THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXVIII.—OCTOBER, 1894.—No. 4.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—THE FOUR GOSPELS AND THE FAITH OF CHRISTENDOM.

BY D. S. SCHAFF, D.D., JACKSONVILLE, ILL.

THE four Gospels are the inner redoubts of Christendom. It is back to them ultimately that the Church will always go for the principles and justification of its faith. It is quite conceivable that the Christian faith might have perpetuated itself, if the Gospel message had never been committed to writing. The persistence of customs and unwritten faiths in the East is pledge of this. The Apostles promulgated the deeds, the sufferings, the resurrection of Christ, and His words by preaching. The oral Gospel was sufficient for the first generation of the Church, while eye-witnesses were still alive and the second coming of Christ was regarded as imminent. The churches, however, especially those at some distance from Judea, visited only once, or at best only occasionally, by an Apostle or apostolic helper, must have felt almost from the earliest times the need of an authoritative record of those things which were surely believed and fully established among Christians (Luke i. 3).

The four Evangelists of the New Testament give the oldest account of Christ in existence, and in general may be said to have been from time immemorial regarded as authoritative. Only a single saying of Christ is preserved in the other parts of the New Testament, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." The few original sayings attributed to Him by the fathers are, all but two or three, improbable, if not manifestly spurious. None of these words add anything to the portraiture of Christ given by the Evangelists, nor is any work of Christ—His appearances after the resurrection excepted (1 Cor. xv.)—ascribed to Him which contributes a single feature to the genuine outlines of His life and labors. The delineation of the four Gospels is final. The portrait of our Lord is complete.

Compared, even, with the other writings of the New Testament, the four Gospels are of unique and supreme importance. The Christian

Church could get along without the Acts, valuable as that book is by its fresh account of the early activity of the Apostles, their martyrdom, and the hopeful confidence with which they preached the Gospel until it was carried to Rome itself. It would continue to maintain itself and efficiently propagate its message, if the Epistles of Paul were destroyed, valuable as they are for the statement and proof of Christian doctrine. But without the Gospel records, the Church could not well maintain its present faith and activities. They are the main building, to which, without disparagement, the other apostolic writings may be regarded as occupying, say, the position of oriel windows and observatory. For the person of Christ and for the events of His life, for His discourses and miracles, we depend upon their narratives. These are the pillars and ground of a living faith. Origen, speaking of the Gospel of John, calls the Gospels the crown of the sacred writings, as John is the crown of the Gospels. It is not without significance that in a discovery such as has just been made on Mt. Sinai, the Lewis Codex, the portion of the Scripture preserved should be Matthew, Mark, John, and Luke (according to its order).

The Gospels accredit themselves chiefly and finally by their contents; all the external evidences together shrink in weight before this one. The reason Coleridge gives in the "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit" for the superhuman origin of the Scripture, "that they found him out at greater depths of his being than any other writings," applies in the highest degree to the evidence of the Gospels. Their message must win the assent of the reader by its own intrinsic value. The exact names of the authors is a matter of importance. The date of their composition, at a period when eye-witnesses of the events of Christ's life were still living, is of very great importance. But that which is of preeminent importance is that the contents of these documents, like a light carried in the darkness, accredit themselves by their own unmistakable excellency, and as superior to the phosphorescent lights which may glisten here and there among the philosophies and literatures of the world. Here, in a profound sense, the entrance of God's Word giveth light to the soul. There is a self-evidencing power in the sunlight to the eye. Charts of astronomy are put aside after the stars themselves have arisen. The eye knows of itself that what it sees are the stars. The Gospels make an immediate appeal to the soul of man. They shine independent of everything else. Other arguments for the truth of Christianity, such as its victories in the world, are subsidiary to this primary evidence. The Gospel narrative itself, with its portraiture of Christ, makes the first and decisive appeal to faith. It responds to the cry of the soul searching after divine truth and longing for the throb of the heart of the Father in heaven. After we have studied the other proofs and have toiled through morasses and thickets of doubt, we return to the simple stories and the unadorned parables of the Gospel, and find in them a

satisfying proof of the divine origin of Christianity. It is a great mystery that the feet of God, in the person of Jesus Christ, should have walked the hills of Judea and left their traces so that we can walk where He walked; but the reverent reason can find rest in no other conclusion than that it was as these inimitable records state.

The childlike argument of immediate experience, or the adaptation of the Scriptures to the needs of the soul, is adduced by the Gospel narratives themselves. "He that doeth My will," said Christ, "he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of Myself." "Come and see," was the simple appeal of Philip to Nathaniel, offsetting sight against the prejudice of predisposition. This, too, was the import of the last words of the Shechemites to the Samaritan woman: "Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that He is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world" (John iv. 42). Anselm couched the general idea in his aphorism, "*Credo ut intelligam.*"

Within the four Gospels there is no claim set up of inspiration. In view of theories which have prevailed in the Church, this absence merits adequate explanation, and the only explanation is that upon no assertion of external authority does their life-giving and convincing power depend. The very personality of the authors is concealed, except in the case of the fourth Evangelist, whose identity with John the apostle amounts to a certainty from the manner in which he makes reference to himself as the "other disciple" and "the disciple whom Jesus loved," in distinction from the rest of the twelve disciples (John xxi. 1–7). Nor is the personality of the first three Evangelists hinted at anywhere else in the New Testament. The reputed authorship aids the mind in its acceptance of the four narratives, and we should feel we had suffered a great loss if any possible discovery were to invalidate the claims of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. It is true that the "Imitation of Christ" would still remain a book of devotion, whether Chancellor Gerson or the Abbot of Vercelli were made out to be the authors instead of Thomas à Kempis, and the "Veni, Spiritus Sancte" would still hold its place in the worship of the sanctuary, if Robert of France were proved not to have been the writer. The case, however, is quite different with the Gospels, which record historical events and portray a personality claiming to be the Son of God. It is fortunate that, from the earliest mention, there is no dissent of any weight as to the authorship of the Gospels. It has been said again and again that no work of ancient times bears such a seal of truthfulness as they. (Schaff. Ch. Hist., vol. i., 585.)

The trustworthiness of the four Evangelists cannot stand upon the statement of St. Paul or St. Peter touching inspiration. When the former says, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable," there is no evidence that any one of our four Gospels was before Him. And the same may be said of Peter when he says,

"Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." In both cases the reference was almost beyond a doubt to the Old Testament writings. Much is to be said in favor of the divine authority of the four Gospels, when they are regarded as a part of a completed volume—the Divine Library, as Jerome calls it. The New Testament, taken as a whole, has a strong argument in its favor for a reverent faith, taught to believe that the Spirit of God operated in the Church, guiding it in the matter of the selection of the sacred Canon. A mosaic may bear upon its face the marks of a master's skill, which a single stone might not be regarded as possessing. The presence of "a presiding mind which planned the whole structure" is felt so powerfully that the Church has always said, "The Spirit of the Lord is here." The Council of Trent (iii. 2), no less emphatically than the Protestant Confessions, declares "God to be the author" of the Scripture.

The ground upon which a Christian faith bases its belief in the inspiration of the Evangelists is the nature and everlasting purport of their message. The purpose of God to redeem the world by Jesus Christ would seem to imply a record with infallible marks of divine authority. It is antecedently probable that the Holy Spirit would possess human agents in some extraordinary degree, so that they might become the unmistakable medium through which we should have the vision of God and His truth. John was in the spirit on the Lord's Day. Paul saw things it was not lawful for him to utter. On the day of Pentecost men spake with other tongues. And when we enter into the inner parts of the Temple of the Gospels, and gaze upon the outgoing glory of Christ and listen to the exalted sayings, we can only exclaim that there is something more than human wisdom there. These writings are from above, not from beneath. Their paternity is not of man. The same line of argument, reaching into the very essence of the thing, suggests itself as the one our Lord used when He placed before the Pharisees the alternative concerning the origin of His works, which they acknowledged to be *extra*-human, in such a way that they could not, without evident absurdity, ascribe them to any other than God, the source of good, and not to Beelzebub, the prince of evil.

No *à priori argument—no argument* from antecedent probability for the inspiration of the Gospel records—can be regarded as final and binding. Such argument, at best, can only be regarded as confirmatory. If there is, then, no claim by the Gospel writers to inspiration, and no statement otherwise in the New Testament which can be with certainty regarded as bearing upon it, the Church is left to the contents themselves and their immediate influence upon the soul, and to the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, the *testimonium Sancti Spiritus*. Upon this final and only binding test of inspiration, the Westminster Confession, in agreement with the other Creeds of Protestantism, has

laid stress in noble language. "The authority of Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God, the Author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the Word of God (iv.)." "Our full persuasion and assurance of its infallible truth and divine authority is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts." A fundamental principle of Protestantism is involved in this acknowledgment.

The degree or manner of inspiration cannot be wisely settled by any *à priori* argument and made obligatory upon believers; nor has their exact definition at any time in the past been regarded as a condition of *ecclesiæ stantis vel cadentis*. The plain danger of defining too closely a theological doctrine would seem to be abundantly proved by the variant theories that have been held by godly men on this subject. The fact of the authority of Scripture is one thing; to formally commit a communion to an authoritative doctrine of the manner and degree of biblical inspiration is quite another, whatever views may be held by writers within its pale. In a realm where the mode of influence must be so subtle and mysterious, conjecture is precarious, and definitive formulation of doctrine beyond the statement of the fact of the special guidance of the Spirit should be modest. "We know not how our own spirits are acted upon by the Eternal Spirit," said Canon Liddon, "though we do not question the fact. We content ourselves with recognizing what we cannot explain."

It has been argued in favor of the so-called inerrancy of Scripture, which is synonymous with verbal inspiration, that because God cannot err, the Scripture must be inerrant. One might as plausibly argue that because one is born of the Spirit, he cannot sin. John, it is true, can be interpreted as saying as much, but he cannot mean that such a one does not commit faults. That would be contrary to experience. The sun created by God has, to speak as man speaketh, defects. Yet the sun is His workmanship, and does His bidding to the universe. The induction that the Gospels are so inspired as to be verbally inerrant has led to wild conclusions. Some of the older divines held the Masoretic pointing of the Hebrew text to be inerrant, as well as the grammar of the New Testament. Some of the older harmonists were led by this theory, in accounting for the differences in the Gospel narratives, into some very unprofitable exegesis, regarding the same event to have occurred two or even three times. Following this canon, one of the Osianders (1537) held that Peter's wife's mother was healed of the fever three distinct times! A theory of inspiration not only reasonable, because it is more evidently in harmony with the acknowledged differences in the narratives and according to the analogy in the natural world, but also sufficient for all purposes, is that the Evangelists, being under special providential guidance, have given to the world, "in all things pertaining to faith

and salvation," an adequate statement of God's will. The Scriptures, of which it is the heart, are the only, as well as the sufficient, guide to eternal life, as the sun is the only and the sufficient minister of light and life to the earth. There is, it seems to us, a higher view of inspiration than that which lingers at the inerrancy of the words of the Gospels, and the immaculate accuracy of all details in description. It is, that the glory of Christ so fills the chambers of the four Gospels that in spite of mistakes in the detail of narrative (if there be any) He is manifest as the Son of God, as the great Teacher and as the Saviour of the world. So the electric flame shines through the glass. So is the flower within the flower-pot. According to this view, as much as the theory, of a verbal inspiration, the words of Athanasius are true, "The Lord is in the words of Scripture;" and inviolable truth can be held to be wrapped up in a single word.

If it still be urged that the believer would in this case have no certain guide, the objector must be referred again to the inspiration promised to the individual Christian in all ages. The Holy Spirit will guide him into all truth in discerning the will of God in the pathways of the Holy Scripture. Does not Paul lay emphasis upon this when He speaks of the Spirit's witness in the believer's heart?

The Church has felt in these records the breathing of the Holy Ghost. In studying them, the mind comes to have a conception of a person who was more than any human being who has ever walked the earth—yet none other than the Son of God. In studying Irving's and other biographies of Washington, there emerges a conception of a man so real that we feel positive in saying of Washington that a certain course of conduct he would not have followed; a certain course he would. So, from the study of the Gospels, there emerges a conception of One unlike any one else of whom we have ever heard or that we know anything about. That comes from the personal contact of the soul, and is above the letter. "I read," said Rudolph Stier, in the third edition of his "Words of Jesus"—"I read the New Testament as a book written by the agency of the Holy Spirit; but I read it in this way, not because of any prior formulation of a doctrine of inspiration, nor because I had put myself in submission to any old system of dogmatic theology, but because this book accredits itself as inspired, more and more powerfully to my understanding, at first unsound but growing sounder through medicine, yea because this Living Word has molded in a thousand ways my inner life, with all its thinking, knowing, and willing, and is molding it. For this reason, I am obedient to it with the whole freedom of my soul." Equally with this confession of a devout and studious theologian, does the very striking confession of Goethe bear upon the evidence from the intrinsic merits of the Gospel. "I hold the Gospels," he said to Eckermann, "for genuine through and through, for there is apparent in them the reflected glory of the majesty which went out from the person of Christ and which is divine

in its nature, as the divine only once was manifested here upon the earth." The statement of Wendt in his "Teaching of Jesus" recognizes this principle when he says that it "attests its own divine truth and value immediately to our consciousness without needing to be accredited by an external authority." The inspiration of the Gospels is the measure of Christ's power over the soul and in the Church. As Irenæus said, "*Ubi Christus, ibi inspiratio.*"

Ecclesiastical authority may call attention to the supreme excellency of the Gospels. It cannot be a substitute for the instrinsic form, which makes direct appeal to the soul. There must be, first, the willing heart and seeing eye. The parable of the Sower still illustrates. The sower's seed must find response in good soil. Had it been left to man to choose a way for the transmission of the revealed will of God, His wisdom might have suggested some incontrovertible external marks of authorship. These do not exist. Letters from Bombay or Pekin bear witness of their starting-point in the stamp on their face. The autographs of the Apostles are not extant, and if by any possibility they should be discovered, who could certify that they were genuine? It would require a miracle to do this. God has chosen some other way to accredit His Word. It is not His method in nature to label the leaf and the petal, "God made me." Faith reads the signs of a divine creation where no alphabet is visible. In the spiritual kingdom, also, the internal force of truth is left to make immediate appeal to conscience, reason, and faith.

(*To be continued.*)

II.—THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION IN OUR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

By William Elliot Griffis, D.D., Ithaca, N. Y.

To the Parliament of Religions neither the Sultan of Turkey nor the Archbishop of Canterbury sent any official delegate. The Nichirenites, the most fanatical of all the Japanese heretical Buddhist sects, sent a letter denouncing their coreligionists from Japan as misrepresenting the teachings of Gautama.

The mental attitude of these men does not seem to us to be that of our Lord, or of His great apostle, Paul. Yet the example of these politico-religious dignitaries of Canterbury and Constantinople is too often that of certain theological teachers. The trainers of our Christian young men who are to be pastors and missionaries are perhaps too apt to proscribe, if not to outlaw, any other religion than that of Christendom; or, possibly, it may be nearer the truth to say, than some fragment or phase of it which is national, denominational, or sectarian.

We pass over what is past and turn to the needs of the present. Is it not true, that there is a real demand that our theological seminaries should be teaching something about religion in its broadest sense, as well as about religions? Among the multiplying "ologies" in our day, should not the oldest of all the phenomena of human history be collected, classified, and made into a science? Should not the term "hierology"* be extended out from mere reference to or association with Egyptian writings and inscriptions, and in our speech and to our minds suggest the science of things sacred? Is it not a fair subject of inquiry, whether the attitude of exclusiveness as represented by the Primate of Canterbury is inherently different from that of the propagators of Islam? They offered but one alternative to the similar in the Koran. The alleged burner of the library of Alexandria considered the absolute all of "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" to be hidden in the Mohammed's monograph. Is such an example like that of Paul, who certainly made himself familiar with the molds of thought in the minds of those whom he addressed? Every one of his epistles shows that the Apostle to the nations was familiar with non-Christian systems of religion. His diction sparkles with immediate and remote allusions to the molds of thought of his readers as well as to their habits, manners, and customs.

The writer has enjoyed four years of actual experience of life on a great mission-field in an Asiatic country, and nearly twenty-five years of fairly close acquaintance with missionaries both green and seasoned. He has studied their methods, failures, triumphs, and varying measures of success. To his mind, the need of theological students receiving instruction in the science of comparative religion is imperative. Acquaintance with intellectual movements in non-Christian countries, with the state of public opinion in the chosen mission-field, and with the methods of thought and emotional habits of his hearers, will greatly increase the immediate usefulness of the missionary. In the end, it will mean vast economy of intellectual and spiritual force. The waste of missionary health, strength, and life is something appalling to consider, but the waste of time and efforts is even greater. To secure harmony with one's environment and wise expenditure of effort is as worthy of consideration as hygiene.

To-day, as shown by the Students' Volunteer Movement, and especially in their recent convention at Detroit, there are thousands of consecrated young men and women who wish to be heralds of Christ. Doubtless many, if not most of them, would like to go immediately to their work, and speak at once to their brethren out of Christ face to face. Like the Christians who stay at home, they bewail the long time that must be spent in mastery of a strange language. They look on it, perhaps, as a mysterious dispensation of Providence that they can-

* After writing this sentence, we turned to the Standard Dictionary, and were glad to find this definition given, "The scientific study and comparison of religions."

not immediately, with their eloquence, assault the strongholds of Satan and teach or preach to the "natives" in their own "uncouth" tongue.

On the contrary, and in reality (as even the seasoned veteran missionary will tell you), it is a kind provision of Providence that forbids the Yankee or the Scotsman to assault at once, with devastation, the emotional and intellectual furniture in the soul of the Japanese or the Hindu. Rare is the man or the woman who can be trusted in the picked army of the Captain of our salvation to carry the heavenly treasure without also the earthen vessel. It is not time to break the pitcher, and let the lamp shine, until thorough drill and preparation reveal the situation and the supreme moment. In the end, he is the most successful missionary who knows how his hearers think and feel. We heartily believe that those theological seminaries which found chairs of Comparative Religion, and put in them men who have a vital as well as an academic interest in their subject, will, other things considered, send forth the most successful missionaries.

We ought to teach Comparative Religion, because this science is Christianity's own child; it is of herself, and has come out of her own body. There are sciences which have no necessary relation to Christian faith or ritual. There are others which, perhaps, could only have grown up in Christian lands, which have no absolutely necessary relation to Christ's religion; but the science of Comparative Religion knows no other parents than Christ and the Church. It was Christian scholars, largely missionaries obeying the direct command of Jesus, who collected the material, formulated the methods, and called into being this grandest of the growing sciences. We do not exaggerate, nor deal in unmeaning superlatives. Some devout men and earnest thinkers believe that the teacher who knows but one religion knows none. Certainly he who ignores the ways of the Spirit and the Providence of God in the nations beyond Christendom, goes against the spirit of both the Old and the New Testament.

So far as we know, there is no theological seminary in the United States which has yet founded a full chair of Comparative Religion, though there are professorships in six universities—Yale, Cornell, the University of the City of New York, Boston, Brown, and the University of Chicago. Special courses of lectures have also been given at Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania. Beginnings have also been made at Princeton, Union, and Bangor Theological Seminaries. The time seems now approaching when, in accordance with the need of the times, our theological seminaries should provide for permanent instruction in this discipline. A vast mass of missionary biography, description, translation, and general literature has aready been accumulated. The library of "The Sacred Books of the East," edited by Max Müller, has reached its fortieth volume, and others are to come. In the various Asiatic and Oriental societies, there is a rich collection of monographs upon which to base induction. Already in several of

our cities there are museums of objects used in the service of religion, while missionaries are annually bringing home richer spoil for the student, as well as trophies for the curious or cultured.

I. The general plan to be followed in the study of Comparative Religion is probably one and the same wherever pursued, though the method of imparting instruction to students must vary according to the time allowed in the curriculum for this new discipline. Indubitably, the first procedure as to study must be to gather the facts in order to know the history. History that is worth anything must be founded upon ethnology. We must know who and what the man whom we are studying is and has been. Especially if we want to convert him must we know how he thinks, and what his view of the universe, of its inhabitants, and of the Power that informs it is. For example, it may be safely affirmed that very much of that vast body of European literature treating of Spanish-American exploration, and of the North and South American aborigines, has been nearly emptied of its value as real history by the researches upon the soil and among the living men by our own students of texts and men. The fanciful narratives of Spanish "historians," and of Irving and Prescott, will no doubt always be interesting; but after the work of Bandelier, Cushing, and Powell they change places, stepping down from history to romance. Indeed, the science of ethnology has played "puss in a corner" with many a ponderous and dignified work, and "Prescott-ized" history is no longer in demand.

So, also, the time-honored but now antiquated method of blackening the character of non-Christian peoples and, somehow or other, associating degrees of morality with the color of one's skin, is hopelessly antiquated. The Revised Version has made awful devastation with some of our un-Christlike and un-Pauline prejudices. The more we know about other seekers after God besides those who know Him in Christ Jesus, the more is our Anglo-Saxon pride humbled. The word "heathen" is no longer in the latest English Bible, for the very simple reason that it never was in the Hebrew or Greek originals. "Nations" and "gentiles" (which mean tribes or nations) are still on the page of inspiration, but heath-man, as a name, can no longer be applied to the polished gentleman in the Japanese cities, nor can the term "pagan" be with any truth given to the devout and cultured men of Delhi or Benares. Even yet, however, the stern monotheists of Islam are popularly called "heathen," and too often associated with "idolaters."

A knowledge of ethnology—that is, a knowledge of how man actually is, as the result of heredity and environment, rather than as Roman dogmatic doctors picture him—is necessary in order properly to interpret that line of record and alleged fact which constitutes his "history," real or so-called. A study of his own books and writings, and of his implements of culture and religion, must be made in order to get any-

thing like truth, and thus obtain what we call facts. These facts, properly classified and related, will inform us as to the story of the man whom we hope to convert, and of his religion, which we expect to change. Thus shall we have the raw material for the making of the philosophy of that religion. Certainly those religions which are older and much more widespread than Christianity, as well as that faith which displaced Christianity over large portions of Asia, Africa, and Europe, and even now possesses its ancestral home, birthplace, and cradle, deserve our respect and examination.

II. The philosophy of religion must next be constructed out of the facts of history. This, when properly expressed, focalizes—gives us the face and features of—the whole body in short space; enables us at a glance to take in the whole. It shortens labor and enlarges time, by enabling us from a bone to construct the whole beast, from a petal to know the whole flower. By a sufficiently wide induction of facts and the application of right methods, we can know the philosophy of any one religion. If we know one religion thoroughly, we are the better prepared to study both the history and the philosophy of other religions.

For our own part, we cannot understand the entire propriety of the would-be missionary who offers to "go wherever the Lord [as represented by the society] sends him"— to Bechuanaland, to Kiōto, or to Arcot. Judging from actual living examples, we doubt the full wisdom of such an offer. We would not be mistaken. We can understand thoroughly the consecration, the unselfishness, the *abandon* of faith. These traits we admire, and we believe that with such a spirit God is well pleased. If this were all, it would be unlovely, or even wicked, to criticize or complain.

Nevertheless, we write as a pastor, part of whose business it is to collect missionary money and to keep alive enthusiasm in givers. There is more to be considered than one's own consecration. We are to remember how costly is missionary work, and how short and uncertain is human life, and we are bound in this warfare of Christ to make the most of ourselves as good soldiers. If we study the principle of adaptation of the preacher to his pulpit, and the man to his duty at home, how much more in the difficult and delicate work of the foreign missionary ought we to think and hesitate before putting "the round peg into the square hole"? War is a science; why should not the saving of men's souls be made scientific, wisely economical? No army on earth more than the German abhors waste and practices rigid economy. Surely, if we study the lives of the Apostles, we can see how each one was fitted both by his gifts and limitations for his special work. He who commanded the disciples to "gather up the fragments, that nothing be lost," does not wish us to waste either time or life.

The would-be missionary should know his field, study it carefully,

and, by being forewarned, be forearmed. The indiscriminate willingness to go anywhere, as ordered, is good as illustrating discipline, whether Jesuit, Protestant, or Christian. Yet even Celtic savages against Romans, as well as Peruvians against Spaniards, and Coreans against United States marines and Dahlgren howitzers, learn by bitter experience that rushing *en masse* on the enemy is the wrong way to fight. Discipline is better than brute strength. Consecrated wisdom is better than consecrated enthusiasm. To know something about the enemy and to learn from him is the axiom of the bravest, wisest, and the most successful generals. Hence some acquaintance with the philosophy of non-Christian religions is wise as well as instantly and permanently valuable. Serious consideration of the question as to the particular field to be chosen is becoming, and may save *lifelong mistakes.* One need not—must not—be too fastidious. Selfishness has no place here. We argue the question simply on that same principle of adaptation which, under the dictates both of common-sense and of the Word of God, we use at home. The many-sided man of ability may offer himself to be sent to any field. The average man, counting his talents rather than consulting his pleasure, had better choose his field.

Some knowledge of the philosophy of religions will enable the young missionary to enter upon his work with the greatest of all Christian graces—charity. It will fill him with sympathy. It will enable him to do what all great orators, preachers, and those who influence men by their words, consider a prime necessity—to find quickly the common ground on which he, the alien teacher, and his possibly hostile auditor can stand. It will enable him to enlarge that ground. It will equip him to disarm native prejudices and mistakes. Naturally, men see differently; they insult each other ignorantly without intending to do so. The true Christian who knows what a precious thing religion is will be slow to call any religion "false." As Doctor James Legge, the veteran missionary to China (who baptized six hundred Chinese converts, besides translating Confucius) says: "The more that a man possesses the Christian spirit and is governed by Christian principle, the more anxious will he be to do justice to every other system of religion, and to hold his own without taint or fetter of bigotry." He will not lightly touch upon his brother's symbols of faith or methods of worship.

Unlike the infidel who wantonly destroys Christian faith, he will not lightly make jest or caricature of his Buddhist or Hindu brother's religion. Like his Master, he will not "come to destroy, but to fulfil."

He will be able also to correct misunderstandings of Christian truth or symbols. We remember once, while walking along a street in Tokio, seeing what we supposed to be the Christian monogram I. H. S. stenciled on the curtains of a Japanese tobacco-shop. Out of

curiosity, and supposing the "heathen" inside was caricaturing Christianity, we went in and asked him why he had those letters on his curtains. He answered that his name was Shimada, and that he had seen the monogram on an English book (presumably a prayer-book); and, naturally, reading the letters as Japanese do, from right to left, he had taken these letters for the Japanese syllable Shi, and his name being Shi-ma-da, he was innocent of any purpose to caricature. The illustration will suffice to show the mutual need of the philosophy of religion. Some of our mercantile misuse of the sacred symbols of the Orientals is shocking.

As yet, however, we have for the teacher of the philosophy of religion very few works which set forth, in brief compass, the secret of life in the great religions of Asia. The stock, branches, and leaves are pictured, but the roots are hidden. It is only in recent years that even the thoughtful men of Europe and America have ceased to imagine that these religions were founded by "impostors" and were "false." Instead of imitating the spirit of Jesus and of Paul, we have in the past too often imitated the spirit and method of Mr. Thomas Paine.

III. "The end crowns the work;" and the end of study in the science of Comparative Religion is to make true and fair comparison between the different religions of the world. To attempt to do this without the previous work in history and philosophy is worse than useless; it is misleading. The good books that have thus far been written on Comparative Religion are very few and very far between. Such works as James Freeman Clark's "Ten Great Religions"; Samuel Johnson's compilations on Chinese, Indian, and Persian faiths; George Matheson's "The Distinctive Messages of the Old Religions," are good enough as introductions to the subject, and are edifying to the general reader. As yet, however, neither from De Saussaye nor from Müller, nor from Edkins, have we any first-rate manual, while the masterpiece in this field of achievement is yet far off. As for missionary literature, the general criticism is in order, that they tell us too much about the outside of the man and not enough of his thoughts, the way he feels, the springs of his action, and the reasons for his view of the universe. Yet the subordinate data are rapidly multiplying, and there is good reason to believe that the day is not far distant when a work in this department, worthy of all acceptation throughout all the world as scientific, will be produced. Already, to the honest and intelligent teacher of Comparative Religion, there is enough material upon which to formulate strong, inspiring, and helpful teachings for the young men who are to go out as our substitutes to the front of the battle.

Apart from the benefits to the intending missionary, the benefits of instruction in this science of Comparative Religion to the preacher who is to remain at home will be great. Unless we utterly mistake,

it will give him a Christlike enthusiasm for humanity, a sympathy with *all* his brother men. He may have pity for some, but for none will he feel contempt. He will understand that even a dark-skinned man who does not wear a hat or leather boots may be intellectual, spiritual, and an earnest seeker after God. He will be kept from that shamefully narrow outlook in religion characteristic of too many who profess to teach Christianity with authority. He will be saved from the equally shameful habit of utterly ignoring the ethnic faiths because he is afraid of them. The study will enable both the preacher and the Church at home to progress unto more essential conformity with the Word of God, and to advance into truth not explicitly declared in it. "The enlarged study of religion will be useful in offsetting the undoubtedly strong trend of the currents of religious thought toward mere ethics." It will bring to his mind, as nothing else can, that man cannot do without worship and communion with the Highest. And last of all, it will bring into greater clearness and fulness the absolute truth of the rightfully apprehended Word of God. Already does the comparative study of religion bear testimony to the unique relation of Christianity to a sense of sin, to repentance, to prayer, to the fatherhood of God, to the person and work of Christ, to forgiveness, to the Christian service of mankind, to the future life, to the weekly day of rest, and to woman.

III.—THE METROPOLITAN FRONTIER.

By Rev. Lyman Edwin Davis, Albany, N. Y.

The metropolitan frontier is the strategic fact of our American civilization. A menace to our institutions, first of all, because its increasing importance as a factor in the social problem is not fully appreciated by public sentiment, it becomes strategic, nevertheless, as holding in itself the key to the whole problem of Christian sociology. And in the social atmosphere, as in the physical, the same cloud which hurls the lightning also brings the rain.

The geographical frontier of America takes form in the popular mind with instant impression, being referred, with varying boundary lines, to the great West; and, whether it maps itself to our thought in the deep forests of the lake region, or on the broad prairies of the Mississippi Valley, or distributes itself in shifting shadows among the mountains and plains of the Pacific States, the frontier always lies in mental association with Indians, buffaloes, dugouts, and emigrant wagons. But the social frontier is not by any means conterminous with the physical frontier. We have already learned about the phenomenal growth of the modern city. We know that some eighteen millions of people, about one-third of the total population of the country, now live in cities of more than eight thousand inhabitants,

as against a few segregated thousands at the beginning of the century; that almost one-third of this metropolitan growth is the phenomenon of a single decade; that this manifolding of the city has been common to the smallest and greatest alike—from infant Spokane, Wash., which leaped, with baby feet, from 350 souls in 1880 to 19,922 in 1890, on up to youthful Chicago, which strode, with iron tread, in that magic decade from 503,185 to 1,099,850; that this plethora is common to all parts of the land, including its typical Birmingham in the South, Brooklyn in the East, Omaha in the interior, and Los Angeles in the far West—and that this growth of cities, generally at the apparent expense of the rural districts, is not peculiar to America, but is a common trend of the age, an inevitable accompaniment of the epoch of invention.

But these facts in themselves, even when linked by logic or illumined with eloquence, are superficial to the last degree. Every civilization, in its intense and refined stage, has witnessed an equal disproportion between town and country. What of Athens and Carthage, and the free cities of Europe, States within themselves, with no rural population to counterbalance or restrain metropolitan tendencies?

The crucial phase of the problem, however, appears at once in the fact and the character of the metropolitan frontier. The great West is being settled, not by immigration primarily, but by displacement. Of the foreigners who enter this country through New York harbor, by far the largest proportion remain in the Empire State, being absorbed without assimilation in the great metropolis, or superseding the native population of the interior. The ethnical lines of a kindred fact are most clearly drawn in San Francisco, which is the Mongolian gateway of the continent, Chinatown being the metropolitan frontier of that city and of the Pacific coast; and there, as in a national fisher's net, are gathered the thousands, bad and good, of the Celestial Empire, while only the scores and hundreds flounder through to be distributed over the country at large. There are now 107,475 Chinese residents in the United States, and of that number 96,000 remain in the Pacific States—72,000 in California alone, and 25,833 in the city of San Francisco alone. And New York is simply a tenfold San Francisco in this gravitation of foreigners around the harbor of entrance, the only difference being that there is in the latter case no corresponding ostracism to make the process apparent.

If the student of Christian sociology undertakes to bound the storm-centers of the metropolitan frontier, he should guard his statements with those qualifications which reflect the commingled good and evil of every community, the best and the worst. And slander by the wholesale, in the thoughtless disparagement of particular cities or sections, is just as reprehensible, if not as actionable, as the individualized type of slander. Indeed, the plague-spots of a city, as of a civilization, are never stationary; and the most accurate designation of

the one decade will have become misleading and unjust in the next. The forces of modern society are kinetic rather than static, with the pneumatic, in the highest spiritual sense, pervading the whole structure, and often determining the result, as with the breath of God, when all the known agencies of our poor little social laboratory leave us in the dark, helpless and alone. The centers of influence, therefore, whether of light or storm, are elusive, fitful, refluent, variable. "The Bend" of Mulberry Street long ago put on the filthy garments of squalor and wickedness which the historical Five Points, with the aid of Christian philanthropy, had cast away. But far into the future still, this old Five Points, the phrase stereotyped in literature, must bear the odium of its discarded history. And are there not even modern sermons, perhaps the far-away rural echo of an older metropolitan description, but possibly resting with easy conscience at the top of some contiguous pastor's "barrel," in which poor old Five Points is made to bear the same homiletic burden it assumed twenty years ago?

But these reflections aside, there are certain contrasts of population which indicate, with tolerable accuracy, the possible storm-centers of the metropolitan frontier. Contrasting the seaboard States with those of the national interior, we find that New York contains a native-born population of 4,426,000 and a foreign-born population of 1,571,000, a proportion of nearly three to one in favor of the American element; this against 1,279,000 native-born people in the State of Kansas to 147,000 foreigners, an American preponderance of more than eight to one. In Massachusetts we find a native-born population of 1,581,000 and a foreign-born population of 657,000, a proportion of nearly two and one-half to one in favor of the American element; but this against 1,587,000 native-born Americans in the State of Iowa, with only 324,000 of foreign birth, an American preponderance of about five to one. In California, the census reports that 841,000 of the population are native-born, while 366,000 are of foreign birth, a proportion of two and one-third to one in favor of native Americans; but this over against Missouri, with only 234,000 foreign-born people to 2,444,000 native Americans, a native preponderance of more than ten to one.

These figures make it very plain that Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri were settled by emigration, with its accompanying displacement, rather than by immigration. And the general contrast of the seaboard territory with the interior sustains the general conclusion, while the exceptions presented in Wisconsin and Minnesota only make the ruling fact the more conspicuous. For the superior enterprise of the foreign population of these latter States over the average of their brothers by the sea, calls instant attention to the division of the army of immigrants on their arrival in this country, by which those who are indolent or purposeless are deposited, to "wait for something to turn up," in the already crowded ports of entry.

What other process than this can explain the fact that in New York City there are three foreigners to every four Americans, while in Brooklyn the proportion is less than two to five? If there is any magnetism in comfort or opportunity, the stranger within our gates would certainly gravitate, in favorable proportion, toward Brooklyn, if he had enterprise enough to cross the East River Bridge. But the immigrant who has a conditional purpose only, and the one who has an evil purpose, and the one who has no purpose at all, simply lodge in the metropolis by natural adhesion, waiting for a free voyage on some unseen river of enterprise, as the drift-wood waits for the next succeeding flood. New York City is the home of the supernumerary.

The contrast between city and country presents very good cumulative evidence on this point. In New York State, including all cities, only one-fourth of the people are foreign-born; but in New York City three-sevenths are foreigners. In California, as a whole, eight-elevenths of the people are American by birth; but in San Francisco only about five-elevenths are native-born. In Massachusetts entire, the population stands American as five to two, but in Boston alone the proportion stands but little more American than five to three.

But figures need not be multiplied. And we do not venture the dogma that the storm-centers of the metropolitan frontier are essentially inherent in a foreign population. We go only the length of precedent and history in asserting, however, with proper exceptions and qualifications, that the paths of immigration are always the paths of storm. And if we would trace the lines of barometric depression, and so anticipate and prevent disaster, we shall look more faithfully to the regions by the sea, with special and prayerful attention to the metropolitan frontier. New England is no longer bounded by the Hudson and the Atlantic; it is distributed, like the metallic apostles whom Cromwell melted into money, all over the Mississippi Valley. The Knickerbocker is as much at home in Chicago as in New York. With the Yankee, and the Knickerbocker and his Scandinavian allies, the geographical frontier is in fairly good hands. Look out for the social frontier at the port of entry! The emigrant wagon, now as always, carries the family Bible as well as the dog and gun. But in the shoulder-pack of the modern immigrant there is apt to be social dynamite. The cyclone of our social atmosphere is not forming over the Western dugout, but over the Eastern tenement.

The danger-signals of history are so clear and manifold that the modern city can almost learn how to go forward simply by looking backward. If Samaria was the metropolitan frontier of ancient Judea, Ephesus stood in something like the same relation to Attica, Corinth to Laconia, Nineveh to Egypt, and Carthage to the Republic of Rome, while Sardis and Babylon, as many modern cities threaten to do, corrupted their own provinces and subverted their own empire. It is of more significance, however, to recall the silent testimony of those

cities whose own destruction can be traced to the social frontier, which found refuge and protection, with all its endemic diseases, within their own massive portals. The watchmen upon their walk were taught to cry instant alarm at the approach of any foreign foe; but against the Cerberus of poverty, ignorance, and sin crouching through their own streets, no voice was heard until the city itself and the civilization it represented went down in a cry of despair.

The metropolitan frontier of Ephesus fortified itself in a perverted right of asylum round about the Temple of Diana; and although Lysimachus, with imprudent sincerity, undertook to drown out that social plague-spot by inundating the whole temple plain, yet the great and beautiful city was at last submerged by its slums. The Egyptian Memphis succumbed to the Arabian Fostat, which began as a metropolitan frontier on the opposite bank of the Nile. Alexandria at last surrendered to her Pirates' Bay. And, not further to multiply ancient examples, we find the logical projection of history in our own times; for the mad democracy of Paris rather than the forests of the Vendée, has constituted, through generations, the metropolitan frontier of France and of Europe.

Among the remedies which suggest themselves in the line of Christian sociology, the following seem to me at once ideal and practicable:

1. *The transformation of the tenement.* As we recall the wonders of the White City to-day, the Palace of the Liberal Arts may come and go in the labyrinths of memory, a dream of knowledge; the Agricultural Building a dream of plenty; Machinery Hall a dream of power; the Palace of Mines a dream of wealth; Horticultural Hall a dream of fragrance, and the Palace of Fine Arts a dream of beauty. But that model of a workingman's house, as exemplified in Philadelphia and exhibited at the entrance of Jackson Park, contained a sweet and simple dream of comfort, the realization of which would be of more solid benefit to humanity than all the others. For beauty, wealth, knowledge, and power must remain, at best, only the crown of the few; while comfort, which is the quickening spirit to all these forms of blessing, is also the essential good, and may be made the common good, of all the families of men.

2. *The isolation of the home* is, therefore, a remedy which follows and implies the transformation of the tenement. The faithful witness of "how the other half lives" has testified that they always keep house with open doors. There are doubtless higher tokens of home than lock and key; and the ring of the door-bell doesn't always touch the notes of "Home, Sweet Home." But the differentiation of the family from the community is fundamental to Christian society, and should be the first step toward the redemption of the metropolitan frontier. The sense of ownership, almost intuitive in relation to property in material things, still needs development with reference to the vested rights of the home. And in view of this fact, the various systems of

rapid transit, encouraging as they do the suburban trend of population, become really important allies of reform. From whatever point of the compass our train sweeps into the great city, we have all seen, and not without appreciating in some measure the humorous side of the enterprise, the projected town of the improvement company and the auctioneer—a kind of metropolis of great expectations, its little wooden sentinels which proclaim "lots for sale" being the only inhabitants of the place, and the streets and avenues almost as imaginary as lines of latitude. But if we could transport to these ample spaces the sweltering thousands of the metropolitan frontier, and multiply the crowded tenement of the slums into isolated homes, albeit they should have no better houses than Indian wigwams, with the traditional stick across the doorway as a sacred token of ownership and seclusion, then the suburb would have begun its true mission, and the problem of the city would have approached, by one long stride, the happy solution for which the Christian prays. And if the two hundred thousand people who moved into lower New York City while seventeen Protestant churches moved out were only formed into suburban villages of one thousand inhabitants each, every thousand would boast its four rival churches, with a pastoral call once a week for each home, besides four visiting Sunday-school committees!

3. *The education of the immigrant* is by no means the least of the remedies to be suggested. In every great city of our land, and especially in every important seaport city, there should be immigrant schools, where all foreigners who desire American citizenship might find instruction in the English language, and in the history and Constitution of the United States. And the privileges of citizenship should be made conditional upon attendance at these free national schools, or upon some honest equivalent to their course of study, to be tested by examination. The native-born American, notwithstanding all the impulses and sentiments of patriotism and domestic love which might stand as worthy substitutes for learning, must yet spend twenty-one years in preparation for the right of suffrage. But the foreigner mounts the platform of equality with him after a few short years, even if that interval has been spent in making dynamite bombs, or forming secret confederacies for the overthrow of the country's laws and institutions. The immigrant school, I am persuaded, would find no warmer champion than the intelligent citizen of foreign birth, who is interested not alone in the welfare of the nation by a loving, sympathetic patriotism, but who is personally anxious to elevate the average character of the welcome strangers within our gates.

4. *The spread of the Gospel*, first and last of all, will infuse into the metropolitan frontier the determinate, saving factor of social regeneration. Jesus loved the city with a love intensely human yet plentifully divine—weeping over Jerusalem, healing Capernaum, comforting Magdala, defending Samaria. He always went "into the next town,"

never forgetting the ostracized leper settlement among the tombs which constituted the metropolitan frontier of the Holy Land. The ministry of the Apostles was a missionary tour of the cities. The epistles of Paul were sent to Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, and Thessalonica. And even the Christian's heaven is described as the city perfected and glorified.

In the golden age of Pericles, when Athens was turning somewhat from the art of war to put on the robes of peace and beauty, the people, in a moment of joyous enthusiasm, brought down the tables of the law of Solon from the temple on the hill to the open market-place in the midst of the town; as if to say that the law, so long hallowed and deified, should henceforth be for the whole people and for the every-day affairs of the multitude. It is the mission of the Christian Church to bring down the law of God from every Sinai and the Gospel of Christ from every Calvary and fuse them into a law of love for the lowliest of mankind, in sympathetic touch with the humblest affairs of human life. In this way, and this alone, we shall find the well-anchored hope of the metropolitan frontier and of our imperiled civilization; and we shall not find it hard to believe in the city, having first learned to believe in humanity above the city, and in God over all.

IV.—HOMILETIC HELPS FROM THE FINE ARTS OF THE COLUMBIAN FAIR.

By Rev. J. Westby Earnshaw, Lowville, N. Y.

That art and homiletics have important relations, common elements, and mutual interests, and that the one may be helpfully suggestive to the other, is manifest in many ways. There is sufficient evidence of this in the frequent reference to works of art by the pulpit, the frequent treatment of religious themes by art, and the close connection in which the two have stood through much of their history; without pressing the claim that sacred oratory is itself one of the fine arts and in essential kinship with all the circle. They are in part allies, aiding and sustaining each other; and in part rivals, asserting and seeking to establish, each for itself, independence and supremacy.

That the pulpit should have a deep concern in art is natural, when we consider its province and influence in human life; and upon the same grounds it is due that the pulpit view it with intelligent, unprejudiced, and appreciative regard.

Art is an index to civilization, a revelation of the tastes, tendencies, and character of the people from whose life it springs, and the age whose spirit it utters. This is as true of art as it is of literature. And, like literature, art holds an important relation to religion, is very sensitive to its influence, finds its subjects and motives largely in

the themes and inspirations which religion supplies, and is an effective exponent thereof.

The art creations of an age reflect the prevailing modes of thought, feeling, and faith. They reproduce those phases of nature by which the sensibilities of the age are impressed; and nature ever gives back to man his own mood and tone. They illustrate history as the age cherishes and construes it; and man reads himself into history as into everything else. They utter the aspiration and idealism of the age, the artist's interpreting skill expressing with vivid effect the dreams and yearnings of which other souls are vaguely conscious. The representations of art, whether of the past or present, the mythical or the historic, the physical or the spiritual, are not simply according to the literal, or traditional, phases of the subjects treated, but as they are unfolded to man's growing thought.

Thus art reveals the direction in which life is moving, the things men are reaching out unto, and the world they are endeavoring to create for themselves.

On the other hand, the best sermons are pictures. I take at random a volume of Phillips Brooks' sermons from the shelf: it proves the four-starred volume, and each one of the twenty subjects treated therein might be the title of a picture—ay, suggests a picture, and is a picture in its unfolding treatment. I will assume that the reader can test this statement for himself by consulting this most excellent collection of sermons; or, for a conspicuous example of a sermon in which a picture is presented to the mental eye, and made the vivid symbol of the truths which the sermon unfolds, its imagery and truths being forever joined in the impression upon the memory, take the fourth sermon in Vol. II., by the same author: "The Pillar in God's Temple." And yet these examples are from a preacher who evidently made no effort at picturesque effects, but whose pictorial quality manifestly arose from his own vivid apprehension of the symbols of sacred truth and the facts of human life. His mental vision was complete, and comprehended the concrete as well as the abstract, embodying form as well as spiritual essence; or, to use again one of his own striking titles, "The Symbol and the Reality."

And here, turning for a moment to the other side, let me say that, if I were an artist, I would read Phillips Brooks' sermons as reverently, as studiously—and I doubt not it would prove as profitably—as I do, being a preacher. The spirit of the noblest and truest art is in them.

There are two ways in which any exhibition or collection of art works may be viewed from the homiletic standpoint. One is that of ethical criticism. What are its tone and quality according to those principles of which the pulpit is preeminently the witness, and what will probably be its effect upon those interests of which the pulpit is specially the guardian? Will it tend to elevate and ennoble in the

degree in which it charms and captivates, or will it have the opposite effect? Will it minister to the best in human nature, or meet and foster what needs rather to be suppressed? In a word, will its influence be favorable or unfavorable to virtue and religion? The other is that of acquisitive study, such as is given to works of literature or science, to see what can be learned therefrom which the preacher can apply in his own work. What insight is revealed by which the preacher's own apprehensions may be quickened or corrected? What elements of beauty, sublimity, pathos, or power are disclosed by which his own resources may be enriched? What themes are treated or suggested which may be serviceable for him? What tones are employed which he may translate into his more definite vocabulary? And what testimony is borne which he may cite in his pleadings?

It is in the latter mode that the fine arts exhibition of the Columbian Fair is to be considered in this paper; but, while thus defined as to its main purpose and character, it is inevitable that the paper embody also some results of the other mode of observation.

The predominant impression made by the Columbian Fair upon those who had the pleasure of visiting it was undoubtedly that of its artistic richness, excellence, and harmony as a whole. The general architectural, landscape, and decorative effects transcended in interest and charm any particular department or other distinctive feature of the Fair. The exterior aspect of the buildings and grounds, with all their manifold adornments and enhancing accessories, captured and captivated with immediate and irresistible power the susceptive sensibilities, and engaged, with an ever-unfolding wealth of artistic beauty, the deepest faculties of taste and judgment.

This is not simply to say that the whole was greater than any of its parts. It is not merely saying that the different departments were appropriately and magnificently housed, that the various structures were admirably grouped and bore well the presence of each other, showing that a capable and judicious art had vied with noble emulation in the several designs, and presided over their disposition and relations; and that, sharing those accessories and adornments which were intended to grace and beautify the whole, they blended in harmonious unison in the general effect. Beyond this, it means that the Exposition as a whole was one superb artistic creation, embodying its manifold wonders in a stately and comprehensive glory of outward form and setting, as unique and splendid as it was stupendous and varied; that it was the sublime conception of an artistic genius, fecundated with the culture and results of all the ages, quickened by a great occasion, and expressing itself with adequate skill and amplest resources, the outcome of millenniums of thought and toil, achievement and growth, the consummate bloom of human artistic development.

This impression overtopped every other as the White City was viewed. It holds its supremacy in the survival of vivid and delightful

memory, and there can be no doubt that the principal influence of the Fair will be through this impression. It afforded the millions who visited it, many of whom were comparatively untraveled, and but few of whom had seen the finer examples of classic architecture and decorative art, a view of the best styles of all lands and ages, carried out on a scale quite beyond their classic originals, all grouped and combined in one vast panoramic spectacle, and set off with enhancing effects of gleaming waters, splendors of illumination, gala pomps, and thronging multitudes of admiring and rejoicing people, never compassed or dreamed of before.

It is true the Fair has been criticized at this point, and the criticism is entitled to respectful consideration, being neither captious, prejudiced, nor supercilious. It is charged that the architecture of the Fair was too classical, or rather that it was a mistake that it was classical in type at all; that the genius of our civilization, under the inspiration of this great celebration, and with our amazing resources and appliances, should have uttered itself in new modes of art, prophetic rather than historic, forecasting and initiating the structural art of the centuries which are before us, instead of reviving and adapting that of the centuries which lie behind; and that this classic renaissance, though so grandly achieved, was a foible, in the indulgence of which we have missed the great art opportunity of our history and of modern history generally, as such an opportunity can occur nowhere else.

Such criticism as this is certainly not to be ignored. It would have been obviated, however, by a truer understanding of our stage of artistic development. New types of art, to be worthy of succession, must spring from the old, and absorb the results of a long and generous cultivation. The New World is not rich in remains of classic art as is the Old. Our people needed to see, and our artists to achieve, the finest effects of which the classic modes were capable. We could not let the classic art pass as something beyond our mastery—a dead language, in which we could not express ourselves. We must do what the ancients have done—ay, outdo them even in their own modes. The old art must have its finest efflorescence in the New World, and our civilization be thoroughly imbued with its principles, before we can let it pass into the custody of archeology.

This has now been sucessfully done. Even criticism has to admit—and it does, with cordial frankness and unstinted eulogium—that our effort in the classic art was masterly. The White City has vanished, as it was destined to do. Its work is done. Our success with the old prepares the way for the new, even as the greatest prophet of Judaism, the new Elijah, was the immediate harbinger of Christianity, and the ascension of the Christ the prelude to the Pentecostal baptism of the Spirit. The great things pass away, not in decadence, but in glory. The glory that excelleth comes not upon their fading, but upon their

culmination. Progress is born not of failure, but of success. The decease of whatever has lived worthily is a transfiguration, the putting on of immortality. It is in the great epochs of history that the word is spoken which "signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that have been made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain."

The new now becomes inevitable. The great Fair will not start an era of Neo-Greek architecture in America. The White City will live as a memory, an inspiration, a realized ideal, not as a model. And when we next invite the nations to come and see what we are doing, and can do, some more original and positive contribution to the art development of the world may be looked for.

But not only was the Fair in its structural, decorative, and scenic effects a stupendous creation of art in its highest mode, with all the mechanical and liberal arts in its service; it included also a Fine Arts Exhibition as one of its principal, and, as it proved, most successful, departments.

This department was planned, superintended, and managed with most competent ability and most elaborate care. It was housed in one of the most perfect buildings of the Fair group. The contributions to it, by the artists, owners, and those in charge of Fine Art collections of other countries, including government officials, and in some instances royal personages, as well as by those of our own land, were most generous. Perhaps there was more general and spirited emulation in this than in any other department of the Fair. It was not only one of the most attractive and successful features of the great exposition, but was undoubtedly the most widely and worthily representative modern Fine Arts Exhibition the world has seen. Indeed its vastness was the chief difficulty it presented, it being impossible in the time an ordinary or even quite extended visit at the Fair allowed to this department to cope with its varied wealth. And probably no class of visitors took a greater interest in this exhibition than ministers of religion.

The Fine Arts Exhibition was, first of all, a revelation of modern life, a synopsis, so to speak, of the modern world; an expression thereof rather than a depiction, and an expression when depiction was least intended.

This is a subject on which the preacher needs the most complete knowledge and the most vivid conceptions. He wants to know it as he cannot by immediate observation, and must study it in all reflections and interpretations. Much of his reading has this in view, and art is a no less important aid.

Modernness was the distinguishing characteristic of this exhibition. The works themselves were distinctly modern, exception being made of some special collections and exhibits. One felt in wandering through this splendid gallery that he was in the modern world, and

that the modern spirit was speaking to him from the canvases and casts about him, as truly as amid the wonders of the Electricity or Transportation building.

The fine arts are closely related to archeology, and are largely devoted to the study and reproduction of the antique. Far more than the liberal, and in utter contrast to the mechanical arts, they feel the influence of classic standards and types. Permanent art museums are accounted rich largely according to the number of works by old masters and examples of celebrated schools which they contain; and in them one feels the spirit of bygone and far-off times. But in exhibitions like this, the modern spirit is in occupation, and modern life finds utterance. The subjects may be antique, but the treatment is modern; and in spite of historic realism and traditional convention the nineteenth century utters itself in its interpretation of the earlier centuries.

(*To be continued.*)

V.—LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TEXTS FROM RECENT DISCOVERIES.

By William Hayes Ward, D.D., New York City.

The City of Nahor.

To us, as students of the Bible, Haran is best known as the city of Nahor, the designation which it receives in Gen. xxiv. 10. It was the city where Abraham's brother Nahor lived with his son Laban, where Terah and Abraham made their home after they left the land of the Chaldees, where Terah died, and whence Abraham was called to go into Canaan. As the city of Abraham's sojourn it has an interest by no means second to Ur of the Chaldees.

On the face of the biblical narrative we know little of Haran beyond the fact that it was a city of what is equally called Mesopotamia and Padan-Aram. But Assyrian studies have given a great interest to this country, and Schrader, Hommel, Delitsch, and Winckler have during the last few years devoted much investigation to this region, and a paper on Haran published this year by the latter scholar is especially important.

Haran is called Charran in the Septuagint, and Harran with the rough H in the Babylonian inscriptions. It was evidently an important place commercially, as its hieroglyph is made by two roads crossing, implying that it was the crossing-place of two caravan routes. It was the chief city of what was called Mesopotamia, not so much because it lay between the Tigris and the Euphrates as because it was included in the angle between the two rivers Euphrates and Habor, the principal affluent of the Euphrates. In its widest extent Mesopotamia did not include the whole of the region between the Tigris and the Euphrates, only this northern, or, rather, middle part, while the southern part was Babylonia, and we might call Padan-Aram North Mesopotamia.

We are apt to think of Babylon and Nineveh as the two great capitals of the East, and to suppose that there were in old times no great kingdoms but the two, Babylonia and Assyria, of which they were the capitals. This is a great mistake. Assyria was of importance only for some six or eight hundred years, before and after which it did not exist, nor did its capital city. We now know that for at least a thousand years before there was any Nineveh, Harran, a more correct form than *Haran*, was one of the most powerful capitals of the east.

The oldest capital of Southern Babylonia was Ur. Its age goes back more than 4000 years before Christ. Its chief deity was the moon-god, who was called Nunnar, the shining one. But all Babylonia, which worshiped the moon-god as the oldest of divinities, father of the sun-god, called him not by the name of Nannar, but of *Sin*. Now Sin was the special name that the moon-god had in Harran, where he had a famous temple, and whence his worship spread east, west, and south, and it is even probable that Mount Sinai is named after him. Just as the Babylonians in extremely early times took the worship of Sin from Harran, so they took from the same neighborhood the worship of other gods, and especially that of Rimmon, or Ramman, their greatly honored storm-god, the source of whose worship was the region of Aleppo and Damascus. More than 3000 years B.C. there was a king of Babylonia named Naram-Sin, into whose name that of the tutelary god of Harran entered by composition.

It was nearly or quite 4000 B.C. when the Southern Babylonian power arose, and it is beyond question that it extended its power and culture all the way to the Phenician coast. Seals of this chiliad have been found even in Cyprus. The astrological tablets ascribed to the ancient Sargas I., whose date is put at 3800 B.C., mention the lands of the west, and distinctly refer to Harran. Cedar wood was rafted down the Euphrates in the time of Gudea, about 3500 B.C., brought from the region of Mount Lebanon or Amanus.

From its own monuments we know nothing of the history of Mesopotamia and its chief city, Harran. None of the many mounds in this region have as yet been excavated. No spade has been put into the mound of Harran, although the place is well known, and still bears its old name without change. We can only guess what treasures for the history of the old world are still hidden there, and await only the enterprise of wealth and scholarship devoted to these studies; for we have only yet made a good beginning in these explorations, and a hundred sites of great importance await excavation. What we know of Harran and Mesopotamia is wholly from the records of the neighboring kingdoms.

From these we learn that the title "King of the World" (*Sar kissati*), the favorite designation of the kings of Assyria, was first assumed by the kings of Harran and adopted by Ramman-Nirari I., about 1400 B.C., on his conquest of what had been the much more powerful kingdom whose capital was Harran. This was a chiliad of great importance in eastern history. It was between 2000 and 1000 B.C. that the Kassites conquered and held Babylonia, that the Hittites and the Aramians took possession of Syria, that the Assyrian Empire was established, and that the Egyptians made their great campaigns in Asia. It was in the latter part of this period that Assyria finally conquered the earlier kingdom of Mesopotamia and took Harran.

To Sin, the moon-god of Harran, the Assyrians gave the second place of honor in their pantheon, next after their own god, Assur. This shows the influence of Harran and the honor in which it was held. When Shalmaneser II. (800 B.C.) wished to restore the kingdom of Assyria to the power it had had 500 years before under Shalmaneser I., he rebuilt the temple of Sin at Harran, regarding it as a royal city.

A curious illustration of the honor in which Harran was held is supplied by an inscription of the time of Assurbanipal, the last great king of Assyria. A scribe, Marduk-sum-ussur, writes to the king:

"When the father of the king, my lord, made an expedition to Egypt, he went to the temple in Harran, built of cedar wood. Sin was sitting on his throne with his head bowed. Two royal crowns were on his head. Nusku waited upon him. The father of the king, my lord, entered in. Sin raised his head and spoke: 'Go forward, and thou shalt conquer the land.' He went forward, and he conquered Egypt. The remaining lands which Assur and Sin have not conquered will the king, the lord of kings, conquer. By the command of Assur, Sin, Shamash, and the other gods shall he sit on a throne of generations."

If Assur, the god of Assur, the first capital of Assyria, was put at the head of

the Assyrian pantheon, Sin was put next, because Assyria did not become a kingdom until it had incorporated Mesopotamia, with its capital city, Harran, and adopted its god, Sin.

Largar, king of Assyria, mentions it as one of the chief acts of his life that he restored the old privileges and rights of the cities of Assur and Harran. This implies that as Assur had been the old capital of Assyria, so Harran had been the capital of Mesopotamia. It was evidently regarded as no common provincial city, but as a famous old center of power and worship.

After the fall of Assyria, Mesopotamia of course fell to Babylonia. When the last king of Babylon, Nabonidus, was in danger of losing Mesopotamia by the inroad of the Scythians who had already invaded Media and Assyria, he attempted to propitiate the gods by rebuilding the temple of Sin in its old glory. It is curious that he usually calls himself "King of Babylon," but in recording this one pious act of his he assumes the designation of the old kings of Harran, and calls himself "king of the world."

We find, then, that in the very oldest times known to us there was in Mesopotamia, or that north part of Mesopotamia included in the angle of the Euphrates and the Habor valleys, called in Genesis Padan-Aram, or Plain of Aram, a kingdom whose capital city was Harran, the biblical Haran. The difference of spelling comes from the fact that the Hebrew language cannot double the letter *r*. We find its tutelary god worshiped in Babylonia as early as 3500 B.C. We find it mentioned several times in an astrological work which was in existence in the second chiliad B.C., and which was referred to a period and an author 2,000 years earlier still. When the Assyrian power arose it became united with the latter, and was so in the time of Shalmaneser I., about 1300 B.C. The advance of the Hittite and other powers reduced the realm of Assyria, but Tiglath-Pileser I., about 1100 B.C., again extended his limits so that Mesopotamia was permanently incorporated with Assyria until the overthrow of the empire by Nabopolassar. Assyria gave no special culture to the world, but borrowed what it had from Babylonia and Padan-Aram, both older kingdoms, with established art and religion, and it was by union with the latter and by its help that Assyria conquered all the regions about, north to the Black Sea, and west to the Mediterranean. This gives us a new point of view to consider the development of civilization in the entire region occupied by the Phenicians, Syrians, and Hittites, including the descendants of Abraham. We see what a distinguished political ancestry the Hebrew had, coming first from Ur of the Chaldees, the capital of the earliest South Babylonian kingdom, and then from Harran, the capital of the nearly equally old and powerful Mesopotamian kingdom. From these two cities he brought the best education and civilization of the ancient world; and we can see how reasonable it was that Abraham and Isaac and Jacob should have sought their relations of kindred with the land where Laban still lived, and should have regretted to see their children seek their wives from the inferior races about them.

A CRITIC, referring to Du Maurier's reputation for ease and naturalness in writing, says: "It is, one suspects, the sort of spontaneity that comes from hard work. The soul of the artist felt deeply, saw clearly, and then worked away with the instrument of language till his vision was made plain to others. *That* is not an easy thing to do; and the greater the artist the harder the work; for he alone is fully conscious of the imperfections of the language at its best to image the mind of man." If you would write more clearly, you must think harder, and put more effort into your endeavor at clear expression. Ease costs hard work.—*Trumbull.*

SERMONIC SECTION.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IN SOME OF ITS CHARACTERISTICS.

A PHILOSOPHICAL EXPOSITION.

BY C. B. HULBERT, D.D. [CONGREGATIONALIST], ADAMS MILLS, OHIO.

Putting away therefore all wickedness and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speaking, as new-born babes long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation, if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.—1 Peter ii. 1, 2.

IT is agreed that religion, subjectively considered, is life. "He that hath the Son hath life." "The gift of God is eternal life." In this fact we find our starting-point. If a man has religion, it is life in him. But it is finite life, limited and dependent. It requires for its continuance outside support and supply. This is true of all finite life from the hyssop up to the archangel. Turning now to this life let us take note of some of its characteristics.

And, first, all life *grows*. This may not be apparent to the eye or any of the senses, but it is to the reason. Growth is the most unambiguous and decisive sign of life. A swelling bud, a beating pulse—this is proof. Life and growth go together as inevitable antecedents and consequents; and where there is growth, there is increment. This does not necessitate augmentation in size. It is not untrue to fact or absurd to say of a thing growing that it is growing small. Many a tree, many an animal, not a few persons of our acquaintance, are not as large as they formerly were. Growing all the time and adding new material, they have yet grown smaller. We sometimes say of a youth that he has "got his growth." To the eye, this may be seemingly true, but not to the reason.

Are we agreed on this first point, that where there is life there is growth? Let us then see if we can agree on a second: wherever there is growth, there is *eating*. All life lives by eating. The plant eats; down in the ground at the end of the rootlets we find spongioles, and these are mouths. In transplanting a shrub or tree, the thing we care for is not to destroy these mouths. If true of vegetable life that it lives by eating, it is more obviously true of animal life. Do you say that in many of the lowest forms of sentient life we find no mouths? True, apparently; but the bodies of such invertebrates abound in absorbents that serve the same purpose. We say then that every form of growth, vegetable or animal, is provided with an apparatus for receiving food into the system.

All life grows; all growth is effected by eating; are we agreed as to this fact? Let us then advance to a third, to wit, that nothing eats without an *appetite*. The etymology of this word (appetitus) gives as its striking meaning a seeking for, longing after. In vegetable life we have the analogon of appetite; for we find that every root, trunk, branch, is elongating itself in pursuit of its required supply. The tree in the thick forest extends itself to get up into the light and heat; and the stray vegetable in the cellar does the same to get out of the dark and cold just where the light and warmth have been pouring in. This power to elongate and reach its supply is one of the most interesting phenomena in the vegetable kingdom.

Nor is it otherwise among animals. Their power to help themselves is itself a department of science, and awakens the deepest interest. Besides the power of elongation to get supply, they have the power of locomotion. Appetite, unsupplied, is hunger, one of the most intense forms of physical unrest; and impels to the most intense exertions to get relief. And now what have we

found? This: everything that lives grows; everything that grows eats; everything that eats has an appetite, and everything that has an appetite has a force stirring within impelling to action. If in a school I should ask a class in physiology what the most characteristic thing in our world is, one pupil might say, life; another might say, no, not life, but growth; a third might rejoin, no, neither life nor growth, but eating; another pupil might come in and say, You are all wrong; how are you going to live and grow and eat without an appetite? *Appetite* is the characteristic thing in the world. Who will dare dispute this last reply? And yet each of the other replies is equally correct; for we have here four links in a chain, and no one is good for anything without the others.

But what next after appetite? You say that our series of organic facts cannot end in appetite; you say it must have its correlative supply. You add that there is a wonderful law in nature ordaining in every grade of life that there shall be as many forms of reciprocal supply as there are subjective wants. For every mouth there is the required morsel, and, in general, a superabundant supply. When appetite has been appeased there is satisfaction; and, in proportion as all the organs act normally, there is health. In man this law bears sway in a threefold form, for he has in him three lives: life of body, brain, and soul. Having three lives, there are three forms of growth, three forms of eating, three forms of appetite, and three forms of supply. The physical life grows by eating what the physical appetite craves: the supplies here are found in the outward physical world. This life can live and grow on bread alone. The intellectual life grows by eating what the intellectual appetite craves; the supplies here are found in the truths of fact and principle discoverable in the world of science. The moral and spiritual life grows by eating what the moral and spiritual life craves; here the supplies are found in all the verities that appertain to the soul in relation to God and the immortal life.

Having these three forms of life, and, in natural order, these three forms of growth, eating, and appetite, and, having these three forms of supply from three different worlds in his environment, man can have three forms of satisfaction: he can be physically, intellectually, and morally supplied and at rest. Therefore he can have three forms of health. He can be whole in body, mind, and soul; or he can be ailing in one department of his being, and well in other respects. In order to perfect health in each life, there must be a perfect working of the functions of each in possession of a perfect supply. A man can have as many forms of hunger, starvation, and death by starvation, as he has lives. Without food, good and wholesome, he starves physically; without truth and enough of it, and in required variety, he starves mentally; and without the Bible and religious instruction, he starves spiritually. As Joseph stored corn in Egypt to forbid famine of body, so science stores at accessible points intellectual food to forbid mental famine. With the same magnanimity, revelation, natural and supernatural, stores up in her treasuries supplies for the soul. The inference here is inevitable, that if a man has in him three lives, and, in his prerogative of free will, can make each growthful or not according as appetite is fed or not fed, then man has in him the power of a threefold suicide. He can take his life physically by refusing food, or eating what is injurious; he can destroy himself mentally by abstaining from an intellectual diet, or feeding on untruths; and he can be the cause of his self-ruin spiritually by a cruel rejection of the provisions of redemption.

Thus far we have been considering life as it develops normally. In its various grades we find it growing according to a natural law inlaid in the constitution. We find it interfered with

only by encroachment and want of supply. Unfallen human life observed this law in the primeval garden. But this adherence to law in an orderly unfolding did not continue. Sin entered, and with it a new factor, *disease*. Our world in its sum total seems at some date to have received a shock that broke its constitution. Into all forms of life there enters a totally new thing, which we call disease; a factor not needed as the complement to life, but as the unalterable enemy of all life. It is one of the black angels that frequent our world, and that are ubiquitous in the earth, everywhere scattering the seeds of death. Death could possibly have taken place without this agency, by a simple withholding of diet. In this case it would be comparatively natural. When induced by disease it is wholly violent. Still disease has been so long a resident in the earth that we are compelled to account it naturalized, so that when death comes even by disease we call it natural. But if nature is the author of disease, then nature is inconsistent with herself. Why should she abound in *materia medica*, agencies that counteract the diseases she induces, if induce them she does? Why give out in one hand what she ruthlessly withdraws in the other? Let us construe disease then not as a natural product, but as coming in that train of evils supernaturally induced upon the race as means of discipline in moral government. It is an easy consequence of sin, itself wholly unnatural; it belongs to that category of thorns and thistles, toil and sweat and birth-pangs, visited upon the race as instruments of probationary discipline and culture. This prepares us to notice the benignity of nature in providing not only for normal but as well for abnormal wants. Not only does she provide for hunger, thirst, rest, to repair waste and recover tone, but she is a storehouse of remedies for disease. There are provisions not only for life when exhausted by expenditure, but when assailed and wounded by assault. It is well known that animals when ill either refuse to eat, or, eating, select a medicinal diet. Such food is found in those forms of supply abounding in nature that are repelled in a state of health. Disease sharpens an instinctive appetite for them, and impels to a search for them. Man as a physical being, diseased, like all animals, finds himself dependent for cure on medicinal remedies stored in nature.

We need to notice here that the abnormal in our world is not confined to the sphere ravaged by disease. Disease is a physical malady. In man, who is more than a physical being, it may disturb and impair his higher nature, but its proper seat is the body. There is a more subtle force in man, and a more destructive one, than disease, and whose proper seat is the soul. It is sin: what disease is to the body, sin is to the spiritual powers of man. The spheres in which these destructive forces work greatly differ, but such is the organic connection between them that we are quick to see the natural alliance of sin and disease.

We have seen that man has in him three lives; that each life lives and grows by eating; that each is characterized by hunger, and that if this hunger is not relieved, starvation will ensue. But it is a startling fact that only one of these lives can, for the want of supply, be starved *to death;* or, for the want of medicine, *die* of disease. The intellectual life, essentially indestructible, can for the want of its appropriate supply be starved; but it will in spite of all drawbacks get enough to eat to live on in an immortally starved condition. So the third and highest life in man, also indestructible, can for the want of its required union with God be starved, but will in the exercise of conscience get enough of divine truth to live immortally in a famished state. But this catastrophe of living on forever in a state of intellectual and spiritual starvation may be averted. It is the most needless calamity that can take place in the history of the universe. Why this is true is apparent.

We have seen how physical life in the earth, smitten by disease, finds stored in nature the required remedies, and instinctively appropriates them. Disease itself seems to create an appetite for a remedy that destroys it. So is it in the spiritual sphere. Over against the intellectual and spiritual life, impaired by sin, and exposed to endless want, we find provisions corresponding to the created need in what God has done for us in the Gospel. Health to a diseased and dying body may come from natural supplies abounding in materia medica, but recovery to a dead and dying soul can come only in the Balm of Gilead and the Physician there. As in physical disease there is a suppression of appetite for common food, and a search for a medicinal diet, so in man's apostate condition and severance from God, there is disclosed in the remains of his fallen nature, in the intuitions of reason and the instincts of a guilty conscience, a longing after some form of deliverance that has an expiatory value. Sin itself seems to evoke a longing for a remedy that will destroy it. Every idol is a shriek of the soul in its famished exile, every pagan altar an inarticulate cry for some antidote that can sprinkle the heart from a conscience foreboding ill. A sick man wants health, and if he finds it at all, he finds it in nature's stores; a lost man wants salvation, and if he finds it at all, he finds it in Christ crucified. A burning fever is no more scientifically allayed by a remedy that is derived from a Peruvian tree than an irate and remorseful conscience is supernaturally pacified and quieted by the blood that flowed from the tree of the Cross.

We have now reached a point where a luminous advance is dependent on a careful analysis. We have seen that man has three lives, physical, intellectual, moral; his moral and highest life, in the unrenewed state, terminates in an inadequate object, the creature, and is, therefore, so completely a negation of what it should be that it is called a dead life; or, if you prefer, a living death. Mark here the point of critical interest: when the sinner in the consciousness of his need turns to Christ and believes on Him, he is born again. In this change, his third life has been taken off the creature as having a supreme interest and placed upon God where it originally belonged; and so, being in Christ Jesus, the man, dead in trespasses and sins, is made alive from the dead. But the new man that is born in him is, to use the apostle's figure, a babe in Christ. There exists still in the converted man the remains of the old nature, and these remains are summed up by the apostle and called the old man. And now what have we? A marvelous phenomenon! a man with *four* lives in him. The physical and intellectual lives remain; then we have the new life, the babe in Christ, called the new man; finally we have a fourth life in the remains of the old life, called by St. Paul the old man. We agree that when the new man was born this old man was struck with death, and is henceforth to live a dying life. He never absolutely expires until he secures the death of the body. Like certain venomous insects, it dies with its victim. In the *soul* of the renewed man then we find two lives; and let us mark their relation to each other. In the first place, the new man though a babe holds the ascendency. He is so much the creation of the Spirit that we can say of him that he is the child of a king. In his minority in this world he has to retain his throne by warfare. The old man, though dethroned, is not wholly overthrown and asserts to the last a tremendous power. He is never discouraged in his attempt to regain his empire. We have here an arena with two combatants in mortal struggle. If the combat is not always raging, it is because the enemy of the new man, exhausted, suspends hostility "for a season" to regain strength for a fresh onset. The nature of this conflict and the strength of the contending parties is given in graphic detail in the seventh chapter of

St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. Here we see the works of the flesh and the works of the Spirit in fierce contention; but victory prevails in spite of temporary repulse and seemingly prolonged defects on the side of him in whose veins flows the blood of the Lion of the tribe of Judah. It is because the believer is thus a duplicate, has two selves in him, that self-denial is possible. One self, the new, is pitted against the old self. These two selves are the two lives to which our Lord refers when He says "whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for My sake shall find it." The self or life which a man retains, he can have only at the cost of the sacrifice of the other. The self or life to be denied is obviously the old man; and the growing babe, the new man filled with the Spirit, is to do the work of denying. He it is who, in the Apostle Paul, smote the old man in him and kept him under and brought him into subjection.

Our interest here centers upon this process of self-denial or self-subjection. We see when and how it begins in regeneration, in a new creature or self springing into being in the soul. This new arrival is a declaration of war. Be not surprised to find as we look into the nature of the conflict that ensues that it is reduced mainly to a question of diet. We have seen that all life lives by eating; and the four lives we find in the believer must live in this way. The two preliminary or subordinate lives in him live on natural food as heretofore; the regenerate or new life born of the Spirit lives on a peculiar diet, called in the text "the spiritual milk which is without guile." The foregoing context makes it clear that this spiritual milk is the word of God —a form of diet never received without an appetite evoked by tasting of the things of God in Christ and finding them to be good. This new-born spiritual man is to live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. It is our Lord Himself who emphasizes this figure of the diet in offering Himself as the bread of life; He includes Himself in the spiritual milk which is without guile. When St. Paul exclaims, "I live, yet not I," he has distinct reference to himself as a duplicate. In his first statement, "I live," he speaks without due discrimination; his words imply that the old man in him has not been slain, and is still ascendent; but, assured that this is not true, he springs to a modification, "yet not I, but Christ in me." In this experience the apostle yields to the condition, "Whosoever will save his life"—by recovering it lost—"shall save it;" but "whosoever will not save his life thus, shall lose it and continue in death."

In the text, St. Peter, addressing believers, urges them to exercise the appetite, characteristic of new-born babes, in their longing for the spiritual milk of the word which is without guile, that they may grow thereby. He assumes the existence of life, and life that is to grow by eating in compliance with an awakened appetite. The reign of law is supreme in all growth. All the characteristics of life in the lower kingdoms of nature reappear here in the spiritual sphere. We have seen that all appetite, wherever found, finds its corresponding supply in its environment. This is true of the life of the believer. That life is divine in its origin from heaven, and in its nature spiritual; therefore corresponding to it is an objective supply equally divine and spiritual. The spiritual milk which is without guile is the word of God, the sum total of revealed truth. It needs to be kept in mind that this world is fitted up with a view to the need of believers as diseased by sin, and is therefore a hospital, and all its inmates are patients nourished upon a diet that is both nutritious and medicinal. There can be no Christian growth without divinely medicated food. Such is the diet furnished in the word of God. Without guile, which means unadulterated, it is richly nutritious, conducive to growth, and remedial and sure to

cure. But you ask, How about the old third life, now called by the apostle the old man, and which we have seen to be living a dying life? Does it grow? I reply that the old man still lives, but, struck with death, is in a mortal decline; there is growth too; but, in proportion as the new man grows strong, he grows weak. If the new life is stationary, the old life holds its own; if it is retrograde, the old life waxes and regains ascendency, "sin reigns." But you say that if the old life lives in any form, even a lingering death, it must have food, and what is it? This is a vital question; can we find an answer? We have seen that the new life is in spirit totally unlike the old life; they differ in kind as light from darkness, Christ from Belial; and cannot therefore live on the same diet, unless it is mixed. Here we fall upon the great source of weakness among believers—*adulteration of food.* The divine plan for the new life is that it should live and grow "on spiritual milk, which is without guile." The word *spiritual* here does not refer to the Holy Spirit as the originator of this diet, but to the spirit of the new life itself, with which this diet is perfectly congruous. The new life is spirit, and has a diet fitted to it as such; but the diet must be without guile, unadulterated, the pure Word of God. When the new life has this food, and only this food, and enough of it, it hastens on to full growth. Instances abound in the Church of persons of signal excellence, in whom this life has had a luxurious exposition. But this food, so nutritious and medicinal to the new man, is innutritious and destructive to the old man. The divine plan is to kill the old life by the natural process of starvation—give it nothing to eat but what it can find on the table set for the new man. It is said that in certain soils clover will not grow under butternut trees; the roots of the butternut extract from the soil all the elements the clover lives on, and so the clover starves and dies. It is by this same law of death by starvation that the old life in believers is to end its career. But the painful fact is that its law is not obeyed. Strange as it may be, believers do not insist that the spiritual milk they drink shall be without adulteration. They allow a mixed diet—elements introduced that are agreeable to the old man. When the diet is half and half, when both the old and the new man can sit at the same table and partake of the same food with equal pleasure, neither is satisfied; both live a stunted life. It is just here that we find an explanation of the mystery of the weakness that abounds in Christian living. Believers half live, because fed on a diet half of which is prepared for the old life. They consult with flesh and blood. They are self-indulgent; and the self they indulge is the old self. They hanker after forbidden good, and God grants them their request, but sends leanness into their souls. How few believers within the range of our observation show a perceptible growth from year to year; in how many the new life finds its symbol in Pharaoh's lean kine, or in the ears of corn blasted by the east wind! In them the old life is robust and well to do, the new is pinched and emaciate. Why is this? Because the divine law of growth in the text is not heeded. Believers are not studious as to their diet. They do not live on the spiritual milk of the Word, and insist that it shall be without guile. They are too tender and sympathetic with the old self. Vigorous self-denial is here demanded; and it is interesting to notice that in the Christian warfare *this* is the Gatling gun. This denial, too, is all comprehended in simply feeding the new life on its required diet. Let all believers live on the food given by our Lord to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus; let them all be compelled to exclaim, "Did not our hearts burn within us while He talked with us by the way and opened to us the Scriptures?"—and the Church of God on earth would be at once transfigured and become irresistible. We

need to remember that the incarnate dwelling-place of the Holy Ghost on earth is the Word of God; and it is only as believers put themselves into receptive contact with *it* that they are filled with Him. The diet they get from the Scriptures is an inspiration of their indwelling author. As the physician falls back upon and utilizes the *vis mediatrix naturæ* for the cure of disease, so in the divine science of redemption, the Gospel, in order to put away all wickedness and all guile, and hypocrisies and envies, and all evil speaking, falls back upon and utilizes the new life which it has implanted. This order is never introverted. It is always the new man in us that drives out the old; and to have the strength required to do it, he must have for his diet the spiritual milk of the Word, which is without guile.

CHRIST, THE KINGLIEST TEACHER OF THE AGES.*

BY S. V. LEECH, D.D. [METHODIST EPISCOPAL], TERRE HAUTE, IND.

"*Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God.*"—John iii. 2.

I ESTEEM it an eminent honor to address this throng of graduates in the presence of this vast audience of prospective teachers. Respecting the sublime life-work you confront, the philosopher Aristotle dared to say, "Those who educate the young well are more to be honored than are those who give them being, for the art of living well is better than life itself."

The centuries have produced moral teachers of celebrity. With respect and gratitude, students have hung on their utterances. Moses, the illustrious founder of the Hebrew nation and institutions; Sakya-Mouni, the distinguished creator of Buddhism; Confucius, the renowned sage of China; Zoroaster, the builder of Parseeism; Socrates, the martyred teacher of Plato; Calvin, Arminius, Luther, and Wesley are among the famous moral teachers of the world. But towering over them all is the personage referred to in the text as "didaskelos apo theou" ("the teacher from God"). Sixty times do the four evangelists refer to Jesus as a teacher imparting knowledge—a tutor guiding human thought along moral lines.

Nicodemus, the first of the two Jewish senators converted to the Christian faith, is having a night interview with Christ. He has recognized His celestial origin. He is receiving his first lesson from the Redeemer in the philosophy of salvation. He is destined to defend Christ when He shall stand before the Sanhedrim. He will remove His remains from the cross. He will give to Him embalmment and burial. He calls Him "Rabbi," or "Chief Teacher." To "Christ, the Kingliest Teacher of the Ages," let us direct our meditation.

Tradition informs us that the splendor of Christ's features baffled the efforts of an artist in painting for a Roman officer the face of Jesus. No orator or essayist can perfectly depict Christ as the kingliest of the moral teachers of earth. Leonardo da Vinci knelt in prayer and invoked divine help when about to portray the Divine Man in his creation known as "The Last Supper." With kindred emotions of reverence and responsibility would we enter on the work of this morning.

1. *Christ is the solitary moral teacher claiming a superhuman and superangelic origin.*

Who among other illustrious teachers of morals and ethics ever claimed a divine, eternal, and celestial nature? In Christ we have a greater revelation and interpretation of God than elsewhere. As at Rome we study the marvels of Guido's fresco, the "Aurora," not by looking upward at the palatial dome it graces, but by looking down on the great circular mirror beneath it, so we are to study God the Father in Jesus Christ. Before heaven's eldest archangel was created "the Word (Christ)

*Baccalaureate discourse before the graduates of the Indiana State Normal School.

was with God and the Word was God." The Gospels and Epistles are aglow with evidences of the Deity of this Teacher of the nations. Holding up His perfect humanity, it cries, "Ecce Homo!" and lifting more loftily His supreme divinity, it exclaims, "Ecce Deus!" The Father's natural attributes—eternity, foreknowledge, supremacy, immutability, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, wisdom and self-existence—the New Testament ascribes to Jesus. God's moral perfections—blessedness, benevolence, compassion, faithfulness, forbearance, goodness, holiness, impartiality, justice, mercy, freedom, and truthfulness—it lavishes on Christ. The divine titles it showers on Him. He received the adoration of the dying Stephen. John represents the celestial hosts as offering ceaseless worship to Him. In marvelous utterances, He claimed equality with the Father. His divine credentials were attested by a series of brilliant miracles. He spoke to the jars at Cana filled with water, and the crystal liquid blushed into crimsoned wine. Tossed among the white caps that crested the stormy breast of the lake, He bade them be calm, and they fell at once into repose. He held a few loaves before the hungry thousands, and they expanded into food sufficient for the multitude. His ears caught the plaintive appeal of a blind beggar for sight, and He conferred on Him an unclouded view of sky and city. He saw a widow following her only son to the sepulcher; a distinguished father bemoaning his dead daughter; sisters weeping at the front of a brother's tomb—and He returned to them alive the beloved ones whose visible presence they craved. Proofs of the Deity of Christ bestud the sacred oracles as the stars spangle the fields of the night. Annihilate the doctrine of the divine origin of this Teacher, and men will witness the fall of the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice for sin; the enthronement of uncertainty in Christian experience; the banishment of the dogma of spiritual purification by the blood of the cross, and Christianity will sink to the level of Oriental systems of religious faith. If Christ was a created moral Teacher, the statements of Evangelists and Apostles are misleading, and primitive saints surrendered life in martyrdom for a baseless fiction. Christianity stands permeated with strength or weakness according to its response to the question, "What think ye of Christ?"

When a group of literary men asked Daniel Webster if he could understand the two-fold nature of Christ, his reply was: "No, I would be ashamed to acknowledge Him as my Saviour if I could comprehend Him. I need a superhuman Saviour—one so great and glorious that I cannot comprehend Him."

The denial of the supreme divinity of Christ has met with a general failure in its mission from the days of Cerinthus and Marcion to this date. But it has poisoned the theological thought of a multitude. The poison that ended the life of Alexander VI. of Italy was no less destructive because it was concealed in a glass of wine. The virus that sent to the grave Sir Thomas Overbury was not the less fatal because it was hidden in a jelly handed to him by a fascinating lady. The bite of the asp that closed the career of Cleopatra was not the less deadly because the reptile rested on roses. Doctrinal poison is none the less mortal because the pen of a prince in erudition inscribes on it the word "scholarship." As the Roman Senate gave its decree that Christ should be the supreme God of the Roman empire, so, by an almost unanimous decision, have the learned men of the Christian civilization given their verdict in favor of the supreme divinity of Jesus as the coequal and copartner of God the Father. As the English peers at the coronation of George III. laid their subordinate diadems at his royal feet, so the great congress of evangelical theological scholars recognize in Christ a divine teacher—"come from

God"—and they would "crown Him Lord of all."

2. *Christ surpasses all other moral teachers in wealth of information, celestial equipment for His work, and the superlative importance of His themes.*

Concerning His mission to the nations, He always claimed that He spoke by authority of God; that His relation to mankind was ambassadorial and representative, and that His equipment was heavenly. Who among the famous teachers who preceded or have succeeded Him has said: "As my Father has taught Me, I speak these things;" "My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me;" "I have not spoken of Myself, but the Father that sent Me. He gave Me commandment what I should say and what I should speak"? An evangelist says of His instructions, "He taught as one having authority." God specially qualified Him for His statements of cardinal truths. Every utterance of Christ was under immediate inspiration of God. Fifty times He announced His union with the Father. He said: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of Myself, but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works." The connection between the mind of Jesus and the divine throne was as intimate as that between the sun and solar light. The Holy Spirit overshadowed and influenced all of His thoughts, utterances, and deeds. He is the solitary person of history claiming a divine corporeal paternity. At His baptism the Holy Spirit, in the embodiment of a dove, sat upon His brow and overshadowed the physical, intellectual, and moral factors of His nature. Before His former neighbors at Nazareth, He publicly declared that He was the divine one referred to, when, eight centuries before His incarnation, Isaiah wrote: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." He told the Pharisees that the Holy Spirit conferred on Him the power to cast out demons from demoniacs. His whole tripartite manhood was imbued and permeated by divine influence. Referring to this fact, John said: "God gave not the spirit by measure unto Him." Where in history is there a teacher speaking under such divine control, celestial directing agency, and the continuous ascendency of the Spirit of God?

Read the biographies and literary creations of the teachers of the past. How little the wisest of them knew! Sakya-Mouni, the founder of Buddhism, incorporated no idea of one supreme God in his religious philosophy. He never claimed divine inspiration for his theories. He denied the existence of all spiritual beings, and claimed that, to seek Nirvana, the extinction of being was the highest manifestation of human wisdom. Confucius never pretended to have received his utterances from God. He never spoke kindly of a woman. He sacrificed to the spirits of his ancestors. He made no statement concerning the immortality of the soul. Zoroaster taught the Persians and others to offer sacrifices to mythological deities and to the sun, moon, and stars. Brahmanism is but the lowest philosophy of pantheism. Its devotees worship water, fire, and the astronomical orbs, besides such imaginary deities as Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The transmigration of human souls for ages through successive generations of beasts, reptiles, and birds is its idea of the future life. Its religious rites of penance and beggary have populated the sacred rivers with suicides and the soil of the Indian Empire with mendicants. Mohammedanism is the most sensual form of Unitarianism. The Koran is replete with childish superstitions. The religion of absolute fatalism, it teaches that all human actions and destinies are

already determined, beyond the possibility of the control or modification of men.

The wisest human teachers have had little knowledge. Well said the eminent Isaac Newton: "I do not know what I may appear to be to those about me, but to myself I appear only as a boy playing upon the seashore, and diverting myself by now and then finding a pebble, or a prettier shell than ordinary, while the great ocean of truth lies all undiscovered around me." The knowledge possessed by men like Plato, Newton, and Sir William Jones has been only a bouquet from a world-wide conservatory of facts—only a cup of spray drops from a Niagara of important truths.

But Jesus knew all things. The inspired Apostle beautifully says: "In Him dwelt all of the fulness of the Godhead bodily." As a teacher He repeatedly announced that He could read the secret thoughts of His auditors. His divine mind saw the events transpiring in heaven and on earth. Every fact of existing truth lay before his intellectual vision continuously, as human features lie on the mirror they confront. He saw the farthest star on its orbital march and the humblest pansy that unfolded on the mountain slope. His gaze was telescopic and microscopic—taking in the far and near, the great and small, and the particulars of history from the creation to the adjournment of the final judgment. Back of His utterances lay an infinite thesaurus of knowledge. Hence His themes were of surpassing importance as related to time and eternity. With the sweep of His divine hand, He struck down all false and typical systems of religious faith, and then on massive foundations, and by divine authority, He erected the palatial temple of our Holy Christianity.

To this Kingliest Teacher of the ages men have gone for 18 centuries for authoritative information as to the vicarious nature of the atonement—the vital relation of the grace called "faith" to human salvation, the character and necessity of regeneration, the essential facts of eschatology, the present enthronement of the administration of the Holy Spirit, and a correct map of the solitary path from earth to heaven.

His reasoning was comprehensible to the educated and the illiterate. The common people heard with gladness His simple but mighty announcements of truth. His doctrinal utterances were as transparent as crystal. His parables were like diamonds burning in rims of pearls. While the productions of other illustrious teachers are read by a few scholarly men, the words of Christ are being studied by multiplied millions, and are already translated into two hundred of the languages and dialects of the world. While their names kindle but meager enthusiasm, the name of Jesus is greeted by transcendent acclamations of applause on earth, and is welcomed by the ceaseless praises of the angels and redeemed hosts of heaven. Christ's utterances are to-day the highest authority in literature, and from His words supreme jurists take no appeal.

3. *Christ is the solitary moral teacher who has perfectly exemplified the system He taught, and placed a perfect example before the world.*

The private and public lives of other renowned moral teachers have been crowded with blemishes. God refused to permit Moses to enter the land of promise because of his misdeeds. Calvin had his defects of character, Luther his failings, and Wesley his weaknesses. In Christ's career all conceivable virtues blended as symmetrically as the seven colors in the rainbow. In absolute perfection His character stands majestic, unique, and in solitude among those of the model men of the race. He breathed the atmosphere of uncorrupted sanctity. Purity filled His inner life and flashed out in His every word. He completely illustrated the moral graces He recommended to others. He stands the ideal and peerless teacher among the most celebrated instructors

of the centuries. Each virtue reached maturity and then took its position in a full and resplendent constellation of excellencies. He publicly challenged His foes to name a flaw in His character or a defect in His moral conduct. His was the life that Goldsmith pictured in the line, "He allured to heaven and led the way." His was the example Shakespeare delineated when he wrote, "He hath a daily beauty in His life." To His matchless exemplification of His teachings liberalists in theological doctrines have paid eloquent tributes, led by such scholars as Kant, Fichte, Richter, Goethe, Rousseau, Carlyle, Renan, and Strauss. His is the only perfect life humanity has seen. The New Testament writers emphasize the spiritual beauty of Christ. Teaching His disciples humility, He served them at supper, washed their feet, and told them that He sought not His own glory nor craved honor from men. Inculcating obedience, He told them that His loftiest ambition was to do His Father's will, and as He approached the cross He looked heavenward and exclaimed, "I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work Thou hast given Me to do." Enforcing self-abnegation for human good, He had no cottage in which to lay His own head, and was compelled to work a miracle in order to secure a coin to pay the Roman Government for a legal right to live. Recommending meekness, He was profoundly silent when wrongs were heaped on Him before Herod and Pilate.

Impressing on men the duty of a life of active philanthropy, His life was replete with moral toil. His earliest recorded words were, "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" His career, more than any in the chronicles of time, illustrated Paul's remark, "No man liveth unto himself." Amid the darkest environment, fidelity to duty rose like the pillar of fire that piloted the marching Hebrews. His heroism in peril was only excelled by His passiveness under reproach. The motives that gave complexion to His words and deeds were as pure as the sea of glass seen by John from Patmos. Faultless beauty so invested His character and life that, both as He began and closed His public teachings, the Father spoke from heaven and said, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

4. *The influence and utterances of no other moral teacher have wrought such personal, social, political, educational, and moral transformations among men.*

The earthquake shock that buried Lisbon in 1755 vibrated until it was felt throughout Europe and among the islands of the Mediterranean Sea. Christ's teachings and influence began the transfiguration of the entire world. When He ascended this great hall would have held His followers; but to-day they number, as nominal Christians, half of the population of the world. In less than four centuries after His crucifixion the Roman Senate voted Him the supreme God of the Roman Empire. His teachings pioneered the overthrow of idolatry, brutal sports, the degradation of womanhood and childhood, slavery, popular illiteracy, open licentiousness, polygamy, and manifold evils among the nations of the world. Popular education; political liberty; the press; schools, colleges, universities; asylums for the insane, the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the magdalen, the poor, the orphan, the inebriate; the elevation of womanhood and childhood; and the churches and Sunday schools of Christian civilization, are some of the fruits of the system founded by Christ. What have Buddhism, Brahmanism, Mohammedanism, Sintuism, Parseeism, Confucianism, and the other false religions of the world done for the individual sanctification, the domestic uplifting, the social purification, the governmental exaltation, the educational elevation, or the moral ennoblement of the nations over which they have had and now have sway? But wherever the teachings of Jesus have been received, Christianity has seen the wilderness blossom as the rose. Long

lines of historians, from Justin Martyr and Arnobius down to Milman and Guizôt, have eloquently described the triumphal march and vast and varied achievements of Christianity. Like the famous Duke of Marlborough, it has never entered on a campaign without success. Like Edward the Black Prince, it has always seen victory perching on its banners. Hours would be consumed were its chief achievements enumerated as related to the fields of personal regeneration, family purification, the elevation of art, literature, science, scholarship, legislation, civil jurisprudence, the rights of women and serfs, and the general cleansing of the ethics of nations and of the moral life of mankind.

The influence of this Kingly Teacher of Palestine will continue to enlarge in all nationalities and expand in all of the cities and villages of the world. It will invade each heathen community and win coronation. It will successfully assail every false system of religious faith, however venerable. It will make assault on popular ignorance until the children of all lands bask in the sunshine of culture. It will make hostile encroachment on political corruption until an ideal ballot-box and pure municipal administration shall be crowning glories of every city in this Republic. It will make steady advancement on gigantic public evils until distilleries, breweries, saloons, gambling-tables, and recognized brothels shall be mere incidents of history. It will so march forward on the avarice of employers and the mistakes of their struggling employees that at the bridal altar of permanent wedlock Capital and Labor shall join their right hands and each say unto the other: "I take thee to be my life partner, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part, and accursed be the political demagogues who may seek our separation; for what God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Six centuries before the birth of this greatest of teachers, Daniel saw the universal conquests of Christianity and wrote: "I saw in the night visions; and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him." John, the last survivor among the twelve disciples of the illustrious Teacher of Palestine, was divinely permitted to hear "great voices in heaven saying, 'the kingdoms of this world ARE become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever.'"

Before me are 1,200 candidates for future teacherships and a large class of graduates. Remember that Diogenes closed his own school that he might listen to the words of the great teacher, Socrates. In the four Gospels He speaks who overshadows the kingly instructors of the past. He is the Divine Tutor, in whom Paul declared that the treasures of wisdom and knowledge lay hid. Pay to Him the divine honor that He merits. Have His image stamped on each and all of your endowments. Let your thought and affection turn toward Him, as the sunflower turns sunward throughout the day, to drink in His light and warmth. Say with Judson, "I do not desire to be like Peter or Paul, but only like Christ." Heed the dying words of the gifted young Dudley Tyng: "Stand up for Jesus." So interlace Christ's example and precepts with your own experience and professional life that you may say with the majestic champion of Christianity, "For me to live is Christ." May your future continuously echo the celestial acclaim, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing."

SOME men can put their light under a bushel without making the bushel very bright.

THE JOY IN THE LIFE OF JESUS.

By Rev. William C. Schaeffer, Ph.D. [Reformed], Huntingdon, Pa.

These things have I spoken unto you, that My joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.—John xv. 11.

Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.—Heb. xii. 2.

The common conception of the earthly life of Jesus is that which is embodied in the title, "The Man of Sorrows." I suppose that most persons who have given the subject any consideration have pictured Him as a sad and sorrowful figure, with very little in all His earthly life to relieve the heavy load of suffering which He carried from the manger to the cross. It is not difficult, I think, to account for this conception. Isaiah drew a picture of a suffering Saviour hundreds of years before the Christ was born; and so true to reality is the picture, that the whole world has recognized in it a description of the life of Jesus. "He was despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid, as it were, our faces from Him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not. Surely He has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him." His life, as described in the four Gospels, answers in full to the prediction. That He was "the man of sorrows" spoken of by Isaiah, admits of no doubt; and the popular conception, to which we have referred, is hence in so far correct.

Yet Jesus Himself speaks of His joy; and He refers to it as sufficient to give to the disciples fulness of joy. In His farewell address He said to them, "These things have I spoken unto you, that My joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full." In His great high-priestly prayer He again refers to it, praying the Father that they might have his joy "fulfilled in themselves" (John xvii. 13). St. Luke records an instance where this joy of His life broke forth into fervent thanksgiving and praise (Luke x. 21). And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of a vision of joy which Jesus had, and which made the sufferings and shame of the cross fade away into insignificance (Heb. xii. 2).

Can we reconcile these two pictures? Can it be true that Jesus was "the man of sorrows" described by Isaiah, and yet possessed of a joy such as is implied in these other statements? Can the two things exist side by side in the same life?

Undoubtedly they may. There may be such an inner serenity and peace that it becomes a perpetual well-spring of joy, and yet the possessor may be placed in such surroundings that there will be a flood of sorrows brought upon him from beyond. The life of many an earnest Christian worker and sufferer bears testimony to this fact. This is especially true of the earthly life of Jesus. The sorrow which He suffered was from without. Isaiah is very particular in saying, "Surely He has borne *our* griefs and carried *our* sorrows. . . . He was wounded for *our* transgressions, He was bruised for *our* iniquities; the chastisement of *our* peace was upon Him." There were no griefs and sorrows of His own which He had to bear; but as the Great Physician, He so entered into sympathy with us, that in effecting our cure He Himself bore our griefs and carried our sorrows. His sorrow all came upon Him from without. From within there was a perpetual well-spring of joy, as wide and deep as the being of Almighty God.

In order, therefore, to form an adequate picture of the life of Jesus we must study also this other side. We miss much of His blessed example if we fail to recognize this. Many a prac-

tical lesson which His life teaches is lost, unless we can realize what He means when He says, "My joy," and unless we can in some measure analyze the sources whence His joy came.

In order to get a realizing sense of the joy that was His, let us look at a few facts. At the very opening of His ministry we find Him at a marriage feast; and not only did He participate in the festivities, but He even performed a miracle to help its cheer. How different in this respect was He from John the Baptist! The Baptist dwelt in the wilderness, lived on locusts and wild honey, and shunned the pleasures of life that he might escape its ills. Jesus, on the other hand, freely mingled in the society of men. Frequently we find Him at feasts. He was no ascetic; but by His example and participation, He bestowed His benediction upon the innocent and legitimate enjoyments of life.

Let us turn now to the sources of joy in His life, bearing in mind that the flood of sorrows came upon Him from without, while the spring of joy is to be sought within, in the conditions and in the communion of His inner life.

1. The primal source of joy is to be found *in His unbroken communion with the Father and the whole heavenly world.*

Let us not forget that Jesus was truly human. He was very man as well as very God. As the Son of man, His life was subject to all the conditions and requirements of our human life. He needed food and drink and rest for His body. So He needed the communion and sympathy of kindred spirits for the comfort and strength of His spirit. How touching is the scene in Gethsemane, when in His deep distress He turned to His disciples and rebuked them when He found them asleep, saying: "What, could ye not watch with Me one hour?" Above all, He needed the communion of His human spirit with the Divine. St. Augustine gave utterance to the deepest need of the human spirit when he said, "Thou madest us for Thyself, O God, and our heart is restless until it rests in Thee." As the ideal man, Jesus had that need as much as any of us.

We know, moreover, that in the case of Jesus this deepest need of the human spirit was most fully met. We know not at what period of His life He woke up to the consciousness of His peculiar relation to the Father. We know that He possessed it at the age of twelve; for on no other basis can we explain His answer to His mother, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" From that day onward His communion with the Father certainly never was broken. How often we find Him alone and on the mountain, engaged in prayer! And He did not simply say His prayers and then have done with it, as it is to be feared so many of us often do; but He continued whole nights in communion with the Father. As when a son or daughter returns from a distant journey, the whole family sometimes sit up for hours in the night in sweet converse, so Jesus, when He had been far out over the wilderness of this world, tarried long on His return in sweet communion with His Father.

In His conversation with Nicodemus Jesus said, "And no man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." Notice that He does not say, the Son of God which is in heaven, but "*the Son of man which is in heaven.*" Though on earth, mingling in its daily affairs and sharing in toil like other men, He was yet as the Son of man continually in heaven. Not only did He at certain times enjoy the ministry of the angels, but that was His continual privilege. He said to Nathanael, "Hereafter thou shalt see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." He did not say, descending and ascending, as if the heaven of the angels were far off from Him; but He says, ascending and descending, implying that He stood in their very midst as the head and center of their heaven. And living thus in the very bosom of

heaven, He possessed a joy which this world could neither give nor take away; and well might He pray that His disciples might have that joy fulfilled in themselves.

2. Another source of joy in His life we find *in His spotless purity.*

After the loss of that direct communion with God and heaven for which we were created, no greater source of unhappiness and sorrow has been brought upon our race than the inner pollution of spirit which has come upon us as a consequence of the Fall. Men may not always be conscious of the fact that they are polluted, yet the fact of their pollution makes them unhappy, all the same. Now we see them vainly trying to get away from themselves and to hide the ugliness of their inner selves in a round of dissipation and pleasure. Again we see them vainly trying to sweep and garnish their house by external reforms. In one way or another, that running, putrefying sore within—the consciousness of uncleanness—haunts men and poisons their happiness and joy. So it has been with the natural man always and among all nations.

When, now, we turn to the life of Jesus, how great and refreshing the difference! As we watch Him moving about among men, how calm and self-possessed He is! The presence of the great does not abash Him. Even as a boy, he is not one whit abashed in the presence of the learned doctors of the law. We observe the most perfect self-possession when He is with the openly wicked and with the social outcasts of His day. Never do we see in Him the least effort to hide either from His own conscience or from the scrutiny of friend of foe. He betrays no fear of contamination from contact with sinners. And the reason is to be found in the fact of the perfect innocence and purity of His life. He alone of men knew no sin. There was no presumption or sham in Him, which could for one moment cause Him to hide from the most searching scrutiny of the lofty and learned. There was no weakness in Him, which was for one moment in danger of contamination from contact with the outcast and sinful. His soul was absolutely pure and spotless, like the newly fallen snow.

Can any one measure the joy which that condition of heart and mind must have brought Him? Those of us who have been with Jesus, who have experienced the blessedness of forgiven sin, and who have begun to walk in the way of His holiness, may have some foretaste of that joy; but what the fulness of that joy was it has not yet entered into the heart of man to conceive.

3. A third source of joy in His life was *His constant activity in the way of doing good, relieving suffering and pain, and walking in the way of God's appointment.*

There is pleasure in healthful activity itself. One may see this on any fine May morning,—

> "While the birds thus sing a joyous song,
> And while the young lambs bound
> As to the tabor's sound."

It is this which gives pleasure to the child in his playful sport, and to the man in his more serious occupation.

But the joy which comes from the activity of doing good, of relieving suffering and pain, and of a conscious walking in the way of God's appointment is infinitely greater. In confirmation of this I appeal to the experience of every earnest Christian worker. The sweetest experience which any of us has had, we may with confidence affirm, has been that which has come to us in the act of relieving some suffering one, or of bringing the light of eternal joy into some heart.

Out of this well-spring of joy Jesus drank constantly and freely. He went about everywhere doing good. Not only did He help some sufferer occasionally; not only did He once in a while bring everlasting blessing into a life or a home, as we must confess is the case even with the best of us, but such experiences were a matter of daily and hourly occurrence with Him. Can we

measure the joy which came to His heart, as He saw the gratitude of the leper whom He had touched into health, as He saw the look of happiness in the eyes which He had opened, or as He shared in the bliss of that home in Bethany to which He had restored a brother from the corruption of the grave? Oh, the joy unspeakable which such experiences must constantly have brought Him!

4. A fourth source of joy for Him was *in the glorious prospect which spread out before Him.*

To this the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers when he says, "Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God."

What was the joy that was set before Him? I will not spoil the picture by attempting any description of my own. St. John, when he was under the enrapturing inspiration of the Spirit on Patmos, strained every resource of metaphor and language to give us a picture. "And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband . . . having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper-stone, clear as crystal; and had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel: on the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles" (Rev. xxi. 2, 11–14).

As you have followed Jesus through the Gospel narrative, did it ever occur to you that His countenance had a far-off look, that He seemed like one having His eye fixed on something beyond the horizon? He had His eye fixed on the throne yonder; He saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem; He was looking for the glorious marriage of the Lamb. And He saw all that glory with far greater distinctness than the eagle-eyed seer on Patmos. That was the joy that was set before Him, in the prospect of which He endured the Cross, despising the shame.

Does this subject bring to us any practical lessons? Yes; it is full of practical suggestions.

1. The Christian religion is a religion of joy. If any one on earth has a right to a cheerful and joyous spirit, the disciple of Jesus has. Once a long face and a morose look were regarded as signs of piety. The world moves, and we have come to a better apprehension of the life and spirit of our Master. He who has shared in the blessings of redemption has a right to share also in the joy of Christ.

2. The antidote to the sorrows of life is found in this joy of our Lord. How can we meet the trials that await us? We cannot hope to get out of the reach of trial. Some may be sick beyond the possibility of recovery; others may have friends who give them pain; still others may be placed in such external surroundings that a veritable flood of sorrows flows in upon them from circumstances over which they have no control. We can meet these trials even as He met His. We can have in us His joy, even in the midst of trial and sorrow.

3. We can have this joy on the same conditions on which He had it. By His help we can live a life of communion with God; we can by degrees attain ever more and more to the same inward purity of thought and life; we can imitate His example in doing good to our fellow men, and we can fix our eyes upon the joys beyond our present horizon, even on the joys which are at God's right hand.

DUTY performed is a moral tonic; if neglected, the tone and strength of both mind and heart are weakened, and the spiritual health undermined.—*Tryon Edwards.*

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

By S. Reese Murray, D.D. [Methodist Protestant], Chestertown, Md.

GEN. XXXI.

The case presented in this chapter is clear, and needs little if any explanation. Jacob builds up immensely the fortune of his uncle, Laban; and when satisfied that his labor ought to end, departs, taking with him his family, his household goods, and other worldly possessions. Laban, who doubtless thinks that he owns Jacob quite as much as he owns his ancestral pastures and flocks, or at least is entitled to the lifetime toil of his nephew, since he gave Jacob a start in life, determined not to let him go, pursues after him, and takes an armed force to make sure of his capture. On his way, while his heart is hot with revenge, God meets him and in a dream speaks to him, saying: "Take heed that thou speak not to Jacob, either good or bad." That is, "Enter into no altercation, do not dispute his journey onward." For God knew that if a controversy arose between them, warfare and bloodshed would be the result. Or if Laban insisted upon Jacob's return, Jacob would resist to the death. Laban therefore alters his intended address, though he abandons no wish of his heart. He meant to smite and brutally take back all that had deserted him. But being deterred from that, he tells a pretty story of sending his nephew forth with songs and harp, and claims that he has been ill repaid in the reprisals that have been made upon his household. At this point the scene changes, and in the picture that follows we find the uncle claiming everything as his own which his nephew possesses, while the latter proceeds to the boldest and severest charges of outrageous cunning and fraud upon the part of the former.

I use this little panorama of the past to draw an analogy between this case of master and servant and the relations of Capital and Labor to-day. Labor is Jacob demanding his own. Capital is Laban contending that *all* is his. Labor is Jacob breaking asunder from the powerful control of his uncle, but working some incidental injury by surreptitiously going, leaving it somewhat unprotected and embarrassed, and taking away possessions not its own. Laban is Capital arming itself with instruments of war, hot with vengeance, determined to make good its demands with sword and slaughter and pillage. Each has been injured, and each seeks redress. Labor breaks away with all its acquired advantages. Capital retaliates with the strong arm of force. What would have resulted had the two clashed, let the history of the recent past and a thousand similar instances, ancient and modern, testify. There was fighting-stock in the Chaldean and in the Hebrew. Hot blood rushed in the veins of each, but Law came in to temper their complaint and adjust their differences. God was Law; and Law said to Laban, Divine Justice said to Capital, "Beware of your demands and your right. Other interests are at stake besides your own, and must and will be guarded." Law averted strife, but it did not exclude debate. Nor did it care to do this. A full and fair review of the case was the best means of setling it, and accordingly it was discussed.

The contention of Capital was: "I own all you see and enjoy. I made you and all you possess. But for me you had been a vagabond and starveling."

But Labor replies: "I *earned* all I have. You *gave* me naught. Through insults, and domineering, and injustice, and even grinding cruelty, I went on my way. Day and night, summer and winter, through perils of robbers and beasts, I protected your property and got but scant reward. You denied me even the most ordinary rights of toil. You took base advantage of me. I was poor. I could not pay for a wife. I could not maintain my family. So, for the love of wife and child, I became as

a slave and served you seven years. Then you defrauded me of the dearest rights of my life. You robbed me of the only possession I had. So I served another seven years, and the fourteen years of toil bear witness to your infamy of conduct. But still you wished my labor, and I, out of sheer poverty, accepted your hard and detestable bargain. I served you six years for wages, and because you had it in your power to grind me between the upper and nether millstone you changed my wages ten times. And even now, but that God had intimidated you, but that Law, which even your monstrous greed is bound to respect, had prevented, you had sent me away empty,—not only impoverished me, but broken up my household, swept away my family by violence and bloodshed."

. . . . . .

It is an old story this, of Capital and Labor. Nothing but the setting is new in any age of the world. The principle and the contention are always the same. Each has rights: rights, too, which God seems to admit. But God does not admit violence as one of the rights of either side. When Labor is headed off, pursued, captured with strife and blood, God says, "Take heed. 'Tis a fatal snare thou dost set for thine own feet." God, however, permits discussion; and sober discussion brings about settlement.

On this occasion God seems to have been wholly on Jacob's side. Labor had a good cause, and Capital a bad one. Oppression, everywhere condemned and specifically denounced in later ages in the "Book of the Law," was characteristic of Capital here, and Divine Justice would not tolerate it. But even oppression could *speak* for itself, no matter how hideous its actions.

It could paint its case, if it pleased, in the most attractive colors. But no doubt the liberty allowed it was to give suffering a chance to reply, that the victim of systematic robbery might shame the tyranny of greed into silence, if not into decency of future conduct; that the bloated insolence of wealth unrighteously gained might be crushed before the virtue of toil and uncomplaining distress. For another reason also was oppression allowed tongue—that by discussion Labor and Capital might see their interests as practically one; that they might form a compact of life for each, and that Law, in its highest and noblest forms, might preside over their operations. When Jacob and Laban had set forth their differences, they entered into an agreement that each could honor and live by, and they called upon God to witness their integrity in the matter. Then building a watchtower of stones, they used the solemn oath that reminded each that the cause was one of divine adjustment and oversight, and not one of mere human forbearance and prudence: "The Lord watch between me and thee when we are absent one from another."

The case of Laban and Jacob suggests three thoughts that are worthy of mention for the present moment: First, that Labor imposes upon itself conditions; second, that Capital assures advantages to Labor; third, that Law guards the rights of each.

We have here, in the first place, a penniless wanderer seeking employment of a rich and powerful herdsman. He is a refugee from home, and must find employment or starve. It is therefore a grateful relief to his mind, and a blessed security to his person and life, that he is given employment. No matter is it that this opulent lord needs laborers—there are always "hands" to be had. Nor is it a defense of the workman's case that he is a skilled laborer and conscientious in his tasks. What we have to look at is that he could *not* have done without work, while the lord *could* have done without him. Their cases are vastly different. The workman has no alternative. He is poor and suffering, and must needs die if he does not get a place. But the man of wealth can live upon his present possessions, and has no real need of this hireling's services. There is, therefore,

in the workman's case a measure of obligation, and there ought to be some sense of gratitude that his position in life and in the world has been bettered by his new relations. He is dependent, and a position of dependence, if it be honorable, ought always to elicit some feeling of thankfulness. It is not something that is owed him, for demerit of conduct or incompetency may snap the bond. It is not necessarily permanent, for he may himself abandon it when he sees chances of greater profit elsewhere. It is a place to which distress has driven him, where comfort has come to him, and where the outlook upon his life has changed his whole being. This should not be forgotten, though he may render an equivalent for it in muscle-stretching and bone-aching toil. For it remains true, in the midst of all his doings, that wealth once held his life and happiness in its hands, and that it made him what he is, and opened to him his present prospect and enjoyment. For these twin blessings thus derived—defense from the gaunt wolf of poverty and betterment of personal estate—he owes, first, a protection to the industry in which he is engaged, and, second, an increase to its operations according to his time and ability. Less than this is an injustice to his position, for honor as well as gratitude must enter into every relation of work and pay. And besides one's personal intentions, employment proceeds upon just such conditions—conditions which need no explanation—that the employee will exert himself in the line of his employer's schemes, and not frustrate them by sloth or other misconduct. Of course wealth does not mean to be idle and stagnant. Its one purpose is development. It gives to its outlet and growth a lifetime of thought. It takes risks. It endures hardships. It suffers long in certain directions to insure its ends by and by. And it demands, in accordance with those laws of reason and common morality and obligation which everywhere prevail, that all who live by its benefits should share in its just endeavors. No one will deny that it has this right, or that its demand in consequence is excessive. Common sense and common honesty enforce its claim and exalt it. But if Labor imposes upon itself these conditions in asking and obtaining relief for its necessities, Capital does not become its *permanent* savior, demanding its eternal thanksgiving and praise. At the point where Labor safeguards wealth and makes opportunities for its enlargement, there wealth must concede advantage. It cannot grow of itself. It needs a multitude of hands to do its minor offices, that it may plan. And the laborious and faithful performance of duties, without which none of its ventures could be possible, compels its acknowledgment of the fact and its reward of the debt. If Labor simply lived upon Capital, contributing nothing to its progress, never enhancing the profit of its leisure, never permitting it to range into unexplored fields and to reap in new and higher delights; if it were but a suppliant at the door of wealth, always taking, never returning, measure for measure, it would be an eternal debtor. But this is not true of it. The vast wealth of our land, the splendid homes of luxury, the palaces by the sea, the European tours, the gilded career of "the 400" in every metropolis in our land, utterly repudiate and denounce such an idea. Labor has given impulse to every industry, and flung wealth and comfort on every hand for millions of our people to enjoy. It has given brain and brawn and even life itself for the furtherance of the enjoyment of Capital. What but this would lay the foundations for such stupendous tasks as the Brooklyn Bridge, endure the fear of exploding firedamps, or ply the brakes from the roofs of freight trains in the deadly winters of the West! If there be heroism, if there be magnanimity, if there be fidelity and foresight and skill, if there be pride in the show of prosperity and the increase of material happiness of those whose interests they serve, pass not by the

workmen of America for most illustrious examples of these virtues. I know not where on earth would be found more intelligent, capable, sympathetic, zealous, heroic workers than these be. And but that they combine in themselves so many of the qualities of advanced industrial enterprise, America could not and would not lead the world as she does in her gigantic material advancement. This is a matter that cannot be overthrown or belittled, and it ought to weigh in the scales of life, and become a factor in wages and happy homes.

To offset this argument—the increment of blessing from the strong hand of toil—wealth, like Laban of old, claims everything. No matter what has resulted, it was first, and made possible the changed aspect of things. "Without it nothing could have gone forward." But possibility and fact are as wide asunder as the poles. Wealth was simply the soil in which toil plowed and sowed and gathered the harvest. There must needs have been soil, and there must needs have been laborers. But every clod broken and every seed scattered in that soil made it richer and richer, until thousands of mens counted their half-millions or millions, and some even possessed hundreds of milliohs. To acknowledge this fact, as well as to urge the dormant potentiality of wealth, is not a matter of grace, but of simple honesty and truth. Wealth, however, is but slow to do it. In the statements of certain recent journals occurred such paragraphs as show the Laban spirit of old—the attributing of a large settlement, with its industries, homes, and comforts, to the creation of money alone, whereas it was money and muscle, drudgery and dollars, that gave birth to it.

This view of wealth no doubt brings round to constant review the matter of wages. Laban had it in his power to change the wages of Jacob, and he did it ruthlessly ten times in six years. And from that day to this wages have had the same precarious existence; and they will continue to remain in the same condition until the complaint of Jacob has force in the world: a complaint which has both right and God back of it. Jacob contends—and God compels Laban to respect this view—that his sleepless vigilance and his wonderful reduplication of his uncle's prosperity were never justly rewarded, but were savagely discounted by reprisals upon his income. If he had had his due, he would have been able long before to set up a home and pasture his flocks upon his own lands instead of being a retainer on his uncle's domain. He does not threaten injury or seek to secure his deserts, but he flings the perfidy in his uncle's teeth, and holds up the desperate meanness of such a fellow to the contempt of all his company.

The Divine Providence and intervention here between wealth and toil suggest something more than a mere livelihood to the toiler as the fruits of his work. There is an intimation of reciprocal duties. Let prosperity pay well for itself. Let the wealthmaker share bountifully with the wealthholder. Let there be something besides the market price of wages. Let not mere demand and supply govern the case, but let the whole matter of increase and development enter into it. Laborers are not animals, simply to be fed and housed. They have careers in the world as well as the aristocracy. They have ambition and intelligence; they have a thirst for knowledge; they have immortal longings, like others of more favored position. And why should they be denied the development of their being, while by their toil they gratify all the sensibilities, the tastes, and glorious passions of those just above them? It is divine to acknowledge their aspirations, and to admit them as participants in our advantage. It is but honoring our own indebtedness to the past to share generously with them their contributions to our greatness.

Law is intended to guard and defend

the interests of each of these parties. And if God were law in *every* case, as here with Jacob and Laban, these disputes between riches and poverty would soon end. Unfortunately law has too often kept an eye open to the rich, but the other eye shut to the poor. It has been bribed to keep silence, to make false decisions, to wreak vengeance on the defenseless. Every sort of outrage upon helplessness has been perpetrated under its name. Nevertheless, in the end, and *in the main*, it has been the counselor and defense of the poor.

It is the friend of the oppressed and baffled, and though it may not secure them justice, and certainly cannot make for them generosity, it at least grants them protection. It is their final appeal, and it is not too much to say that, as things are constituted, it renders them splendid service.

This law is a common sentiment with this great nation, and that sentiment wealth *has to respect*. Take our best journals, our best pulpits, our best political assemblies, and the heart of this great land finds no uncertain utterance there in sympathy with the sacred cause of Labor. None of these agencies can wring the neck of corporate wealth and plunder it for the poor, nor would they wish to do so. They cannot dislodge it from its eminence. But every decade shows that the combined influences of the press and the pulpit are potent in restraining it, often successful in making it grandly beneficent, and in forcing it to make more tolerable the condition of its dependents.

Law permits the settlement of controversies by peaceful conferences and arguments. It looks to arbitration as the way out of difficulties. Let men state their differences. Let the oppressor present his claims and the oppressed his counterclaims, and then let the happy adjustment come and end the strife.

But Law will not permit combat. It looks aghast upon bloodshed. No more futile and devilish way of settling troubles can be devised than by fighting "money" against "men." No more senseless contest can be undertaken than by pitting *poverty* against the power of entrenched *wealth*. When Capital or Labor resorts to arms, and in the awful throes of the struggle life is yielded up, it is the saddest comment upon the inhumanity of riches and the most humiliating reflection upon the honor of toil that can possibly be made. No man in his senses can justify this, and least of all those whose lives and *cause* are sacrificed at the same time. And it so happens that in nearly all these cases life and the cause of Labor go down in the same struggle. If wealth arm itself for murderous fray, the power wealth dares not oppose—the condemnation of the land—compels its disarmament. But if labor meets it with military weapons, and in the deluge of blood seeks to redress its calamities, it only drowns itself in the swirl of furious carnage. The heart of the land stops beating with it, the shout of common sympathy and encouragement becomes ominously hushed.

Law is mightier than the screams of anger and the whistle of bullets; and to Law the appeal comes, and always comes. The appeal may be delayed, and the barbarous crash of cannon and the flash of fire may intervene. But wounds and death make men sober; and when they have taken second thought, and widows and desolate homes make the interval between that and their first intention, they feel the grandeur of Law and the pitifulness of murder, and to Law they submit their case.

What, then, is gained by this red-handed process of resistance? What future wages will atone for these brave lives sacrificed, these orphans and widows left helpless and heart-broken? Far better were it to endure affliction than to fall at last upon Law with damaged cause and empty firesides. Jacob's scale of wages slid ten times downward. Fraud and dishonor and treachery met him at every turn of his opportunity. But Law righted his case at

last! And so will it deal with you, and me, and all who submit to its decrees.

Two or three things need to be said in closing.

1. Capital and Labor both have rights, and among these rights is that of self-protection. If the laborer may guard his home, so also may the capitalist guard his property. Neither has any right to molest the other. Were the principle of interference allowed, no home would be safe nor would any industry be secure. Law guards each, and *equally*.

2. But veritably it should be LAW that is engaged to defend the workshop even more, if possible, than the home. The corporation, in defense of its property, may hire men to shoot and do murder, but the individual who presumes to do so may endanger his life with the courts. It is for this reason that wealth, which has always such tremendous advantages, should link those advantages with Law, and not array them in defiance of it. Capital has its magnificent hours of opportunity at such times as these. *Protected industries*, by which poor men may and do amass millions, can afford to be magnanimous. Wealth has no such opportunities anywhere as it has in this land of ours, and it does not need to stand in everlasting jealous guard over them. It may "suffer long" and "render good for evil" in ways that would mean poverty and destruction to Labor if Labor attempted to live by the employment of the same principle. And where destruction of industry to thousands is involved, and not bloodshed and murder, it may (for so runneth the divine requirement) delay or avert the strife and sorrow by the exercise of mercy, that mercy which is "thrice blessed."

I speak here neither to defend Labor nor to condemn Capital, but to preach righteous dealing and charity, which the Word of God commends to us. And I say that if these had been recognized; if wealth, in glorious recognition of its power, had thrust some large sweets of indulgence upon the palate of need, an anguish and heartache which no human service can now avert would be unknown. Christianity is abroad, and it teaches a higher and diviner duty than mere *fair-dealing*. To love mercy, to exercise pity, to pour out charity, are as much commended as to repent of sins and to walk humbly before God. We may not live to see the day when either private or corporate riches will exalt the divine law above its selfishness, but the law stands, and is eternal. Men may violate it and Christians may disown it, but "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you," will last as obligations while Jesus reigns and His kingdom endures.

The President's "Labor Commission" may apply a more wholesome rule to the vexing question of work and wages than society has yet known. But even then, until men respect the rule of divine right—regard one another as brothers, and in this regard do as under similar situations they would be done by—there will be occasion to preach God's law on the subject. It is false to say the Gospel is not equal to all these troubles, for every adjustment of them is in the line of its spirit. Man may be governed by certain necessities which "know no law," so to speak; nevertheless those necessities must not transgress the principles of right, which are at least each man's welfare equally.

It is to this that every distinct advancement in civilization leads, and to-day more so than ever, because to-day it is the individual who makes himself heard. The highest advancement is to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God. When the Gospel has implanted these three virtues—justice the first but lowest of all; mercy, the vast improvement upon the inflexibility of justice; and humility before God, or the spirit of bringing all actions before His approval—then will the earth realize in full measure the long-delayed prophecy of "peace on earth and goodwill among men."

BELIEVING BETTER THAN BEHOLDING.

By Pastor William Olney, Haddon Hall, Bermondsey, Eng.

Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.—John xx. 29.

Strong Son of God! Immortal love!
Whom we, that have not seen Thy face,
By faith, and faith alone, embrace;
Believing where we cannot prove.

So sang England's great poet, who a few months ago exchanged, as we hope, the Laureate's crown on earth for the "crown of righteousness that fadeth not away." Where, in this company, there is a man or a woman who can take up Tennyson's sweet lines and say, "Yes, Jesus, though I have never seen Thee, yet my faith embraces Thee," they are included in the benediction of our text, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed."

It is a great strength to faith to remember that others have seen. It was on a Sunday night and the people had gathered together in an upper room. The doors were shut for fear of the persecuting Jews without. There was a crowded attendance, for a week ago Jesus had come, and the question during the week between the disciples had been, "Will He come again, do you think?" Expectation sat upon the face of each as the meeting commenced. Very likely one of the Apostles gave out a psalm. Perhaps already the congregation had begun to chant, "God is a refuge for us," when suddenly, behold, there Christ was! No one could tell how he had come, but there He stood. "Jesus stood in their midst!" Not a mere vision flashing before their eyes for a moment, like the mock miracles of the Spiritualists of the nineteenth century—when a man says, "There, there it is," and you see a flash of light, and then the vision fades away. Not such a mock miracle, but a living, substantial, real Person standing in the midst of the expectant crowd, quietly taking His place in the very midst of the assembly. What a sight it was! Turning His eyes in the direction of Thomas, the Master lifts up His hand, as though He would beckon His disciple to His side, and says, "Reach hither thy finger and behold My hands." There, sure enough, were the nail-prints! Then, once more, "Reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side." Yes, there was the gash the spear-head had made. Then He added, "Be not faithless, but believing." Miracle of the Resurrection! Seal of the Gospel of God's Son!

It is said that Comte, the prophet of Positivism, was very greatly distressed because he did not see the cause of Positivism prosper as he wished it to. He communicated the sorrows of his heart to one of his friends. The friend, a wise French statesman, said: "M. Comte, if you would have Positivism succeed, I will tell you what you must do. *You must submit to be crucified, and to be buried, and the third day you must rise again.*" This is the power of the Gospel to-day. It is founded, not only upon the cross, not only upon the tomb, but upon a living Person—Jesus Christ Himself, the living foundation-stone. As Thomas looked he believed. Then came the profession of his faith—a very short and very concise summing up of what the heart was feeling—"My Lord and my God," after which came the words from the lips of Jesus, which we have taken for our text to-night, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

This text is *a rebuke to those who are constantly wishing to see.* We might say that the greatest lust of the heart at the present day is this hankering after sight. The preaching of faith to-day is not fashionable. Men desire to see. Christ rebukes this in the words of our text. "Ah!" says one, "if only I could have looked upon Jesus Christ for five minutes, then I think I must have been a Christian. This believing, it is all too mysterious a thing for me." Dear friend, this saying, "I will not believe unless I see," is a great sin. God has

chosen to save men, not by sight, but by faith; not by seeing, but by believing. He who turns away from this and says, "Nay, not faith, but sight for me," is going contrary to the Gospel of the grace of God. One who thus said, "I cannot believe that anything is real but that which I can see," was holding a conversation with a Christian missionary. The man of God answered, "Then I cannot hold any further discussion with you at all." "Why not?" said the man. "Because," said the servant of God, "I only care to converse with intelligent men." The man colored up. "I demand to know your meaning." The missionary replied, "I like to talk with a man with brains, and *you* will not admit you have any, for *you certainly never saw them.*" He who will not believe in anything but what he can see is not only going contrary to the will of God, but also to the demands of common sense. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Here is God's own chosen way for the soul to pass from death unto life.

We must remember, too, that *seeing did not always lead to believing.* Three most solemn words out of Matthew (xxviii. 17) show us this. When the disciples were gathered around Jesus upon the mountain in Galilee, we read, "but some doubted." We do not know their names, but there, in that little group, was the doubting heart. Seeing did not lead immediately to believing. If you could turn history back these 2,000 years and catch a glimpse of the Son of God as He stood upon the earth, who knows but the thought might rise in your heart, "Even my senses may be mistaken; I dare not say that I can always believe my sight"? Yonder traveler in the desert, as he is about perishing of thirst, thinks he sees a well of water and trees yonder. He leads his fainting camel to the spot, but alas! it is a mirage in the desert. When he reaches the spot there is nothing but a heap of sand, and he and his weary beast sink down to die. The senses may be mistaken—seeing is not always believing. There was one who came up for examination (I think it was for the navy), and he was asked, as his examiner held up a watch, "Can you hear this watch tick?" "Yes," said the man. Then the examiner took it back a farther distance and said to the man, "Can you hear it now?" "Yes," said the man again. "Well," said the examiner, "you are a clever fellow, for *the watch stopped two months ago.*" We are not sure whether, in that case, a positive lie was told, or whether, in his eagerness, the man thought he heard the ticking of the watch, and so his senses deceived him. Not so with faith. When a man grounds his confidence upon the word of his God, *that* can never deceive him. Although the eye may have been deceived, and the ear may have been deceived, the very touch may have been deceived (as in Isaac's day), yet faith can never be deceived when it is founded upon the Word and the truth of Jehovah Himself.

It is a blessed thing to know that *God has given to us who cannot see Jesus a very wonderful substitute for seeing,* even *faith.* One of the grandest temperance workers of the present day is Lady Henry Somerset. The story of her conversion is very singular. She had been convinced of her sinful state before God, and wished to be a Christian, but the whirl of fashionable life caught her, and for months she delayed accepting. The Spirit of God again aroused her to a sense of her need, and to desire to know the Lord Jesus Christ. One day, while walking in her garden meditating on things divine, there came a voice to her heart, which was as real as if it had been spoken in her ear. It said, "Act as if I were, and you shall know that I am." That little sentence changed the whole current of Lady Somerset's life. If only some in this house would act upon the same teaching, the current of their lives should be changed too. Act as though Christ were your Redeemer. Go to

Him with your guiltiness, that His atoning blood may cleanse it all away. You will soon find out that He is your Saviour indeed. Act as though He were your Saviour. Go to Him with your poor, weak, silly heart that He may give a new nature and grace to serve God. You would soon find out that He is indeed a living Saviour. Act as though He were your Friend. Speak out into His ear your trials, your temptations. You will soon find out that He is indeed "a Friend that sticketh closer than a brother." Though eyes cannot see Him, He is very real to faith, and when we trust Him we find him to be all that the Word of God declares Him to be.

This blessed believing leads the heart into *the enjoyment of the very things that others have seen.* Let me explain this. Dr. Andrew Bonar once used a very blessed parable, which I dare say was, indeed, akin to the facts. He told how that Paul, on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, visited Peter. Paul tells us of this visit in the Epistle to the Galatians. One morning Peter said, "Paul, let us go out for a walk together." The course the walk took was down the hill upon which the temple was built, and over the little brook Cedron, and up the Mount of Olives. Presently they came to a gate, and Peter said: "Stop, brother! This is where most of them stayed, just here by the gate. It was only the Master, with James, John, and I, who went farther." Then Paul knew he was in Gethsemane. Walking on a little farther, Peter said again: "Stop, brother! It was just here where we sat down. *He* told us to stay and watch for Him; but no sooner had we sat down than the weakness of the body overcame us, and we were soon asleep. The next thought we had was that the Master was by our side. He called us, and woke us up, and as we looked at Him, we saw the lines of sorrow on His face, and I made up my mind that I would not go to sleep again. He went a second time, and oh, if I had known what He was suffering, I would not have slept, but I did! He came again, and we saw the mark of blood upon His forehead; and yet, Paul, when He left us, we were asleep again soon, so weary were we. The third time when He came back it was too late to watch, for Judas and the servants were coming through the garden gate." I am sure Paul could not have heard the story without the tears starting to his eyes. He might have said: "Well, Peter, I did not see it, but you make it real to me. How the Lord must have loved us when the very thought of the work He had to do for us caused Him in an agony of prayer to sweat, as it were, great drops of blood, falling upon the ground!" The next morning (so Bonar's parable runs) Peter said to Paul, "Would you like to go out for a walk again?" Paul said, "That I would, brother, if it is going to be like yesterday morning's walk." This time they went along a street leading to one of the outer gates, the way Jesus went when He bore the cross upon His shoulder. When they passed the gate and reached a little mound, in the shape of a man's head, called Golgotha—the place of a skull—Peter said, "Stop, Paul. There it was, dear brother, that the cross was set up. I was a long way off; but, oh! I saw it all. Just about as high as *that* there were His pierced feet; and as I looked up to Him I saw every now and then how the eyes closed as if He was in prayer, and then I noticed the crimson drops as they fell from the thorn-crowned head, and from the pierced hands and feet." I can think that Paul said: "Peter, I thank you for bringing me here. Next to the privilege of seeing, I prize your talk about it. I can believe it, though my eyes never looked upon it. He loved me to the death. Oh, thou blessed, blessed Christ!" Yes, brethren, you and I are not permitted to see, but *we can believe;* and that which the eye can never look upon —the sufferings of the Lord Jesus for us—faith can rest upon, and we can picture Him, "the Lamb of God slain

for sin, slain for me!" "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Are you among that company, young man? Are you, dear sister, among this favored class? If not, cry, even as you sit there, "Blessed Holy Spirit, bring me by faith to understand and enjoy the story of Jesus' love."

And then notice, *faith does not insult God by asking to see.* I will imagine the case of a man in the congregation who says to me, "I have heard, Mr. Preacher, a good deal about love. I do not believe in love myself, neither will I ever believe in love without I see it. Show me love incarnate, and then I will believe in it." One of the best gifts that Adam brought out of the Garden of Eden with him was Love. What, man, are you a stranger to love? Can you remember the child who was taken from your side years ago, its tender looks, and the music of its voice which still seems to echo in your ears, and can you doubt that there is such a thing as love? And that wife of yours, who came to you years back and left her father's house, and committed her well-being into your hands, and yet do you doubt there is such a thing as love? You, who, before you came to the service to-night, felt the twining of the babe's arm around your neck and heard the little lips lisp, "Father," can you doubt there is such a thing as love? Do you not see that to ask a sight of love is to insult this blessed gift of God! How much more is it, then, to insult the living God, when we ask a visible witness of His wondrous love to us in giving His Son to die for sinners? This is a story that could never be manufactured in the human mind. Listen to it again. The Son of God, pitying men in their lost condition, became man in order to redeem his fellow man. He went to Calvary's cross and died the death, was buried in the tomb, and rose again the third day, leaving behind Him this wondrous message, that the man who is linked on to Him by faith will share His dying, and will share His perfect righteousness, and so, redeemed by His poured-out blood, shall be everlastingly saved. Tell me, did man invent the story? In all the books of the religions of the world—travel north and south, and east and west—there is no story to match this. Nay, there is nothing to approach it. It is so sublime in its wonderful divinity of love, that God alone could have done the work, and God alone could have sent the message. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

In closing, notice this very sweet thought, that although seeing is denied us, yet *believing on the Lord Jesus Christ we receive all the benefits which they could enjoy who had a sight of Him.* Let me illustrate this to you. Yonder little tax-gatherer is short: he cannot see over the heads of the people, so, as the Bible story tells, Zacchæus ran before and climbed up into a sycamore tree, that he might see Jesus, who He was, for He was to pass that way. Here comes the Son of Man, and Zacchæus watches Him through the leaves, and sees the marvelous shades of feeling on the face of Jesus; His pity and compassion as He looked on some poor sinner in the crowd; the joy of His heart reflected in His face as He turns His eyes to the blue sky where is His Father's home. Now the Son of Man has come right beneath the tree. See, He has stopped! Zacchæus feels his heart beating. Jesus has His eyes fixed upon him. He calls him. "Zacchæus, make haste and come down, for to-day I must abide at thy house." Down from the tree comes the tax-gatherer, and in a moment is side by side with the Son of Man. Oh, sirs, a sight of that wondrous countenance is denied you and me, but the call of the Son of God is sent to us also. The invitation of Christ is as surely directed to us as to Zacchæus up yonder in the sycamore tree. If your faith wills, you may put your hand in Christ's hand, and He will come home with you as he did with Zacchæus; nay, your heart shall be His

home. There shall be the forgiveness of past sin and the implanting of a new desire to love Him, and live for Him, and to be like Him. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

Let me give you another illustration to show that those of us who are denied a sight have the same blessings as those who saw, if we only believe. There were three crosses yonder. Jesus upon the center cross. Upon the right hand was one who had been a great sinner, but who now, at the twelfth hour, in the very evening of life, as the sun goes down quickly, repents and prays. Listen to his cry, "Lord, remember me." Listen to the Saviour's answer, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise." What a sight yonder dying malefactor saw—a sight we should have loved to have seen. But the prayer that went up from that dying sinner may go up from every heart. The lips of faith may speak it. Pray here and now, "Lord, remember me." Although thou canst not see, yet to the ear of faith the answer shall come, "Thou shalt be with Me in life! Thou shalt be with Me in death! In eternity thou shalt be with Me!" "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

Have you heard the lines of Ray Palmer? They seem to take our text and weave it into a song—

Jesus, these eyes have never seen
That radiant form of Thine:
The veil of sense hangs dark between
Thy blessed face and mine.

I see Thee not, I hear Thee not,
Yet art Thou oft with me;
And earth hath ne'er so dear a spot
As where I meet with Thee.

Like some bright dream that comes unsought,
When slumbers o'er me roll,
Thine image ever fills my thought,
And charms my ravished soul.

Yes, though I have not seen, and still
Must rest by faith alone,
I love Thee, dearest Lord, and will,
Unseen, but not unknown.

"Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

HOW TO KNOW GOD.

By C. V. Anthony, D.D. [Methodist Episcopal], Sacramento, Cal.

For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.—1 Cor. ii. 11, 12.

There is a profound philosophy in these words, yet they contain a practical teaching of the utmost importance to every man. Paul was a great thinker, and he has put a great thought into these words, yet he has an eye to a most valuable duty and responsibility as well. There never was a time in the history of men when a proper understanding of these words was more needed than now. There have been some careless thinkers in the world who, following their thoughts to the utmost limit of human apprehension, have denied to man the knowledge of the Infinite. Their argument reduced to a logical form is about this: The infinite is unknowable, unthinkable. The idea of God is infinite; therefore, God is unknowable. Professor Huxley has coined the word that expresses these men's theory, Agnosticism. An atheist denies that there is a God. A deist of the old style admits the existence of God, but denies other knowledge of Him than that revealed in nature. The agnostic simply denies the possibility of any certain knowledge of God in any way. The fallacy of the formula given is seen in the first proposition. The infinite is knowable. While we cannot grasp the thought, nor comprehend it altogether, we *have* the thought and can use it. As a factor in mathematics, it becomes of real service in fixing material relations. Now Paul, in the text, tells us that God can be known, and that by a process entirely reasonable. That process is *knowing Him from likeness to Him.*

One of the most common facts of nature is this, that "like begets like." Where intelligence is involved, like loves to beget like. A man loves to see his own characteristics in his son. Even if he is not altogether correct himself, he will not be displeased if his own imperfections reappear in his child. Tracing this tendency back to its origin, we may well believe that if there is a God, he would create beings possessing, in some respects, His own characteristics. So when the Bible tells us of angels, archangels, and heavenly powers, we may readily believe that the universe is full of creatures bearing somewhat the character of God. Man seems to have been a new creation of this same type. God said to those whom He took into His eternal councils, and whom He employed in carrying out His infinite plans, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air and over the cattle, and over all the earth." Here are two things to be considered: first, likeness to God; and, second, dominion. These two should go together. Man should be lord of this lower world. He is rapidly learning to be that, but the lesson will never be perfectly learned until in moral and spiritual character he becomes like God. The millennium, whatever the word may mean, waits for a regenerated humanity. Man, conformed to his Creator's will, can make a paradise of this earth in one generation. But as an immortal being, we may well conclude that great power as well as glory shall be his. He is to rule. "Be thou ruler," was the decision of the Judge of all to one that had used his talents well. Says Paul, "Do ye not know that ye shall judge angels?" Oh, that men might see that only by regeneration into the likeness of God, shall man ever succeed in being both happy and great.

Now, the argument of the text is that we can know one we are like. We have a nature common with the beasts that perish. We live in the flesh. We have nerves that feel. Even our reason is not altogether different from the brute. Therefore there is the ground of a mutual understanding. Though the chasm between the lowest man and the highest brute is so broad that, instead of a single link, it will take a whole chain of existences to cross it, yet we can know them, and on the earthly side they can know us. There is a kind of fellowship between an educated lady and her pet dog. So in a much higher sense there is a kinship between man and man. On all points we are alike. The anatomy of one serves for all, of every nation and every clime. So if a man would write a book on mental science, he can make it universally acceptable if he but thoroughly knows himself, and can succeed in writing himself into his production. Why, then, should we hesitate in looking upward to believe we have a kind of kinship with the angels? We belong to the family to which Christ has given his name, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth are named." Let us hope that we may know some time what these words mean, "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the *heavenly* Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect."

Now it is on this divine, this heavenly, this spiritual side that man can know God. It is because the Spirit has given us piety that we may know the things of God. It is by this that we can hold "fellowship with the Father." We can walk with Him. By the "kindlings of His love," we are able to hear Him "speak to our hearts." This, so far from being beyond us, out of our reach, is so simple that childhood learns it often sooner than men of science and philosophy.

The only difficulty in this process is the difficulty that sin has made. The genesis of losing the idea of God is given

by Paul thus: "When they knew God they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imagination and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." It is true that our agnostic friends no longer bow down to "images made with hands," but it by no means follows that they are free from the blinding effects of sin, which dominates the natural man and from which only the grace of God can set us free. Indeed it may be doubted if, from the standpoint of God's sight of human affairs, the thoughts of the wise of this world are not as vain and foolish as were the degradations of a religion brought down to the groveling conceptions of a sensual and selfish humanity. For "hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"

We reach the following conclusions:

I. We can know God. We cannot know Him perfectly. That is to say, what we know is perfect in itself, but it must of necessity be but in part. Indeed, we know nothing perfectly in this sense. Matter itself is a mystery that eludes the most careful study of the scientific man. And after all why should we make so much of the infinite? The infinite in space is but the extension of what we occupy to an illimitable distance. The infinite in time is but duration without beginning and continued without end. We know it in the sense that we know it must be, and a portion of it we use as much as though we comprehended eternity. Now God is infinite. He knows all things, past, present, and future, so he knows us, and at the point where he knows us we can know Him and feel that though "this knowledge is too high for us," some of it we can use—indeed, all of it that we are capable of using—and we can "grow up" in this knowledge forever and ever. He is infinite in power. He not only made all things, but is able to make infinitely more than He has made. Nor is His power exhausted by what he has done, but remains omnipotent forever. But he has made us with peculiar power, and endowed us with a knowledge of what he has done, not only in us, but around us, and here His power turns to our benefit. We can trust Him. The ancients thought the Atlantic extended to eternal limits. At least, there was no crossing it. Yet they knew it. They could bathe in its waters, find food from its inhabitants, and bear the riches of other lands to their own homes on its bosom. Happy for us if thoughts of the greatness and majesty of God shall not obscure our conceptions of Him as our Father, "in whom we live and move and have our being." Happy if we can see that a measure of His own infinite nature has been inbreathed into our souls, so that in some good sense we can feel as He feels, love as He loves, and know as He knows.

II. *The process by which we know him is consistent and reasonable.* Every different kind of knowledge has its own way of being known. By induction we study natural science. We test by experiment. We go into the laboratory. We climb mountains. We make observations. We compare and classify. There is another way to do it. If we attempt to do it by any other process we utterly fail. We get our knowledge of ideas by a very different process. Here we have no need of the chemist's apparatus. Here the syllogism comes in play. We reason and form judgments. There is no other way; we are shut up to this and make ourselves ridiculous if we try. In mathematics, we gain our knowledge by demonstration. Here experiment, analysis, and syllogism alike are discarded, simple facts and relations are alone considered. Now, it must be very apparent that in gaining knowledge of characters and persons we have entirely a different process to follow. We know each other only as we come in personal contact with each other. I

must see a man, talk with a man, and hold communion and fellowship with him before I can fully know him. Even then there must be the element of *likeness* in order to make knowledge perfect. Many a biography has been a failure for want of due sympathy between the writer and his subject. The same law holds good in the study of the divine personality. Prayer, communion, fellowship—what words are these? And yet inspired record puts them into our mouths. These are the channels of knowledge by which alone we can know our God. No man can study this subject as he studies the stars, or rocks, or ideas, or numbers. By such searching we shall never find out God. We must go at it in a very different way. "Come, taste and see that the Lord is good," is the invitation of the Psalmist. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." We can pray in the language of the poet, with a certainty that our aspirations will meet with a ready response from the Lord of lords and King of kings:

> Talk with us, Lord; thyself reveal,
> While here o'er earth we rove—
> Speak to our hearts and let us feel
> The kindlings of thy love!

III. This brings us to the greatest truth of our holy religion, the fact that *the agency of the Holy Spirit is a necessity to our knowing God.* Christ came to "show us God." He said, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," and yet how little His apostles knew of God or of Him until the Spirit was given? The office work of the Spirit was to make us know "the things of Christ"; knowing these, we know God. The Spirit knows the things of God, and He alone can reveal them unto us. "They are spiritually discerned." This work goes on exactly in proportion to the work of purity in our own souls. "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." "God is love." We must be transformed into this image of God and be controlled by love before we can possibly know and appreciate Him. This is the "narrow way," but it is the only way. Repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, will bring us to a knowledge of Him whom "to know aright is life eternal."

THE LEGACY OF THE REFORMATION.*

PASTOR ERNST BOEHME [EVANGELICAL], DIACONUS IN LOBEDA, GERMANY.

And we have the word of prophecy made more sure; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, and the day star arise in your hearts.—2 Pet. i. 19.

BELOVED in the Lord, fortunate the congregation in the heart of which the memories of the great Reformation are still living realities, who still have the consciousness and appreciation of the great things that God accomplished in His Church in those heroic days. Only recently have the Churches of Germany celebrated with one accord the Harvest Home festival. Reformation day is the spiritual Harvest Home festival for our Christian people, the greatest glory of whom is the possession of the Word of God restored to them under God through the Reformation of the sixteenth century. In view of this, it is eminently proper on this occasion to discuss THE WORD OF GOD, THE LEGACY OF THE REFORMATION.

I. Its precious possession.

II. A sacred duty this involves.

III. A noble aim.

I. In the first place, then, the celebration of Reformation Day reminds us of the fact that in the restored Word of Holy Scripture we have a precious possession. The Apostle Peter calls it "the word of prophecy made more sure." And just at the present it is the duty

* Anniversary sermon for October 13, the day upon which Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the cathedral door at Wittenburg, thereby inaugurating the great work of the Reformation. In the Protestant Churches on the Continent and in the Lutheran Church of America this day is universally observed by special services.

of all positive Evangelical Christians to evince a keen appreciation of these words and appropriate the confession of the Apostle with regard to the character of the divine Word for himself and make it his own personal confession. If such is the case, then, just on this anniversary day, can we feel how rich in the highest and greatest of gifts the Evangelical Church of Christ on earth is? We have a prophetic Word made more sure. These are the words which the Apostle cries out to the little bands of primitive Christians as a firm, reassuring conviction, full of comfort and cheer under the most adverse circumstances and surroundings; and whoever was in that day rooted in the apostolic doctrine and teachings and appreciated the significance of the Gospel of Jesus Christ—so necessary—saw in this apostolic declaration the expression of His own innermost soul-cheering conviction, and must have felt constrained to cry out in return: "Yea, we have such a prophet's word!" And in making such a confession, the Christians of the apostolic period indicated the source of their greatest wealth and glory, and thereby they called, in appealing tone, to those who had not yet felt the joyousness of a communion of faith in Christ Jesus, showing to them unto what a glorious possession they too could enter by an acceptance of the Gospel of the Nazarene. And, indeed, they were right, in those days of primitive faith, to proclaim the Word of God as such a sure basis of faith and hope. The sure prophetic Word concerning the grace of God in Jesus Christ their Lord; the prophetic Word of the reconciliation with God and the restoration of childhood with God; the sure prophetic Word of life eternal, fixed and established in the communion of life with the Lord and Saviour—is unconditional faith in the love of God. This was the assurance that filled their hearts and souls.

But has this consciousness always been maintained and retained in the heart of Christendom? Has the spread of the Gospel over the whole earth, and the faith in the sure prophetic Word, also gained ground steadily? Just to-day, the anniversary of the great Reformation of Luther and his coadjutors, the knowledge of the fact that this was not the case is all the more emphatically prominent. It was indeed through that great deed of God that the Word of prophetic power again became the leading factor and force in the development of Christianity and the life of the Church. Church history shows how soon after the apostolic era the Word of God was confused and mixed with the word of man, and that the old, firm, fixed, and certain foundation of Christian faith and life was undermined, and that the wisdom of God's Word was compelled to give way in a greater or less degree to the wisdom and philosophy of men. It was only thus, by a departure from the landmarks of this sure prophetic Word, that it became possible to establish a hierarchical system with a pretended vicar of Christ at its head, instead of acknowledging the one Lord and Saviour as the sole and undisputed Head of the Church, thus depriving the Church of God on earth of its dearly bought liberty and freedom and glory. With this could go, and caused by the same departure from the sure prophetic Word, the inner corruption of the Church doctrine and confession, in which the brightest jewels of Christian creed, such as the central doctrine of justification by faith alone, were hidden, obscured, and even lost, bringing in its wake a whole legion of teachings, false and soul-destroying. Indeed the message may yet, from time to time, have been heard, that the Church of God had a sure prophetic Word, but it was no longer understood or appreciated; the words were mere sound without contents or substance for the Church. Hence it became necessary that God should awaken for His cause a chosen instrument to deliver, through His grace and by His power, the Church from its ignorance, error, and false doctrine, and restore to her the grand and glori-

ous possession of God's own eternal trust. This was the historical significance of the great Reformation; it was essentially the reestablishment of the Church of God upon the original foundation of the prophets and apostles, of which Christ Himself was the chief corner-stone. It was not a revolution, it was a reformation along the original lines laid down by the Founder and His inspired helpers, the lines of the word of prophetic and apostolic teaching. The Church of the Reformation is preeminently the Church of the Word of God; and this is confessedly its formal principle. It was this, according to Luther, in his grand old battle-hymn of the Reformation, where he says "a firm stronghold our God is still." With this principle the work of the Reformation stood and fell; and accordingly the Church of that day sang also its famous hymn:

"Preserve to us, O Lord, thy Word!"

"The Word of God they shall let stand
And not a thank have for it"—

are the words of challenge in the Church of the Reformation. Luther himself had, through a most wonderful spiritual experience, felt and learned to know what it was to have such a sure prophetic Word upon which to establish faith in life and death. This, then, he upheld against sin, death, and hell, and in the promises of this Word he found life, light, and the certainty of eternal happiness. This spirit he and others transmitted to the Church restored to its primitive character, and ever since that the Word of God has been the rallying cry and war-cry of the hosts of Protestant Christendom, with which they have ever won the victory. With this he and they gained the day, and against this the gates of hell shall not prevail. Nothing contributed more to the success of Luther's work than the translation of the Bible into the German, and nothing has done more to keep German Christianity in the ranks of conservative positive faith.

Let us, therefore, on this day, recall what a glory, inheritance, and legacy the Church of the Reformation has entrusted to its descendants. Just at present, when the struggle for the Word and its divine character is of such prominence in the Church itself, let us never forget what a treasure its possession was to the Church of God in its primitive days, and again what a power it proved to be in the glorious days of the restoration to primitive faith and life. In this sign the Church has always conquered, and if this sign is discarded victory is lost.

II. But possession brings with it also responsibilities—to whom much has been given, from him also much will be demanded. While we this day glory in the possession of the Word of God as a legacy restored to us by the Reformation, let us not forget the duties which the possession of this good treasure involves. The Apostle continues, saying: "Whereunto ye do well that ye take heed as unto a lamp shining in a dark place." These words sound like the advice given by a good friend; in reality, however, they contain earnest admonitions of grave and responsible duties devolving upon every Evangelical Christian. Would it have been possible for those to whom these words were originally addressed to be in any doubt concerning this matter? And in view of what is going on all around us, can we who profess to be Evangelical Christians be in doubt as to these sacred duties? Yea, indeed, "Ye do well if ye take heed," for your soul's salvation is at stake, and for its sake we should heed the sure prophetic Word, to make it and its teachings and spirit a living reality and truth in our spiritual life and growth. The apostolic words imply that those who heed their injunctions and listen to and follow the Word of prophetic teachings are blessed over all.

And how deeply significant are the times in which we live! How pregnant with dangers on this very cardinal and fundamental point of Christian teaching! In many circles there is a strong

tendency to deny the faith of the fathers, to desert the Church, and to cast aside all belief in God and His guidance and love for the human family. And within the Church itself a tendency to remove the Scriptures from the prominence given to them by apostolic injunction and by Reformation teaching and example has arisen that portends anything but good for the prosperity of the Church. As a natural result of the wonderful complex and nervous life of our own day and date, the Word of God is no longer the center of thought in Christian family circles and in individual Christian life, as was the case in earlier generations. Our people are not so well grounded in the Scrpitures as their fathers were; its instructions are not to the same extent made the basis of the education of the children as was the case at one time; the thought and activity of the age is not so saturated with Scriptural ideas and ideals as was the glory of Christians at one time. Hence there is all the more reason to heed St. Peter's injunction, to take heed to this apostolic word of sure prophecy, as it is a light that shines in a dark place. How true this proved to be the case in the age of the Reformation! Wherever the Word of God came, the Gospel light penetrated, and a revived and reviving Christianity went out conquering and to conquer. It was the life prinicple of the wonderful work of those days.

In the memory of those days, we should seek constantly to be mindful of the duties devolving upon us as the possessors of the revealed truth. The struggles of the Church are by no means over, just as little as the struggles of the individual Christian in the development of his Christian life and virtues toward the attainment of Christian sanctification are over. And in this struggle the Church and the Christian must use that weapon with which alone they conquer, and that weapon is the Word of God, the two-edged sword of the Word of the Spirit. The courage of victory and conquest one can have only with this in his hands. The anti-Christian Church of Rome is fighting against Protestanism as much as it did three centuries ago; the struggle between the principles of darkness and of light continues as before. If the former is to be victorious now, as it was in the heroic days of the Reformation, it must use the same weapon that then proved so effective and successful, namely, the Word of God, as a power of God unto salvation. Only recently there was exhibited by the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church for adoration a pretended seamless coat of Christ, and countless thousands flocked to do veneration. Signs like these show how keenly this Church of error feels the consciousness of its strength, and how much the Church of the Reformation must continue the struggles begun by its fathers. Let us take heed to the prophetic Word, and let this be a light shining in the dark places, and the contest with the darkness of human error need not appall the Church of the Reformation in our day. Thanks be to God, Evangelical Christendom has not yet lost its treasure, and in large portions of the Church its value and blessings are yet appreciated and the duty to use it for the prosperity of the Church in the heart, in the family, in the congregation, and in the world at large is yet understood. And as long as this is the case, as long as the Word is yet the leaven in Christian consciousness and life, so long the Church is safe and is sure to accomplish its divine mission and work. Equipped with this armor, victory will surely be hers.

III. And this brings us to the glorious aim and ideal held out in our text by the Apostle for all Christendom, and for every congregation and member, in the words, "Until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts." Oh, that the promises which attach themselves to these words were appreciated in their whole blessed content and the hope they bring would become a reality in the soul of Christendom! How often

the Christian, both for himself and for the Church, is inclined to tremble when he sees the anti-Christian forces at work in and all around about him; when he sees how man in his deception and error will desert the truth of God's own precious Word and promise! Then, in the midst of such glory, he asks, "Watchman, what of the night?" and his heart is filled with the longing for a dawn of the day in which this spiritual gloom shall be entirely dispelled, and this can be realized. We have the promise and the prediction of this in the words of St. Peter. He said, notwithstanding this gloom, look into the future with cheerfulness and assurance. The morning star, the star of the day, Jesus Christ, will arise and be such for all mankind and for all living souls. A continuance in faith, with the Word of God as the fountain-head and source of Christian faith and life, clung to and adhered to, will bring the growth and spread of the Gospel to the ends of the earth. Faith is the means which God has appointed to be a power unto salvation—will bring this salvation to the people of the four corners of the globe. Such visions may seem the expression of fantastic dreams, but firm Christian hope cannot be otherwise than optimistic in the hope that the Lord will accomplish His ends and that the kingdom of our Lord will be established and become what it was intended to be, the regenerative power of the world and of mankind. Christianity should heed the apostolic admonition to heed the Word and do so confidently, hopefully awaiting the day when the day star shall arise in the hearts of all mankind. In this hope the Church of the Reformation, in the faith of that Reformation, goes on her way, holding fast to its great treasure and legacy, the inspired Word of God, which can make us wise unto salvation.

THE timely warning has been given that Protestantism be on its guard lest it mistake esthetic for spiritual satisfaction.

STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

EVERY sin is an unpardonable sin until it be repented of, and the sin which persistently and defiantly hates God and calls evil good, every sin which willingly puts darkness for light and light for darkness, every sin which willingly sells itself to do evil, is an utter abnegation of the spirit of love, and is therefore death, and is therefore corruption. But this, at least, is certain—no man who is sorry for sin, no man who comes to Christ for forgiveness, no man who flies for refuge to the hope set before him, can have committed a sin against the Holy Ghost, for Christ flung wide open the golden gates of repentance when He gave that most gracious epitome of all that is most tender in revelation, the parable of the Prodigal Son; and He flung those gates wide open when He said, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest, and Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out."—*Farrar.* (1 John iv. 8.)

HE who can cling to a righteous cause because he believes that God is in it, and that it is the right thing for man, at the very time when the world is pushing it over the precipice with contempt; he who can endure shame for the sake of righteousness, and bear the cruelty of lies for the sake of truth; who can be serene when all else despair, for he knows that God is Master of the world; who never lets go his grip, but tightens it closer round thoughts and aims that belong to truth, the more bitter and heavy grows the opposition of the world; and who can pass away, if need be, as Jesus passed, not by a glorious death in battle, but by the ignominy of the cross, alone, despised, apparently defeated, yet convinced of the future, and seeing the Father in the hour of His dissolution—he has the highest courage, the courage which makes him know that he is immortal, the courage which is absolute peace, the courage which is the serene and noble victory of faith, and which leaves to mankind the dearest legacy: "Peace I leave with you; My peace I give unto you."—*Brooke.* (Matt. viii. 23-27.)

ENTHUSIASM cannot listen to practical wisdom when it attempts to deter it from a Divine serivce because it pronounces it Utopian. Its only answer to such a suggestion is, Away with the thought; it is from beneath, not from above; it is of the earth, earthy; it may be, even, that it is of the devil, devilish. But, nevertheless, it has much to teach us. It cannot define what is possible to faith, but it has much to say as to the method in which our work is to be conducted. It is a very insufficient master; it is an invaluable servant. God has given to His Church diversities of gifts, and the consecration of them all is essential to success in this heavenly work. It is a solemn obligation that we serve Him with our best, and it needs wise thought in order that our work may be of the best. But, above all, it needs the most passionate fervor of the heart, and with this no tame and cowardly counsels must be allowed to interfere. It is necessary that we measure our forces and use them to the best advantage. What we have to dread is lest we listen too readily to the selfish love of ease or fear of difficulties. If the extreme of enthusiasm is unreasoning rashness, the extreme of prudence is timid and cowardly indolence. Let us beware, at least, lest we fall into the latter evil. Alas! for the Church if, amid the luxury of Capua, its children should lose any of that hardness which is to be endured by good soldiers of Jesus Christ. There are

still frowning heights of Alps and Apennines to be climbed; there are still desperate conflicts of Cannæ to be fought; and we shall be unequal to the task if we content ourselves with talking of the heroes of the past without ever seeking to emulate their valor and devotion.—*Rogers.* (2 Cor. v. 13, 14.)

If you have a bar of gold and want to double its value, you may do so, no doubt, by doubling its length, but you may also do so by doubling its thickness, and in certain circumstances this may be more serviceable. Now life, in the same way, may be increased in value, not by being prolonged, but by being deepened. If two men live a year, but one of them puts into every day twice as much work and enjoyment and usefulness as the other, his life is of course far more valuable than the other. This is what Christ does. He deepens our lives. I well remember a friend of my own who had gone a great length, living what is called a fast life and exploring, as he thought at the time, all the heights and depths of existence, but on whom God had mercy. I remember him saying to me with great earnestness, on one occasion, that he would not give one day of his changed life for all the years of pleasure that he had previously enjoyed. And that is the tone in which all true Christians are disposed to talk when they are contrasting their old lives with the new. Among men of the world it is a common enough question whether life is worth living, but among true and hearty Christians there is no such question possible. God makes their life golden, He deepens it, and that is what He means when in our text He says, "I am come to give life, and to give more abundantly."—*Stalker.* (John x. 10.)

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. The Obligation of Culture. "The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary: he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned."—Isa. l. 4. Rev. G. W. Belsey, Geneva, Ohio.
2. Decay of Moral Perception. "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter."—Isa. v. 20. Rev. William Hayne Leavell, Houston, Tex.
3. The Irresistible Influence of Christ. "The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? Behold, the world is gone after Him."—John xii. 19. Rev. R. T. Snaith, Croydon, North Queensland, Australia.
4. Lessons from the Great Railroad Strike. "Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth."—James v. 4. Henry M. Field, D.D., New York City.
5. Signs of the Times. "And He said also to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is," etc.—Luke xii. 54-56. William Durant, D.D., Saratoga, N. Y.
6. The Reign of Law. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."—Matt. v. 17, 18. Rev. Henry Neill, Chicago, Ill.
7. Love for the Sanctuary. "My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth, for the courts of the Lord."—Ps. lxxxiv. 2. Rev. William L. McEwan, Pittsburg, Pa.
8. The Capitalist and the Laborer. "Is not this the carpenter?"—Mark iv. 3. Rev. James S. Moore, Alden, N. Y.
9. Seashore Opportunities and Obligations. "He lodgeth with one Simon, a tanner, whose house is by the seaside."—Acts x. 6. John Balcom Shaw, D.D., New York City.
10. The Crisis of the World and the Attitude of the Church. "Now is the judgment of this world."—John xi. 31. Rev. John Rusk, Ph.D., Chicago, Ill.
11. Laughter as a Grace. "Then was our mouth filled with laughter."—Ps. cxxvi. 2. T. De Witt Talmage, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
12. Public Worship an Occasion of Giving. "Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, Give unto the Lord glory and strength. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name; bring an offering, and come into His courts."—Ps. xci. 7, 8. D. C. Abbott, D.D., Monaghan, Ireland.

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. Enthusiasm in Mission Work. ("For whether we be beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we be of sober mind, it is unto you; for the love of Christ constraineth us."—2 Cor. v. 13, 14.)
2. The Sure Test of Love to God. ("If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"—1 John iv. 20.)
3. The Glory of the Commonplace. ("What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common."—Acts x. 15.)
4. The Service of Example. ("Be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity."—1 Tim. iv. 12.)
5. The Entertainment of Divine Guests. ("And he pressed upon them greatly; and they turned in unto him and entered into his house; and he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat."—Gen. xix. 3.)
6. The Suicidal Character of Sin. ("They shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm."—Isa. ix. 20.)
7. God's Withdrawn Promises. ("I said that thy house, and the house of thy father should walk before me forever, but now the Lord saith, Be it far from Me; for them that honor Me I will honor, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed."—1 Sam. ii. 30.)
8. The Charity of Sorrow. ("Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided: they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions."—2 Sam. i. 28.)
9. Increasing the Value of Life. ("I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."—John x. 10.)
10. The Prohibition of Emptyhandedness. ("They shall not appear before the Lord empty; every man shall give as he is

able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God, which he hath given thee." —Deut. xvi. 16, 17.)

11. The Nakedness of Death. ("Be not thou afraid when one is made rich, when the glory of his house is increased; for when he dieth he shall carry nothing away: his glory shall not descend after him."—Ps. xlix. 16, 17.)

12. Prayer the Cure of Care. ("Be careful for nothing: but in everything, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." —Phil. iv. 6.)

13. Adaptation to Circumstances in Christian Work. ("I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound; everywhere, and in all things, I am instructed, both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need."—Phil. iv. 12.)

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

By Arthur T. Pierson, D.D.

Marginal Commentary: Notes on Genesis.

Gen. xiv. 5. *And smote the Rephaims* (Sept., *giants*). Og seems to have belonged to this tribe, and to have been the last survivor. His bedstead (or sarcophagus?) was 13 or 14 feet long, of course much longer than the body for which it was made. The valley of Rephaim was named after this tribe. It is a curious fact that this word Rephaim seems in after time to have been used for the *dead*, or *ghosts* (Isa. xiv. 9, etc.). *Ashteroth Karnaim*, or Ashteroth of the double horn, was probably the place of Og's abode, and named after Astarte, or Ashtoreth, whose image suggested a horned figure, like Moses' statues, which the Latin Church made horned because the Vulgate renders the word "shone," by *cornuta*.

In Ex. xxxiv. 29, where the Hebrew word is *Kāran*, to shine, but which by a very obvious metaphor is linked to *keren*, a horn (from the radiation of rays), and so, curiously, the Vulgate rendering is: "Et ignorabat quod cornuta esset facies sua ex consortio sermonis Domini." This is one of the most quaint of all the misapprehensions coming through Bible translation. The Zuzims and Emims are thought to be other giants or heroes.

6. *The Horites*,, *i.e.*, "inhabitants of caves." They abode in the mountainous country of Sin. The rock structures near Petra may be traceable to them.

There follows now a brief narrative of a battle between the King of Sodom, with his five allies, and Chedorlaomer, with his four allies; and the former were routed in the vale of Siddim, where the asphalt pits are, which gave to the Dead Sea its name—Sea of Asphalt. The King of Sodom was one of those who fled to the mountain. Lot and his goods were taken captive. Abram is told of the fact, and at once arms his retainers to the number of 318 and pursues the captors, with the help of certain confederates (comp. verse 13, 24). By skilful strategy he defeated the foe and recovered Lot and his family and goods.

The narrative seems introduced here mainly for the purpose of bringing to notice the typical personage, *Melchizedek*, who is the first and most prominent type of Christ found in the Old Testament. Incidentally, there is no doubt significance in *Abram's rescue of Lot*. The whole history of Lot foreshadows a backsliding believer, who becomes ensnared in this world and its lusts and associations. Here is the first marked result of his pitching his tent toward Sodom—he is *taken captive*. The very world he courts becomes his foe and carries him away as a prey, and he has to be delivered by a more faithful and consistent and spiritual believer, who has broken with the world and its seductions (comp. James v. 19, 20; Gal. vi. 1). This is the history of the Church in miniature. Some there are who prove too weak to resist the world's attractions, and they are taken captive by its lusts. If they are restored at all, it is by those who are

spiritual, who bestir themselves to attempt their deliverance. Those who in a selfish spirit choose the best which the world can offer and compel others to separate from them in self-denial afterward owe to them the rescue which can be wrought only by prayer, holy example, and devotion to God.

18. *And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most High God.*

This first mention of this unique personage demands careful attention. All that we know of him is compressed into two or three passages: Gen. xiv. 18–20; Heb. v., vi., vii. 1–21; Psa. cx. 4.

Few questions in the whole range of biblical discussion have excited more widely differing opinions or conjectures than this: Who was Melchizedek? The name means king of righteousness. Salem seems to be the ancient equivalent of Jeru-Salem. Opinions may be thus classified:

1. The name is a *title*, not a proper name.

2. Melchizedek was Shem. This is traceable to the Targums and Jewish traditions.

3. A prince of the country and king of Jerusalem.

4. Christ himself in a preincarnation.

5. An angel of God.

His position in both Testaments is sufficiently important to justify a careful collation of testimony concerning him.

Whether, if human, he was of the Semitic or Canaanitish race does not appear. The name is Semitic. He was a worshiper and priest of the true God, but so were Job and others not Semitic in race.

He is described as "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life."

This may mean no more than that he had no traceable or recorded genealogy, and no history like the patriarchs, whose birth and death are so carefully noted.

What most concerns us is that he was obviously a *type of Christ*, as the epistle to the Hebrews expressly teaches:

1. He was the representative of an earlier and universal faith, antedating and outranking the Levitical system, as well as surviving it.

2. Hence he was *the priest of the Most High God*, Nobe—not simply Jehovah, but a broader and more comprehensive name.

3. His priesthood was not local, national, temporary, but catholic, universal, and the type of permanency; not one of a class having his "course" and limited period.

4. Hence he was superior to Abraham and received from him tithes, a token of subjection and inferiority, and blessed him, a sign of superiority on his part.

5. He was both king and priest, and not unlikely combined with these the prophetic character also.

6. No beginning or ending is assigned either to his life or official service, nor has he any human genealogy.

7. He is both king of righteousness and king of peace. King of righteousness first, that he may be king of peace, which comes only through righteousness (comp. Heb. vii. 2, 3); and it is a point to be noted that *righteousness* lies in his very name, peace in the name of the realm he ruled. Christ is inherent by righteousness, for that is His attribute. Peace is not an attribute, but a result and effect seen in the realm Christ rules (comp. Isa. xxxii. 17) when this relation is only delineated. A fine outline by Dr. MacLaren is connected with this passage in Heb. vii. 2, 3.

Righteousness precedes peace—

1. In Christ's work with God in reconciliation.

2. In His work in man, in the experience of the new life.

3. In His work in the world—peace only so far as righteousness.

4. Here is a prophecy of the final end or result.

It is also worthy of note that Melchizedek is here specially mentioned as bringing forth "*bread and wine.*"

The early Church counted this a type of the Eucharist. Literally translating the terms of the 18th verse, it becomes a significant first glimpse of Christ in his greatest Old Testament type.

And the king of righteousness (who was also the king of peace) brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the Most High God.

And he (prophetically) blessed Abram and said: "Blessed of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth, be Abram; and blessed be God, most high, who hath given thine enemies into thy hand." And to Melchizedek Abram gave tithes of all (the spoil).

Let any one read these words carefully and note the obvious typical forecast of the person and work of the Messiah.

Before we leave this mysterious personage we note:

1. This is also the first mention of *priest*. The word here occurs first, and in connection with worship antecedent to the Levitical system. Melchizedek was more than a patriarchal priest; he was also a king, and performed various priestly acts of which we have no account hitherto—receiving tithes, conferring blessings, etc. Tradition attributes to him also sacrificial acts, offering first fruits of the spoil, etc.

2. The first time *Elion* (Most High God) occurs is here. Four times it is here found (18–22).

This title, El, occurs about 250 times, as Elohim does 2,500, and Jehovah 7,600. El means strong, first, preeminent; and seems to point to God as almighty, the great first cause of all. Hence it calls attention principally to God as *creator*, the "possessor (by creative right) of heaven and earth." When this name is used, it is commonly in connection with some of the attributes or perfections of the Creator, such as almighty, everlasting, jealous, or demanding exclusive homage, truth, holiness, etc.; greatness and terribleness—living, merciful, faithful, mighty, and terrible, etc.

Those who care to examine this matter further may refer to Gen. xvii. 1, xxi. 33; Exod. xx. 5; Num. xxiv. 16; Deut. iv. 31, vii. 9, 21, x. 17, xxxii. 4, 18; Josh. iii. 10; Psa. vii. 18, ix. 2, xviii. 13, xlvii. 2, lxxviii. 35. It is also to be noted that Abram immediately after uses the same name, and couples it with Jehovah, showing the two to be tithes of *one God*.

20. *And he* (Abram) *gave him* (Melchizedek) *tithes of all*. If this statement is equivocal here, Heb. vii. 4–10 makes plain who paid and who received the tithes. This being the first mention of TITHES, we tarry to consider the *tithe system*, its origin, growth, and significance.

1. The word tithe means simply tenth part. The rendition of tithes can be traced to the very beginnings of authentic history. It is connected with *stewardship*, and undoubtedly sprung from it. A steward was a servant who was entrusted by his master with the care of goods, and even of estates, as Eliezer was with the property of Abraham, and Joseph with Potiphar's. As landed estates grew, the owner was compelled to give into other hands their administration; and often the property thus put in care of another was at a distance, where there could be no practical supervision of the estate save through the steward.

One of the first questions that would arise would be as to the *steward's proportion* of the yield of the estate. We will suppose a vineyard on Mt. Lebanon belonging to a proprietor in Bethlehem. A steward is sent there, with his family, to take charge. He must have from the proceeds of the vineyard a suitable provision for wants of self and family. The yield of the vineyard is uncertain, depending on many changeable conditions; sometimes it will be very large, sometimes very small, scarce enough to pay for the labor. It is necessary to fix some rate or proportion to be paid to the owner from annual proceeds; and it is quite obvious that if the steward were permitted to reserve for himself and family in no circumstances *more*

than nine-tenths of the produce, this would leave *one-tenth at least uniformly due to the owner*. The origin of the tithe system is somewhat obscure, but as far as it can be traced this seems to be its beginning, the uniform reservation of at least one-tenth or tithe for the proprietor by the steward.

2. It follows, then, that the tithe represents not the *maximum, but the minimum*. It was what in most unproductive years was reserved for the owner. Of course, when plenteous years came and the yield was very abundant, the steward would "render of the fruits in their seasons" to his lord more abundantly, still reserving for his own wants amply sufficient.

Accordingly we find that among the Jews the tithe was what the poorest gave; and as a matter of fact the rich and even those not wealthy gave two, three, and often as high as seven-tenths of their income to God and his service. Very erroneous impressions obtain about the whole tithe and first-fruits system. Christians nowadays talk about the tithe as though to give one-tenth to God exhausted all claim upon their income. If a man out of $1,000 gives $100, he may cause himself no little self-denial. But to give $1,000 out of $10,000, or $10,000 out of $100,000 may necessitate no real self-denial. God must certainly regard what we *keep* rather than what we *give*.

Those who care to study the Jewish tithe system will be surprised to find how much more it involved than is commonly supposed.

A *twofold tithe* was required of each Jewish citizen: First, a tenth of the produce of field, and flock, herds, and trees, for maintenance of Levites, etc., and a second to be expended in tabernacle or temple (comp. Gen. xiv. 20, xxviii. 22; Num. xviii. 21-24, 26-28, xxxi. 31; Lev. xxviii. 30-32; 1 Sam. viii. 15, 17; and Deut. xii. 17-19, 22-29, xvi. 22-27).

Then every third year a special "poor tithe" was collected (Deut. xiv. 28, 29).

Divine blessing was withheld when these tithes were not paid. And in addition to these tithes and first fruits, there were the free-will offerings, etc.

3. The tithe system was both a *perpetual recognition of stewardship* and a constant *challenge to faith*. Every such tithe paid to God's service was a tribute to the original and inalienable *Owner of all;* and every rendition of first fruits while as yet the harvest was unreaped was a venture of faith. For how knew the man who brought the firstling of his flock whether he should have any other lamb that escaped disease and death, or he who brought the first sheaf whether the rest of his crop might not suffer blight? There is a sublime double lesson taught by the whole order, that God owns all things and is to be so acknowledged, and that all power to till the soil or increase flocks and herds depends on His favor and blessing.

4. As to the tithe now sufficing, the whole New Testament teaching is *on a higher plane* than the Jewish code. We are bought with a price, and are to regard ourselves and all we have as the Lord's. Disciples may rebel, but the consistent teaching of the Gospel is that whatsoever we do we are to do for the glory of God; that we are to sanctify all income and outgo—even our meat and drink and clothing are to be to God's glory. The redemption of Christ is all-inclusive, and those who thus live, abide in the smile of God; but it is a melancholy fact that they are few.

This chapter closes with the record of another transaction which has doubtless some reference to the lesson already taught us on stewardship.

The King of Sodom offers to allow Abram to retain any property of his he may have taken, restoring only the people he has rescued. Abram solemnly, with an oath after the form of Oriental peoples, with uplifted hand, refuses to take even the value of a shoelatchet or thread from the King of Sodom.

The reader of Scripture has only to observe this marked contrast to learn

the *first great lesson of Scripture* on the *relation of money to the kingdom.*

Observe the contrast at every point between the two occurrences:

Abram receives from Melchizedek sustenance and refreshment, and bows his head as he pronounces blessing upon him; and to him he renders tithes of all. From the King of Sodom he will receive nothing, however trifling, for his own enrichment, lifting his own hand in solemn adjuration. To Melchizedek his bearing is respectful and reverential, but to the King of Sodom cold, reserved, business-like, and marked by the principle of separation. That worldly king is identified with the vicious, licentious, blasphemous Sodomites, and he avoids all complications and association with him and them. We think of those who in later time "went forth for His name's sake, taking nothing of the Gentiles" (comp. 2 Kings v.)

He must be a dull student of Scripture who does not see in Holy Scripture *one uniform teaching* concerning money and the kingdom, namely, that on the one hand God is to be regarded and treated as the universal proprietor, and we are to think of ourselves as his stewards and render him tithes of all; and on the other, we are not to become complicated with this world even for riches' sake. Most of all are we not to ask money of the ungodly to carry on the affairs of God. God needs not unsanctified capital. The altar must sanctify the gift, and the offerer must first offer himself if his gift is to be acceptable. What has brought more reproach on the Master than the practice of looking to worldly support and even appealing for help from the positively idolatrous worshipers of mammon in promoting the sacred cause of missions? We are taught that all things belong to God; that we need only to ask in faith and all things are ours; that we are to make sacrifices for His kingdom, and to avoid conformity to the world. And yet our churches are built, our ministers sustained, our benevolent work carried on by a distinct appeal to those who do not even confess allegiance to Christ. And this double result is inevitable: First, the Church becomes a worldly body by catering to the worldliness whose support it seeks, and paying court to the men of the world whose patronage is desired; and secondly, the men of the world themselves are ensnared into the belief that they have laid God under obligation by their gifts, or at least accumulated some merit in his eyes by their "benevolence." Let us read the sublime lesson of Ps. l., where God teaches those who have entered into covenant with Him in the matter of offerings and sacrifices, that *He has no needs*, and therefore giving is for our good, not for His benefit; and that no gift is acceptable from one who casts behind him the words of the Master and is in rebellion against His authority. The doctrine is still a part of "the offense of the Cross"; but it is in every part of Scripture taught that God is independent of all unsanctified offerings. And the Church will inevitably decline in piety and conformity to God whenever there is dependence upon worldly patronage for her sacred enterprises or even for the support of the ministry. "No taxation without representation" is a broad principle of political equity, which gives donors and patrons a right to a voice in the affairs of the society or institution they help to maintain. If the Church seeks support outside of the brotherhood of faith, then it is legitimate to admit to her councils and put on her official boards the parties whose help is sought. Hence comes that monstrous anomaly, wholly unknown to the New Testament, professedly unconverted men occupying positions as trustees of Churches of Christ.

THE flower sheds its leaves, and ordinary mortals mourn over the departing glory; but the prophet looks from the falling leaves to the coming fruit, for which the flower but prepares the way.

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By Wayland Hoyt, D.D.

Oct. 1–6. — Concerning Prayer. —1 Tim. ii. 1, 3.

I. Consider what *various elements* there are in prayer. "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and givings of thanks be made for all men." It is quite impossible precisely to distinguish a perfectly differentiated meaning in these four words to set forth the variety and the width of prayer. The significance of the words overlaps and shades into each other. Yet there are certain real differences of meaning in the words.

Supplication mean petition springing out of a sense of personal need for specific things. Prayer means the communion and interchange of spirit with the Divine Spirit, which one may have with God and with God only. Intercession means the longing, yearning prayer which one lifts toward the Throne in behalf of others. Thanksgiving means devout mindfulness of the favors flowing to us from God's hands.

Get a conception of the width and variety of prayer. You are not shut up to a single exercise in your use of prayer. You pray when you petition for some special thing you much desire from God. But you also pray when you hold yourself in confiding communion with the Father of your spirit; when sometimes, in a wordless way, your soul reaches up toward God and finds Him; when you crave benisons for others, not thinking of yourself, and also when you cease request and let the soul exhale in thankfulness. And since prayer is so wide and various a matter, do not refuse to use all sorts and shades of prayer.

II. Consider the *value and validity* of prayer. "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour."

(*a*) God will not cheat you. The instinct of prayer has been implanted in us.

(*b*) And be sure God can answer your prayer without the breaking of natural law. As man, through better knowledge of natural law, can manipulate it to ends of service—*e.g.*, the laws of steam and of electricity—certainly God, the source of all such law, can, through the use of law, cause to fall upon your head the blessing for which you cry.

III. Consider again: the Apostle is here enjoining *intercessory prayer.*

(*a*) Notice what such prayer will do for ourselves. It will cause us to render acceptable service. "For this is good and acceptable," etc. It will broaden our sympathies.

(*b*) Notice for whom we are to offer this intercessory prayer—"for all men."

All men includes those *in business relations* with us.

All men includes our *enemies* (Matt vi. 43), etc. Said General Gordon: "I believe very much in praying for others; it takes away all bitterness toward them. The only remedy with me is to pray for every one who worries me; it is wonderful what such prayer does. In heaven our Lord intercedes for us, and He governs heaven and earth. Prayer for others relieves our own burdens."

All men includes *our rulers.* Remember the habit of the ancient Christians. Says Tertullian: "We Christians looking up to heaven with outspread hands because they are free from stain, with uncovered heads because there is nothing to make us blush, without a prompter because we pray from our hearts, do intercede for all the emperors that their lives may be prolonged their governments be secured to them that their families may be preserved in safety, their senates faithful to them, their armies brave, the people honest, and the whole empire at peace, and for whatever other things are desired by the people or the Cæsar." And prayers like this were lifted even for rulers of the type of Nero.

All men includes the *outlying nations* who do not know the Lord Jesus. Steadily should we pray for missions.

IV. Consider what we can always do —we can pray.

> "More things are wrought by prayer
> Than this world dreams of."

V. Think of it. What a strange wonder, a man not praying either for himself or for others!

OCT. 7-13.—THE YOUNG MAN TIMOTHY.—1 Tim. i. 2.

It is a most wise thing, now and then, to cull out and gather together the scattered biographical hints concerning some personage in the Bible; look at them as a whole, and seek to learn the lessons which such study of a human life may teach. One of the most interesting and stimulating of the New Testament characters is the young man Timothy.

Scene 1. It is at Lystra, a city of Lyconia. This Lystra was the residence of Timothy. He was a boy under the care of his mother, Eunice, and his grandmother, Lois. Remember what occurs at Lystra. Paul and Barnabas are there on Paul's first great evangelizing journey. They are preaching; there is the miracle of the healing of the impotent man; the acclaim of the populace; then the swift change of the mob's mood. Paul and Barnabas are stoned. It is probable that this preaching, healing, popular applause, quick hatred of the changeful mob, stoning, Timothy heard and saw. It is probable that Timothy became at this time one of Paul's converts (2 Tim. iii. 10, 11). Timothy was at the time a young boy, scarcely fifteen years old.

Scene 2. It is again at Lystra. Seven years have sped away. Think a little of what has been taking place during those seven years: the return of Paul to Antioch, his rehearsal of his missionary experiences to the Church there; the plying of his ministry there for a good while; the breaking out of the discussions about the relations of the Mosaic ritual to the New Covenant; the council at Jerusalem; the proposal of Paul to Barnabas to go upon a second missionary journey; the break with Barnabas about Mark; the choice of Silas as companion, and the Apostle is again at Lystra. Here the Apostle is told about the young Christian Timothy, who during all these seven years has been standing firm and growing. Paul finds Timothy in high repute among the brethren (Acts xvi. 2). Him would Paul have to go forth with him (Acts xvi. 3). Timothy is now a young man of twenty-two. Timothy's mother yields him to the Lord's service. Timothy is circumcised; Titus was not (Gal. ii. 3). Notice the reason of the difference: In Timothy's case his circumcision was a wise expediency. In Titus' case, to have caused him to be circumcised would have been false to principle. Be wisely expedient. Be firm as granite when a principle is at stake. So Timothy, properly accredited and ordained, goes forth on his ministry the companion of the Apostle.

Thenceforward the lives of Paul and Timothy are intertwined. Timothy is toward Paul his most loved and trusted companion, sympathizer, helper, messenger, consoler.

It is not needful to trace further Timothy and Paul along their winding ways of evangelizing journeying.*

When there is any special and delicate duty to be done, as, for example, at Corinth, to bring the churches into the remembrance of the ways† of the Apostle, Timothy is the one sent oftenest to do it. When the Apostle must hasten on, and the believers gathered in some city, as at Berea, need further edification and organization amid embittered foes, it is to Timothy the duty is chiefly delegated.‡ When, as at Corinth, there is a long period of settled labor, Timothy is the Apostle's trusted helper.§ When, as among the Thessalonians, the hearts of believers are sink-

* 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6, iv. 5.
† Cor. iv. 17. ‡ Acts xvii. 10, 11.
§ Acts xviii. 5.

ing amid manifold tribulations, it is Timothy who is sent to establish them and to comfort them concerning their faith.* When the Apostle writes letters to the various churches, it is Timothy whose name the Apostle oftenest associates with his own. When the Apostle is a prisoner at Rome, though we have no record of Timothy's presence with him during the long journey thither—probably he could not travel with him as a prisoner—it is Timothy who comes at once to Rome to identify himself with the Apostle, to be his rejoicing support and stay.† And it is of this true and steadfast friend Timothy, here with him at Rome, that the Apostle writes to the Philippian Christians his grand commendation: "But I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort when I know your state. For I have no man like-minded who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's." But Timothy still was true. "But ye know"—the Apostle appeals to their knowledge of Timothy when he was with Him and them at Philippi—"but ye know the proof of Him, that as a son with the father, he hath served with me in the Gospel. Him therefore, I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it shall go with me."‡

After the deliverance of the Apostle from his first imprisonment at Rome, it is still Timothy who is his companion in much of his journeying.§ Subsequently, the Apostle gave him oversight of the Church at Ephesus. It is while he serves in this capacity that the Apostle addresses to him, from Macedonia, the letter we call the first Epistle to Timothy.‖

But soon the great Apostle's course is hastening to its close. In a little time he is seized and carried to Rome a prisoner a second time.* It is amid the rigors of the great first general persecution under Nero. The first imprisonment was like a June day compared with the second, which was like an Arctic winter. To be known as Paul's friend now was a very serious and dangerous matter. It is too hazardous a thing for some who have hitherto called themselves his friends. Demas forsakes him. Crescens leaves him, too. Possibly even Titus fails in thorough friendship.† Only Luke stands faithful. And the aged Apostle yearns for Timothy. And so he writes to him what we know as the Second Epistle to Timothy, urging him to come to him. There are most pathetic touches in this Second Epistle—the last one we have from the hands of the Apostle. Paul is aged, and his prison is cold, and his covering scanty, and so he asks Timothy to be sure to bring the travelling cloak he left at Troas. Also he tells him to certainly bring as well the books and parchments‡—these will ease a little the tedium of his captivity.

If, as is the opinion of many scholars, we believe that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by Paul but by some other hand, possibly by that of Barnabas or of Apollos, and shortly after the death of Paul,§ we learn there how nobly Timothy, true to the last, responded to this call of Paul the aged. For in the 13th chapter of that Epistle and at the 23d verse the author says, 'Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty?" So that Timothy came to Paul at Rome, and stood by him even to sharing his imprisonment, though at that time he misses Paul's fate, for Paul was slain. Afterwards, tradition says, Timothy himself met also a martyr's death at Ephesus.‖

Gather up now certain lessons.

1. The value of a religious ancestry (2 Tim. i. 5).

* Thes. iii. 2, 3.
† Colos. i. 1, Philemon i.
‡ Phil. ii. 19, 23.
§ 1 Tim. i. 3.
‖ Conybeare and Howson, "Life of St. Paul," vol. ii., p. 462.

* Conybeare and Howson, "Life of St. Paul," vol. ii., pp. 482, 491.
† 2 Tim. iv. 10. ‡ 2 Tim. iv. 13.
§ Conybeare and Howson, "Life of St. Paul," vol. ii., pp. 511, 516.
‖ From my "Gleams from Paul's Prison."

2. The power of a Christian motherhood. Get a glimpse of the house-training of Timothy's mother, Eunice (2 Tim. iii. 14, 15).

3. Learn never to think the conversion of a child of small account. Timothy was but fifteen years old. Doubtless the oldest converts at Lystra spoke of him as "only little Timothy." But little Timothy was the most important convert Paul gained in Lystra.

4. Learn what exceeding carefulness should be exercised about introduction into the Christian ministry (Acts xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 7).

5. Learn the power of Christ over natural disposition. This Timothy was not naturally a great, strong pioneering character (1 Tim. v. 23); nor one who naturally, in an easy way, shouldered responsibility (2 Tim. ii. 1, 3); nor naturally a man careless of criticism and insensitive (2 Tim. i. 4). But how the power of Christ in him triumphed over natural disposition.

6. What a great and noble thing it is to be the means of the conversion of a young Timothy.

OCT. 14-20.—THE NEED OF A RIGHT DOING WITHOUT.—John xii. 24.

The noble life is not the life ascetic. True words these of Frederic W. Robertson's: "To shroud ourselves in no false mist of holiness; to dare to show ourselves as we are, making no solemn affectation of reserve or difference from others; to be found at the marriage feast; to accept the invitation of the rich Pharisee Simon, and the scorned publican Zaccheus; to mix with the crowd of men, and yet, amid it all, to remain a consecrated spirit—a being set apart alone in the heart's deeps with God; to put the cup of this world's gladness to the lips and yet be unintoxicated; to gaze steadily on all its grandeur and yet be undazzled, plain and simple in personal desires; to feel the world's brightness and yet deny its thrall—this is the difficult and rare and glorious life of God in the soul of man." Behold the domain and possession of the Christian (1 Cor. iii. 21, 23).

And yet, though the noble life is not asceticism, and though it have possession as wide as the world and as limitless as eternity, in most real and even grim sense sacrifice must be in the noble life; there must be in it a real yielding, a right doing without. For, according to the teaching of the Master in our Scripture, the symbol of the noble life is the buried seed. And the buried seed, in order that it may grow and greaten into harvest, yields much—its beautiful smoothness and roundness, its stores of nutriment—that the germ within it may be fed, the outer air for the darkness of its burial.

A right doing without—this is the inexorable need and the inexorable note and badge of the true life.

See how true this is, and in several directions.

I. A right-doing without is the need and badge of the better life in the direction of a *material prosperity*.

And every one should desire this sort of prosperity. That is admirable advice which Robert Burns sings to a young friend:

> "To catch Dame Fortune's golden smile,
> Assiduous wait upon her;
> And gather gear by ev'ry wile
> That's justified by honor;
> Not for to hide it in a hedge,
> Not for a train attendant;
> But for the glorious privilege
> Of being independent."

But a man cannot do this in right ways and honest except he make up his mind that there are multitudes of things which he must do without. Thomas Carlyle says, "A man who has a sixpence is master of the world to the extent of that sixpence." But a man can only hold such mastery as, doing without a useless expenditure, he keeps his sixpence. This is the true path to honorable fortune.

II. A right doing without is the need and badge of the better life in the realm of the *acquiring of knowledge*. Here is a bit of a story I once came on. Fifteen years ago two poor boys from

the old town of Plymouth, in New England, went down to a lonely part of the coast to gather a certain seaweed from the rocks, which when bleached and dried is sold as Irish moss. The boys lived in a little hut on the beach; they were out before dawn to gather or prepare the moss, which had to be wet with salt water many times, and spread out in the sun until it was thoroughly whitened. They had one hour each day free from work. One of them spent it lying on the sand asleep, and in places of amusement and grogshops. The other had brought out his books and studied for that hour, trying to keep up with his schoolmates. The first boy is now a middle-aged man. He still gathers moss on the coast near Plymouth. The other, in a Western State, is a wealthy and most influential citizen. "No matter what was my work," he said lately, "I always contrived to give one hour to my education. That is the cause of my success in life." The bit of a story is easy of application. No education was ever won, even in the most favorable circumstances, but the one who won it did bravely without leisure, disinclination from attacking hard problems, many a soliciting delight, when study was the duty.

III. A right doing without is the frequent need and badge of the nobler life in the direction of *the wielding of a helping and controlling Christian influence.*

Paul's refusal to eat meat, if in any way he should thus run the risk of making a weak brother stumble, is a case in point.

IV. A doing without and yielding of sin is the inexorable need in the direction of *becoming Christian.*

The Christian life is not the ascetic life. The domain of the Christian is very broad and beautiful. But in order to enter and possess it, a man must yield and do without a conscious sinning. Christ came to save us from our sin, not in our sin. A man must do without his sin if he would become a Christian.

OCT. 21-27.—OUR HOPE.—1 Tim. i. 1.

Many a time in "dark" hours—for sometimes there are dark hours—the memory of this which some one else has written has come to me, singing its song of a cheerful Hope: "Here is Cyrus Field conceiving the idea of binding the Atlantic with a cord, of making that awful crystal dome a whispering gallery between two worlds. In carrying out this idea the man has two servants to help him, the Faith that it can be done, and the Hope that he shall do it. With these ideas he goes to work. Faith steadies him; Hope inspires him. Faith works; Hope flies. Faith deliberates; Hope anticipates. Faith lets the cable go, and it breaks and is lost; 'Nay, not lost,' cries Hope, and fishes it up again. Faith threw the cord; Hope caught it."

Yes, it is precisely so. What strung the cable through the waste of the Atlantic was Faith indeed, but mainly Hope. It is only where Hope lights her torch and holds it bravely flaming over the way of life that man can have much heart for treading it. The hopeless man is always the defeated man.

I wonder if you have ever noticed this most remarkable thing about the Apostle Paul, that he was a man of steadily increasing and brightening hope, away down to the very end; away down to the stroke of the sword of the Roman executioner. Therefore was Paul such a valiant man and vanquishing.

But do not imagine that the Apostle did not meet immensities of things which would naturally damage his hope and dampen it.

(*a*) There was his perpetual physical infirmity—the thorn in the flesh.

(*b*) There was the trouble breaking out in the churches he had founded with such painstaking.

(*c*) There was the steady dragging at him of his enemies.

(*d*) There was, I think, a great spiritual disappointment concerning the second coming of the Lord. Not at

once and wholly was revelation made to Paul. I think at first Paul thought the Lord would return during his own lifetime, and that later he came to see that the time of that return was distant and hidden, and that he himself was not to be one of those who, missing death, was to be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. And, as I gather from a quite extensive study of the matter, this fell on Paul as the heaviest sort of a spiritual disappointment. He had so longed otherwise for himself.

And yet the Apostle does not fail in a vanquishing and cheering hope (Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 1).

And now the Apostle is here a prisoner in Rome, and he writes to his son Timothy; and his first word to him is a word of hope, our Scripture, "And Lord Jesus Christ which is our hope."

Notice the ground and reason of the Apostle's hope. It was not in

(*a*) Dispositional tendency.

(*b*) Nor in favoring circumstances—he was prisoner.

(*c*) Nor in his human friendships—for many of these failed him.

It was in the person, Jesus Christ. "And our Lord Jesus Christ which is our hope."

Think of some of the ways in which our Lord Jesus Christ is our hope.

I. Because He is the revelation to us of the essential worth and dignity of our human nature. For He became incarnate in it. It is so great and worthful a thing, your human nature and mine, that He would become incarnate in it. Oh, where hope flickers, and you think you can be nothing and achieve nothing, remember that your nature is a thing so grand and great that even Deity deigns to wear it! And thus get heart that you can be and do.

II. Our Lord Jesus Christ is our hope because He is the revelation of the Divine love to us. Gazing at Christ, it is impossible to doubt God's love. Nature may be "red in beak and claw," but God's heart is love, for Christ discloses it.

III. Our Lord Jesus Christ is our hope because He is the revelation of a particular Providence toward us. So we are not in the grip of chance or fate, but in the hand of a care infinite. Hope thus.

IV. Also Jesus Christ is our hope because He is the revelation of another life to us. Read Tennyson's exquisite "Crossing the Bar." It was impossible that such a song be sung save in the light of another life which Jesus Christ reveals to us.

Some practical reflections.

(*a*) Since we have such a hope as is furnished in Jesus Christ we ought not to allow ourselves to despair.

(*b*) We ought to persistently look at the brighter side of things; and be sure there is a brighter side.

(*c*) We ought cheerfully to lay our hands to things.

(*d*) The way to keep young and fresh is to cheerfully lay one's hands to things in hope. It is impossible ever to think of Paul as a failing and complaining old man.

LIGHT ON SCRIPTURAL TRUTHS FROM RECENT SCIENCE AND HISTORY.

By Rev. Geo. V. Reichel, A.M., Brockport, N. Y., Member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

"For What is Your Life." The vanity of earthly pomp and power is well shown by the famous painting, "Les Conquérants," recently executed by Pierre Fritel. It represents upon an immense canvas a scene in the valley of the Shadow of Death.

While the whole lies in appalling gloom, the observer may recognize advancing toward him the form of Julius

Cæsar, who leads a grim procession, in close ranks, of earth's most famous kings and warriors. Among these we single out Napoleon and Charlemagne, with Attila, Tamerlane, and Hannibal, followed by Rameses and Alexander riding in their imperial war-chariots. Each apparition appears clad in the habiliments supposed to have been most generally worn in life. But despite the glittering accouterments of rank, the flush of victory, the pride of conquest, and the conscious air of authority are absent. Sad, remorseful, hollowed of cheek and sunken of eye, the terrible procession issues from the depths of the darkness only to reenter the night again in one endless, unbroken line.

The effect of the picture is deepened by the presence of a double row of naked corpses lying prone, with feet stretched toward the passing multitudes.

"WE BROUGHT NOTHING INTO THIS WORLD, AND IT IS CERTAIN WE CAN CARRY NOTHING OUT" (1 Tim. 6, 7).—Albert Maignan has recently produced a large painting, which he has dedicated to the memory of the sculptor Carpeaux.

In it he has depicted a striking scene. Carpeaux is represented seated in his studio, dying. On every side he is surrounded by all that is finest of his work. These creations have left the marble, and in human semblance are seeking to console their creator in his last moments. One of them, a beautiful nymph, is bending over him and impressing a farewell kiss, while the "Fountain Figures," the "Opera-House Dance," and the "Flore" of the Tuileries, and others are appropriately grouped about the dying figure, looking upon him with intensest sympathy and pity.

"AND THIS IS HIS COMMANDMENT, THAT WE SHOULD LOVE ONE ANOTHER" (1 John iii. 23).—Another work of art, just finished, by Henri Camilla Danger, is illustrative of the above text.

This is a large painting, representing an immense plain under a frowning sky. Everywhere, as far as the eye can see, are strewn naked human bodies, bleeding and mutilated in a most terrible manner. In the background of this awful picture are to be seen many ruins of walls, towers, cities, and monuments. The last fires of a widespread conflagration are paling upon the horizon, while numberless standards of war hang from battered wall and casement, or lie upon the plain torn and shattered. Through all this horror and desolation passes the beautiful figure of the Christ, veiling His eyes from the awful sights.

"I WILL GIVE THEE THE UTTERMOST PARTS OF THE EARTH FOR THINE INHERITANCE."—This is one of the promises to Christ's Church which has not yet been entirely fulfilled.

While almost every portion of the inhabited globe has been reached by the Gospel, it still remains a fact that nearly one-quarter of the globe is altogether unknown to us. It is therefore of vast interest to observe the untiring efforts made to reach these unexplored regions, to bring to them the light and benefits of Christian civilization.

Thus the exploits of Nansen and Peary in the Arctic zone, of Bauman in Africa, to say nothing of those few but intrepid hearts who are seeking to penetrate into the new sections of the Kuen-Lun and the Sulimani Mountains and vast areas of Arabia, fill us with anticipation. Thibet also, and Afghanistan, with Beloochistan, Mongolia, and sections of Siberia, South America, and the Philippine group, wait their natal hour, which by Divine grace we trust is not far distant. As yet, however, only the promise is ours.

"THERE BE FOUR THINGS WHICH ARE BUT LITTLE UPON THE EARTH, BUT THEY ARE EXCEEDING WISE" (Prov. xxx. 24).—The ant, the cony, the locust, and the spider are the four "little" but "wise" things referred to.

The truth of the wise man's observa-

tion has recently been most beautifully shown, for Mr. L. N. Badenoch, in his "Romance of the Insect World," gives us the following interesting facts concerning the ant.

He tells us that in nothing is the wisdom of the ant so clearly demonstrated as in his wonderful house-building. Take, for example, the instance of the tree ant (*Ecophylla smaragdina*), which builds its nest of leaves. "The leaves utilized," says Mr. Badenoch, "were as broad as one's hand, and were bent and glued to each other at their tips. How the ant manages to bring the leaves into the required position was never ascertained, but thousands were once seen uniting their strength to hold them down, while other busy multitudes were employed within in applying the gluten that was to prevent them turning back."

So, again, "in the forests of Cayenne, the nests of Formica bispinosa are remarkably like a sponge or an overgrown fungus. The down or cottony matter enveloping the seeds in the pods of the Bombax ceiba is used for their construction—vegetable fibers that are too short to convert into fabrics, but which the ants contrive to felt and weave into a compact and uniform mass so dexterously that all trace of the individuality of the threads is lost. The material much resembles amadou, and, like that substance, is valuable for stopping violent discharges of blood. In size, the nests generally have a diameter of eight or nine inches. The ant itself is little and dark, and noted for two long spines of great sharpness on its thorax, one on either side; hence its scientific name of bispinosa. Popularly, it has been called the fungus ant.

The genus Chartergus, one of the important groups of the cardboard or paper-making insects, includes insects apparently similar, which practice two strangely different forms of nidification. The nests of C. chartarius, the most common in collections, are of frequent occurrence in tropical America. Their cardboard is white, gray, or of a buff color tending to yellow, very fine, and of a polished smoothness; at the same time it is strong, and so solid as to be impervious to the weather.

"It cannot be urged sufficiently," says Réaumur, "that this kind of envelope is indeed of a veritable cardboard, as beautiful as any that man knows how to make." Réaumur once showed a piece to a cardboard manufacturer, and not the slightest suspicion of its real nature was suggested to his mind. He turned it over and over; he examined it thoroughly by the touch; he tore it, and after all declared it to be made by one of his own profession, mentioning manufacturers in Orleans as the probable producers.

"Doth the Hawk Fly by Thy Wisdom, and Stretch her Wings Toward the South?"—In experimenting upon the possibilities of, at some near period, finding means to navigate the air, scientists have been led to study more and more closely the structure of a bird's wing. The marvelous wisdom of the Creator is shown in the following description by Prof. Joseph Le Conte. He says:

"The structure of a bird's wing is a marvel of exquisite contrivance — a wonderful combination of lightness, elasticity, and strength. The hollow quill, the tapering shaft, the vane composed of barbs clinging together by elastic hooks, making thus an impermeable yet flexible plane—all this has been often insisted on by writers on design in nature. But there are two points not so often noticed, which especially concern us here. Of the two vanes of each feather, the hinder one is much the broader. This, together with the manner of overlapping, causes the feathers to rotate and close up into an impervious plane in the down-stroke, and to open and allow the air to pass freely through in the up-stroke. This structure and arrangement produce the greatest possible effectiveness of the down-stroke and the least possible loss in recovery for another stroke. The

plane of the wing, also, is supported not along the middle, but along the extreme anterior border, as shown in any diagrammatic cross-section of a wing.

The same admirable adaptation is carried out in every part of the bird. The whole bird is an exquisitely constructed flying-machine. The smallness of the head, the feet, and the viscera, the lightness and the strength of the bones, all show that everything is subordinated to this one supreme function.

But it is in the use of the wing as an aeroplane that the most wonderful feats of bird locomotion consist. If we are ever to achieve artificial flight, it must be by the application of the principles underlying these. There are four of these feats of bird flight which require special notice as bearing upon the subject of artificial flight. These are hovering, poising, soaring, and sailing."

"HE THAT HATETH HIS BROTHER IS A MURDERER" (1 John iii. 15).—The Rev. G. R. Dodson, of Alameda, Cal., speaking recently upon "Morals and the Nervous System," said: "A part of every action of thinking or willing is that current of nervous energy which passes at the time through some portion of the nervous system. When we think about doing something, for instance, there is a comparatively faint excitation of the nervous system; a stronger impulse causes the act to be done. Thought and feeling are thus actions which do not get beyond the limits of our own bodies." How this reinforces the teaching of Jesus, that not the overt act alone constitutes the crime, but that the sin is committed when the desire is cherished in the heart! Indeed, the desire is the action incomplete, restrained within the limits of the body. Thus, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer," is physiologically true; hate is murder on the way. Lust is adultery begun.

Another important relation between morals and the nervous system is that repetition makes any action easier. The nerve currents meet with considerable resistance at first, but by repeatedly going over the same paths they "hew out" and "widen" the ways, so to speak, until they become lines of small resistance and actions become easy.

From the close connection between thinking about an action and directing the body in the performance of it there comes a surprising result. To be ever thinking of doing anything is to be always beginning to do it. The continual use of the nervous system in thinking of some evil deed is really practicing the thing itself—is making more pervious to the nerve currents the nerve paths which would be used in the performance of the action. Thus it is that some time, when off guard, the temptation (the physiological stimulus) comes, a surplus of nervous energy is discharged along these lines of least resistance, and the deed is done. In this way many young people, who were supposed to be the models of moral perfection, have to their own surprise, as well as that of their friends, suddenly fallen. In such cases the evil desire, which had before been kept within the limits of the body, is simply continued and completed in the outer world. With what force come to us the words, "Blessed are the pure in heart," and again, "Whatsoever things are true, honorable, just, lovely, pure and of good report, whatever is praiseworthy and virtuous, *think on these things!*"

Physiological psychology gives the strongest emphasis to these old moral precepts. Nerve-paths used constantly in true thinking and noble sentiment become the lines of least resistance, while those for ignoble thought and feeling become like unused, neglected roads—difficult to travel. It thus becomes constitutionally easy to live nobly, and organically difficult to do wrong. In the second place, when evil thoughts are aroused they are at once automatically negatived (inhibited) by good impulses, and without any action of the will there is an instinctive recoil from the evil suggestion.

THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH.—The Bible often reminds us that in the very pursuit of knowledge, to overtake truth, we find our reward. The more persistently we follow our aim, the more do we realize that we are fulfilling it, though it be capable of infinite expansion and opportunity immeasurable.

William H. Dall concludes a recent lecture on biology before the American Association for the Advancement of Science thus:

"But those whose high privilege it has been to commune with Nature in her sacred haunts, to waste in studious mood the midnight oil and grasp by efforts slow, severe, prolonged, some new truth from the mazy labyrinth, these will feel, with Newton, that their labors in the past, and all that any single man may hope to add, are to the contents of great Nature's book but as the gleanings of some little child gathering shells along an ocean strand."

Yet, notwithstanding this, the student rightly feels that every new truth is gathered for all time, and is its own reward; and that, in spite of human error, prejudice, and weakness, imperfect comprehension of the glories of the harvest and faulty applications of experience, progress is constant. Before the strong breath of persevering and repeated investigation, flake by flake, the chaff is winnowed away. That which remains fit for the granary of knowledge is imperishable. Let us, then, accept the lesson, in graceful verse recorded by a poet naturalist, taught by the ever-expanding camerated coil of pearly nautilus, contemporary of the ages past as well as of the living present:

"Year after year beheld the silent toil
That spread his lustrous coil;
Still as the spiral grew
He left his past year's dwelling for the new,
Stole with soft step its shining archway through,
Built up its idle door;
Stretched in his new-found home and knew the old no more.

Thanks for the heavenly message brought by thee,
Child of the wandering sea,
Cast from her lap forlorn; from thy dead lips a clearer note is borne
Than ever Triton blew from wreathed horn;
While on mine ear it rings
Through the dark caves of thought,
I hear a voice that sings:

'Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll;
Leave thy low vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by Life's unresting sea.'"

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

ST. PAUL'S SERMONS.

BY PROF. W. GARDEN BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IT does not appear that nature had been very bountiful to St. Paul in the outward or physical gifts of an orator. Appearance, voice, and manner seem all to have been naturally against him (2 Cor. x. 10). To these disadvantages another was added when it seemed most out of place,—the "thorn in the flesh," as to the nature of which we can only guess, but the effect of which was to impede him greatly in preaching the Gospel. His natural good sense would lead him to remedy as far as possible the ordinary physical defects under which he labored; and as to the thorn in the flesh, "the messenger of Satan to buffet him," he was so troubled by it that thrice over in a season of very near communion with his Lord he entreated that he might be set free from it, but in that form the entreaty could not be complied with. All his life long, therefore, like Jacob limping on his injured thigh, he labored under some defect which embarrassed him greatly in proclaiming the Gospel.

But both nature and grace were very bountiful to him otherwise. Nature gave him that extraordinary vital force which we see alike in his body, his intellect, his imagination, and his heart; and grace gave him those intimations of spiritual truth and those intense yearnings for the good of others that caused his words to be uttered not only with all the fervor of his own soul, but in the very power of the Holy Ghost. It was not only that he held the truth, he was held by it—*teneo et teneor;* his thought and feelings came to him in great waves and currents, and his enthusiasm guided him instinctively to the most suitable forms of expression and modes of appeal. Of labored and artificial oratory he knew absolutely nothing; but during all his preaching life he must have been constantly pouring out passages of extraordinary power and beauty—the appropriate and necessary outcome of a head so richly furnished, and a heart so powerfully moved.

The records of his sermons are very scanty. In the Acts of the Apostles, besides a few brief notices, we have only a short outline of two,—that delivered at Antioch in Pisidia, (ch. xiii.) and that at Mars Hill in Athens (ch. xvii.). These would be altogether insufficient to enable us to form a judgment of his qualities as a preacher. But in his epistles we find passages that are sermons in substance though not in form, and that give us a much better idea of his preaching gifts. We propose in this paper to examine one discourse of each class, and probably the most instructive will be found to be the sermon at Athens, a discourse in form as well as in reality, and the exposition of the doctrine of the resurrection in 1 Cor. xv., a sermon in reality though not in form.

1. The sermon at Athens is in many respects a peculiar one. This arises from the fact that there was so little common ground between the preacher and his audience. At Antioch in Pisidia he was addressing Jews, and with them he had a threefold common ground—a common history, a common book, and a witness whom they both acknowledged—John the Baptist (see Acts xiii.). But for the Athenians neither history, nor literature, nor biography furnished him with anything of the kind. He must find his common ground elsewhere. And find it he did. Perambulating the streets he had seen an altar with the inscription, ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ—"To an unknown God." So he and the Athenians were at one in acknowledging a God, and in offering Him worship. But the light of nature was too dim to illuminate this very vital region of duty and privilege. Was it not a proof of this that in their city an altar had been erected to a God of whom even his worshipers knew nothing? "You own that there is an unknown God. The very duty committed to me is to make Him known!" Was not this a stroke of genius—making a trifle, which to most men would only have occasioned a sigh, subserve a great end? Some one has defined "genius" to be the power of perceiving analogies, natural but not obvious. Was it not genius that found a text for a Christian sermon on a pagan altar, suddenly turning the gun of the enemy right against himself?

The report of the address is crowded into a few lines, and we have often to read between them to get the sense. We find first a series of appeals to the intellect, and thereafter the conscience is summoned into court.

The folly of idolatry is shown from a variety of sources. (*a*) It is proved from the immensity of God. He is Lord of heaven and earth (24); therefore it is absurd to think of Him as confined to temples built with human hands. (*b*) He is the owner and giver to all of life and breath and all things; therefore He stands in no need of our gifts and offerings, nor can we, by means of these, place Him under any obligation to us (25). (*c*) He hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth, and determined their appointed

seasons and the bounds of their habitation; therefore the idea of local deities or tutelary protectors of this country or of that is out of the question (26). (*d*) He has implanted in men's hearts desires after Him, made them eager to find him, as being not far from any one of them; but men have been baffled in their gropings after Him, and therefore ought to listen eagerly to any, who, like the Apostle and his comrades, profess to have found Him (27). (*e*) He is the author of our spiritual nature, of all that raises us above the animals and stamps us with godlike features; "in Him we live and move and have our being." Therefore it is not mechanical but spiritual worship that we should offer to him (28). (*f*) We bear to him a still closer affinity, as one of your own poets has said, "We are all also his offspring"; there is a community of nature between us; therefore "we ought not to think that the Godhead is like to gold or silver or stone graven by art and man's device" (29). We may readily understand how thoroughly Paul would be in his element expanding these elementary views of theism and the relation of God to man.

But now, like a skilful preacher, as he was, the Apostle changes his tack. Turning round on his audience, he now makes an appeal to their consciences. It was not only an error to worship idols, but a sin. It was not a mere fault of judgment, but a crime against nature, an affront to God. It was to degrade God beneath the level of man—to deny him all His preeminent glory. True, God had borne long with this unworthy treatment. But this season of forbearance was now at an end. His call to men everywhere was to repent. A crisis had come, a day of universal judgment had been appointed, and the Lord had given assurance of these events to all, in that he had raised the appointed judge from the dead (30, 31).

The whole discourse was peculiar. There was nothing in it of the Cross or of the Saviour. Either the preacher was interrupted, or the report of his discourse is imperfect. It seems most probable that having once roused the consciences of his audience by showing them the folly, the sin, and the coming judgment of idolatry, he designed to show them their need of redemption, and then to guide them to the blood of sprinkling. That he made a certain impression on his audience we cannot doubt. They seem to have been in that critical condition in which a very little thing turns the balance one way or another—like the people of Nazareth when they wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of Jesus' mouth. In the case of the Athenians it was the idea of the resurrection that turned the scale, and turned it the wrong way. "When they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked." Was this the wonderful solution of the mysteries of life and death which Paul professed to be able to offer: "Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus!" On the other hand, some of his hearers were impressed and became converts, although not so many as to make the church of Athens a notable, or even a noticeable, one in the history of the early Church.

The theory of Renan and others that Christianity was the outcome of Hellenism and Hebraism finds no countenance from Paul's experience at Athens. Greek art and culture, Greek philosophy and literature, did not turn out in this case to be much of a "preparatio evangelica."

2. We proceed to what we may call the Apostle's sermon on the resurrection of the body (1 Cor. xv.). It is a remarkable circumstance that the sublimest piece of writing that ever came from his pen bore not on our immortal spirit, but on the inferior part of our nature. And this is the more remarkable because St. Paul was so strenuous an advocate of bodily discipline and control, and counted the claims of the body so unworthy of consideration when they clashed with spiritual duty or enterprise. We cannot but connect his surpassingly high view of the resur-

rection of the body with what he saw on the way to Damascus—the glorified human body of our Lord. That was indeed a memorable sight! Such beauty of expression, such tenderness of feeling, such majesty of intellect, revealed themselves through that bodily form, that the apostle was ravished—it was a revelation of beauty and glory infinitely surpassing all he had ever seen. And must it not have been that glorified body that was in his view when he described the product of the resurrection —sown in weakness, raised in power—sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body—this corruptible putting on incorruption, and this mortal immortality? Not only here but in other passages the glorified body of Jesus is the type to which the bodies of all Christians would be conformed, since God had "predestinated them to be conformed to the image of His Son that He might be the firstborn among many brethren."

The resurrection is discussed under two divisions: argumentative (1–34), and illustrative (35–57); these are followed by a brief application (58).

The argument, which is emphatically Pauline in form and character, is directed to show, first, the reality of Christ's bodily resurrection, and then, by way of inference, the certainty of the resurrection of the bodies of His people.

The proofs adduced of the resurrection of Jesus culminate in His own experience on the way to Damascus. The Lord appears to have revealed his bodily glory more fully to Paul than to any other apostle, creating an indelible impression both that it was a real body and that it was a body of unsurpassable glory.

The proof derived from our Lord's resurrection of the resurrection of his people is varied and manifold. (*a*) He begins with a negative proof, a sort of *reductio ad absurdum* (12–19); if the dead are not to be raised, Christ could not have risen, and if Christ has not risen, the whole fabric of Christianity crumbles into ruin. Christ and his people are of the same nature; but if in the future life the one should have a corporeal nature and not the other, they would not be the same. Either both will have the corporeal nature, or neither; if His people are not to have it, He cannot have it—He cannot be risen; and if Christ be not risen, where is the evidence that God has accepted of His redeeming work, and where is the proof that He is Lord of death and the grave? (*b*) This is further brought out by the *representative* character of Christ; He is the second Adam, and those whom He represents must share His life (20–23). (*c*) Further, it is proved by the *exaltation* of Christ (24–28). He has been constituted the head of a glorious dispensation for putting down all rule and all authority and power that conflicts with His own, preparatory to the time when all the objects of His mediatorial dominion having been achieved, He shall resign it into the hands of the Father. And is it to be imagined that He would hold His work completed so long as Death retained its control even over the bodies of His people? (*d*) He confirms this view by reference to an obscure practice—baptism for the dead (29), and (*e*) by reference to the unexampled sufferings that he and others were undergoing in the cause of Christ (30–32).

All this makes a long argument. It is time now to change the tone and have a thrust at conscience. This he does by a hint that it is evil company that has been perverting the Corinthians on the subject of the resurrection (33, 34), and that if they would awake to righteousness and sin not, they would not be entangled in the meshes of heresy.

And now comes the more brilliant part of the discourse—the illustration. This likewise is in two parts: first, a series of analogies, and then a living dramatic picture, as often happened in the case of our Lord (Luke x. 29, xv. 2, etc.). It is in his answers to the objections of opponents that the apostle brings out his richest views of

truth. In answering the question, "How are the dead raised?" he gives us his first analogy—the seed dying and losing its old life in giving birth to the new. Then follows a whole series of analogies derived from the difference between one kind of flesh and another, and then, rising higher, between the various heavenly bodies—all of them designed to illustrate the difference, yet substantial identity, of the present body and the resurrection body. Can we find anywhere a more felicitous expression of contrasts? "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," and so on till the climax is reached: "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

The way is now fully prepared for the grand finale—the dramatic picture of the resurrection—which is to the whole discourse like the Hallelujah chorus to Handel's oratorio. The end will come with awful suddenness: "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." This will bring a complete end to that reign of Death, under whose gloomy government all earthly life has hitherto been spent—"death shall be swallowed up in victory." And then, like one possessed by that glorious truth; like one who sees with his mental eye the world passing from the dominion of death to the dominion of life; who sees the old monarch dethroned, his tombs and charnel-houses, and poisoned darts, and crossbones, and skeletons all swept clean off the scene and replaced by the brightness and the beauty and the gladness of the new creation—he bursts into the apostrophe: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" But lest we should forget what it is that has given to Death his dominion, and who that stronger One is that has disarmed and overpowered him, he adds: "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Such a discourse needs but little formal application. The preacher has been in contact with the most susceptible parts of the heart, especially toward the close; he has kindled the spirit of wonder and exultation, and made his hearers conscious of an incalculable obligation. A single word of fervent and affectionate counsel is all that is needed: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast and immovable; always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

Could the two great objects of preaching—instruction and persuasion—have been more successfully combined? The appeal to intellect, conscience, feeling, and imagination; the varied figures of speech—analogy, resemblance, contrast, alliteration, antithesis, and apostrophe; the play of life in every part; the sublime heights to which he rises, from which he finds it easy to come yet down to the common paths of duty; the glow of feeling with which the whole is warmed; the glorious vista opened into the future; the hopes that are raised, vague from their very glory, yet disclosing "scenes surpassing fable"—all such things indicate the work of a mighty preacher, and yet of one who made so little of himself and his methods, and had such surpassing confidence in the power of the Spirit as the only power to move man's heart, that he could say of himself: "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." "I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." It would be a blessed achievement could we combine the two things—such skill in dealing with the human soul, and such dependence for the desired effect on the Spirit of God!

SOCIOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

Papers in Social Science and Comparative Religion.

By Rev. B. F. Kidder, Ph.D.

IV.—Intemperance and Immorality in Mohammedan Countries.

That Mohammedans at present drink less wine than nominally Christian races there can be no doubt. I say *at present*, because indications are not wanting (as, for example, in Algiers, where Christian (?) civilization is most strongly modifying Mohammedan types) that the followers of the Prophet will some time rival their Christian brothers in devotion to the pagan Bacchus. Mohammed's prohibition of the use of wine has certainly exerted a marvelously strong and good influence over his followers for more than 1,200 years. We would not detract one iota from his farsightedness or from their faithfulness in this regard, but rather unite with all good Mohammedans in the earnest wish that the "backsliders" may be "reclaimed," and that the "faithful" may have sense and grace enough in spite of corrupting influences from without to keep the precept unto the end.

Having said this, it is necessary to say a great deal more. The question of intemperance among Mohammedans is not so easily to be disposed of. Unfortunately for the Mussulman as for everybody else, wine is not the only thing that brings "woe, sorrow, contentions, babbling, wounds without cause, redness of eyes." The Mohammedan has studied his Koran far more carefully than many of those who praise him for his abstinence from wine, and he has discovered that the Prophet said nothing about cognac, neither did he prohibit drunkenness; and like many others who profess better things, he often rigidly keeps the letter of the law, and takes advantage of his opportunities.

Among the surprises which Prof. Max Müller has recently given the reading public is the statement made in his article on "Mohammedanism and Christianity," which appeared in the February number of *The Nineteenth Century*, to the effect that Mohammedanism has cured that cancer of our civilization, intemperance. The very day that my attention was called to this article I had been observing the effect of cognac upon a Mohammedan tippler at Cairo, and came uncomfortably near suffering personal violence for my temerity. This would amount to comparatively nothing, as an isolated experience, any more than the sight of a drunken member of a Christian church; but, unfortunately, it stands for a too general condition of things which is causing increasing alarm among the most thoughtful and conscientious Mohammedans. The use of spirituous and intoxicating liquors is an evil which threatens Mohammedan countries hardly less gravely than it threatens Christendom. I am glad to record that no Mohammedan city which I have visited presents any such array of grog-shops, or turns loose upon its streets any such horde of drunken rowdies, as may be seen in many cities of the West; but the evil is working subtly.

Much of the curse from which Mohammedan countries suffer has been brought to them from lands that are more advanced, and that have the light of a better gospel. Ours is the greater shame. But the evil is not wholly from without. There is a native liquor which is causing greater havoc among the Mohammedans of Barbary, Egypt, and Turkey than any that is imported from Europe or America. I refer to the concoction known as "raki," used not so much by the "aristocracy" as by the "common people."

In the very city in which Professor Müller received from his Mohammedan friends such marvelous reports in regard to their sobriety, I learned of

many recent cases of delirium tremens and death from the use of this peculiar drink. An eminent scientist in Constantinople (a professor in Roberts College), who has made an analysis of the poison, and who has carefully observed its effects upon those who use it, is authority for the statement that it is the worst of all the different kinds of alcohol known to science. This liquor is being consumed in increasing quantities by Mohammedans; and the results are not perceptibly different from those produced by other kinds of alcohol upon other men—drunkenness, disease, death, to say nothing of moral effects.

It is not easy to secure statistics among people who keep no statistics, and whose private lives are so deeply hidden from the general view; but the facts here stated in a somewhat general way are attested, not only by personal observations at Constantinople and in all of the Mohammedan countries of the Mediterranean except the regency of Tripoli, but also by Mohammedan testimony, as well as by the testimony of many Europeans, Americans, and others, who have spent years among the Mohammedans as business men, educators, missionaries, and especially physicians, who often have accurate knowledge of the private life where others can receive only general impressions.

Undoubtedly some will say: "But why such conflicting accounts from those studying social conditions in the same territory? What are we to believe?" If any of the statements made in this paper are incorrect, I shall be pleased for any one who is in possession of *facts* (not merely suffering from an attack of *sentiment*), to point out such mistakes. And if any shall feel that our conclusions or the processes which have led us to those conclusions are unreliable, he is at liberty to take them at his own valuation, or pass any criticism that he may see fit. I must claim for myself the privilege thus freely granted to others, and without intending the slightest affront to the great savant of Oxford, I shall venture to tell the readers of THE REVIEW something which I know that many of them will be pleased (at least amused) to hear, and that is the way in which the distinguished professor was led to his remarkable conclusions. I give the account as it was given to me by an eminent and most highly respected resident of Constantinople.

Not long since, some Mohammedan in India started the report that the British Government was about to remove the official head of the Sultan of Turkey and place some other man on the throne of the Caliphs. The Sultan was greatly alarmed. This happened just before Professor Müller's visit to Constantinople. A bright young man, whose identity I need not disclose (residing at Constantinople), hit upon a very bright plan to help secure for Professor Müller a pleasant reception in the famous capital; and he caused the report to be circulated in such a way that it was sure to come to the Sultan's ears that the celebrated Professor M., of Oxford, who was about to visit the city, was very widely and favorably known in India, and probably had more influence with the Mohammedans of that country than any other living man. (This was of course without the slightest knowledge or collusion on the part of Professor M.) The ruse worked perfectly. The distinguished professor had hardly arrived in Constantinople before he was invited to the Royal Palace, and he was most royally feasted and fêted by the Sultan and his friends, and told many beautiful things concerning Mohammedans, some of which he saw fit to repeat.

More subtle and more serious than the question of intemperance is the question of immorality among Mohammedans. Professor Müller was led by his Mohammedan friends to believe that this cancer has also been cured. This were indeed a marvel—nay, more, a miracle—if it were true; but the only marvelous thing about it in reality is the fact that a man of Professor Müller's

intelligence could be made to believe such an absurdity. He says: "If I may trust my Turkish friends, no Turkish Mohammedan woman leads an openly immoral life." It may be true that no Mohammedan woman in Turkey sits unveiled at the door of her house, as described by Solomon, or walks the street as a painted, brazen strumpet, seeking her victims; I, with Professor Müller, certainly saw none such; but, unfortunately, the virtue of Mohammedan women cannot be so easily established.

The rigidity of the social conditions to which all Mohammedan women are submitted, however pure and noble they may be (as, for example, the wearing of the veil, and their exclusion from the society of all men except their own husbands), of necessity compels the impure to adopt tactics that are somewhat peculiar to the situation. If any man doubts that these women have procurers, let him take an evening stroll along the streets of Constantinople, Beiroot, Damascus, or almost any other Turkish city, and his doubts will soon be dissipated.

But how is any decent man to be reasonably sure that the inmates of these places are Mohammedans? There is good evidence that may be secured. An intelligent young Syrian who had lived a fast life until his conversion to Christ about a year ago, assured me that to his personal knowledge most of the inmates of the houses of ill-repute in Damascus and a large per cent. of those at Beiroot were Mohammedans. An intelligent Mohammedan at Cairo, whose veracity among those who know him is unquestioned, told me (without, of course, suspecting the use which might be made of the information) the story of his once dissipated and immoral life; and the picture which he drew of nights in Turkish brothels will quite equal anything that has ever been brought to light in darkest New York. These are only two among many similar witnesses whose testimony cannot be lightly set aside.

It might not be counted a strange thing if Mohammedan countries should furnish a quota of depraved women as well as bad men, even if the precepts of Islam were perfect. Islam certainly contains many beautiful moral precepts, such as exhortations to "truthfulness," "honesty in business," "modesty, or decency of behavior," "fraternity" (between all Moslems), "benevolence and kindness toward all creatures," etc., none of which we would wittingly minimize. But, in spite of all this, it contains precepts and directly sanctions practices which must open the floodgates of immorality. Evidence of this result is overwhelming.

A Mohammedan may call a woman his wife (and by woman is meant a girl anywhere from eight or ten years of age upward), and after three weeks cast her off, without excuse save his own caprice. (The abuse in regard to concubines is even less restricted.) A few of these unfortunate girls may become the wives of other men; but, as a matter of fact, many of them sink to lives of shame.

It is true that the orthodox Moslem holds up his hands in holy horror at this moral lapse, and is ready to take up stones to stone the offender; but his wrath is too much like that of Judah against Tamar. If the Creator has made any discrimination between woman's sin and man's, if he has discriminated against that which is unholy, for a single day, in favor of essentially the same thing for a little longer period of time, we have not yet heard of it. If both are not damnable, the moral law has failed to disclose the fact, at least to uninspired intelligence. Mohammed said that the Almighty assured him that the thing was all right in his case; but the rest of us have received no such word.

This is not a charge of personal immorality against all Mohammedans. Many of them are living pure lives, each of them the husband of one wife, the keeper of no concubine. But, until the system is revised, Mohammedanism

must bear the weight of the immorality which it sanctions, and the immoral conditions which it creates and fosters.

If any such thing could be laid to the charge of Christianity, the common conscience of Christendom would call for a revision of the system. It is fairly safe to assert that the larger part of the Christian public listened with mingled amazement, sorrow, and indignation to a certain proposition made some time after the so-called "Dark Ages" for the church to open a vestry saloon for its young men (doubtless as a kind of final substitute for the prayer-meeting); but it is still safer to assert that even the few who may have favored the saloon proposition will turn away with unqualified disgust, or boldly utter their denunciation, if any would-be reformer shall ever suggest that the Church of Christ become patron to such relations between the sexes as everywhere prevail under Islam.

The licensing of vice in Mohammedan countries can hardly be balanced against the licensing of vice in nominally Christian countries; for, in the former (where Church and State are one), it is the direct act of the religious body; while in the latter it is in spite of the direct protest of the religious body. If any State-Church or Church-State is guilty of this crime against society, it must individually bear the responsibility; the Spirit of Christ and the Church Universal have no part or lot in the matter.

It is painful to disclose even the small part of the evidence which seems necessary to a fair understanding of this case, but truth demands it.

The present official head of Islam is perhaps one of the best who has occupied that distinguished place. In both mental and moral tone, he is certainly far above many who have preceded him. Yet, may we not ask what must be the moral influence upon the Moslem rising generation when this spiritual head and great religious light, in addition to his numerous wives, probably keeps more concubines than any other living man? Nay, more, when (if it be true, as every intelligent man in Turkey with whom I conversed on the subject unhesitatingly believes, and as certain of good repute would be willing to prove were it not for the fact that disagreeable witnesses in that part of the world have the disagreeable habit of not living to old age) he receives at least once every year at the close of the great religious Fast of Ramadhan the addition (often temporary) to his harem of the most beautiful woman that can be found in Turkey?

There are many things that contribute to an understanding of moral conditions in Mohammedan countries. Throughout the North African States, as well as in Turkey proper, I was assured by people of irreproachable candor and undoubted intelligence that, as a rule, the young Mohammedan who does not keep one or more mistresses is guyed and goaded by his friends and held up to ridicule as being less than a man.

I am not unaware of the fact that society in Christian lands is far from being in an ideal state in this regard. But everywhere in Christendom, the man, young or old, married or unmarried, rich or poor, who keeps a mistress is branded, not always by fawning, vapid "society," so called, but by sturdy Christian sentiment, as a "rake." One of the most terribly suggestive and painful disclosures that was made to me in the progress of these investigations came from hospitals and medical men. Without exception, in answer to the question, "What are the prevailing diseases among Mohammedans?" the first named was the most loathsome private disease known to the medical profession. In one of these hospitals for the treatment of Mohammedans, the head missionary told me that among those treated for this malady are many of very tender years. When the first of these, a lad of 14, came to the hospital, the physician expressed his surprise, and the boy replied in substance: "I don't believe that you can find a boy

of my age in all —— (mentioning the name of the city) who has not suffered more or less from this disease." The same medical authority said to me (I quote his exact words): "Sodomy also prevails among them to a frightful extent."

It may be true, as is often claimed, that the moral régime which Mohammedanism inaugurated is better than that which it displaced, but this is poor excuse in itself for its continuance. The cancer of Mohammedan civilization cannot be cured, at least by any force within Islam, until the knife is laid at the root of Islam's cancer.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

The Christian Minister and Tobacco.

BY REV. N. I. M. BOGERT, CLOVER HILL, N. J.

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church which met at Portland, Oreg., in 1892, passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this Assembly would, and does, hereby earnestly call the most thoughtful and serious attention of all our ministers and elders and our candidates for the ministry in the academy, college, and seminary to the very apparent propriety and pressing importance of total abstinence from the tobacco habit." (Minutes, p. 217.)

It is understood, of course, that we have here, not the enactment of a prohibitory law, but a strong expression of the sentiment of the General Assembly. Is such an expression wise? Is it demanded by circumstances? No one can ever look upon this highest court of one of our most respected denominations without a profound regard for its intelligence and spiritual worth, and the presumption therefore is that a matter claiming its notice is of much importance. The fact that the conservative American Tract Society publishes a 64-page essay on "The Influence of Tobacco upon Life and Health" strengthens the presumption in favor of the above resolution. If we draw a circle and, for argument's sake, call it now the field of personal liberty, there are two propositions to which all ministers of Christ will give their assent, for they indicate what plainly lies beyond the territory of indifferent things.

1. *No minister of the Gospel has a right to injure his health or impair his higher powers.*

We say "minister," because what is true regarding *every* man is especially true in reference to the preacher of the Gospel. Is any work in the world so important as his? Does any employment require such a splendid condition of the whole man, physical, mental, and moral? The conception and elaboration of sermonic truth, the optimistic view of life, the powerful utterance, the glow of feeling, with an abundance of effort in pulpit and out, and often of the most exhaustive kind, require that one keep himself in the best possible condition. The physical man must therefore be preserved in vigorous health and strength. A full measure of years, with powers unimpaired, should be eagerly sought by the minister of Christ as by no other man. That tobacco may be, and is, often used to the extent of physical injury, to say nothing of harm to the higher powers, no one will deny. Is it ever so used by ministers? The innocence of the question produces a smile. Any minister in middle life, we venture to say, can recall instances in the range of personal acquaintance of those who have injured health, contracted usefulness, and even shortened life by such use. And these instances multiply with increasing years and a wider observation. When needs of the world are so great for all the moral forces that can be secured, is not such a fact lamentably sad, especially if for years, according to the ritual of

their Church, these victims of tobacco have read aloud to the listening congregation every Sabbath morning the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill"?

2. *The other proposition which cannot be denied is that no minister of the Gospel can, without contracting guilt, put himself in bondage to any physical habit.*

Paul, in 1 Cor. vi. 12, says: "All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any," *i.e.*, I will not make myself its slave. Dr. C. Hodge, in his commentary, says with reference to this passage:

"It is of great importance to the moral health of the soul that it should preserve its self-control, and not be in subjection to any appetite or desire, however innocent that desire in itself may be. This is a Scriptural rule which Christians often violate. They are slaves to certain forms of indulgence, which they defend on the ground that they are not in themselves wrong, forgetting that it is wrong to be in bondage to any appetite or habit."

Are ministers ever thus in bondage? Many, alas! are the very slaves of the tobacco habit. Tobacco shows no respect to great minds or noble hearts; it lays hold of *the nervous system*. When the sexton must keep a spittoon in the pulpit, when at the end of the sermon a quid must be taken, or when one cannot sit down in his study without biting off one end of a cigar and putting a match to the other, surely no further evidence of ignoble servitude can be demanded. Even in the schools, before the arena of life is reached, students, as is well known, will grasp hands for mutual assistance on a pledge for a month's abstinence from tobacco. We write from vivid recollection. To show that we are not dreaming here, we will quote from a volume called "Oats and Wild Oats," written by Dr. J. M. Buckley, of the Methodist Church. The author tells us his own experience and says:

"Its (tobacco's) hold can be seen in the fact that of all I have known to try to quit it, very few indeed have succeeded. And I failed more than ten times, and that after solemn pledges to friends before I finally succeeded."

Dr. Talmage writes to young men:

"To get rid of the (tobacco) habit will require a struggle, as I know by bitter experience. Cigars and midnight study nearly put an end to my existence at 25 years of age. I got so I could do no kind of study without a cigar in my mouth—as complete a slave was I as some of you are."

Mr. Chauncey M. Depew at one time smoked 20 cigars a day. When he became convinced that tobacco was ruining him, he determined to abandon it, and gained the victory, but the severity of the struggle may be seen in these words of his: "For three months thereafter I underwent the most awful agony. I never expect to suffer more in this world or in the next."

Wisely indeed did Dr. John Hall answer when asked in his Yale lectures on preaching, Have you any opinion on clerical smoking? "I would advise those who have not become dependent on tobacco to preserve their freedom" (p. 270). Shall a man sharing the anointing of Christ "to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" be himself a hopeless prisoner, in agony at times for the intoxication of nicotin? Can he with any assurance declare that God's spirit and grace can break every yoke so long as he himself remains in fetters? Will not other bondmen, those of alcohol or opium, for instance, reply when they hear the call to freedom, "Physician, heal thyself"?

Let us now, with agreement on the above propositions, enter the field of personal liberty, so-called, to which we referred in the beginning, where the bondage has not as yet begun nor any injury been given to the frame. In this territory is the real arena of discussion. We may remark, in passing, that this boundary line is very much like the equator, which sailors often pass in the night, and therefore do not see.

We remark that even within the indicated bounds—

1. *Many ministers become unfitted for the discharge of several important offices.*

Some of the most delicate tasks of a pastor—I might say his finest work—demands proximity of person. He holds intimate conversations with individuals or with families, when affliction, bereavement, or some other sorrow distresses the heart. He bends over the sick and converses with religious inquirers. Now, shall he mar his welcome and injure his usefulness by an odor of clothing or of breath which is to many—to the ladies for example, and especially to sick ladies—distressing? This case recently came to our notice: A minister was called in to see a sick woman. When the latter was asked after a while whether she would like another visit, she replied; "No, don't send for him; I cannot endure his breath." This consideration of unfitness induced has, as we know, led some to give up tobacco.

2. *The "body is the temple of the Holy Ghost," and we should keep it pure.*

Some may object to this point, denying that it is relevant to the subject. We admit the delicacy we feel here, and content ourselves with quoting from a sermon by that grand man, President Mark Hopkins, who bore the title of M.D. as well as D.D.:

"It is said that a German professor can soak his system in lager beer and saturate it with tobacco and be as profound a student and live as long as he would otherwise. Be it so. The question here is not that. It is on a higher plane. It is whether he can do these things and consecrate his body, as he might otherwise, to be a temple of the Holy Ghost. A temple may stand as long as it would otherwise and be as strong, and yet be *defiled*. It is of defilement rather than of impaired strength that a temple is in danger, and he who would hold his body as a temple must study and heed in its broadest import the injunction, 'Keep thyself pure.'"

He adds further on:

"Let me say, therefore, to those who expect to be ministers, that I believe that sermons, even those called great sermons, which are the product of alcoholic or narcotic stimulation are a service of God by 'strange fire,' and that for men to be scrupulous about their attire as clerical and yet to enter upon religious services with narcotized bodies and a breath that 'smells to heaven' of anything but incense, is an incongruity and an offense, a cropping out of the old Pharisaism that made clean 'the outside of the cup and the platter.' Not that abstinence has merit or secures consecration. It is only its best condition."

3. *The example of the tobacco-using minister is injurious.*

He is a man of education and of moral worth. A knowledge of the laws of health, refinement of manner, tenderness of heart, and, above all, high conscientiousness are so many strong cords to hold him within certain limits, and often sucessfully; but multitudes about him, who observe his habits and hear his voice, do not have these restraints. Many are ignorant, rude, without any culture, even of the heart, and they often wallow in the very filth of tobacco. Shall we by our example encourage others, and especially the young, to do what in their case, if not in ours, will, in many instances, work harm? Does not Paul's declaration, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend," apply here?

Thus, in the sphere of the lawful, so-called, do not the considerations of unfitness, in part, for the discharge of important duties, the defilement of the temple of the body, and the baneful influence of example indicate an expediency which has the grip of a moral principle? And it may be said also, dropping now all moral considerations—

1. *None are so independent of this source of good (so called) as the minister of Christ.*

No class of men are so broad in their culture and sympathies. God's thoughts thrill their souls. God's spirit dwells in them in large measure. Here is exhilaration. (See sermon by F. W. Robertson on "Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit.") All literature, nature, art, refined society, and noble af-

fections minister to the joy of the preacher of the Gospel. He ranges through the eternities, and the universe is his home. He knows not "the formidable curse of 'tœdium vitæ,'" of which poor De Quincey speaks. He needs not "an artificial state of pleasurable excitement," as the renowned opium-eater thought he did.

2. *No one should be so devoted to the natural, in the true sense of the word, as the Christian minister.*

He who preeminently stands close to the God of nature should, above all others, it is evident, be a friend to nature. He ponders the divine wisdom in the natural world. He often declares the sad fact of human life, that it is unnatural, abnormal, fallen away from its original constitution. By him, then, natural stimulation by proper food, exercise, and sleep should be sought rather than the artificial. To him God's way is ever better than man's. God-given appetites are enough. Human nature has all that it can do (and, alas! too often more) to govern aright its wild horses, the natural appetites, without making the problem of life more difficult by adding the artificial—a new world of appetite to conquer. Hannah More has well written:

"To acknowledge that we find it hard to serve God as we ought, and yet to be systematically indulging habits which must naturally increase the difficulty, makes our character almost ridiculous, while it renders our duty almost impracticable. The determined Christian becomes his own pioneer; he makes his path easy by voluntarily clearing it of the obstacles which impede his progress."

Besides, nature tells us that the saliva has an important office in connection with our food and should not be ejected from the mouth; that inhalation should be by the nostrils, not by the mouth; and of fresh air, not of smoke. The senses should be kept keen for the odor of God's flowers and the taste of God's fruits. Wives and mothers need a sedative as much as any man who may toil with hand or brain, but the sharp line between the sexes in the use of tobacco shows how artificial, superficial, and therefore unnecessary the whole business is.

We conclude, therefore, that the resolution of the General Assembly with which we began is a wise and necessary one. No doubt nine-tenths of what is seen in ministerial life here is the fruit of early habit formed before the ministry was contemplated, before, perhaps, grace touched the heart. As the iceberg floats down to the tropics, so early habits are often carried into the ministerial career. The resolution, therefore, speaks of "the academy" as well as "the college and seminary," and so intimates that the early and formative period of life should be guarded. Here is the real battle-ground, where the surest victories may be achieved. Mr. Beecher once wrote: "I rejoice to say that I was brought up from my youth to abstain from tobacco. It is unhealthy, it is filthy from beginning to end." We venture the assertion that every other minister who has been thus by a father's example and counsel shielded from the evil of tobacco remembers the unspeakable good done him all his days. Good Dr. Miller, of Princeton Seminary, in his "Letters on Clerical Manners," pleads earnestly on this subject. He begs his "Student" not to touch tobacco and says:

"I beseech you, my young friend, not to disregard this advice. Rely on it, if you are so happy as to escape the thraldom which the odious vegetable in question has imposed upon millions, you will rejoice in it as long as you live."

We believe that the ideal and ultimate character and equipment of the Christian minister will show, with many other features, of course, an elimination of both stimulants and narcotics. Let none despair, thinking the standard beyond reach. See the advance as to stimulants since the early days of Dr. Goodell (Memoirs by E. D. G. Prime, D.D., pp. 20, 21), when the pastor in his visits felt compelled to drink or give offense, until his head became

affected and he was in danger of saying or doing some foolish thing. When do we now hear of the presentation of a gold snuff-box, a thing common in the days of Jackson and Webster? Already the Methodist Episcopal Church requires of its ministers that they "wholly abstain from the use of tobacco." The Government schools at West Point and Annapolis forbid the use of the weed, to make better soldiers and sailors, and why should not the beneficiaries of our boards of education be required to abstain as thereby securing, in one respect, the best condition for success and preserving from waste the money given for a definite and sacred purpose?

We sincerely hope that the time may speedily come when all our teachers of the young in school, college, and seminary will, by example and precept, help to raise up a non-tobacco-using ministry.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

Bishop Moorhouse and Sermonettes.

WHEN the late Dr. Guard entered upon his pastorate in Baltimore, he advertised his people that he should preach no sermonettes, and nobody ever desired him to do so. Bishop Moorhouse seems to forget that all Gospel preachers are not burdened with an almost interminable liturgy, such is exhausting to both preacher and hearer before the sermon is reached. An Episcopal rector recently said to me that the reading of his "service" required fully an hour, and that, however it might be with his audience, before the sermon was reached he at least was quite tired out. It is easy enough to understand that, under such circumstances, a 20-minute sermon, especially if a poor one, would be a godsend, or on a hot day. In case, however, one's introductory be but 15 minutes, a 20-minute sermon would bring the whole service within the limit of 35 or 40 minutes—obviously ridiculously brief. Meantime, sometimes other than a liturgical service is burdened with an unnecessarily lengthy introductory. If, besides the reading of a responsive psalm, two chapters from the Bible are read and the "long" prayer is literally so long as to lull a congregation to sleep, or the choir seeks to entertain the hearer by rendering not less than four set pieces of one sort and another, it is not difficult, we admit, to realize the eminent fitness of a 20-minute sermon. But where the introductory portion of the service occupies no more than 25 or 30 minutes, leading up naturally to the sermon—assuming the latter to be thoughtful and fervent, a real message and not simply a homily, an essay, or a rehash of doctrinal platitudes—30, 40, or 45 minutes can hardly be deemed unreasonably long for the discourse. Even then the entire service may be brought within the limit of 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Of course the proper length of the sermon must be estimated somewhat by the place the latter occupies in the Church service. If to the liturgy be assigned the first place, as doubtless Bishop Moorhouse holds it should, then the latter is consistent enough in advocating that the sermon, recognized as only a sort of adjunct or appendage to the liturgy, should be brief—the briefer the better. Our non-liturgical Churches, however, on the other hand, proceeding upon the assumption that the factor of worship should be made subsidiary to the preaching of the Gospel, and realizing that the power and success of their religious service depend chiefly on the pulpit, naturally assign not only a large but the chief place in religious exercises to the sermon. Within the limit prescribed by the Bishop, in the

estimation of the average Gospel minister, time is afforded only for a brief explication of the text and a still briefer appeal. Preceded by a praise and followed by what we Methodists call an "altar service," or an "inquiry meeting," such a discourse were admirably adapted to the Sunday evening meeting. But in 20 minutes, plainly no great practical spiritual truth can ever be unfolded, applied, enforced; nor within that time could the average speaker's faculties become fully roused. Shut up to such a limit, who would have ever heard of Simpson, Spurgeon, Durbin, Punshon, or Robert Hall? The late Dr. Daniel Curry once said that the preacher who, other things equal, could not interest an audience 45 minutes, had obviously mistaken his calling. Meanwhile, suppose, by way of variety, some of the strictures ordinarily devoted to long sermons as the cause of tediously protracted religious or Church services be directed to long prayers, long lessons, long ceremonies, long voluntaries, and long-winded pulpit notices.

R. H. Howard.

Newton Lower Falls, Mass.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

The Indian Question.

By Chaplain C. C. Bateman, U. S. A., Fort Assiniboine, Mont.

A residence of more than 30 years west of the Missouri River, 20 years of which time being spent in the Pacific States and Territories, may have given the writer of this article some knowledge of Indians and Indian affairs. His information was gained in part by actual official service on two Indian reservations. He is more or less familiar with the character and customs of ten tribes inhabiting the far West.

The views herein set forth are not, I fear, those commonly held by readers of the "Leather-Stocking Tales." Cooper's ideal Indians I have never encountered.

In the year 1878, Shelden & Co., of New York, published a book entitled "The Indian Question," by Lieut.-Col. Elwell S. Otis, an officer of the regular army. The author is to-day no less a personage than the Brigadier-General commanding the military department of the Columbia, including the Pacific Northwest. The book did not strike a popular chord—it was too true to be popular, and is now out of print. But its doctrines are known to embody the highest wisdom in a setting of unanswerable argument. Truth always burns through to daylight, though ever so deeply covered by the rubbish of antiquated opinion and prejudice.

When the Indian is the subject under consideration, not a few prefer poetry to hard fact and plain prose. There are no flights of fancy in the work referred to, but its premises and conclusions remain unshaken in the minds of those who are acquainted with the American savage.

The history of our "Indian policy" is a record of lamentable blunders. To have ever conceded a national status to roaming barbarous tribes was a colossal legal mistake. There is not, and there never was, a tribe of savages on the continent possessed of the elements of national solidarity. We have for a century treated with chiefs who in turn were unable to hold their followers to the fulfilment of stipulations.

No Indian father exercises control over a son after the latter is strong enough to draw a man's bow or shoulder a rifle. Parental government is a thing unknown to the domestic life of our uncivilized aborigines. The redoubtable chieftain is not altogether master in his own tepee; how, then,

may he be expected to bind the consciences of a tribe to the faithful performance of a covenant? In reading Parkman, no conviction has forced itself so strongly upon me as that the Indian has received more credit than was his just due. This "child of nature" overran primeval America for ages. All the resources were here under his feet and about his dwelling. What use did he make of them? It required from 6,000 acres to 50,000 acres per Indian to supply the game upon which he subsisted.

He left the soil untilled, the forest uncleared, the mines unworked, the cataracts unharnessed. He had proved himself an unprofitable steward of the richest estates ever spread out to the conquest and cultivation of man.

Canaan was a land flowing with milk and honey while the natives still possessed it undisturbed. Were the Canaanites worthy of such a country? Clearly they were not. An inferior race, devoid of genius, incapable of noble ideas, institutions of enlightenment, and national progress, it was in the providence of God that the land should be given to another people. God has not allowed peoples to abuse their privilege beyond a certain point.

This should have been the first lesson taught the Indian: that the European had come to share with him these neglected lands; and that he was to adjust himself to new conditions, joining with a brother in the enjoyment of the arts of peace. Ah, we were not brave and humane enough to announce such doctrines and stand by them!

Instead, we fed and flattered him into the belief that he was a nation; that he owned the land; that the timber, mines, and rivers were his. We confessed to ourselves and to him that we had come to steal his country; we still confess that we are a nation of thieves. A Christian race pleading guilty to the gigantic crime of stealing a hemisphere!

The truth lies in an opposite direction. When the Indian failed to use the country's resources for purposes of good he forfeited his title to this eminent domain, and henceforth he was a man without a country. To regain any part of his lost heritage, he must consent to develop it. We purchased of him what he had no right to sell; we pandered to his inordinate self-esteem. He boasted that he was a great man, and we agreed with him most perfectly.

That it should have required numerous and bloody wars to convince him that he was not the superior man he had imagined himself to be seems not strange in the light of all we had by implication taught him.

Our Indian wars have cost, in round numbers, the stupendous sum of $500,000,000, and necessitate still the maintenance of numerous and expensive garrisons on the frontier. The number of Indians killed in these wars has been usually exaggerated. From 1778 to 1878, a period including all our notable armed struggles, about 8,000 Indians fell in battle with the whites—some say not over 6,000. The Indian's antagonist has suffered far greater losses. The compensation for the Indian's property confiscated or destroyed has been munificent.

We are reminded, now and again, that the Indian is fast dying out. What are the facts? It is believed by many whose views are entitled to respect that there are living in this year of grace nearly or quite as many natives as were in existence when Columbus first landed at San Salvador.

Inter-tribal wars always kept the Indian population sparse; many of these were most destructive, and wiped out large villages. It is true some tribes have become extinct since the advent of the white man, but there are several tribes which enroll a greater number than at any previous period. During the past decade there has been an appreciable increase. The present policy of massing tribes on large reservations is one fraught with evil, in that it gives duration to the *blanket age*.

The Indian is somehow to be evolved

out of the age of the blanket and tepee. On large reservations, far removed from localities where the home-life and industries of our people may be best observed, the conditions are found for the perpetuation of tribal peculiarities and customs.

Here, also, race hatreds are nurtured and murders planned. I recall the possible peril which surrounded an agent and his small group of officials upon a reservation where hundreds of Indians were congregated during the progress of the Modoc War, in the autumn and winter of 1872–73. The reservation was little more than 200 miles from the Lava Beds, the scene of conflict. I recall the insolence of the Indians whom we were feeding fast and full, according to official instructions from Washington, to keep them quiet, and how each employee went about his daily duties with nerves strung to the snapping tension, but determined, should the worse befall, to sell his life as dearly as possible. The gleam of the signal-fires along the mountain sides, which finally told the reservation Indians of General Canby's death, and set them laughing in undisguised satisfaction among themselves, is still vivid in memory.

It is, therefore, with an emphasis begotten of personal experience that the following paragraph is quoted from the book by General Otis: "The dimensions of reservations should be determined by calculations based upon some opinion regarding agricultural demands according to the number of proposed occupants. Large tribes ought to be divided as to residence. Experience proves that small tribes are more susceptible of improvement than those which are numerous, after both have been located. An aggregate of 1,000 or 1,500 souls collected upon a single reservation exacts the entire time and ability of the faithful agent and his corps of assistants. Small bodies are also more easily tranquilized and influenced in all respects than great ones. The attempt to collect large masses upon the reservations in the Northwest and control them efficiently has resulted in disaster, because of continued agitation and turbulence thereby rather provoked than allayed. Agents could do little more than feed them, and if a portion reached a well-considered intention to locate and till the soil, the opposition was too strong to allow of its execution. Those reservations became nurseries for treasonable projects and criminal designs. Pampered indolence indulged in licentious debauchery and all those vices in which depraved barbarous nature takes delight. The agent was at the mercy of his savage people. His safety consisted in the fact that he was the dispenser of Government bounties, and therefore profit insured his preservation.

The policy of allotting to tribes vast tracts of country, in remote regions, only to take the same from them when civilization shall have reached those parts, is a national disgrace. When these lands are required for actual settlement, a commission is appointed who re-enact that childish but expensive play of "trading back." There has been such a commission at work very recently, and representative Indians have paid numerous visits to Washington in order to interview the "Great Father" concerning their real or imaginary wrongs. Prodigal in the use of money, with no real appreciation of property value, they will for a trifle dispose of to individuals that which the Government would purchase at a handsome price. No tribe was ever entirely satisfied with the result of any trade whatsoever.

Touching this phase of the Indian question, I have clipped the following editorial paragraph from a well-known Western newspaper:

"It is but natural that the Indian, in his supersensitive dread of being cheated at the hands of the white man, should flock to Washington whenever a question that interests him comes up; but it is a fact, none the less, that more

good could be accomplished by keeping the ceaseless procession of Indian lobbyists and attorneys at home. In the case of the Kiowas, Comanches, and Apaches, who have petitioned against the opening of the Fort Sill country, there is a well-defined suspicion that they are actuated by the interests of the cattlemen as much as by their own. Secretary Smith has promised these tribes that they will be protected in their lease until the sale of the lands is ratified, but Congress can hardly be expected to annul the whole treaty and keep 3,000,000 acres of fertile land unopened on any such grounds as those set forth in the petition."

The tens of thousands of dollars of public funds expended upon several contract schools, which have been of little real service to the Indian, might have been more wisely used in the purchase of small fertile reservations in the heart of highly civilized and thrifty communities. Upon these, divisions of large tribes should long ago have been placed and set to work. The contract-school system has in not a few instances proved a grave disappointment in quantity and quality of results. The policy of appropriating funds from the Federal treasury for the support, in whole or in part, of sectarian schools among the Indians is one so clearly opposed to the genius of our civil institutions that its discontinuance cannot come too soon. Most of the large religious bodies have signified their disinclination to receive further aid from public funds. The Baptists have been conspicuous always for their consistent course in opposition to sectarian contract schools. The Catholics, who receive very large subsidies, are as consistently opposed to relinquishing any customary claim upon the national coffers. With a few notable exceptions, the Government schools, free from every species of sectarianism, are incomparably superior to those of the contract system.

There is hope, large hope, for Indian youth, but chiefly through a consistent policy of segregation from the parent mass. The experiment, on trial during recent years, of making soldiers of superfluous able-bodied Indians has practically ended in failure. The uneducated Indian cannot be satisfactorily disciplined as a regular soldier. He is a born savage, not a born soldier. Take from him his liberty to roam, and he will either mutiny at an unexpected time or sink into hopeless or sullen inaction, a prey to the most violent form of nostalgia.

A homesick Indian is about the most woe-begone human specimen yet catalogued. Before, however, the present policy of the War Department to abolish the companies of regular Indian soldiers shall have been fully carried into effect, I hope to see an experiment made which, it seems to me, is worth trying. It is noticed that the discontented Indians in barracks are the more stupid, illiterate ones. Why could not the places of these men be filled by the brightest and best young Indians, who are year by year completing the course of study in the Government schools? This policy would provide positions for a number who are confronted with the grave question on leaving school, "What am I to do?" These Indian youths cannot be left to lapse into the old life of the blanket. To be sure, many will be urged and helped to engage in agricultural pursuits. Some are carpenters, some brick and stone masons, but when the jobs are all manned, there still remains an overplus of unused force.

I have known some of the brightest youngsters to become first-class gamblers, largely because there seemed to be no place to put them. It is simply out of the question to think that the Government can prepare Indians for the learned professions. Such a policy would be an unfair discrimination against the whites and blacks of the country. The Government might place a few hundred vacancies in the file of the regular army at the disposal of the Indian schools as special rewards for

proficiency. Indeed, it was currently reported during the year 1893 that one class of Indian school "graduates" petitioned to be admitted as privates into the army, upon the ground that they could not return to the old life on the reservation without much loss, and there were no positions open to them among white people, with whom they wished to reside in future.

Social sorrows fall heavily upon a race in its transition period. We wish to care for the Indian; in our desire to do so we create in him a dependent spirit. He knows we will not allow him to starve, hence he will lazily rely upon our bounty. If we are a little slow in securing to him his weekly rations, he knows well how to hasten matters. A "row in camp," mutterings against the "dishonest agent," the killing unlawfully of a few head of cattle off the reservation, an insolent remark that "some Injuns go on warpath"—these gentle reminders bring the rations, and possibly an order removing the agent "for cause."

No philosopher has yet found a solution to the Indian problem; but it is within the truth to assert that nowadays it is the white man who is the one imposed upon. Policies of the immediate future, howsoever wisely conceived, may scarcely be expected to wholly correct the evils which are incident to and have grown up about the Indian question.

It is well always to remember that an Indian's testimony may sadly substitute wants for needs. Good and faithful agents have been sacrificed by official decapitation and newspaper condemnation because they recognized the Indian's needs, but refused to entertain voluble statements of his wants. I have heard Indians argue their wants with such vehemence as would do credit to a criminal lawyer skilled in the art of making the lesser appear the greater reason.

Exact justice is to be done the Indian, the officials who directly control him, and the Government which supports him. Any act which discriminates against either of these three parties postpones the day of equitable adjustment.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A Drawing Preacher or a Holding Church?

It is said that Dr. Henry Van Dyke, of New York, was at one time requested to recommend to a wealthy church a preacher who would *draw*, and that he replied: "What you want is a church that will *hold*. You haven't got it. Twenty congregations have passed through your church in the last twenty years, and they have passed through because you have not had a church that will hold. . . . Success depends not half so much upon the minister as upon you, the church."

There is more than a little truth in the reply, as it has a general application. The preacher's function is not that of drawing or that of holding; it is that of preaching, and that alone. His mind is not to be taken up with distracting anxiety as to how to get men to come to him. His absorbing thought should be to present the truth so as to get men to come to Christ. The preacher who is an adept at "drawing" congregations is, in ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred, a failure at winning souls. Unconsciously it may be, yet too surely, he yields to the temptation of tickling ears rather than fulfilling his obligation of touching hearts. This, we say, is almost invariably true of one who thinks much about "drawing." But it is equally true that he who, possessing average ability and making a consecrated use of it in the study of the Word, of nature, of providence, and of man, gives himself to the work of winning souls, will be a drawing preacher.

At the same time, it is in the power of a Church to do either of two things with those who are drawn to it: to thaw them in or to freeze them out. We say

"thaw them in," that is, by manifestation of a truly Christian love, move them to a more and more complete identification of themselves with the Church in its various expressions of life and activity. Love on the part of the people more than the eloquence of the pastor will hold a congregation together, while, on the contrary, indifference and coldness on the part of the people, despite all the ability shown in the pulpit, will serve to dissipate any congregation.

The Roman Catholic Church and the Liquor Traffic.

The decision of the Papal Delegate, Satolli, in supporting the position of Bishop Watterson with reference to the expulsion of liquor dealers from membership in Catholic societies will be hailed by evangelical Christians everywhere with great satisfaction and delight. The fact that so large a proportion of those engaged in the nefarious traffic have their membership in the Romish Church, and, despite the iniquity of their business, have hitherto been permitted to enjoy all the offices of that Church, renders this decision one of momentous significance. It brings the Papacy into accord on this question with the majority of our Potestant denominations, many of which have long since taken similar action. When it is definitely settled that there is no ecclesiastical refuge for men who seek to enrich themselves at the cost of their neighbors' degradation and pauperization, it can hardly be questioned that many will be deterred from entering upon this business, and some, at least, who are in it will forsake it. That enlightened Christian sentiment is almost unanimously opposed to it as a mighty enemy of the general weal will tend to make men think twice before adopting it as a means of livelihood. The great Roman Church has never been regarded as "cranky" upon any question of public morals, and this action will not be regarded as the outcome of a spasmodic enthusiasm or fanaticism, but of a deliberate conviction which has come to stay. "The morning cometh!" It will yet be seen that Rum and Romanism are not inseparably joined together. The statement, apparently official, that the Pope has determined to make Satolli sovereign in ecclesiastical matters in America, following, as it does, immediately upon this important decision, seems to indicate that the Supreme Pontiff is in sympathy with his representative's views and is ready to support them.

It is gratifying to note the agitation and alarm expressed in the leading organs of the liquor traffic. It is the best of indications that the Delegate's "fulmination" is regarded as something more than thunder. There is considerable lightning in it. By the confession of *The Wine and Spirit Gazette*, "the strict enforcement of this decree would be a severer blow to the liquor trade than anything the Prohibition cranks and the cold-water fanatics have accomplished within the last 40 years."

Suppression of Lotteries.

All friends of morality will sincerely rejoice in the action of the present Congress looking to the suppression of lottery traffic through national and international commerce and the postal service subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the United States. By this action "any person who, within the jurisdiction and subject to the laws of the United States, shall contrive, propose, set up, or draw a lottery, so-called gift concern, or similar enterprise offering prizes dependent upon lot or chance, or assist in such contriving, proposing, setting up, or drawing, in any place within the jurisdiction and subject to the laws of the United States, and who, from any place whatever, whether within or without such jurisdiction, shall cause to be sold, transferred, or delivered within any place, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the United States, and who shall cause to be brought within any place subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the United States from abroad, or deposited or carried by the mails of the United States, or carried from one State to another in the United States, any paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of such lottery, so-called gift concern, or similar enterprise offering prizes dependent upon lot or chance, or shall cause any advertisement of such lottery, so-called gift concern, or similar prize enterprise offering prizes dependent upon lot or chance, to be brought into the United States or deposited in or carried by the mails of the United States, or transferred from one State to another in the same, shall be guilty of a felony, and be punishable in the first offense by imprisonment for not more than two years or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both, and in the second and after offenses by imprisonment only."

Printed in the United States.