonderful things, but that wonderful claims are set up for Him in these books. We are to study these books and let them make their own impression on us as to their truthfulness.

On one point at least we may say that the scholarship of the world is agreed, and we may safely accept its verdict—viz., that not only is Jesus of Nazareth a real and not a fictitious person, but that He was a being "perfect beyond what the most gifted impostor could fabricate, and beyond what the most enthusiastic fanatic could have dreamed." And this verdict is based on the record contained in these books irrespective of all questions respecting their authorship.

Now these books contain accounts of very remarkable things done by Jesus. It could scarcely be otherwise than that a careful study of these



accounts, in the order of their occurrence, would produce in our minds some definite and strong convictions as to their truthfulness. Certainly such study could not fail to be both interesting and profitable. To produce its complete effect it ought to include all of these wonderful occurrences in all the three aspects and in the settings in which we find them.

The remainder of the space that can be given to this article will be used in an attempt to present a sample of such study.

We will select for this purpose, as one that will test our theory as severely as possible, the occurrence related by Luke in the first eleven verses of his fifth chapter. The severity of the test will be due to the fact that the whole transaction can be easily explained without the supposition of anything supernatural, though Luke's whole tone and manner plainly assume that the event was miraculous. Let us attend carefully to the narrative, and at the close decide which hypothesis is most in harmony with the facts.

Jesus, standing in Simon's boat a little out from the land, had been teaching the people standing on the shore. When He finished speaking He said to Simon: "Launch out into the deep and let down the net." Simon replied that he and his partners had toiled all night (the favorable time) and had taken nothing, but obeyed the word of Jesus, and the result was a wonderful catch of fishes. It is easy to say that this was only a happy guess on the part of Jesus, and that He risked nothing in hazarding the guess. If there is anything supernatural it is either a superhuman knowledge that the school of fishes was on that spot, or a superhuman power to bring them into the net. Viewed also as an act of kindness, the case is by no means a strong one. The need was not probably pressing, far less so than when He fed the multitude in a desert place. If we are to find justification for a miracle here, it seems that we must find it in the third aspect of the transaction as a lesson for His disciples and for us.

To this, then, let us turn.

In chronological order this is the third of the recorded miracles, and we confine our study to those that are recorded.

1. We notice already here, what will appear more evident as we follow the record in chronological order, a distinct advance. The advance is not that of an experimenter not wholly confident of his power or skill, but that of a wise teacher adapting his lessons to the capacity of his pupils. The chief work of Jesus during His three years' ministry was to instruct and train the disciples whom He had chosen for their life-work. It was by them that the Gospel was to be made known to the world and the world saved. His miracles constituted an important part of His teaching. We therefore look for progress in the truth taught by His miracles.

In the first miracle—the changing of water to wine—Jesus showed Himself Lord of inanimate matter. He changed the constitution of matter. Men were familiar with the production of wine according to natural laws. They had seen the vine grow from the planted seed, the cluster grow from



the vine, and the juice of the cluster changed by mechanical and chemical processes into wine. There was nothing supernatural in all this, though all depended on the power of God. But now they saw water changed to wine in an instant at the word of Jesus, and they recognized His power as divine.

In the second recorded miracle they saw the power of Jesus exercised over disease, doing by a word in an instant what medicine either could not do at all or could do only by slow processes. This was a distinct advance upon the first miracle. At Cana Christ had shown His power over matter devoid of life, and had symbolized the mission of His Gospel to improve and enrich every good thing in this world which it touched. In the healing of the nobleman's son, Jesus manifested His power to correct disorder, to overcome positive evil in the form of deadly disease, and symbolized His mission to save that which was lost, to heal the fatal malady of sin.

In this third miracle we see Jesus advancing into another realm and manifesting His lordship there. Christ, as the head of the race, had come to restore to the race what it had lost by sin, and He manifested His lordship over animated nature by making the fish of the sea obey the silent exercise of His authority. Thus step by step Jesus makes Himself known to the disciples, who, though they believed on Him, needed to have their conceptions of Him enlarged and elevated. If the draught of fishes was due to the exercise of Divine power over the fish of the sea, we see in the miracle a new revelation of the Divine nature that dwelt in Jesus. If Jesus only made a happy guess when He bade Simon launch out into the deep and let down the net, we have in the story told with such graphic particularity an incident too insignificant to deserve a record.

2. We see in this occurrence an advance lesson for the disciples respecting their relations to Jesus as their Master.

There were present on this occasion four disciples who had joined themselves to Him on the banks of the Jordan. He had taken them with him to Cana, where by the first miracle He had manifested to them His glory, and His disciples believed on Him. Up to the time of this third miracle Jesus had not called them to abandon the occupations by which they earned their bread to follow Him. The time had now come when it was necessary for them to do this. He was about to choose twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach—that is, it was time for them to enter fully upon the course of instruction and training by which they were to be qualified as the first heralds of the Gospel and the founders of the Church. To do this they must not only leave home and father and mother, but must abandon the trade by which they earned for themselves and those dependent on them their daily bread. To do this will require a measure of faith which hitherto they had had no occasion to exercise, and for which they had had no warrant. It may be easy for us to say that they ought to have trusted that He who could turn water into

wine, and heal disease by a silent command, could provide food for His followers ; but we must remember that His disciples were as yet only as children, who needed the plainest and simplest lessons. And so, before Jesus gives the command, "Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men," He had to give them assurance by means of an impressive object lesson that He was able to supply all their need. They understood His meaning and believed in Him, and forsook all and followed Him. If the draught of fishes was miraculous, their faith was well founded. If it was only chance and good luck, they were acting foolishly.

3. We may see in the scene by the Sea of Galilee an epitome of a whole book of instruction in evangelistic work.

The keynote is the saying of Jesus to Simon : "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men." Simon was filled with a strange awe on beholding the wonderful draught of fishes he had taken through obedience to the word of Jesus, and he fell down at Jesus' knees and prayed, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." Simon did not doubt that Jesus had exercised supernatural power. His former miracles had not so deeply impressed him with a sense of the superhuman character of Jesus. Consciousness of sinfulness made him afraid in the presence of Divine power. Jesus allays his fears by directing his thoughts to the lesson He is teaching him. As if He had said : "Learn from this incident how to win men from the paths of sin, as these fishes are won from the paths of the sea." Not then did Simon fully understand all the points of the lesson, but long afterward, as he went forth seeking to catch men in the Gospel net, this scene by the Sea of Galilee would stand out before him, and he would learn from it the lessons the Master intended them to teach. They were such as—

(1) The habits formed and the skill acquired by an industrious life in any honest calling are useful as a preparation for the work of winning souls and extending the kingdom of Christ. Christ chose His apostles not from the idle poor or the indolent rich, but from those engaged in industrious pursuits, and the business ability of Matthew and the tent-making skill of Paul, and the fisherman's tact of Simon, or the rabbinic learning of Paul, or the eloquence of Apollos could all be turned to good account when consecrated to the work of Christ's kingdom.

(2) There are favorable seasons and opportunities for catching men of which those who are watching for souls and listening obediently for the Master's commands will be prompt to avail themselves. He who guides the fishes through the paths of the seas knows how to lead lost men, in a way that they know not, into the paths of peace by the hands of His chosen shepherds. Let the shepherds have their ears open to hear the voice of the Great Shepherd.

(3) But what may seem to men the favorable season will not always prove to be so. Often the servant of Christ will toil all night when everything seems promising and take nothing. Perhaps Peter, on the morning

of the day of Pentecost, after the disciples with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, had been praying day and night with one accord so long, felt as he did that morning by the Sea of Galilee—that his expectations had all been disappointed ; but his ears were still open to the Master's voice, and it was not long ere the sound as of a rushing mighty wind was heard, and then Peter stood up and let down the Gospel net and caught three thousand men. Jesus had in mind the fact that Simon had toiled all night when He bade him let down the net, and He meant that Simon should learn that labor done at the proper time is not lost. Had the disciples been idle when they ought to have been toiling, Jesus would not have filled their nets by miracle.

Our limited space compels us to pause here. Our purpose will be gained if the impression has been made that the accounts of our Saviour's miracles are rich in religious teaching for His disciples now as well as for those who witnessed them, and that even those which seem easily explained as ordinary events have a deeper meaning and yield richer instruction when we recognize in them a supernatural element.

---

#### V.—DENOMINATIONAL FEDERATION.

BY PROFESSOR JESSE B. THOMAS, D.D., NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

A STRIKING article appeared in a recent number of the *Westminster Review* on "Federation, the Polity of the Future." The mutual jealousy of European nations (the writer affirmed) is largely responsible for the poverty, disheartenment, and restlessness so conspicuously finding utterance in socialism, communism, Chauvinism, and the like. For this jealousy artificially and wantonly compels conscription and extra taxation to maintain an unproductive military force, interferes with the normal price of food through mutual imposts, and disturbs the course of trade and industrial pursuits through insecurity due to diplomatic intrigue. For all these evils the true remedy, suggested by historic induction, he finds to be a federation of Europe, the natural and next great step toward the realization of the poet's dream of a "federation of the world."

Taken in connection with the theoretic emphasis laid in our time upon co-operation in industrial life, as the panacea for the evils brought about by unrestrained competition, and the practical reinforcement of the theory through the combinations of capital in the great "trusts"—actually producing larger profits, at less cost to the consumer, than independent manufacturers had been able to do—it is inevitable that the value of confederate action in other spheres, and among the rest in that of religious work, should be suggested.

The writer above mentioned suggests the United States of America, as

having by its successful career vindicated its right to be taken as a pattern for such a European combination. He does not seem to think it necessary, apparently, that the autonomy of individual States should be disturbed, nor that they should be brought to uniformity in organization, but only that they should bestow upon the newly created central administration such specific powers as might pertain strictly to international relations. In such case there need be no army except that which must be jointly maintained to enforce confederate judgments upon recreant States. Such enforcement he regards as alone supplying an adequate enforcement of international law, "for without force the very conception of law vanishes."

Dare we hope that the "United States of Christendom" may, after this or some analogous form, soon emerge into actuality? That there is abundant dissatisfaction within and criticism from without, because of present conditions, and that these are in some degree at least justified by obvious waste and hindrance due to isolation, alienation, recrimination, friction, reprisal or other unwholesome phenomenon, betokening maladjustment, nobody need hesitate to admit. The Kentucky printer who perpetrated an unconscious joke upon the "United Baptists" of that State, by typographical inversion, so as to describe them on the title-page of their minutes as "Untied Baptists," might in sober earnest invert the letters, if describing the Protestantism of to-day. So inveterate has been the tendency to divide and subdivide into capillary minuteness that one can hardly wonder at the vigor with which the amiable and venerable Taylor Lewis protested against it in his letter to the Evangelical Alliance of 1873: "There must be no more division. May that man be anathema who seeks to create a new sect."

We need not pause to discuss the legitimacy of "anathema" as an agency in the extermination of existing sects or the prevention of new ones, further than to remind ourselves that the method cannot be indiscriminately applied with safety: for every sect must have been at some time new, and indiscriminate suppression would have robbed the world, at the outset, of that "sect which was everywhere spoken against." The Pharisees undertook thus to suppress a volcano with the thumb, but Gamaliel more wisely advised to let it burn itself out if it would. Nor need we inquire at length whether sects have ordinarily come into existence through the deliberate creative effort of some man. In many cases, certainly (those of Luther and Wesley being conspicuous instances) the men have been reluctantly pushed out of the Church; and names of sects have usually been fastened upon them without either the consent of their founders or their own. Nor is it essential to settle the question whether the partition of Protestantism into sects is in itself a sin, as some contend; or an inevitable evil, as held by others; or a positive blessing, as it appears to still a third class. The question is a much narrower one, busying itself solely with the feasibility and fitness of a specific remedy for the removal of unquestionable evils.

The proposal of federation of denominations implies, as is indicated by the political analogy above set forth, that the idea of reconstruction of individual symbol or canon, in order to secure uniformity of doctrine, rite or polity, be waived, and, of course, that organic unity in the structural sense be also ignored. For a federation is but a qualified agreement; it is binding only *quoad hoc* and *pro tanto*. From the nature of the case it could not settle or even canvass subjects of doubt or controversy within denominations, but only those which are interdenominational or of universal significance. Such a Pan-Christian league would, however, imply a degree of permanence and, within its sphere, a degree of authority not reached by a mere convention such as the Pan-Anglican or Pan-Presbyterian councils, the International Missionary Conference, or the Evangelical Alliance. It would necessarily have corporate and lasting entity and individuality.

The first inquiry naturally arising in connection with such an ideal is as to the particular difficulties demanding settlement and the aptness of such a tribunal for the handling of them. It may fairly be assumed that neither Romanism nor so-called liberalism would be included in the scheme. The attitude of Evangelical Protestantism toward these, its relations toward social and political problems, or international questions, such as the substitution of arbitration for war, might fitly come before it. The local relations of church activity at home and abroad might also reasonably be considered, since one of the chief occasions of criticism has been the collision of denominations, or wasteful rivalry of churches in home fields, and the intrusion of proselyting missionaries into long cultivated fields abroad. But perplexity must at once arise when this scheme begins to take more definite outline. There is, for instance, nothing like unanimity of sentiment among the denominations as to the primary question, whether the Church of Rome is a Christian Church or the embodied antichrist. And even allowing unanimous recognition that it is antagonistic, there is great difference of opinion as to the legitimacy or expediency of particular methods of assault upon it, through political, social, or purely evangelistic agencies. Now, since the federation in question would have administrative functions merely, how could it proceed to devise a plan of campaign, while its constituents were yet unagreed whether carnal weapons may be used, or even whether it be lawful to assume an aggressive attitude at all?

Again, in the matter of missionary interference, one of the most conspicuous offenders in the past has been the "S. P. G." But this society, which declined even to compromise itself by engaging in a mild and informal discussion concerning missionary methods at the International Conference, could hardly be expected to take so much more decided a step as to submit itself to the joint control of the denominations by entrance into such a federation. Is it, then, to be put into the category of antagonists with Rome and liberalism?

But the chief difficulty is a more radical one. The recent effort to confederate the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of Japan conveys

an instructive lesson, directly illustrating it. Patient and intelligent effort was made there to perfect a plan by which a working combination could be effected between the young churches under which the faith and independent polity of the individual churches of either order might be wholly undisturbed. But it failed, for a significant reason. The Presbyterians insisted that the new Board of Control should control absolutely; the Independent churches insisted that each church should be left free to control itself, unless it chose to ask decision and to abide by the result. That is to say, each required that the fundamental principle underlying its own local polity should be reproduced in the general organization. And "to this complexion" all schemes of confederation are likely to "come at last." The proposed federation must have administration for its chief object. But for the Episcopalian, autocracy is the only effective plan of government; for the Presbyterian it should be aristocracy, and for the Independent churches it would be suicidally inconsistent to submit to any superior magistracy in any form. It is not easily conceivable that the responsible representatives of the various denominations would have the temerity to contract in behalf of their constituents in so radical a matter, nor, should they so undertake, that they would be able to "deliver the goods." There could thus be no authoritative combination of the denominational bodies as such, but the whole movement would depend on the informal aggregation of individual churches or individual men. Such an aggregation of like-minded Christians the Evangelical Alliance is understood to be, the very name "federation" having been used to describe its aim in its original formation. Its aim, however, is not to exercise authority, but to shape opinion, leaving mutual self-adjustment to perfect itself through comity. Probably the general sentiment of Protestantism would lead to distrust of any movement pointing toward centralization of power, as involving new evils greater than those to be remedied. Even Rome has often been embarrassed by single and supreme sovereignty. Without celibacy of the clergy and monasticism, it is not easy to see how even such effective control as exists could be maintained by the Pope. But Protestantism has no clerical phalanx, no monastic guilds, no elements susceptible of combination into effective resistance of Rome, upon her theoretic lines of force.

For some time to come Europe is likely to be dependent upon the automatic self-adjustment of independent nationalities, which have run into unity along the natural lines of affinity through common speech, custom, racial inheritance, and local interest, depending upon the beneficent working of that inner instinct of self-preservation, which originally produced a "balance of power," still, unhelped, to maintain it. It is doubtful whether any artificial or consciously devised appliances can wisely undertake to supersede the mastery of that invisible "spirit of life," that teaches the leaves and branches how to grow symmetrically without the help of rule or caliper, and how to "clap their hands" musically, without turning them into fists. "There are differences of administrations, but the same Lord."



## SERMONIC SECTION.

## THE CHIEF OF SINNERS.

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

*Of whom I am chief.*—1 Tim. i. 15.

THE less teachers of religion talk about themselves the better; and yet there is a kind of personal reference, far removed from egotism and offensiveness. Few such men have ever spoken more of themselves than Paul did, and yet none have been truer to his motto: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus." For the scope of almost all his personal references is the depreciation of self, and the magnifying of the wonderful mercy which drew him to Jesus Christ. Whenever he speaks of his conversion it is with deep emotion and with burning cheeks. Here, for instance, he adduces himself as the typical example of God's long-suffering. If *he* were saved, none need despair.

I take it that this saying of the Apostle's, "of whom I am chief," paradoxical and exaggerated as it seems to many men, is in spirit that which all who know themselves ought to re-echo, and without which there is little strength in Christian life.

I. And so I ask you to note, first, what this man thinks of himself.

"Of whom I am chief." Now if we set what we know of the character of Saul of Tarsus before he was a Christian by the side of that of many who have won a bad supremacy in wickedness, the words seem entirely strained and exaggerated. But the principle of the apostle's estimate is to be found in his belief that, not the outward manifestation of evil in specific acts of immorality, or flagrant breaches of commandment, but the inward principle from which the deeds flowed, is the measure of a man's criminality, and that, according to the uniform teaching of Scripture, the very root of sin, and that which is common to all the things that the world's conscience and ordinary moral-

ity designate as wrong, is to be found here, that self has become the centre, the aim, and the law, instead of God. "This is the condemnation," said Paul's Master—"not that men have" done so-and-so and so-and-so, but—"that light is come into the world, and men love darkness." That is the root of evil. "When the Comforter is come," said Paul's Master, "He will convince the world of sin." Because they have broken the commandments? Because they have been lustful, ambitious, passionate, murderous, profligate, and so on? No! "Because they believe not in Me."

The common root of all sin is alienation of heart and will from God. And it is by the root, and not by the black clusters of poisonous berries that have come from it, that men are to be judged. Here is the mother-tincture. You may color it in different ways, and you may flavor it with different consciences, and you will get a whole *pharmacopæia* of poisons out of it. But the mother-poison of them all is this, that men turn away from the Light, which is God; and for you and me is God in Christ.

So this man, looking back from the to-day of his present devotion and love to the yesterdays of his hostility, avails himself indeed of the palliation, "I did it ignorantly, in unbelief," but yet breaks down in the consciousness that while as touching the righteousness that is of the law he was blameless, his attitude to that incarnate love was such as now, he thinks, stamps him as the worst of men.

Brethren, *there* is the standard by which we have to try ourselves. If we get down below the mere surface of acts, and think, not of what we do, but of what we are, we shall then, at any rate, have in our hands the means by which we can truly estimate ourselves.

But what have we to say about that word "chief"? Is not that exaggeration? Well, yes and no. For every



man ought to know the weak and evil places of his own heart better than he does those of any besides. And if he does so know them, he will understand that the ordinary classification of sin, according to the apparent blackness of the deed, is very superficial and misleading. Obviously the worst of acts need not be done by the worst of men. And it does not follow at all that the man who does the awful deed stands out from his fellows in the same bad pre-eminence in which his deed stands out from theirs.

Take a concrete case. Go into the slums of Manchester, and take some of the people there, battered almost out of the semblance of humanity, and all crusted over and leprous with foul-smelling evils that you and I never come within a thousand miles of thinking it possible that we should do. Did you ever think that it is quite possible that the worst harlot, thief, drunkard, profligate in your back streets may be more innocent in their profligacy than you are in your respectability; and that we may even come to this paradox, that the worse the act, as a rule, the less guilty the doer? It is not such a paradox as it looks, because, on the one hand, the presence of temptation, and, on the other hand, the absence of light, make all the difference. And these people, who could not have been anything else, are innocent in their degradation as compared with you, with all your education and culture, and opportunities of going straight, and knowledge of Christ and His love. The little transgressions that you do are far greater than the gross ones that they do. "But for the grace of God, there goes John Bradford," said the old preacher, when he saw a man going to the scaffold. And you and I, if we know ourselves, will not think that we have an instance of exaggeration, but only of the object nearest seeming the largest. when Paul said, "Of whom I am chief."

Only go and look for your sins in the way they look for Guy Fawkes at the House of Commons before the session.

Take a dark lantern, and go down into the cellars. And if you do not find something there that will take all the conceit out of you, it must be because you are very shortsighted, or phenomenally self-complacent.

What does it matter though there be vineyards on the slopes of Vesuvius, and bright houses nestling at its base, and beauty lying all around like the dream of a god, if, when a man cranes his neck over the top of the crater, he sees that that cone, so graceful on the outside, is seething with fire and sulphur? Let us look down into the crater of our own hearts, and what we see there may well make us feel as Paul did when he said, "Of whom I am chief."

Now, such an estimate is perfectly consistent with a clear recognition of any good that may be in the character and manifest in life. For the same Paul who says "Of whom I am chief," says, in the almost contemporaneous letter sent to the same person, "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith." And he is the same man who asserted, "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing." The true Christian estimate of one's own evil and sin does not in the least interfere with the recognition of what God strengthens one to do, or of the progress which, by God's grace, may have been made in holiness and righteousness. The two things may lie side by side with perfect harmony, and ought to do so, in every Christian heart.

But notice one more point. The apostle does not say "I *was*," but "I *am* chief." What! A man who could say, in another connection, "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature; old things are passed away"—the man who could say, in another connection, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God"—does he also say "I *am* chief"? Is he speaking about his present? Are old sins bound round a man's neck for evermore? If

they be, what is the meaning of the Gospel that Jesus Christ redeems us from our sin? Well, he means this. No lapse of time, nor any gift of Divine pardon, nor any subsequent advancement in holiness and righteousness, can alter the fact that I, the very same *I* that am now rejoicing in God's salvation, am the man that did all these things; and, in a very profound sense, they remain mine through all eternity. I may be a forgiven sinner, and a cleansed sinner, and a sanctified sinner, but *I am* a sinner—not *I was*. The imperishable connection between a man and his past, which may be so tragical, and, thank God, may be so blessed, even in the case of remembered and confessed sin, is solemnly hinted at in the words before us. We carry with us ever the fact of past transgression, and no forgiveness nor any future "perfecting of holiness in the fear" and by the grace "of the Lord," can alter that fact. Therefore, let us beware lest we bring upon our souls any more of the stains which, though they be in a blessed and sufficient sense blotted out, do yet leave the marks of where they have fallen forever.

II. Note how this man comes to such an estimate of himself.

He did not think so deeply and penitently of his past at the beginning of his career, true and deep as his repentance, and valid and genuine as his conversion were. But as he advanced in the love of Jesus Christ, his former active hostility became more monstrous to him, and the higher he rose, the clearer was his vision of the depth from which he had struggled; for growth in Christian holiness deepens the conviction of prior imperfection.

If God has forgiven my sin the more need for me to remember it. "Thou shalt be ashamed and confounded and never open thy mouth any more because of thy transgressions, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done." If you, my brother, have any real and genuine hold of God's pardoning mercy, it will bow you down

the more completely on your knees in the recognition of your own sin. The man who, as soon as the pressure of guilt and danger which is laid upon him seems to him to be lifted off, springs up like some elastic figure of india-rubber, and goes on his way in jaunty forgetfulness of his past evil, needs to ask himself whether he has ever passed from death unto life. Not to remember the old sin is to be blind. The surest sign that we are pardoned is the depth of our habitual penitence. Try yourselves, you Christian people who are so sure of your forgiveness—try yourselves by that test, and if you find that you are thinking less of your evil, be doubtful whether you have ever entered into the genuine possession of the forgiving mercy of your God.

And then, still further, this penitent retrospect is the direct result of advancement in Christian characteristics. We are drawn to begin some study or enterprise by the illusion that there is but a little way to go. "Alps arise" when once we have climbed a short distance up the hill, and it has become as difficult to go back as to go forward.

So it is in the Christian life—the sign of growing perfection is the growing consciousness of imperfection. A spot upon a clean palm is more conspicuous than a diffused griminess over all the hand. One stain upon a white robe spoils it which would not be noticed upon one less lustrously clean. And so the more we grow toward God in Christ, and the more we appropriate and make our own His righteousness, the more we shall be conscious of our deficiencies, and the less we shall be prepared to assert virtues for ourselves.

Thus it comes to pass that conscience is least sensitive when it is most needed, and most swift to act when it has least to do. So it comes to pass, too, that no man's acquittal of himself can be accepted as sufficient; and that he is a fool in self-knowledge who says, "I am not conscious of guilt, therefore I am innocent." "I know nothing

against myself, yet am I not hereby justified: but He that judgeth me is the Lord." The more you get like Christ the more you will find out your unlikeness to Him.

III. Lastly, note what this judgment of himself did for this man.

I said in the beginning of my remarks that it seemed to me that without the reproduction of this estimate of ourselves there would be little strong Christian life in us. It seems to me that that continual remembrance which Paul carried with him, of what he had been, and of Christ's marvellous love in drawing him to Himself, was the very spring of all that was noble and conspicuously Christian in his career. And I venture to say, in two or three words, what I think you and I will never have unless we have this lowly self-estimate.

Without it there will be no intensity of cleaving to Jesus Christ. If you do not know that you are ill you will not take the medicine. If you do not believe that the house is on fire, you will not mind the escape. The life-buoy lies unnoticed on the shelf above the berth as long as the sea is calm, and everything goes well. Unless you have been down into the depths of your own heart, and seen the evil that is there, you will not care for the redeeming Christ, nor will you grasp Him as a man does who knows that there is nothing between him and ruin except that strong hand. We must be driven to the Saviour as well as drawn to Him if there is to be any reality or tightness in the clutch with which we hold Him. And if you do not hold Him with a firm clutch you do not hold Him at all.

Further, without this lowly estimate there will be no fervor of grateful love. That is the reason why so much both of orthodox and heterodox religion among us to-day is such a tepid thing as it is. It is because men have never felt either that they need a Redeemer, or that Jesus Christ has redeemed them. I believe that there is only one power that will strike the rock of a human heart, and make the water of grateful

devotion flow out, and that is the belief in Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of mankind, and as my Saviour—unless that be your faith, which it will not be except you have this conviction of my text in its spirit and essence, there will not be in your hearts the love which will glow there, an all-transforming power.

And is there anything in the world more obnoxious, more insipid, than lukewarm religion? If, with marks of quotation, I might use the coarse, strong expression of John Milton—"It gives a vomit to God Himself." "Because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

And without it there will be little pity of, and love for, our fellows. Unless we feel the common evil, and estimate by the intensity of its working in ourselves how sad are its ravages in others, our charity to men will be as tepid as our love to God. Did you ever notice that, historically, the widest benevolence to man goes along with what some people call the "narrowest" theology? People tell us, for instance, to mark the contrast between the theology which is usually called evangelical and the wide benevolence usually accompanying it, and ask how the two things agree. The "wide" benevolence comes directly from the "narrow" theology. He that knows the plague of his own heart, and how Christ has redeemed him, will go, with the pity of Christ in his heart, to help to redeem others.

So, dear friends, "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

#### THE USE AND ABUSE OF PARTY POLITICS.

BY REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.  
[METHODIST], LONDON, ENG.

*Let your forbearance be known unto all men.*—Phil. iv. 5.

IN the Authorized Version, as every one knows, it is translated "modera-

tion." It is a very good thing, probably, to get rid of that word, because so many people imagine that it has some special or exclusive reference to the use of strong drink. Of course the apostle is not thinking of anything of the sort. "Let your *forbearance* be known unto all men." In the margin, as an alternative suggestion, the word *gentleness* is used—"Let your *gentleness* be known unto all men." Many will remember that the late Mr. Matthew Arnold translated the word, with much of his usual verbal felicity, *sweet reasonableness*—"Let your *sweet reasonableness* be known unto all men." The word, in fact, is, in itself, a very high tribute to the delicate and lofty morality which the best Greek minds have reached, and it expresses the state of mind in which we make due allowance for the conduct of others, and especially of our opponents, and in which we are alive to our own mental defects. Now I need scarcely remind you or prove to you that there is no sphere of life in which this moderation or forbearance or gentleness or sweet reasonableness is more urgently demanded than in the region which men call Politics; and I have to speak this afternoon of "The Use and Abuse of Party Politics." But before I say a word about party politics, I must try to bring home to everybody's mind, although there seems to be some extraordinary difficulty in the process, that there is an immense difference between politics and party politics, although the great majority of those who either speak or think or write upon the subject seem to be incapable of grasping the idea that there is anything which may be called Politics except that with which we are almost too familiar, and which is more properly called Party Politics.

But what is Politics, in the legitimate sense of that word? Why, it is the science of Social Conduct! And every act of your life outside the domestic circle is a political act. There are a great many acts of your life, also, inside the domestic circle, which are strictly political. So that the man who says, as a

great many unthinking or ill-informed men say, that he is not a politician is like that remarkable man, in the well-known French play, who expressed his astonishment at the discovery that he had been talking grammar all his life without knowing it. Why, everybody is a politician! You cannot help being a politician. You cannot live for an hour without being a politician. But what a man generally means when he says that he is not a politician I am afraid is this—that he has been all his life enjoying his political privileges and grossly neglecting his political duties; and in that sense the observation is scarcely to his credit. As a matter of fact, politics, properly understood, is simply Science of Life—the doctrine of the way in which I am to do my duty to my neighbor, which is an essential part of true religion. It is nothing in the world except Religion applied to human society; in fact, it is the practical recognition of the Second Table of the Law of God.

But if this is so, how is it that so many persons who sincerely desire to please God, and to do the will of God, speak so suspiciously and so disparagingly of politics? How is it that politics have been so much misunderstood and disparaged? It is because politics, as I have already said, have been confounded with party politics; have often been contemptible and wicked beyond description; and, indeed, when not carried so far as that, there are a great many persons who positively cannot discuss politics without losing their temper. And this is so well known that the subject is tabooed to a very great extent in polite society, so-called, so that if you go to a dinner party the one thing of which you must not speak is politics, and the place that might reasonably be occupied by noble and instructive conversation about the science and art of life, and human progress, is occupied by inane, and worse than inane, gossip.

Then, again, it is very much too common on the part of those who either

talk or write about politics to impute the vilest motives to their political opponents, and to carry on their observations in a perfect shower of personalities. And I am bound to add further that, in consequence of these pollutions, and of this unhappy temper of mind, the arguments in which a great many persons who discuss politics indulge are of the most puerile and even asinine character. I am bound, with some reluctance and shame, to add that I know not a few Christians, sincere Christians, who have been so eaten up with party politics that they have even sacrificed their Church to the supposed interests of their political party, have put loyalty to their party chiefs before loyalty to Jesus Christ; and you cannot imagine anything more disgraceful than that on the part of a Christian.

Moreover, party political prejudice and passion have been carried so far in this country that a public speaker, like myself, never dares to mention in a mixed assembly the name of any great statesman, because the moment you do that, not only will his friends and supporters cheer him, which is an innocent and inoffensive amusement on their part, but a number of geese in the audience begin at once to hiss. Now, I say that a country in which that takes place is not yet civilized, that if a man cannot restrain his feelings so far as to abstain from insulting those with whom he does not happen to agree, the man is a savage; because, one of the fundamental distinctions between a savage and a civilized man is, that a civilized man is able to restrain himself. But every one who listens to me is aware that this miserable party spirit has been carried so far in this country that public speakers like myself are never able to quote prominent politicians even on issues that have nothing whatever to do with party politics, because we hear these offensive sounds. The truth is, political discussions have been carried on in this country hitherto so completely outside the pale of religion, and even of ordinary social restraints, that when

men discuss politics they seem to give a free rein to their temper, and to take leave of their reason.

Now this being to a very great extent the case, what ought you and I to do? Some one might say: "Take no part in politics at all." I have heard a great many persons say that. The great majority of my co-religionists said it when I was a boy; I do not think they say it now. But there are a great many people who do say it. Some excellent Christians said so to me last week, and I found they were strongly urging me to take no part in politics because they imagined that I did not agree with their political opinions, which is not a sufficient reason, in all cases, for abstention. I very much astonished them by saying that I had never taken part in party politics, that I had never voted, except for my university, and that I had never appeared upon a party political platform. But the difficulty of such excellent persons is, that they have never yet distinguished between politics and party politics. I, for my part, hold very strongly that, as a rule, Christian ministers would do well to abstain from taking an active part in party politics; but I am bound to say that, if politicians choose to discuss questions that have moral issues, I am not going to be gagged and muzzled. For I have a prior claim to be heard on everything that affects righteousness and character and morality.

But not referring to persons who, like myself, are Christian ministers, and who therefore occupy a somewhat exceptional position, and who are bound to remember that in their congregations they have every variety of political opinion—what is the course under these painful circumstances which ordinary Christians ought to take? The hasty and superficial reply of many, as I have already said, is this: As people cannot discuss politics without losing their tempers, as so much mud is flung about, as it is so disturbing to the serene spirit of the devout man—take no part in politics whatever. There are several objec-



tions to that ; but, perhaps, one that I may name will suffice—it is *advice that it is impossible to take*, for, as I have already explained, everybody must be a politician if he happens to live in a country like this. If he takes himself off with his wife and children to a solitary island, perhaps he may live without being, in the strict sense of the word, a politician ; but the moment he employs a servant politics enters, for his relation to the person whom he employs has to be determined. It is very difficult, therefore, even in a very thinly populated island, to avoid being a politician ; but it is absolutely impossible in England, and it is all nonsense to talk about it. It only indicates a man's ignorance, that he should suppose it is possible for him to abstain from being a politician. I quite admit, as I have already said, that he may abstain in the sense of neglecting his political duty, and allowing the country to go to the devil as far as he is concerned, but that is not the sort of example a Christian minister can commend, or that would have any commendation whatever in the Bible. So far as men abstain from discharging their political duties, because that discharge involves annoyance, or perhaps loss in business, or introduces some painful element into life, they are cowards. They are treacherous to Jesus Christ, they are deserting the post of duty ; and, so far as they are concerned, they are handing over all the resources of civilization to the devil, to which I, personally, strongly object. I have fully admitted that political activity is liable to abuse, but all good things are liable to abuse, and the better they are the more liable are they to abuse ; but the fact that this peril exists should not reduce us to political impotence, but should set us on our guard, and teach us to set our neighbors a better example. Free and just political institutions are absolutely essential to the progress and development both of the individual and of the race.

I know there are some persons—they must be very ill-informed, and they

must be absolutely ignorant of history—who cherish the delusion that personal happiness and the interests of religion are not dependent in any sense upon political institutions. This is the exact opposite of the truth. I appeal to the whole course of human history from its dawn. The great outburst of ancient thought and art in Greece took place among the free citizens of Athens, and not among the military slaves of Sparta. It was just the same in the Middle Ages. It is just the same in Modern Europe to-day. It is a lesson drawn from the history of all ages, that Literature, Art, Science, as well as Religion, always follow the fortunes, and flourish under the flag, of political freedom. It is, therefore, a part of our high duty to God and man to use all our influence in every direction to establish and to extend political freedom, and just political institutions. It is a matter of life and death to everybody who loves God and his neighbor to do his duty in this direction. Yes, you say, that may be all right, it is quite evident to any one who takes an intelligent and scriptural sense of the scope of human duty that it is impossible for us to neglect our political duty without neglecting both our duty to God and man, but what of party politics? That is no duty.

It is an old saying among thinkers that every man who is born into this world is naturally either a follower of Plato or a follower of Aristotle ; and we might say with respect to life that everybody is naturally a Conservative or a Liberal, and that there must always therefore be, in some form or other, and with some name or other, these two great tendencies of the human mind expressing themselves in two great organizations. The Conservative is predominantly anxious to conserve existing good, and he is very sensitively alive to the perils of change. On the other hand the Liberal is predominantly anxious to realize further improvement, and he is so conscious of that that he gladly runs the risk of any peril that improvement



may involve. But whatever view we may take of political opinion, when we think over the matter calmly we must admit that there is no justification whatever for the violent language which politicians are too apt to use with respect to their opponents. Probably the best excuse for it is that really they do not believe it themselves, and use it simply in a Pickwickian sense. When politicians address great gatherings of their own adherents, they seem to think it is necessary to put all that pepper, mustard, and vinegar into their speech so as to keep the meeting lively, and if it is quite understood that it means nothing I do not know that it does very much harm. But at any rate this is certain—looking at this important phase of human life, especially on the eve of the General Election—that every Christian is bound, if he is a real Christian, to keep his temper when he discusses politics, and that any Christian who loses his temper ought to be excommunicated until he publicly repents. I say that he is not only not a Christian but he is not a civilized man, and has no pretence whatever to elementary civilization. We have been far too tolerant of the naughty tempers of people when they discuss politics, and we must insist upon the introduction of politeness and courtesy into public life. The Speaker of the House of Commons insists upon it there, where no doubt his influence is very much needed in that direction. I think that the chairman of a public meeting ought to have a similar power of restraining the impetuosity of ardent advocates. Unless there is some very exceptional occasion we ought to admit that those who differ from us are, as a rule, quite as honest as we are, that their ideal is a lofty one, even if we prefer our own; and that, as a matter of fact, there is no political party which has the absolute monopoly of Right and Truth, and that it would not really be to the permanent advantage of the British Empire that either of the two great political parties should disappear.

I think, further, that we are fully

agreed that every intelligent Christian ought to take a keen and active interest in politics, and if any one doubts that, I need simply utter the words "United States." Let any one go to the United States of America, as I did last year; let him consider the awful state of New York; let him consult intelligent men in any part of the States with respect to the condition of public affairs, and he will find a general consensus of opinion among the upright citizens of America that politics there have become so unscrupulous and so mercenary and so dirty that good men cannot afford to touch them. To that, of course, my answer was: "Your good men are the cause; for if you had been touching them they would never have been found in the position in which they are to-day."

What is it that has saved this old country, with all its corruption and with all its tendency to these abuses, from sinking so low? One has said, "Monarchy." I do not wish to discuss that question now, but I am afraid that the mere existence of monarchy in itself is not sufficient without the co-operation of all good citizens to secure the objects which are desired. I should like to remind my friend, without in the least degree disputing the immense importance of monarchy in this country—which I never have done—that there are some monarchical countries in this world that are even more degraded than the United States; and that, as a matter of fact, the most degraded countries in the world at this moment are monarchical. I might also say that in some respects the Monarchy in this country is not so powerful as the Presidency is in America, so long as it lasts. But this is rather taking us off the logical line of thought. By all means, at the right time, let us advocate the immense importance of monarchy; but I am sure of this, that whether you happen to call the constitution of your country Monarchical or Republican—and the difference is very often more verbal than real—whatever be its title, it is im-

possible to maintain the purity of public life, and to prevent bribery and corruption and the utmost degradation of the State unless every individual citizen discharges his duty as constantly and honestly as I am proud to think Queen Victoria has during her public life. For my own part, I confess that I am very anxious in all possible ways to secure the co-operation of good women as well as of good men in the public service of my country.

It is very astonishing that so many people talk so much about politics without having ever studied them and without knowing anything about them. I am afraid the majority of the free and independent electors of this country really do not know much about politics. I think if you pursue your inquiries in the cities, as well as in the villages, you will find that there are a great many persons who vote who really know nothing at all about politics. It is a very serious thing when we consider that the great interests of the British Empire, and through the British Empire of the human race, are very largely dependent upon the votes of persons who have never taken the least trouble to understand either the history of their country or the meaning of political terms.

Politics is the only serious subject that men think themselves qualified to act upon without any previous education or instruction whatever. If it happened to be astronomy, or botany, or medicine, or law, he would never be allowed to work in any of these arts, or to take a decisive part in the history of any one of these sciences without having, at least, acquired the A B C of it ; but the awful fact of politics is that we do not take the trouble seriously to understand the political situation. I am afraid most men who even try to acquire some information from the newspapers—a very ambiguous source of information—constantly read those with which they agree instead of those with which they differ. I confess it gives me no pleasure to read those with which I agree ; I spend all my time in

reading the papers with which I do not agree. It is not always very pleasant reading, but I am sure it is more profitable than merely hearing my own views echoed.

Now, I do implore those who are listening to me to realize the gravity of all these questions. There is nothing that you do in all your life for which you are more accountable to God, or which is more serious, than the vote which many of you are going to give at the approaching General Election. I dare say you have already made up your mind which party you are going to vote for, but I confess I have some suspicion that, even in an unusually intelligent audience like this, if I brought some of you up to this platform and elicited from you for whom you were going to vote, and then were permitted to cross-examine you as to why you were going to give that vote, the answers which you would give would not satisfy yourselves or the audience. It is a very serious matter. You may have time, even now, before the General Election, to acquire a more intelligent knowledge of the questions which will be submitted to the people of this country when that grave event takes place.

Let me say, in conclusion, that I hope we shall all learn two lessons, deeply religious lessons, from one of the greatest political thinkers of our race—Edmund Burke. One is this, that party politics are inevitable, that we must tolerate the existence of two great parties in the State, which from time to time will hold office under the Crown ; and, therefore, our business is to try and narrow the area of controversy and to cultivate to the utmost extent mutual confidence and mutual goodwill.

And, secondly, let those of us who feel most keenly and most deeply on these questions—as the best Christians and those who have most of the mind of Christ must feel—remember the great saying of Edmund Burke : “ *Compromise is the soul of politics.* ” As the human race is inevitably divided into two great parties, as we cannot help

looking at different sides of the shield, as the very constitution of our minds compel us to take somewhat divergent standpoints—it is perfectly ridiculous for any man to expect that he is going to have all his own way, or that the party to which he belongs must triumph all along the line, and must carry out its policy absolutely. The real progress of this country, and the absence hitherto of the bitter strife which has desolated families and churches, has been due to a sort of saving common-sense which has characterized the British people, and especially the English people, which has led those who are most opposed to certain changes to accept them and to have done with them when they have become inevitable; and which has led the reformers to realize that they must consult the convictions of others as well as their own, and that the honorable solution of all controversy is some reasonable compromise. I have already referred to the splendid and imperishable services which the Queen has rendered to this country from time to time, but of all her great services I think that none was greater, more courageous, or more sagacious than the course which she took on a very recent occasion, when there seemed to be a possibility of a deadlock between the two Houses of Parliament, and some bitter and disastrous strife, in relation to the last extension of the franchise, when she used her immense influence to compel all political parties to come together, and by an honorable compromise to accept that Extension of the Franchise and Redistribution of Seats under which we now live. The Queen herself used her great influence on that occasion to bring the controversy to an end and to secure a peaceful solution. And I cannot but think, with respect to other bitter controversies, about which opinion is inevitably divided, that the Queen herself could occupy no nobler or more patriotic position than that of a peacemaker, and of one who will compel politicians of all parties to avoid the falsehood of extremes.

#### RICH AND POOR OR, THE FRIENDSHIP OF MAMMON.

BY VEN. WILLIAM M. SINCLAIR, D.D.,  
ARCHDEACON OF LONDON.

*Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.*—Luke xvi. 9.

THERE can be no doubt that our blessed Lord greatly preferred the poor, as a class, to the rich. In looking round to see what kind of persons would be likely to satisfy those conditions of simplicity, singleness of heart and purpose, earnestness, directness of faith, sincerity and unreservedness of love which He required for the new society or kingdom which He was founding on the earth, He observed that these qualities were far more spontaneous and unfettered among those who had little means for the cultivation of the unspiritual pleasures of this life than among those who had every conceivable temptation to habitual self-indulgence. The words of our Lord are not much in fashion in our times, and they are constantly explained away. But this quiet, firm, unworldly attitude of His mind cannot be seriously denied. It was not very often that the subject of riches was brought before Him, for He chose to be born a poor man, and to move from first to last among the very humblest and poorest of the people. But whenever the facts of wealth occurred to Him, His position with regard to them was one and unvarying. Some of these sayings sound to us at first hearing exceedingly harsh, until we discover the profound pity, the Divine truth which underlay them. "Woe unto you that are rich!" He said, without any qualification, "for ye have received your consolation." One of His most uncompromising parables is about the wealthy fool, and He wound it up by saying: "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." In that parable by which He so memorably described the different kinds of hearers of His heavenly message He seemed to think it perfectly natural, probable, and common that, in the case

of those who were exposed to the trial of having property, "the deceitfulness of riches would choke the word, and they would become unfruitful." One of the most important counsels of His most important, characteristic, and typical Sermon on the Mount was that any who wished to be His disciples must "not lay up for themselves treasures upon earth, because where their treasure was there would their heart be also." In the same sense He told them on another occasion, with His gracious, unquestionable, unhesitating authority, that it was not for them to "labor in any way for the meat which perisheth;" and, again, that they were to "take no trouble about the future—what they were to eat or drink or to wear." Such things were objects of interest to those who remained outside the kingdom. If they continued to occupy their minds with these matters, where would be the difference between themselves and the unregenerate world? Perhaps the most startling, and, to the ordinary citizen of the world, the most repulsive, statement of His feeling of candid recognition of the extreme dangers of wealth was that most courageous and penetrating injunction to the rich young man, which lost Him what would have seemed likely to be a useful and fruitful follower, that "if he would be perfect he must go and sell all that he had, and give to the poor, and he should have treasure in heaven." And when the young man had rejected this counsel of perfection, and had gone away sorrowful, our Lord, in the most solemn manner, gave utterance to a general truth, introduced by His most emphatic formula of asseveration, and of which He evidently felt the tremendous gravity: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that a rich man shall with difficulty enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." And when His disciples, hearing this most wholesome and vital lesson—so

marked an advance, for example, on the rather worldly and comfortable teaching of the book of Proverbs—were exceedingly amazed, saying, "Who, then, can be saved?" He thought it necessary to emphasize yet further the difficulty which He saw by saying that only by God's special interference could the rich be weaned from their absorbing affection for things below. "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible."

And I do not think that much comfort will be found by those who fancy that it was necessary for our Lord to be stern in order to suit the special circumstances of an unique crisis, but that the apostles after Him would accommodate themselves more genially to general society. St. Paul follows exactly the same line: "They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which, while some coveted after they had erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." St. James has a very vigorous cut at the worldly spirit, which is so powerful an enemy of our spiritual life at this very hour, in his description of the two men going to church, one with a gold ring and goodly apparel, the other a poor man in vile raiment, and the very different reception which they got. And then he makes a touching appeal to them: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?" But his remarks about the rich are by no means encouraging. In another place he addresses such of them as were selfish and self-indulgent in language of the boldest vigor: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries which shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall

eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days." St. John, the apostle of love, cuts the ground away from the feet of those who spend their incomes on themselves, with no less clearness and severity: "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"

Our Lord and His apostles did not take this depreciatory view of the value of money to the individual on account of the poor, that they might have the benefit of superfluities, but for the sake of the rich themselves, for their character, their spirituality, their chance of becoming members of the kingdom, their hopes of heaven. Everybody is rich, from the Christian point of view, who has more than is necessary for the simplest style of plain and wholesome living, and for the maintenance and education of his family. Our Lord knows nothing about stations in life, differences in rank and position, and corresponding obligations to live up to supposed standards of magnificence. He saw how extraordinarily strong the temptations of the rich would be to unspirituality of life. Their whole habits, their whole mutual intercourse with each other, their little worldly ambitions and rivalries, their love of the color and comfort of a luxurious life, their matrimonial campaigns, the wonderful breadth of their resources for amusement, the skill and zeal with which great classes of the industrious would make it the business of their lives to cater for their entertainment and angle for their money, the universal tone which there would be among them of seeking for little but constant hourly amusement and a succession of pleasurable excitements, the almost universal lapse there would be in their society from the standard of unworldliness and simplicity, plain living and active benevolence, which was necessary to the kingdom of Christ—all this would have a terrible power in making them set their affections on

things below and not on 'things above, in making them selfish, and therefore, as selfishness is the origin and meaning of all sin, in making them sinful. We all know, for example, how it is with so many a young man who has been brought up in great abundance. He has never been taught to deny himself anything for which he has wished. From his cradle he has, metaphorically speaking, been like the rich man in the parable—the reason of whose going to hell most of us find it so very hard in these days to understand; we almost fancy that there must have been something left out—clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day. He has been sent to one of our great homes of religious and useful learning, and there he has met with seven or eight hundred young soldiers of Christ who have been brought up in just the same unhappy, unspiritual surroundings as himself. By universal custom, example, and precept, he learns that life is one long organized system of amusement. First surround yourself with comfort, then spend all your energies in amusement—that is the great moral he takes away with him from school. The amusement may be wholesome, healthy, manly, and may, from a pagan point of view, produce admirable results; but pursued as a system, as an occupation for every day, it is utterly disastrous to the spiritual life of the Christian. This was the kind of danger which our Lord foresaw. A perpetual series of hunting, shooting, fishing, travelling, dancing, feasting, drinking, and playing, and the devotion of the whole income to these absorbing pursuits would mean voluntary expatriation from His kingdom. And then our young man becomes absorbed in the world of London. "A great estate left to an heir," says Bacon, "is as a lure to all the birds of prey round about to seize on him, if he be not the better established in years and judgment." But it is not necessary to have a great estate for this purpose. A few superfluous hundreds or thousands are enough. We



all know how skilful, voracious, and remorseless are the birds of prey. And he finds London life just the same as that to which he has been always accustomed ; almost the whole of the powers and resources of his associates devoted to ceaseless entertainments and amusements. If he marries, he is taught to marry for money or influence, and the chances are that his wife will be as worldly as himself. So his children will begin again as he himself began. They will be taught mechanically to repeat their catechism, and to renounce the pomps and vanities of this wicked world and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. But these will in time become their second nature. I think we cannot help admitting that the temptations and difficulties of the rich are beyond comparison greater than the difficulties and temptations of the poor.

And we need not wonder that, after all these years of the preaching of the kingdom of God, these dangers to our life in Christ should be so great, when we leave the safe shelter of this sacred building, and go out among our friends and acquaintances in the world. A great heresy on this subject has spread over the Church. It is a heresy from the old Judaizing days, when people thought that they ought to live as closely by the Old Testament as by the New. Uncomfortable at the doctrine of the Kingdom of Christ, that we must devote all that we are and have to the service of God and of man, these people fortunately hit upon the happy discovery that the Jews paid a tenth of their produce for the support of the priests, the Levites, and the temple. This was, in fact, merely an arrangement for the support of the national worship and did not include anything which the Jews gave to the fatherless, the widow, and the stranger. It had nothing to do with what we call almsgiving or charity. But having made their discovery, these Judaizing perverters of the kingdom of Christ taught that if you gave a tenth of your annual income to what they are pleased to call charity, and devote all

the other nine tenths to the world, you are not only doing all which God can possibly expect of you, but are actually performing a sublime, heroic, and most Christian action. God must be content with one tenth, the world may and must have all the rest. That is not the doctrine of the kingdom of Christ. Nothing, indeed, could be farther from it. "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." "Give alms," said our Lord, "not of a tenth, but of such things as ye have. Seek ye the kingdom of God," He said, "and what you need will be added to you. After all these things do the nations of the world seek : and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. Fear not, little flock : for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the true kingdom. Sell that ye have, and give alms provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that falleth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth ; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." "He that taketh not his cross, he that is not dead, that is, to the things of the world, and followeth after Me, is not worthy of Me. He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." That is the serious, true, earnest spirit of the kingdom of God. No dallying with a miserable tenth, but the sacrifice of the whole being—body, soul, and spirit—to the service of God. "Charge them that are rich in this world," wrote St. Paul, "that they be not high-minded, nor have their hope set on the uncertainty of riches, but on God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy ; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to share their goods with others : laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." And, again, remember the well-known words which you learned long ago, but which



so many of us neglect : " I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And be not fashioned according to this world : but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God." Henceforth we will abolish from among ourselves that fatal and deadly heresy of the tenth.

But our Lord Jesus Christ, in His infinite pity and His Divine wisdom, badly as He thought of the natural condition of the rich, would not leave them without hope. He strongly preferred the poor, and urgently advised all rich people to divest themselves of those unspiritual cares which would in most cases make their reward a very small one in the kingdom of heaven. But He saw that all would not do this, and He was willing to leave them in the possession of their wealth on one condition. They were to make to themselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. Mammon means wealth ; they were to use this wealth as trustees of God, and as stewards for the poor. If they must keep such dangerous and poisonous materials in their own hands, that was the only means they would have at once of escaping from the snares and slavery of the world, and of proving their devotion to their God. That is the gospel for the rich, and that is their difficulty—to have in their hands all the means of luxury and self-indulgence, of amusement and pleasure, and yet not to use them for themselves ; to be surrounded by pagan friends and acquaintances, who are devoting all their energies to the refinements of civilization, and yet to be themselves wholly given to the doing of good. That is the touchstone of the rich, and that is God's Divine remedy for the sufferings and inequalities which men have brought upon themselves by their recklessness, their follies, their sins, and the futility of their arrangements. Our blessed Lord never gave the slightest en-

couragement to Socialism. The wealth of the rich was not to be taken away from them for the good of the rest. They were to have the responsibility of keeping it in their own hands. All was to be purely voluntary.

There is a canting spirit going about in these days, which pretends that no good can be done by money, but that everything must be achieved by personal effort. This foolish boast is merely the combined result of conceit on the part of those who have not the money to give, and of hypocrisy on the part of those who have the money, but do not like to give it. " If there were none of these maligned rich people," wrote a sensible American lady, " who would build hospitals, and provide asylums for orphans, and for the deaf and dumb, and the blind ?" It would be the impertinence of levity to deny that the million of George Peabody has been an incalculable blessing to the artisans of London. It would be mere scepticism to say that the half million of Mr. Baird has not proved a happy godsend to the National Church of Scotland in carrying the message of the kingdom of Christ to the dark alleys and godless suburbs of her manufacturing towns ; or that all the great foundations and churches of modern London, some of them (as in the case of my late parish) the result of the immense and magnificent liberalities of single benefactors, have been useless and ineffectual ; or that the £30,000,000 raised by the National Society for the Christian Education of the Poor have been without benefit to the nation ; or that the six modern bishoprics of recent times in England have been useless ; or that the seventy or eighty colonial, Indian, and missionary sees, which have been founded by the Christian people of England, have not been spreading light and hope and life in distant lands ; or that the hospitals and dispensaries of Christian London have done nothing to elevate the sufferings of the struggling millions. Even the daily button-hole flowers of fifty young men would make fifty

widows rich beyond their most hopeful dreams. Is there no satisfaction to two well-known families that out of their single-handed munificence the two ancient cathedrals of Dublin—St. Patrick's and Christ Church—have been raised from a condition of squalor and neglect to a state of consummate and exemplary beauty? Do you suppose that there is no reward of conscience for him who devotes a quarter of a million sterling to the improvement of the dwellings of the humblest of the poor; or who consecrates a beautiful park for the refreshment of the inhabitants of the dull and dreary districts of North London; or who rears a noble home for the inspiring reminiscences of the heroes of British history, the greatest and best of Britain's sons? Those who would take from the rich their hope and consolation of doing good are about as wise as those other perverse and pedantic wise-aces, who think that all evils can be cured by a judicious and extended administration of the poor-law, and who, if they had their way, would soon make all Christian virtue to consist in a patient submission to the many burdens of a constantly increasing taxation.

You, dear Christian people, are not of the same mind as the perverse theorists who deny the power of Christian wealth and benevolence. You know the joy of those who have abundance for the carrying on of the government of God in the world, and you daily thank Him for having put it into your hearts to make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness. Not in vain has the almost vindictive song of triumph of the Blessed Virgin sounded as a warning in your ears day after day and week after week. "The rich He hath sent empty away." You rejoice that it is in your power to make innumerable families of the unsuccessful happy and prosperous by emigration; to increase the usefulness of the hospitals, which are struggling even for existence, by additional endowments; to erect public baths in many a dingy, dreary, cheerless area; to supply every district

among the working classes with clubs and gymnasia for young men; to eliminate for the future that hopeless and innumerable class of general laborers by supplying secondary education, polytechnics, people's palaces, in every district of London; to breathe health and life into the stunted myriads of our street children by liberal support to the country holidays' fund; by providing ample and inalienable playing-fields for each of the vast districts now separated by almost insuperable miles of houses from white clouds and green fields and daisies; by granting pensions to thousands of aged derelicts—men and women—now rotting in cellars and garrets, saintly in their patience and resignation, and bringing them, by your sympathetic charity, to the very gates of heaven; by supplying every separate municipal division of London with its own almshouses; by showing your patriotism, local and general, in the erection of libraries and picture-galleries which might in time actually rival those of provincial towns; by inspiring hope into every society for home missions; by adequately supporting the great foreign missionary societies in their glorious and most successful tasks of preaching the Gospel to every creature.

The latest of our social and religious reformers, if the Christian people of this country have confidence in his judgment, should not find the slightest difficulty in obtaining the million for which he asks. It is for these very experiments that great fortunes and sums of money have been permitted by Divine Providence to accumulate in these times in so many hands. It is the height of absurdity to suppose that the National Church would have any jealousy whatever of any success in the proposed direction, however great. Clergy and laity alike would rejoice to see their unhappy brothers and sisters, now degraded to the lowest depths by drink, at length clothed and in their right mind. Their condition is the greatest scandal which the earth has ever seen; but it

is a scandal which reflects on our system of government, not on our religious institutions. It is the very problem at which the National Church, clergy and laity alike, have for half a century been working, since the population of our country began to multiply so enormously on our hands. We have doubted whether remedies on so vast a scale as are now suggested would not be likely to defeat their own object by publicity, and the impossibility of dealing with so huge an aggregate of cases individually ; but if others can do it, in God's name let them try. It was on this very subject that I first addressed the clergy of East London from my official seat ; I explained why there was no one remedy ; I spoke of the duty of decentralizing the local government of the cities which make up London ; of overcrowding, which lies very much at the root of our troubles, and its remedies ; of foreign pauper immigration ; of the possibility of state training for the unfit ; of warnings to rural districts against the expectation of always finding work in the town ; I spoke of emigration, and of colonization ; of the laws we needed for the prevention of intemperance ; of local councils for improving the condition of the poor. The plan for organizing farms for the discipline of those who have fallen out of the race of labor in large towns was all worked out some winters ago at the Mansion House, under the presidency of an enlightened lord mayor. There are numerous societies for colonization and emigration. Carts for collecting the abundant remains of the rich man's table were organized by my friends in the West of London. The suggested plans are all familiar. They have, indeed, been crippled for want of funds. If the popularity and public position of our latest reformer can command the superfluities of the wealthy to carry out his schemes, much good may be accomplished, at which all will cordially rejoice. The idea of the combination of religious emotion with strict personal discipline is full of hope. Even if the reformer should be

unable to change the lot of the whole three millions whom he estimates, even if in so prodigious and complex a civilization as ours there must always be a residuum of incapables, still the effort is worth making, and cannot fail to accomplish fortunate results. There is room for every kind of effort and experiment. It is quite clear that something will be attempted. May that abundant blessing of Him who has promised that the poor shall not always be forgot rest on so much zeal, courage, and enthusiasm. May His Holy Spirit bestow that prudence and caution without which enthusiasm will end in disaster !

Such are the true joys of the rich ; and they teach us how great a happiness our Lord was opening to us when He spoke to us of the friendship of mammon. There are those among us who have believed our Lord and taken Him at His word. Great will be their reward in heaven. Is there not something very pathetic in remembering that our Lord has put into our hands the cure for every human ill, personal and social ; and yet for generations, age after age, His words have been neglected and perverted, and even now, perhaps, are less practised than they were in the first age of the Church ? Would it not be worth our while to persuade others outside to adopt His golden rule as we do ourselves ? It would, indeed, be a great secret of happiness to them if they could discover it. "He that soweth little shall reap little, and he that soweth plenteously shall reap plenteously." There is more depth of truth in that than the familiarity of the words would allow us to suppose. "To do good and to distribute, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Generosity, liberality, self-sacrifice, self-devotion, unworldliness, simplicity, plain living, the daily and persistent doing of good—these will be to us like angels, and their wings will be filled with the Spirit of Christ Himself, and His grace will strengthen them, and they will bear us up, and

Christ will accept our work and labor of love as done for Him, and so we shall at length be received into everlasting habitations.

#### THE IMMORALITY OF UNBELIEF.

By REV. S. W. REIGART [PRESBYTERIAN], SALISBURY, MD.

*He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning His Son.—1 John v. 10.*

THE sources of our knowledge are various. Some things we learn through the exercise of our senses. It is by means of our sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell that we obtain a large part of our knowledge of the world around us. I know that the sun shines, because I see it shine. I know that paper is smooth and wood is hard because I feel these qualities in the materials before me. And so, through *observation*, I derive a knowledge of the form, size, color, and various other characteristics of a great many objects of the world in which I live. But not all of my knowledge, nor the larger part of it, is derived from this source. If I knew nothing of this universe to which I belong beyond what had come under my own observation, my knowledge of it would be extremely limited, for it is a very small portion of it, indeed, that has come within the cognizance of my senses. The man who has travelled most widely has seen but a small fragment of God's illimitable empire. The bulk of my knowledge has been derived from other sources than the observation of my senses. All that I know of other countries or regions than the little spot I call my home I have learned from others. It is from books, newspapers, letters, lectures, conversations that I have acquired most of the knowledge which I possess of the world about me. I know that in Kentucky there is a mammoth cave, extending ten miles or more under ground, not because I have actually seen it, but because I have

been told of it by those who have seen it. I know that on the banks of the Tiber, in Italy, there is a famous city called Rome, and in that city lives an old man who claims to be the head of the Church on earth, not because I have ever been there, but because I have heard of Rome and Leo XIII. from others. And so with regard to ten thousand other facts with which we are acquainted. We know them because they have been vouched for by others. It is upon the testimony of others that we depend for the greater part of the knowledge which we acquire. All our knowledge of the past, and all our knowledge of other portions of the world than the little spot on which we live and move, and all our knowledge of scientific truths that we have not evolved for ourselves, we owe to the testimony of others. *And this knowledge is just as certain as knowledge derived in any other way.* I am just as certain that Queen Victoria rules over the British Empire, though I have never seen her, as that I am occupying this pulpit to-day, and that you are seated before me. We assent readily to truths communicated to us by others, and we must constantly rely upon the testimony of others, or be content to remain forever idiots and fools. The child relies upon the word of its father, the pupil upon the word of his teacher, the student of history upon the word of the historian, the purchaser upon the word of the merchant, the merchant upon the word of his customer, the patient upon the word of his physician, the client upon the word of his lawyer—every man must rely to a very large degree upon the word of his neighbor, or the bonds of human society would be rent asunder, and the trade and progress of the world come to a pause.

Now, this principle which holds society together, which is the key to all progress in knowledge, to all achievements in science, which is the spring of all useful activity in the world, and which, in a religious sense, is the source of all piety in the soul, is *faith*. For

faith is but dependence upon the word of another—the assent of the mind to a truth or fact which is based upon testimony—trust in the credibility of one who makes a statement to us not to be ratified by our own observation. It is not a common but an exceptional thing to withhold assent to a statement made by another. And when we do so we impugn the veracity of our informer; we look upon him as a deceiver and a liar.

Now, just as in relation to those countries which lie outside of the limits of our daily experience and observation, we are indebted for our knowledge to the evidence of others, so in relation to those worlds which lie beyond the range of this material universe, and those spiritual truths which transcend the bounds of human experience and reason, we must depend for our knowledge upon the testimony of another. What can we know of heaven or the state beyond the grave from our own observation? How, of ourselves, can we attain to a knowledge of God's plans and purposes? "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or, being His counsellor, hath instructed Him?" Who can tell of himself what God the Creator intends to do with His creature, man? For this knowledge we must depend upon the testimony of none other than the Almighty Himself. He alone can disclose to us His purposes and plans. To accept the testimony of God is to exercise true faith. To reject such testimony is to disbelieve the Word of God. And this unbelief is not the innocent thing many people suppose it to be. It is not a mere intellectual exercise. It involves a *moral* act. To set aside the testimony of another is to impugn his veracity; to set aside the testimony of God is to impeach His truthfulness. "He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning His Son."

I. The text teaches, in the first place, that God hath borne witness concerning His Son—that is, concerning the char-

acter and mission of the Lord Jesus Christ. To the mere facts connected with the life of Jesus of Nazareth, human testimony is a sufficient ground of evidence. As we place confidence in the historians who relate to us the deeds of Alexander, Julius Cæsar, and Napoleon Bonaparte, so we need nothing more than the testimony of any respectable writer to the incidents which form the earthly life of Jesus Christ. But to the fact that He was the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, Divine testimony is necessary to compel our assent. His mission must be authenticated by Him from whom He came, and in whose name He professed to act. And Christ's work *was* authenticated. God the Father hath set His seal to the fact that Jesus is His Son. The context refers to some forms in which God hath borne witness to the Divine character and work of the Son. "There are three that bear witness" to the divinity of Christ, "the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." "This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood; and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth." The coming "with" or "in the water" refers to the baptism of Jesus Christ, when He entered upon His public work, and when the Father bare witness from the opened heavens to the divine Messiahship of the Son, proclaiming in a voice that all could hear, "This is My beloved Son," and the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove, descended and rested upon Him. The coming "with blood" or "in blood" refers to the agonies of the crucifixion, the pouring out of His life on the cross, the signs and wonders accompanying which awful event, as well as the god-like bearing and sublime patience of the sufferer extorted from the Roman centurion at the foot of the cross the confession: "Truly this was the Son of God." In the baptism and death of the Lord Jesus Christ the Holy Spirit bare witness to His divine Messiahship. And



in the corresponding sacraments of the Christian Church, in the water of baptism, which signifies our cleansing from sin, and in the blood of the supper, which sets forth our incorporation into Christ, and the benefits of His death—in the holy ordinances of His Church, ordinances instituted by Christ Himself, the Spirit bears perpetual witness to the divine Messiahship of the Lord Jesus, and the divine origin of His Church. By all those wonderful miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus Christ while on earth, works such as no other one ever wrought in his own name; by those wonderful discourses, such as no other one ever delivered; by all the acts of His wonderful life, by His wonderful death, by His wonderful resurrection from the dead, the most firmly established of all historical facts, God, the Father, hath borne witness to the divine mission of the Son as the Saviour of the world. By the mouth of the prophets of the old dispensation who proclaimed a Saviour to come, as well as by the lips of the apostles and preachers of the new dispensation who proclaim a Saviour that has come, a "Christ crucified" for the sins of the world, God has given evidence to the divine character and work of His Son. In this blessed volume, wherein is contained God's revelation of Himself and the plan of redemption from the curse of sin, a revelation authenticated by the sublimity of its doctrines, by their consonance with the nature of God and the nature of man, by their wonderful agreement, though given "at sundry times and in divers manners"—a revelation authenticated by the fulfilment in the course of events of many of its most startling predictions, authenticated and sealed by the blood of innumerable martyrs, and the steady advance of the Christian Church despite the opposition of the powers of earth and hell—proved to be worthy of belief by the pure lives and triumphant deaths of its sincere advocates and followers—in this blessed Book we have "the witness that God hath borne concerning His Son." None but God could

have given us such a record. None but an Almighty Mind could have conceived a plan of redemption such as is made known in this Book. None but God could have accomplished it. None but God could have made it known. The boldest human mind would never have conceived the idea of mounting to heaven to bring a Saviour down from the throne of Deity. The most daring intellect would never have undertaken to bring up a dead man from the grave, a grave guarded by Roman soldiers, and proclaim Him before a world cognizant of His death, as the Saviour of lost men. The human imagination has brought forth some grand conceptions, but no human imagination evolved the grand and glorious scheme of salvation contained in the Word of God. The true revelation of God's will may have many counterfeits. False bibles and false religions there are. But on every page of *this* blessed volume we behold the stamp of its Divine origin. If there be a God, and an eternal world, and a way of life, here, in the Holy Scriptures, we have "the witness which God hath borne concerning His Son."

II. The text implies, in the second place, that *some men do not credit* the testimony of God. Very many, indeed, reject the evidence which God gives of His Son. It was so when Christ yet dwelt upon the earth. It might be thought that a rational being had only to *see* the miracles wrought by such a one as the Lord Jesus Christ to admit His claims to be the Son for the Most High God. But such was not the fact. The miracles themselves were not denied by those who witnessed them. Opening the eyes of the blind, calming tempests, multiplying loaves and fishes, raising the dead are not miracles that can be easily counterfeited. Even the *enemies* of Christ admitted—they were forced to admit—the genuineness of His miracles. But how did they evade the logical consequences of such an admission? By the absurd expedient of attributing them to the power of the evil one. As though a holy life, a life



spent in works of benevolence and love, were the result of satanic possession! As though the devil were engaged in promoting the good of man and the glory of God! Men still reject the testimony of God, and as absurdly and wickedly as the Pharisees of old, attempt to account for the miracle of a Bible that has withstood the assaults of hundreds of ages, the combined powers of despots and kings, the onsets of scepticism of every form; and the miracle of a Church that has stood for nineteen centuries, though attacked by every art and power of hell.

III. But, finally, the text teaches the rejection of the witness of God with respect to His Son is not simply an error of judgment, a mistake of the intellect, but an insult of the deepest dye offered to the greatest of all beings in the universe. "He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning His Son." I shudder to read the language in which the Bible describes the sin of unbelief. Yet it is a true description. He that rejects the testimony of this blessed Bible, or, what is the same thing, refuses to accept and obey its teachings, not only charges the ministry who are engaged in promulgating its doctrines with hypocrisy and imposture, and Christians with weak-mindedness and credulity in accepting as truths these teachings, but charges the Almighty Sovereign of the universe, the Author of this revelation, with falsehood, and a deliberate purpose to deceive and impose upon His rational creatures. See what unbelief does! It says that this religion, this Christianity, which we profess and practice, is a delusion; its teachings are myths; its hopes are vain; its prospects are dreams; that prayer is but an empty form of words; it does nobody any good; it never *can* do any good. Our mothers' prayers were but senseless repetitions. The worship round the old hearthstone at home, when we were children, and our fathers sought God's blessing and guid-

ance on our footsteps, was but a vain mummerly. The hopes which cheered our kindred as they bade adieu to earth and entered the dark river were delusive imaginings. Unbelief says: "There is no coming wrath that we need dread. No hell that we need shun. No heaven to which we need hope to attain. No fellowship with God and Christ, and redeemed spirits beyond the grave." Unbelief declares: "There is no sin that needs an expiation; no justifying righteousness required by man; that he can save himself from all the dangers to which he is exposed, and that the Gospel saying that 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners,' is not 'faithful' nor 'worthy of' *any* 'acceptation,' and so the 'witness that God hath borne to His Son' is false!" See what unbelief does, my brethren! It justifies the greatest of all crimes, the murder of the Lord Jesus Christ. It tramples upon the Son of God. It counts the blood of the covenant—that blood by which our pardon is secured and sealed—an unhallowed, polluted thing. It mocks at the dying agonies of the Lamb of God, and jeers at the sufferings of those who witnessed by their death their fidelity to Him. It enters the chamber of sickness, and ridicules the prayers that go up from pallid lips, and derides the faith and confidence of those who fall asleep in Jesus. It enters the sanctuary of God, mocks at the worship of the Most High, and sneers at the preaching of His Word. It invades the very dwelling-place of God, and, attempting to silence the hallelujahs that continually ascend from ten thousand times ten thousand voices of angels and redeemed spirits that surround the throne, it charges the Most High and Holy God, the Lord of heaven and earth, with falsehood in the testimony which He hath given of His Son! Can impiety go farther than this? Can there be a more damning sin than unbelief? Is atheism worse? Atheism says: "There is no God." Unbelief says: "God is untrue. He is endeavoring to deceive

His creatures. He is imposing upon the world a false system of doctrines, an untrustworthy scheme of salvation through a crucified Redeemer." This is the hideous character of unbelief as painted by the inspired apostle. Does not its exhibition in the text fill the mind of every one here with abhorrence? You tremble at the blasphemy of calling God a liar, and yet, dear hearer, you who refuse to put your trust in Him who was proven by signs and wonders, especially by His resurrection from the dead, to be the eternal Son of God and Saviour of the world, what are you doing but impugning the veracity of God and setting aside the witness which He hath borne concerning His Son? Oh, pause and consider whether this spirit of unbelief is leading you. Consider calmly and solemnly the unimpeachable testimony of God. Give to it your sincere assent. Take this Jesus as your Saviour. Yield to Him your heart, and you will soon enjoy in your own breast the evidence that He is worthy to be trusted. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning His Son."

#### TAKING THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN BY VIOLENCE.

BY REV. JAMES M. CAMPBELL [CONGREGATIONAL], MORGAN PARK, ILL.

*The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.*—Matt. xi. 12.

THE kingdom of heaven is here likened unto a walled city, moated, garrisoned, and strongly fortified. It is attacked by a besieging army that attempts to capture it by storm. Who compose the army of attack? Earnest souls that seek salvation? The enemies of Christ who seek the overthrow of His kingdom? Neither.

To understand these words we must

look at them in their contextual setting. The brief and stirring ministry of John had inaugurated a popular movement in favor of Christ. The people were aflame with enthusiasm. To the Nazarene prophet all their Messianic hopes had been transferred. They were upon the very tiptoe of expectation. Any day Christ might assert His royal prerogative and set up His kingdom. The people stood prepared to flock around His standard. No reason could they see why He should longer refuse to declare Himself. They were intensely excited. Further delay they could not brook. In the heat of their impatience they wished to bring things to a crisis at once. Not understanding the nature of the kingdom which He had come to establish, they thought it could be taken possession of by violence. In their impetuosity they were ready "violently to press in for their share in it" (so Alford); they were ready to "clutch at the approaching kingdom as those who were seizing spoils" (so Meyer).

Afterward, when this popular enthusiasm subsided and the Jews began to understand the nature of the King and the kingdom to which John had introduced them; when they began to see that the kingdom of Christ was not of this world, that instead of promising worldly glory it demanded inward purity, bitterly did they oppose it. Instead of meekly accepting it, they raged and blasphemed against it; instead of seeking to possess it by violence, they sought to destroy it by violence; instead of bowing their necks to a sceptre of spiritual authority, they cried out against the One who held that sceptre in His hand: "Away with Him! crucify Him!"

A parallel case is found in that incident in the Galilean ministry of our Lord, when, immediately after the miracle of the multiplying of the loaves and the feeding of the five thousand, the people, convinced that Jesus was "of a truth that prophet which should come into the world," were moved by a common impulse "to take Him by force and

make Him a king." Without waiting for His consent, they would fain have carried Him away by main force to the Holy City, and there seated Him upon the empty throne of David, which had long been waiting for its proper king. How shallow and hollow this outburst of enthusiasm was, Jesus well knew; He knew the surface motives from which it sprung; He knew that a clear disclosure of the nature of His kingdom would change that throng of willing subjects into one of open enemies, and, sick at heart, He turned away and withdrew Himself into solitude, that He might commune in prayer with the Father.

I. *It is evident that the violence referred to in our text is not something to be commended, but something to be condemned.* The conduct of the Jews in this instance is not an example, but a warning; it is not something we are to follow, but something we are to shun.

All violence in religion is displeasing to God. The kingdom of heaven does not take us by force, and we are not to take it by force. It has, indeed, suffered violence, and the violent have attempted to capture it by force. All sorts of men have tried to press into it. Many whose hearts and hands were unclean have seized upon it with eagerness because of the temporal advantages which they expected to reap from connection with it. The tide-wave of popularity has always carried upon its crest a vast quantity of rubbish. When the loaves and fishes have been abundant, many have sought Christ, who have deserted Him afterward when He had only spiritual blessings to dispense.

Whenever force of arms has been substituted for force of argument, the condemnation of our text has been incurred. The Spanish priests who drove the Indians to the baptismal font at the point of the sword tried to take the kingdom of heaven by violence. Constantine the Great sought to take the kingdom of heaven by violence when he established the Church by the strong arm of the State. Peter sought to de-

fend the kingdom of heaven by violence when he cut off the ear of Malchus.

"Put your sword into its scabbard" is the word of Christ to all who seek to advance or defend His kingdom by violence. He has no use for carnal weapons. It is not by such means that His cause is promoted. The zeal that discards the truth and has recourse to force is blind and misguided; it may be a zeal of God, but it is not according to knowledge. Instead, then, of exclaiming, with Ambrose, "O blessed violence!" let us rather exclaim, "O unseemly violence!"

II. *All violence in religion is unsuccessful.* It was so in the case of the Jews. Their aim was frustrated. The weapons employed by them did not prosper. The kingdom of God could not be forced. Success would have meant such an irruption of worldly power into the moral empire of Christ as to have changed its character and nullified its mission.

Those who cling to the conventional interpretation of this text will be ready to ask: "Is it not true that those only who are in dead earnest succeed in obtaining salvation? that those only who strive with agony enter in at the strait gate?" Not for a moment is that to be questioned; but that is not the truth presented here. These words do not lay down the rule for entering the kingdom of Christ; rather do they give an illustration of unlawful and unsuccessful striving; they do not present an argument on behalf of persevering prayer and resolute endeavor, but an argument against an unholy zeal that is neither according to knowledge as to its end, nor according to wisdom as to its means.

III. *All violence in religion springs from mistaken ideas of God, and of His kingdom.* It is spiritual blindness that has led the Church to depend upon force for the establishment of God's kingdom on the earth. "It is not apostolical," says Erasmus, "to wield the iron sword." Heaven's victories are won, not by physical force, but by the power of truth and love.

When God seems to delay in setting up His kingdom, let the spirit of impatience that would hurry Him up be checked. We can well afford to wait for the unfolding of His purposes. The gates of opportunity will open in good time, that the righteous nation that keepeth His laws may enter in.

In the matter of the attainment of eternal life, violence or force is not to be thought of. There is no need to storm the strong castle of the kingdom that by our importunity we may force God to capitulate. The proper symbol of heaven is not a barred, but an open gate. Alford says truly, in the present connection, "The kingdom of heaven was now laid open to the entrance of man—spread out that all might take." All violence is therefore uncalled for.

Far from us be the thought that prayers and tears are required to move the heart of God and turn Him to His children. Salvation is not something to be wrung from a reluctant hand. Men are not to pray that God may be made merciful; they are to pray to Him because He is merciful. The Gospel is not to be preached as a means of disposing God to show mercy; it is to be preached as a revelation of His mercy.

The seeking soul is misguided when he is told to struggle and wrestle with God until He yields—to keep battering at the gate of heaven until it opens. All his struggling ought to be with himself. Not to overcome Divine reluctance, but to overcome the obstinacy that exists within his own heart ought to be the end of all his striving. The true way of entering the kingdom is not by violent assault, but by walking humbly and softly through the lowly gate, way of repentance. Not as the conqueror of God, but as the conqueror of self; not as a victorious warrior, but as a little child does any soul enter into the kingdom of God.

---

NATURE when subjected to the torture never leads us astray.—*Barnes*

### THE ANOINTING OF GOD.

By A. J. GORDON, D.D. [BAPTIST],  
NORTHFIELD, MASS.

*Moreover the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take thou also unto thee principal spices, of pure myrrh five hundred shekels, and of sweet cinnamon half so much, even two hundred and fifty shekels, etc.—Ex. xxx. 22-25.*

It certainly seems strange to go back to such ancient passages of Scripture to find a text for a subject that is set forth in the New Testament, and that shall be characteristic of the Christian dispensation. I do this the rather to show what wondrous harmony there is between the Old and the New Testaments, and how the old covenant sheds a clear and distinct light upon the teachings of the new. There are a great many who disparage the types of the Old Testament. I speak solemnly when I say that I believe these types are as accurate as mathematics. The printer will sometimes make a mistake by reversing his letter, and give you a bad period, but I have found no instance where the types of God have been imperfect. Now, every Christian who is well instructed, or who knows the first principles of faith, understands that the two great doctrines of the Gospel as touching us are, first, justification, and second, sanctification, or to put it, perhaps, in a simpler way, our conversion, and, second, our consecration, the one having direct relation to Jesus Christ and the other having direct relation to the Holy Spirit. Now, it is wonderful how the types set forth these facts in due order and relation so that there is no confusion. For instance, let us look at the ceremony of the cleansing of the leper, who was always accounted a type of the sinner. God commands them to take the blood of the victim and with it to touch the right ear, and the right thumb, and the right toe, and then the priest is to dip his finger in the oil and put the oil upon the right ear, the right thumb, and the right toe of the leper three times. This is repeated, always the

same, the oil after blood. The blood of Jesus Christ first cleanses us from our sins and then the Holy Spirit comes to sanctify and purify us.

When the fire is taken as an emblem of the Spirit, it takes the same relation. Come with me for just a moment in the Holy of Holies. The great High Priest has entered on the Day of Atonement. He sprinkles the golden lid of the Mercy Seat with the blood, then the pillar of fire rests down upon the blood. Blood first, fire second. We must first come under the blood of Jesus Christ before we can be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Again, water is sometimes used as a symbol of the Holy Spirit. Let us watch now the priest about his ministry. He comes first to the brazen altar, where the blood is sprinkled, and which cleanses from sin, and then he proceeds inward until he comes to the laver, where he washes his feet; first the blood, and then the water; first justification through Jesus Christ's atoning death and then sanctification by His Spirit shed upon us.

Now, brethren, let us dwell just a moment upon this wonderful compound. Do you think God went through all the pains of giving these directions for making this costly ointment simply because he took a fancy? Let us notice this wonderful compound. What was it for? It was for the anointing of Aaron as he was inducted into the priesthood. He was not anointed as the leper was, but for his ministry and office, which we are now talking about. And so Aaron is anointed and inducted into the sacred mysteries, and this wonderful compound is not to be simply sprinkled upon the right ear, the right thumb, and the right toe, but it is poured upon his head in great profusion, running down his beard, even down to the skirts of his garments, so that all the room is filled with the fragrance thereof; and Aaron was but the type of our great High Priest. Those are wonderful words in the 133d Psalm: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in

unity." The great commentary on the Psalms says that it is not unity with one another that is meant, but unity with the great Head which makes unity with one another. For brethren to dwell together in unity is like the precious ointment upon the head that ran down the beard, even Aaron's beard; that went down to the skirts of his garments. The Holy Ghost was poured upon Him who is the Head of all things, and then it ran down all of His mystical body from the Day of Pentecost, descending down until it shall touch the last member in that body, which is to enter in when the Church, the bride of Christ, is to be completed. All of us share in the anointing of our great High Priest. May God grant that we may be coming under that gracious anointing now.

Now, this is all very uplifting and comforting; but there is that in this text which suggests the most radical and searching lines of truth, which I proceed to give you in the three prohibitions in regard to the use of this sacred ointment. First, "Whosoever putteth any of it on a stranger shall be cut off from his people;" second, "whosoever compoundeth anything like it shall be even cut off from his people;" third, "upon man's flesh it shall not be poured." Now, this may sound very mystical, but I believe in these three prohibitions. I find the tests which apply to the times in which we live. First, "Whosoever putteth any of it on a stranger shall be cut off from his people." Isn't it the most subtle and dangerous and widespread heresy of the time that there are no strangers now, that all men are the sons of God; or to put it as I heard it recently said: "The Church is co-extensive with humanity; everybody belongs to the Church." When I speak of it I am sure to have somebody rise up with serious questioning; they say: "What! are we not all created by God?" I want you to ponder for a moment on the fact that creation does not make a son; if I make a watch, that watch is not my



son. If I built a steamboat, that steamboat would not be my son; it would simply be my workmanship. Adam is not called a son of God, but it reads in the Greek, "Adam of God," which does not mean a son of God. Adam was created; it is only being begotten again that makes us sons of God. How are we sons of God? By adoption. That word adoption should never appear in our Scriptures. Anybody that understands Greek knows that it means "son-making," and therefore should read "sonship," and if a man has not been begotten of God he is not a son of God according to Scripture. "As many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." The only way that we can become sons of God is to be begotten of God; therefore you cannot put the Holy Ghost through the symbols and ordinances of the Church, which are the signs and channels of the Holy Spirit, upon those who have never been regenerated by the Holy Ghost, for if you do, you put this anointing oil upon a stranger.

The apostle says, very solemnly, that, "In our former state we were strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the Word." That is our condition—strangers and aliens. One of the best commentators says that it is a very striking fact that in the Court of the Gentiles in the temple there were placards all around written in Greek and Latin, on which were simply these words: "Draw not nigh." They were warned off from coming into the Holy Place, and most of all from approaching the Holy of Holies, and so were placed on every side the words, "Draw not nigh." But look up; there is another inscription! This is written not only in Greek and Latin, but in Hebrew: "Jesus, King of the Jews." But it means more than that. The words which the Gentiles read "Draw not nigh," now read, "Let us draw nigh." How can the blood of Christ make us nigh? Distance is not always

mathematical, it is moral. There may be a man sitting beside you who, in a moral sense, is very far from you. There may be two persons living on opposite sides of the globe who are at this moment in such close communion with Jesus Christ that they are in very close contact with each other. The Roman soldier who thrust the spear into the side of Jesus Christ was physically very near to Christ, but morally was not so near to Christ as some penitent in a far distant part of the world to-day. How nigh the blood of Jesus Christ has brought us who were once far off! I am standing close to you this morning so that we could touch arms, but you are not as near me as my arm, because my arm is a part of me, and we are parts of Christ's body and of His flesh and of His bones, so near that we cannot be nearer; as near as two parts of His mystical body. Therefore, when the holy ointment is poured on our High Priest it comes upon us, but we are not permitted to place this holy anointing oil upon a stranger.

Observe the second prohibition: "Whosoever compoundeth anything like it shall be cut off from his people." Isn't that the great mistake in the Church of Jesus Christ to-day—trying to counterfeit everything that applies to the work of God in His house? Now, what is the Church of Jesus Christ to-day? The Church of Jesus Christ is not simply a body of those who have voluntarily established themselves for the worship and the service of God. The Church of Jesus Christ to-day is a body of believers united in Him who is head over all things to His Church through the Holy Ghost. Now, suppose that Peter and James and John had got together after Jesus ascended to form a church; they could not have done it. They could not form a church until the Holy Ghost came down. When that came then the Church began. Now, it is interesting to read the first of the Acts of the Apostles on this point and notice the addition. The first thing we read after the outpouring of



the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost is that three thousand souls were added. Added to what? There is nothing in the Greek to show what they were added to, and so the translators have put it "added to them." But they were not added to the apostles. If I add myself to you and add you to me, that does not make a church. The Holy Ghost is the first numeral, and when the Holy Ghost came down and took His place, then you could begin to add; so the passage should read that three thousand souls were added unto the Lord. You cannot have any church until you have the Lord in the centre to add to. The Church is the temple of God, indwelt by the Holy Ghost. I wish that we could just pause a moment and think what that means. He is not here as the guest; He is here as the host. He is not in the Church by invitation, to come and go as He pleases; He is in the Church to occupy and to rule. He is in the Church as the very executor of God. Now, I want you to think of this and just for a moment let your thoughts come to the conclusion that they should reach instantly. What does it mean that the Holy Ghost is in the Church to rule, guide and occupy it? It means that we are to let Him go do what He is there to do, and that is everything. Worship; is that the first business of the Church of God? God is a spirit, and He seeketh such to worship Him in spirit and in truth. In the Holy Ghost we have the Person who is to carry on all the work of the Church.

Now, as to the singing. How is the singing of God's Church to be carried on? By those who feel the Spirit speaking to them. They should praise God in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in their hearts. The only condition is that they be filled with the Spirit. What have we been doing in our churches these last years? Haven't we been making an apothecary's compound to imitate all sorts of singing for the music of God's house? We have gone to the theatre for the myrrh, and to the opera

for the aloes, and to the concert hall for the cinnamon, and I know not what else, and they have all been mixed up, and on Sunday morning we have a mixture that fills the room with its fragrance; but those who are spiritual do not enjoy the fragrance. Those who have the best voices are selected for the singers, no matter if they are unconverted. Suppose some Sunday morning I should come into the pulpit where I minister, and I should find another man occupying my place, I should be astonished, and I might ask, "What does this mean?" and suppose they should reply, "Well, we have concluded that he has a better voice than you have. He has a more eloquent and rhetorical style than you have. We don't wish to turn you out, but we have just put him in to help you out." I should say, "I do not care to be helped out in that way. If you want this man to preach for you, I will go;" and I believe that in many churches those who have been trying to help out the Holy Ghost by their artificial, apothecary's singing, have driven out the Holy Ghost, and He has ceased to dwell there.

Do I speak strongly? I have been now for twenty-two years the pastor of one flock, and for ten years I was in the most desperate bondage to the concocted, classical music, and for the last ten years I believe I have seen the power of God in that church, and I think the secret of it more than anything else is that we have been freed from this artificial method of worship. There is no singing like that of the Holy Ghost. If you are filled with the Spirit, you will utter the kind of music that will please the angels. Woe to that church that undertakes to be sanctified and puts upon the unsanctified people that which belongs only to the saints, the sanctified of the Holy Ghost.

And how about the preaching? When a great painter was asked by one who sat entranced before his picture, "With what do you mix your colors, in order to have such an exquisite result?" he replied, "With brains." When the

Apostle Peter preached his great sermon, he was asked, "How did you succeed in preaching that sermon?" and he replied, "With the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." I do not know how much of art or rhetoric there may have been in Peter's sermon; but I do know that the power of it was due to the fact that he was taken up and swept by the Holy Ghost.

#### THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE.

BY JAY N. TAFT, D.D. [CONGREGATIONAL], GREENVILLE, MICH.

*These twelve Jesus sent forth.*—Matt. x. 4.

THE eloquence of the Bible is seen in what it does not say as truly as in what it does say. The future writers on Christian evidences will make more of this reticence than they do now. Never man spake as did Jesus, but His silence was as impressive as His speech. The world claims to have had seven bibles. See which of them allows you the greatest opportunity to read between the lines. Of Christ it is written, "He opened not His mouth." The fact is most suggestive. We call speech silver, silence golden, and so advise him who would be thought wise to hold his tongue. Scripture silence is instructive. Christ sent forth twelve men, but we know very little of their life-work. The few items we have would form a meagre record. It would take a tiny space in your pocket. You would probably have room enough left for a card-case, pen-holder and pencil. The minus quality is noteworthy. We know that Philip once remarked on the contents of a lad's lunch-basket, and that he, with Judas—not Iscariot, the delegate to Antioch—asked for some physical manifestation of Messiah; but beyond this all is a blank. James and John are conspicuous for saying what they would like to be and were unfitted to be—premiers in Christ's kingdom—for they would call fire from heaven on those who opposed them. Simon Zelotes is after the Herr Most order, and An-

drew we might call the apostle of good manners, and fancy him saying to the Master, "Allow me to introduce to you my brother," while of Nathanael we know little more than that he was "without guile." Judas's publicity was a warning.

Dr. Bruce points out the Lord's sagacity in selecting Galileans, with but one exception. It was a small district. The workers chosen were obscure men; but Galilee, by its location, allowed of contact with the men of the age and the thoughts of the time. Though rustic, Galileans were courageous. Josephus says they did not know what fear was. The new religion needed men of intrepidity. Boneless and jelly-faced Christians never amount to much. God chooses for His work men unknown to the world. Moses was a shepherd and Christ a carpenter. The apostles were fishermen and publicans. There were, however, three requisites—they must have been with Christ, they were to preach the Gospel, and also work miracles.

1. Our first lesson from the suppression of details, such as might have gratified our curiosity as to their individual lives, is this, the simplicity of the apostolic function. They were to build, not a hierarchy, but to build up men. They were to preach the Gospel of Christ, and not to establish a pontifical supremacy. The fact that "Paul withstood Peter to the face, because he ought to be blamed," shows their equality. If Peter was the first pope, Paul was the first Protestant. The apostles could exchange pulpits and ignore the use of a surplice without violating any ecclesiastical law. Just as the simplicity of Christianity was more and more recognized, Jewish spectacular display disappeared. Just as the purity of primitive piety was debased, formalism increased in the early Church. We need to heed the lesson. As a walking and talking Lazarus was an irrefutable proof of resurrection to the unbelievers of his day, so a living, consistent Christian is now the most effective evidence

of the truth of religion. As the work of the apostle was to preach, not himself, but Christ, so we should make the central end of our teaching and living the grace and truth of God.

2. We are taught that the real worker is Christ, and that the human success depends wholly on Him. We must plant and labor, but He alone can give the increase. We are not to glory in man. John does not mention his own name in his Gospel; and when Matthew alludes to himself he puts to his name the opprobrious epithet, "The publican." The Bible is not a book of human biographies, but a story of God's grace. Christ is all and in all. Luke, in his record of apostolic work, refers to a previous account of what Christ "began to do," and goes on to tell what Christ continued to do through the voice and hands of the apostles. The Scriptures are a great signboard, on which appears the one, all-important sentence, "Behold the Lamb of God!" Let us not say, "Dr. A.'s church, Dr. B.'s church," but sink self out of sight before the august glory of Him who cometh with "dyed garments, mighty to save."

3. From the silence of Scripture as to these matters we also learn that much, if not most, of the good work done is not rewarded here. God, however, is not unrighteous to forget or to record it. Take courage, obscure toiler, for the Thomas and the Bartholomew of whom we know little here may perhaps outshine John or Paul, of whom we know more. I know a minister who has said, "If one blow not his own horn, by whom shall his horn be blown?" You may be sure that his horn is blown often and loud. But of Jesus it was said, "He shall not cry, nor lift up nor cause His voice to be heard in the street."

True living is measured not by years, but by deeds; not by figures on a dial, but by heart-throbs for God and man. The world is too busy to care much for what we do; but God keeps the angels writing, writing, as the years go by; and what a revelation will be hereafter!

Names now heralded will be forgotten, while sainted sufferers, men and women unknown to the world, but rich in faith and self-sacrifice, will be honored in the presence of the King. Let us, then, labor on in patience and hope, for our reward is sure.

As Havergal has said:

"Now the sowing and the weeping,  
 . . . then the reaping,  
 Harvest home and grateful song."

### THE OLD GARMENT AND THE NEW; LEGALISM AND GRACE.

BY EDWARD JUDSON, D.D. [BAPTIST],  
 NEW YORK CITY.

*No man putteth a piece of new cloth on to  
 an old garment.*—Matt. ix. 16.

To study the beginnings of things is interesting to us. The picture of your friend in boyhood and anecdotes of his early life possess a peculiar charm. The childhood of great men always attracts readers. The life of an oak folded in the leaves of an acorn is full of suggestiveness. The records of Christ's life and that of His Church, for this reason, possess absorbing interest to us. We see two growths, one crystallizing about the person of John the Baptist, the other about Jesus Christ. The disciples of the two had warm discussions on matters of belief and practice. Baptism was one topic. The followers of the forerunner put a higher moral value on his baptism than they did on the baptism of Jesus. John and Jesus understood each other. Churches now clash while their pastors may remain undisturbed. Indeed, John preached his disciples away to Jesus, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God." He was not anxious about "our church," so much as he was to have them know Him who took away the sins of the world. It should be noticed that there was a basis of deep, moral earnestness in these discussions. The spirit of indifference, the "don't care" attitude toward truth, is reprehensible. Here we find men in earnest. John's disciples fasted and

wore a long face, it is true; they were like those who travel to a pilgrim shrine. They cultivated an ascetic temper, while those with Jesus rejoiced as those who hastened to a wedding. They were full of gladness and smiles, like the thousands of Endeavorers who have crowded our streets the past week. How is this? Some may have asked the question of Jesus in a way that showed their contempt of Him and His new religion, as if it were not worthy respect. They saw no propriety in this manifested happiness, but chose the yoke of their fathers. Others may have put the query with a real desire to know the secret of a peace which they felt they did not themselves possess. They fasted and wept; they did this and that service, and sought to gain the righteousness which is according to the law. But the followers of Jesus learned of Him. They rejoiced, for the Bridegroom was with them. How could they mourn?

The thought of the text is concrete, and is clothed in a homely garb, unlike the ornate, majestic forms which modern preachers often adopt. Old cloth and new cloth are not to be put together, for they are unlike in appearance. They may look piebald or mixed. More than that, the one tears away from the other. Old skins or bottles cannot hold the new wine, for fermentation will swell, stretch, and burst the old bottles. These figures are simple and plain. Now, what was the one truth Christ taught? Just this: that He founded a religion radically new and not a patched-up Judaism. John presented to the people a revised Judaism, an old suit made over and repaired. Repentance and Righteousness were its two vital elements, important, indeed, but not all the truth. Sorrow for sin must be felt and manifested outwardly by sackcloth and ashes, by attitude and expression. Then, in addition, they must do right, keep doing, according to the law of Moses. On the other hand, Christ brought good tidings, good news. Judaism was neither new nor good, though the best the world then had.

The heathen of India have always known what it is to feel sorrow for wrongdoing. Oriental philosophers exalt rightdoing, but where is the inspiration and power? Pharisaism was Judaism gone to seed. It showed an outward sorrow which was not felt within. There was the hypocritical disfigurement of the face without genuine grief at sin. Righteousness degenerated into punctiliousness. Ritualism took the place of sincere obedience. John seeks to purify and rehabilitate the old system. He urges men to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, to be honest in devotions, and not to perform them at the street corners to be seen of men. But Jesus unfolds in place of Repentance and Righteousness, two other ideas practically new, Forgiveness and Regeneration. He made all things new in revealing salvation through grace, in presenting the liberty of the Gospel in place of Jewish legalism. By faith in Jesus Christ there is a forgiveness of sin more complete and satisfying than that which is related to the blood of bulls and goats, or to the mortification of the body of the sinner himself. Christ in us becomes the power of a new life. Love to Him makes our will obedient and our service an easy yoke. Two lessons are to be learned from this passage:

1. Forgiveness is better than penance. Penance is superficial. It has to do with the body. Penance is proud. "I fast twice in the week," said the Pharisee (Luke xviii.). The harder the burden imposed, the more popular the system with many. Fear and threats have a power to secure obedience which the love of Jesus fails to establish. Men, nine to one, would rather "work their passage" to heaven than to accept the free grace of Jesus Christ.

2. Do not be discouraged if you find the Gospel unpopular and hear it said, "The old is better." The papacy is Judaism, penance and merit with a thin veneer of Christianity. Too many of us, even, come under the bonds of legalism, trying to do this and do that,

instead of enjoying the freedom of the children of God. Where are you, my brother? Let the love of Christ be the mainspring of effort. Though others may choose the old garment, "PUT YE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST!"

### STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

God, revealed and revealing, is the glory of this matchless song of creation and providence. No blind force inherent in Nature has produced this ordered and beautiful universe. It is the product of a Divine Thinker, and the many-voiced witness to His infinite wisdom. It is His dwelling-place. He lives in its every moment. His strength is the source of its ceaseless movement, His mind the fountain of its ideas, His heart the spring of its boundless goodness. "The heavens, even the heavens are the Lord's; the earth hath He given to the children of men;" but "the sea is His, and He made it." It belongs to Him in a unique sense. Man holds a brief lease of the land; he ploughs and sows it, and reaps a harvest; builds on it his huts and houses, castles and palaces, and rules it from the rivers to the ends of the earth. His axe cuts down the forests, and his spade and trowel build the town. His plough powders the hills, his hand scatters the seed, and the granaries are full of corn. The plains are populated by his children, the rivers and straits are spanned by his suspension bridges, and he tunnels his way through the rock-ribbed hills. On island and continent we cannot get away from his handiwork; but on the sea we may travel for miles and never hear his voice, or see the signs of his activity. Man has no abiding dominion there. He passes over it with his ships, and leaves no traces behind. He uses it, and links together distant peoples, but he cannot own it. It scorns his puny strength and will not be tamed by his skill, and when once the fury of its anger is reached flings him to ruin in a moment. Even Mont Cenis cannot stop his engineering, for he makes his way from side to side of the Alps; but the sea will not defer to his behests or respect his fears. It is God's sea. He made it, and He rules it. It voices His irresistible strength. It reveals His almighty power, and repeats to the sailor's soul, in many languages and with every variety of tone, the primitive Abrahamic Gospel, "I am the Lord God Almighty; walk before Me and be thou perfect."—*Citford*. (Ps. civ. 24-27.)

GRIEF, sorrow, pain of heart, mourning, is no partition-wall between man and God. So far is it from opposing any obstacle to the passage of God's light into man's soul, that the Lord congratulates them that mourn. There is no evil in sorrow. True, it is not an essential good, a good in itself, like love; but it will mingle with any good thing, and is even so allied to good that it will open the door of the heart for any good. More of sorrowful than of joyful men are always standing about the everlasting doors that open into the presence of the Most High.—*Macdonald*. (Matt. v. 4.)

THERE is a terrible responsibility incurred in all beginnings that do not finish—beginnings made without calculation, without rational, cool, clear-headed resolution; without counting the cost, without anticipating the stress and securing the resources. And it is for the honor of the cause, it is for the honor of the kingdom that our Lord would bar all such unbusiness-like disasters, and therefore He turns on the

crowd as they vaguely follow, sternly bidding them beware; let them take care, there is a risk run in starting on the Christian's life; the work will be severe and long the labors; the kingdom cannot afford a series of defeats, an exhibition of folly; there must be no irrational hurrying in reckless enthusiasm. These, if they lapse, do more than fail—they hurt and damage the Kingdom and the Cause. Then there must be inspiration and zeal, just because they are so sorely needed. They must not be frittered away or wasted in rash efforts that begin in heedless haste and cannot finish.—*Holland*. (Luxe xiv. 28-30.)

THE Maker of these heavens and of this earth, the infinite and Eternal One whom we cannot comprehend, stoops down to take notice of you and me, follows us about in our wanderings—and, oh! into what strange places we often lead Him—governs us every instant, works out His great Divine purposes through our failures as well as our successes. You were awakened this morning by the touch of His hand; He was with you when you thought about the services of this day, and heard the unspoken conclusions to which you came; He is with you now in that pew, separating you from your fellow-worshippers, and sees every ripple that is passing over the surface of your soul. To-morrow He will be with you in every way that you take, in every bargain you strike, and stand by a silent Listener to your every conversation. I say it is a stupendous thought. No wonder that David exclaimed, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it."—*Hastings*. (1 Tim. iv. 10.)

THE gladsome child runs farther afield; the wounded child turns to go home. The weeper sits down close to the gate; the Lord of life draws nigh to him from within. God loves not sorrow, yet rejoices to see a man sorrowful, for in his sorrow man leaves his heavenward door on the latch, and God can enter to help him. He loves, I say, to see him sorrowful, for then He can come near to part him from that which makes his sorrow a welcome sight. When Ephraim bemoans himself, he is a pleasant child. So good a medicine is sorrow, so powerful to slay the moths that infest and devour the human heart, that the Lord is glad to see a man weep. He congratulates him on his sadness. Grief is an ill-favored thing, but she is Love's own child, and her mother loves her.—*Macdonald*. (Matt. v. 4.)

"It is not the will of your Father in Heaven," said Christ, "that one of these little ones should perish." Ah! do they not perish? In millions. Think of the physical degradation; think of the moral waste! Every year hundreds of little children in Christian England alone are overlaid by their drunken mothers, and most of them on Saturday night, when the worst work is done by the vile god of our national faithlessness. Every year thousands of little English children die poisoned by the taint inherited by vitiated blood of their parents, and yet this perishing is not nearly so deadly as that of those who grow up in the gutter and the slum in our drink and greed-created hotbeds, for the artificial breeding among us of harlotry and crime. And, oh, what a frightful perishing it is! How black, how leprous do the souls become which might have been so fair and so innocent!—*Farrar*. (Matt. vi. 10.)

WE speak of Christianity as a historical religion. It is true, because it is builded on historical facts and not on theory. You would have an easier task to prove that Washington or Napoleon never lived than that Christ was never resurrected from the dead. Christianity is historical because Christianity has made history. It was an apt reply which James Russell Lowell made at a dinner in England, shortly before his



return to this country, when a man sneered at the Christian religion. He said: "Gentlemen, there is not a spot a mile square on the continent where you would care to live if it were not Christianized or where Christian institutions do not exist." Christianity is historical, because it is making history every day. If the history of the hearts in this church to-night could be written, it would testify to the helpfulness of the Christian religion.—*Behrends*.

### THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Necessity of Concentration. "One thing I know."—John xix. 25. "One thing is needful."—Luke x. 42. "One thing have I desired."—Psalm xxvii. 4. "One thing I do."—Phil. iii. 13. A. J. F. Behrends, D.D., Rochester, N. Y.
2. Suicide: The Vice of Civilization. "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged," etc.—Matt. vii. 1-5. Rev. Elmer E. Willey, St. Louis, Mo.
3. The Veiled Revealed. "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known."—1 Cor. xiii. 12. J. P. Lauder, D.D., York, Pa.
4. Prayer and Prosperity. "O Lord, I beseech thee, send now prosperity."—Psalm cxviii. 25.—Rev. H. H. Donly, York, Pa.
5. The Involutions and the Revolutions of Providence. "The appearance of the wheels and their work was like unto the color of a beryl; and they four had one likeness: and their appearance and their work was as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel. When they went they went upon the four sides; and they turned not when they went," etc.—Ezek. i. 16-18. J. L. Kephart, D.D., Dayton, O.
6. The Demand of Immediate Service. "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard."—Matt. xxi. 28. H. Allen Tupper, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
7. The Uplifted Saviour All-Conquering. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life."—John iii. 14, 15. W. F. Bolling, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
8. Love, the Nature of God. "And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him."—1 John iv. 16. Rev. F. B. Meyer, North field, Mass.
9. The Good Samaritan; or, Practical Religion. "But Jesus answering said, A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead," etc.—Luke x. 30-37. H. W. Conry, D.D., Tulane, Cal.
10. The Prayer of Submission. "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."—Matt. vi. 10. Ven. F. W. Farrar, D.D., London, Eng.
11. The Reward of Obedience. "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

. . . Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye," etc.—Matt. v. 7, 10-12. George Macdonald, LL.D.

12. The Church's Manifesto. "We trust in the living God."—1 Tim. iv. 10. Rev. J. B. Hastings, B.A., London, Eng.
13. Elements of Christian Graciousness. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen."—Phil. iv. 23. G. Chapman Jones, LL.D., Rochester, N. Y.

### Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. The Divine Provision for Honesty and Content. ("Study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, even as we have charged you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing."—1 Thess. iv. 11, 12.)
  2. The Ground of Christian Fearlessness. ("He hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee. So that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me."—Heb. xiii. 5, 6.)
  3. The Ignorance of Sorrow and the Sorrow of Ignorance. ("And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him."—John xx. 13.)
  4. The Divine Compensation of Human Liberty. ("Ye sent once and again unto my need. . . . And my God shall fulfil every need of yours according to His riches in glory in Christ Jesus."—Phil. iv. 16, 19.)
  5. All Things Through, Unto, After and In Christ. ("All things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist."—Col. i. 16, 17.)
  6. God's Reversal of Human Designs. ("Let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. . . . And from thence did the Lord scatter them upon the face of all the earth."—Gen. xi. 6, 9.)
- BLOOD THEOLOGY: A SERIES.
7. Life through Blood. ("Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."—John vi. 54.)
  8. Redemption through Blood. ("In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace."—Eph. i. 7.)
  9. Justification by Blood. ("Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him."—Rom. v. 9.)
  10. Pacification through Blood. ("And having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."—Col. i. 20.)
  11. Sanctification by Blood. ("Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate."—Heb. xiii. 12.)



## THANKSGIVING THEMES.

12. The Best Method of Observing a Day of Thanksgiving. ("Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared; for this day is holy unto our Lord; neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength."—Neh. viii. 10.)
13. Thanksgiving for National Deliverances. ("The Lord is my strength and song, and He is become my salvation; He is my God, and I will prepare Him a habitation; my father's God, and I will exalt Him."—Ex. xv. 2.)
14. Desirable Immigration. ("Therefore shall thy gates be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought."—Isa. ix. 11.)
15. Gratitude for Translation from Darkness to Light. ("Giving thanks unto the Father, who made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love."—Col. i. 12, 13.)

## HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

## A Study of Psalm XXIII.

WHAT the Lord is to the believer is here set forth in a poem peculiarly Oriental in imagery. Two figures are employed, both very familiar to the Eastern mind—the *Shepherd* and the *Host*. One is expressed, the other implied.

The full beauty of this double representation is apparent only when we study its parallel structure, and place corresponding parts side by side. Then three things will be seen:

1. That two figures are employed because either alone is inadequate.

2. That each is complementary to the other.

3. That the second uniformly is an advance upon the first.

Seven suggestions are very prominent:

1. All *wants* are met in God. Tender pastures and waters of rest. A prepared table and an overflowing cup. Here the second figure shows the advance in thought. The shepherd only finds pasture; the host prepares the banquet.

2. All *energy* and joy are supplied in God. The restorative to the soul—the anointing of holy cheerfulness and power for service.

3. All needed *guidance*. The shepherd conducts the sheep—the host brings the guest to the banqueting hall.

4. All blessed *companionship*. Here

is the celestial escort. The Lord goes before, and goodness and mercy, like twin attendants, follow after.

5. All *security*. In the valley of the shadow of death we walk through unharmed, in the Lord's house we stand before our foes, beholding their discomfiture.

6. All *comfort* in sorrow. God's rod of correction and staff of protection are alike a comfort to believers. And His anointing fills them with joy and ecstasy.

7. An *abiding-place* for homeless souls. We *walk through* the valley of the shadow of death; we *dwell* forevermore in the house of the Lord.

All this depends on our faith, whether we can appropriate God and truly say, "My Shepherd." It is curious to notice how the second figure is left to be *inferred*. Why did not David, in introducing the second part, say, "Jehovah is my *Host*"? Perhaps because the fullness of this relationship waited to be revealed (John i. 11, 12). God is in Christ more than Host, and we are more than *guests*. He is our Father, and we are His sons and daughters. Hence our welcome home and our dwelling-place there. He is ours and we are His, and all that is His is ours. To the Jew He was Shepherd, to the Christian believer He is Father. (Compare John x. and xiv.—xviii. for progress of doctrine.)

### The Abundance of Grace.

Rom. v. 8-21.

To these fourteen verses one expression, five times used, at the turning points of the argument, is the key—"MUCH MORE." The passage is the battle-ground of the ages, where theologians have fought; it is also the exposition ground of the ages, where God displays His grace. The argument is very close-jointed and compact, but the leading thoughts may be viewed in *six pairs*.

I. Two facts. Sin and death, both universal and both implying law, since sin is transgression and death is penalty.

II. Two laws. One a written law, through Moses; the other an unwritten one, in nature, found in the very structure of the universe and the nature of man.

III. Two heads. Adam, physically and federally and naturally. Christ spiritually and in the covenant of grace.

IV. Two falls. Germinally in Adam, as the seed and stock from which the race springs; and voluntarily by the wilful sin of each man, and especially rejection of Christ.

V. Two risings. Without faith, so far as our fall is only in Adam; by faith, so far as the will enters into sin and guilt.

VI. Two aspects of God's character.  
1. A necessary exercise of judgment, as obligatory on a universal governor; a voluntary exercise of justification, in grace toward enemies and sinners.

Hence, 1. Infant salvation is provided for in a scheme of grace, since infants have not voluntarily sinned.

2. Human responsibility, since no man is finally condemned without wilful sin.

3. Conditional salvation, since grace reigns through *righteousness* unto eternal life.

4. No standing still; we must be much more saved or much more lost.

5. Redemption complete. Rev. xxii. brings us back to Gen. i. They that have washed their robes have a right

to the tree of life. Only now there is a city, not a garden, and security in God—we shall go no more out, no more curse.

### Philosophy of Prayer.

ADOLPH MONOD's dying regret was that he had *not prayed more*.

True prayer is the reflection in the human soul of the mind and will of God; and to understand it we need to understand the two advocates (compare 1 John ii. 1, John xiv. 16, and Rom. viii. 26, 34).

There we are taught the source and the ultimate end of prayer. It starts in the spirit in the heart and ends in Christ's intercession, and so reaches the Divine ear.

The nature of these two forms of intercession we cannot now know, but we know that the Spirit's advocacy lies in awakening and directing of holy desires and affections.

The burden of Christ's intercession at the throne is in behalf of his saints (Heb. vii. 25; Luke xxii. 31; John xvii. 9). Perpetual pleading for His own followers. Even the Father is involved, for it is "according to God." The Son reflects the Father's thought and will, and the Spirit and Son reflect together the will of God, and so through the true prayers of believers, the very mind of God courses back to God (Col. i. 9; ii. 1; iv. 2, 12). Hence come such expressions as of Jude, "praying in the Holy Ghost."

It is of highest importance to rise above a worldly atmosphere and get to the higher altitude where we find God's currents.

"*Infirmities*," the Spirit helps. 1. *Ignorance*, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought. When dealing with promises we have only to claim, but sometimes we have no definite promise and need to be taught. We need, in such cases, to listen and wait till we find whether our prayer is of God, and so we obtain a new promise in this consciousness. 2. *In-*

*constancy* (1 Thess. v. 17; Eph. vi. 18; Luke xviii. 1). However otherwise occupied, a strong current runs through the heart—a current of prayer. May not every act have a Godward tendency? Christ's answers to men were His answers to God—responses to the Father. Every incident and question may be a part of interchange with God. 3. *Unbelief*. We need the level of faith to appreciate the answer, as well as to ask. We need to be lifted to the level of faith; to give God His right place and to take our own. Hence (Matt. xviii. 19), one man may mistake the working of the Spirit, but not two men. Hence, also, asking in the *name* of Christ is beyond asking for His *sake*. To use the name of Jesus is to use His *authority* (John xvi.). We already *have* what we so ask (1 John v. 14). The Spirit will never lead us to plead for what is not the will of God. Canon Liddon distinguishes the prayer of *supplication* from that of *impartation*. Much prayer is simply receptive of blessing.

#### Power in Service.

A GREAT question now under discussion is that concerning the sources of dynamic power. The source of spiritual power is revealed (Acts i. 8). Our need is to know how to receive and apply this power (comp. Acts x.). If you would use nature's power, the laws of the power must be obeyed. "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." Christ Himself obeyed the slightest prompting of the Holy Spirit (Matt. viii. 9).

1. Peter did not separate the power of God from God Himself (Acts xi. 15). A famous Welsh preacher was overheard to say to God, "I will not go to preach unless You go with me." He felt the personality of the power.

2. The Spirit works through surrendered men (Acts vi. 4). "We will *give ourselves* to prayer and to the ministry of the Word." We fritter life away by spreading ourselves over too broad a surface. We ought to narrow our aim

down to be channels of the Spirit. Even Peter's parenthesis is a revelation ("He is Lord of all") (Acts x. 36. Revised Version.) See Paul emphasize what *Christ wrought through him* (Rom. xv. 18; John xiv. 12).

3. God drained Peter of self-conceit (Acts ix. 43). This must have been a humiliating experience for the head of the apostles. God uses some way to empty all whom He will fill (2 Cor. xii.).

4. The agent must yield himself to God's plan. It is always safe to stop still where we are till God shows His plan. Three signs must concur: First, the voice within; second, the Word of God without; and, third, the circumstances, or providential sign.

5. Men through whom God works are men of prayer; they do not lose individuality or even idiosyncrasy. They will have no assumption (Acts x. 26), and encourage no hero-worship.

6. The supreme motive will be the glory of God. If the inner motive is really to *have* power, or even to build up a strong church, or even to win souls, it is not the purest motive.

7. Such men are free from care and worry. The whole issue is left with God. The work is His, and the servant simply delivers God's message, and has nothing to do with consequences.

REV. F. B. MEYER.

#### The Method, Ministry, Message of Reconciliation.

*Now then we are ambassadors, etc.—*  
2 Cor. v. 18-21.

##### I. THE *method* of reconciliation.

1. A sin offering. Christ died for all, in behalf of all. Vicarious atonement.

2. A non-imputation of sin. Transgressions not reckoned to our account, but transferred to His.

3. A new creation in Christ. A positive transformation into a new likeness, forming basis of permanent agreement.

##### II. The *ministry* of reconciliation, based on ambassadorship. Define an ambassador—one who represents the

sovereign in a foreign court. Hence includes, 1, mediation ; 2, identity with God and with man ; 3, authority to represent the parties and transact in their name.

III. The *message* of reconciliation. There are three possible attitudes : 1, mutual alienation ; 2, partial reconciliation, one party being in an attitude of reconciliation and the other alienated, which is here represented to be the attitude of God and man ; and, 3, complete reconciliation where both are turned toward each other in mutual harmony.

It is said that while alienated and seated back to back, Jerrold wheeled about and addressed Dickens in language of reconciliation. Then it needed but that Dickens should *meet* Jerrold's advances to make reconciliation mutual and complete.

---

THERE is a debatable ground between what is clearly sinful and what is clearly right, and there is the master snare of Satan. It presents no firm footing, no sure standing-place. There is always risk of ruin ; one is perpetually standing on slippery places, plucking flowers on the edge of a crevasse, crossing thin ice bridges over chasms. Dr. Cheever compares worldly amusements to wooden arches on which habits of self-indulgence are built like the solid, permanent stone arches ; then the wooden arch is knocked away and burned, but the *habit* of self-will and self-gratification remains forever, built into the structure of the soul.

---

Is there not also a midway ground between duty and delight, piety and privilege, where God's children do what pertains to an unselfish ministry to God and to man, but in a spirit of constraint, coldly, unsympathetically, and almost unwillingly ? God loves a cheerful giver, a cheerful doer of His will. To preach such a gospel simply because woe is me if I do not ; to teach the ignorant simply to satisfy a sense of

obligation ; to give money because I must, and forget how much more blessed it is to give than to receive ; to engage in service without a sense of its high honor and privilege—is not this an unspeakable loss of delight and liberty in God ?

---

DISPUTE it as we may, a disciple should aim at the highest perfection, an ideal life in God. A few only attain to the practicable, not to say possible, level of holy living ; but to these few it is given to hold the very keys of the kingdom of heaven. There is no constraint or compulsion about a high standard of holiness. We may be saved yet so as by fire. But as Jesus said, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

---

#### Thoughts for a Funeral Occasion.

NOTHING needs to be learned by us more than the lesson of our dependence on God, unless it be His *independence of us*. His work is nothing for its continuance or its success upon any one workman. Moses seemed indispensable to the Hebrew nation, and his death occurred at what man would have called a most "inopportune" time, yet God had a Joshua waiting orders, who stepped into the breach and proved as grandly fitted to succeed Moses as Moses had proved to precede Joshua. There was not a day's delay or blocking of God's work. When Elijah was caught up to heaven, it seemed as though the great reformer, prophet, miracle-worker, intercessor, could not be dispensed with ; yet Elisha had been called from the plough to succeed him, and proved to be his counterpart, actually not only carrying on but completing his work. John Wesley's tomb in Westminster Abbey has the significant inscription : "God buries His workman, but He carries on his work." If we could see as God sees we should find that not one true life has ever been cut off in its incompleteness, that no true work done for God was ever permitted to be

wrecked on the rocks of a premature death. God is an economist, and He saves the energies He has accumulated. He values the lives of His saints, counts their hairs, and every drop of their blood is precious. How marvellous those three passages are, taken together: "Put Thou my tears in Thy bottle," "The very hairs of your head are all numbered," "Precious shall their blood be in His sight."

AN infidel said, "David was a man after God's own heart. Was he? And yet a pretty specimen of God's man! An adulterer, liar, and murderer." "You are a proof of the truth of God's Word," quietly answered the disciple to whom these words were addressed; "for the Bible says that Nathan told David, 'By this deed thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme!'"

THERE have been eight golden ages: Athens under Pericles, Egypt under Ptolemies, Rome under Augustus, Russia under Ivan IV., England under Elizabeth, France under Louis XIV., Italy under Leo X., and Palestine under Solomon.

JOB xiii. 26-28 contains one of the most terribly suggestive passages about sin in the entire Old Testament. It seems to refer to the moral and even physical consequences of sin under the operation of Divine laws. "Thou writest bitter things against me," the awful record of sin, both in the memory of the sinner and the remembrance of God. "Thou makest me to possess (or in-

herit) the iniquities of my youth"—the fearful legacy of sin transmitted from youth even to old age, a treasure of guilt and wrath and suffering. "Thou puttest my feet also in the stocks, and markest all my paths." "Thou drawest Thee a line about the soles of my feet." May this not refer to the retributive power of habit, which both holds the sinner in bondage and scourges him at the same time? "Though I am like a rotten thing that consumeth—like a garment that is moth-eaten." What a description this is of the destructive power of sin, eating away at body and soul until the very constitution of man is like a garment full of holes made by moths! Thus in three verses we have exhibited sin's power in *transcription*, *transmission*, *self-retribution*, *self-consumption*.

THE words "right," "rectitude," "erectness," "straight" are mathematical words applied to moral subjects. They are singularly expressive. What is a right course but one that makes a right angle with duty; what is an erect man but one who has no bends and twists in character, and leans toward no wrong; and what is a straight path but the shortest way, the most direct road between life's true starting-point and goal.

HOLINESS is higher than rectitude; it is the love of the right for its own sake, without respect to penalties and rewards. It implies sympathy with God, a law within, obeyed from an inward impulse, rather than a law without, obeyed from external constraint or restraint.

## THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

NOV. 1-5.—THREE SIGHTS OF A SAVIOUR.—Mark vi. 1, 6.

One, not a minister, who has attained a very high place in our American literature, writes thus to an habitual non-

churchgoer: "I suppose that you do not often consider the fact that the greatest amount of genuine thinking done in the world is done by preachers. I suppose you may never have reflected

that, in the midst of all this din of business and clashing of various interests, in the midst of the clamors and horrors of war, the universal pursuit of amusements and the vanities and inanities of fashion and the indulgence of multitudinous vices, there is a class of self-denying men of the best education and the best talents and habits, who in their quiet rooms are thinking and writing upon the purest and noblest themes which can engage any mind. Among these men may be found the most splendid specimens of intellectual power that the world contains. Among these men are many who are slow—stupid, if you insist upon it—but there is not one in a thousand of them who does not know more than you do. You can learn something of them all. I tell you that if you suppose the American pulpit to be contemptible, you are very much mistaken. You have stayed away from it for ten years. During all these ten years I have attended its weekly ministrations, and I have a better right to speak about it than you have, because I know more about it. I tell you that I have received during these ten years more intellectual nourishment and stimulus from the pulpit than from all other sources combined, yet my every-day pursuits are literary, while yours are not."

But there is a stronger reason than the merely intellectual why men should be constant attendants upon public worship. He who was the *Example* for men was constant in His attendance on it. The ancient synagogue represents our modern church, and every hint about Him shows that our Lord was a steady sharer in the public worship of the time. When the Sabbath came, Jesus, *as His custom was*, went into the synagogue, we are told in another place.

And, as we behold Jesus in the synagogue here and amid the scenes immediately succeeding His attendance on it, let us seek to gain *three sights of a Saviour*.

Our first sight is a *Saviour persistent*.

Jesus is here at Nazareth. This is not His first appearance in the synagogue, here at Nazareth, since the beginning of His public ministry (see Luke iv. 16, 30); but notwithstanding His former rejection, the next year our Lord is again in the synagogue at Nazareth, offering Himself for the acceptance of the people; and so we get this vision of a Saviour lovingly persistent; and in this guise of One lovingly persistent the ascended and glorified Jesus is still standing. By the Christian atmosphere our Lord has induced about us, by recurring Sabbaths, by the special persuasions of the Holy Spirit, by the particular providences which touch us, by godly ancestries, in ten thousand nameless ways the Lord Jesus beseeches our acceptance of Himself, our acceptance of His salvation. Yet, how many men, like the Nazarenes in that revisited synagogue, are persistently rejecting.

Our second sight is a *Saviour identified*. Let us take up the wondering conversation of these Nazarenes. Is not this the Carpenter? Yes, He is the sanctifier of daily and homely toil. Is He not the Son of Mary? Yes, He is a sharer in our humanity. Are not His brothers and sisters here with us? Yes, He stands in usual human relationships. Is not this His country? Yes, He knew no wider land than the narrow Palestine. Can these explain Him? Can such things adequately answer the perpetual question (verse 2), "From whence hath this man these things? And what wisdom is this which is given unto Him? that even such mighty works are wrought by His hands?" No; the only possible answer concerning the character of Christ is that He is God as well as man. The late ex-President Porter, of Yale College, said:

"I have the happiness of having a pupil whom I meet several times a week, who is a highly educated Japanese young man, sent here several years ago as one of the firstfruits of Christian missions in Japan. He was early educated in the school of Confucius. The



first thing that arrested his attention in a different direction was the Sermon on the Mount, which he says 'surprised me and overwhelmed me; then I struggled with the miracles. It was a long time before I could accept them; it cost me two or three years. Then there broke upon my mind that amazing conception of the person of Christ, possessing me and subduing me. Then I could understand those mysteries; those wonderful words which we find recorded in the Gospel of John: the testimony of Jesus concerning Himself, His disciples and His Church.' The process, as he says, occupied several months or years. This shows what power there is in the historic Christ, and that the Christ who was seen by visible eyes—through whose eyes the Divine man looked out upon the disciples—is present from one generation to another, with those whom He gains to His obedience."

But how wonderful and blissful the fact that this Divine One is the Son of Mary, does stand in our human relationships, was the carpenter! How it brings God near to us! So we identify this Christ as the Divine-human Saviour you need—the One who can save, will hear our prayer, is our perfect example, whose tender high priesthood is vibrating with sympathy for us.

But our third sight is that of a *Saviour baffled* (verses 5, 6). "With God is no freedom but to do what is fitting," says the great Anselm. "The real difficulties lie, generally speaking, with the will," says Canon Liddon. If we will not accept this Saviour, we may prevent, even as did these Nazarenes, the fulness of His ministry toward ourselves. "And He could there do no mighty work, save that He laid His hand upon a few sick and healed them. And He marvelled because of their unbelief."

Nov. 6-12.—THE WITNESSES.—Acts ii. 32.

At length they led him between the

pillars, "those two massy pillars, that to the arched roof gave main support."

"Straining all his nerves he bowed;  
As with the force of winds and waters pent,  
When mountains tremble, those two massy pillars,  
With horrible convulsion to and fro  
He tugg'd, he shook till down they came and drew  
The whole roof after them, with burst of thunder,  
Upon the heads of all who sat beneath."

So, in his "Samson Agonistes," Milton sings of Samson's exploit of strength when he wrought his last destruction on the Philistines.

And if any Samson of scepticism could ever pull down the massy pillar of the Resurrection, Christianity would lie in ruins as real and vast and irretrievable, and all the hopes which find their home in Christianity would be crushed to nothingness. It is a newspaper story. I cannot vouch for it, though it was published in as reputable a paper as the *Inquirer* of Philadelphia; but as the story goes—

"One terrible snowy, sleety day in Washington, Washington McLean was sitting in the Riggs House reading-room, looking out upon the dreary scene on Pennsylvania Avenue. Presently in came Colonel Bob Ingersoll, the great agnostic. As he entered the apartment he held out his hand, saying: 'Hello, Wash, how do you do?' Mr. McLean took his hand and, as he did so, said: 'Bob, I wish you could have been here a little while ago. I saw a scene out there that made me wish I was twenty years younger. A poor, old, crippled soldier was limping across the avenue, when a young lusty fellow ran by him, and, as he did so, kicked the crutch from under him and tumbled him down into the slush.' 'The villain,' said Ingersoll. 'He should have been sent to the penitentiary.' 'Do you really think so?' said McLean. 'Why, certainly,' replied the colonel. 'What else could I think?' 'And yet, Bob,' said McLean, 'that is what you are doing every week in the year. Here are poor, old, infirm Christians with

nothing to aid or support them but their belief in religion; nothing to keep them out of the mire of despair but faith; and yet you go about kicking the crutch from under them worse than even this fictitious fellow did to this fictitious soldier.' "

Well, it is sad business for any man to be engaged in, this knocking the crutch of faith from under the shoulders of some struggling yet hoping soul; but if Jesus were not triumphant in the Resurrection, Christianity has not even a crutch of support to offer to any weak and struggling soul.

I put it precisely as the apostle puts it in that great fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. Listen. 1 Cor. xv. 14: "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."

But concerning this immense and hinging matter of the Resurrection let us summon the witnesses. "Whereof we are witnesses," our Scripture says.

(A) There are the witnesses of the *Senses*.

What is the meaning of the Incarnation? This, that God came forth from the realm of invisibility—whose veil no mortal could draw aside—and making Himself evident and visible in Jesus Christ, lowered Himself into the realm of the human senses. How even startlingly matter-of-fact the aged John the Apostle makes it all when remembering his intercourse with the Lord Jesus through the senses, he declares in his first epistle, "That which we have seen," etc. And will you think that the reality of the deliverance of our senses is a structural fact of life? "How do you know that to be so?" asked a quizzing student of Dr. Wayland, in his class in metaphysics. "By our native inborn gumption," replied the doctor. And in this way, whatever the philosophers may say, we are every one of us certain of the trustworthiness of our senses.

And now, descending into the realm of the human senses in the Incarnation our Lord remains in the realm of the human senses after the Resurrection,

that these senses may test and tell the granitic reality of His Resurrection. To the sense of *hearing* our risen Lord submitted Himself, as when Mary heard her name falling from His lips, and the disciples caught the music of His "all hail" and "peace." Also to the sense of *seeing*—"See My hands and My feet that it is I Myself." Also to the sense of *touching*—"Handle Me and see," etc. Also our risen Lord submitted Himself to the testing of the human senses *many times*; remember the number of His appearances. Also our risen Lord submitted to the testings of the senses of *many persons*—the more than five hundred, etc. Yes, the witness of the human senses report Jesus veritably risen.

(B) The witness of a *great difference*. Dead as was Jesus were the hopes of the disciples; but they sprang into sturdiest and persistent life. The only explanation of this vast difference is the Resurrection.

"It is impossible that a being who had stolen half-dead out of the sepulchre, who crept about weak and ill, wanting medical treatment, who required bandaging, strengthening, and nursing, and who yet at last yielded to His sufferings, could have given to the disciples the impression that He was a conqueror over death and the grave, the Prince of Life, an impression which lay at the basis of their future ministry. Such a resuscitation could only have weakened the impression which He made upon them in life and in death, but could by no possibility have changed their sorrow into enthusiasm, have elevated their reverence into worship."

(C) The witness of a *great challenge*. As when Peter at the day of Pentecost based his whole sermon on the fact of the Resurrection. Everything which Peter did and said would have become nullity, if only the scribes and Pharisees had produced the dead body of Jesus; but this they could not do, and so the challenge of the Resurrection stands.

(D) The witness of an *unchallenged document*. The genuineness and au-

thenticity of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is universally admitted, but that epistle unequivocally affirms the Resurrection (see fifteenth chapter).

(E) The witness of a mighty institution—the Church. It is founded on the fact of the Resurrection.

(F) The witness of a *vast change*—the Sabbath. This change is perpetual testimony to the verity of the Resurrection.

(G) The witness of *subsequent appearance*, as to Paul on the road to Damascus, and to John at Patmos.

Such are some of the witnesses. They never have been falsified. They never can be. The veritable Resurrection is veritably a fact.

Since there are such witnesses for the fact of the Resurrection, let us give heed to the mighty truths the Resurrection involves.

(a) The divinity of our Lord.

(b) The seal thus set upon His teachings.

(c) A certified atonement.

(d) The certainty that we have a living and victorious Christ to trust in.

(e) The certainty of the other life.

(f) That at the last we shall conquer death through death's conqueror.

---

Nov. 13-19. — GOD'S DEMAND. — Mark xii. 30.

Analyze this first commandment, this great Divine demand a little.

First. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy *heart*—that is the first element in God's demand. These words, heart, mind, soul, strength, are not the language of merely emphatic iteration. There is deep and separate significance in each.

"With all thy *heart*." The heart is the seat of the affections, the emotions. First and profoundest, God demands our heart. We are not simply to obey God outwardly, from the finger-tips. We are to obey God inwardly from our heart, and so upward and outward to the finger-tips. It is upon our affections, emotions, that God lays primal

claim. The word heart is used in the Bible 800 times; the word soul, 440 times; the word head only 80 times. For many reasons does God thus primarily demand our heart.

(a) Because only as we yield God our heart can we be at peace with Him. There can be no genuine peace where there are clashing loves. In order to peace we must love what God loves and hate what He hates.

(b) Because service from the heart is the only genuine service.

(c) Because only as we yield Him our heart can we be held in the practice of righteousness. It is the heart which is the controlling power. In the long run, no man can live better than he loves.

Second. "With all thy *soul*." The word soul is the Scripture word which stands for life. The meaning is the entire range and region of your existence, everything included in it, everything going on in it must be dominated by the thought of God. The central gravitating point, around which reason, conscience, taste, appetite, passion, every other part or power, all that makes up your life shall revolve, must be God. You may do business, but only with reference to God. You may enter into pleasure, but only into such pleasure as you are sure God's smile rests on. Not too strongly does Novalis put it—you are to be a "God-intoxicated" man. So you are to love God with all your soul—that is to say, everything that goes to make up your life is to be beneath His supreme will and rule.

Third. "With all thy *mind*." Oh, this subtle, inner realm of thought and various imagining! May I not be fancy free? Casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God and bringing into captivity *every thought* to the obedience of Christ (2 Cor. x. 5).

Fourth. "With all thy *strength*." That is to say, all this love and homage rendered to God by the whole being—heart, soul, mind, is not to be a rendering intermittent. There is a group of stars called Perseus. The group shines

for two days with the brilliancy of a star of the second magnitude; then, suddenly, it loses its light, and in three hours drops to the radiance of a star of the fourth magnitude; then, in another three hours and a half, it flashes up into its former brightness, but only to grow dim again. Not such may be toward God our shining. Steadily, with all our strength, are we to render Him unintermittent love and homage.

In view of this swift analysis of God's great demand on men, learn certain lessons.

(a) This demand must be unalterable. It is what ought to be. It cannot change.

(b) See how a man may be very good in a certain surface sense, and yet very sinful in a real and profound sense.

(c) Behold our need of Christ; for no one of us has met the Divine demand. How imperious our need of Him who is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

---

Nov. 20-26.—COMFORT FOR US.—  
Deut. ii. 7.

It is the swan-song of Moses. He is just about to climb Pisgah and behold the land his feet may never tread. He is making last rehearsal to the Israelites of God's great dealings with them. He is telling them the story of their long pilgrimage, their apparent disappointments, which yet really are the seeds and causes of the triumph in which now at last they stand. He is asking them to look backward with him.

And now, though the children of Israel might not yet cease their pilgrimage; though for many a weary month, and along many a difficult and weary way their pilgrimage must stretch on, Moses reminds them how, notwithstanding, there was yet comfort for them. And this was the comfort for them: "*For He knoweth thy walking through this great wilderness.*"

There is some music you cannot forget. It is a rest to you inexpressible. It mates itself with your deepest and

your shyest moods. You find yourself softly crooning the familiar notes; and the music is at once a pillow for your weariness and a pillar against which your weakness leans. I think our Scripture is such a music for us. It is a certainty for us as real as for those old Israelites.

First. *A fact general.* He knoweth thy walking through this *great wilderness.* It was not a wilderness in the sense of being an altogether arid place—that wilderness in which the Israelites were so long wandering. Wilderness and a complete barrenness are not synonymous in Scripture. There were palms of Elim, and wells of Moses, and beautiful withdrawn places where the grass grew, and the date-palm hung its fruit, and the flowers gladdened, and the brooks laughed; and, besides, there was manna dropping from the kindly skies, and the stream which followed from the rock which Moses smote; and yet it was a wilderness great and often terrible. There were vast regions of blistering sands and torrid heats and sheer and frowning heights of desolate mountains. Besides, their path was very long and winding and athrong with dangers and menacing with uncertainties; and the issue of their arduous journeying they could only see by faith, not much by sight.

After all, like such a wilderness is life. It is not *all* a wilderness. We sing it falsely when we sing it thus. There are pleasant places in it, and homes, and loving hearts; and yet there are stretches where the way winds through the driest sands, and there are haunting fears, and huge dangers, and tantalizing uncertainties, and deaths and graves and desolate hearts. This is the fact general—that the usual human life has a good deal of wilderness in it.

Life is a wilderness because—

- (a) of its mystery;
- (b) of its discipline;
- (c) of its unreached ideals;
- (d) of its transitoriness;
- (e) of its enemies—Egyptians, Amale-

kites, Midianites, Edomites, Moabites, Amorites throng against it ;

(f) of its death. "Wa, wa," wailed out the Norse king, Clothaire, "what strange death is this which tears down the strength of the strongest kings?"

Second. A fact *personal*. "He knoweth *thy* walking through this great wilderness. The personal fact is that you must thread *your* way through this strange, great wilderness of a life. Nobody can tread the path for you. The decisions of it you must make. The results of your decisions you must abide.

Third. *The girding comfort for us*. He knoweth *thy* walking through this great wilderness.

(a) He knoweth *sympathizingly*. It is

such meaning God's knowing always carries in the Scripture.

(b) He knoweth *in detail*. *Thy* walking ; precious truth this of the Divine omniscience of us.

(c) He knoweth, *taking account of thy weakness*. How tender God was toward these Israelites !

(d) He knoweth, *wisely providing*. Think how all the various discipline of the wilderness wandering issued in the change of the Israelites from a mob into a nation.

Fourth. What then ?

(a) I can walk the way.

(b) I shall not be lost.

(c) I shall reach Canaan.

(d) I have comfort for the journey.

## EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

### "The New Testament."

By PROFESSOR WILLIAM MILLIGAN,  
D.D., ABERDEEN, SCOTLAND.

*For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.*

*For a testament is of force after men are dead : otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.—Heb. ix. 16, 17.*

THE interest and importance of the above passage are well known to all students of Scripture, and equally well known is the remarkable consensus of opinion which determines in favor of rendering the word *διαθήκη*, which occurs in it, by "testament," not "covenant." It would be a laborious task, and one hardly rewarding the amount of labor it would cost, to gather together the names of those commentators or critics who have taken up one side or the other in the famous controversy into which we propose to look. Yet it may, in some small degree perhaps, awaken the sympathy of our readers if we enumerate at least a few of the more recent writers who have respectively taken their stand upon each of the above in-

terpretations. The list we can produce for "covenant" is but small indeed—Ebrard, Professor Forbes, Moulton, Rendall, Westcott. "Covenant" has found little favor. A more imposing array appears on behalf of "testament." The following may be named : Bengel, Moses Stuart, Alford, Dr. S. Davidson, Professor Davidson, Lightfoot, Hofmann (with a very slight qualification), Delitzsch, Lünemann, Riehm, DeWitte, Kurz, Keil, Weiss, Edwards, and the two revision companies of England and America. With a little trouble this last list especially might be easily extended, till it might almost seem as if, in the face of authorities so many and so great, it were foolish to dispute their verdict. We shall see that there is too much dogmatic truth involved in the controversy to permit refuge to be taken either in cowardice or despair. Shall we translate *διαθήκη* "testament" or "covenant" in the two verses mentioned at the head of this paper ? is, accordingly, the question that we have now to ask.

If we adopt the first of these renderings we shall probably translate, with

the R. V., "For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a testament is of force where there hath been death, for doth it ever avail while he that made it liveth?" (or, as in the margin adopted by the American revisers, "For it doth never avail while he that made it liveth"). If we adopt the second rendering we shall probably translate, leaving certain expressions to be more fully explained hereafter, "For where a covenant is, there must of necessity be brought in (or assumed) the death of the covenanter. For a covenant is of force over the dead (dead persons or things), for it never hath strength while the covenanter liveth." The two translations are not only very different, they connect themselves with different views of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews upon cardinal questions of Christian doctrine.

I. What is the true meaning of *διαθήκη*? It must mean *either* testament or covenant. Professor Davidson says (*in loc.*), "The word *διαθήκη* means both covenant and testament; and in verses 16 and 17 the author seems to play on this double meaning, and to use the word in this latter sense." It is only necessary to say that there can be no play upon the word here. When we meet with a play upon a word, we understand that the word may be taken in two senses, each of which is good and applicable to the sentence, though the two affirmations are wholly different. That is not now the case. The advocate of the meaning "testament" denies that "covenant" is right, and he is met with a similar denial from the other side. The word cannot at the same moment have two meanings quite distinct from each other. Its meaning must be single and definite. Professor Davidson is, accordingly, under the necessity of coming to this conclusion, and he decides for "testament." Attention may be called to the following considerations:

1. The true and proper meaning of *διαθήκη* throughout the New Testament

is "covenant," unless the single passage with which we are dealing be an exception. In Thayer's Grimm, Gal. iii. 15—"Though it be but a man's covenant (*margin of R. V., 'or testament'*), yet when it hath been confirmed, no man maketh it void or addeth thereto"—is indeed given as a text in which the word means "disposition or arrangement, specifically testament, so far forth as it is a specimen or example of that disposition." Cræmer (under *διαθήκη*) expresses the same view. It may well be doubted whether any commentator would adopt the statement. The word in Gal. iii. 15 means an arrangement, a covenant, made with another. Dr. Lightfoot has no doubt upon the point, and Mr. Rendall, commenting upon Heb. ix. 16, says: "There is but one reference to a purely human covenant in the New Testament—viz., in Gal. iii. 15; and there the sense admits no question: for it is used to illustrate the unalterable nature of God's covenant, as being itself also beyond the maker's power to alter when once confirmed: now this is as false of a testament as it is true of a covenant." This passage thus disposed of, it may be taken for granted without further proof, so universal is the agreement regarding it that the *invariable* meaning of *διαθήκη* in the New Testament, unless we except the passage before us, is *covenant*.

2. The same or nearly the same remark may be made as to the meaning of *διαθήκη* in the LXX. Almost invariably there, in about 274 out of 278 times that it is used, it is the rendering of the Hebrew word *בְּרִית* (or covenant), one of the best understood words of the Hebrew tongue. In addition, it is used only four times more: (a) as the translation of *רָךְ*, a word, "that He may establish the word (evidently conveying the same idea as covenant) which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob" (Deut. ix. 5); (b) in giving again the expression *בְּרִית בְּרָךְ*, where it stands for both words, and can hardly thus be regarded



as an exception to the rule (Jer. xxxiv., or in the Greek xli. 18); (c) in being the translation on one occasion of יְרֵכָה, habitation, but where the reading cannot be depended on, another reading being σκηνήν (adopted by Tischendorf, Lev. xxvii. 11); (d) in being the translation, also once, of אָוֶן, a word also signifying covenant, though apparently bringing into prominence the conditions laid down on the side of God (Ex. xxxi. 7). In no single instance is the word used in the sense of testament or will. Similar remarks apply to the use of διαθήκη in the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, where it constantly means covenant, never testament. Finally, the same thing appears in the general Greek of the time—so far, at least, as it is modified by Jewish thought. "Philo," says Dr. Westcott (on Hebrews, p. 299), "refers to a treatise of his on covenants which has unfortunately been lost. But in the same context he states the general idea which he attached to a Divine διαθήκη. 'Covenants,' he says, 'are written for the benefit of those who are worthy of bounty. So a covenant is a symbol of grace which God sets between Himself, who extends the boon, and man, who receives it.'"

Against this ancient meaning of the word it is no valid argument that the common Latin rendering of בְּרִית is *testamentum*. By the time we reach the date of the Latin versions the idea of a testament had taken possession of the Church. Besides which, it is worthy of notice that the Latins would seem to have possessed no other word to which they could trust as a rendering of διαθήκη, either in the Old Testament or the New. They use it at least continually for the purpose, and that in many a passage where the greatest stickler for that idea in the words before us would never dream of introducing any other thought than that of covenant. Thus they use it, Ps. xxv. 14, where we read, "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him; and He will show them His *testamentum*;" and

again in Ps. l. 16, "But unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare My statutes, and that thou shouldst take My *testamentum* in thy mouth." In like manner the same word occurs in Heb. viii. 8, 9, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new *testamentum* with the house of Israel . . . not according to the *testamentum* that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt;" and in the verses preceding and following the words we are examining (Heb. ix. 15, 20), into which no commentator is bold enough even to attempt to introduce the thought of testament or will. *Testamentum* must, therefore, have had to these fathers the meaning "covenant," and we cannot be justified in putting it aside because to an English ear *testamentum* is very closely akin to testament.

3. The conclusion naturally flowing from the true and proper meaning of the word διαθήκη itself is greatly strengthened by the consideration that it is exactly what the readers of the epistle would expect. The idea of a testament was not—that of a covenant was—familiar to them. It is generally allowed that the practice of making wills was, up to the point with which we are now dealing, almost wholly, if not wholly, Gentile. It may have to some extent, about the beginning of the Christian era, found its way into Israel, but only to a degree which could not have as yet superseded the old meaning of the word διαθήκη, or made the new one familiar to the people. The Jews did not need to make wills. God Himself had prescribed the mode in which realized property should descend from one generation to another, and there was little other property to think of. The members of the Herodian family made wills (Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," Heir), but that would hardly commend the thought of doing so to pious Jews. On the other hand, no thought was more familiar to Jews than that of a covenant. Their whole history had

been full of covenants, at one time between God and their fathers, at another time between individual members of their nation. The idea of a will could have little power over their minds, that of a covenant was associated with all that had been most glorious, and its breach with all that had been most disastrous in their history. Any one appealing to them would be most unlikely to draw an illustration from the former; an illustration from the latter would be instantly apprehended and felt.

II. We have spoken of the true meaning of *διαθήκη* considered in itself; and we are entitled to conclude that only very powerful considerations, drawn from the context, from other particulars of the statement, or from what we otherwise know of the views of the writer whom we are studying, will justify a departure from it. How far there may be anything of this kind in the present case we have now to see.

1. As to the context. It is not a question, it is almost universally and cordially admitted, that alike in the verses preceding and following verses 16 and 17 the translation "covenant" must be adopted. In verse 15 no one proposes to read "the Mediator of a new testament" or "the transgressions that were under the first testament." In verse 20, again, "the blood of the covenant" (not the testament) is unhesitatingly read by all. Nay, more. Mr. Wood, in his "Problems of the New Testament" (p. 140), calls attention to what he describes as the "scarcely credible" fact that the revisers, after having translated by "testament" in verses 16 and 17, at the beginning of verse 18, where *ἡ πρόση* meets us without its substantive, supply its place by "covenant." The word *διαθήκη*, Mr. Wood reminds us, is not expressed in the Greek, and it is introduced by the revisers as *covenant*, though supplied from the previous verse, where it is rendered *testament*! Thus in a continuous argument, in which each successive step is closely dependent upon what precedes, we meet *διαθήκη* five—it may even be

said six—times, in the first and last two of which it is allowed that it means "covenant." How shall it be possible to understand the argument if in the middle two the meaning is completely changed? Let us notice somewhat more particularly the connection with verse 15. That verse runs, "And for this cause He is the Mediator of a new covenant, that, a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance." Then follow the first words of verse 16, *ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη*. Is the *γὰρ* to have no meaning? or, with it standing where it is, is it possible to think that this last *διαθήκη* can be any other than that of verse 15? The latter verse is the explanation of the earlier. Surely the key-word in both must be interpreted in the same way. So much is this felt by some that Lünemann (*in loc.*) can only account for the change of interpretation which he considers necessary by the thought of a "logical inaccuracy;" and Kurz (*in loc.*), who has an equally strong feeling as to the propriety of supposing a change, but who cannot accept such a cutting of the Gordian knot, takes refuge in the supposition—one set aside, so far as we know, by every commentator—that in verses 15 and 18 *διαθήκη* is to be understood in the sense of establishing an heir. The connection with what follows is not less conclusive upon the point. Every one must admit that the facts adduced at verses 18 and 19 from the history of Israel are referred to for the sake of elucidating the argument: "Wherefore even the first covenant hath not been dedicated without blood." Why is "blood" spoken of? Why not death alone? It is obviously sacrificial blood that is here in view, and something, therefore, associated with such blood, and not with death only, must be found in the statement which the historical analogy is intended to explain and to enforce.

It is no doubt urged that the transi-

tion from the one meaning to the other is perfectly natural. The words of Thayer, in the work formerly referred to, may be taken as an expression of this statement: "Finally must be quoted the amphiboly or twofold use by which the writer to the Hebrews in ix. 16 sq. substitutes for the meaning *covenant*, which *διαθήκη* bears elsewhere in the epistle, the meaning *testament*, and likens Christ to a testator, not only because the author regards eternal blessedness as an inheritance bequeathed by Christ, but also because he is endeavoring to show both that the attainment of eternal salvation is made possible for

the disciples of Christ by His death (ix. 15), and that even the Mosaic covenant had been consecrated by blood (18 sqq.)." Dr. Lightfoot had in like manner said: "The sacred writer, though he starts from the sense of a covenant, glides into that of a testament" (on Gal. iii. 15). Statements such as these can be allowed no weight. The transition from covenant to testament is simply as difficult as the two things are different. So far from the argument being helped by such a transition it becomes hopelessly entangled.

(To be concluded.)

## SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

### Ethics and Politics—III. International Ethics.

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, S.T.D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

APART from ethics there is no sound basis of international relations. What we call "international law" is found, when we examine it more closely, not to occupy the same plane with "municipal" or national law. It is a law without a legislature to define its terms, or a judiciary to interpret and apply, or an executive to enforce obedience to it. It deals with the large questions which arise between sovereign States which own no superior, and which can be controlled only by considerations of what is right up to the measure of their apprehension of right. Hence the text writers mention as the prolific source of its maxims "right reason and natural equity."

That this so-called international law is not law in the ordinary sense of the word is shown by the efforts of the legal profession to convert it into something generically different from what it is. There is a tendency to harden its elastic traditions into rules as stiff as those of the statute-book. Thus the "three-mile limit" of international jurisdiction is referred to as though it had been en-

acted in so many words by some international legislature, when in truth it means nothing but the line reached for the shore by an ordinary cannon-shot, and has been thrust far out to sea by the modern improvements in ordnance. So again the legal profession strongly favors something like a codification of international law in the interest of greater exactness. But codes are for the few; they are the property of a profession, while ethical principles are the common possession of all men. This is a field in which popular feeling is sure to have a decisive influence on national policy; and it is best that the grounds of decision should be those on which all men can find themselves.

Indeed, it is a signal gain to the development of law generally that this branch of it should be left so much under control of ethical considerations. It is a gain that so much of public life and conduct is left outside the positive prescriptions of the statute book, compelling us always to fall back upon simple considerations of right. Municipal law has been helped into closer conformity with ethical principle by the attraction of international law, which often has outrun it in the direction of justice and humanity.

It is true that democratic peoples thus far have not been remarkable for their open-mindedness to merely ethical considerations, when their passions have been aroused or their interests imperilled by the conduct of a neighbor State. They have lacked that atmosphere of calm in which such questions must be discussed. But they generally have responded in the long run to the equity of strong men at the helm of State, as when Washington signed Jay's treaty, and Lincoln surrendered the Confederate envoys, Messrs. Mason and Slidell. It is hard for Demos to recognize in its true character the just thing that looks like a surrender, but it is one of his indispensable lessons. And when we remember that under monarchical rule wars have been waged for an epigram or a harlot, we consider that we are not the worse off.

1. Of the duties nations owe to each other, I put first that of sympathy with the feeling of nationality, with the sentiment of patriotism. Indeed, this international sympathy is indispensable to right regard for our own country. "If I count it," says Frederick Maurice, "an unspeakable blessing for myself to be the citizen of a nation, I must count it an unspeakable blessing for every man. If I, being an Englishman, desire to be thoroughly an Englishman, I must respect every Frenchman who strives to be thoroughly a Frenchman, every German who strives to be thoroughly a German. I must learn more of the worth and grandeur of his position the more I estimate the worth and grandeur of my own" ("Social Morality," p. 123).

2. This sympathy carries with it the recognition of every sister nation's right to its own life, and the free control of its own national order. Each has the right to be one people apart from all other people; the right to give what shape it pleases to its government; the right to work out its own destiny in whatever fashion it pleases, so long as it does not infringe upon the rights of its neighbors. This principle antago-

nizes the imperial schemes of conquest, which wage war upon national societies, generally on the plea of bringing them under a more perfect order or within the scope of a higher civilization. In our own history imperialism used to present itself as "the gray-eyed man of destiny," under whose lead we were to subdue the continent from pole to pole. Of late this talk has been less noisy than before the war.

But even now we hear of desires to bring our Northern neighbor into the Union, will she, nill she. Has the command "Thou shalt not covet" no validity for nations? Were Canada to ask admission into the Union, even then it might be worth while to hesitate and reflect before adding her problems to our own. In truth the best service she can render us is to develop a strong, vigorous and independent nationality on our northern frontier—if not to balance our own, yet to show us the other way of doing things that we both have to do. Rome was not the stronger and more lasting power for having wiped out Carthage, its only rival. Canada never can destroy our preponderance, since we have an area twice as extensive as the Roman Empire, and a population greater than that of all the rest of the continent.

International respect for the sentiment of nationality has gained and grown with every decade of this century. When "kings crept out again to feel the sun" after Napoleon's fall, and met in Vienna to reconstruct the map of Europe, it was Talleyrand who saved France from penal dismemberment by persuading the monarchs that the only safe principle for them was that of *legitimacy*. That is, they must recognize political power as equally sacred with private property, and put Europe back to where it was in 1789. So Germany and Italy became once more the likenesses of "crazy quilts," the former being divided up among some two score of sovereign princes, each with the right to wage war, coin money, enact laws, and intermarry with the royal caste. A

former neighbor of mine in Philadelphia told me that he used to take his morning walk across the territories of two sovereign principalities; and at the universities it was said that a reckless fly once effaced one principality from the map by leaving a fly-speck there! Goods passing up the Rhine in 1816 paid duties at twenty-two custom-house frontiers before they reached Constanz, getting rebates from the States they were leaving. And as for Italy, Metternich said that the name was nothing but "a geographical expression!"

Legitimacy ruled to the overthrow of Spanish liberty and the suppression of free speech in Germany by the Holy Alliance. But when the Greeks revolted against the Turks, all educated Europe blazed out in sympathy. Yet it was only by a diplomatist's oversight that the allied fleet annihilated that of Turkey at Navarino in 1827; and George IV. spoke the sentiments of his fellow-sovereigns when he publicly called that battle "an untoward event." But the magic word "Nationality" had been spoken, and the dead nations began to "search for swords in their sepulchres." Poland, Italy, Germany, Belgium, one after another was stirred; and in 1859 Italy was reunited to an extent it had not been since the time of the Ostrogoths. Germany in 1866 and 1871 became a nation, and Italy in those years completed her process. Whoever looks on the map of Europe to-day sees a very different coloring from that put on it in 1815; and whoever lives to see that map in 1915 may find Poland, Bohemia, and Ireland no longer colored with the coloring of neighbor powers, and the Balkan peninsula a federal State of Christian nationalities.

It is indeed in the Balkans that the process of European opinion is best illustrated. At the opening of the century the Christian peoples were held to one another, and to Russia by common religious sympathies. As the century went on, and ethnographical science emphasized the ties and differences of race among them, they began to fall

apart, but the Slavic peoples of Servia, Bulgaria, and Macedonia clung to Russia still. Thanks to the impulse given to the rising generation in Roberts College by American missionaries, these racial sympathies gave place to those of nationality, leaving Russia somewhat in the position of the respectable hen who has hatched out a brood of young ducks and sees them take to the water. So throughout Christendom we find the peoples striving for national unity and distinctness. Their battles are ours, and their victories ours also.

3. The next duty one people owes to its neighbors is respect for their rights of possession. "Thou shalt not steal" is just as much a command for them as "Thou shalt not kill." "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark; and let all the people say amen." The Monroe Doctrine is an application of that principle to the affairs of this continent. It built a wall of fire around the nascent nationalities of the new world, and commanded the Holy Alliance to confine its lawlessness to the European continent. It would have been well if all our relations with our neighbors had always been on the same level. But we abandoned our own position in the war of aggression we waged upon a sister republic twenty-five years later. It is not hard to see that that war, a concession to the demands of the slave power, led on by moral necessity to the war for the Union, in which our sin against Mexico as well as against the slave was so fearfully avenged. But it was the Monroe Doctrine, fearlessly applied by Secretary Seward, which set the soil of Mexico free from French invasion; and it is the same doctrine which shuts this continent against the schemes of partition and colonization, in whose interest Africa has just been divided among the leading powers of Europe.

It is objected that our occupation of our own territory rests on an unjust foundation, if this principle be true. Were not the red race the rightful owners, and we the unrighteous intruders?



But in what sense could the little handful of red men—some 250,000 in all, according to the best authorities—be said to possess the territory now occupied and yet not filled by 65,000,000? And while there are many stains upon the dealings of the white man with the red, it is not true that the story is one of mere plunder and violence. In the commonwealth of Massachusetts, for instance, his title to the land was extinguished by fair purchase; and in one case, where the settlers of a new town had driven a hard bargain with him, the general court of its own motion set that aside, and ordered that just compensation be given. In truth the Indian always has been ready to sell, because his own savagery made his land worth far less to him than were the things he obtained in exchange. His condition altogether has been improved by his contact with American civilization. It is a pity we have not done more for him, and that we have not absorbed him entirely into our civilized life.

4. It may sound strange when I say that war is at times an international duty. But this is exactly what must be said of a just war in defence of national rights or in vindication of oppressed peoples. There are many good people who hold war to be the worst of international evils, one indeed which embraces all others, and is therefore to be avoided at any sacrifice. They speak of it as a source of hatred and bitterness between men and nations. It is not necessarily so. It is certain that such feelings seldom exist between the actual combatants, and there is no need that they should exist at all. And on the same ground we might act for the suppression of suits at law, which certainly have this evil tendency in an eminent degree. Equally weak is the argument against war from the suffering and death it occasions. Some reason on this point as though the slain in battle would have lived forever if war had not been, while, in fact, most of them probably would have found more painful deaths in their beds. To our hedonist age mere

physical suffering seems the worst of evils; but this is to confound nerves with conscience, when we make pain an evidence of moral evil.

I shall not linger on the objection that war occasions the destruction of property, for often as this Mammonite argument is pressed upon us, it is safe to say that the conscience rejects it whenever any moral principle is seen to be at stake. Indeed, among the uses of war is this, that it serves as a corrective to the worship of Mammon and to the individual selfishness which threatens to overthrow modern society. It awakens men to the sense of something greater than possessions, or than life itself. It emphasizes the ethical principle that in everything but conscience the individual is at the service of the community in which he lives. If the human world has been constructed for moral ends, war will not cease until we attain to its uses without it. When selfish pleasure and the love of ease cease to be controlling motives in life, when heroism is as attainable without as with the touchstone of peril, and when public spirit makes all sensual good seem a lesser boon than social well-being, then we will disband the armies and melt the cannon.

But it is war in *international* relations that we are to discuss; and I do not hesitate to say that the greatest service that one nation can render to another may be to thresh it into a sense of its duty to its own people and the world. The duty is still plainer when war means the emancipation of subject peoples from the rule of "the unspeakable Turk" or any similar despotism. All the wars that have been waged for the emancipation of the Balkan peninsula, from that rule, stand for less misery and wrong-doing than a single decade of the rule under which the Christian peoples of that region have dwelt for centuries. It is to such wars that I allude in denying that war is wrong in principle.

It is argued that between civilized nations, at least, there should be a recog-



nized method of arbitration. To me, as to Professor Sedgwick, of Cambridge, this seems to be one of the many cases in which good people seek a mechanical substitute for the ethical growth, which alone can put a final end to such evils as the conflict of international interests. And it is a device which is sure to break down disastrously as soon as a case arises in which the feeling is intense on the side against which the arbitrators decide. It will avail only for the settlement of petty disputes.

It is argued more specifically that arbitration should be established between the two great English-speaking powers, so that peace may reign uninterrupted throughout the Anglo-Saxon world. It is well to remember in this connection that England has waged more wars since 1815 than all the rest of the civilized world, and that these generally have been wars suggested by the mean motives of trade or conquest, or both, only that with Russia being a collision with a great power. It certainly would be convenient for her to have a nation which no other dare attack single-handed, tie its hands by a pledge that under no circumstances will it fight her. But the oppressed peoples, whose corpses she has built into the fabric of her empire, would have reason to mourn that we had set her hands free for farther aggression.

5. While international ethics condemns all unjust and aggressive wars as wholesale murders, it also exerts upon all kinds of warfare a steady pressure in the interest of humanity and of peace. It has effected the exemption of non-combatants from the hardships of military operations, so far as this is possible. It has enlarged the exemptions of private property from seizure. It has imposed just and effective restrictions upon the means used to destroy hostile armies, and has placed its ban upon all measures of needless and useless slaughter. In the future it will extend these restrictions more widely.

6. In the same spirit, international ethics has tended to remove restrictions

from the intercourse between the nations, and to facilitate the migration of individuals and families from the more densely settled parts of the world to those which offer them better openings for self-maintenance. It is now asked whether national self-preservation does not require in our own case that severe restrictions be placed on immigration. We already have the just restrictions which forbid the importation of labor under contracts which debar it from demanding the highest rate of wages that is paid. But it is said that this is insufficient, and that, in the interests both of American nationality and of American labor, immigration should be placed under restrictions, which would reduce it to very small dimensions.

As to the fear of swamping nationality, that is not new. It was first awakened when the great Scotch-Irish immigration poured into the northern tier of the New England States, and flowed into Massachusetts, and next flooded Pennsylvania, deposing the Quakers from the control of the commonwealth, and setting aside Penn's humane Indian policy. Professor A. L. Perry tells me that in Worcester, Mass., the immigrants began to build themselves a Presbyterian church, but the solid men of the town came in the night and tore down the framework, saying, "We will have no Irish church here!" So it has been with every successive flood of immigrants, and yet the American nationality has shown itself strong and attractive enough to assimilate all those varied elements, and has grown richer and more varied by the process. Today, in our public school and college system, we have the means of carrying forward this assimilation as never before; and the largest free immigration is relatively smaller, as compared with the whole nation, than it was in the past.

As to the American workingman, he is helped and not hindered by the coming of free, self-respecting immigrants, who will take nothing less than American wages. Each immigrant is a competitor for employment with the men in

his own line of work, but a customer for those in every other line, and it is to be remembered that we have not yet entirely recovered from the harm done by the importation of contract labor before the peasant law was strictly enforced.

It is argued that the coming of so many Roman Catholics must endanger our liberties and imperil our educational system. Then, why have the American people strengthened the hands of that Church by the annexation of so many Roman Catholics in Louisiana, Florida, and the annexed districts of Mexico? My own interest in the struggle for Ireland's emancipation from alien rule has brought me into very close and friendly relations with a great many adherents of that Church; and I am persuaded that the fear of its disastrous influence on American liberties is baseless. Its members love and prize the freedom of our land, and for the most part have a righteous jealousy of any encroachment upon those liberties which are the heritage of us all. They would join one and all in the prayer of their own poet-bishop, Spaulding, of Peoria:

"And thou, O God, of whom we hold  
Our country and our freedom fair,  
Within Thy tender love enfold  
This land; for all Thy people care.  
Teach us that only they are free  
Who walk obedient to Thy will;  
And slaves are they who follow ill,  
Which is the foe of Liberty.

"Lift up our hearts above our fortunes high,  
Let not the good we have make us forget  
The better things that in Thy heaven lie!  
Keep still, amid the fever and the fret  
Of all this eager life, our thoughts on Thee,  
The hope, the strength, the God of all the free."

7. The last duty of international ethics I shall discuss is that of peaceful influence through example and opinion. How much more potent this is than military force may be seen from the story of our own relations to the State system of Europe. It was, for instance, the example of a democratic people maintaining their national unity by the most splendid sacrifices, and tak-

ing up with honor and honesty the burdens that war had entailed, which changed the drift of public opinion in Europe from imperialism to democracy, and thus made the overthrow of the second empire inevitable. The same grand example strengthened the nationalist sentiment in Italy and Germany, and helped to their unification. The weight of American opinion is admitted by Mr. Gladstone to be a great help to him in the policy of justice to Ireland. Let us hope that American example and opinion will avail also for the overthrow of the militarism which is crushing Europe, by giving fuller scope to the principle of nationality, and thus reconstructing the lines between Germany and its neighbors on lines of justice and peace.

I cannot agree with Mr. Gladstone and Lord Tennyson that trade between the nations has had a similar influence for good. The poet's "fair, white-winged peace-maker" has been too often a "swamp angel." The great trading nations have been the great fighting nations, not excepting Rome, which engaged in the last Punic war at the instigation of her bankers, who were underbid in the money market by their Punic rivals. Venice, Genoa, Holland, England, these have been no promoters of peace. As General Napier wrote to Mr. Gurney, the traders mostly began the wars, and the soldiers put an end to them. In truth, trade as at present managed is so purely a matter of selfishness that it cannot be expected to serve ethical uses in the regulation of international intercourse. It is noteworthy that the trading class in China and Japan is generally out of sympathy with the unselfish labors of the missionaries, while the military class in India, on the contrary, generally sympathizes with and supports them.

Our own influence has been greatest and most beneficial in countries with which we have not much trade. The grand work done by the missionary colleges at Constantinople and Beyrout is an instance of the highest service one

nationality can render to another. It has been all the stronger because the American in Turkey is not known as a trader seeking private ends, but as a teacher giving his life for the welfare of an alien people. On those lines, in

diplomacy and in missions, by the contact of public opinion with opinion, and by the inspiration of example, let us who have freely received of the best things God has to bestow freely give to our fellow-men!

---

## MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

### How to See Something of Europe, Egypt and Palestine on Two Dollars a Day.

BY REV. CAMDEN M. COBERN, PH.D.,  
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

"The scholar who cherishes the love of comfort is not fit to be deemed a scholar."

—CONFUCIUS.

If the Parisian papers are to be trusted, it has not been many months since the *Potsdamer Zeitung* was prosecuted by the Emperor of Germany for libel because of a paragraph which stated that His Majesty occasionally travelled in a second-class coach!

For Americans of such royal sensitiveness the following practical and homely suggestions were not intended. It is the writer's conviction that there are many young students and ministers who would not fail to take a year for foreign travel if they knew how cheaply it could be done. Such a man is willing to endure some discomfort for the sake of economy. He wants to see the country, the people, the museums, the art galleries. Little does it matter to him whether he sits down to the elaborate *table d'hôte* at The Central or stands by the counter and helps himself in the Workingman's Restaurant. He has a good appetite, and can eat what is set before him, asking no questions for conscience' sake. His sister might notice the table linen or peep into the back kitchen, but this young Petruccio sees only the small balance at his banker's and grows healthier and heavier on rough diet. To such an one these hints may be of some value.

If any reader who possesses the un-

comfortable gift of a fastidious palate desires also to profit by them, let him multiply the living expenses accordingly. If this same brother has a wife who must also see the sights with him, let him multiply the entire expense account several times more.

Let it be added, further, that no attempt is here made to do more than estimate the actual necessary outlay for travelling, lodging, and board. Personal expenses for clothing, baggage, books, pictures, souvenirs, tips and fees at museums and palaces, stationery, etc., are too arbitrary and indefinite to be calculated. My note-book tells me that I spent a dollar a week for paper and stamps alone!

It may be said in the beginning that the prudent man will travel alone or with one or two carefully chosen companions. He will take with him no trunk, but a solid valise, in which he can carry one change of clothing, various weights of underwear, a few staple medicines, some soap and a towel, and whatever else he needs. A light pillow and stool may be strapped to the valise. A kodak and large shawl can be carried by hand. The married man will also leave a good life and accident insurance policy behind him, although it has been said that he is less liable to be killed abroad than if he had stayed at home. Certainly if he lives to return, his increased vitality will be his best investment for years to come. Now for some figures.

The actual expenses of transit on an extended tour are surprisingly low. Second cabin from New York to Liver-

pool on the Inman Line, \$35 to \$40; White Star, \$40; Cunard, \$35; Guion, \$30 to \$35. First cabin is not to be thought of—it would cost from fifty to two hundred and fifty per cent additional. Steerage is out of the question. Steerage passage might be made very comfortable by chartering a ship and reserving that end of it exclusively for students; but as matters stand, the companions and vile smells and diseases of the steerage should not be risked by any student, however hardy. A short deck passage might be taken as a joke across the British Channel or the North Sea, or even from Beyrout to Jaffa, or from Jaffa to Alexandria; but longer trips would be hazardous to enthusiasm and health.

From Liverpool one can take any one of several routes to London, with the privilege of breaking the journey at pleasure. On one of these routes he could stop at Chester (from which he could make a run of ten miles by rail to Hawarden, Mr. Gladstone's home), Shrewsbury, Leamington (from which place he can reach Stratford-on-Avon), Kenilworth and Coventry, and also at Warwick, Oxford, and Slough (from which point he can easily visit Windsor). All this costs him, in railroad fare, something less than the sum of \$5; and because of the frequency of trains, it can, if necessary, all be put into three short days. I have, of course, calculated that he would go third class, which indeed offers as comfortable accommodations as our ordinary cars.

Perhaps one would prefer to land at Queenstown instead of Liverpool, and take a look at Ireland and Scotland. It is easily done. Many routes could be chosen. A specimen would be as follows: Queenstown, Cork, Mallow, Kilarney, Limerick, Galway, "jauntin' car" through the picturesque district of Connemara by way of Clifden, the Twelve Pin Mountains, and Leenam to Westport, rail to Dublin, thence to Londonderry *via* Sligo, Bundora, Donegal Bay, continuing to Portrush (for Giant's Causeway), Belfast, Glasgow,

Loch Lomond, Loch Katrine, Trossachs, Callander, Stirling, Edinburgh, Melrose, Appleby (for English lakes), Bedford, London.

Second-class rail, and saloon on steamer, \$45. This is the long tourist route as laid down in the "Excursionist." By shortening the trip and by eliminating the "saloon," the expense could be abbreviated. Tipperary, the centre of the disturbances and the stronghold of Parnell, could be included as a trifling extra.

Fair hotel accommodation for \$1.50 per day could be had at the Rob Roy, in Queenstown; at Turner's, in Cork; at Dobbyn's, in Tipperary; at Wynn's, in Dublin. The two-dollar-a-day man must, however, generally keep away from the city hotels, either making for the villages or else settling down in the great centres in some plain boarding-house. By all means get out of the ruts of travel if possible. A few days spent in some out-of-the-way town or country-place usually costs half and is worth double to the student-traveller. It will pay richly to spend some days in North Wales.

Concerning Scotland, a friend writes: "Go from Liverpool to the English Lake district. This you can 'do' in one day, and at a moderate expenditure. Reach it *via* Kendal Junction and Windermere. Make the round of the lake and land at Ambleside. You can easily walk to Grasmere *via* the homes of Dr. Arnold, Hartley, Coleridge, and Wordsworth. At Grasmere take coach for twelve-mile ride to Keswick. Here is the home and grave of Southey, and one and a half miles away the ruins of a Druid temple. Thence to Penrith, where the main line is reached for the North. Stop over at Dumfries, where Burns lived and where he is buried. Then on to Ayr, his birthplace and early home, and then on to Glasgow. The North British Hotel, near Queen Street Station, is a comfortable hostelry. A day in Glasgow is quite adequate if well employed. If you do not go to the Trossachs you can go to Edin-

burgh for sixty-two and a half cents. By the way, it is just as well to buy your ticket from point to point. You should have two days in Edinburgh. The City Temperance Hotel is all right and cheap. And now for Melrose. If you go to Abbotsford (three miles) and want to keep down expenses, you must walk. In fact this is one of the secrets of cheap travel. From here go south *via* Newcastle, Durham, Leeds, etc., or *via* Doncaster to Haxey and Epworth. Thence *via* Lincoln or Sheffield to Rugby, Coventry, Kenilworth, Warwick, and Stratford. Don't miss Stratford, and if you want low rates don't stop at the Red Horse. They will make you pay dearly for sleeping in Washington Irving's bed (No. 15). Thence *via* Oxford and Windsor to London. Don't stay overnight in Windsor. In London secure a room, and take meals at restaurants. The Aërated Bread Company's coffee-houses are elegant places to get a lunch."

In London a good room can be obtained in a good street near the British Museum for \$1.25 to \$1.50 per week. Breakfast can be had in the room for six or eight pence extra. Dinner can be obtained at a restaurant for twenty to twenty-five cents. A light supper at a dairy counter will cost a dime, making the actual necessary daily expense for food and lodging seventy cents per day or less. If one is inclined to frequently patronize the vegetarian restaurant he can do better than this. I find, from my note-book, that my average daily expense for food during seven consecutive days was thirty-two and a half cents. Let me give some sample meals. Breakfast—hot sausage, potatoes, roll and butter, nine cents; hot coffee, fish, toast, roll and butter, sixteen cents. Dinner—soup, vegetable steak, potatoes, roll and butter, and maize, sixteen cents; baked potatoes, beans, tomatoes alpha cutlet, roll and butter, custard and raisins, sixteen cents; vegetable sausage, beans, cabbage, baked potatoes, roll and butter, and rice pudding, sixteen cents; hot

pork-chop, potatoes, beans, roll and butter, and apple pie (with tip), twenty-two cents. Supper—hot coffee, roll and butter, eight cents; oatmeal porridge, six cents.

It goes for the saying that when a man is in London all England lies at his elbow, and can be visited for a few sixpences, so far as railroad fare is concerned. The smaller the town the cheaper the living as a rule. From London one may reach Berlin *via* Harwich, Rotterdam, and Emmerich for \$14.25 (second-class). Second-class coaches in Holland and Germany are almost as good as our parlor cars. By tipping the guard an uninterrupted night's sleep may generally be obtained, and the seats make good couches. Separate waiting-rooms are prepared for the various classes of passengers, but the most striking difference consists in the fact that in the first and second-class waiting-rooms the statuary is of Parian marble; in the third-class, of plaster of Paris; in the fourth-class, of imitation bronze. The fourth-class coaches are plain as our cattle cars, and are unprovided with seats. I paid ninety-five cents to ride third-class from Berlin to Wittenberg, a distance of fifty-five miles. Coming back I bought a fourth-class ticket for forty-eight cents. Second-class would have probably cost me \$1.75, and first-class, \$2.75.

One can live about as cheaply in Berlin as in London. A good room in an eligible location can be found for \$7 to \$8 per month. This will include light, heat, and attendance. My average daily bill at restaurants for ten consecutive days amounted to forty-nine cents. For this sum I obtained three substantial meals each day. A sample twenty-five-cent dinner at the Christian Hospice is as follows: Soup and roll, the best of sausage and cauliflower, roast beef and potatoes, fruit, coffee. It is a mistake to suppose that beer is forced upon one at the restaurants. A man is not charged for it unless he orders it. The expenses in Leipzig are about the same

as in Berlin. In smaller towns the expenses are lighter. All of these figures for England and Germany go on the supposition that a man has come to a place to settle down for a while. He has taken some time and pains to look up a room and restaurant that suit his tastes and purse. The man that flies into a city one day, sees the sights the next day, and flies out the day after, must expect to go to a good hotel and pay regular prices. Yet even then one can get a lofty room at the best hotel in Berlin for \$1, and easily get three comfortable meals at a chance restaurant for \$1 more.

The fare from London to Paris (second-class) is only \$6.30. Third-class costs considerably less. This is *via* the old cathedral city, Rouen, where one may still see the charred timbers and other relics of the burning of Joan of Arc.

The fare to Rome (second-class) *via* Dieppe, Rouen, Paris, Turin, Genoa, Pisa, is \$32.10. Even in these chief cities one can live easily on considerably less than \$2 a day. In Paris a room can be obtained at the Hotel de la Porte St. Martin or the Grand Hotel de la Honte for 50 cents to \$1; per month, \$5 to \$15. Breakfasts served in the room, twelve to fifteen cents. In the Palais Royal, right across from the Louvre, a tiptop three-course dinner can be got for twenty-five to thirty cents—wine included! The average cost of my meals for seven consecutive days was fifty-seven cents. At the Hotel Suisse, Turin, room and service can be had for fifty cents a day, you to furnish your own candles. You can take your supper in the hotel as follows: Bread, butter, and tea, twenty-five cents—with two eggs, thirty-five cents—with mutton-chops and potatoes, sixty-five cents. At the restaurants one can do quite as well as in Paris. This can be said with equal truth of other Italian cities, while even at Rome one can get good room and boarding at the Pension Lermann, 71 Via Cavour, for \$1.50 per day.

But, after all, I have not yet mentioned the cheapest and best way of seeing Europe. The best way is to go on a wheel. The cyclist can save railroad fare and all carriage fees. A friend of mine bought a bicycle in England, for which he paid \$65. This carried him two thousand miles over the British Isles, France, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Norway, and Sweden, and on reaching America he sold it for \$100. The average expenditure for lodging and board during this entire journey was \$1 per day. Of course he did not patronize the city hotels much, but lived on the plain food of the villages and farms. After reading some narratives of travel, a man might imagine that in order to live cheaply in Europe one must eat only macaroni in Italy, rye bread and whey in Switzerland, potatoes and sauerkraut in Germany; that he must sleep in the open air or go to the theatre at night to save the cost of coals!

This is a mistake. The gentleman referred to above is a wealthy business man of culture and taste, and what would be satisfactory to him ought to satisfy most men. He cut down the expense by avoiding all fashionable resorts, stopping overnight in small towns, and often getting his meals in the farm-houses. He declares the roads to be the very best for wheeling, and that the scenery in Norway and Sweden is superior to that of Switzerland. It ought to be added that the season for bicycling in Italy only lasts from the middle of December to the last of February.

Russia, where a banana or an apple costs a dime, and a beefsteak costs a dollar, must be avoided by the two-dollar-a-day man.

My fare from London to Cairo *via* Dieppe, Rouen, Paris, Turin, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, Rome, Naples, Pompeii, Brindisi, Alexandria, cost me \$80.63. Milan and Venice could have been included at little extra cost.

It is difficult to live cheaply in Egypt. Just as I was starting for that country



an Oxford professor said to me: "To one who knows Arabic, Egypt is the cheapest place in the world; to one who does not, it is the dearest." Miss Edwards also wrote as follows: "Any one who is able to speak Arabic and who takes his own tent with him, may set it up just outside Cairo (or even within the walls), and by doing his own marketing, live at the rate of two shillings a day, whereas it would cost him twelve shillings a day at least to live in the ordinary way. The best time to go to Egypt would be in November, and unless you can stand great heat, it would be well to leave in April or May. The Fund explorers camp out, and for food take out stores of tinned meats, biscuits, etc., buying other provisions in the native markets wherever they happen to be at work."

Certainly the two-dollar-a-day man cannot afford Shepherd's or the Hotel du Nil. I think, however, that board and room could be furnished at the Khedivial for \$11 to \$12 a week; and I know that after a few days' search I found a private house where I was given a large, well-furnished room and most excellent boarding for \$1.25 per day. If one takes the trip up the Nile it will cost him much more. It is far better, however, to make all arrangements for such a trip on the spot, as it is quite easy at times, because of the competition between Messrs. Cook and Gaze to cut the regular rates in two. Besides, one ought to examine the boat in which the journey is to be made and his stateroom before making his deposit. If it comes to the worst and no cut rates are to be obtained and one's pocketbook demands it, it is best to take the train from Cairo to Assiout, and from there engage passage—as a native, and not as a tourist—on the mail-boat to Luxor, and after spending as much time as is desired there, go on in the same way to Assouan. At Luxor all the ruins of ancient Thebes surround one. There are Karnak, the Ramesseum, Medenet Habou, the Colossi, Dayr el Medeeneh, Koorneh, the tombs of the kings, and Dayr el

Balree (where the royal mummies were found). At Assouan one visits the granite quarries, cataract, Isle of Philae, etc. To the natives the actual transit by rail and on deck of steamer from Cairo to Assouan and back again would cost perhaps \$50. One who would attempt such a two weeks' journey must carry with him his own supply of provisions. The regular price on these postal steamers for first class passengers (food included) is \$140. The only thing missed of very great importance in this rush by rail to Assiout, and then on by boat to Assouan, would be Beni Hassan. It is probable, however, that a stop-over could be obtained at Sharara, and that the tombs of Beni Hassan could be visited from that place. Nevertheless, this would hardly be feasible for one who had no dragoman and could not speak Arabic. It may be best to add that unless one is a practical traveller this independent method of making the Nile journey ought not to be attempted.

Even if the Nile trip must be given up, much remains to be seen in Egypt. Either coming or going, one is likely to pass over the road from Suez to Cairo *via* Ismailia. If one is very much interested in antiquities it will pay him to stop at Ismailia or Mahsamah, and make a donkey excursion (taking an interpreter, a tent, provisions, etc.) to Tel-el-Muskutah, the site of ancient Pithom, in the land of Goshen, where may yet be seen standing some of the walls which the Israelites built, according to the word of Scripture (Ex. i. 11). Whether this is done or not, no one should fail to stop at Zag-a-zig and examine the vast heaps of bubastis excavated by M. Naville, 1887-89.

When in Cairo it is only a twenty-cent ride by rail to Heliopolis, the ancient On, where Joseph lived. The Sphinx and Pyramids of Geezeh can be reached in about three hours by donkey. Old Cairo (Fostat) with its curious Coptic cathedrals or the great Geezeh Museum can be reached in one hour in the same way. A donkey and boy can be hired

for \$1 a day. Memphis, the Apis Mausoleum, the Pyramid of Lakkorah, etc., can easily be reached from Cairo at a light expense. One place no traveller ever visits, which no traveller can afford to miss. It is the Fayoum, and it can be reached for \$1 from Cairo. There the Bahr Yuseph (Canal of Joseph) leaps and gurgles like a natural river, and there the primitive simplicity of the natives is as yet wholly uncorrupted by the sight of a European and the cry of "backshish." Out in the desert near Gurah and Kahun, where Mr. Flinders Petrie was then making his surprising and epoch-making discoveries, I have seen the little children seemingly frightened half to death at the sight of the "white devil." To reach this spot, however, or the Pyramids of Illahoun or Hawara, or the site of the ancient Labyrinth, or of Lake Mæris, would require a very long, hard desert ride. At the Greek hotel at Medunet-el-Fayoum one could find an interpreter and get provisions, etc., for the trip. From Alexandria one can get back to London by steamer *via* Malta and Gibraltar for \$50.

If he desires to visit the Holy Land, he will strike for Jaffa, thirty-six hours distant. A twenty-eight days' tour through Palestine (*via* Galilee, Damascus, and Baalbec) to Beyrout, on to Smyrna (for Ephesus excursion), Constantinople, Athens, Corinth, Patras, Brindisi, Naples, Rome, Florence, Milan, Como, St. Gothard, Lucine, Bâle, Paris, Dieppe, London (second-class), \$300.

If one has previously taken the latter half of the above journey he may choose, as did the writer, to get the best terms possible from Ralla Floyd, the celebrated agent of Gaze & Son in Jaffa for the long Palestine tour, and be delivered from all worry of every kind. From Beyrout I took ship for Liverpool *via* Jaffa, Suez, Alexandria, Malta, and Gibraltar. To go from Cairo to Jerusalem, stop at one of the best hotels in Jerusalem, visit all the points of interest in the suburbs; make the journey to

Bethlehem and Hebron and the Pools of Solomon; the three days' journey to Jericho, the Jordan, and the Dead Sea; and then the long, four weeks' journey to Beyrout *via* Nazareth, the Sea of Galilee, Damascus, and Baalbec (seven weeks' tour in all), actually cost me \$200.

It could be done much cheaper. The Hospitium Franciscanum, in Jerusalem, offers clean beds, good rooms, with carpets and frescoed ceilings, excellent toilet arrangements, and three good meals, which (with the exception of the breakfast) will compare favorably with the hotels—all *gratis*—with the expectation, however, that the "pilgrim" will make a gift of \$1 to the institution for each day that he stays. Each traveller is welcome to stay fourteen days. There are several other hospices nearby, if not quite as good. One of these alone offers accommodations for three hundred guests. If one did not have a delicacy about accepting the entertainment provided for Christians of another faith, and presumably in other circumstances, he could save much money by making this his headquarters. A man who had carefully studied the cheapest routes and methods of living, who was thoroughly acquainted with everything he ought to see on the way, and who was a practical traveller and possessed of a hardy constitution, might also take the long trip through Palestine independently, hiring a dragoon to make all arrangements for lodging and provisions. A student-friend of mine, a man of most scholarly and refined tastes, after giving six months or more to the special study of Palestinian travel and exploration, did this at a cost of only \$3 a day, but the last three or four days he could not eat the native food. I myself made the Philistine journey *via* Ashdod, Askelon, Lachish, etc., on even less than this, but it is a dangerous trip to take that way and not to be advised. The same young gentleman mentioned above—who, because of his careful study of routes and prices, is not to be confounded with the ordinary traveller—went

from Berlin to Alexandria *via* Dresden, Prague, Vienna, and Venice, thence by P. and O. steamer, spent one month in Cairo and vicinity, ten and one half weeks in Palestine, returned to Berlin *via* Smyrna, Ephesus, Athens, Naples, Rome, Florence, and Munich, for \$450. The trip occupied four and a half months, and this sum included all expenses, except for curios, during this time, including even payments for clothing and incidentals. Such a man could spend twelve months and see much of Europe, Egypt, and Palestine on \$2 a day. Go thou and do likewise.

"Go, worthy man, and bring home understanding,

For if the merchant through unknown seas  
plough

To get his wealth, then, dear sir, what must  
you

To gather wisdom? Go and go alone,

Only your noble mind for your companion.

"Go far, too far you cannot, still the farther  
The more experience finds you: and go sparing.

One meal a-week will serve you and one suit  
Through all your travels."

*Beaumont and Fletcher.*

### The Minister's Use of Biography.

By REV. W. A. PERRINS, BEDFORD O.

I PREFACE my observations on the above subject in the words of Horace Mann, one of America's conscientious statesmen, a study of whose memorials must inevitably end in a heroic and intelligent philanthropy; it is simply nothing short of an inspiration to become familiar with his enlightened, untiring efforts, and the unprecedented measure of success which attended his labors in the cause of common-school education. The following is what Mann says: "Biography, especially the biography of the great and good, who have risen by their own exertions from poverty and obscurity to eminence and usefulness, is an inspiring and ennobling study. Its direct tendency is to reproduce the excellence it records."

One of my greatest and most pleasurable delights is the study of biography;

and the lives which offer the most interesting biography are such as Thomas à Kempis, Archbishop Leighton, Erasmus, and Rutherford. On a cloudless summer evening, and a short time after the sun has gone down, the stars begin to appear one by one, till six or twelve may be seen by the naked eye. And an hour or two later, when the entire glittering galaxy is marshalled forth, the first six or twelve, or even eighteen, are still pre-eminent. The brighter stars are called the stars of the "first magnitude." These are the foremost to arrest the upturned gaze, and their fine, incomparable effulgence will sometimes attract the glance of intelligent and matured persons, or fill even the vulgar with delight and wonder. The "first magnitudes" are the land-marks of the firmament.

And so, looking upon the firmament of biography, there are some lives which outglory all the rest; some twenty, or thirty, or fifty, or it may be one hundred stars of the "first magnitude," burning and shining lights, whose illustrious splendor retains the attention of the eye, and which haunts the memory when the eye is closed—brilliant names, conspicuous lights serving as landmarks and points of attractive reference—and arrest the notice and awake the wonder which God has set in His world's biographic sky: Theology—Bunyan, Baxter, and Bruce; Poetry—Milton, Robert Browning and Longfellow; History—Lecky, Bede, and Bancroft; Politics—Defoe, Webster, and Gladstone; Art—Angelo, Raphael, and Leonardo; Music—Beethoven, Mozart, and Handel. These are all stars of the "first magnitude" in the biographic sky.

The minister's is a life of periodic transition. The age in which we live is one of change; and the theology of the modern Church is not exempt. An acquaintance, therefore, with the lives of our greatest theologians of the past will help us very materially to "fix on a point amid the whirl;" or to be

"True as the needle to the pole,  
Or as the dial to the sun."

The transition or division in the schools of religious thought to-day is but a reproduction of that which marked the Christian Church of the twelfth century. In this period there were important distinctions among the *teachers*; they were divided into two classes. Among the first division there were those who were called the *biblici*--the Bible divines; the *dogmatici*--the dogmatic divines; and the *veteres*--the ancient divines. Among the second were the *scholastics*--the advanced divines; and the *novi*--the new divines. The *biblici* believed in and expounded the Bible, and were not in the slightest degree dependent upon reason and philosophy; they sought for the evidences of righteousness, not reason--faith, not philosophy; they believed the Scriptures to be their own interpreters. The *scholastics* showed an utter disregard of the Bible, and expounded a "Book of Sentences"; they finally, through the subtlety of their philosophy, reduced whatever the Scriptures proposed as an object of faith and rule of practice, and obscured its divine doctrines and precepts by vain questions and worn-out speculations. And to study the memorials of such heroic, conscientious thinkers as St. Bernard, Thomas Aquinas, Godfrey, and Becket--especially those of St. Bernard, whose zeal was ardent beyond all expression, and whose influence and authority were equal to his zeal--will act as a corrective influence, will help us "to fix on decisions indisputable."

We are rapidly drifting into the deficiency of faith and soul, so evident in the earlier part of the reign of Queen Anne, and which reached its misty noon under George II.--"a dewless night succeeded by a sunless dawn." The Puritans were buried and the Methodists were not born. The philosopher of the age was Bolingbroke, the moralist was Addison, the minstrel was Pope, and the preacher was Atterbury. The world had an idle, discontented look of the morning after some mad holiday. The reign of buffoonery was past, and the reign of faith and genuine spiritual life

had not commenced. During the first forty years of the century the eye that sought for spiritual life could hardly find it, or as Bishop Butler has represented it in these words: "It was taken for granted that Christianity was not so much as a subject of inquiry, but was at length discovered to be fictitious. And men treated it as if this were an agreed point among all people of discernment." And there is, therefore, inspiration for us in the biography of the leaders who resolutely withstood the degenerate influences of their age, and clarified the mist so awfully dense around them. Read the life of Whitefield, "the prince of English preachers," who, in his rapture and self-devotion, traversed England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales for thirty-four years, and crossed the Atlantic thirteen times, preaching the love of God and His great gift to man. Also John and Charles Wesley. Of John Wesley it is said that he rose every morning at four, traveling every year upward of four thousand miles, and preaching nearly a thousand sermons, speaking at "class-meetings," editing books, writing letters, and always ready to talk to and sympathize with all classes of people. And further, Augustus Toplady, of whom it is declared that "his voice was music, and spirituality and elevation seem to emanate from his ethereal countenance and light, immortal form." And he who penned the "Rock of Ages, cleft for me" could also from easy explanations advance to rapid and conclusive argument, till science began to burn and feelings to take fire from his own kindled spirit. And equal in piety and strength with any of his contemporaries was William Grimshaw, who, with meat to eat that others knew not of, would dine on a crust of bread, then preaching the love of Jesus till the tears ploughed white channels in the grim faces of the Yorkshire colliers, would turn into his hay-loft and find in it a great heaven in his dream. And there are, further, the lives of Romaine, John Newton, Venn, and Simeon. Such

will help us to meet and more fully understand the age in which we live.

It is as inspiring as it is interesting to notice the perturbations of the political expanse in the fifteenth, the seventeenth, and even in the commencement of the present century in connection with the "men who have mastered the forces." Our noted statesmen have repeatedly avowed that the present political upheavals, or at least "rumblings," are evident reappearances of political polemics of past centuries. And I maintain that a minister has to associate himself with politics, and it will depend largely upon the ministry of the future as to the tendency of our political life. It is, therefore, of incomparable advantage to the minister of the Gospel to be very interested in the "Life of Savonarola," who seemed to have had at one time in his being the influences of heaven and the forces of earth. He had over him the beneficent feature in which the providence of God moves and the powers of heaven are; and he had in and around him the great truths which ultimately made Locke, Bacon, and Gibbon, and which to-day move in the lives of Bismarck, Gladstone, and Blaine. Also the memorials of Milton, whose high idealism, masterly thoroughness, and unbending persistency were not likely to wreck the bark in which he sailed—he who, after he lost his eyesight, rose at four in the summer and five in the winter, and began the day by having the Hebrew Scriptures read to him, then he contemplated. At seven his man came to him again, and then read to him and wrote till dinner. The writing was as much as the reading. Reading till six in the evening, after which friends were admitted to his company. And, further, a study of the life of Defoe, who was the "exceptional" man of the seventeenth century. He was a man of action as well as a man of letters. He was nearly sixty when he wrote his immortal "Robinson Crusoe"; he had, in fact, as adventurous a life as any of his own heroes, and had met quickly succeeding difficulties with

equally ready and fertile ingenuity. Also Burke, Russell, and Disraeli; Washington, Webster, and Madison. Such a study will help the minister to discharge his duty with becoming decorum, and thus educate his people in the performance of their civic obligations. "If the clergy of all denominations abstain from influencing the political life of the nation, the mainsprings of national progress are likely to become unspiritualized."

And there are varied experiences in the life of the pastor and preacher in which he will find very material aid by reading the lives of man who, by force of intellectual brilliancy, commercial success, and moral greatness, have made themselves; and if we undertake to read anything else, such will leave us *ad captandum vulgus*; but all intellectual, commercial, and moral efficiency embodied in "mortal clay" will be forceful and undeniably good. This thought is very characteristically put by Emerson in these words: "I cannot even hear of personal vigor of any kind, great power of performance, without fresh resolution. We are emulous of all that men can do. Cecil's saying of Sir Walter Raleigh, 'I know that he can toil terribly,' is an electric touch. So are Clarendon's portraits—of Hampton, 'who was of an industry and vigilance not to be tired out or wearied by the most laborious, and of parts not to be imposed on by the most subtle and sharp, and of a personal courage equal to his best parts'; of Falkland, 'who was so severe an adorer of truth that he could as easily given himself leave to steal as to dissemble.' We cannot read Plutarch without a tingling of the blood; and I accept the saying of the Chinese Mencius: 'A sage is the instructor of a hundred ages. When the manners of Loo are heard of, the stupid become intelligent and the wavering determined.'"

---

THE soul is the enigma; God is the solution.—*Dodges.*

## PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

## The Second Advent.

"A READER, Santa Barbara, Cal.," will find brief and satisfactory answers to his queries in relation to the Second Advent (HOMILETIC REVIEW, July, 1892, p. 94) in a small reprint of various articles published in the *British Weekly* in 1887, by James Pott & Co., 14 and 16 Astor Place, New York—a small book in paper covers entitled "The Second Advent, will it be Before the Millennium?" and in a little volume by Rev. John C. Rankin, D.D., published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York, entitled "The Coming of the Lord." In the former the question is discussed *affirmatively* by Rev. Canon Fausset, D.D., Rev. Professor Godet, D.D., and others, and *negatively* by Rev. Professor J. Agar Beet, Rev. Principal T. C. Edwards, D.D., and Rev. Principal Brown, D.D. The latter book is an able presentation of the post-millennial view. J. B. K.

## The Lost Savor of Salt.

ON several occasions lately I have been asked as to the meaning of our Lord's words concerning salt losing its savor. Such a thing, my questioners assert, is unknown in our own country as that the saltiness of salt should be lost. Can any of the readers of the HOMILETIC state whether such is also true of Eastern countries? If so, was

the Master putting a hypothetical case, virtually saying, "Should salt lose its savor, wherewith could it be salted"? Or did He rather refer to the well-known aptitude of salt to absorb the qualities of other substances and so to become tainted? E. E. S.

## City or Country.

I HAVE recently been graduated from the theological seminary. As yet I have not known pastoral work. There lie before me on my desk two calls, one from a church in the city, the other from one in the country. Friends whom I have consulted advise me differently. Some present the advantages of a city pastorate, others the corresponding advantages of a country pastorate. Of course I recognize the fact that there are diversities of gifts fitting men to varying positions. But what I desire is to know whether it is generally understood to be the case that a man does well in submitting himself to the sacrifices of a country pastorate in his early ministry as a discipline for larger and more important services in his more advanced ministry? If such be the case, I shall be glad to do what I can in the country charge. As a young man, it will be a matter for gratitude if some of my elders will give me a word of help through the pages of this REVIEW. A. T. R.

## EDITORIAL SECTION.

## LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

## National Perils.

BY S. V. LEECH, D.D., PUEBLO, COL.

*Jerusalem is ruined and Judah is fallen.*

—Isa. iii. 8.

PALESTINE was once a magnificent country. It lay under an Oriental sky, with form and domain much resembling

New Hampshire, but far superior in richness of soil and salubrity of climate to the noble State that was fifth in ratifying the Federal Constitution. The Mediterranean Sea laved its western shore. Along its mountain slopes were herds and flocks. Its valleys were golden with harvests. Olives, pome-



granates, figs, and grapes were abundant. The descendants of Judah had the purest system of government the world had known. Jerusalem sat in her glory on the central table-land of Judea, more than two thousand feet above the sea—Jerusalem, the beautiful and illustrious metropolis, where religion and politics centred; Jerusalem, famous for historical events of interest, from the trial of the faith of Abraham to the crucifixion of Christ; Jerusalem, where the posterity of Judah were enthroned; Jerusalem, where worshipped the line of Judah's offspring, from whose loins came David and the Son of God.

What is to-day the condition of Palestine, whose inhabitants despised a multitude of Divine warnings and rejected the Christ? The hills terraced once with fruits, and the luxuriant valleys that were white with cereals, are now sterile. The majestic forests are gone. A few thousands of the children of Judah wail and weep at Jerusalem on sacred days. The Turk rules them with an iron rod, and Mohammedanism, with its great mosque, occupies the centre of the melancholy Hebrew capital.

Our fair land infinitely excels Palestine, in its palmyest period, from many standpoints. In territorial vastness, in the variety and abundance of its resources, in the physical grandeur of its mountains, valleys, lakes, and rivers, in isolation from monarchical governments, and in educational and religious culture, we have a glorious heritage. And yet the republic develops amid dangers unique and alarming. The path of our progress is replete with obstructions. The country steps from the apex of one rumbling volcano to the peak of another equally as forbidding. We are environed with more threatening risks than any that undermined the minor republics of ancient times. Unless we move forward with cautious and thoughtful tread, the historian of the twentieth century may write of our fate: "Jerusalem is ruined and Judah

is fallen." What are some of our chief national perils?

I. *The corruption existing at the ballot-box.*

In our country each voter is a sovereign. Our rulers, from a village supervisor to the President of the United States, are supposed to be elected to their respective offices by a majority of legal voters. But the induction of men into official positions has become a conscienceless science. When the present writer was chaplain of the Senate of New York a prominent senator declared his conviction that no honest ballot-box existed in any large city of the commonwealth. The inside facts of an ordinary election are as corrupt as an old vault in a cemetery. In the great metropolis the corruption of the franchise is appalling. New York decided the presidential election in 1884, and yet a change of one vote in each thousand votes would have defeated the successful contestant for the priceless honor. The registration books are so manipulated and falsified that hundreds of illegal ballots are cast annually in single cities. There can be no possible doubt that illegal votes and untruthful certifications of returns have elevated men to gubernatorial, judicial, congressional, and possibly to presidential posts of power. Pure men, regardless of party affiliations, look on this increasing corruption at the ballot-box with profound regret and alarm. Laws against bribing voters are rarely enforced, and the votes of thousands are openly purchased at every State and national election. The most virtuous men in legislative, judicial, and executive life, and the patriotic men of all parties, ought to combine their tireless efforts to purify the ballot-box until its contents shall accurately express the will of the people. With such a ballot-box the proverb would be well-nigh true, *Vox populi vox Dei.*"

Another immense peril to national rest and prosperity is:

II. *The attitude of Roman Catholic*

*prelates and priests toward our public schools.*

Protestant governments encourage popular education, divorced from sectarian control. All such governments have either an inexpensive or a free system of unsectarian education for young people. Probably none across the Atlantic will equal the systems of some of our wealthiest States. Almost all, if not absolutely all, of our States and their respective county sub-divisions have excellent systems of public instruction, by which the poorest boy or girl may receive, at little cost, a fair English and even a classical education. The children of peasants and millionaires, Jews and Gentiles, Roman Catholics and Protestants, regardless of color or sex, may have the advantages of a non-denominational and comprehensive curriculum. Outside of Protestant lands Romanism takes a limited interest in the general education of the young. The illiteracy of the adult population of such countries as Italy, Mexico, Austria, and Spain conspicuously illustrates this fact. From seventy to ninety per cent of these people can neither read nor write. In nearly all of our States Romanism has made, and is making, war on the public schools. Parishioners who patronize them are threatened with excommunication. Where school boards permit the teachers to open the daily sessions with the Word of God they are assailed as "sectarian" institutions. Where the use of the Bible is prohibited they are termed "godless" schools. The latest stratagem of the papal hierarchy in populous cities is to control their operations through sympathetic school boards. Bishops and archbishops have, by the hundred, traduced our public-school systems, and admonished Roman Catholic parents to patronize only the parochial schools of the Church. General Lafayette, himself a Roman Catholic, said: "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed they will fall by the hands of the Roman clergy." Had he substituted the word "schools" for "liberties" his prophecy would have

a wider indorsement. The Protestant ministry and laity cannot too vigilantly watch the machinations of Romanism in its relation to the schools sustained by public taxation and free from sectarian control. An additional peril to our highest national progress is:

III. *The enormous, continuous, and increasing immigration of the criminals and paupers from European lands.*

Worthy people from beyond the Atlantic should ever find a hospitable welcome on our shores. Many of our best citizens were born across the ocean. But thousands of worthless paupers and ex-convicts come to the United States. They are foremost in the promotion of strikes, in the establishment of saloons, in furnishing work for criminal juries, and in inciting and prosecuting riots. The man shot down at New Orleans by the angry citizens for the assassination of the chief of the policemen were blood-stained exiles. They forced our Government into unpleasant relations with its friend Italy. English journals have stated that three fourths of the men discharged from the prisons of Ireland come to the United States. They furnish us with our dangerous classes. From their ranks come anarchists, burglars, highwaymen, and tramps. They elbow our laboring men out of remunerative positions by furnishing what is termed "cheap labor." There is room on the soil of this republic for all of the industrious foreigners who come to us, but the representative men of the great political parties should perseveringly labor to secure from Congress such legislation as will steadily decrease excessive immigration, and prevent our territory from becoming the vast dumping-ground on which European nations shall continue to deposit their criminal and pauper populations. Another grave national peril is:

IV. *The startling increase of Sunday desecration.*

Human obligation to refrain from unnecessary manual labor during one day in seven is both perpetual and universal. The lofty estimate God placed on

the sacred observance of the Sabbath He formulated into the comprehensive fourth commandment of the Decalogue. Human duty, associated with its consecration to physical recuperation and religious worship, He illustrated in His providential ministrations among the Hebrews during forty years of itinerant disappointments. In the Levitical code He transfigured Sabbath observance into a national institution, weaving it into the fabric of civil government, and enjoining the threefold duty of suspension from manual labor, domestic recognition, and religious worship.

Especially to wage-earners is Sunday God's golden gift. To the sons and daughters of severe toil the fifty-two Sundays of the year ought to be so many calm havens fringing the stormy ocean of life. No employer has any moral right to rob his employés of a divinely conferred individual right, compelling the most conscientious to choose between the constant suppression of convictions of duty or the surrender of their positions in business life. Nehemiah informed the sons of Judah that with national calamities God would retribute the profanation of His Sabbaths. God is immutable. Mr. Moody never uttered a truer sentiment than when, at Northfield, he said: "Show me any nation that has given up the observance of the Sabbath, and I will show you a nation that has in its heart the seeds of decay."

The American Sunday is not to-day what it was a half century ago. Louis Agassiz, on reaching our shores, was profoundly impressed with the quiet and sanctified observance of the Lord's Day. That period has passed from us. The tremendous tide of immigration that has surged on our Eastern docks for decades has done much in transforming our consecrated Sabbaths into general holidays associated with amusement and dissipation. Before our Civil War, few metropolitan daily papers regarded it as popular or profitable to issue seven daily editions per week. During

the four exciting years of battles the public demanded daily news from the great armies at the front. To-day hundreds of our chief city dailies issue immense and sensational editions, read more widely than any other daily issue. No strike of workmen would so thrill with sympathy the popular heart as a general strike among newspaper employés, the motor men and conductors of street car lines, telegraph operators, railroad engineers and conductors, and Sunday employés everywhere, against Sunday work that paralyzes conscience, injures health, and impairs public morality. No corporations have any moral right to say to God-fearing clerks and laborers: "You must leave our employ or work on Sunday." When Stephen Girard dismissed one of his most valued cashiers for refusing to work on a Sunday during a business pressure, the infidel millionaire's conscience so smote him that he secretly secured for the discharged man the place of a cashier in a new bank, saying: "A young man willing to lose a remunerative position for his conscience' sake will make a trustworthy cashier."

We talk of the dissipation of a European continental Sunday! The writer has been a pastor in a large American city totally destitute of Sunday laws. He has seen more drunkenness and depraved dissipation there on Sunday than he ever witnessed in London, Paris, Geneva, Venice, or Rome. In a majority of our great cities the percentage of men who attend on church services is small. The more judges, district attorneys, and policemen protect Sabbath-breakers the surer are they in securing permanency of office. The base-ball grounds are populous with young men and women on the Lord's Day. Immense excursions occur, and the railroad trains and steamers are crowded. Many offices, stores, shops, and saloons are open. Theatres and concert halls, cable and electric cars are packed. Give us good Sunday laws, well-enforced by men in local authority, and our churches will be full of worshippers, and our

young men and young women will be attracted to the divine service. A mighty combination of the churches of the United States could win from Congress, the State legislatures, and municipal councils all legislation essential to this splendid consummation.

Another stupendous obstruction to our national peace and commercial prosperity is :

V. *The dangerous investiture of impulsive and narrow-minded demagogues with the leadership of vast labor unions.*

Probably all pastors have an intense sympathy with men and women who receive small remuneration for hard toil. Few of us would fail to endorse the wisdom of organizing labor associations and trades unions among the masses engaged in the mechanical avocations of the United States. But we affirm that such confederations ought to be under the control of clear-headed, calm-minded, and patient men. Probably not one extensive strike in ten results in the remotest benefit to those who, voluntarily or from necessity, cooperate with the exasperated and chafed men. Thoughtful ministers who have vigilantly watched the inception, progress, and termination of labor suspensions, must have been impressed with the folly and needlessness of some extensive railroad, steel mills, and trades-union strikes, in which thousands of contented workmen have ceased to work and endured privations at the bidding of a few district masters and walking delegates. Millions of dollars have been lost through the agency of these rebellions against employers in periods of business emergency, and these losses have chiefly fallen on the families of the strikers. Discreet generals only should direct the movements of the tremendous army of our wage-earners. Poor men, earning fair remuneration, should enter very cautiously into an aggressive contest with wealthy capitalists, and ponder well the expediency of challenging corporations and millionaires to financial combat. Men in a free country have a right to work or to

stop working for employers, and employers have a right to determine whom they will employ and what wages they are able or willing to pay for service. No committee of arbitration can settle a strike, because neither employers nor employes are under any legal obligation to accept their verdict. No combination of strikers have any legal or moral right to threaten or assault the men who take their vacant positions, or dictate to employers what men they shall employ and at what rates, or destroy the property of the men whose service they have voluntarily abandoned, or crush their business with boycotts from ocean to ocean. No man whose splendid talents have won him fortune and fame should be traduced simply on account of his wealth. But for the enormous ventures of capital, which ventures have impoverished more men than they have enriched, hundreds of thousands of hard toilers would be unemployed to-day. So-called "plutocrats," "nabobs," and "Cresuses" carried over mountain ranges the great trans continental railways of the West. Their wealth and enterprise have made possible the existence of many a city and town between the Mississippi and the Pacific. Their vast fortunes are locked up in manufactories of every kind and grade, from that of the doll of the baby to that of the gigantic locomotive. What the majority of day laborers should boycott promptly is the saloon—that prevents them from being proprietors of homes, refuses them the ownership of life-insurance policies for family protection, and robs their children of social and educational culture.

But the censure for the strikes of labor unions should not all fall on the rebellious workmen or their fallible leaders. Thousands and tens of thousands of men and women are financially outraged by employers. The writer was pastor, eight years ago, of a gifted young lady who, for three years, had been a prominent clerk in an immense variety store at a salary of but three dollars per week, she having to provide

her own room and board. Multitudes are under the iron heels of avaricious corporations. It nettles and incenses such persons when they learn that through the labor of employés and speculative ventures twenty-four thousand and six hundred persons own thirty-two thousand millions of money and property in a country having seventy millions of people. This proprietorship equals half of the money and real estate of the nation. It vexes and ruffles the toiling masses when they call to mind the fact that most of these colossal private fortunes were won by wrecking the small investments of the humble, and grinding down employés to starvation wages. Labor and capital ought to be firm friends. The Christian pastor should see to it that the wage-earners hereafter find in the Church, instituted by the Carpenter of Nazareth, a truer friend than the district master or the walking delegate.

But the overshadowing peril to our national prosperity is :

VI. *The enormous influence and diabolical work of the American liquor traffic.*

No existing curse compares with this in its awful results. Oliver Cromwell fitly said of it : " This national curse is a thing with which God will yet reckon." It is an unmitigated evil, blasting homes and breaking hearts all over our territory. The saloons of the country placed side by side would stretch a thousand miles. The brewers and distillers have a thousand millions of dollars invested in their business of ruining for both worlds, fathers, husbands, brothers, and sons. The various leagues of liquor manufacturers and vendors expend annually vast sums at our State capitals in the dictation and control of legislation. They direct the primaries in legislative and municipal elections. Their representatives are in all city councils and public offices. Their traffic is responsible for three fourths of all crime and taxation, for a vast amount of public immorality, and for nearly all of our pauperism. The drink bill of the nation exceeds its bread

bill, and is five times as large as the boot and shoe bill. It costs our citizens seventy times as much to sustain the saloons as to sustain the churches. The country spends ten times as much for malt and distilled drinks as it expends on its public schools. The combined national, State, and local taxes are but eighty per cent of our annual expenditures for intoxicants. The trial of high license for the regulation of the traffic has been a comparative failure. The small saloon has been closed, but the gilded bar, equally as dangerous, has expanded its sales. The revenues of towns and cities have been enlarged, while crime has been unchecked and the public conscience drugged. The one hundred and seventy thousand saloons continue to destroy hecatombs of our young men. They constitute the chief hindrance to the signal success of our churches, and the churches ought to lead the van of the army on whose banners are inscribed, " The saloon must go." No man can be a true Christian and fail to be a foe of the drink curse. The liquor traffic works and votes for its own interests, regardless of the party affinities of its constituency. Some day the churches and temperance organizations will display equal wisdom. The words of Jesus are still applicable to His friends : " The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

Retribution for the gross violation of the Divine laws comes to nations as well as to individuals. All along the departed centuries the trumpet of admonition has been sounding, " With what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you again." History has echoed the words of David : " His enemies shall lick the dust." Nemesis has for thousands of years been one of His active messengers to men and nations. Anne of Austria appropriately said to Richelieu : " My Lord Cardinal, God is a sure paymaster. He may not pay at the end of every week or month, but He always pays in the end." The permanent prosperity and perpetuity of any



nation that spurns God's laws are like the banquet of Damocles, over which constantly quivered the sheathless, hair-hung sword. Theoretically we are a Christian people. Nationally we recognize the sanctity of the Sabbath, kiss

the Bible in the court-room, stamp on our coins the name of Deity, and annually consecrate to His honor a day of general thanksgiving. Of us may no historian ever write: "Jerusalem is ruined and Judah is fallen."

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

##### Getting Out the Kinks.

It is one of the striking facts in the unfolding history of the Church of Jesus Christ that with one book in its possession as the rule of faith and practice there should be such a variety, and even conflict, in the views of those who receive its truths. That which is true to one is but partially true, or wholly untrue, to another. And yet the promise of the Master was that when the Spirit of Truth should come, He would guide those to whom He came into all truth. There can be only one inference. Either that the promise was untrue, or that it was meant to cover only such truth as can be called essential. The divineness of the Master renders it impossible to hold the first inference. His word cannot be broken. Therefore the divergent views of the various branches of the Church have had only to do with things which are matters of indifference. Why then magnify them? Why attempt to draw men together on the basis of them? The rule of the Head of the Church, "If any man do the will he shall know of the doctrine" is one that holds universally with reference to all that needs to be believed. Denominationalism centres in what men read not in but into their Bibles. Full consecration of life will dispel all the shadows worth minding. As to non-essentials it will doubtless hold true to the end of time for every believer, "Now I know in part." Therefore the "more excellent way" than debate or animadversion or abuse is that which Paul emphasizes in 1 Cor. xiii., the way of the love that is kind; that seeketh not its own; that is not easily provoked; that shall not fail,

even when knowledge, or supposed knowledge, shall be done away. Then the darkening glasses of imperfect theological systems shall be forever broken, and men shall see face to face, and be one as the Father and the Son are one.

---

##### Dull Sermons.

DR. TALMAGE, in writing recently on some of the reasons for the failure of the pulpit to maintain its hold on certain classes, pronounced dullness the unpardonable sin of the preacher. How any one with such a message to proclaim, with such an inspiration as that of the Spirit of the Almighty, with such an opportunity of meeting the great needs of his fellows with the one thing able to satisfy them, can be dull, it is hard to see. Certainly the gift of proisiness is not a Divine one. Pope, in his semi-profane way, professed to believe that it was a visitation on the hearer for his sin:

"I whisper, gracious God!  
What sin of mine could merit such a rod  
That all the shot of dullness now must be  
From this Thy blunderbuss discharged on me?"

Many a congregation would be justified in repeating the question if his explanation is to be accepted. Unfortunately there is too good reason for the conviction that prosing in the pulpit is but the public expression of dozing in the study. If the pastor is drowsy in the latter he need have no wonder that his people are drowsy when he comes to stand in the former. With a sword put into his hands so sharp that it can pierce to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, there is no excuse for him if by his handling of it he makes it dull.